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Abstract
Elizabeth Ellsworth asked, “How does the fact of human embodiment affect activities of teaching and learning?” (2005, p. 2). I explored an expanded understanding beyond ‘what counts’ as literacy that exceeds the outcome-based approach of the New London Group (1996), to look closely at children’s embodied, affective ways of knowing. I examined the quality of participants’ exchanges and overall experiences as they continued to produce exciting affects, which generated new affects and intensities. I retraced participants’ interactions and productions of varied affects produced during interactions with other humans and non-humans, which played important, pivotal roles in participants’ interactions in an after-school space. In an era where standardized testing often privileges outcome-based learning and ignores individuals’ affective responses to their environment, play-oriented events may be discouraged in school spaces, yet demand a role in children’s development.
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Chapter One: Introduction

As an adolescent, I made and sold my own beaded and sculpted clay jewelry. I spent hours molding and baking colorful clay beads and stringing necklaces, bracelets and earrings, which I sold at a local bakery and the craft bazaar at my childhood church. I loved everything about creating and stringing beads, and I still enjoy beadwork, although my work now is much different from my earlier work. Twenty-something years later, during the summer after my first year of graduate studies at Penn State, I was introduced to cultural beading practices during a class called “Exploring indigenous ways of knowing among the Ojibwe.” Many Ojibwe showed their exquisite beadwork to us, and I found their work so beautiful, that I wanted to learn how to bead in my own way. The following image shows an example of Mel Losh’s fastidious beadwork on a buckskin pipe bag and a bandolier bag. Losh carefully plans and implements beaded designs with very little space between each bead, a sign of an expert bead artist. Losh’s work is owned by many private collectors, but is also on display at The Minnesota Historical Society, The Plaines Art Museum and the Smithsonian Institute. Losh is also known for his beautiful porcupine quill baskets and for his signature ladybug.
Figure 1: Beaded pipe bag (left), Beaded bandolier bag (right) by Mel Losh. Courtesy Kevin Slivka.
Like many doctoral candidates in Language, Culture and Society, my initial focus was on children’s practices in and out of school that can easily be identified as literacy. After returning from the trip to Minnesota, I began to think about how Ojibwe beading practices could be considered as a literacy practice, an expression of story and community or individual meaning and a communication of important values and events. Continuing to draw inspiration from artists’ beadwork, I began to gather resources to learn about various historical and contemporary cultural beading practices. I taught myself a variety of contemporary beading techniques using Internet videos and “how to” descriptions. I also began to consider how beadwork could be brought into school curriculum as a way for children to both participate in this artistic form and to communicate their own identities and concerns.

To consider beading through the lens of literacy is to recognize it as a form of making and communicating meaning. Through its 1996 “A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies,” the New London Group opened the door for a radical broadening of what counts as “literacy.” The authors of *A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies* have developed two overarching arguments. The first argument referred to multiple modes of information presentation and integration and showed connections among visual, textual and behavioral understandings. The second argument referred to the ways that “multiliteracies” attend to the member-diversity of a global society. The authors proposed six design elements that impact participants’ creations of meaning, which include Linguistic Meaning, Visual Meaning, Audio Meaning, Gestural Meaning, Spatial Meaning, and Multimodal ways of knowing that integrate the five previous modes. The authors suggest that meaning making may take place through Situated Practice, where participants engage in practical learning.
scenarios, and real-world skills. Overt Instruction is a way for instructors to collaboratively scaffold learning activities through metalanguages, which serve to explain form, content and function of the language in use. Critical Framing illustrates the ways that participants interpret and understand the social and historical contexts of practice. Transformed Practice accounts for the transfer of information in participants’ meaning-making efforts.

The International Multiliteracies Project was created to continue the work begun in *A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies*. Multiliteracies can serve as powerful literacy vehicles because they can engage participants in ways that are relevant to their pre-existing, co-constructed social realities (Alvermann, 2008; Gee, 2003; Sanford & Madill, 2007). Various compilations and means of representation can support comprehension through interwoven layers of information found in images, video, sound, or text when blended, where modes of learning share equal importance. New literacies also facilitate socio-cultural communications with other individuals in various ways, synchronously (e.g., verbal/moving image/written communication during multiplayer online games) or asynchronously, (e.g., email, instant messaging, etc.). Use of multiple modes of learning can highlight participants’ various strengths, de-center the authority of traditional printed texts and the instructor, empower the individual and foster participants’ agency; “to assume responsibility for the attainment of cognitive goals,” (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 2008, p. 71). Semali (2001, 2003) called for the use of new literacies in classrooms, and for critical examination of texts, images and films to potentially encourage participants to think even more critically when confronted with an increasing sea of media.
Alternative literacies offered diverse entry points to participate in critical thinking and discussion, as well as opportunities to use various forms of digital media. Pitcher, Albright, DeLaney, and Walker (2007) argued that digital media, when compared to traditional forms of literature, have potential to be highly motivating to users. Pitcher et al. explained, “Using adolescents’ preferred reading materials and modes of instruction will lead to increased motivation, and perhaps to improvements in reading outcomes” (p. 378). While this may enhance the learning experience for some participants, others may prefer alternate learning experiences based on personal preferences, which may not involve digital media.

In the fall of 2011, I drew on my understanding of “A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies” to begin to explore doing beadwork with children at Digital Learning Center (DLC) School, a local, public charter school for 5th – 8th graders. I offered a class with a focus on fibers, beading, needlework and other techniques. In the early stages of this project, I imagined that I would inquire into participants’ beaded and written constructions of gender and identity. I asked participants to represent their ideas, identities, and feelings or desires in multiple ways, sometimes verbally, and other times, in the ways that they approached embodied activities through alternative art and craft forms such as sewing and cutting cloth, as well as beading. For example, I provided examples of my beadwork and library books with pictures of expert beadwork and beadwork created around the world. In response, one participant explained that she used blue and gold beads to represent clouds in the sky, which she explained, are colors that represent happiness.
However, things did not go as I expected. From very early on, I struggled to keep the children focused on identity communicating work. It became difficult to discern whether participants worked to meet the requirements of an assignment. I began to wonder if my expectations that ideas or identities were expressed in such self-conscious and overtly representational ways were adequate to understand what was happening. If I focused only on moments where I could identify a clearly expressed emotion or identity, I had to ignore much of what was happening in the time together and it very often seemed beside the point of what mattered to the students. My understanding of where I should focus my efforts and attention on student activity began to change and I began to notice two things. The first was that as much or more than anything else that was going on, the children were excited and engaged by the constant fueling of social interactions during the beadwork, particularly in the form of quick witted banter and all different kinds of play, particularly those that elicited laughter. For example, the girls repeatedly played a chasing game that involved singing and acting out the following lyrics; “I am a little green monster, monster, I come from a little green world. I am a little green monster and I eat people who hurl. Blah!” Then both the “monster” and the “prey” enjoyed the fun of chasing each other around the room, usually resulting in the “monster” catching and tickling the “prey.”

The second thing I noticed was that the children were only somewhat, if at all, interested in the kind of direct or obvious representations of identity I was asking for. Rather, they seemed more excited to create wearable items that often became gifts to give to each other such as friendship bracelets or as they acquired additional beading skills, beaded friendship bracelets and other small beaded items such as earrings or rings that
took little time to create. They also moved beyond the limitations presented by beads and involved wider varieties of materials, incorporating duct tape wallets and sewn articles into their repertoires. Additionally, they engaged in all sorts of playful activities, constantly modifying their contributions to try to generate a high level of excitement.

After four months, I made the decision to abandon the focus on direct expressions of identity and instead to begin to ask myself what it was that the children were doing. In other words, my study went from my attempt to control what the children would produce to asking myself what, if given materials and latitude, would emerge. This was a risky move, because it took the study farther afield from being obviously identifiable as literacy. However, as Leander and Boldt (2013) argue, there is much for literacy researchers to learn by following what is emergent in a situation. I made the decision to set aside my anxiety over the question, “How is this literacy?” and to instead, participate in and follow what was emerging in the classroom, and then ask the question, “How does this help us to think about literacy?” That is a question I will address in the conclusion to this dissertation.

The change in my focus, practically, meant that how I set up and worked with the students changed. In order to encourage attendance and participation in my study, I asked the participants for ideas for materials that they would like to use, and then I purchased these materials each week to support the kinds of projects that they wished to make. Some of the materials that they requested included hot pink sparkly tulle for a tutu, red and blue glass beads and duct tape. When I brought the materials that they requested, they eagerly, feverishly began or continued to work on their projects. Aria draped and redraped the pink tulle around her body before deciding to continue to work on her tulle
project at home. After missing several weeks of our class, Betsy returned to our class to find her red beads, and she exclaimed how pretty she thought they were before she remembered that she requested those beads. She immediately began to string the red beads. The girls were attracted to the duct tape like magnets to metal, and created different projects including wallets, earrings and bracelets. I served to support them in their activity, gathering additional materials that they requested or helping them to solve problems. The more that I supported the participants with materials for the projects that they designed, participants began to more regularly attend my elective after school class, and additional participants joined the group. By the end of the study, we had more participation than ever before.

The Digital Learning Center charter school is a unique setting that allowed me to pursue a study that allowed children to work in exploratory rather than obviously product or goal oriented ways. DLC approached curriculum with a focus on technology and “real-world,” project-based learning. Students enjoyed exploratory, hands-on opportunities to conduct research in inquiry projects and create presentations in various content areas. For example, eighth grade students were charged with creating recumbent bicycles made from two regular bicycles. Fifth and sixth-grade students also conducted research on several topics and then presented their research to the larger education community. DLC also offered a free, elective after-school program with different offerings that students could sign in and out of as they wished. This after-school program was the framework for my beading study, which was one of the classes offered after school. Some of the other after-school choices were active games, a place to work on homework, drama club and several other choices. Additionally, the after-school teachers held great interest in each
unique offering. Each choice offered opportunities for students to explore and investigate a variety of interests.

Although I led both an in-school specials beading class and an after school beading class, for this study, I have elected data from the after school beading class because the data that I was able to collect was richer due to the more open-ended nature of the after-school class. The in-school specials class informed the after-school class because I learned about what interested the students and found that the students produced interesting material without teacher direction in an elective space. The children could attend any after-school elective, signing in or out of class at any time, which influenced who chose to attend my after-school class. The majority of my participants were girls, and most of the time, only girls attended my class. Lisa, one of the participants, explained that she liked our class because only girls attended. Most of the participants were fifth and sixth grade girls that attended in large part to spend time with friends.

It is not uncommon for researchers to explore out-of-school spaces in which multiple kinds of activities occur in order to further understand how children’s desires and interests relate to in-school practices, (Leander & Boldt, 2013; Moje & Tysvaer, 2010; Teitle, 2012; Springgay, 2008). Leander and Boldt (2013) argue, studying children in out of school time may allow us to see things that might be harder to recognize in a school setting and may allow us to wonder what is being missed when our understandings of literate practices function as too determining an analytic frame. With this in mind, I was able to begin attending to what, given particular materials in a particular setting, children would do. My question shifted from, “How do I make beading mean something?” to “What does beading in this particular setting with these particular people
do?” As I will describe in what follows, four major understandings emerged from this new way of observing and participating. 1) I began to attend to the specificity of beading itself; 2) I began to recognize the amodal nature of what the participants were doing; and 3) I began to recognize and appreciate the significance of the role that movement and 4) affect played in the classroom. I will introduce these below and explore them in greater depths in the following chapters.

**The Specificity of Beading**

Although I was no longer focused on using beading to communicate identity or to represent literacy in a direct or obvious way, the focus on beading continued to provide a touchstone both for the participants’ activities and my observations. The centrality of beading, established through the materials and examples provided and the force of my own work and passions, meant that some things happened and other things did not. Beading composed the class in a very particular way. For example, studying participants’ interactions with beads and other materials allowed me to notice the children’s interactions with colors, shapes and textures that I might not otherwise notice if I strictly studied their reading behaviors. Participants experienced important interactions not only with the visual characteristics of materials, but also with the smell and feel of the materials.

Most of the beads that we worked with were smooth on all sides, and some participants found them pleasing to the touch. Creating jewelry with prefabricated glass beads also negated the need for heating elements to fuse glass or metal, which made beads an ideal material to distribute and transport easily. We were able to work just about anywhere, moving to a new space on short notice, and at the children’s request, we even
worked outside. However, when we worked outside, the wind blew some of our beads around, which forced participants to stabilize and protect their piles of beads. Materials influenced the children’s decisions to participate as well as interactions between individuals, for example, in their willingness to share or not share materials. Children’s interactions with materials allowed me to notice different ways that we are affected and embodied.

Individuals brought a variety of skill levels and background experiences in art and craft, affecting both their abilities and interest in doing beadwork. Participants’ interests, desires, and varying needle-and-thread abilities influenced what was possible for participants to produce, so I asked them to develop their own ideas for self-selected projects. In other words, both proficiency and lack of proficiency with the skills needed to bead gave rise to what else happened in the class. Some of the participants designed loomed projects, and others studied and interacted with materials without generating formal projects. Although I struggled with this at first, I gradually let go of my desire for an outcome-based approach, and instead, privileged the participants’ desires.

For example, Lily brought prior knowledge of sewing techniques to the class. She was already proficient in threading a needle, tying strong knots, avoiding tangles in her work, untangling existing tangles, sorting and organizing beads, and creating designs. Lily strung beads on a thread and selected beads to place on a paper plate. She looked carefully into the box of beads and selected one bead at a time, putting the needle through each bead. She looked at me as she straightened the thread that she worked with. Over and over, she smoothed the thread out as she put on another bead, before adding another bead. She looked at her work after she added each bead. She turned her project over and
over in her hands, looking at her work. Lily whetted the end of the thread with her mouth to stick all of the ends of the thread together in order to help her to thread the needle. She also used the oils on her fingers to pick up beads and transfer them into her workspace.

Lily’s occasional comments about her proficiency in sewing skills that she brought to the class indicated that relationships with people in her home life were a source for her sewing expertise. From time to time, she explained that her grandmother made quilts, and that she spent time quilting with her. At other times, she explained that she made beaded bracelets with her sister. She also explained at one point that her mother purchased the same bead organizer as the one we used for class, just for her. Supplying Lily with such materials indicated that she had family members that encouraged her artwork. She further explained, “I used to have a lot of beads and I used to play with them all the time, and my sister said that she thinks I'm really good at making up patterns.” Lily’s background experience in beadwork and her sister’s praise for her designs impacted her perceptions of the objects that her senses have become accustomed to noticing, and influenced what was possible for her to do.

Other participants in the class were also affected by their own past experiences and cultural influences, evident in material and activity choices. Participants constantly made new decisions concerning the ways that they used time and space in the after school group. One participant used traditional beading materials in a new way, adhering beads in an alternative way. Seventh-grader Betsy ‘invented’ a duct tape beaded bracelet sculpture following a discussion about the cost and uses of duct tape (See Figure 2).
Betsy explained that duct tape was a precious commodity at home, not to be ‘wasted.’ In our group, however, I had begun to encourage the participants to use the materials in any ways they needed, within reason. She spontaneously veered away from traditional techniques. Instead of sewing beads together, she explored a new way to use beads by sticking them to duct tape. Although she applied beads to the duct tape, beads as a medium could be traded for any small, confetti-like material. Applying beads in this way negated the need for the hole in each small object and opened up several new
projects the children now undertook based on the realization that the beads did not have to be sewn.

**Amodality**

It is important to consider that children’s understandings are always impacted in multiple ways in relation to whatever is present in one’s environment. Otherwise, in schools we run the risk of dominating one form of knowing over all others, when in fact we know, engage, explore, learn and express through our bodies in multiple ways. For example, I began to notice that the children sometimes used their teeth, tongues, eyes and hands to thread needle. Others measured fabric by carefully placing one hand on the fabric directly next to the other hand, then shifting the first hand so that fingertips touched the palm of the second hand. They repeated this process, counting the number of times that they placed each hand. At other times, they required using the body of another child to solve a problem, asking friends to hold out an arm to be used for folding or draping fabric, or using the wrist of the child next to them to measure a wrist before completing a bracelet.

As a classroom teacher, I relied on multimodal texts and activities to offer multiple entry points to material for my students. Multimodal texts involve communicating through multiple semiotic modes, but are limited because they separate modes of learning and do not account for multiple sense modes used at once. Amodal processes differ from multimodal texts because they resist making divisions among sense modes. Daniel Stern introduces the term amodal to refer to events without a distinction between sense modes. “The abilities to sense a core self and other and to sense intersubjective relatedness through attunement have depended in part on amodal capacities,” (Stern, 1985, p. 176).
People sense stimuli through their bodies through multiple senses most of the time, not just one sense at a time. We move and interact in our bodies in our physical environments, sensing information from multiple senses at once which offers increased opportunities for more rapid-fire processing than learning based on one sense mode at a time. Massumi (2011) further suggests that amodal events indicate that the individual is able to jump from any sense mode to another in various situations. For example, when driving a car, I must listen to traffic at the same time that I read traffic signs and cautiously watch others’ driving behavior, and occasionally, my sense of smell might warn me of a potential problem. I engage my entire body in the driving experience. In such a real-life situation that could determine whether I live or die on the road, I cannot choose to privilege one sense mode over others. I use all of my senses amodally, jumping constantly from one sense mode to another, sometimes all at once.

The concept of multimodal processes indicates a transfer of information across ways of sensing, but the term multimodal does not account for the interaction between senses or simultaneous appearances of multiple senses. Framing an event as amodal makes it possible to perceive the abstract interactions between senses, or those that occur without the senses, without framing an event in any one mode. As Leander and Boldt (2013) argue, multimodality privileges that which is rational and controllable, subject to planning. Understanding events as amodal rather than multimodal makes it possible to focus abstractly on the thinking-feeling of an event, where thinking is at one with feeling. Considering interactions as inseparable and amodal diminishes separations and blurs boundaries among a plurality of terms such as embodied literacy and other ways of understanding participants’ activities, such as arts-based practices.
In the beading class, thinking about what the students were doing as a form of multimodality offered a limited understanding of participants’ practices and allowed me to attend to some of their activities, but in other ways, literacy is a narrow, partial lens. Such limitation led me to question, “To what extent do participants consider our activity to be literacy, if at all?” Participants’ chosen activities involved limited forms of literacy and privileged discussion, but were also void of traditionally defined literacy. Participants’ arts-based practices were not fully explained by embodied literacy theory because literacy offers a narrow framework that privileges language-based ways of knowing. Participants often demonstrated ways of knowing that were void of language, but still facilitated exploring, interacting, effecting, knowing, learning and communicating. This was especially apparent during participants’ interactions with materials, which helped me to explain the interactions of participants with materials, ideas and environment.

**Movement**

Equally compelling was my emergent understanding that the children’s interests and activities often moved rapidly, from one thing to the next, not unlike the way that people often produce and follow trends. For example, immediately after Betsy created her duct tape bracelet, another participant called Ellie used the same technique to create earrings with duct tape and beads. Betsy then created a ring that she explained she would give to her mother, and Toni also created a duct tape and bead bracelet.

This movement from one type of creation to the emergence of a related but new product was echoed by the way participants spent the class time, although the connections among their movements weren’t always so clear. During a typical class, the
participants might start with browsing beads, move suddenly to a short game of tag, and then browse the selection of fabric before choosing a sample to sew. All the time this was happening, conversation likewise flew from topic to topic, perhaps starting with something that happened in a class, shifting quickly to the latest gossip about who was in trouble, and then abruptly to participants’ weekend plans.

The energy generated through these rapid shifts seemed important to maintaining excitement for participation in the class. Of course, there were participants who sometimes worked with deep concentration and little speech while working on a particular project throughout an entire class period. However, what was more common was that they excitedly pursued collective interests that they could share together and then, just as quickly, they would abandon a project for something new.

For example, for a short time during winter, 2012, several girls became interested in sewing with a machine, likely because of its efficiency and novelty. I brought in two vintage sewing patterns of a shark and a radio (both pictured below) that my husband Kevin used when he took home economics in middle school. I brought the patterns, along with a sample of the shark, and presented them as an option for anyone in the group to use. Two girls, Joe and Wanda, decided to sew with the patterns, and began to cut fabric. At first, they seemed to be extremely excited to sew with patterns.

![Figure 3: Pattern for shark pillow and sample. Courtesy Julie Slivka.](image-url)
Over the next few days, Joe and Wanda continued to cut and sew fabric for these projects, but then their initial excitement gradually waned as they continued to follow instructions. Joe cut a piece of silky red fabric for her vintage radio pattern, and Wanda cut apart a thrifted sweater for her shark pattern. Even though they cut out most of the fabric pieces, they discontinued their work on the pillows after several days. Joe and Wanda then quickly moved onto new projects.

The girls’ interest in sewing was now in the air, even with this project abandoned, so we managed to lug several anachronistic sewing machines from the school’s attic downstairs to the classroom, and I quickly threaded each one. After I gave a brief
overview of the machines, I explained that some people like to pin fabric in place before sewing. However, after I noticed their dismay, I assured them that the choice to pin or not to pin was up to them. Several of the girls decided to fold the seams without pinning, and hurriedly, excitedly sewed pieces of fabric together without a formal plan. In a flurry of activity, they draped the fabric across each other’s bodies, discussed what they could make with the drape of the fabric. They eventually created a patchwork apron.

In the meantime, all of us began to notice that the machines began to produce electrical burning smells, which seemed to make the sewing machines even more interesting, although I voiced my concern about the machines as potential fire hazards. The older sewing machines did not always sew properly, and thread sometimes bunched up in the fabric, which would cause the seamstress, or more often, me, to carefully rip out all of the thread so that the participant could start again. Sometimes the older sewing machines seemed to char the thread, leaving finished products with dark brown seams. While some of the girls stopped using the machines after they noticed the electrical burning smell, some of the girls tried to continue using them, until I intervened, eliminating the antiquated machines from our activity.

Because one girl continued to silently observe a machine even though we stopped using it to sew, I thought there might still be an interest in sewing. The next time we met for class, I brought my 2005 personal sewing machine in hopes that they would find it useful. Surprisingly, my machine did not garner even a fraction of the interest and use that the older models received. It sat unused on the end of the table for several weeks, until eventually I stopped bringing it into the classroom. Instead, I left it in my car’s trunk in case someone wanted to use it, but no one ever asked for it again. It seemed that the
older sewing machines engaged the senses and created problems for everyone to solve that might have been more interesting to the girls than the proper functioning of a working sewing machine. While the girls seemed to understand the curriculum required to sew, they eschewed sewing patterns and instead, privileged play-like events that engaged the senses in unexpected ways, moving from one exciting event to the next.

*Figure 6*: Lisa sewing with a vintage sewing machine. Courtesy Julie Slivka.
Figure 7: Lisa showing her nearly completed pillow. Courtesy Julie Slivka.

The flows of affect and energy, driving and driven by movements among possible actions and investments is one way of considering what the role of movement. Another way is to consider the ways that the children’s intertwining of play and art was a kind of movement that likewise joined with and generated affect and energy. In our after school group, participants’ art activities involved their emerging exploration and manipulation of specific materials, and their play involved all of the ways that they generated pleasure and an array of means to produce excitement. Under prime circumstances, both play and art can emerge alongside each other. Sutton-Smith further explained the simultaneous presence of composition and play.

The writer or artist might be thought to draw incessantly from his or her own broadly or narrowly conceived play activity in the process of being an
artist…the incessant activity of the playing mind is constantly present, intermixing with the processes of composition. (2001, p. 136)

The play that emerged kept the energy going and gave rise to new events. In addition to the “Little Green Monster” play, the girls also directed playful interactions with their own reflections mirrored by the computer’s camera. They frequently approached the computer and made many funny faces while looking at their reflection. Additionally, they frequently broke out in silly songs and many joined in the fun. Clearly, the generation of affective intensity was central to maintaining the participant’s interest in coming to the voluntary class. In order to consider participants’ intensities, I turned to affect theory to understand driving forces behind participants’ activities.

**Affect**

Affect proved to be powerful catalysts for activity. Participants were constantly impacted by their own flows of energy, emotions and attitudes and those of the people around them. By focusing on the flow of affect, the rise and fall of intensity in the room, and the role of energy and emotion in powering events in the beading class, I was able to attend to events and interactions large and small that I previously had to ignore. My ability to attend to these features developed as I read different and at times, irreconcilable approaches to affect by Deleuze and Guattari (1987); Deleuze (1978, 1997); Massumi (1987, 1992, 2002, 2011); Tomkins (1962, 1963, 1981, 1991, 1992, 1995a, 1995b, 2008); Stewart (2005, 2007); Sedgwick and Frank (1995); and Sedgwick, (2003).

Sylvan Tomkins (1995a & 1995b) approached affect as a primary evolutionary motivator from a psychology or psychobiology background. Tomkins explained that
affects are non-intentional bodily reactions influencing and influenced by emotions that contribute to systems that are separate from knowledge and cognition. Triggered by memory or experience, affect is capable of producing an embodied and cognitive response, moving freely in regards to time, intensity, combination and object. This is why, for example, a particular smell can conjure a long-buried childhood memory. For Tomkins, objects may elicit emotions, however, they may merely conjure physiological responses devoid of intention or meaning. Tomkins noted disjunctions between affect and cognition, understanding the two as separate systems. Affective systems impact an individual’s central nervous system before the person is able to decide how the stimulus inspires feeling or emotion (Tomkins, 2008). Tomkins explained that affects are systems of “responses involving the facial muscles, the viscera, the respiratory system, the skeleton, autonomic blood flow changes, and vocalisations that act together to produce an analogue of the particular gradient or intensity of stimulation impinging on the organism” (Demos, 1995, 19).

Affect scholars owe Tomkins a debt of gratitude for his research contributions on affect theory, particularly in relation to his contributions to theories of motivation, where affects compel activities. For example, hunger is often motivated by negative affects such as irritability or distress before one realizes the reason for the negative affect. Tomkins believed that affect is the primary motivator, which suggests that affect plays an important role in the development of intention. Tomkins theorized intention through the theory of “the Image,” which he described as:

a blueprint for the feedback mechanism: as such it is purposive and directive. Affect we conceive of as a motive, by which we mean
immediately rewarding or punishing experience mediated by receptors activated by the individual’s own responses. Motives may or may not externalize themselves in purposes. Ordinarily they do and generally tend to maximize reward and minimize punishment. Human beings are so designed that they prefer to repeat rewarding affects and to reduce punishing affects, but they need not act on these preferences. (Tomkins, 1995a, p. 45)

Tomkins uses “the Image” synonymously to mean ‘purpose,’ as a mechanism for humans to project potential events in relation to affect. Individuals use “the Image” with experience and memory to visualize in a similar way that schema theory facilitates the individual’s ability to create abstract knowledge structures to create memories. In order to further explain ‘purpose’ or “the Image,” Tomkins provided an example of driving a car while engaged in conversation, where the individual is minimally aware of the act of driving (1995a; 2008). The subject relies on the Image to provide direction or purpose for activity, while moving amodally between one sense mode and the next.

