

The definitive, peer-reviewed and edited version of this article is published in:

Inside the English education lab: Critical qualitative and ethnographic perspectives on the academies experiment, Edited by Christy Kulz, Kirsty Morrin and Ruth McGinity © 2022 Author(s). Published by Manchester University Press.

What ‘these kids’ need: discipline, misrecognition and resistance in an English academy school

The head teacher came out into the playground ‘Oh look’ Tracey said, ‘here comes Hitler’. I laughed, ‘Have you met him?’ I asked. She said, ‘Yeah he’s alright actually, to the parents, don’t know what he’s like with the kids though, strict, but then that’s what they need’ (Sarah’s field notes, March 2014)

Introduction

Processes of marketization have fundamentally re-shaped England’s state education both in terms of access and ethos. This chapter locates the pedagogic practices of a primary academy school on an English council estate within neoliberal logics, where dominant discourses of responsabilisation and choice (Burgess et al., 2011) are mediated through localised constructions of community provision (Bhattacharya, 2013). Drawing upon eighteen months of ethnographic fieldwork conducted on a council estate between 2013-14, the chapter explores the reformation of educational provision on The Estateⁱ through processes of academisation, outlining an analysis of Estate Primary which was closed following its ‘failing’ status and reopened as an academy in 2013.

The academies programme, first introduced in 2002, aimed to replace schools in England located in areas of high socio-economic disadvantage with new schools independent of local government control and managed by charitable companies and governing bodies established by sponsors (National Audit Office, 2010). Academy and free schools now make up 32 per cent of primary schools and 75 per cent of secondary schools in England (Department for Education, 2019). Thus, academisation has more comprehensively transformed secondary educational provision, with primary academies concentrated within the most disadvantaged communities. When compared to all primary schools, primary academies have a higher than average rate of free school meal eligibility, with 17.1 per cent of pupils eligible, compared with 15.1 per cent in local authority maintained primary schools. In the current pupil population of Estate Primary there are 62.2 per cent of pupils who are or have been eligible for free school meals at any time during the past six years (National Statistics, pupil population in 2017-2018). As such, the academisation of Estate Primary is facilitated and mediated through the material disadvantages of The Estate. Through an analysis of the interplay between the social and material conditions of The Estate and the pedagogic practices of Estate Primary, this chapter contributes to the literature by providing insight into the transformation of primary school provision through localised constructions of ‘community need’.

The extension of market principles, legitimised and enacted through parental choice, have diversified and further hierarchised state education within England. The unequal distribution of resources of choice (Burgess et al., 2011) reveals the logics of this neoliberal policy. As Reay (2007) argues, schools are highly politicised spaces where the policy and practice of parental choice reproduces geographies of schooling differentiated along class lines. The responsabilisation of parents in securing access to ‘good’ schooling for their children is encouraged through admission guidance provided by the local council. The guidance champions equal access to schools through the exercising of choice, offering a ‘wealth of information to help [parents] consider the right schools’, and highlighting attendance at open days, examination of Ofsted reports and knowledge of school ethos and specialisations as examples of responsible choosing. Parents are asked to provide three primary schools in order of preference in the hope their child will be allocated one of the three (Warrington, 2005; Wright, 2012). Nevertheless, parents are advised that they ‘have the right to express a preference rather than choose a school’, with home to school distance informing admissions once priorities have been met. Therefore, despite the egalitarian rhetoric of choice, the associated resources of choice are unevenly distributed (Burgess et al., 2011), with material and social boundaries restricting the options available to families living on The Estate. Consequently, the geographical dislocation of The Estate on the eastern edge of the city, and the associated stigmatising representations of The Estate (Leaney, 2019), result in Estate Primary being unpopular amongst parents with the requisite resources to enact choice and send their children elsewhere (Benson et al., 2015; Reay et al., 2011). Thus, Estate Primary is the ‘choice’ for those unable to enact ‘responsible choosing’, a choice founded upon necessity or a rejection of the possibility of choice altogether.