Similarly, individuals in the beading group often engaged fully in conversation while paying minimal attention to their beading activities, which also reflected my own late-night beading practices in the glow of the television. Beading, like driving, may require just a portion of a person’s attention, freeing one to simultaneously engage in other activities. Similarly, I can recall numerous times when my former public school students engaged in conversation with each other while minimally attending to the requirements of school assignments, which
they still successfully completed. In school assignments, skills are so often separated from the lived event and only account for a small amount of the activity that children generate. Observing and valuing individuals’ productions of affect is one way to more fully attend to children’s interests and contributions, where affect reciprocally incites cognition, blurring or eliminating any boundaries between the two.

Drawing upon the work of Tomkins, Sedgwick and Frank (1995) and Sedgwick (2003) also recognized distinctions between affect and cognition, and Sedgwick’s scholarship focused particularly on the unique characteristics that the subject attributes to objects and situations. Expanding upon Tomkins’ non-intentionalist approach, Sedgwick’s research pointed out that while the subject’s attributes toward an object may attach the individual to an object, such attachments might not create nor indicate meaning. She further identified that affective reactions exhibit each individual’s differences from other subjects, which is important in relation to my study because participants constantly generated a variety of responses to beading materials and to each other. This seems to be an important reason to value the differences that all individuals bring to a learning event, or to any event.

Sedgwick’s scholarship made important contributions toward building understanding of relationships between feeling, learning and action by observing emotion and expression in relation to queer theory. Sedgwick made use of literature to closely follow individuals’ affective and emotional productions, drawing attention to the ways that individuals form attributes in relation to objects and events. Although I am not
attending to literature or queer theories, her scholarship helped me to notice the ways that
participants engaged affectively with objects and with each other.

My research is further informed by theories of affect by Deleuze & Guattari (1987) and Massumi (2002, 2011). In contrast to the psychobiological approach to affect by Tomkins and Sedgwick, Deleuze & Guattari situated affect as a force generated in an assemblage, rather than primarily from the individual’s body. For Deleuze & Guattari, affect precedes emotion and encompasses a moving field of developments that involve humans and nonhumans. Deleuze and Guattari explained that affect is “the effectuation of the power of the pack that throws the self into up-heaval and makes it reel,” (1987, p. 240). For Deleuze & Guattari, affects are highly productive intensities of various gradients that are generated by all of the components in an assemblage that motivates activity, not only contained within the individual. All of the human and non-human forces within a field influence production of intensities.

Massumi further theorized Deleuze’s explanation of the elusive, constantly moving nature of affect, where feelings are always in motion with other feelings.

*L’affect* (Spinoza’s *affectus*) is an ability to affect and be affected. It is a prepersonal intensity corresponding to the passage from one experiential state of the body to another and implying an augmentation or diminution in that body’s capacity to act. *L’affection* (Spinoza’s *affectio*) is each such state considered as an encounter between the affected body and a second, affecting, body. (Massumi, 1987, xvi)

Like Tomkins and Sedgwick, for Massumi and Deleuze, affects are prepersonal intensities that precede feelings. Emotions or feelings are personal in the sense that they
are interpreted based on previous experiences; they are social projections of noticed affect. Deleuze (1997), however, is interested not so much in “positive” or “negative” affects as Tompkins was, but rather in how affects involve the creation of intensities. He points to two examples of shame from the experiences of T.E. Lawrence in the desert, first through the bodies of others, and second, through the shame of his own body. First, he described Lawrence’s reaction of uncontrollable laughter to witnessing the writhing movements of many dying Turks. Second, Deleuze attended to Lawrence’s feelings of shame resulting from his own arousal during sexual abuse by soldiers. Deleuze points to Lawrence’s drawing of glory from his shame and to his despising of the animal limitations of his body. Lawrence is not defeated by his failure to attain standards of goodness or purity, but rather, he is able to move freely precisely because he moves among assemblages of multitudinous, overlapping currents - visual, auditory, political and emotional - which provide a constantly shifting center of gravity.

The participants in my study undoubtedly encountered their own shifting, exciting and glorious affective responses. In this dissertation, I chose to write about several events that stood out from everyday activity that seemed to convey significant affective intensities, even though it is impossible to adequately represent or abstract others’ embodied intensities. I can only describe events that produced intensities. An example that I will further illustrate in chapter five follows a participant’s experiences with transmissible affects while advertising her artwork at the local Arts Fest. At first, she received and transmitted many positive interactions with quite a few Mom-aged, female patrons of the Arts Fest, but her energy dramatically diminished when she received negative responses from two girls her own age. The sensation that the negative affects
created inhibited her desire to advertise her work to the crowd momentarily, and so she
took a break from selling her work, but another change in events led to her regaining her
sense of efficacy (and glory).

Affect and affection have important implications to explain the movements of
power in participants’ activities in the beading class. My work is informed by the
psychobiology of differential affects as evolutionary hardwiring as described by
Sedgwick and Tomkins, and simultaneously influenced by the work of Deleuze and
Massumi, locating affect in the midst of assemblages produce intensities and constitute
bodies and worlds. Each of these researchers offers important insight into the
complicated ways that affect influences activity.

**Beading and Rhizoanalysis**

*Spiral bead weaving is beading technique that I find rewarding. To create a spiral
weave, I must first create a foundation ring of beads, which I will use to build my
weaving. After creating the initial ring of beads, I weave additional beads, one by one, in*
between the beads in the foundation ring. This expands the size of the original foundation ring because it creates new spaces in between each of the original beads. Over time, this process produces beading that constantly wraps back on itself in a spiral and often takes off in a new, unexpected direction as I introduce new beads of varying size and shape. I follow the materials, which suggest what to add next; whether I should add larger or smaller beads, vary the color combination, etc. Together, the beads and I dictate what will happen next. The result is not known until I bring myself together with the materials.

Beading not only informed my dissertation writing because it has been deeply personal undertaking for me for the past three years, but also because it serves as a metaphor for the ways that ideas and theories weave together and move apart to create a strong, multifaceted approach to teaching and learning. Beading informed the way that I wrote this dissertation because it allowed me to weave together different and sometimes unexpected perspectives on art, literacy, play and production, affect, embodiment and research, and to notice different ways that participants contributed to the group that may not be readily recognized, perhaps suppressed or ignored in spaces with more narrow concepts of literacy.

This depiction of beading as a way of being with rather than controlling is compatible with what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) call “a rhizomatic analysis” or a “rhizoanalysis.” Rhizoanalysis is based on the concept of the rhizome, a metaphor that compares spontaneous events to a bulb that produces offshoots that produce new growths, like the way grass or strawberries grow.
A rhizomatic approach to description and understanding always works from the middle or the edges of events. As Deleuze and Guattari explain, “a rhizome has no beginning or end; it is always in the middle, between things, interbeing, *intermezzo,*” (1987, p. 25). Rhizomes oppose hierarchies and are characterized by six principles: connectivity, heterogeneity, multiplicity, asignifying rupture, cartography and decalcomania (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, pp. 3-25). Rhizomes are distinguished by connectivity in the ways that “any point of a rhizome can be connected to anything other, and must be,” (p. 7), indicating the heterogeneity and multiplicity of rhizomatic connections. Deleuze and Guattari explain that a signifying rupture occurs when, “A rhizome may be broken, shattered at a given spot, but it will start up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines” (p. 9). Rhizomes are also identified by the ways that they relate to cartography. “A rhizome is not amenable to any structural or generative model,” (p. 12). The nature of a rhizome fits the emergent nature of this study and allows...
participants to have greater freedom and mobility than they could experience in any generative model.

Such an approach to analysis may more adequately explain the way participant-led events unfold. Participants’ contributions do not reflect a linear model, but rather emerge rhizomatically from the middles of events. They are full of ruptures and of heterogeneous connections. Rhizoanalysis allows the researcher to “read across theory and data as a “plane” toward a new mode of interpreting and engaging with performances,” (Leander & Rowe, p. 433, 2006). This allowed the data to lead the analysis by mapping events across theoretical underpinnings. Rhizoanalysis underscores continual interactions that are influenced by affective intensities in a social organization that emerges from the learning environment (Leander, Phillips & Taylor, 2010). Leander and Rowe (2006) demonstrated rhizoanalysis of embodied literacy practices of high school English participants’ poster presentations of their responses to content from Upton Sinclair’s tale *The Jungle*. The students created a performance informed by posters that they created, which included images of pickled human feet to indicate corruption in the meat packing plant. In a rhizomatic fashion, Leander and Rowe consider participants’ affective intensities during their presentation and interaction with classmates, and analyze how participants become the text, become producers and consumers, become ‘dismembered,’ and produce identity. The authors concluded by promoting a rhizomatic literacy pedagogy, where educators richly investigate participants’ performances of literacy, looking for connections and productions of difference. This study strongly informs my work with participants because I am interested in the ways that the details of art and literacy performances contribute to interest and desire to engage in learning. In
response to the ways that participants produce events rhizomatically, I present data in
ways that allow the reader to draw connections between events and performances. As
with beading when I allowed the work to suggest what direction to take next, for
example, the size, shape, color and quantity of beads to add, rhizoanalysis likewise
allowed me not only to notice but to also to support and therefore promote participants’
interests and desires. For example, when I noticed that the participants enjoyed playful
singing interactions, I allowed the girls to continue their play, communicating my
approval with smiles and engaging with them in conversation during their play. In these
ways, I encouraged them to continue to try new things without obstructing their attempts
to play and interact with each other, which I believe influenced their choice to attend my
class.

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) argued about the clash between meaning-based
approaches to learning and alternate approaches to follow events to see what emerges
(Stewart, 2005). Like the emergent beadwork I created, considering what was happening
as a rhizome allowed me to follow participants’ constructions of assemblages. I
understand assemblages to include all of the components that form social organizations of
bodies (Leander & Rowe, 2006). Deleuze and Guattari explain that an assemblage
involves an “increase in the dimensions of a multiplicity that necessarily changes in
social assemblages, such as “the family” are often composed of smaller assemblages,
such as “motherhood” or the relationship between the bodies of mother and child (pp. 82-
83). Deleuze and Guattari attend to the actual and virtual dimensions of assemblages,
considering the potential factors that combine to create an assemblage. I am interested in
the ways that affect works as an immanent mechanism of assemblage, where Deleuze and Guattari explain, “Assemblages are machinic assemblages of (affect,) desire and collective assemblages of enunciation,” (1987, p. 22). The rhizome and the assemblage are influenced by the variety of ways that subjects construct affect and desire, which lead the focus of this study.

To follow and participate in the flows of the participants in my study required accepting a rhizomatic approach to my research and an appreciation of the rhizomatic nature of what happened in the class. The participants drew constantly changing palettes of experience, play, imagination and a variety of approaches to composition. For example, Betsy challenged rules and boundaries associated with the “proper” use of duct tape and simultaneously redefined what it is to “bead” by sweeping beads onto sticky duct tape, like adhering glitter to a gluey surface. She challenged typical notions of “beading;” tediously threading beads together with a needle and thread. Betsy’s new invention offered a metaphor to disrupt a linear approach to beading. Even though Betsy was certainly capable of threading beads, which she did on many occasions, she chose a different activity, possibly one that seemed considerably less tedious and more interesting. Betsy’s new beading process still involved the juxtaposition of many beads, not unlike beading with needle and thread.

Betsy’s new approach reflects many children’s personal literacy practices that emerge from experience, in a similar way that Dyson’s 2003 study follows children’s experimental literacies influenced by play with textual toys and cultural materials such as Space Jam, Star Wars and Donkey Kong. Reading is often understood to suggest a linear, word-by-word approach, “threading” ideas together continuously. Dyson argues that
instead of focusing on the singular components of language; for example, phonemes, morphemes, graphemes and other building blocks of language, what is crucial for children’s literacy development involves

the complex gestalts of children’s cultural resources. Those resources evidence children’s powers of adaptation and improvisation; and it is children’s exploitation of these cross-cultural childhood strengths… and their ways of stretching, reconfiguring, and rearticulating their resources, that are key to literacy learning in contemporary times. (2003, p. 5)

While beads can be compared to phonemes, words, or any other singular element of language, we can consider how play with beads and various cultural materials mirrors play with language complicated by children’s experiences with in-school literacies and other textual tools. Through improvisation, Betsy integrated beading practices with other cultural practices, generating a complex, unique configuration. While Toni’s bead-by-bead loomwork might represent a linear construction of language constructed word-by-word, Betsy’s approach might parallel a playful or other kind of non-linear approach in language or other way of knowing, for example, stream of consciousness writing, brainstorming, word play or any other kinds of spontaneous literacies. Betsy’s new uses of materials indicated that she did not need to follow an established set of instructions. The participants internalized and experimented with sewing and beading processes, not unlike the way that the children in Dyson’s study played with language and cultural materials. Like those playful experiences made possible with rich textual tools in Dyson’s study, beading and sewing materials in an open space allowed participants in my study to
create new configurations from the view “inside a particular child culture out toward
school demands,” (p. 5).

Likewise, my participants offered opportunities to witness snapshots inside their
after-school culture out toward the requirements of school and school-like assignments, a
view that would not be possible if I assigned beading activities instead of encouraging
them to choose when and how they wished to use materials. Betsy’s idea seemed to
organically and powerfully instigate a trend, ultimately offering the class an alternative
way to use beads. Her contribution expanded the class’s repertoire of ‘beading skills.’
The class participants constantly informed and resonated with each other’s works as they
learned from each other, “reading” each other in embodied ways, for example, watching
the making process. In fact, the girls constantly perceived or “read” all aspects of their
environment, responding in different, often imaginative ways. Informed by their
environment, they constantly capitalized upon the limits of their social embodiment in
relation to materials present, and also in relation to each other.

Through Betsy’s making, she interpreted relationships among materials, creating
new ways of knowing. Her efforts to create the first bracelet became embedded in her
schema, and then transferred from her interpretation to materials. Betsy’s symbolic
knowledge transference became evident in her second project, a duct tape and bead ring.
Further, the girls worked quickly through somatic activities and rarely paused to refer to a
disconnected written set of instructions, perhaps because this might impede their
intentions, otherwise not support their work, or perhaps individuals had unique reasons to
eschew school-like literacies during beading endeavors. In the early stages of this study, I
suggested that they might use video beading tutorials, but few participants, if any, viewed
such tutorials. Instead, most of the participants engaged in experimental beadwork that did not require written or otherwise performed instructions. Written beading instructions might have seemed redundant in relation to experimental or practiced activity. For example, instead of writing directions describing beading processes, they could easily demonstrate directly to each other, as Betsy exhibited to her peers. Their embodied activities showed evidence of their thinking where action was thought; beading became thinking in a similar way that writing is thinking. The girls’ choices indicated that they did not require an additional mode of representation for their activity. The freedom to operate in self-selected ways of knowing seemed to generate play and other productive forms of activity that might have otherwise been lost if school-based literacies remained a focus.

Although participants might have been inspired by Betsy’s initial construction, each new production was not mere mimicry of her first construction. Each girl produced her own unique work. Observation and experimentation with different techniques over time allowed the artists to build toolkits from which they could draw strategies to serve different purposes. Some of these techniques became well established, while others lost importance. For example, participants only affixed beads to duct tape on one occasion, and instead, moved on to use materials in new ways.

For me, beading is mostly a relaxing activity, although at times, I encounter frustration or impatience while working. I often create a loose plan for my work, pouring piles of beads onto several plastic coasters, those designed to protect tables from liquid. I always use thermally bonded, waxed beading thread that resists being pierced by the needle when I make multiple passes through various beads. When I weave beads in a
spiral pattern, I look closely at the finished work before adding a new bead. I frequently look down into the coaster to choose one or several beads to add to the spiral, and use my forefingers and thumbs on both hands to simultaneously pierce and guide the beads onto the needle. Then I slowly guide the beads along the thread, smoothing the thread to avoid tangles, which can slow or halt my work. Again, I look at my work and push the beads snugly, but not too tightly against the other beads. I continue this process, often changing the colors, sizes and number of beads spontaneously. Beading is a form of play for me that can be enjoyable and relaxing. My mother and aunts have scolded me for “wasting time” creating beaded work for them, but I do not see it that way, and I wish that instead of scolding me, they would just enjoy the gifts. Beading has long been a relaxing evening activity to keep my wandering mind busy, yet calm, with the added bonus of creating gifts for loved ones. Likewise, beading is not just a pretext for observing children’s behaviors and play, but rather, each child that elects to participate can find unique benefits from beadwork.

Before I began this study, I expected to pursue teacher research implementing practical applications integrating art and literacy. In order to promote such a study, I would have had to continually prompt and refocus participants’ attention on those content areas, missing a good deal of the participants’ contributions. Further, I would have likely lost many participants from our elective after-school space because there were many other interesting choices and friends to be around. As the study progressed, I began to notice more about what brought the kids together. I improved upon my ability to notice, provide for and support opportunities for play and self-selected productivity. As I further acquired and understood different learning theories and philosophies, I could better attend
to the emerging activities and interests of the participants. If we relate those learning
theories and beliefs to beads, then like a strongly woven beaded piece, I became able to
create a stronger foundation to support the girls’ self-selected explorations and
productions with materials and play-based activities. My research is essentially beaded
together with a wide assortment of experiences and approaches to learning as led by the
girls in my study, moving closer to a child-centered classroom that is well-served by a
lived curriculum that accounts for participants’ interests and experiences.

Research Questions

Leander and Rowe (2006) explained that literacy performances are often
insufficient to adequately explain explanations of embodied, affective activities. This
issue relates to the elusiveness of representation. My understanding of these movements
in participants’ activities contributes to literacy education and education in general,
attending to participants’ practices of desire or drive rather than merely to outcomes of
intentional practices (New London Group, 1996). While the NLG tends to focus on final
outcomes of learning processes, my research interests focus on the processes that
participants engage in, rather than on the final products that result from their
constructions of understanding. Some participants did not produce anything physical in
the class, and instead, produced dialogues and relationships with others, while others
produced different events, interacting with materials and saying nothing at all. Each
participant’s contributions served as valuable influences within the cumulative narrative
of the group. I resisted positioning participants’ efforts into a hierarchical continuum that
privileged traditional literacy practices, and instead, I considered what was valuable
about each person’s input. I studied ways that these processes expanded the traditional
notion of literacy to include different ways of knowing. This work also explored
participants’ engagement in various activities, sometimes constructing narratives of
identity, perhaps engaging in play, agreement, disagreement, or any other amodal
constructions. Literacy occurred alongside constructions of artwork, vignettes of identity,
narratives, and other events, but literacy only one part of our practices (Leander and
Boldt, 2013). It was more important to me to understand how participants used after
school time to produce what they considered to be valuable interactions. It is necessary to
theorize their activities based on the ways that affect and other influences impacted their
constructions.

My overarching research question is: How do participants knit together time,
movement, affect, relationships and materials in the space of our shared classroom? I
investigated ways that participants authored and involved themselves in conversations
and activities that interwove the self, multiple selves and alternate selves in relationships
with each other, the space and the materials theorized through rhizomatic social
organization and informed by understandings of the impact of affect. In my study, I
examined ways that participants’ practices and narratives related to other participants,
contributions to the assemblage. I wanted to learn more about how these concepts
potentially offered insight into ways that participants produced desire and interest in a
classroom space. The second focus of this study is to examine the overlapping, amodal
folds of art, literacy and other events that emerged through activities. I observed
emergent events when participants gathered electively with peers to “hang out,” explore
materials and possibly create self-selected projects.
My research questions guided me to look carefully at the participants’ unfolding activities and rhizomatically expanding activities that they engaged in that included art making and spontaneous narrative and literacy processes, but that were often not driven by the desire to engage in either art or literacy. In other words, often neither art nor literacy were the drive for what was happening but provided the occasion or materials that gave the pretext for shared time and space. By addressing the following research questions, I intended to provide a framework to further develop an understanding of participants’ interests and desires.

- How does participants’ engagement with materials or non-human bodies afford or elide certain events and experiences, and not others?
- What range of desires, interests and other factors brings individuals to gather together in these spaces? How does the role of affect impact participants’ interactions?
- In what ways does rhizoanalysis offer opportunities to understand how experience exceeds representation?

These questions have helped me to understand how my exploratory research ranges between and outside the fields of literacy and art education by understanding movements of the nomadic, embodied participant in integrated, amodal art and literacy spaces. These research questions have emerged rhizomatically from my understanding of existing theory from the NLG, literacy education and embodied arts practices. The data leads this study, showing how participants’ activities resonated through gestures, interactions with materials, and with each other. My research focused on the processes that participants created during activities rather than on the resulting products. Some of
the participants only produced dialogues and relationships with others, or interacted with materials, saying nothing at all.

Theories of embodiment have potential to explain participants’ efforts when they engage physically in activities such as touching materials, stringing beads, cutting fabric, knotting embroidery floss, or other materials, as well as their embodied interactions with each other. These embodied contributions play important roles in understanding participants’ intents because they use their bodies to communicate important information to themselves and to others. Participants’ embodied activities also contribute to the relationships that they create with materials and with others. When somatic theories of art production fail to fully explain productions of relationships, it is necessary to theorize activity based on the ways that affect and other influences impact participants’ constructions.

Each question above relates to my explorations of participants’ experiences, while avoiding a hierarchy of outcomes. These events purposefully avoided a traditional top-down, arborescent teaching model and instead, grew rhizomatically from the middle, where participants’ interests, desires, play and experience met embodied skill and intent. Participation was often investigative as individuals experimented and interacted with materials and with each other, often informing literacy and art events before they occur.

This work contributes to literacy education, attending to participants’ activities rather than only on outcomes of practice, (New London Group, 1996). I investigated ways that participants’ contributions informed and sustained activities, influencing variables of time, space and materials requested. Participants’ spoken and gestural, embodied responses were inseparable from these processes. This work also contributes to
the field of embodied literacies, particularly, as Fleckenstein describes, somatic, polyscopic, and lateral literacies, (2003). While my participants engaged in practices unrecognized as traditional literacies, their activities constantly involved embodied literacies with each other and with the materials. All of these contributions addressed relationships among participants and were often impacted by affective responses that impacted choices contributing to communicative processes. This work attended to the limitations of literacy as a framework for learning, moving from embodied literacies and attending to individuals’ uses of literacies and other ways of knowing. My work also contributed to educators’ understandings of somatic meaning-making processes that may relate to literacy practices at times, and at other times, to lived curriculum and embodied art production. This work has potential to inform areas of integrative arts between literacy and art processes. What I hope to achieve through this work is an approach to study that allows me to more adequately understand participants’ self-selected, embodied desires and interests.

Summary of Chapters

In chapter two, I provide an overview of the conceptual framework of my study as it emerged and changed over time. I explain how my personal experiences influenced the study, followed by the timeline of the research, and a description of my research design. Further, I present a description of participation, a description of the school’s project-based curriculum, ethical issues that impacted the work, validity, and the methods that I used to analyze data. I also present descriptions illustrating ways that the study influenced my decisions to change how I presented material to participants.
In chapter three, I explore participants’ productions of affect in response to images in a beading book. First, I critique my efforts to privilege an academic discussion about decorative eggs over the participants’ affective, play-based discussion. I then focus on the continuously moving roles of materials in the organization that the participants produced. Further, I explore participants’ embodied ways of knowing and expressing knowledge, followed by a discussion regarding the ways that affect drove much of the activity during the beading group.

In chapter four, I describe an event when two girls engaged in spontaneous play wrestling during an unstructured summer session while they prepared for the summer Arts Fest. Through their play, the girls co-constructed excitement by producing affects and intensities that influenced relationships with each other and with materials including a vacuum cleaner that they called “Henry” and beading materials. I analyze the ways that Henry and his environment provided certain potentials and unique problems for the girls to solve in a continuously moving relational field. I explore ways that affect and affection offer fresh insights into power dynamics within participants’ activities. Further, I investigate ways that the girls explored their own bodies in space in relation to each other, and finally, I present a discussion regarding participants’ opportunities to invest spaces with emotional and relational intensities.

In chapter five, I attend to the participants’ efforts to sell their artwork to the public at the Arts Fest. The girls shouted to the crowd to advertise their work, creating opportunities for interaction with potential customers. One of the participants experienced a negative interaction with an audience member, and although she was deeply affected by the negative experience, she was able to wrangle other affordances of
the social field to rebound. I present an analysis of the ways that the girls’ bodies were affected by various societal regulations. Finally, I consider the participants’ exhibitions that indicated their engagement in profound thinking-feeling resulting from the negative event.

In closing, I address the functions of the participants’ productions and responses to affects in a continuously moving relational field. Further, I address the way that the separation between language and embodied action impacts pedagogy and curriculum. I return to the question of the implications of this research for literacy. Finally, I call for further investigation into the ways that children’s affects influence activity.
Chapter Two: Methodology

In the following section, I described the ways that my exploratory research study unfolded and changed over time as I developed new ways to think about what was happening in the classroom. In the first section, I attend to some of the ways that my personal and teaching experiences impacted the emerging conceptual framework of the study. I ultimately provided a space for participants to “hang out,” supported them in their self-selected activities, and learned about their efforts to engage in activity with each other. In the second section, I summarize a timeline of the 16-month study, focusing on our work that took place during an after school club, and then ended as an elective summer camp, with a finale at Arts Fest Children’s Day. In the third section, I present a brief description of my research design, as well as my role as participant-observer (Jorgensen, 1989; Powell, 2006). In the fourth section, I summarize how participants’ involvement in the study changed over time due to scheduling changes, modifications to instruction, and especially participant interest. In the fifth section, I draw attention to ethical issues that emerged in the study, including approval by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the Penn State Office of Research Protection, as well as issues of subjectivity. The sixth section addressed issues of validity in the study. In the seventh section I present the methods that I used to analyze data, where I provide descriptions of embodied events through narratives informed by rhizoanalysis. I explore the influence of materials on activity in order to further understand the desires, interests and affective responses that brought participants together in our elective space. I also investigate ways that rhizomatic interactions impacted participants’ activities. In the last section, I explain
our shift away from the “Beaded Narrative” class due to the problem of representation in art and experience. I stopped asking participants to represent ideas through beadwork and written summaries. Instead of manufacturing an outcome-based curriculum, I learned to consider embodied literacies to include the truth that participants produced in their perceptions and interactions. This exploratory study has helped me to reconceptualize ‘what counts’ as literacy and learning in a traditional classroom, investigating affective, embodied processes and interactions that bring participants together in elective spaces.