As an extension of broader processes of marketisation (Gewirtz, 2002), the academies programme facilitates the ‘specialisation’ of state education, contributing to a ‘new politics of recognition’ acting to further naturalise educational inequalities (Power and Franji, 2010: 2). The school’s rebranding centred on the ‘common sense’ discourses of neoliberal educational policy (Hall and O’Shea, 2013), locating success in the soft measures of ‘ambition’ and ‘aspirations’ (Morrin, 2018). Within this logic, the experiential consequences of material and structural inequality are relocated within a psychologised language of individual endeavour, as the school encourages its staff and pupils to be ‘great by choice’. The school mission statement is consistent with these aspirational individual logics, requiring that: ‘We won’t accept excuses and we won’t make excuses’.

The ongoing ‘diversification’ of the British education system (Exley, 2012; Gibson, 2015; Ball, 2016), facilitated through processes of academisation has enabled the transformation of schools in terms of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. This specialisation of state education provision is often framed by ideas of inclusion, where teaching is ‘designed and delivered to engage students in learning that is meaningful, relevant and accessible’ (Hockings, 2010: 1). And yet in practice, desires to be inclusive are shaped by the broader socio-political context and social relations within which teaching and learning takes place, with Burke and Crozier (2012) theorising inclusivity as involving a complex, contextual set of pedagogical experiences, practices, identities and relations. There is therefore a specific need to interrogate normative assumptions of inclusion, particularly in terms of how these relate to the contexts of space/place in which they might appear. As such, the academisation of Estate Primary marked a shift transforming conceptualisations of the school’s purpose, through constructions of the ‘community needs’ of The Estate. Therefore, analyses of the school as a field within which particular formations of self are produced and reproduced (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990; Ingram, 2011) can no longer assume education to be the site of reproduction of dominant middle-class culture. Rather than Estate Primary forming a ‘relatively autonomous sphere[s] of play’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 17), together with interrelated structuring structures (such as

housing, healthcare, welfare provision) it is formative of a classificatory system which defines The Estate through common sense divisions of value. In this way, I understand the school to be a productive site of the children's sense of place, where the habitus is formed in moments of being positioned as 'valueless' (Skeggs and Loveday, 2012).

In this chapter, I explore how the deepening of 'diversification' within the curriculum, under processes of academisation, enables the entanglement of corporeal discipline within pedagogical practices (Lupton & Hempel-Jorgensen, 2012). Key to Estate Primary's transformation under academisation was the implementation of a pedagogic package Performance Based Learningⁱⁱ, a new learning system defined by exaggerated actions and special vocabulary. As a highly embodied practice, Performance Based Learning identifies 'comportment, demeanour and behaviour' as the site of learning, constructing particular classed, raced and gendered bodies as 'the impossible learner' (Hollingworth, 2015: 1241). This centring of embodied practice as the foundation of learning constructs the working class as 'unteachable'. Therefore, I argue Estate Primary is not simply reproducing middle class culture, rather, through accounts of who 'these kids' are and what 'these kids' need, the school reifies an estate culture as defined through lack (Parsons, 2012).

To this end, this chapter explores the role of the school in the social formation of the body through processes of (mis)recognition (Bourdieu, 2000; James, 2015). I begin by outlining the qualitative methodology of the research, identifying the ways in which ethnography draws attention to the practices of the everyday that may be made visible in moments of the research encounter. I introduce the context of the research through an account of the discursive construction of 'community' on The Estate, where stigmatising representations are formative of Estate Primary's specialised provision which aims to meet 'community needs'. The chapter is founded upon Bourdieu's conceptualisation of habitus (Bourdieu, 1990) as forged within the 'moment of exchange' (Skeggs, 2004), where relational classifications become inscribed. This theorisation of the classed body and its positioning within the field, enables an exploration of the ways in which difference is read onto the body within a social context. Through analysis of the embodied processes of discipline, misrecognition and resistance within Estate Primary, I consider the impact of the narrowing conceptualisation of education within academisation. Focussing on the dynamic between habitus and field, I argue that the social production of docile bodies (Foucault, 1977) within Estate Primary may be located within the tension of resistance and domination.

Ethnographic representations

The key site of my research was the community centre on The Estate and my interest in Estate Primary grew out of my participation in the community centre's 'after-school' club. There is a physical proximity between Estate Primary and the community centre, with children running from the school gates to the community centre, often unattended, through a pedestrian path which connects the two. Nevertheless, there is also considerable social distance and lack of interaction between these two sites of educational provision on The Estate. Consequently, gaining research access to Estate Primary took a long time. I attempted to make contact through formal and informal networks, sending emails, phoning and visiting the school. None of this correspondence was answered. Six months into the research it was announced that the headteacher would be leaving as part of the school's re-branding as an academy. It became apparent that my difficulty gaining access had been shaped by circumstances which had placed the school under increased scrutiny whereby many of its staff had found themselves located in precarious positions. However, upon the re-opening of the newly formed academy, I was able to meet with the new headteacher, and as reflected in the following field note, I entered the 'new' school with ease.

My meeting with the head teacher seems a bit of a blur – I had an hour meeting but can't have been with him for more than ten minutes – I signed into the school at 10.25am and came out at 10.40am!

He was very friendly, but difficult to read. He had a clear 'Can-Do' attitude – it was like bish bash bosh: you're in, no questions asked.

'See it's easy' he said, 'Don't worry, it's easy'.

As he walked me back down the corridor, he said there's nothing to worry about here, 'See it's calm and quiet'. I agreed, 'Where is everyone?' I asked.

'They're learning!' he said. I felt like I was getting the sales pitch. (Sarah's field notes, March 2014)

I reflected afterwards that there was something within the re-branding of the school that also encompassed a re-definition of what 'research' might represent within this newly configured space: not so much surveillance and monitoring, but more a means to display change and measure success. An apparent openness to research was part of the school's new ethos, made visible through the presence of multiple researchers during my time in the school, which resulted in the subsequent incorporation of positivistic research instruments into the monitoring of pupils and an investment in internal observations of classroom teaching by senior members of staff.

In 2014, I spent four weeks as an ethnographer within the school. Using the register of the children who attended the community centre, I selected a Year Four (ages eight and nine) class that had the highest proportion of these children. I wanted to follow the children I had known for almost a year at the community centre and observe the ways in which they engaged within school. In the classroom I took on the role of 'helper', observing the whole class and working with small groups. As my focus in the school was on this one group of children, I followed the class throughout their school day. This meant I moved beyond the classroom to school assembly, to PE lessons and on school trips. During break time, I went with the children to the playground and ate my lunch with them in the lunch hall. My research encounters within the school were far more contained, in terms of attention to specific interactions, than those of my wider ethnography beyond the school gates. This was partly a consequence of the evolution of my research. Almost a year into the broader ethnography my interest in the school became re-shaped by emerging themes. In particular, my engagement with the school was informed by a deepening concern with children as social agents. This meant that I wanted to explore how the children engaged with school and negotiated their role as 'pupil', moving my concern beyond the ways in which the school merely acted upon them. My shift in focus was also strategic: I needed to find a way to negotiate access and to create and maintain working research relationships with those with power to grant permissions within the school. I therefore deliberately distinguished my research focus away from the evaluative gaze often associated with the processes of becoming an academy.

As a methodology, ethnography produces a form of representation where the specificity of the ethnographic encounter is produced between the participant and researcher framing this as a site of knowledge production (of what is known of the people of the research). As such, representations of participants are formed within moments where they 'show and tell' aspects of their everyday lives. In this way, the ethnographic representation is not formed through being the same or even learning to become like one another, rather it is hewn in moments of difference. This focus on the research interaction de-stabilises a notion of the authentic stable identity position that remains consistent through time. Rather, knowledge of the everyday is produced in and through moment-by-moment interaction.