**Personal experience and knowledge inform conceptual framework**

During my experience as a classroom teacher that began in 2003, during the early stages of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) era in Maryland public schools, I was trained to focus on standardized outcomes and assessments based largely on quantitative measurements in literacy education. In 2005, I was hired at a Title 1 elementary school in Washington County, MD, where nearly 70% of students received free and reduced meals. Before the 2005-2006 school year began, the central office administration reconstituted the entire staff based on a prediction that the school would not meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). However, when the test results arrived, the test scores met AYP. Despite the success, the reconstitution process was already in effect and the entire staff was in transition. Those teachers that chose to stay at the school were required to reapply for their jobs, and new hires from other counties or states could also apply for jobs. This is how I came to teach for this school system, as a newlywed and a transplant searching for a teaching job. The dismissals by the central office created a climate of fear, distrust and paranoia, sending me and other frantic, novice teachers searching for “best practices,” or at least presenting the illusion of “best practices.” These decisions often had negative
effects on the relationships among staff members, dramatically impacting opportunities for positive collaborations (Shore & Wright, 1999). Advancement of county and state mandates for standardized outcomes created an uneasy environment that encouraged a curriculum focused on final products instead of processes. The ways that these expectations were delivered to teachers and the ways that the administration tracked teacher performance and students’ test scores manifested in rigid timelines that made it difficult to attend to complicated concepts before it became time to rush to the next concept. This hasty, standardized curriculum often promoted fragmented attempts to meet standards rather than to provide for infused, project-based opportunities for learning. In order to demonstrate diligent attendance to state and county teaching standards, many classrooms proceeded from a top-down approach instead of a truly individual-initiated, inquiry-driven curriculum. I felt constantly frustrated with the ways that I was unevenly supervised and supported in my efforts, resulting in a “disembodied, prosaic language of the typical curriculum-as-plan,” (Aoki, 2005, p. 273). I envisioned opportunities for research into individual-directed choices in learning opportunities. These painful periods of growth in my early teaching experiences will always impact my instructional decisions, and it is my desire to use this knowledge to support students and other teachers in constructive, positive learning experiences.

These early experiences inspired my interest in creating spaces for children to engage in self-selected, embodied learning. At times, I felt that I was nearly forced into unwanted collusion with the school system against the students in our collective exertion of a narrow curriculum that offered limited prospects for success. Even though I taught to the best of my abilities with the time and materials I had, I inevitably missed
opportunities to involve my students in the development of the curriculum that they were ultimately responsible for learning. In some ways, my study signifies a modest reparation to my former students not only for my shortcomings as a teacher, but also in the ways that the school systems demanded such an abstract curriculum with constricted outcomes, too often irrelevant to children’s actual or virtual lives. These experiences fueled my interests in collaborating with young people in their pursuits of valuable experiences.

Since my advisor recommended a local charter school as a potential research site for my study, I was immediately curious about the way that this school was designed. The school describes itself as a technology-supported, project-based, public charter school. My early teaching experiences in crowded Maryland public elementary and middle schools often demanded focus on goals of efficiency and passing test scores. I desired to create a career path in education to avoid burnout that accompanied a curriculum tied so closely to standardized testing. I was extremely interested to learn about the ways that a charter middle school in a central Pennsylvania university-town might operate differently from schools where I had worked in the past. Given my experience with narrow, outcome-driven schooling, I was surprised by the school’s openness to art making in the classroom, which was discouraged at the schools where I formerly worked. The charter school allowed me to develop an approach to learning that privileged art making and seemed to provide interesting, open-ended opportunities for participants to approach expression from many angles.

My childhood art-making practices influenced the materials and skills that I brought to the group. As an adolescent, I enjoyed selling handmade jewelry at the craft fair at my church. As a pre-teen, I also suffered from an acute addiction to fiction from
the library at the local military base, and was fiercely committed to reading every entry in several series of books, including The Boxcar Children, The Babysitter’s Club, and Nancy Drew, and loyal to my two most beloved authors, Beverly Cleary and Judy Blume. When I wasn’t glued to a book, I contentedly sculpted clay miniatures and beads, and made jewelry endlessly. I proudly sold my jewelry at the autumn craft fair at my family church over three consecutive years. As I reflected on what I found valuable about my own childhood experiences, I decided to offer some of my favorite materials, beads, to young participants to see what they might create. Over the course of this exploratory study, my advisor helped me to look more carefully at the rich processes and dynamics that participants created together and with materials.

**Participation**

The Business Manager at the charter school explained the faculty’s efforts to support students in a variety of learning spaces:

> The mission of (the school) is to create a powerful, safe, secure, active, project-based learning environment in which students develop the necessary knowledge, skills, and attributes to lead fulfilled and successful lives (Dussias, 2012, p. 4).

This study is informed by the design of its host, a public charter middle school in central Pennsylvania. The design of the charter school was teacher-led, involving all staff members in instructional design, implementation, benchmarks and other assessments aligned with Pennsylvania state requirements for content at each grade level. The teachers challenged students to meet and exceed Pennsylvania Learning standards through a project-based, technology supported learning environment. Each student was
assigned a laptop to complete assignments, integrating science, social studies, language arts and math in “real world projects” that included museum exhibitions, educational games, animation projects, movies, presentations and websites. This approach offered an alternate approach to teaching and learning at local public schools.

According to the school’s 2012 Charter Annual Report, the school accommodated 98 students, where one student identified as Asian, five as African American, one Hispanic, 89 Caucasian and two Multicultural students. In addition to youth from the nearby college town, there was a large population of rural, low-income families, where 30% of students were eligible for free and reduced meals. The school also served a high number of students with special needs, where 28 of the students received special services. The gender composition within the school impacted participants’ attendance to the after-school beading class where boys outnumbered girls by approximately 3:1.

Parents and guardians inevitably had many different reasons for enrolling their children at this charter school. It was highly possible that students and their families desired a school that offered a strong sense of community, which this charter school offers due to the teachers’ commitment to collaboration, participation in the school’s leadership and with students’ activities, and extension of invitations to community members to teach specials classes. Many parents and guardians were highly involved in their children’s education through clubs, specials classes or other ways of being involved, and may have preferred the small school size and access to a variety of specials classes taught by a diverse group of teachers. Parents, guardians, teachers and students may have valued the connections that the school promoted between instruction and “real world projects,” the technology-driven instruction, and may have regarded the value that the
staff placed on understanding potential contexts of content. Parents and guardians likely chose to enroll their children at this charter school based on what it promoted that was not present at other local schools. Perhaps parents or guardians were dissatisfied with other public or private school options available to them for different reasons. This charter school provided students a sense of independence and exciting, project-based alternatives to instruction at local public schools. The school’s Business Manager further explained,

    The result of project-based learning supported by technology is that students have high expectations for themselves because they have been able to successfully meet the high expectations of adults with whom they have formed meaningful and close relationships (Dussias, 2012, p. 6).

The school’s approach to project-based learning informed and seeped into the specials classes and after-school program. The faculty’s interest in project-based approaches to learning generated a supportive climate that fostered other projects, which offered unique opportunities to observe the students’ affective choices. Our beading class resonated with the school’s project-based approach to instruction, as many of the children engaged in hands-on activity with beads and other materials. In order to recruit participants, I created a poster to advertise my class and continued to encourage recruitment by word of mouth in the school.iii During the fall 2011-spring 2012 school year, our after-school class was structured in limited ways and students were free to sign in or out of any after-school elective. It was difficult to track participation because students sometimes attended my class for five minutes before signing out to attend a different after-school elective. Typical attendance might have included between two and eight girls each Monday afternoon, with few boys attending, if any. There was very little
diversity within the group. Most of the full-time participants were Caucasian, one identified as Hispanic and another as Multicultural. Attendance fluctuated during each session, however, most of the girls that attended the beading group chose to participate in my study and three of those girls continued participation in the summer during preparation for Arts Fest.

**Timeline of the Study**

From the fall of 2011 through the spring of 2012, I used my new MacBook Pro to record data using iMovie, and offered the beading class as an after school choice nearly every Monday from approximately 3:00 pm - 4:15 pm, and sometimes for an extended period of time. We met for a total of 24 sessions. During the school year from 2011-2012, I collected over 34 hours of video data. We also met in the summer to prepare for Arts Fest for a total of six sessions, followed by Arts Fest Children’s Day, 2012 from 10:00 am-3:00 pm. During this time, I videotaped a total of 38 hours and 30 minutes of activity. Throughout the spring semester of 2012, I also served as a supervisor for two student teachers that were placed at the school in grades five and six, and I occasionally observed lessons in their regular classroom space attended by a handful of students that also participated in the beading group. Participants in the elective after school group were all females, with the exception of several classes when a male student attended briefly without choosing to become involved in the study. During this time, I became acquainted with the participants, their classmates, teachers and families. The girls shared their interests in books, music, media, favorite subjects, families, and most of all, their relationships with peers. The relationships that they produced among themselves seemed to generate a constant supply of energy.
After considering my own childhood experiences, I suggested that the girls might consider participating in the local Festival of the Arts that would take place in the summer. The Central Pennsylvania Festival of the Arts, commonly called “Arts Fest,” was well known as a yearly gathering of artists from across the nation that took place across four summer days. Artists sold their artwork to visitors, who took in dance, music and theater performances, attended gallery exhibitions, or observed sand sculptures. The event’s organizers offered a day for young artists to sell their work. The participants’ discussions about potential participation in Arts Fest generated many questions. The girls discussed and debated whether they should donate any of their proceeds to charities, and whether they should all choose the same charity. Their questions generated problem-solving discussions, although they never reached a consensus. Preparing to sell work at the Arts Fest sale seemed to create a shift in participants’ purposes for creating projects. Instead of creating very time-consuming projects, many of the contributors began to produce multiple items more quickly, possibly with the additional goal of selling work and making money. Despite this shift, the girls continued to create affects and intensities in their relationships with others and with materials, always generating fun in their daily activities.

**Research Design**

In order to link practice and theory, this exploratory study has been rooted in pragmatism as I investigated participants’ self-selected activities and production of relationships with each other (Biesta & Burbules, 2003; Dewey, 1934, 1938, 2005). The research design of this study calls for pragmatic methods to address the data that participants produced spontaneously. Pragmatism helps to clarify “the contents of
hypotheses by tracing their ‘practical consequences,’” (Hookway, 2010). I align myself with pragmatist purposes to actively seek ways to understand ‘practical consequences,’ the data that participants produced.

This work relates in important ways to action research, which addresses practical purposes in attempt to draw together everyday practice and academic research (Reason, 2006). Throughout the child-centered study, we constantly implemented inquiry and reflected upon our practices and implemented solutions that best served participants’ beading efforts and overall wellbeing. The participants’ desires led the research. However, my work diverges from action research because I am not solving a problem presented by a group of activist researchers. Unlike a study that sets out to solve a problem, this study allows activity to emerge, mainly from the middles of individually produced events. This study began and progressed as exploratory work where participants investigated relationships with each other and interacted with materials.

It has become increasingly important to me to study my own instruction to better understand and improve my efforts to support learning, to allow participants to have control over the content and how it is delivered, and very importantly, to avoid intruding upon the time and space of another teacher in my pursuit of research. I have been motivated to do the best that I can to form positive relationships with others, and to support participants’ relationships with each other (Jorgensen, 1989). These intentions led me to pursue a study informed by classroom participation observation, which offers possibilities for the researcher to engage with participants in co-constructed, spoken and embodied practice, and to work reflexively to “understand the ways in which knowledge of self and other mutually inform each other” (Powell, 2006, p. 36). Participation
observation is complicated by the subjective, often emotional ways that people encounter situations, further influenced by personal bias (St. Pierre, 1997). Jorgensen explains that participant observation has the following seven criteria:

- a special interest in human meaning and interaction as viewed from the perspective of people who are insiders or members of particular situations and settings;
- location in the here and now of everyday life situations and settings as the foundation of inquiry and method;
- a form of theory and theorizing stressing interpretation and understanding of human existence;
- a logic and process of inquiry that is open-ended, flexible, opportunistic, and requires constant redefinition of what is problematic, based on facts gathered in concrete settings of human existence;
- an in-depth, qualitative, case study approach and design;
- the performance of a participant role or roles that involves establishing and maintaining relationships with natives in the field; and
- the use of direct observation along with other methods of gathering information, (1989, pp. 13-14).

I understand that the participant observer must make an effort to guard participants and their contributions from misinterpretations and recognize implied understandings that emerge from time spent with participants. I have attempted to make
my descriptions of events as clear as possible while addressing ethical concerns. My study was informed by these criteria for participant observation because the major focus of our work centered upon participants’ embodied ways of knowing and the surrounding gestures and conversations that emerge and influence folding and unfolding relationships. My role as researcher was complicated by simultaneous, supportive roles as instructor and student, and participant observation offered expansive opportunities to choose and analyze data by including ordinary events.

**Explanation of participant activity in the emergent study**

During the summer of 2010, I felt extremely eager to find a research site and begin a study. My advisor put me in touch with Kathy, the specials and after-school coordinator at a school where she serves as president of the board. I arranged a meeting with Kathy and nervously introduced myself to her, my face red hot with self-consciousness. I believed that I was asking a lot for the school to take me in to conduct research for the first time. What kinds of questions would she ask me, and would I have the right answers? What about parents’ or guardians’ questions? My study was so emergent, I didn’t have many answers at the time. I frantically wondered if she would think, “Who does she think she is?” I worked hard to stay calm and appear relaxed, although I am sure that all the sweating gave me away. I braced myself for her response that I was so sure would be an irreversible “thanks, but we’re not interested.” This early meeting was one of the many times that in my overly anxious preconceptions, I could not have predicted how this calm, thoughtful, insightful and lovely specials teacher would react to one of my earliest requests. Kathy gave me a fighting chance to try out my study, and she turned out to be one of the most caring and pleasant colleagues I had ever
encountered throughout my teaching career. She always showed unparalleled genuine concern for all school students, which they seemed to recognize by their continuous interactions and engagement with her.

Just as I could not have predicted how pleasant and supportive Kathy would be, I didn’t realize how much the adolescent participants would move our activity away from my initial lesson plans. I became extremely interested in the teaching and learning made possible upon disengaging the lesson plan-parachute, freeing participants to choose among interesting events. While it sometimes felt risky to abandon my plans, it was also freeing to abandon structure and manufactured outcomes. I began to realize that participants would change my plans to suit their needs as often as possible. The process taught me to relax the obsessive, outcome-based drives initiated by my early teaching experiences driven by NCLB. In the following selection, I explained how my approaches to instruction changed over time. Expecting this to be a study of gender and identity narratives constructed through beads and in writing, I prepared lesson plans that addressed beading techniques for our classes. I brought beading books to share ways that people in different cultures used beads. However, the participants’ activities never aligned with my lesson plans. In reality, I taught very few beading techniques, and instead, participants played and chatted constantly, explored materials, often beginning projects and leaving them unfinished as they moved on to the next interesting activity. At the time, this haunted the NCLB-era, goal-driven teacher in me. It also concerned me as a researcher. I worried that my integrated literacy-and-art study would not be successful due to a lack of participation. Even though I encouraged participants to learn different beading stitches and find ways to present identity, gender or cultural narratives, they
respectfully resisted, creating simple projects in very little time and spent most of their
time engaging in playful exchanges with each other. While I originally thought that they
would bead things that represented “who I am,” they had difficulty connecting how what
they made expressed an idea of identity, and often seemed to make it up as an
afterthought to appease my requests. I started to realize that this approach to research was
not delivering the results that I hoped to achieve through our work. Over time, I
researched alternate approaches to literacy and ways of knowing, which eventually
helped me to more effectively plan for class time, and shifted my expectations of
participants.

The following example illustrates an event when my efforts to teach beading
techniques did not offer the results I had hoped for. One day, a girl named Amy asked
how to make a beaded doll like one she saw in one of the beading books. After
studying the doll, I suggested a rather complicated stitch and tried to teach her, but my technique
was so tedious that it caused her to give up on the project after several extended attempts.
Looking back, I wished that I wouldn’t have urged Amy to pursue such a complicated
method. She could have simply strung beads on a thread and then wrapped the thread
around the doll’s body. As I packed away materials at the end of the lesson, I
reprimanded myself for privileging the complicated method over the simpler solution. I
needed to learn to relax and allow them to explore materials if I wanted my study to
survive. There was at least one day that semester when no participants signed up for my
class, which made me feel very worried about the study’s viability. I knew that I needed
to adapt, or the study would fail.
I started to ask the participants what they would like to have during our classes. They emphatically requested chocolates and candies, which became a staple during our sessions. They also requested materials to make rings and keychains, along with new beads in wide ranges of colors and materials. Some participants also requested various fabrics. Gradually, new participants joined our group, while others found alternative options for after school activities. Most of the participants were girls, and occasionally, a few boys joined us. They created simple bracelets, rings, keychains and necklaces, like those that they might make at summer camp. Participants played with the camera, took photographs of people and things and sometimes they shot video. One day, I brought a ring-making kit that was designed for artists to paint and glue together, but Amy saw a much more creative, innovative opportunity for these materials. She used her computer to shrink an image of a band she liked, then printed the image, cut it out and glued it between the plastic drop that covered the ring. Her innovative technique inspired imitations from other participants. I remember feeling excited about Amy’s inventive use of materials, and yet I had little to do with planning this event other than providing a ring kit. She created something special and personal when she had an opportunity to make something the way she wanted to, instead of addressing a pre-planned activity.

We gradually shifted away from an approach that privileged beading techniques and instead, made more room for the participants’ ideas for their own activity⁶. Over time, our collective activities began to take on more of the qualities of a lived curriculum (Aoki, 2005). Kathy helped me to organize my class that I called “Beaded Narratives,” because I planned to ask participants to consider creating written and beaded narratives to tell stories, literally integrating literacy and art practices. Looking back, I now know that
I did not have to take such a literal approach, but I did this because I felt that I needed to securely tie my research to literacy and a socially active curriculum, integrating arts practices. I brought beading materials to the class and continued to address the class with activity prompts, asking the participants to address their beadwork as narratives and to write about their work. Again, the participants responded politely to my prompts and delivered straightforward, narrative work, but did not attend to the identity work that I had hoped they might produce. When identity is part of the explicit nature of an assignment, it may get in the way and often fails to produce an identity inquiry because it produces representation, ‘fixing’ identity, rendering it static, when in fact, identity is always in the making (Leander & Boldt, 2013; McCarthey & Moje, 2002). The participants’ prompted, written narratives paled in comparison to the co-constructed play, relationships and inquiry through arts materials. Throughout their events and relational processes, the participants were already, always investigating and formulating their identities that are always in the making. Since the participants seemed to value their playful, affective relationships more than attending to teacher-created prompts during a structured time, I considered the persistence of the participants’ failure or refusal to produce things I could easily name as literacy or identity work. I needed to change the focus of my emergent study.

All of the participants in the after-school group engaged in different projects, and rarely created anything similar to another’s project. Some of the participants gradually constructed increasingly complicated beading projects as they developed beading skills. For example, several participants graduated from threading beads onto a single thread to creating beaded loomwork. Others skipped from one unfinished project to the next,
moving to a new project to keep learning interesting. All of their interactions played important roles in their participation and contributed to what they learned from each other and from the materials in the class. Those participants that prepared for Arts Fest produced emergent, self-selected activities in an unstructured environment that provided opportunities for them to make decisions about their activities based on interest and affect.

During the summer beading sessions, participants watched self-selected movies, produced artwork including jewelry and hand-drawn buttons, and perhaps more importantly, played together, taking advantage of the unstructured curriculum and creating their own lived curriculum. Two participants enjoyed co-constructed play wrestling so exhilarating that they produced a script and a play to continue to produce the excitement. On the day of Arts Fest, they playfully hawked their wares to many smiling passers-by, and successfully drew in quite a few customers. The intensities they co-created were surprisingly rich, and they were active in some way at nearly every moment. I cannot claim the same outcome for my former participants’ activities in my middle school English Language Arts classroom. Supporting participants’ desires afforded a unique richness of content and seemed to eliminate many external frustrations for participants and teacher.

I began to realize that integrating art and literacy didn’t have to be quite so literal and our class eventually lost its original name. As artists’ narratives changed over time, the authors could attribute different meanings to projects at different times. The only “truth” produced lay in the lived events as participants produced activities. My role served to support participants, just as the materials and classroom environment were
available as needed. This is not to suggest a false dichotomy between participants’ choices and teaching. Participants often had a variety of opportunities to align their own choices as a curriculum within a curriculum. My presence and efforts to organize the classroom provided additional resources to the participants, just as the beads and books served as supplies for participants’ productions. I worked in the periphery to create a specific, supportive environment and contributed information that influenced each event. I also considered that through my instructor role, I set scenes and inserted myself as just one among many influences on the participants’ emerging, affective activities. All of these elements influenced the emergent curriculum. While my presence and available materials certainly influenced participants’ attendance, the most influential draw for participation was to share the time and space with friends.

**Addressing ethical issues**

Before beginning my work in this study, I planned to address ethical concerns by cooperating with the codes of conduct delineated by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the Penn State Office of Research Protection. The IRB reviewed my proposal for studies and offered recommendations to help me to prepare a scrupulous research project. After the IRB declared that my study was free of ethical concerns, I provided verbal and written explanations of my study, along with my contact information, explaining potential risks to families of participants, who were all minors from ages 10 to 14. I explained and supported their right to decline from participation and withdraw from my study without consequences, but no participants chose to withdraw from my study. I offered options to the participants so that they could have greater choice in their involvement with the data that I collected. This decision was influenced by my
experience with the specials class during the spring of 2011, when I only offered options for participants to be videotaped or to refuse to participate in the study. I decided after that experience to include options for participants to be videotaped only, audiotaped only, or photographed only, or to have only hands and work videotaped. This arrangement offered participants greater control over their involvement in my study. A sensitivity issue that I faced when presenting video data to audiences related to participants’ privacy. While I explained my use of data in conference presentations, the dissertation and in possible publications, I felt concerned about sharing events that made participants feel uncomfortable with potential exposure in publications. For example, I shared a transcript based on video data in which one participant disputed data. When she read the transcript, she was sitting next to her mother, and she repeatedly insisted that she did not say the transcribed words. I could have disputed her argument with videotaped evidence, but because I wanted to be sensitive toward her feelings and to encourage further participation in my study, I said, “Oh, really? I’ll have to go back and check it out.” I then explained to her that I would remove that part of the transcript because I did not want to make her feel uncomfortable or distrustful of me, even though my data was accurate. Because of this event, I have some reservations about including data that might make the participants feel uncomfortable. In order to prevent the discomfort of my participants as much as possible, I chose only the data that fit my study, and avoided selecting data that caused perceptible discomfort for the participants. Presenting video data of participants to an audience of educators generates a new context where new spectators potentially impact the ways that the data is perceived. While I cannot prevent new perceptions of data by audiences, I have offered my best efforts to present data fairly and honestly.
In my efforts to present my data clearly, videotaping has been essential for me to transcribe participants’ gazes as well as spoken and gestural contributions. The outside gaze captured by videotaped data, like a second pair of eyes, made it possible for me to observe details that I did not notice during my efforts toward instruction and participant-support. However, limits of videotaped data surfaced, for example, when participants moved off-camera, or when audio recordings become inaudible. When this happened, I addressed this in my data collection by indicating that the participant contributions were imperceptible. Additionally, choosing a location to place the camera included some data while excluding other information. Because of this, the actual context of events did not always come through clearly. This forced me to look at the video data again and again, and describe as accurately as possible the details of the actual events shown in the video data. The information that the camera captured was constantly in flux, as participants’ physical locations changed frequently. During several of our meetings I presented past video of the participants to them to promote new discussions, both with and without prompts. Instead of attending to the verbal content of the video, the participants’ reactions seemed to express concern about what they previously looked like, what they wore, and how they acted. Additionally, my fallible memory of concurrent off-camera events faded over time. To address this concern, simultaneous field notes and photographs further informed these events by indicating details that may not be clear in the video data. As I analyzed video data, I prevented distortion of data by reviewing data repeatedly, and described only what the video showed. My efforts were further complicated by my dual roles as teacher and researcher in participant observation.
Although participation varied in relation to interest and other variables, the 16-month study allowed me to explore ways that participants’ involvement and interests changed over a significant length of time. It is my hope that my analysis speaks to my desire to allow the data to lead this study in a reflexive generation of theory-supported data. My approach to research has changed over time, beginning in a directive way and emerging rhizomatically, rapidly, into participant-led exploration of materials and interactions with each other with minimal teacher-direction aside from general safety.

**Moving away from “Beaded Narrative”**

I began to understand that my well-intentioned prompts were problematic in relation to the problem of representation in art and experience. By requiring a written representation of artwork, I inadvertently taught the participants that I privileged written representations over art practices and experience. Asking participants to summarize one possible representation of their artwork promoted a hierarchy that privileged linguistic ways of knowing over the visual, nearly pushing aside embodied experience in an outcome-driven curriculum. This resulted from my early desire to grasp at a structured curriculum, resulting from my experience as a public school elementary and English Language Arts teacher in efforts to maintain an academic focus in my research. I learned that the participants created the most important and lasting narratives through their shared experiences, perceptions and physical activities during interactions with materials and conversations.