By providing an account of the processes of the research encounter, ethnography highlights the ways in which the self is defined and the practices by which connections with others are formed and maintained. In the following field-note, Ruby challenges my identity position, questioning the contradiction within my claim to be ‘researcher’ and my actions, which for Ruby, assume the authority to ‘teach’.

Ruby asked me, ‘If you’re not a teacher, why are you teaching us?’ She continues to push boundaries with me but is submissive to Mr Johnson [teacher]. She acknowledges my position as other to ‘teacher’ and allows me to be part of her rule breaking, giving me a chewing gum during playtime and offering me food in the lunch hall, despite the strict ‘no sharing’ policy (Sarah’s field notes, May 2014)

Through participation in Ruby’s everyday rule breaking, I not only accessed this social practice but facilitated it. Therefore, ethnography does not negate perceived differences and unequal distributions of power that define the research encounter, but centres them as the object of research (Skeggs, 2001). In this way, the ethnographic representation is not a looking in, or a capturing of an authentic way of being; rather it is an attention to the practices of the everyday that may be made visible in moments of the research encounter.

Ethnographic analysis employs a critical bifocality (Weis and Fine, 2012) that explores the potentialities of agency whilst contextualising the individual actor within the material and structural conditions of social position. As an analytic sensibility, critical bifocality is a practice that threads through the entire research process. In this way, I think it is appropriate to speak of moments of analysis as formative of the research project: the ethnographic encounter, the writing of field-notes, and the textual representation of the ethnography. Within this conceptualisation, the ethnographic encounter can be understood as the site of everyday analysis, suggesting that meaning is co-constructed through performances of communal beingness (Walkerdine, 2010). Processes of objectification form another moment of analysis, in the writing of field-notes, their re-stylisation and the connections and disconnections within the research narrative I construct. And, there is a time and space of analysis where data becomes artefact to be re-presented, re-animated and re-told through the act of writing. This approach to analysis enables me to work within the tension of deductive and inductive reasoning, re-imagining knowing as a cyclical process. Thinking of analysis as a formative process, I understand knowledge production to be iterative; where the research object is constructed and reconstructed through the dynamic between theory and observation (Cerwonka and Malkki, 2008). In the next section, I outline the formation of community on The Estate, engaging with a bifocal analysis to draw attention to the co-constitution of dominant discourses of The Estate and everyday life on The Estate.

The classification of community

Being housed on The Estate entails a structural positioning within a specific social, cultural and political milieu. The Estate of this research is located at the edge of the city, situated within a valley. It is visually and physically contained. The Estate juts into the rural landscape, the bottom forms the entrance, with the main street stretching up a steep hill, each side is enclosed by a wall of green that wraps around The Estate. There is no through way, the top of The Estate forms a dead end; it is simply the turning bay for the bus that serves The Estate. This physical dislocation of The Estate produces a social distancing whereby the ‘proximate stranger’ (Bhabha, 1996) is imagined through repeated cultural representations (Raisborough and Adams, 2008). Such dominant discourses which produce The Estate as ‘other’ (Featherstone, 2013; Mckenzie, 2015) circulate on The Estate and are drawn upon as resources in everyday struggles for recognition.

In the break between the after-school clubs, youth workers Joe and Sharon who live on The Estate were talking about Benefits Streetⁱⁱⁱ. They were joking about where ‘Benefit Street’ is on The Estate. Entangled with their gossip and judgements was self-deprecation and kindness. Their conversation walked a tightrope where they negotiated the stigmatising representations of the television programme with their everyday social and material connections to welfare benefit receipt. (Sarah’s field notes, January 2014)

Thus, everyday life on The Estate is mediated through value systems which give meaning to its structured materiality. Dominant discourses which stigmatize council estates are mobilised and reproduced through everyday practices on The Estate, where housing, embodied practices and cultural aesthetics inform judgments by which residents’ mark distinction (Bourdieu, 1984; Robertson, 2013).

As ‘illusion’ (Brent, 2004), ‘paradox’ (Hill and Wright, 2003) and exclusionary construction (Back 2009), ‘community’ is positioned as an ambivalent concept within class analysis. Nevertheless, in representations of the Council Estate, community continues to do much of the conceptual work of connecting people and place in academic, political and popular understandings of class. Following the discursive turn within theorisations of class (Reay, 2002; Skeggs, 2014; Hollingworth, 2015), we may understand community as produced and reproduced within power dynamics which shape the possibility of individuals and institutions accessing positionings within discourse as a resource (Skeggs, 2005). Power lies in the ability to name, to claim to know and to resist and redefine such positionings (Pelletier, 2012; Mair et al., 2012). Discourse is therefore socially produced, in that it is shaped by histories which structure its reproduction, and formed inter-relationally, through the connections between personal and communal narratives (Walkerline, 2010). In this way, I understand the mobilisation of discourses of community as a process of making class on The Estate.

Through the telling and re-telling of encounters with the community, Estate Primary institutionalises knowledge of the community through the active weaving together of multiple representations (Thornham and Parry, 2014).

Mr Johnson talked about how he started at the school twelve years ago – how he’d been tricked into it – he said his agency called and said there were two possible positions: one at a Catholic School with what they said was a ‘challenging class’ and the other at Estate Primary. The agency asked whether he had ever heard of The Estate and he said no – they said, ‘Oh okay it’s a lovely little school’. When he went to the school, the head teacher at the time took him into a room and asked, ‘When can you start?’ He said, ‘Aren’t you going to interview me?’ Mr Johnson told me ‘Back then there were kids on the roof throwing tiles at the teachers’ – he’s told me this story before – ‘it’s much better now’. (Sarah’s field notes, May 2014)

Pathological representations of children on The Estate construct working-class childhood against normative ideas of what childhood should be. Here, working-class childhood becomes defined by lack (Reay, 2000). As Steedman notes, ‘the children of the poor are only a measure of what they lack as children: they are a falling short of a more complicated and richly endowed “real” child’ (Steedman, 1986: 127-8). This construction of childhood informs and legitimates the school’s disciplining practices, whereby the children of Estate Primary are juxtaposed with the middle-class embodiment of the ideal learner.

Mr Johnson continued, ‘I must like it here, perhaps I’m a bit masochistic’. He said, ‘If you have a class in a middle-class suburb, you tell them what to go and do, then they do it. You

don't really need to be there, they would do the same without you. But with these kids, it's a constant struggle, you're constantly pushing them'. (Sarah's field notes, May 2014)

The requirement of children to perform specific embodied practices in order to 'learn' and 'know' constructs the working class as 'unteachable' (Lupton & Hempel-Jorgensen, 2012). This is exemplified in the implementation of Performance Based Learning, where the conflation of embodied action and learning, results in the entanglement of corporeal discipline and pedagogical practices within Estate Primary. Here knowledge becomes equated with the mastery of rhythmic, gentle movements and measured speech patterns, assuming 'ontology to be the grounds of epistemology, that what I am determines what and how I know' (Skeggs, 1997: 131). The narrowing of learning to the performance of particular actions necessitates the intense regulation of bodies within the classroom. Therefore, the academisation of Estate Primary centred on a reassertion of 'traditional' education, both aesthetically, with children sitting in rows, and pedagogically, with the use of teacher-student repetition and answer-response. In the next section, I outline Bourdieu's theorisation of habitus, capital and field as a conceptual toolkit to inform my analysis of the classifications of the body within Estate Primary.