When I understood that the participants’ experiences were embodied narratives themselves, and with the freedom from a mandated, graded curriculum, the participants and I became freed from the confines of a structured curriculum. In our classroom, the
participants together determined their own activities, influenced by affect and desire. Participants’ co-constructed events were the true narratives, unlike any of the elusive representations that I asked them to produce. Each event and all of the surrounding interactions influenced what was possible next as I continued to ask, “What range of desires, interests and other factors brings individuals to gather together in these spaces?” Writing narratives in response to teacher-created prompts had little influence on participants’ desires, interests and consequently, participation in the group. As I minimized my direction for participants’ activities, listened to their interests and desires and offered materials that they requested, together we created more space for participants to direct their own activities.
Chapter Three: Productions of Affect

Affection is therefore not only the instantaneous effect of a body upon my own, but also has an effect on my own duration—a pleasure or pain, a joy or sadness. These are passages, becomings, rises and falls, continuous variations of power (puissance) that pass from one state to another. We will call them affects, strictly speaking, and no longer affections. They are signs of increase and decrease, signs that are vectorial (of the joy-sadness type) and no longer scalar like the affections, sensations or perceptions. (Deleuze, 1997, p. 139)

Affects connect and influence people’s actions like the nearly invisible threads that connect beads woven together. Deleuze uses the term affect to explain a multidimensional vector of assigned meaning that influences the ways that the body and mind are prepared to receive or not receive stimuli, depending on intensity, rhythm and time. Affects potentially impact and are impacted by constructions that are made possible in relationships. I hypothesize that affects are invisible yet ubiquitous influences that may impact participants’ choices in multidimensional ways. Participants’ interactions with each other elicit affects that they then may or may not attribute to prior understandings of emotions and feelings, attributing these understandings to choices that they make. All of these interactions are rhizomatic and influence constructions of meaning impacting participants’ contributions to the group. Group dynamics constantly impact individuals’ choices and influences, generating new possibilities and productive, rhizomatic activities.
Affects have potential to serve as motivators for individuals. Further, Tomkins (1962) suggests that individuals can maintain interest in activities because of the influences of the affect of interest and the individual’s orientation reactions, which involve the mechanisms of surprise-startle, interest-excitement and related reflexes. These mechanisms may help me to better understand adolescent participants’ constructions of relationships as they constantly produce and engage in activities.

Tomkins indicates that “stimulation increase, stimulation level, and stimulation decrease” are three activators of affect that may inform my understanding of the participants’ activities (1981, p. 317). These activators vary widely in relation to contexts, participants and materials, evoke scores of combinations of affects, and produce various outcomes.

Tomkins presented nine highly motivational affects and their responses; interest-excitement, enjoyment-joy, the resetting affect of startle-surprise, distress-anguish, shame-humiliation, contempt-disgust, anger-rage, dissmell, an embodied reaction to an unpleasant smell, and fear-terror. Although fewer than ten primary affects exist, they combine in many contexts to produce scores of outcomes. Understanding the different roles that affects play in participants’ experiences helped me to attend to my research question: “What range of desires, interests and other factors brings individuals to gather together in these spaces? How does the role of affect impact participants’ interactions?”

In the following selection from my data, I presented narrative descriptions and analyses of two participants’ affective reactions to beaded art in a textbook.

**Beaded Egg-guts**

Usually, between four and eight participants (all girls) elected to attend our after school class each Monday from 3:15 p.m.-4:30 p.m. However, on several occasions, no
one attended, due to interest or other obligations. Our classes typically involved an assortment of different art and craft activities, varying from one individual to the next. The girls constantly engaged in cheerful conversations about their activities, friends and interests while constantly moving hands across materials, tying knots and threading beads, their activity frequently punctuated by laughter and play. In the following event, I have described a conversation between two participants during a sunny September Monday, just weeks into my study. It was rare for us to have such a small group of two. One of the girls was Toni, an eleven year-old fifth grader. The other girl was Betsy, a twelve year-old sixth grader. They casually entered the room, dropped their backpacks and lunch boxes off at nearby tables and chairs, and immediately investigated the newly replenished candy stash. Usually, participants would begin by sorting through materials own their own while talking with each other, collecting desirable items, and then starting a project or resuming an existing project. Most of the time, I did not prompt or guide their activity, and instead, served in a supporting role to allow the participants to make as many of their own decisions as possible. On this particular day, however, I suggested that if they wished, they might look at images in several library books depicting beaded art forms for ten minutes before starting their own artwork, which they did. My suggestion was not meant to guide the girls’ discussions or activities, or to require that they look at the books, but was an effort to share background regarding artists’ uses of materials, techniques, form and content. Presenting beading books was just one way that I presented materials to the participants, who led the discussion as they meandered through the text. I chose to include this discussion because it represented the kind of inquisitive, playful conversations that involved everyone in the beading group on a regular basis, but it also
shows my early attempts to enrich their beading activities with beading resources. I wished to share images of beaded art with them with hopes that they might draw inspiration from other beading artists’ work. Even though I continued to present beading books over the next few weeks, I noticed that few participants actively pursued the books, so I gradually limited such teacher resources and instead, focused on bringing materials that the participants requested, which included specific kinds of beads, thread, duct tape, and fabric. I quickly learned to curb my “furor to teach” in order to create space for the children to make their own decisions about their activities in our elective space (Britzman, 2006). It was important for me to support participant interest, which was directly related to attendance, since the survival of my study depended on the participants’ willingness to attend. I chose to include the following event because of the ways that play emerged from the girls’ adaptations of our co-created lived curriculum influenced in part by the textbooks, and more importantly by the girls’ contributions, for example, during Toni’s physical egg-emptying performance-explanation. While the girls’ discussion was similar in form to many other participant conversations throughout the semester, Toni’s egg-emptying explanation in connection to her experience was quite unique and seemed to surprise Betsy. I chose to include this example because of the way that Toni used language and embodied expression to communicate an egg-emptying process that she had learned from her father. Like many of the conversations that emerged from our beading context, the girls’ discussion that follows is marked by intensities, excitement and play.

Around 3:30 p.m. after school, Toni noticed an image in one of the books and spontaneously exclaimed, “Cool! Look at the eggs! They covered the eggs with beads.”
Betsy paused from looking at her own book and leaned over to look at the image Toni referred to, saying in a singing and rhythmic voice while bouncing in her chair, “Mm hmm. They’re egg carriers!” In the next moment, Betsy asked, “But what if the egg goes bad?”

Toni considered Betsy’s suggestion for a moment and chimed in with, “Eww,” stretching out the utterance. Toni continued, “Oh, I know…”

Toni’s speech quickened and her pitch repeatedly rose and fell as she explained a procedure. Toni rapidly explained, “Well, you know how you can keep the egg from going bad? Well, you can,” she paused, then continued, “take an egg, poke a little hole through it, poke another little hole through it…” She looked at me while she explained and gestured intensely with her hands continuously to show how she poked two holes into two ends of an “egg.” She held the “egg” with one hand, and with the other hand, she simulated poking a hole into the top and bottom of the “egg.” Then she took a deep breath, filled her lungs with oxygen, lowered her head to her hands and blew noisily for several seconds into the “egg,” simulating the expulsion of the “egg’s” contents. Her deep, gestural inhalation and forceful exhalation were analogous to the way that one would fill a deflated balloon with air, or as though she would blow through an embouchure while playing the trumpet (Figure 10).
Immediately after she completed this obstreperous exhalation performance, she turned her face and torso to look at Betsy and laughed excitedly. Toni hid her mouth slightly behind her hands that were previously holding the “egg,” as she giggled and looked at Betsy. Betsy looked up from her own book, and looked at Toni while she was making this noise. Toni looked at Betsy and laughed for several seconds with her hands still in front of her mouth, while Betsy looked at Toni out of the corner of her eyes opened wide, mouth slightly agape. Betsy’s hand, previously turning a page in a book, was poised motionless in the air, signifying a turn in her gaze as she turned toward Toni with her mouth slightly open and head tilted, gaze following Toni’s movement (Figure 11).
After watching and listening to Toni and me laugh for several seconds, Betsy smiled at Toni and laughed softly. After seeing Betsy’s reaction, Toni finally looked away from Betsy (Figure 12).

In between inhalations from my own laughter, I referred to Toni’s physical embodiment of the “egg” emptying activity, asking, “What does that do?”

Toni laughed until she was almost out of breath, and then explained immediately in a straightforward tone, “It squeezes all the guts out.”
Toni and I laughed at once, and Betsy joined in, nearly shouting rhythmically, then laughing, “Guts! Guts, guts, guts!”

In between fits of laughter, Toni struggled to produce speech, further explaining breathlessly, “And then, you'll have a little bowl of egg, out the end, and you'll have an empty egg with an undamaged eggshell.” Toni gestured again vividly with her hands, demonstrating the movement of the egg’s contents and the undamaged eggshell. She explained that her father taught her how to drain eggs to dye them. Next, I explained the process of dyeing Pysanky eggs, continuing the egg-centered conversation. Betsy, however, did not engage in the beaded-egg conversation, and instead, pointed out pictures in the book that interested her.

Meanwhile, still on the topic of eggs, Toni continued to explain emphatically, “Like, even though this, you would think that that was egg right there, but it isn't, actually, that's more white beads. Right there!” Toni took turns pointing to an image in her book with each hand and leaned her whole body near the image so that her eyes were just inches away from the picture.

I exclaimed, “Oh, really?”

Toni explained, “You can tell because there’s little dots on it. See?”

Simultaneously, Betsy looked at an image of a beaded sculpture of a person in her own book, then leaned her head back and opened her mouth into a round circular shape. As she produced this expression, no one else seemed to notice, yet her behavior was captured by videotape (Figure 13).
In the next moment, Betsy moved her body and leaned her head next to Toni’s, just a few inches above the image in Toni’s book. Betsy explained, “No, they're not. I think those are just little swirlies. I think it's just a fake egg.”

Toni agreed, “Yeah, it looks like a fake egg.”

Betsy sat upright again before Toni stood up. Betsy looked back into her own book, and referred again to the image of the beaded sculpture of a figure making a round circular-shape with its mouth. For a second time, Betsy dropped her jaw open and formed an o-shape with her mouth, similar to a singer’s expression when holding a long note. This time, Betsy produced a short-o sound while she satirized the representation in the image and turned, looked at Toni, stuck her tongue out and pointed to the image with her left hand. Toni also engaged in this performance, laughed and made a round shape with her mouth, uttering a short-o sound (Figure 14).
Figure 14: Betsy and Toni make faces together. Courtesy Julie Slivka.

Analysis

In this analysis, I have investigated ways that participants effected each other in the preceding event, considered the varying roles of materials, potentials of understanding activity through a lived curriculum, influence of affects, and the ways that language and the body communicate information in different ways. First, I explore the ways that present and absent materials influenced possible participation and outcomes. Second, I consider the possibility that the girls produced a lived curriculum in addition to play and excitement. Thirdly, I investigate ways that affects defined what was possible. Finally, I consider the ways that language and embodied activity influenced participants’ communication. These events helped me to further understand participants’ desires that brought them together in an elective, after-school space, and influenced the ways that I supported their activities throughout the rest of the school year.

The Real and Virtually Present

I often considered that the participants’ interests in my class would wax and wane due partly to opportunities in the other spaces of the after-school program, such as a place to get a head start on homework, or another where they could play games, or any number
of non-school alternatives. Males rarely came to beading in the after-school time and the school’s ratio of 3:1 (boys-to-girls) significantly reduced the number of participants. In order to compete with other after-school activities, I felt that I needed to demonstrate as many interesting examples and materials as possible to hold participants’ interests and to show some possibilities of potential projects. I displayed hard-bound, image-filled beading books from the local university library, colorful bead order forms, physical examples of my beaded artwork, and all different kinds of beading materials. The extensive beading materials included do-it-yourself cardboard prototypes and commercial, metal beading looms, my sewing machine and two large tubs of various materials. These tubs contained different-colored wire, white thermally bonded Wildfire beading thread measuring .15mm in diameter, an array of colored embroidery floss, candy-hued sewing thread, a medley of textured yarn, scrap linens, tawny leather bits, assorted hooks and clasps and shiny earring hooks. In addition, the tubs included different sized-beads made of textured, tinted glass, shell, wood, metal, ceramic, acrylic and plastic. Participants and their families thoughtfully donated many of the materials, and I purchased the rest of the materials often requested by participants, using coupons to find the lowest prices and was then reimbursed by the school. Finally, I brought individually wrapped pieces of chocolate and fruit-flavored candy that I often purchased on-sale at local grocery and discount retail stores after the holidays. It often became routine for the participants to investigate the bag of candy available at the start of each session. By repeatedly restocking my inventory of variegated beads and other materials, I hoped that the young participants would find interest in their activities on Monday afternoons.
The beaded-egg interaction was a micro-example of participants’ involvement with materials. During her interaction with beading books, Toni almost immediately made a positive connection to an image of a beaded egg. Her contribution gave way to Betsy’s agreement and extension, followed by her critical question, “But what if the egg goes bad?” Her question yielded Toni’s affective response, “Eww,” demonstrating that both girls engaged in a critical consideration of possibilities for materials. Shortly after, Toni used available materials; hands, mouth, an exhalation and noise. When she needed additional materials, she simply invented them. During her imaginative demonstration for emptying an egg, she conceived a “virtual-real” egg that allowed her to explain the process that she used to empty the egg. Deleuze explained that something is virtual if it can be conceived conceptually, and further explained that the abstraction is simultaneously real. Not unlike the abstract organization of virtual-real language, through her explanation, Toni created her own rules to support the embodied invention of the virtual-real egg, “as in a game in which each move changes the rules,” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 110). She created the rules of the game, making the virtual “egg” become real because it interactively supported her explanation. She made this game visible to Betsy, and suddenly her invention became vulnerable, possibly because of the question of Betsy’s willingness to accept Toni’s “rules” of her representation. All of the elements present within the assemblage hung in the balance for a moment, playing continuously shifting roles in the overall construction of the event.

Likewise, that which was absent influenced the event. Additional audience members and an outcome-based curriculum were missing from the environment where the girls co-produced these events. The absence of additional peers existed as a presence
because the girls seemed to take additional risks participating frequently during small group discussions. I was able to notice this in part because I visited several of the girls’ classrooms during the school day as a supervisor for student teachers. During those in-school visits, I noticed that some of the girls in my study verbally participated less often in class discussion than they did during the voluntary after school group discussions. In the after school program, they engaged in different sorts of verbal and physical play that they might not have in the presence of mixed company, or during school hours. Our elective after-school context made it possible for many participants to engage each other with a variety of contents in self-selected ways. For example, the girls engaged in dramatic narrated tag, where the girls would first sing, and then chase each other around the classroom before tickling each other and giggling. At other times, the girls participated in ways that they might not have in another context, such as spontaneous singing, jewelry making, or discussing fashion or celebrities. In other words, even things absent were present as potential or virtual elements. Participants reclaimed ownership over their time and space generated a ‘girls’ space’ in our after-school group made possible by materials and their social associations. The relaxed framework of the after-school group based on expectations of the school and the teacher also influenced what was made possible for the girls. One way of framing this activity is through a lived curriculum.

**Lived curriculum as a framework**

Aoki’s lived curriculum lends itself to my study as the basis of a framework to understand our collective reactions and individual interpretations that influenced the direction of conversation and activity. While I began classes early in the study with
suggestions for beading techniques such as peyote, spiral, right angle weave, brick or square stitches, most participants chose to use beads in different ways and did not request to learn formal, tedious beading stitches. The participants’ interests changed my plans from the very beginning, and although they did not always choose to engage in standard beading techniques, they were constantly doing something self-selected. Participants’ productions could be understood as planning in the making, a child-driven lived curriculum that emerged from materials and somatic literacy performances, where interest and excitement played an important role in the emergent curriculum. It seemed that through interaction in our emergent, lived curriculum, the participants in this event produced many positive intensities that constantly yielded new excitement. I offered beading books that played a parallel role alongside the beads and other materials, as resources that the girls could refer to. While the participants were free to use the materials in any different way, their sensuous forms and cultural uses controlled and guided participants’ activities in limited ways. For example, the books bestowed their own sets of unstated yet understood rules that the girls had to navigate. These resources served the participants in a similar way that I played a supporting role to make room for girls’ contributions. By backgrounding materials and minimizing teacher-driven “goals,” the children’s interests and desires took center stage and led their activity. I am not suggesting that I did not have any goals of my own. Rather, the participants’ interests and desires drove their involvement in my study, influencing my supporting contributions, for example, listening to their ideas, suggesting and acquiring materials or helping them to solve their own problems. In the event presented above, I listened to their discussion and answered questions in ways that I hoped would position the girls as knowledgeable and
valuable. My efforts to decenter my teacher role centralized the children’s contributions. The participants’ actions influenced the trajectories of the lived curriculum. For example, Toni’s spontaneous, emphatic egg-emptying demonstration emerged as part of our collective lived curriculum. She moved away from the pages of the textbook and used embodied performance to teach the rest of the group how to prepare an eggshell for art activity. While her somatic performance may be removed from traditional literacy practice, she was still able to communicate information effectively and expediently. Although Toni was quite capable of transcribing her explanation into another extrasomatic memory system, her embodied explanation seemed to sufficiently communicate her egg-emptying process without a redundant transcription. Her embodied explanation contributed significantly to our lived curriculum. Further, available materials served as cultural tools that the girls drew from as they created and lived the curriculum. The girls frequently used or referred to available cultural tools to create excitement and engage each other in conversation. While I asked the girls to look at the books to glean ideas for ten minutes, I did not confine their activity with prompts or other teacher-imposed structure. For example, the girls flipped through images in the beading books not necessarily to learn how to create beaded art, but instead, they excitedly reacted to images and engaged in conversation with each other and me. The images in the books played a secondary role to their engagement in playful conversation. Additionally, while play may seem counterproductive to a lived curriculum, it served an essential role in our classroom. Play was an important part of our lived curriculum that seemed to keep participants interested in returning to class. Betsy’s playful shout; “Guts! Guts, guts guts,” in response to an image of beaded artwork was important to the continuation of our
curriculum. Although her outburst may at first seem out of place in a curriculum, she was not only drawing upon her aesthetic experience reading *Ramona the Brave* by Beverly Cleary (1975), but she was also making a playful connection to the beaded image that she shared with Toni. Their laughter bubbled over, punctuating their clever observations. Both girls were fully engaged in the playful conversation that they led, in contrast to forced, listless conversations that frequently arise from structured, teacher-prompted discussion. I do not mean to suggest that structured, teacher-prompted discussions never elicit playful, exciting conversation, but such structured prompts may limit what children can contribute to discussions and promote narrow responses from a select few students that produce “teacher-approved,” academically inclined responses. Instead, I hope to draw attention to the variety of ways that children are able to produce and sustain interesting conversation and interactions, where it is possible for spontaneous play to serve curricula. I believe that children often make important, clever contributions that are otherwise ignored, suppressed or eliminated in the teacher’s “furor to teach” established, often-tested curricula (Britzman, 2006). When any narrow focus controls or dominates children’s activity, while it may privilege certain academic responses and therefore, privilege certain individuals, it can simultaneously bulldoze other students’ experiential contributions, creating little room for “other” ways of knowing, causing them to “tune out.” Instead, I am interested in curricula that accommodate as many approaches as possible. This seems to me to be a way to involve as many different ways of knowing as possible, for example, through play. Through play, the participants reclaimed curricula, made authentic, relevant contributions to the class and retrieved ownership over their time and space in the classroom.
Affects

Participants’ transmissions and negotiations of affects produced among ensembles of relations have important implications upon the movement of power throughout participants’ activities in our class. More importantly, it seemed that the participants returned each Monday to generate fun, play, relaxation after a full day of classes, and perhaps to build relationships with each other. Perhaps they were actively pursuing the smile of joy, as I was. Tomkins (1995) explained that a smiling response can be activated by reduction in a negative stimulation or any other combination of stimuli. Toni, Betsy and the other participants frequently exhibited physical evidence of smiling responses during our time together, which in turn often incited new affects in others. It seemed that the pursuit of excitement encouraged the girls to continue to engage in the next exciting event. Consequentially, their efforts to create excitement often resulted in play in our after school group, even though there were at times, disruptive moments that challenged our generally positive climate.

Apathy was conspicuously absent from the girls’ behaviors. I attribute the lack of apathy in large part to the girls’ abilities to choose how they would spend their time after school, which I believe related to the ways that they responded to my questions and involvement with their activity. For example, when I asked questions to extend explanations, the girls could have ignored my questions or changed the subject, although Betsy worked hard to change the subject when Toni led the conversation. Perhaps they answered my questions because of their own expectations of themselves in relation to my role as their teacher, or in relation to other factors of the rhizome. Both girls worked hard to centralize their roles in the discussion. Further, Toni was capable of producing an
entirely verbal explanation about ejecting the egg’s contents, but she produced a much more creative, playful, visual response complete with raspberry sound effects, demonstrating how “It squeezes all the guts out,” eliciting more fun and laughter from a negotiated moment, a threshold moment that could develop in any emotional and/or interpretive direction. However, her word choices served as an inroad that Betsy chose to connect to, as she shouted, “Guts! Guts, guts, guts!” Betsy’s playful response to Toni’s contribution of content indicated her complicity in the conversation, and her approval seemed to allow Toni to continue, where a negative response might have stopped Toni in her tracks, changing the activity’s course. In isolation, the girls’ playful responses may not have elicited such exciting responses, but during their co-constructed play, they used affectual exchanges through performance to produce a seemingly endless supply of excitement. Affect became part of the elective lived curriculum due partly to the ways that affective micro events during play sustained attention and produced new opportunities for the participants to make unique connections in each new assemblage. Together, the girls frequently demonstrated enjoyment-joy responses through frequent laughter and smiles.

Participants’ activities were equally influenced by corrective responses that generated negative affects. After Betsy made several rather unsuccessful attempts to engage Toni and me with similar “academic” content to Toni’s, for example, a beaded wine glass, Betsy effectively changed the direction of the activity by disagreeing with Toni’s interpretation of an image of a beaded egg. Betsy disagreed with Toni’s suggestion that tiny dots in an image indicated beads, although the image actually depicted beads, as seen in the following image of a beaded egg.
By risking a challenge against Toni’s finding, she inspired a negative reaction in Toni that successfully created a break in the discussion about decorative eggs. The unspoken agreement between the girls of “getting along” seemed more influential than the words or message alone. While it was unclear whether Betsy’s response created negative affects in Toni, her actions productively changed the conversation topic from the beaded egg image to the picture of the facial expression portrayed in a beaded sculpture. Betsy responded negatively to Toni’s discovery, then encouraged spontaneous play in response to an image of her own choice. Toni abandoned her “academic” conversation to create space for play with Betsy. Affect contributed a powerful force on the emergent lived curriculum, evident in the ways that their reactions to each other moved them from one activity to the next, never standing still.

Our classroom was often filled with laughter, smiles, songs and playful banter. Major arguments or frequent bouts of tears were conspicuously absent. It seemed that the energy in the room powerfully impacted what became possible in relationships, which directly and indirectly influenced the curricular productions in the group and made it
possible for participants to move rapidly from one activity to the next. Understanding how individuals react physically and emotionally to experiences offers potential for teachers to better support students. Understanding how pre-emotional reactions influence learning is vital to participants and teachers because humans constantly produce, respond and trigger highly productive cultural responses. Participants’ interactions with each other further elicited responses that they then attributed to prior understandings of emotions and feelings, impacting the choices they made, which ultimately impacted attendance. All of these interactions influenced participants’ contributions to the group, while group dynamics impacted individuals’ choices and influences that constantly generated new possibilities in each new assemblage. Therefore, co-created affect played essential roles in processes that determined the quality, content and intensity of their constructions, ultimately defining what was possible in the event. Affects influence embodied, unwritten histories that individuals carry with them throughout life, uncontrolled by time. Therefore, individuals carry memories of responses to affect that can either hinder or generate multiple and different possibilities. While it is impossible to disconnect participants’ reactions from their embodied performances, I turn next to the ways that they communicated information through language and through their embodied performances.

**Language and the Body**

Cole (2011) explained that affect influences approaches to pedagogy, evident in the dynamics between my interactions with individuals in my study; specifically evidenced in my efforts to investigate participants’ desires and interests in addition to my encouragement to return to our class. Cole further explained that one role of affect
represents the ways that language is so often used to characterize “truth,” which becomes apparent in curriculum organization. This role of affect primarily focuses on the pursuit of “truth” by the institution or instructor. This becomes evident, for example, in the ways that test-based data is overwhelmingly used to indicate children’s academic success. Language-based information becomes the dominating force used to define growth, which potentially overrides other embodied, affective ways of knowing. In our classroom, however, our pursuit of “truth” was much different because we privileged materials and activities that drew participants to class, based upon their choices that included play, exploration and excitement. We privileged different ways of knowing that nearly always involved the body. Vygotsky’s (1986) thought-cloud suggests that individuals conceive many ideas at once, and typically communicate these ideas through a linear language process. Vygotsky’s thought-cloud does not have to be limited by linear language. However, if we only look at individuals’ productions of language, I believe that we miss rich opportunities to notice other embodied, affective ways of communicating.

Throughout my study, I noticed parallels and disconnects between participants’ uses of language and embodied expression. The girls used their bodies as forms of media to convey information in addition to their spoken words, exemplified by Toni during her egg-emptying description. Her gestures further informed her spoken explanation, in other words they were co-influential and multimodal pedagogy. However, during our discussion about beaded eggs, it seemed that there was some discontinuity in the relationship between Betsy’s spoken words and her behavior while she viewed the books and involved herself in our conversation. Betsy’s embodied activity seemed to question her spoken words. Although she verbally expressed interest in several images in the
book, possibly addressing academic content that she assumed I expected, Betsy looked only fleetingly at the images. Further, the girls physically expressed much more than they verbally expressed during their disagreement about the presence of beads in the photo of a beaded egg. Betsy changed the direction of the conversation after multiple attempts over a two-minute span. If the girls had considered only the words of their conversation, disconnected from feeling or their relationship, then Toni might have argued how she knew that the image indicated many beads. However, the feelings of the event powerfully influenced the girls’ actions. Toni’s interesting choice to avoid argument might have indicated a desire to cooperate with Betsy, or perhaps her agreement related to something else. I propose that Toni’s response reflected her ability to sustain civil interactions with peers, which indicates her desire for relationships. Both girls’ performances told slightly different, more complicated stories than their words expressed. The girls’ embodied ways of knowing recall Butler’s explanation that the body indicates that which language exceeds. Butler explains:

Language emerges from the body, constituting an emission of sorts. The body is that upon which language falters, and the body carries its own signs, its own signifiers, in ways that remain largely unconscious…We say something, and mean something by what we say, but we also do something with our speech, and what we do, how we act upon another with our language, is not the same as the meaning we consciously convey.