Thinking with Bourdieu: class and the body

Bourdieu's conceptualisation of habitus transcends dichotomies of individual and society, locating class practice within the dialectic of 'the objectified products and the incorporated products of historical practice' (Bourdieu, 1990: 52). Habitus is therefore a process of embodiment, where 'objective potentialities [are] immediately inscribed in the present' (1990: 53), cultivating affects compatible with the material conditions of class: 'to refuse what is anyway denied and to will the inevitable' (1990: 54). In other words, the objective and subjective realities of class are co-constituted, with the material conditions of class productive of and reproduced by the social and cultural conditions of class. For Bourdieu, this process of embodiment entails the 'forgetting of history': as a product of history, the habitus produces more history in accordance with the schemes generated by history. Think for example of a child who enjoys reading, in their practice of reading they do not need to reflect on the rules and principles of reading, they are not necessarily concerned with calculating the benefits of their reading beyond their own pleasure. Yet there is a forgotten history of this seemingly personal and often private disposition, one inculcated by early education, required by the social group and inscribed in language, thought and the body (1990: 103-4). It is the 'forgetting' of such capital accumulation which is central to the meritocratic assumptions of education, where objective material conditions are assessed as subjective dispositions and in turn objectified through institutional qualifications.

Nevertheless, the process of 'forgetting' is far from neutral (Leaney, 2018) and feminist scholars thinking with Bourdieu have explored habitus formation as an 'affective practice' (Wetherell, 2012; Loveday, 2016). The conceptualisation of class as a process of 'making through marking' (Skeggs, 2004: 12), acknowledges the 'visceral affective reactions against one's social fate and the attempts to escape they can generate' (Lane, 2012: 3). For Skeggs, 'bodies are being inscribed simultaneously by different symbolic systems', yet it is only in the moment of exchange that this inscription becomes actualised, as 'we learn to interpret bodies through different perspectives to which we have access' (2004: 3). Through an emphasis on agency, feminist developments of Bourdieu map the physical and psychic distancing of the self from classed inscriptions (Reay & Lucey, 2000; 2002) exploring the 'different forms and volumes of resources that [the working class] are able to deploy in coping with social and material limitations' (Vincent et al., 2008: 7). Following Bourdieu's dialectic of subjectivity and objectivity (Bourdieu, 1990), Skeggs maintains the link between symbolic value and structural constraints, which results in some forms of culture being 'condensed and inscribed onto

social groups and bodies that then mark them and restrict their movement in social space' (Skeggs, 2004: 2). As Loveday (2016) notes, certain forms of classed embodiment are devalued within the 'moral economy' (Skeggs, 2009) so 'that the mere presence of a body creates a feeling of disorder within a specific social field' (Loveday, 2016: 1150).

Thus, the habitus is forged through its encounters within the field, individuals occupy relative positions in a space of relations; they 'exist and subsist in and through difference' (Bourdieu, 1998: 31). Following the dialectic implicit within Bourdieu's theorisations, the field is a structure both constitutive of and by the relations of which it is made. Therefore, the field is a fluid structure, it is simultaneously a space of conflict and competition, with changes in the 'distribution and relative weight of forms of capital' in turn modifying the structure of the field (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 17). The introduction of social and cultural capital by Bourdieu into class analysis moves beyond purely economic definitions of class, highlighting that 'cultural lifestyle is not...an effect of structure, but rather one of the means by which stratification position is constituted' (Bottero, 2005: 83).

For Bourdieu this relational network, formed of positionings of relative power and resources, is not reducible to an empirical network of permanent structural relations. Rather, the field is formed of relations 'actualised in and by particular exchange' (Bottero, 2009: 5). It is the feel for the game that Bourdieu suggests effects differential positioning within the field, it is the 'sense of the imminent future of the game, the sense of the direction of the history of the game that gives the game its sense' (Bourdieu, 1990: 82). It is in the thinking of habitus, field and capital together that Bourdieu's theory provides a 'metaphoric model' of social space which enables us to think about different formations of value and mobility (Adkins and Skeggs, 2004: 21), thus introducing the possibility of 'multiple reformations' of class.