(2004, pp. 198-199)

Although Butler refers to gender performances, I have extended this disconnect between language and the body to include any disconnect between spoken language and
the body’s gestures. The body conveys “truth” that is unattained and often obfuscated by language. It seemed that Betsy pointed out other images to distract us from the beaded egg conversation, perhaps to engage us in play or to move on, perhaps, to more exciting content. She continuously attempted to engage us in similar academic conversation that Toni engaged in, but did not garner the same degree of involvement, so she tried a different, playful approach. It seemed that when she quickly flipped through pages of the book, fleetingly looking at the images, her efforts related only trivially to personal interest, as she stated in her claim. Rather, it appeared that she spent more time looking at Toni and me, while attempting to change the subject through her bodily gestures. While Toni agreed with Betsy, “Yeah, it looks like a fake egg,” it is unclear whether Toni really believed what she said. This marked the end of the discussion about the beaded egg. Perhaps Toni’s gesture of agreement served to promote identification between the two girls, where Betsy was Toni’s senior, or perhaps her desire for a relationship, or simply to sustain civility, or something else entirely influenced her response. Regardless, the girls playfully produced silly faces in response to the images and to each other, which generated additional excitement and laughter and opened new opportunities to continue conversation and play. Although the language that they used might or might not have communicated what they really thought, their physical involvement overshadowed the conversation, indicating mutual interest in fellowship and playing together. The relationship that both girls produced together eclipsed the academic conversation regarding beads. I presented this event in order to illustrate some of the limits of language, and to suggest the importance of embodiment, which is often relegated to the background in classrooms.
Human embodiment in an elective after-school space

I return to Elizabeth Ellsworth’s question, “How does the fact of human embodiment affect activities of teaching and learning?” (2005, p. 2). I am extending Ellsworth’s question to include after-school contexts in which learning plays frequently changing roles in children’s experiences. In an assemblage in which both my attitude and the materials provided for an openness that is outside the norm in schools due in part to the ungraded, loose structure, I had the opportunity to understand how participants would, if given the chance, constantly seek ways to energize and re-energize what was happening, including curriculum. Considering this event offered me an opportunity to become more sensitive to the ways that a teacher-directed, academic focus might overwhelm or eliminate participants’ contributions to the group, influencing my decisions during the rest of the study. The participants also offered insight into the ways that they used available materials or spontaneously generated virtual-real materials to communicate. Toni’s interest in the discussion allowed her to solve the problem of providing necessary materials for her explanation, which might not have been possible without her interest in the content, historically situated in her own personal experience. Further, the girls’ productions of affects operated as surprisingly powerful stimuli, influencing and even disrupting their spoken and embodied contributions. Participants’ embodied performances offered additional insight into their productions of truth.
Chapter Four: Affect and Materials

“You could fall in love with him (Henry) and kiss him if you want!”

-Toni, Grade 6

In the following chapter, I attend to adolescent participants’ engagement with materials that afforded or elided certain events and experiences, but not others. I attend to affects that participants produced during play, which I found inseparable from their embodied activities and construction of relationships. During Spring, 2012 participants in our after school beading class and elective summer sessions reclaimed time and space to hang out with each other and make any kinds of projects every Monday. In what follows, I argue that participants’ affectively experienced, embodied ways of knowing account for most human efforts to engage the world. I present narrative and images to describe a series of events that unfolded in the beading class revolving around Henry, the school’s well-known, anthropomorphized vacuum cleaner. All of the school’s students were already familiar with Henry because the students were responsible for keeping the classroom spaces tidy. Because the charter school did not hire a full-time custodian, the teachers and students collaborated to keep the school clean, which may explain why so many of the students already knew how to access Henry. The preliminary event that I describe with Henry established a continuing narrative that the participants continued to play with over time. Following the first event, I investigated an event that occurred several months later, when two girls projected Henry as a participant and pretended to claim Henry as ‘her own.’ They proceeded to wrestle with each other on the floor and generated such profound energies and intensities that they compelled themselves to
reiterate the initial event through multiple performances. Although a spontaneous wrestling event seems to be an uncommon choice to demonstrate learning processes, the participants were extremely engaged and attentive during play, which I believe suggest important implications for play in a lived curriculum.

While it would be almost unthinkable to allow physical play wrestling in a traditional classroom, physical movements and interactive play were common lived experiences in our unstructured, exploratory out-of-school space in the summer. This event was not typical of the participants’ activities during the beading class. However, I chose to write about this event because the girls found so much excitement in their collaborative play with each other and with materials. The girls’ wrestling-play was so exciting that they made multiple attempts to continue the play and excitement, even taking it up again in academic play, through a written script and a performance. Although physical contact was out of the norm, the girls’ interactions were similar to playground play that could take place out of doors or possibly during play at a slumber party, for example. Their care to avoid causing injury toward each other’s bodies during play was critical and allowed them to continue to play. The two girls had my attention during their rambunctious play, and I was in close physical proximity and involved in the conversation, which was especially important due to the girls’ physical contact between students. Participants produced a series of intense embodied events throughout the beading class. The openness, unstructured time and space made improvisational outcomes possible that may have been eliminated, ignored or left underdeveloped in a teacher-directed pedagogy.

The girls produced embodied interactions and emergent affects in a “relational
and continuously moving field,” “a space in which non-human forces are equally at play and work as constitutive factors in children’s learnings and becomings” (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. 527). The materials acted upon the participants just as they acted upon the non-human forces. Further, Law and Mol (1995) explained that materials “are interactively constituted; outside their interactions they have no existence, no reality. Machines, people, social institutions, the natural world, the divine – all are effects or products.” (p. 277). All humans and non-human actors are engaged in an assemblage, and are largely unproductive outside interactions in an assemblage. For example, Henry serves no purpose in the closet, but he becomes productive and important the moment he is engaged in thought and dialogue. The participants engaged with each other and with inanimate objects and the surroundings that also acted on and otherwise impacted what became possible for humans and inanimate objects alike (Olsson, 2009, pp. 19-20). Although it may appear that ‘he’ remained passive, in fact, Henry the Vacuum acted upon the girls’ bodies as they acted on him, just as the floor, gravity, time and other physical influences determined possibilities and outcomes for learning and other activities. What became possible, for example, generating excitement or surprise, could not be divided from the context of the learning environment, and so the individuals became entangled with each other and the milieu in a state of becoming as time moved and events unfolded (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010). Henry and the environment provided certain potentials and unique problems for the girls to solve in a continuously moving relational field.

Affect and affection served as powerful influences on participation that offer fresh insights into power dynamics within participants’ activities in the beading class as they developed greater understandings and intuition within the relationships that they co-
created. Participants constantly produced a community through interconnected affects as they sought to produce their own activities and changed their minds. I have tried to explain, in the fashion of Stewart (2007) who explained that participants’ embodied experiences resonate with and through affects; “I am trying to bring them into view as a scene of immanent force, rather than leave them looking like dead effects imposed on an innocent world.” (p. 1). I explore second-by-second micro events of embodied experiences through narrative in a similar way that Stewart “tries to slow the quick jump to representational thinking and evaluative critique long enough to find ways of approaching the complex and uncertain objects that fascinate because they literally hit us or exert a pull on us” (p. 4). We came closer to this through detailed explanations of events. I demonstrated in the following narrative that Henry the Vacuum became a nodal point that the girls could go to time and again to incite engagement in unplanned ways. The girls’ co-produced pre-emotional intensities inspired reactions and worked as the unpredictable, inseparable and living connective tissue that served to link and inform their relationships with each other and with materials.

The girls produced theatrical performances and physical interactivity during their spirited, co-constructed skirmish. The affects produced in each event became interwoven with others throughout these events, giving force and direction to but not containing emergent events. The girls constantly reconfigured renditions of the initial and subsequent Henry events to produce excitement as often as possible. Throughout the described events I explore the salience of affect, materiality, time and space as affordances that offered opportunities for children to create and guide their activities in the classroom space, activities that included learning, communicating, feeling,
experimenting and inciting. The participants constantly produced affects in relation to materials and the continuously moving field that revealed potentials that might have otherwise remained hidden or unimagined in a top-down learning model that seeks to manufacture particular learning outcomes or that (mis)imagines learning as the only important thing that happens in a classroom. Our open approach privileged the children’s affective contributions, disrupting a traditional learning model.

“Who’s Henry?”

Beading class ended on a late April Monday, when the end of the school year produced a precariousness in previously more stable activities and emotions. Near the end of the beading class, there was a sudden spike in energy and excitement when one of the girls spilled hundreds of glass seed beads that bounced across the floor. Prior to the spill, the room was relatively still, punctuated by quiet mutterings and occasional laughs, and then suddenly - CRASH – a muffled and voluminous tic-tac of bouncing glass beads hitting each other as they plummeted toward the carpeted flooring and then a flurry of beads freed from their state of rest, now scattering across the floor. The girls were likewise mobilized. Chairs SCREECHED against each other as the girls jerked to stand and bend low, fumbling to collect the beads. I asked the girls, “(Do) you know where the vacuum is?”

The question created a catalyst for activity. Mumbling, her attention still focused on selecting just the right beads, Boo ordered, “Go get Henry, Toni.” Not waiting for Toni to respond, Boo stopped what she was doing and headed out of the room.

I asked, “Who’s Henry?”

Hearing my question, Boo paused and called back an explanation: “Henry’s our
vacuum.” Her voice faded as she exited our classroom and entered the large entryway.

Looking up from my efforts to reorganize materials, I asked, “Do you know where it is?” I didn’t realize that Boo was on her way to get the vacuum.

Toni giggled and repeated ironically, “Hen- Henry’s our vacuum? Wow. These people are weird.” She spoke as though she was an outside audience member, even as she referred to herself and Boo.

Several moments later, Boo returned to our classroom, smiling and lugging Henry at her heels. She introduced, “This is Henry.” Henry was the resident red-orange, bashfully smiling vacuum cleaner made by the Numatic Company in the United Kingdom (Figure 16). Short in stature, he wore a black hat, a black vacuum hose for a nose, four wheels, and a yellow cord for a tail. His eyes looked coyly upwards toward the right, and two of his small black wheels resembled tiny black paws under his ‘chin.’

Toni ran across the room, arms outstretched, toward Henry, yelling, “Hi, Henry! How are you, Henry?” Boo lifted the power brush attached to the hose of the vacuum cleaner toward Toni’s face, who carried on the fun of the fantasy play, producing a shrill scream.

Lisa now entered the play, asking, “Were you always called Henry?”

“Because his name is Henry.” Boo clarified. “See? Henry!” She pointed to the label on the vacuum cleaner.

Toni further explained, “He has a face, and everything!”

Lisa exclaimed, “Oh yeah, Henry!”

“'You could fall in love with him and kiss him if you want,” giggled Toni, causing all the rest of us to chuckle as Boo powered the vacuum cleaner and swept up the loose beads. Boo aimed the arm of the vacuum again at Toni, pretending to vacuum her. Toni screamed piercingly again, then smiled and moved as though she had been tickled.
as she gathered materials. Smiling, Boo returned to vacuum glass seed beads, as well as other debris that gathered throughout the school day.

Fast-forward three months to a balmy summer day in the same classroom space. Boo and Aria returned to school during their free time in the summer to prepare for the next day’s art and craft fair downtown. They had been working for months to prepare items to sell at their table, and they were nearly finished. Outside the open door of the classroom, birds sang cheerily in the sunshine. It was a fleeting, luxurious day that was redolent of the easy-going, unplanned summer days of my childhood, all but hidden among the cobwebs of my memory. It reminded me of all the times that my mother moved quietly, tirelessly throughout the house, tackling chores, while she trusted me to do whatever I chose. Over twenty years later, I attempted to support others’ moments of carefree activity, or perhaps I was experiencing my own return to an event that I had long cherished. This time, it was my turn to organize materials so Aria and Boo, two seventh grade girls, could play.

Aria sat at her computer, typing something, and Boo stood nearby, with her back turned toward Aria. Boo used her fingertips to carefully place tiny rhinestones into a pendant. I indirectly rambled a request to clean up all of the loose beads on the floor, “if you want to.” My suggestions served to create a plan for my own activity rather than to assign tasks to the girls.

Aria volunteered, “Yeah, I’ll, like, vacuum with, like, Henry.” Although Aria was not present when Henry made his previous appearance in the beading class, both incidents made it evident that Henry was a powerful presence in other times and spaces in the school.
Unexpectedly, Boo turned her torso around to face Aria, narrowed her eyebrows frighteningly and bared her teeth. She instigated in a low, menacing voice, “Henry is mine!” Her scowl turned quickly into a joyful smile (Figure 18). I wondered if she recalled Toni’s earlier suggestion that one could kiss Henry.

![Figure 18: Aria and Boo claiming Henry. Courtesy Julie Slivka.](image)

Also smiling, Aria added, in an equally ominous, thrasher-film growl, “Henry is mine first!”

This time, Boo turned her entire body around and glowered directly at a grinning Aria. “No! He was always mine!” Boo retorted, in the same gruff, nearly threatening snarl.

“He was mine first!” Aria growled.

“Never!” Boo hissed sinisterly and made a scary face. The corners of her mouth twisted readily into a smile. Clearly, both girls had picked up on the pleasure of using Henry as the center of their constructed ‘argument.’ Their gazes moved from each other to the tiny beads they held between their fingers, yet pauses between new, excited exclamations did not last long.
Abruptly, Aria instigated firmly in a baleful voice, “Henry is MINE.” They quickly picked up speed again, bantering vociferously, enthusiastically back and forth, fervidly arguing which girl could ultimately lay claim to Henry. After a slight decrease in intensity, their tireless declarations became increasingly boisterous and their faces filled with glee. I expressed my appreciation for their interest in vacuuming, but they corrected me.

Boo plainly informed me, “It’s just because of Henry.”

Aria agreed, adding, “Henry! If it wasn’t for Henry, I wouldn’t want to do it.” She smiled. Their conversation indicated that Henry’s form played an important role in their interactions.

I improvised, following their lead. “Look at Henry’s face. He looks so shy.”

Spontaneously, the girls effortlessly bounced up from their chairs in fits of giggles, Aria trailing Boo (Figure 19).

Figure 19: Aria and Boo running toward Henry. Courtesy Julie Slivka.
Boo cried boisterously, “I love you, Henry!” Her declaration was reminiscent of Toni’s earlier comment regarding Henry. Both Aria and Boo raced to the side of the room where Henry sat with his yellow cord plugged into the wall.

I cautioned, “Hey, be careful!” and turned the computer-camera in order to capture the girls’ interactions. I couldn’t have predicted what would happen next. With abandon, they threw their bodies on top of the dusty vacuum cleaner and each other. They struggled to seize Henry, constantly moving, laughing, and taking turns arguing possessively. The girls wrestled and shouted back and forth in a playful exchange. Boo knelt and draped her torso on top of the vacuum cleaner, hugging it to her chest. Aria squatted next to her, vigorously working to pry Boo’s arms away from Henry (Figure 20).

![Figure 20: Aria and Boo arguing over Henry. Courtesy Julie Slivka.](image)

Straightway, I walked across the room so that I was nearby, keeping an eye on them as they wrestled for what seemed like many long moments, and I smiled, although I looked uncertainly at the camera, and again at the girls. Consistent with the decentered teacher role that had evolved over the course of two years during the study, I decided to let the event unfold. My discomfort and uncertainty was obvious in my comments about
what they were doing. While I worried about the possible outcomes of this transgression for the girls and for me, I took advantage of this event as after school time and I trusted the girls to play safely. This trust was rewarded as they listened to each other and moved carefully to avoid hurting each other during their play.

Aria rose to her feet, and was followed by Boo. They laughed between intense inhalations as they slowly took several cautious steps away from Henry, always keeping their eyes penetratingly locked on each other. Spontaneously, Boo aimed a Tang Soo Do kick toward Aria, successfully avoiding making actual contact (Figure 21).

Figure 21: Boo performs Tang soo do. Courtesy Julie Slivka.
She missed Aria, who took advantage of Boo’s one-footed stance to race back to Henry. Although they wrestled carefully, I looked hesitantly at the camera, concerned about how others might view my response. I fought the urge of my inner-traditional teacher to tell them to stop while both girls maintained intense focus on their interactivity.

Guessing that that my words would be futile, I asked unconvincingly, “OK… can we call a truce?”

Both girls roared in chorus, “NO!” They continued to laugh and assert their claim to Henry.

After this went on for quite a while, I asked quizzically, “How do you know that Henry likes girls?”

Dryly, Boo explained, “He loves me, he wants to marry me.”

Aria immediately clarified, “No, he doesn’t want to marry me. He’s my child.”

“He’s your child?” I repeated.

“He’s my child,” Aria reiterated firmly.

“Oh, you’re my mother-in-law?” Boo asked Aria in surprise. “Yay! Henry’s both of ours!” Boo delightedly waved her bare feet toward Aria’s face, possibly instigating another affective response from her.

Aria persisted, “He’s mine, though. I get to vacuum with him. See how this settled? (Can) we have a round of applause?” All of us clapped cheerfully.

I contributed encouragingly, “Amazing!”

Aria recapitulated, “All because we were misunderstood! I thought she was stealing my son!”
Boo added, “And I thought she was stealing my husband!” All three of us clapped and smiled at their resolution.

Without wasting a moment following this highly affective wrestling event, Aria spontaneously wrote a play on her computer based on her interactions with Boo, without any prompting from me. She even helped me to load her file to my computer only minutes later. Immediately after typing and printing the play, she and Boo produced and filmed the play in several locations within the school, beginning upstairs in the library loft. In the span of an hour, they spontaneously constructed a wrestling scene where Boo’s character pushed Aria’s character down the stairs. In response to my concerns that this might not be safe, she reassured me that her theater teacher, Kathy, taught her how to carefully fall down stairs in dramatic fashion, which she slowly demonstrated, even including sound-effects. After she and Boo filmed their performance of this scene, they moved downstairs again to add an additional scene showcasing a forgotten plastic Halloween skull that they discovered in the loft. Aria spontaneously wrote a brief obituary script for the scene before she aimed the camera at the skull and read her lines off-camera. She changed her real name in the script, but she stated her real name and had to repeat, “Here lies Aria,” in the scene over and over. Each time that she realized her mistake, she and Boo laughed hysterically and patiently recorded the scene again. Each of their attempts created new events, spurring fresh intensities, seeming to prolong the event. After about ten minutes of performing and filming, Aria expressed her desire to perform her short play as an opening act for the school’s seasonal play. This was the last time the girls mentioned Henry or the event. Through their production and recording of their own cultural event, Aria and Boo created the potential for the emergence of new
events and new affects through showing the film to others, thus drawing them into a new chapter of Henry play.

**Analysis**

In the following section, I analyze the ‘Henry event’ based on questions that arose from the data. First, I attend to the ways that the humans and non-humans involved created unique problems and opportunities in a continuously moving relational field. I consider the ways that Henry was cast as a flexible relational effect, acted upon the event and the ways that other materials influenced possibilities. In the second section, I investigate ways that affect and affection influenced energies and power dynamics between the girls. In the third and final section, I explore ways that the girls investigated their own bodies in space in relation to each other through heteronormative rough-and-tumble play.

**Henry and the environment provided certain potentials and unique problems for the girls to solve in a continuously moving relational field**

Hultman and Lenz Taguchi (2010) argue that most research privileges a social, anthropocentric approach that pays little attention to non-human dynamics, and contend that material forces have agency within the components that form social organizations of bodies. Each element within the rhizome: the relational and embodied materiality of the participants, the environment and Henry played important roles in the collective event and influenced the other components of the rhizome. The available materials played an important role in relation to my own actions, for example, in directing my request that we clean up the room. As a guest to the school, I was responsible for leaving the classroom in a clean state, which was challenging due to quantity and tiny size of the glass seed.
beads scattered across the nubby carpet of the large classroom. Even though I suggested that the girls might help me to clean the room, they reclaimed ownership over their own activities within the ever-moving rhizome through their desire to interact and create intensities each other and with local materials. Since my directions were optional, the girls were able to playfully pursue the exciting interactions between each other and with Henry. My teacher-role was set in the background alongside the role of the classroom environment, and the girls’ interactions with each other continued as the primary focus in the room.

Henry became a flexible relational effect, constantly cast back and forth as character, machine and participant, capable of inspiring imaginative responses from humans (Law & Mol, 1995). While moments earlier, Henry was collecting dust in a closet, the girls spontaneously cast coyly smiling Henry as a heterosexual male playmate in the constantly shifting rhizome. Due to the limits of his materiality, Henry had no choice but to silently comply with their play, making it possible for the girls to frame him however they desired. They moved from node to node while making connections to Henry and other nodes as necessary. Toni’s affective outburst responded to Henry’s physical form, “You could fall in love with him and kiss him if you want,” and lived on as an exciting, hilarious suggestion that the vacuum cleaner was an object of a person’s affections. Toni suggested a surprising, preposterous relationship with Henry that originally yielded excitement and positioned the vacuum cleaner as a fetish, or “the target of desire, invested with intense emotional significance,” (Lupton, 1993, p. 11). Henry, the cute and coy vacuum cleaner, generated emotional responses beyond those usually associated with a machine intended for cleaning. He became “a fetish as its functional
aspects give way to psychological incentives,” (p. 10). Perhaps Henry merely served as a placeholder for an object of affections, for example, a boy or the idea of a boy, as the idea of a heterosexual relationship took center stage. The way that Toni framed Henry in relation to the adolescent female participants’ play indicated an ever-moving rhizomatic development within the heterosexual role-play that the girls engaged in over time, where Henry served as a node that they could return to again and again.

It seems that Boo carried the valance of this prior role-play in her memory, unleashing it in the summer in an innovative way to produce new events, continuing the excitement through writing and performing possibly for a new audience through their film. The participants collectively developed a strong relational attachment to Henry through their play and not vacuuming, as Boo and Aria explained that they only considered vacuuming because of Henry, resulting in play that they could create in relation to him. I contributed admiration for Henry’s form, adding to the social organizations of bodies in space, in hopes of soliciting help to clean the room and to be involved with the girls’ play, contributing new modes to the rhizome. Henry served as another participant that would always be available as an influential nodal point that we could all return to in order to produce excitement.

The materials, time and environment greatly impacted possible opportunities. The loose beads scattered on the classroom floor, the camera, preexisting narratives, and my physical presence collectively served as nodes that impacted the experience in interesting and unexpected ways. Although the girls directed much of their own experience, the materials also influenced possible activities and generated opportunities to react to the materials. In two distinct events, I approached them with the problem of loose beads on
the floor, and they created a solution that began with Henry as another character in the room, but also yielded new, constantly moving and exciting events.

**Affect and affection offer fresh insights into power dynamics within participants’ activities**

Thought and imagination often directed participants’ frequent amodal transfers from one sensory mode to another, allowing a wide variety of possibilities for thought and action. Henry’s presence elicited physiological responses from Boo and Aria that they used to apply intention and meaning. Henry awoke dormant affects in the girls based on their previous experience with “him.” Upon their reunion with Henry in the open after-school space, they brought “him” into an increasingly exciting encounter where the two girls fed off of each other’s excitement. While the affects inspired by Henry provoked reactions, the girls responded to those reactions with the intention of recreating excitement (Tomkins, 1995). Further, it is highly likely that both girls’ reactions to each other and to Henry produced many thoughts and feelings that they could not possibly act upon. However, with their eyes constantly fixed upon each other, they co-created responses to each other that kept the excitement going. While Aria and Boo intended to keep excitement going, it was impossible for them to recreate the intensity of the first part of the skirmish over Henry. Like Deleuze’s description of the embodied experiences of T.E. Lawrence (1997), their bodies did not do exactly what they wanted them to do, which was to maintain high levels of excitement. Although they constantly tried to find rational ways to keep excitement going, they were never able to repeat the same level of excitement as the first iteration, yet their desire to produce excitement led them to spontaneously, productively create a script and perform a play. Through rhizoanalysis, I
am able to map the intensities that the participants built, and to notice what they returned to in order to continue to produce excitement. For example, both girls revisited the intensely amusing wrestling event on multiple occasions in attempts to reignite the intensity of the moment. In this event, Aria and Boo smudged their imaginative interactions with Henry and others into an affective, intensely felt, embodied wrestling activity, creating new opportunities for action, some that became apparent, and others that were thought or felt, but never actualized. The example of wrestling is a moment that might otherwise go unnoticed, or more likely, would be terminated immediately in a traditional classroom. I could have easily asked the girls to stop wrestling, and they probably would have accommodated my request. Instead, I stood back, made sure they knew I was watching, and let them co-construct their decisions about play, directed by their own emergent affects and intensities. Our collective decisions, Henry’s presence and the milieu influenced the artificial struggle that the girls produced between their bodies when they wrestled. Each detail of the event played a role in their continual production of affects and intensities, producing new events. The girls worked together to push on typical in-school and out-of-school limits to create excitement, simultaneously working together to establish and learn about each other’s limits.

The girls’ portrayal of Henry as a potential possession generated additional opportunities to produce intensities. Boo and Aria created contrast by juxtaposing excitement with mischievous ‘threatening’ tones as they argued, “Henry is mine!” Whether it was intentional or not, they elected to co-construct conflict resolution at the end of the wrestling event when they ascribed different reasons for their attachments to Henry. Aria and Boo observed each other’s embodied responses before producing new
intensities at different rates during their scripted performance in comparison to their preliminary, spontaneous and boisterous wrestling. The girls created purposeful and unplanned changes to the degree and length of intensities that impacted their excitement levels over time. Changes in excitement can make events feel more and less intense, especially when there is a large reduction or increase in intensity over a short duration (Tomkins, 1962). Interactions with Henry seemed to produce such an increase in intensity that they tried to maintain. The girls’ embodied experiences privileged physical over verbal communication, and simultaneously allowed me to notice events in a way that I would not have if they had engaged in verbal play, which may not have transitioned into such a unique event (Leander & Boldt, 2013). If they had engaged in mere word play, they may not have produced such profound reactions, for example, while laughing and gasping for air.

**Play at work**

Throughout the girls’ exuberant performances with Henry, we can see their capacity for clever, responsive, affective readings of each other during a specific, embodied play event. Their interactions are made possible by affects that happen in impulses, sensations, expectations, daydreams, encounters, and habits of relating, in strategies and their failures, in forms of persuasion, contagion, and compulsion, in modes of attention, attachment, and agency, and in publics and social worlds of all kinds that catch people up in something that feels like *something*. (Stewart, 2007, p. 2)

Through play, Aria and Boo co-created interactive, innovative physical slapstick play that offered embodied opportunities to observe their co-produced excitement and
what followed. In this case, they spontaneously produced a script based on their preliminary play with Henry, then enacted and recorded a live performance, which they turned into a film. The girls did not produce a slapstick curriculum, but rather, created a series of events that they found meaningful and engaging, perhaps joyful. The wrestling event must have been so exciting and amusing that it motivated them to extend the excitement through the creation of a film. For these girls, the particular assemblage of the moment contained all of the elements that required for an event to be humorous.

Generally, humor requires a setup, a paradox, dénouement and a release (Beeman, 2000). A humorous event can produce particular affects that often vary in relation to individuals’ age or cultural backgrounds, occurring alongside others, cultural memories, knowledge or any other factors. Unique, unexpected combinations of different nodes in a rhizome can influence whether or not an event is perceived as ‘humorous.’ Perhaps the unexpected amalgamation and presentation of human and non-human forces at play explains why the girls reacted so intensely to the way that they framed Henry. Aria and Boo continuously created opportunities that elicited laughter from each other and from me. Aria suggested that her peers might also find the event funny when she suggested that she might show the video or produce her play to the school to extemporaneously produce new intensities. The girls spontaneously co-produced events that were so humorous and engaging that they wanted to continue to produce new events based on their experiences. “An affective or sensational pedagogy is a pedagogy of encounters that engender movement, duration, force, and intensity, rather than a semiotic regime of signification and representation,” (Springgay, 2010, p. 78). While it may seem that through their interactions, they were able to add more details to the written and filmed play, adding exciting or memorable
details, it is unlikely that they acted for the purpose of producing academic work.

Together, the participants’ play generated an atmosphere of acceptance for open-ended, improvisational contributions.

**The girls explored their bodies in space in relation to each other**

As a former classroom teacher, I became accustomed to eliminating aggressive behaviors including rough-and-tumble play in my classroom. However, I took advantage of the after-school space to create room for their interactions and desires and avoided interrupting their play, although I was obviously uncomfortable. My transition into this teaching role emerged over several years from highly planned classroom teaching experiences framed by rules and guidelines to a decentered participant observer of children in an unstructured after-school space. I decided that if I wanted to learn about the participants’ interests and desires that brought them together in an unstructured learning environment, I should continue to play a supportive role and allow events to emerge with caution.

It is important to note clear distinctions between playful aggression and real aggression. Rats, for example, posture to nip each other on the nape of the neck, limiting damaging outcomes during play, but during a real fight, a rat will bite another on its rump, causing injury (Pellis & Pellis, 2009). The girls engaged in rough-and-tumble play, not aggressive fighting, as indicated by their smiles, laughter, and even in the way that Boo used both arms to gently lower Aria from her lap to the ground. Pellis & Pellis suggest the possibility that childhood play fighting may promote social competence later in life. However, Sutton-Smith contends that there is little evidence to support the idea that rough-and-tumble play generates a meaningful outcome such as dominance or
preparation for fighting, and instead, generates excitement through interaction. Sutton-Smith (2001) continues to draw distinctions between play and fighting:

It is important to note here that fighting acts are simulated and exaggerated but fighting outcomes are inhibited. This may be a display of fighting, but it is also the opposite of fighting, seeing as it is carried on by those who are not enemies and who do not intend to harm each other, and always accompanied by the special faces and signals that different species use to convey that their intent is only to play. Playfighting as an analogy to real fighting seems more like displaying the meaning of fighting than rehearsing for real combat. (p. 22)

During play, aggressive outcomes are curbed that may otherwise result in injury during real fighting. Rough-and-tumble play offers participants opportunities to bond affectively with each other, to influence others’ affective states, to experience a sense of shared community, to experience excitement, foster intimacy and trust or a combination of these and/or any other reasons. Play served pivotal roles in what became possible or could become possible. “It is worth considering that the main adaptive function of play may be the generation of positive emotional states. In such states animals may be more willing and more likely to behave in flexible and creative ways,” (Panksepp, 1993, p. 177). The girls excitedly and continuously explored their own bodies in space in relation to each other, and in relation to props and materials that they used. They took advantage of an opportunity to play in a safe school space where they could experiment with risks, affects, and commit attention to “the continual movements and transformations within places,” (Leander, Phillips & Headrick Taylor, 2010, p. 341) within several rooms of the
school. The girls produced relationships with each other and with the environment in ways that they may not have otherwise pursued if others were present or if the event had occurred in any other way.

Additionally, the girls’ wrestling event can be theorized through a heteronormative performance lens, where each girl subscribes to the idea that heterosexuality is the ‘normal’ sexual orientation, and contends for the attention of the anthropomorphized male vacuum cleaner. Although the girls’ heteronormative play is evident within the data, the focus of this article addresses the range of what their play produces, such as generating affects from a relational materialist perspective. I demonstrate the girls’ Henry-play as a discrete data set; however, throughout the course of the study, the girls did not constantly seek heteronormative play as a primary pursuit or interest. They expressed a wide range of interests, and not just a collective interest in boys. Although studies such as Myers and Raymond’s 2010 analysis of heteronormative behaviors of elementary school-age girls suggest that heteronormativity dominates the talk and play of 8 – 10 year old boys and girls, this was not the case in my study and seems to oversimplify girls’ interpersonal relationships. Heteronormative play was just one development within all of the factors that form social associations of bodies. While it is unclear or unlikely that the girls considered ways that society might frame their playful wrestling behavior, by engaging in wrestling, they resisted passivity that is so often pushed onto girls’ bodies (Holland, 2003, p. 27). Their boisterous behavior intensified their imaginative rough-and-tumble play with a heteronormative script where females rival for male attention. Pellegrini (2003) contends that rough-and-tumble play serves as an opportunity for girls and boys to engage in a low-risk form of heterosexual interaction.
Participants took up rough-and-tumble play differently, engaged in same-sex wrestling. Further, they minimized risk by replacing a boy with a non-human that could not refuse or talk back, a perfect gentleman. While their play still generated elements of risk, perhaps their same-sex play risked less than heterosexual play might have offered. They constructed fantasy play alongside heteronormative boundaries that potentially made their play feel “safe” and eliminated threat or discomfort that might have accompanied similar heterosexual play.

Henry’s non-human form allowed the girls opportunities to apply and spontaneously change his roles in their play. Toward the end of their boisterous play, I asked, “How do you know that Henry likes girls?” By drawing attention to Henry’s desires, perhaps I was interested in the sorts of responses they might create, possibly challenging the heteronormative dialogue. However, viewing my question as an intervention, I presupposed an adult-child hierarchy that might have served as a catalyst to send things off in new directions. From this standpoint, my question can be seen as a challenge to the girls’ creative play rather than simply accepting their creative contributions. Immediately, Aria explained that she and Boo misunderstood each other when she unexpectedly modified the rivalry, applying a new relationship to Henry, now her son. Although her new maternal role still contained a heteronormative association, the girls were “inhabiting the norms in order to mobilise the rules differently,” (Butler, 2006, p. 532). By manipulating Henry’s role, Aria distanced herself from a heterosexual, romantic relationship with Henry, and took on another heteronormative role, that of mother. The inanimate form of the vacuum cleaner offered opportunities for the girls to
cast Henry in various roles as they needed. Henry served the girls as a nodal point that they were able to return to again and again during their rhizomatic constructions.

**Creating opportunities to invest spaces with emotional and relational intensities**

In my efforts to conduct literacy research for a terminal degree, a local charter school welcomed me to implement a study in an after-school space. Teitle (2012) recognized that after-school spaces often offer literacy researchers flexible opportunities to consider literacy in innovative ways. However, she cautioned literacy researchers to avoid disrupting youth programs by substituting ‘successful literacy events’ for unstructured time that allows youth opportunities to engage in activities outside those that are tested and measured. Over time, I developed a more convincing argument for the value of unstructured activity, which eased my anxiety over providing a ‘quality literacy program,’ and resulted in a less-restricted, planned approach that instead privileged the participants’ desires. In an era where standardized testing often privileges outcome-based learning and ignores participants’ affective responses to their environment, play-oriented events like these may be discouraged in school spaces, which is unfortunate because play offers endless opportunities to engage in rich experiences.

I do not suggest that standards-based learning should be replaced with free play or wrestling. Rather, I encourage fellow educators to notice important learning opportunities made possible when there is room left for emotional and relational intensities, and to identify ways that various kinds of play invest spaces with ancillary affective intensities. As participants constantly created and learned how to read others’ affects and intensities, each new production influenced subsequent actions and relations. If I would have interrupted or terminated the girls’ spontaneous wrestling activities, Aria may not have
pursued the event’s intensity, or felt inspired to produce, perform and record a play about their dramatic “fight” over Henry. If I had asked them to stop, I would have interrupted the momentum that they co-created. I would have had to drop all of these possibilities that the girls produced. This event allowed the girls to produce intensities that brought them back to class, evidenced in the way that Aria and Boo continued to try to reproduce the initial intensities. Allowing space for various kinds of play allowed participants to push on possibilities, expanding what could become possible in the rhizome. Play expanded rhizomatic possibilities that the children could choose to create.

Participants’ interests in activities were often driven by affect, influenced by available materials. My unique opportunity to witness this event during out-of-school time allowed me to notice it in a way that I might not have if it had just been verbal play. Allowing participants to improvise in such embodied ways offered insight into their affective productions that elicited new events. Play can lead in unexpected ways to learning and work that both is and is not recognized as valued uses of time in school. Although they did not do very much vacuuming, that was never the driving force behind their activity. Instead, the girls’ play and their attention to affects made their activities possible and ultimately enhanced the productions that they collectively created, evident in their continued attendance to a non-mandatory class.
Chapter Five: Hawking Wares

The more beads in a piece, the less likely the beadwork will break—just as with communities, there’s safety in numbers. The holes in the beads are like the orifices we use to communicate. One to the next, beads are strung, as soundwaves connect us from mouth to ear. (Clark, 2008, p. 111)

In the following selection, I present a narrative in three parts describing participants’ efforts in the midst of advertising their beadwork and other arts and crafts that generated significant positive responses. While most of our time together in the beading study took place in a classroom, several of the girls elected to sell their work at the annual Children’s Day Arts Fest on July 11, 2012. After the end of the school year, we met during several days in the summer so the girls could prepare to sell some of their work. The following vignette illustrates a moment during Arts Fest while they were busy selling their work to customers. The girls, their family members, their teacher Andrea and I set up tables, chairs and an umbrella and the girls arranged their wares to appeal to potential customers. When one of the girls received negative feedback from her peers and later, from two passersby, she sought encouragement from the rest of the group and was able to return to advertise her work to the crowds. The descriptions that I present allow me to draw attention to the participants’ affective contributions that yielded new intensities. Like the beads that we wove together, the sense of community in the relationships that we built during the school year continuously offered support to the participants to take risks while the girls acted upon and were affected by their new environment.
On the day of Arts Fest, Aria, Betsy, Boo and I sat at our table under the scorching July sun. Aria sat on the far left, closest to the video camera. Betsy sat to her left with Boo on her left, and I sat to Boo’s left at the end of the table (Figure 22). They greeted passersby and began to advertise their wares. Their attempts to engage the crowd increased in volume and intensity over time as they received a constant supply of positive responses from Mom-aged patrons of the Arts Fest crowd. Of all three girls, Aria spent the most time engaging the crowd, and after she received significant encouragement from passersby, Betsy and Boo joined in the fun.

“Free HSB pins! Low prices!” Aria advertised, calling out to the crowd. She embellished as she shouted, “What’s not to love about these great prices? She and Betsy shared a smile. She stood up next to the table to better advertise their goods. She called out to the crowd, “There’s a vampire pin!” Several potential customers responded positively to Aria, smiling and laughing with her, making encouraging comments. She continued, “If you’re a dog person, there’s a dog person (pin)! If you like ducks, there’s a duck pin.”
Betsy cautioned Aria, “OK, Aria, I think you’re overdoing it.” Betsy wrapped her right arm across her own back and looked behind her left shoulder toward the ground.

Aria agreed but explained, “Yeah, I’m overdoing it. I know. I’m trying to be a good salesperson!” She took a break from selling for a moment, then suggested, “Betsy, do you want to be a model for this bracelet?”

In a slightly tired voice, Betsy answered, “Not really.”

Aria gently protested, “You make me sad!” However, she continued advertising, calling out, “Mistakes turned into masterpieces! Bracelets, pins! Coffee lovers! There’s a coffee lover pin! If you love coffee, then you should show it!”

“Aria!” Boo whispered, “You can just say pins!”

Aria defended, “But people won’t know…”

**Audience reactions influence possible activities**

*Figure 23: Boo and Betsy hawking wares. Courtesy Julie Slivka.*

Aria continued to hawk the coffee lover pin, and Boo also called out to the crowd to advertise her own jewelry, gaining momentum (Figure 23). Betsy also gradually joined
in the fun, shouting to promote her own work. Aria shouted, “If you love coffee, then show it!” A woman in the audience laughed and smiled at Aria.

Betsy suggested, “Well, we’re making people laugh!”

Aria whispered, “This is exhausting,” yet she persevered, continuing to call out, “If you love coffee, get the ‘I love coffee’ pin!”

Then two adolescent girls walked by, and one exclaimed and laughed, “I hate coffee!”

The other immediately agreed, “I hate coffee! That doesn’t help, sorry!” They laughed and walked away.

Aria dropped the coffee pin on the table with a loud clanging sound. She silently left her post next to the table and sat next to Betsy with her head bowed. After a moment, she spoke softly to Betsy, who offered her the shady seat next to her under the green umbrella, then encouraged her to take a drink of her lemonade. Betsy lowered her head closer to Aria as she whispered, and put her arm around Aria’s shoulders (Figure 24).

![Figure 24: Betsy comforted Aria. Courtesy Julie Slivka.](image-url)
Aria stood up slowly and then wove behind Betsy’s chair and around to the space beside me. She leaned her elbows on the table and bent her head close to mine, under my umbrella. As Aria explained the event to me, I listened with my mouth agape and shook my head (Figure 25). I encouraged her to ignore the girls’ comments, and explained to Aria that she was getting a lot of positive feedback from most people. Aria slowly moved back to her own chair.

Figure 25: Aria told Julie what happened. Courtesy Julie Slivka.

Perseverance! We did it!

Aria picked up several plastic sandwich bags of jewelry and replaced them on the table. She quietly whispered in despair to Betsy, “I’m missing something, that’s worth, like, so much money.” She pulled a small bracelet from a bag and paused. Then she shakily drew a deep breath and called hesitantly out to the crowd. Soon, she stopped, then she moved behind the table and expressed to Betsy and me, “This is really boring.” She decided to take a break from advertising her wares, and walked by a few of the nearby
craft tables with Betsy. The girls returned with snacks and after a short break, Aria stood next to her table again and began to advertise her work again.

She held out a pin. “If you like epic vampires, you… Heyyyy!” Aria cheerily greeted a friend that walked by.

Her friend responded excitedly and asked, “How, how are you?”

Aria responded, “I’m good.” They leaned forward over the video camera and hugged hello even though the video camera created a significant distance between them. Aria reassured, “That, that’s the best we can manage!” The girls giggled and agreed. “Yeah, we tried. We tried. Perseverance!”

Her friend suggested, “How about air hug?” They both laughed and extended their arms toward each other in an embrace without actually touching each other. Betsy smiled at them.

Aria shouted, “We did it!” She giggled even more.

**Analysis**

In the following three sections, I analyzed this narrative data by observing the ways that the participants’ bodies were effected by others’ contagious affects in the Arts Fest setting. It became clear that at least in the case of an exchange that the girls interpreted negatively, their social experiences in the alternative school generated different expectations than those they experienced elsewhere, with new participants where different rules were brought into the assemblage. I also investigate ways that the unstructured after school time offered opportunities for the girls to consider how they were perceived during their experiences, creating room for elective opportunities to engage in thinking-feeling that accompanied the deeply-felt event.
Disciplined bodies

Philosopher Michel Foucault (1979) argued that society regulates and scrutinizes bodies that are disciplined through understated coercion, privileging normative behaviors. The preceding narrative is just one example that describes peers’ disciplinary regulations upon Aria’s play. While Aria explained the items that she was selling, Betsy cautioned Aria to avoid “overdoing it” and Boo suggested that she limit her description of items. What was it about the event that caused Boo and Betsy to warn Aria not to ‘overdo it?’ Had Betsy or Boo experienced similar discipline for past performances that produced unwanted results? Aria listened to their cautionary advice, but persevered, explaining that she needed to tell the crowd what she was selling or they would not know.

Although Aria seemed to be undeterred by early cautions to limit her somewhat risky advertising efforts, it is likely that her friends’ responses influenced her energy and activity, although Aria followed the excitement generated from her interactions with quite a few Mom-aged patrons. It is unclear whether Betsy and Boo intended provide support or not, or rather, if they were not quite able to verbalize exactly what they wished to say to their friend. Aria shared supportive relationships with Boo and Betsy that grew over the course of at least one school year, and perhaps she felt comfortable to take time to explain her choices to them, but it is possible that she also felt frustrated by what she perceived as their lack of support. Aria may have experienced a tipping point when two strangers explained and laughed, “I hate coffee!” and “That doesn’t help, sorry!” Even though the unknown girls’ contributions did not attack Aria or her work directly, Aria’s energy seemed to decrease dramatically, changing the mood of the entire event. Although the new girls did not focus on Aria’s work, their comments echoed earlier cautions from
Betsy and Boo but were unaccompanied by previous experiences of support from these two strangers.

While I cannot know with certainty that my interpretations of the events that unfolded between the girls are correct, I can explain how the events affected me, the onlooker. The reactions of Boo and Betsy to Aria affected my experience of the event, further complicated by my roles as after-school teacher and participant observer. At first, I was surprised by Aria’s enthusiasm as she performed to sell her work. When I was growing up I often felt shy, so embarrassment would have likely prevented me from engaging in such a performance. I attributed confidence to her performance, though I worried about different ways that others might react to her. However, I reserved caution and trusted her to make her own decisions. To some extent, I agreed with Betsy and Boo in their cautions to attempt to protect her from negative reactions. Nevertheless, since I noticed that Aria received a great deal of positive support, I decided not to caution her against hawking wares to give her room to make her own choices. I wished that Betsy and Boo had offered Aria more support earlier, and I was upset to see Aria so unhappy during her reaction to the response from the two strangers.

However, Aria’s reaction successfully regalvanized the support that she had lost earlier from the other two girls. Since it is often more complicated to be angry with friends, by transferring the anger or hurt onto these relatively innocuous passersby, Aria very effectively used her emotional response to show her two friends how the strangers were behaving in an unsupportive way, similar to Boo and Betsy’s responses. She expressed her reaction to her friends and rallied them to her side. She turned their criticisms of strangers, which in fact proved the point her friends were making earlier,
into support from these same, previously critical friends. Perhaps part of what rallied Betsy and Boo was the need of these tween girls to protect themselves from two adolescents. While it is not surprising that adults were encouraging about the girls’ wares, relationships between tweens and adolescents are often complicated by feelings of insecurity, rivalry and jealousy, sometimes enacted through exclusion, sarcasm or gossip. Relationships are confounded by individuals’ desires for acceptance and varying degrees of attention, depending upon context.

The girls seemed to feel comfortable to publicly take risks and push the contextual limits for “acceptable” behaviors for girls in their age group. In the after-school Arts Fest context, the rules of engagement were complicated, for example, by teachers controlling affect in an institution. While affects and responses to affects are present in all learning environments, the physical results are often ignored or suppressed by institutional limitations, social expectations and discipline. Throughout this event, the girls continuously sought and generated positive responses in their performances of selling wares, and their lived assemblages enabled them to perform in reaction to emotions inspired by affects. Without the framework of an institution to control affect-induced responses, the girls loosely monitored each other’s exchanges. The absence of external systems that govern emotional responses opened up possibilities for the girls to take risks and make mistakes and yet certain participants simultaneously felt compelled to monitor and redirect others’ behavior in efforts to encourage “acceptable” behavior, electively disciplining each other.
Contagious affects

Researcher Anna Gibbs compared the transfer of affects to the transmissible nature of fire:

Bodies can catch feelings as easily as catch fire: affect leaps from one body to another, evoking tenderness, inciting shame, igniting rage, exciting fear – in short, communicable affect can inflame nerves and muscles in a conflagration of every conceivable kind of passion. (2001, p. 1)

Gibbs explained that interaffectivity refers to the way that affects, like flame or viruses, can be rapidly passed from one person to the next. Anthropologist Kathleen Stewart explained, “ordinary affects are the varied, surging capacities to affect and to be affected that give everyday life the quality of a continual motion of relations, scenes, contingencies and emergences,” (Stewart, 2007, pp. 1-2). Further, affects are transmitted quickly and may yield so many varied results that an individual cannot possibly live all possibilities. Affects have actual and virtual effects that drove many of the day’s events. Virtual effects refer to all of the potential responses that a person may consciously or unconsciously think or feel in response to an affect. While it is impossible to perceive how another individual responds virtually to affects, actual responses may be more readily identified.

Massumi (2002) explained that an actual effect refers to a “functional limitation;” what can be, and a virtual effect indicates “the autonomy of relation;” that which is without functional limitations, (p. 35). Massumi (1995) further explained, “the virtual is a lived paradox where what are normally opposites coexist, coalesce, and connect; where
what cannot be experienced cannot but be felt—albeit reduced and contained,” (p. 91).

Since virtual affects exist potentially, unencumbered by physical expression, they present possibilities to create unlimited opportunities for affect. Virtual and actual affects occur when “forms of power and meaning become circuits lodged in singularities but they can also remain, or become again, dispersed, floating, recombining,” (Stewart, 2007, p. 6).

Like energy, affects move freely between individuals. While it is impossible to identify the virtual affects that the girls felt during the day, they influenced the actual effects that resulted in sensations and emotions that the girls felt, inciting action in the environment and influenced by other humans and non-human influences.

Although the heat of the day seemed to influence our energy levels, all three girls excitedly advertised their wares to the crowd, often demonstrating confidence when reacting to positive reinforcement of their efforts. I wondered how their positive interactions and supportive relationships influenced their willingness or desire to engage the crowd. They gingerly tested early advertising performances in hushed tones by including incentives for the customer, offering free pins with any purchase. Over time, they dropped the ‘free pin’ enticement and instead, focused on advertising the content of their work with increasingly louder volume. Although the girls often repeated a number of sale-statements, for example, “if you like coffee,” they constantly varied and embellished each reiteration that they presented. Although they often used the same phrases over and over again, they presented variations from one presentation to the next, so no two were alike. Each of the girls’ performances, even the repetitions, held potential to create all sorts of new affects and unplanned intensities during interactions with the ever-moving crowd. All three girls, especially Aria, chased the excitement of interacting
with the crowd of customers, producing an assemblage of intensities in a new
environment with strangers and some people that the girls already knew. The girls were
often rewarded for their efforts with smiles, positive feedback from customers,
encouraging laughs and perhaps most importantly, making sales.

A turning point resulted when two peer strangers contributed responses to Aria’s
performance selling a coffee pin, causing Aria’s hard-won enjoyment-joy to move toward
distress-anguish or shame-humiliation (Tomkins, 1995). It is unclear whether the content
of the strangers’ comments, their dislike for coffee or something else influenced Aria’s
distress. Affects “work not through “meanings” per se, but rather in the way that they
pick up density and texture as they move through bodies, dreams, dramas, and the social
worldings of all kinds,” (Stewart, 2007, p. 3). Rationally, the strangers’ words were
benign, but contagious affects inspired feelings that caused participants in the assemblage
to choose particular reactions, creating movement in the assemblage. It seems unlikely
that the strangers’ feelings about coffee would bother Aria, but rather, the attitude and
texture of the assemblage that all of the girls contributed to shifted participants’ motion,
an additive element to things that were already present, causing an intense reduction in
Aria’s energy and excitement. Immediately, Betsy sensed Aria’s reduced energy level
and offered support by listening, offering encouragement, and through her suddenly
compassionate physical performance, imbued with compassion and positive affects.
While it is unclear whether Betsy made a connection between her earlier warnings to the
strangers’ cautions, it was important was that she ‘read’ Aria’s responses to affects well
enough to act and show support.

Deleuze and Guattari explained, “A rhizome may be broken, shattered at a given
spot, but it will start up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines.” (1987, p. 9). Aria’s decisions and behaviors around this moment exemplify the resiliency of rhizomatic growth. Shortly after hearing the strangers’ discouraging remarks, Aria suddenly explained that she thought selling her work was ‘boring,’ possibly an indication of the distress that she felt only moments before. She decided to take a break from selling her creations and went for a short walk with Betsy. After a short amount of time away from selling her work, Aria returned to the table to continue advertising as she did before. Suddenly, she demonstrated a swift, positive change in excitement and enjoyment in her activities when she encountered a friend, hugging a ‘hello’ over the video camera and sharing an ‘air hug.’ She exclaimed, “That’s the best we can manage,” and “We tried. Perseverance!” and “We did it!” Her word choices not only explained their efforts to share a hug, but also demonstrated how she decided not to allow disappointing events to stop her, and instead, to cope with the shift that she felt after her friend and two strangers denied her earlier performances. Aria’s buoyancy and pursuit of positive affects compelled her to constantly bring positive contributions into the larger social assemblage, surpassing the effects of the negative affects.

**Thinking through affects**

Affect theorist Theresa Brennan explained the role that affects play in maintaining attention to a task; “The more one lives in the emotional world of judging or being judged the more affects disrupt concentration or the process of sustaining attention,” (2003, pp. 126-127). Aria’s performances were positively enforced by audience members’ engagement and support of her contributions. However, Aria’s attention and activity was disrupted by her disagreement with Betsy, Boo and the two strangers, possibly indicating
differences between their expectations for appropriate behavior. Perhaps this disagreement indicated something else, such as a power struggle driven by reactions to contagious affects. Their previous experiences in the after school space influenced Aria’s reactions to the event and her deep engagement in thinking-feeling, inciting others to notice and feel affects. By forcing Betsy and Boo to indirectly look at their lack of support, Aria incited support from Betsy, and eventually recovered from the damage of the negative affects. Aria’s shift, supported by kindness that she demanded from her friends, is what Theresa Brennan calls the practice of discernment, which is “not to give in to common negative affects,” (p. 124). Due partly to her time in the afterschool program with Boo and Betsy, Aria knew how to rally their support. It appeared that Aria was once again able to view her own actions positively after experiencing negative affects, evident in her reengagement in sales performance.

“Kindness” Education

American schools are often dominated by the idea of a curriculum of respect that must be spoken in official words, which I will refer to as ‘the official curriculum of niceness.’ American teachers are often encouraged to think they must intervene to make kids be nice to one another, following curricular interventions often found in “community circles” to “teach” the skills of kindness. Children are often faced with directive outcome-based agendas that frame and limit their activities, even though they constantly find ways around such formal curricula to generate unique responses even in the most highly structured situations. Such formal curricula of respect are reminiscent of religious teachings that have historically controlled affects by structuring behavior and teaching preferred, coded responses. Further, Brennan (2003) explained,
the education of finer feelings was partially accomplished through
religious codes and codes of courtesy. This is to say, codes of courtesy and
ethical or religious conduct operate on a level similar to philosophical and
psychological discernment insofar as they use the same means:
comparison, detachment, and living attention. (p. 122)

Prescribed friendship curricula sometimes resemble religious approaches to
affects and feelings, and often tout similarly detached versions of ‘socialization of
respect,’ but miss rich opportunities to deeply examine interactions between children
outside of classroom spaces or in other environments where they cannot avoid occasions
for socialization. For example, a 2009 study by Solís, Kattan and Baquedano-López
focused on the teacher’s promotion of ‘respect’ through control of third grade children’s
physical activities through scripted I-Messages during “Community Circles.” However, it
is not clear whether the authors considered varying definitions of respect in unique
situations or children’s affective transactions. It seemed that this curriculum served to
control children’s affects rather than to deeply explore children’s beliefs about respect,
not unlike many cut-and-dry religious or legal regulations of affect that do not consider
ethical gray areas. I suggest that children’s responses to everyday social experiences are
substantially more significant than practicing scripts merely to promote illusions of
respect. For example, although the girls in my study did not follow a scripted kindness
curriculum, they experienced opportunities to choose or not choose to show kindness to
each other. Although their initial responses to each other may not have been kind, they
listened to each other and eventually shared kindness.
Further, Tobin (1995) pointed out that early childhood institutions valorize such logocentric approaches to communication and expression, promoting instead, distant representations of ‘truth.’ He argued that children’s feelings are often replaced by expressions of feeling, which are further replaced by statements about feeling, as evident in the distant representations of feelings in the 2009 study of Community Circles. Tobin warned that such pedagogies of self-expression served to merely control children’s affects, and instead, called for a balance “between uncontrolled desire and the desirelessness,” (1995, p. 253). Instead of attempting to firmly control how children respond to affects or alternately, managing interactions in a laissez-faire manner, a balanced approach managed with discussions allows space for children to experience and react with reason to affects.

In our after school space, children were given wide latitude to work with a range of experiences, emotions and responses to one another with reserved teacher intervention, and participants still managed to show kindness to each other, even if that took some time. Additionally, ‘who they are’ was allowed to influence what emerged in serious ways. Children had the chance to play through the reality of complex human interactions, emotions and the flows of affect, and not just the version of human interaction that occurs in school “niceness curricula.” Aria did not require a teacher-led curriculum to delineate a positive outcome for her; instead, she cleverly juxtaposed two different events, generating her own affirming result.

After Aria experienced a lapse in kindness from her peers, she effectively utilized hapless strangers to force the issue and elicit kindness from her friends who were failing to be kind, effectively using the transmissibility of affect. Community Circles allegedly
“help” kids “learn” to be “kind” to one another but may be experienced by the kids as punishment. For example, Wohlwend (2007) pointed out drawbacks and misuse of a “friendship meeting” by several first grade girls. A misunderstanding between a first grade boy and girl instigated aggressive responses from several other first grade girls, who lined up next to each other to corner the boy at recess, qualifying their confrontation as a “friendship meeting.” Although the girls misappropriated the idea of a “friendship meeting” as taught in school to resolve social conflicts, such formal approaches to conflict resolution may allow children to gain access to other individuals to express grievances, but do little to resolve issues between individuals. Brennan suggested that “negative affects are transformed in the presence of other variants of living attention: love, optimism, logic,” (2003, p. 130). Love and optimism are unlikely to be manufactured by a prescriptive curriculum, and instead, may emerge when individuals have reasons, opportunities and desire to care for each other.

Contagious affects continuously influenced and disciplined participants in unstructured spaces. Unstructured after-school contexts, sometimes not subject to the same norms of “school niceness,” may offer unique opportunities for children to try various ways of enacting responses to affects and feelings, to develop strategies that help them to learn how to make their own way in society. Such after-school contexts offer children opportunities to experiment with multiple ways of responding within particular contexts, which is not necessarily possible in structured and restrictive ‘kindness education.’

I suggest that schools minimize applied ‘official curricula of niceness,’ and instead, notice social opportunities to intuit feelings that children construct for themselves
in and out of school. For example, Tobin (1995) explained that Japanese teachers teach children to determine their own solutions to social conflict without teaching resolution skills directly. When children settled their own disputes without direction from the teacher, they learned to perceive others’ feelings in appropriate contexts. Of course, this may not be possible at all times, and in some cases, teachers must intervene to encourage desired, appropriate responses from children to maintain order. While teachers’ choices certainly influenced appropriate interactions with each other and with children, unstructured social interactions with other children also offered important opportunities to learn how to notice others’ feelings and to respond appropriately to each other. Since thinking-feeling in response to contagious affects varies greatly from one individual to the next, external regulations of affect, for example, within a kindness curriculum, insufficiently serve individual needs. Affects impacted the girls’ experiences in more significant ways than the teacher’s influence or any other part of the supporting environment. The problems and issues that they faced, often transmitted through contagious affects became the girls’ greatest teachers in ways that a scripted or otherwise structured “kindness curriculum” could never be.
Chapter 6: Closing Thoughts

This dissertation study speaks to the unpredictable and uncontrollable nature of pedagogy and research and the partiality of ‘knowledge,’ especially in our relations with other people. My research questions allowed me to focus on the rhizomatic connections and interactions between participants’ activity and also allowed opportunities to notice ways that the participants communicated and acquired information in different ways that exceeded traditional notions of literacy. Approaching data through rhizoanalysis has allowed me to understand participants’ emerging data and activity, permitting me to observe the continuously moving roles of materials and affects during participants’ exchanges. In these closing thoughts, I draw attention to potential paths suggested by my research questions and emergent findings.

Through the process of rhizoanalysis, I observed rhizomatic connections that allowed data to remain imminent, “open and connectable in all its dimensions; ... susceptible to constant modification,” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 12). Rhizoanalysis allowed me to approach analysis in multiple ways without making fixed or forced conclusions. A challenge that I faced throughout this research was to come to terms with tensions and incongruities that emerged through rhizoanalysis in the larger assemblage. Each event emerged from literacy, lived curricula, and other emergent influences including play or affects. Each time I reviewed my data I understood assemblages of chaotic events in different ways and made new connections between data and theory. This unfolding approach offered many opportunities to understand how participants’ assemblages of visible and invisible experiences exceeded representation, such as how
the girls’ affects surpassed representation in nearly every moment. For example, while I	noticed Toni’s excitement while she demonstrated how to empty an egg, it was
impossible to adequately understand or represent her affects. However, I was able to
follow or ‘map’ the behaviors incited by affects and other influences that she felt, which
allowed me to notice the influence of deeply felt affects in the assemblage. A greater
understanding of the ways that rhizomatic means of research open opportunities to
understand children’s varying contributions may suggest that rhizomatic approaches to
pedagogy similarly allow for difference. In a time when standardized testing primarily
privileges conformity through dominant ways of knowing, children may need fresh
opportunities to express difference now more than ever. Our rhizomatic approach to
research allowed these differences to emerge without obstruction.

Rather than privileging top-down academic approaches, rhizomatic
understandings of children’s amodal, affective contributions make it possible to allow
them to focus on their thinking-feeling, opening opportunities for children to be seen as
successful in different ways. Affects impacted participants’ energy and responses to each
other, presented opportunities for some individuals to grow closer together, and at times,
created disconnects between individuals. Opportunities to address thinking-feeling
allowed the girls in my study to consider the complexity of their efforts in a greater social
assemblage. A rhizomatic approach to data also allowed me to perceive visible and
invisible forces that influenced the activity that emerged, further influenced by all of the
human and non-human participants.

It became clear that the participants’ engagement with non-human materials,
events and experiences played important, yet continuously moving roles in relation to
their activity. A relational materialist approach to activity informs pedagogical and curricular possibilities that socially organize bodies in space because material forces also have agency within the components that form social organizations of bodies. For example, beads and jewelry components significantly precluded much participation of boys in particular to our study, with the exception of a few individuals that stayed only long enough to eat available candy or to create a gift for a loved one. Simultaneously, the gendered narratives of available materials influenced the after-school space that drew in quite a few girls. The availability of beads and other materials influenced the girls’ engagement in different sorts of play each week, where they often exchanged handmade gifts with each other. It seemed that the freedom to use materials as they chose influenced their desire to participate, and possibly kept them coming back for more. The collective assemblage that we created allowed participants to engage in particular kinds of play that might not be made possible elsewhere. The girls’ imaginative Henry-play related partly to the materiality of the vacuum cleaner and also to their requirement for another member of the group.

Further, the girls projected Henry as a flexible relational effect, taking on different roles including character, machine and participant. Interactively constituted materials were effects that added new dimensions and changing textures to the girls’ thinking-feeling because they could return to objects like beads or Henry the vacuum cleaner to generate new and exciting affects and events. Henry carried historical narratives related to housework and gender throughout the passage of time, and further adopted new narratives in his role as the school’s vacuum cleaner. The girls responded to each emotional response to Henry, and designated him as their heterosexual playmate,
although they did not primarily seek heteronormative play during their time together. Henry’s charming form enticed the girls to include him in their play in ways that they might not have if his form had been different. This after-school event allowed me to notice ways that the girls engaged with materials in ways that might not be possible in school settings. Participants had unique opportunities to attend to materials and affects in assemblages within our unstructured after-school spaces. It is important that educators notice the ways that materials and other influences impact children’s activities, creating certain opportunities while limiting others. Influences such as materials matter and function variously in relation to affect and thinking-feeling present in all spaces occupied by individuals. While materials have little use outside of assemblages constructed by individuals, when they are involved in assemblages, they have potential to perhaps obstruct activity, or gain movement and cultural significance, or serve as nodes of transfer in relation to desires and interests.

Finally, I consider the range of desires, interests and other factors that brought individuals to gather together in these after-school assemblages, drawing particular attention to the role of affect in participants’ interactions. Although one parent directly questioned the “productive” value of our after-school activities, the participants seemed to notice the inherent value of our after school group, and many returned week after week. Participants were able to engage in their affects and desires through free play, which allowed exclusive insight into participants’ actions. Reducing or eliminating directive ‘goals’ or ‘outcomes’ potentially opens space for children’s interests and affects to take center stage, offering opportunities to further understand what brings individuals to elective spaces. While the New London Group (1996) offered important insight into
alternative literacies, they privileged text-based literacies that preference outcomes over relational processes, overlooking opportunities to notice ways that children engage in other embodied ways of communicating. These limitations reveal opportunities to notice the embodied ways that children produce affects and explore emotional intensities within relational fields. Understanding ways that affects impact participants’ experiences offers potential to more adequately understand and support children’s contributions. I do not suggest that we allow children to act on every affect they feel, which would create certain chaos! However, it is impossible to control children’s affects via problematic “kindness curricula” that frame appropriate responses, for example, with structured “I-messages.” Instead, children deserve an approach that balances opportunities to engage in social interactions with their desires and affects (Tobin, 1995). I suggest that schools and other institutions should allow children to perceive their own and others’ feelings and emotional intensities in less-structured spaces. My study suggests that children notice affective responses and often react appropriately, if not always immediately, and often without adult or other external guidance. Different kinds of play are rich sites for embodied, social interaction that allow children to express and notice various affects in social spaces. Play offers many open-ended opportunities for individuals to interact in assemblages without privileging a dominant mode of communication, such as language.

**But What Does This Have to Do with Literacy?**

The term “embodied literacies” implies that I am studying a specific kind of literacy that is distinct and yet related to other forms of literacy, for example, visual, auditory or olfactory literacies. I am interested in the intersections between embodied ways of knowing and how these processes are or are not understood as literacy. Although
my participants’ activities were not considered traditional literacy events, they constantly communicated information in embodied ways through their affective interactions with other humans and non-humans. Physical body qualities and affective interactions may create or limit what opportunities are possible for each individual, influencing possibilities in literacy classrooms or any other kind of environment. While literacies accounted for some of the participants’ activities, at other times, their preferred modes of interaction involved other ways of knowing than literacy.

“Embodied literacies” can be understood as “the belief that imagery, the incarnation of meaning in various modes and modalities, is inextricable from the linguistic manifestation of meaning and thus inextricable from the ways in which linguistic meaning is taught” (Fleckenstein, 2003, p. 2). Fleckenstein argued that embodied literacies integrate imagery and the written word, restructuring the traditional tendency in schools to privilege the written word over the image. I extend Fleckenstein’s perspective, arguing that embodied literacies go far beyond the visual, also taking account of multiple ways that the body is central to human efforts to know the world, especially evident in the ways that people “read” and react to stimuli in the assemblage.

The perception of visual images and language is inextricably linked in reading and written processes in both teaching and learning, which Fleckenstein terms *imageword*, to illustrate the interconnectedness of various ways of knowing. In the beading study, literacy not only includes school-based literacy practices, but also incorporates participants’ abilities to explore and generate embodied and visual literacies. Fleckenstein posits that many cognitive psychologists do not highly value the power of mental images, and instead, privilege linguistic modes of understanding (2003). Additionally, linguistic
modes of understanding dominate image-based representation and are based on schema theory, an often-prevailing theory in writing.

Schema theory suggests that individuals construct abstract knowledge structures to create memories, influencing comprehension and privileging the reader’s prior knowledge, as well as linguistic representation over visual representations (Fleckenstein, 2003; Sadoski, M, Paivio, A. & Goetz, E., 1991). Since there are few prevailing models to substitute for schema theory, it remains the dominant theory, and linguistic representations continue to dominate alternate ways to explain comprehension.

Attempting to separate linguistic and non-linguistic ways of knowing striates ways of understanding that are often generated through multiple learning modes, often oversimplifying the way that individuals learn. These limitations suggest rich opportunities to attend to theories that draw upon arts-based ways of knowing, affects, or other combinations of different learning modes.

It is important to consider that children’s understandings are always impacted in multiple ways in relation to whatever is present in one’s environment. Otherwise, in schools we run the risk of recognizing and drawing upon one form of knowing over all others. I extend Fleckenstein’s use of the term literacy to suggest a “way of knowing or constructing meaning” that positions literacy as inextricably happening among other events and therefore is not possible to study separately. Fleckenstein draws on Vygotskian theory and works from the premise that humans perceive events in totality, rather than singling out events or items separately, “In his (a speaker’s) mind the whole thought is present at once….A thought may be compared to a cloud shedding a shower of
words” (Vygotsky, 1986, p. 251). All of the elements of this cloud of thought cannot be adequately revealed through language alone.

Throughout their time in our classroom, the participant’s embodied activities showed evidence of their thinking where action was thought; beading became thinking in a similar way that writing or other forms of literacy are thinking. The girls’ choices indicated that they did not require visible representations or forms of literacy for their activity. The freedom to operate in self-selected ways of knowing seemed to generate play and other productive forms of activity that might have otherwise been lost if school-based literacies remained a focus.

I return to Cole’s (2011) suggestion that affect potentially interferes with the ways that institutions privilege language in curricula. He identified the problem that language is one of the only instruments used to measure academic growth, overlooking embodied ways of knowing, indicating a division between representation through language and lived experience. Additionally, Butler (2004) suggested that the body often challenges hierarchies of verbal or written discourse, for example, in prescribed curricula. While students may or may not successfully meet assigned academic criteria, their embodied efforts often differ from and even exceed what they are able to successfully represent through traditional forms of communication. These limitations suggest powerful opportunities for individuals to engage in alternate ways of knowing such as play and a variety of art-based ways of knowing that accommodate affective responses. While abstract affect is a powerful bodily response to interaction, it, like conceptual thinking-feeling, often eludes measurement or representation. The elusive nature of affect makes it difficult to represent, although it proved again and again to be extremely influential upon
my participants’ experiences. For example, while Toni explained her egg-emptying process, Betsy appealed to us to look at the images that she pointed out in her book. However, it was not clear whether she was really interested in the images or if she was trying to change the subject. She successfully used affect to move the conversation focus away from ‘academic’ conversation about art-making processes to an opportunity to play, successfully challenging the hierarchy of academic discourses.

If an academic, language-based approach were the primary measurement of success in this interaction, it is likely that Betsy’s clever manipulation of the conversation might have gone unnoticed. However, mapping rhizomatic activity in pursuit of the girls’ affective exchanges made it possible to notice the way that she cleverly achieved a desired result. Observing ways that children manipulate affect offers opportunities to notice their cleverness in alternative ways that exceed representation, for example, in traditional text-based literacy. I do not suggest that teachers should replace curricula with a focus primarily upon affect, but rather, allow opportunities for children to invest spaces with embodied ways of knowing like affect. Reading and reacting to others’ affects influences individuals’ relationships with each other, for example, in the way that Toni 'read' Betsy's affects and agreed to change the subject. Participants’ activities were constantly influenced by affects that played important roles in delicate assemblages.

**Lived, Embodied Curriculum**

At times, school curricula are planned outside of the school setting by curriculum planners that have never met and may never meet the teachers and children who will experience their planning. This disconnect is most apparent in curricula like direct instruction, where much of the curriculum is planned and scripted without the input of
teachers or students and is intended to produce measurable, observable behaviors (Rupley, Blair & Nichols, 2009). Direct instruction is often touted as a way to increase reading ability quickly and is often directed toward students with minority and/or low socio-economic status or different home languages.

At times, direct instruction of specific skills may be necessary to teach concepts, but I believe that direct instruction must be blended with alternative approaches to instruction in order to offer students a variety of ways to attend to concepts, especially if teachers wish to support students’ varying interests and strengths. When direct instruction replaces opportunities for interest-based, hands-on learning events, I believe that those affected students lose valuable learning opportunities that are often available to students with higher socio-economic status. While such a behaviorist approach may scaffold explicit teaching of skills and prepare students for tests, this method does not necessarily emphasize the mind’s activities, nor does it value what children may bring to a learning event.

If educators wish to capture and maintain the interest of children and meet their needs, it is important to present curricula that make it possible for us to notice and value children’s needs, contributions and interests. Otherwise, we may view children as “empty vessels” that we need to fill, instead of noticing all that they contribute. My embodied, exploratory approach is informed by movement between the intentions of “curriculum as planned” and the enacted “curriculum as lived,” generating a responsive curriculum necessary to work flexibly with participants’ choices and ideas, to support their work, their practices and to fuel imaginative design. Teachers often refer to curriculum as
planned to organize and enrich course content, however, implementing material may (and I argue, should) vary among teachers in relation to student needs and interests.

Curriculum theorist Ted Aoki drew attention to the complicated intersections between curriculum as planned and lived curriculum. A lived curriculum implements curriculum as planned while creating and respecting ever-changing student-teacher dynamics and meaningful connections to real-world applications contributed by students and teachers. Aoki further explained lived curriculum as “concretely situated, embodied and incarnated, often narratively told,” (2005, p. 273), enacting the curriculum from the written page and bringing it to life, even if it strays from the written page.

Lived curricula are constantly negotiated in different ways, depending on student needs and interests and the teacher’s contributions. For example, Lajevic & Powell (2011) introduced a knitted lived curriculum that privileged self-understanding rather than mere course objectives, observing all that the participants produced in relation to each other and in addition to each knitted object. Evidence of this self-understanding emerged through participants’ conversations during knitting activities, generating a knitted curriculum that was “simultaneously and continually becoming as it is un-becoming, or unraveling,” (p. 24).

Similarly, our beaded curriculum was always becoming and unraveling at once, led by the participants. While Lajevic and Powell privileged a pedagogy of touch in a knitted lived curriculum that “exists within and around each teacher and student,” (p. 4), touch informs my participants’ embodied ways of knowing in their involvement with materials and sometimes with each other, but a pedagogy of touch does not account for
participants’ affective, internally felt reactions to social interactions, which played an important role in my study.

Furthermore, Lajevic & Powell privileged an activist approach through knitivism. Their knitivism held underlying political discourse which may have influenced participant involvement because it was guided by this concept, where participants’ discourses in this study were multiple and constantly influenced each other, tugging and pulling at each other’s affective responses and interests. Lajevic & Powell explained, “in touch, people and objects connect,” (p. 24), which is also true for the participants in my study. They constantly moved their hands over materials while discussing content that was unrelated to the materials. Additionally, the participants connected with each other and the objects through spoken and unspoken communication, without the use of touch, involving emotional and affective responses and ways of knowing.

Like the 2011 study by Lajevic & Powell, the lived curriculum of our study created space for participants’ spoken and embodied contributions, and our lived curriculum also drew attention to emerging intensities of interactions between participants. While our curriculum was carefully planned in the earliest stages of my study, participants’ interests took precedence and changed the plans that I brought. Originally, I planned to teach specific beading techniques each day, and later, I asked participants to represent ideas through beads and also in writing. Over a short period of time, I realized this was redundant. I abandoned my lesson plans and instead, supported the participants to make their own plans using available materials or any other materials that they requested. The organized beading group offered potential for producers to make their own choices in a space that made room for many explorations and choices in a
curriculum deliberately planned loosely to provide a curriculum as lived, marked by setting the stage with particular materials. The beading curriculum-as-lived placed children’s intentions and interests at the helm of their experiences, time and materials, which led to emergent learning experiences.

While our classroom activities were loosely planned, they were also not unplanned because the beading materials, beaded samples and early class title and class description, “Beaded Narrative,” a beading class, offered structure and guidance to class activity. My plan involved supporting the participants in their own self-selected explorative or constructive activities. My supporting role in the class included making myself available to participants to answer questions, helping to solve problems of material issues, or to plan ahead for materials or activities to come. This elective after-school class was loosely structured in order to create room for the children to have control over their time and activity, and because of this, participants’ activities slipped in and outside of Aoki’s lived curriculum (2005). Our activity resembled the way that Aoki’s teachers began instruction with plans that became alive in the classroom, but served as a starting place. Instead of privileging the teacher’s plans, the children’s plans took over.

Over the course of the study, my curriculum-as-lived gave way to support the children’s ideas for their own individualized, emergent curricula-as-lived, largely impacted by materials. Although the participants did not engage in formal written lesson planning, they constantly developed ideas that fueled their construction, and each individual engaged uniquely in a distinct endeavor. For example, Toni pursued loomwork and created many pairs of earrings, while Betsy created a variety of bracelets, earrings, an
apron, and both girls often mugged at the video camera in my computer that displayed a moving mirror image of that which was videotaped. Lisa often made attempts to plan her own activity, and would often string beads but eventually take all of the beads apart, rarely completing a finished project. Instead, she most often touched materials over and over, and ate candy at each meeting. During one class, she completed sewing a tiny pillow, shown in Figure 7. Available materials served the participants’ living plans because the materials’ sensuous forms enabled certain opportunities, depending largely upon the ways that the individuals perceived and manipulated materials.

Since we met outside of school time and our class was ungraded, I organized our time together so that the girls were free to create and explore their own purposes for attending the class, which frequently involved play-based singing, chasing games, gentle banter or other interactions. Instead of hijacking play and repackaging a pre-fabricated idea of play in order to serve teacher purposes within a formal curriculum, and in doing so, robbing play of its authenticity, our after school space allowed play to emerge organically, authentically. The spontaneous ways that the girls engaged in these activities may fall outside of the definition of curriculum, but these activities seemed to play an important role in relation to participants’ attendance in our class each week. In a roundabout way, play became a part of our un/planned, lived curriculum due to our collective acceptance of play activities to encourage participation and attendance. The girls’ extemporaneous play-based activities became an important part of my study, owing to the complex and diverse interactions they engaged in with each other that brought them back to class each week. While it is clear that in-school time may involve more planned curriculum and specific goals, my dissertation raises and implicitly highlights the
poverty of standards driven practices that have driven most time and space for play out of school.

Participants’ sensory experiences offered multiple entry points to opportunities and played important roles during different occasions. Participants’ reactions to pictures and three-dimensional forms of beadwork formulated our lived curriculum. Additionally, some children simply observed and touched shiny glass, metal, shell or plastic beads. Their activities were punctuated constantly by laughter and endless production of affects. In our lived curriculum, the participants themselves may be compared to beads they worked with because they knit themselves together with socially driven interactions and their responses to each event. Their interactions brought them together to play and have fun, yet sometimes reactions to each other disconnected the girls, similar to the way that beadwork breaks apart if there is a weakened thread.

Diasporic artist Sonya Clark (2008) explained how her personified beadwork allows her to build embodied cultural memory, relationships, and communities.

The more beads in a piece, the less likely the beadwork will break—just as with communities, there’s safety in numbers. The holes in the beads are like the orifices we use to communicate. One to the next, beads are strung, as soundwaves connect us from mouth to ear. (p. 111)
Clark’s work draws attention to multiple ways to consider embodiment through beads and beaded tubes that denote cultural transfers of information. She uses beads to represent collaboration and communication among community members, a metaphor that extends to the participants in my study. In our lived curriculum, the students were like the beads, where their interactions might draw them together, strengthening relationships like the beads in artwork, or perhaps serve to disintegrate ties among individuals. While lived curriculum may provide an academic framework for participants’ activities, it MUST ALSO address the deeply felt, affective activities that strayed outside of the academic context.

Throughout this study, the participants and I co-created positive emotional relationships by attending to the ways that affect charged our interactions. I believe that we attended to Ellsworth’s 2005 call to create “places where the force of children’s
passages into and within the spaces between what we already think we know about the world and its relationalities is augmented and assembled in ways that inflect the social body’s ways of knowing with children’s ways of knowing,” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 143). By decentering my teacher-role and desires, the children’s desires and interests emerged and flourished. Mapping the girls’ intensities through rhizoanalysis allowed me to notice many of their abounding, compelling ways of knowing. This study offered abundant opportunities to notice the rich, affective content that the children continuously brought to the group, in the ways that they pursued and gained their own desires, constantly sought opportunities for play in their environments, and cared for each other’s well-being.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Timetable of Research

Fall 2010-Summer 2012

This document offers written recordings of the time that I spend with my group of students at the charter middle school, both during and after school. Fall 2010 Pilot study; Mondays or Wednesdays, after school (no videotape, only a few photos).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-8-10</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-13-10</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-20-10</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-27-10</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-4-10</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11-10</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-18-10</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-25-10</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-1-10</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-8-10</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-10</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-6-10</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time</td>
<td>14 hours, 26 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specials Class Thursday afternoons; two sessions, each approximately one hour, missed one day because of travel out of state for sister-in-law’s graduation. Videotape did not cover all of our time together because I was using my digital video camera purchased in 2003, which was only supposed to record several minutes of data. We added additional memory to the camera, which I think was overwhelming for the camera, so sometimes the video would stop recording before our work ended, and I would have to restart the camera multiple times. Another problem related to the camera was that it did not give a date/time stamp. This information influenced my data collection during the school year from 2011-2012, when I collected data on a new MacBook.

Thursday, March 17, 2011 12:50pm -3:00pm
3-24-11 12:50pm -3:00pm
3-31-11 12:50pm -3:00pm
4-7-11 12:50pm -3:00pm
4-14-11 12:50pm -3:00pm
4-28-11 12:50pm -3:00pm
5-5-11 12:50pm -3:00pm
5-19-11 12:50pm -3:00pm
5-26-11 12:50pm -3:00pm
6-2-11 12:50pm -3:00pm

Total hours of face time with participants: 21 hours, 40 min.
Total video data: 446 minutes, 14 seconds, or approximately 7.43 hours

After school class 2011-2012 from 3:00-4:15, sometimes longer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Video Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12, 2011</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>No video- first day of class, distributed permission slips and introduced the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 19, 2011</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>53 minutes, 30 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 26, 2011</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>53 minutes, 27 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 3, 2011</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>31 minutes, 45 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10, 2011</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>(High Definition) 63 minutes, 47 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 17, 2011</td>
<td>No class- I had a doctor appointment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 24, 2011</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>62 minutes, 32 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 31, 2011</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>58 minutes, 49 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 7, 2011</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>68 minutes, 34 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 14, 2011</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>50 minutes, 36 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 21, 2011</td>
<td>No class- Penn State on Thanksgiving Break. I visited my parents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 28, 2011</td>
<td>No class- School district on Thanksgiving Break.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 5, 2011</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>61 minutes, 25 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 12, 2011</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>50 minutes, 06 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 9, 2012</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>47 minutes, 53 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 16, 2012</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>56 minutes, 28 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 23, 2012</td>
<td>3:00pm-4:15pm</td>
<td>54 minutes, 06 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jan. 30, 2012  3:00pm-4:15pm  63 minutes, 58 seconds
Feb. 6, 2012  3:00pm-4:15pm  55 minutes, 03 seconds
Feb. 13, 2012  3:00pm-4:15pm  56 minutes, 12 seconds
Feb. 20, 2012  3:00pm-4:15pm  64 minutes, 56 seconds
Feb. 27, 2012  No class
March 5, 2012  No class, Spring Break
Mar. 12, 2012  3:00pm-4:50pm  91 minutes, 25 seconds
Mar. 19, 2012  3:00pm-4:15pm  64 minutes, 25 seconds
Mar. 26, 2012  3:00pm-4:50pm  90 minutes, 50 seconds
Apr. 2, 2012  3:00pm-4:50pm  92 minutes, 54 seconds
April 9, 2012  No class, Easter Monday
Apr. 16, 2012  3:00pm-4:15pm  56 minutes, 33 seconds
Apr. 23, 2012  3:00pm-4:50pm  90 minutes, 20 seconds
Apr. 30, 2012  3:00pm-4:50pm  84 minutes, 59 seconds
Total Hours  2007 minutes; 33.45 Hours
            34 hours, 15 minutes of video data

Summer, 2012
June 25, 2012  8:00am-3:00pm  230 minutes, 20 seconds
June 27, 2012  8:00am-11:30am  No video data- individual was extremely quiet and still, I did not want to push videotape because I did not want to make
her uncomfortable. Only one individual present (Joe).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity Details</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 2012</td>
<td>I arrived 8:00am, Boo arrived 10:45am-1:15pm</td>
<td>132 minutes, 30 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6, 2012</td>
<td>Boo arrived approximately 9am-3pm, Aria arrived approximately 11:30am-3:00pm.</td>
<td>6 hours, 33 minutes, 37 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9, 2012</td>
<td>Boo arrived 8:30am-3:00pm, Betsy 8:40am-12:15pm, Aria 11:23-3:00pm</td>
<td>6 hours, 44 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10, 2012</td>
<td>Boo 8:10am-3:00pm, Aria 10:00am-3:00pm</td>
<td>6 hours, 8 minutes, 17 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 11, 2012</td>
<td>Arts Fest 10:00am-3:00pm, girls arrived 8:30am to help set up</td>
<td>Video Clips located on MacBook Pro:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDV_1148.MP4: 1:02:33 (1.94 GB)</td>
<td>SDV_1148.MP4: 1:02:33 (1.94 GB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDV_1149.MP4: 36:49 (1.14 GB)</td>
<td>SDV_1149.MP4: 36:49 (1.14 GB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDV_1150.MP4: 18:31 (575.8 MB)</td>
<td>SDV_1150.MP4: 18:31 (575.8 MB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following are located on Kingston Flash Drive:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDV_1151.MP4: 1:02:33 (1.8 GB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SDV_1152.MP4: 3:44 (110MB)
SDV_1153.MP4: 1:02:33 (1.8 GB)
SDV_1154.MP4: 34:42 (1 GB)
SDV_1155.MP4: 1:02:33 (1.8 GB)

Total Face Time together during summer 2012: 38 hours, 30 min.
Total video time in summer 2012: 1866 minutes, 402 seconds;
31.211666666666666 Hours Total

Grand total during entire study from 2010-2012: 108 hours, 51 min.
Total video time collected during study duration: 3843.483 minutes;
64.058050000000001 Hours Total
Appendix B: Outline of Video Data and Summaries

May 26, 2011-In folder “Beaded Narrative Video Data”

MOVO 2473; 7 sec; Mary’s video of me, making a face

MOVO2618. MPG; 1 min 1 sec; Lily selecting materials inside classroom

MOVO 2619; 10 min, 21 sec, Lily working

MOVO 2622; 9 min, 46 sec; Charlie, Mike, Zach, Lily, Greg outside

MOVO2623. MPG; 7 min, 7 sec; Lily and Greg outside beading next to shed

MOVO2624. MPG; 17 min, 29 sec; Mike, Charlie, Zach beading outside

MOVO2625. MPG; 2 min, 58 sec; Lily and Greg beading next to shed outside to stay out of sun

MOVO 2626; 8 min, 43 sec; Mike, Charlie, Zach outside; Greg, Lily

MOVO2627. MPG; 47 min, 10 sec; Christina, Alli, Chris beading outside

MOVO 2713; 39 min, 36 sec; Zach, Mike, Greg, Lily

MOVO 2714; 2 min 41 sec; Zach, Lily, Charlie, Greg

MOVO 2717; 4 min, 23 sec; Lily, Charlie, Mike, Greg

MOVO 2719; 10 min, 21 sec; Lily stringing beads

MOVO 2720; 11 min, 40 sec; Chris, Christina, Alli

MOVO 2721; 5 min, 24 sec; Chris, Christina, Alli

MOVO 2722; 39 sec; Chris, Christina, Alli

MOVO 2723; 28 sec; Chris, Christina, Alli

MOVO 2724; 18 min, 14 sec; Christina, Alli, Chris

MOVO2873. MPG; 29 min, 50 sec; Mike, Zach, Brian, Lily, Greg, etc.

MOVO2874. MPG; 23 min, 12 sec; Mike, Zach, Brian, Lily, Greg, etc.
MOVO2875. MPG; image; Mike, Zach, Brian, Lily, Greg, etc.

958_0143.MOV; 43 min, 65 sec; Mary, Chris

958_0142.MOV; 54 min, 33 sec; Lily

MOVO2882. MPG; 5 min, 33 sec; Mary, Curt, Mila, Chris, Alli; projects

MOVO2889. MPG 84.5 MB; 3 min 51 sec; Mike, Zach, Greg, Brian, Two unknown girls (unsure of permission slip status)

MOVO2891.MPG 7.6 MB; 20 sec; Video of question written on the board: “How has your project changed over time? What influenced your thinking behind your project? How did the materials limit what you could represent?” Video pans to participants writing answers in response to questions (Zach, Greg, two unknown girls)

MOVO2892.MPG 309.6 MB; 14 min 10 sec; Mike, Zach, Greg, Brian, Two unknown girls, Julie, Charlie; adolescents move from written work to work with beads and other materials

MOVO2893.MPG 17.4 MB; 47 sec; Zach, Brian working on looms

MOVO2894.MPG 185.6 MB; 8 min 29 sec; Mike, Zach, Greg, Brian, Lily’s sister, another girl, Julie, Charlie; adolescents work with beads and other materials

MOVO2895.MPG 312.9MB; 14 min 19 sec; Mike, Zach, Greg, Brian, Lily’s sister, another girl, Julie, Charlie; adolescents work with beads and other materials

MOVO2897.MPG 6.1MB; 16 sec; Greg wraps a piece of leather around his wrist

MOVO2899.MPG 18.3MB; 50 sec; Charlie strings red/pink beads, Greg works on leather cuff, other adolescents work on projects
MOVO2900.MPG 109.4MB; 5:00 min; Close ups; Charlie’s hands stringing beads;
Mike’s hands at loom; girls’ hands, Greg’s hands sorting leather and punching holes into
leather, someone scooping beads into a small bag; Greg again
MOVO2901.MPG 56.7MB; 2 min 35 sec; close up of Zach’s hands working loom
MOVO2909.MPG 143.1 MB; 6 min 33 sec; Mila, Alli, Mary, Curt, Christina, Chris,
Julie; talking, writing, gathering materials, Maya has stuffing, boys walk around
classroom,
MOVO2910.MPG 391.8MB; 17 min 56 sec; Mila, Alli, Mary, Christina, Julie; talking,
gathering materials, Maya has stuffing, constructing projects, end with close up of loom
work
MOVO2911.MPG Christina Beadwork Stalker Conversation 3 min 17 sec; close up on
Christina’s beadwork
MOVO2912.MPG; 12 min 29 sec; Alli, Mary, Chris, Curt, Christina, Mila; various
projects
September 19, 2011 Toni, Betsy, Aria, Julie 53 min 30 sec
September 26, 2011 Toni, Betsy ‘Guts’ 53 min 27 sec
Oct. 3; 31:45
Oct. 10; (HD) 15:07; 37:22; 11:18; Betsy, Toni, Aria, Ellie
October 24, 2011; 36 min 14 sec; Lisa, Aria, Toni, Rachael watch video of themselves
from previous week, can hear recording of my voice on computer’s recording and
adolescents discuss the video where they are seen, laugh at what they are doing in the
video
October 24, 2011; 26 min 18 sec; Lisa, Aria, Toni, Rachael & Ellie construct projects
Two lollipops per individual, Kathy dressed as Blues Clues, Lisa dressed up, Betsy wearing Vampires t-shirt,

November 7, 2011; 68 min, 34 sec; Lisa, Betsy, Aria, Toni; Library books, beaded preschool child’s game, small amount of writing, loomwork, etc.

November 14, 2011; 50 min 36 sec; Joe, Toni, Rachael, Betsy, Lisa, Give small beaded gifts that I made, sewing machine at back table, projects, at the end, Betsy and Ellie try to make an apron with sewing machine. I wear Betsy’s earrings

December 5, 2011; 61 min, 25 sec; Lisa, Toni, Betsy; sewing machine and beads in small English/Spanish classroom

December 12, 2011; 50 min, 06 sec; Joe stringing loom, Toni wearing owl hat, Toni hasn’t eaten lunch, Lisa joins a little later, strings loom

January 9, 2012; 47 min, 53 sec; Pixy stix, explaining reasons for beaded narrative class;

Lisa, Aria, Joe, Wanda

January 16, 2012; 56 min 28 sec; Wanda, Lisa, Joe; wide use of fabric, fabric spread over table, Lisa uses sewing machine,

January 23, 2012; 54 min, 06 sec; Wanda, Toni, Joe, Julie, Lisa; lime green duct tape, cutting up thrifted sweaters, Sharkie pattern

January 30, 2012; 63 min, 58 min; I bring prizes, nail polish, wooden boxes, sewing machines, boxes of scrap fabric, looking at a beading book for a few minutes, sewing machine not working correctly

February 6, 2012; 55 min, 03 sec; My sewing machine, bags of candy, school museum, Wanda cuts fabric, Toni, Betsy, Joe, Aria; Wanda, Betsy sew,
February 13, 2012; 56 min, 12 sec; I am later than usual to set up, the girls help me to set up. I brought fabric for Aria’s project; setting up while girls are arriving. Wanda, Aria, Toni, Lisa, Joe, Betsy. Betsy helps to “dress” Aria. Wanda uses plastic lacing, Lisa-loom, Joe- plastic lacing

February 20, 2012; 64 min, 56 sec; Lisa, Aria discuss Parent Trap. Boo arrives, two 7th/8th grade adolescents arrive, everyone eats candy, Toni. The two older adolescents that are not in the study seem to change class dynamic. Someone puts music on computer.

March 12, 2012; 91 min, 25 sec; Joe, Aria, discuss candy (post-Valentine’s Day candy) Discuss arts fest, Wanda, Toni, Brian comes in later, Aria makes headband

March 19, 2012; 64 min 25 sec; Joe explains that she wants to teach herself how to make something; Jackie, Toni, Boo, Lisa makes beaded embroidery floss project

March 26, 2012; 90 min, 50 sec; Deeann, Joe, Toni, Jackie, Aria, Lisa,

April 2, 2012; 92 min, 54 sec; Lisa, Anna, Toni, Aria, Joe, Deeann, Jackie, Wanda, explain to Anna what they do in the class,

April 16, 2012; 56 min 33 sec; Aria, Jackie, Toni, Boo, Deeann, posters for Arts Fest? Betsy, Toni, Lisa and Jackie make posters for Arts Fest, boy joins group to make something for his Mom who was in hospital. He sews a pillow. I help Deeann sew ripped sweatshirt back together

April 23, 2012; 90 min, 20 sec; Lisa, Jackie, Boo, Aria, Betsy, Toni, Joe, few minutes for a meeting to discuss where money should go for Arts Fest proceeds. Aria explains that PAWS money only goes toward lighting.

April 30, 2012; 8 min 33 sec; Toni, Jackie, Boo, Deeann, Lisa, Wanda, Joe; View video from November, 2011.
April 30, 2012; 76 min, 26 sec; Toni, Jackie, Boo, Deeann, Lisa, Wanda, Joe, Aria, Betsy; Final day of Beaded Narrative during 2012 Spring semester; Gathering materials to work on before Arts Fest, etc.
Appendix C: Child & Parent/Guardian Consent Form

BEADED NARRATIVES: BEADWEAVING IN AN AFTER-SCHOOL SETTING

Student & Parent/Guardian Consent Form
Title of Project: Beaded Narratives: Beadweaving in an After-School Setting

Principal Investigator: Julie Stock
Doctoral Candidate
Language, Culture and Society
163 Chambers
Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802
EMAIL: jas1071@psu.edu
TELEPHONE: XXX-XXX-XXXX

Advisor: Gail Boldt
Associate Professor of Education, Language, Culture and Society
1648 Chambers
Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802
EMAIL: gmb15@psu.edu
TELEPHONE: XXX-XXX-XXXX

1. What is project about? You are being asked to participate in a research study. Studies like this one help researchers learn about how students learn to do bead making techniques from members of a bead community. This form will tell you about the study so that you decide whether or not you want to participate. Students can ask any questions before making a decision, and can think about it and discuss it with family or friends before deciding. It is okay to say “no” if students don’t want to be in the study. If students say “yes,” they can change their minds and quit being in the study at any time. If students decide to be in the study, an adult (parent, guardian) will also need to give permission to participate in the study. Students who choose to participate will be photographed, audio and/or videotaped during bead sessions. Students and families may request that only students’ hands and beadwork may be photographed, or only audiotape and written recordings of their work, and these requests will be fulfilled.

2. What is the research about? The research will help researchers understand ways that students extend their understanding of beadwork techniques through personal practice in an after-school classroom environment.

3. How long will it take? Each beadwork session lasts about 75 minutes long (but could be shorter) during fourteen after school classes, taking place on Mondays from 3:15 pm-4:45 pm. During beadwork sessions, students may use beading tutorials, observe examples of beadwork techniques found in online bead communities, and learn techniques from each other. Julie will assist students in learning beadwork techniques, record field notes about students’ learning, record video and/or audiotape to collect students’ conversations, and take pictures of students while they are working on your beaded projects. If students feel uncomfortable during the activities, they can stop at any time.

5. Voluntary Participation: Students’ ability to participate/ not participate in the beadwork activities will not be affected if you participate or decide that you do not want to participate in the study. Students’ decisions to be in this research are voluntary. Students can choose not to answer certain questions. Refusing to participate or withdrawing early from the study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits students would be entitled to otherwise. If students decide not to participate, they may decide to do another activity during after-school club. After the results of the study are complete, Julie will be happy to share them with the participants by arranging a meeting with participants and parents/guardians, after school.

6. Confidentiality of Participation: All of the observations that researcher Julie Stock writes down, as well as any photographs taken from this study, will not be matched to student names. Julie will analyze the data, but never match data with names or other information about students when summarizing, presenting, or publishing the results of the research. With explicit permission, photographs of participants will be used in the researcher’s dissertation and potential articles for publication. If preferred, pictures of only students’ hands working on bead projects may be published if this work is accepted for publication. Julie will contact individual students for permission to publish any photographs if this work is accepted for publication.

7. If students’ parents or students do not want to participate in the research, please tell the teacher so that she makes sure not to include your comments or any images of you. You are still welcome to make beadwork even if you are not involved in this study. There are no reasonably foreseeable discomforts or risks of participating in the study. Benefits of participating in the study for participants include learning new beadwork techniques, creating personalized beadwork to keep or to give as gifts, and to socialize with friends in bead club. Other benefits include learning about the history of bead, and ways that bead making may be used in other cultures.

The recordings will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in Julie Stock’s residence. Only she will have access to field notes and photographs, and upon parent request, she will be able to share this information with students’ parents/guardians. Photographs will be destroyed within five years of the study.
Thank you for considering your involvement in this research.

If you and your child agree to the information describe above and want to participate in the research regarding beaded narratives, please print your child’s first and last name below and sign two copies of the parental consent forms provided in this mailing. Then, please return one signed copy to after-school teacher/PSU researcher Julie Sivko. Please keep one copy for your reference or future use.

“I give permission for my child, ____________________________, to participate in this research.”

___ I give my permission to be PHOTOGRAPHED as I am assembling my beaded projects and for these photographs to be released to the Julie Sivko, the principal investigator of this study for the purpose of studying students’ understanding of beading techniques and surrounding conversations.
___ I give my permission for ONLY HANDS AND WORK PRODUCED to be PHOTOGRAPHED.
___ I DO NOT give my permission to be PHOTOGRAPHED.

___ I give my permission to be VIDEOTAPED as I am assembling my beaded projects and for video footage to be released to the Julie Sivko, the principal investigator of this study for the purpose of studying students’ understanding of beading techniques and surrounding conversations.
___ I give my permission for ONLY HANDS AND WORK PRODUCED to be VIDEOTAPED.
___ I DO NOT give my permission to be VIDEOTAPED.

___ I give my permission to be AUDIOTAPED as I am assembling/explaining my beaded projects and for AUDIO recordings to be released to the Julie Sivko, the principal investigator of this study for the purpose of studying students' understanding of beading techniques and surrounding conversations.
___ I DO NOT give my permission to be AUDIOTAPED.

PARENT CONSENT: Signature of Parent / Guardian  Date

ASSENT: Signature of teenagers age 13 and Older  Date

Signature of Principal Investigator / Person Obtaining Consent  Date

Please keep one copy of this signed and dated consent form for your records, and please return the other copy to Julie Sivko, after-school teacher/PSU researcher. Thank you!
Appendix D: Permissions from Specials Coordinator at the School

**Title of Project:** D.I.Y. Communities of Practice: Beadweaving with Adolescents in an After-School Setting

August 9, 2010

To the Personnel at the Pennsylvania State Office of Research Protections,

On behalf of Centre Learning Community Charter School Extended School Program, Kathy Morrow grants permission to Julie Slivka to conduct research at our school facility. Kathy Morrow completed basic training on the Protection of Human Participants on May 6, 2010. This study investigates ways students learn from Do-It-Yourself, or D.I.Y. tutorials on the Internet, (specifically, seed beading techniques), from teachers, and from each other. We understand the purpose, benefits and drawbacks of this research, and reserve the right to participate or to not participate in this study at any time.

Regards,
Kathy Morrow

Email: Kathy@clccharter.org
Phone: 814-861-7980
Cell phone: 814-933-2642

**Principal Investigator:** Julie Slivka
Doctoral Candidate
153 Chambers
Penn State University, University Park, PA 16802
EMAIL: jas1071@psu.edu
TELEPHONE: 240-818-7189
Title of Project: Adolescents' use of beadwork in narratives: A pilot study

February 16, 2011

To the Personnel at the Pennsylvania State Office of Research Protections,

On behalf of Centre Learning Community Charter School Specials Program, Kathy Morrow grants permission to Julie Slivka to conduct research at our school facility. Kathy Morrow completed basic training on the Protection of Human Participants on May 6, 2010. This study investigates ways students learn from Do-It-Yourself, or D.I.Y. tutorials on the Internet, (specifically, seed beading techniques), from teachers, and from each other in order to create beaded narratives. This research is focused on beaded narratives as alternative literacies. We understand the purpose, benefits and drawbacks of this research, and reserve the right to participate or to not participate in this study at any time.

Regards,

Kathy Morrow

Email: Kathy@clccharter.org
Phone: 814-861-7980
Cell phone: 814-933-2642

Principal Investigator: Julie Slivka
Doctoral Candidate
163 Chambers
Penn State University, University Park, PA 16802
EMAIL: jas1071@psu.edu
TELEPHONE: 240-818-7189
Appendix E: Letter explaining “Arts Fest” schedule of activity

April 30, 2012

Dear Students and Families,

You are invited to participate in the Beaded Narrative table at the XXXXX Xxxxxx Arts Fest, Children’s Day on July 11, 2012 from 10:00am-3:00pm. Participants have made really lovely pieces all year, and will have to carefully consider whether to keep or sell items. In order to prepare for the big day, we will need to organize our inventory and place price tags on items for sale. Participants are invited to come back to school during the following summer days to continue to work on projects, from 8:00am-3:00pm. Just bring lunch and a snack and join us for several days to work on your projects!

Monday, June 25, 2012, 8:00am-3:00pm
Wednesday, June 27, 2012, 8:00am-3:00pm
Friday, June 29, 2012, 8:00am-3:00pm
(July 4, no meeting - holiday)
Friday, July 6, 8:00am-3:00pm
Monday, July 9, 8:00am-3:00pm
Tuesday, July 10, 8:00am-3:00pm

Wednesday, July 11 Children’s Day at Arts Fest! 10:00am-3:00pm,
downtown XXXX XXXXXXX, table location TBA. I will arrive early to set up our table. Arts Fest rules allow us to have three children at our table at one time. Participants that are present and I will be available to sell artwork for those participants that are not present, as long as we have your inventory and pricing information. We are looking forward to an exciting Arts Fest this year! Thank you for all of your participation.

Regards,

Julie Slivka

XXX-XXX-XXXX

jas1071@psu.edu
Endnotes

\(^i\) Digital Learning Center (DLC) School is a pseudonym for the school in this study.

\(^{ii}\) Lily was a participant in our in-school specials class during the spring of 2011. Her skillful activity reflected the later activity of many of the after-school beading class participants.

\(^{iii}\) During the in-school specials class in Spring 2011, individuals were placed in classes by selecting their top three choices for electives, and then the specials coordinator, Kathy, used students’ data to match schedules to top choices as closely as possible. While many individuals were placed in their favorite choices, some were not, and so some of the students in my classes may not have chosen to be there. Since the student body was two-thirds males and one-third females, most of the students in my specials classes were male.

The first specials group was comprised of five boys and one girl, and the second group was comprised of two boys and four girls. Many of the potential participants explained that they did not want to be videotaped, so they chose not to participate in my study. Only a small fraction of the total number of students in the specials class chose to participate. If I had presented them with alternative options, perhaps additional students would have participated in my study. I learned from this experience and developed alternative options for potential participants in the after-school group.

\(^{iv}\) During Fall 2010, I began a pilot study as an after school group that met from 3:15 p.m. until 4:15 p.m. during 12 sessions for a total of approximately 14 hours, 30 minutes.

During these sessions, children that stayed after school chose from an assortment of after-school electives and could stay as long as they wished, or switch from one activity to another at any time. Individuals that attended my class often strung beads and made
friendship bracelets but did not often seek the beading techniques that I offered to teach. See ‘Appendix A’ for a timeline of the after school class. I also offered a “Beaded Narrative” specials class during the spring of 2011. Specials classes at the school met ten times for one-hour classes every Thursday. I was assigned two specials sections, one meeting from 12:50 pm - 1:50 pm, and the other from 1:55 pm - 2:55 pm. During the spring semester of 2011, we met during a total of 21 hours, 40 minutes, although I only have 7.43 hours of video data. This was a result of taping with a digital camera that I purchased in 2003, that was not quite equipped to handle the extra memory that I inserted.

 Altogether, I met with participants during and after school for over 108 hours and 51 minutes over the course of 16 months, collecting over 64 hours of video data.

 I was pleased when Kathy considered the after school class successful enough to allow me to move it to a specials class that took place during school. As I planned to teach the class as a specials class, I was required to turn in lesson plans, but I referred to these plans as suggestions for participants’ activities rather than mandated outcomes.
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