The field as a conceptual tool for analysis does appear to move beyond deficit models of class as it is not the actions or inactions of an individual, it is their relative position of difference that determines their recognition within the field: class identity is negotiated through processes of self-identification and othering. In the following analysis, I draw attention to the intersubjective (Barnes, 2000) through an interest in the dynamic of objective/subjective relations, exploring the processes through which one becomes classed.

Disciplining the body

Following Zirkel et al.'s (2011) analysis of the 'othering' practices within a charter school in the USA, we may understand the 'tough' pedagogic practices of Estate Primary as legitimised through broader stigmatising representations of The Estate. Dominant discourses mobilised within the cultural (Skeggs and Wood, 2012) and political sphere (McKenzie, 2015) discursively construct the 'community' and its respective 'needs'. Thus, the pathologization of the working class, specifically those 'housed' on The Estate, not only informs in-school practices as 'technologies of control', but legitimises them within wider 'technologies of consent' (Jensen and Tyler, 2015). In this way, the 'tough' disciplining strategies of Estate Primary are accepted as 'what these kids need'.

As the teacher read another question from their script, Harvey's raised hand, already shaking with anticipation, began to extend higher pulling his body from the chair. Harvey stood exposed, as the classroom door opened, and the head teacher entered the class. He asked the teacher why there were children out of their seats, after a brief glance towards me, she explained it was part of the activity. Harvey was told to sit down. (Sarah's field notes, March 2014)

In the field note above, Harvey's body is out of place creating disorder within the classroom (Loveday, 2016). Harvey's failure to regulate his body in line with the requirements of Performance Based Learning, to express knowledge, participation and learning in the correct way, results in his exclusion from the activity. Yet, it is not just the student who is regulated through the implementation of Performance Based Learning, teachers are restricted to 'act out' their role in the exchange. In the field note, the teacher struggles to embody the exaggerated actions and special vocabulary of Performance Based Learning. Their movements are interrupted by picking up and putting down the script, their speech fragmented as they revisit instructions to ensure they have used the correct terminology.

When the head teacher enters the classroom his power is palpable, impacting the behaviour of both the teacher and the children. The activity is paused, the teacher stops reading from the script and the children turn to face the head teacher. In this moment of confrontation 'the social order inscribes itself in bodies' ... [through the] pressure or oppression, continuous and often unnoticed, of the ordinary order of things' (Bourdieu, 2000: 141). The head teacher asserts dominance over the children, enforcing the expectations of embodied learning in the classroom. But in addressing the question to the teacher he makes explicit his role in the surveillance of teaching and learning practices within the school. Within the logics of Performance Based Learning, there is no interest in what Harvey's answer to the question is. Through his inability to embody learning in this context, Harvey is positioned as an 'impossible learner' (Hollingsworth, 2015), his body disciplined as he is asked to sit down. In the next section, I further explore the ways embodied practice is misrecognised within Estate Primary, suggesting that as an affective practice, moments of misrecognition foreground the logics of divisions of value.

The misrecognition of 'doing nothing'

Drawing upon Skeggs' conceptualisation of the possessive individual (2004), I argue that although all identity claims have associated value (Archer et al., 2007), values connected to the structurally disadvantaged become reified through the misrecognition of bodily difference. Misrecognition occurs within education through the transformation of social classification into academic classification (Grenfell and James, 1998). This misrecognition is symbolic violence in the sense that it is the imposition of a cultural arbitrary by an arbitrary power (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990: 5), it is a process by which an action is not recognised for what it is and is instead attributed another meaning whereby 'interests, inequities or other effects may be maintained whilst they remain concealed' (James, 2015: 100).

The following fieldnote reflects a moment of misrecognition, where one principle of vision and division is constituted as the 'ultimate, unquestionable principle of all others' (Bourdieu, 2000: 104). In the fieldnote, the coach draws lines of division between 'doing something' and 'doing nothing'. For him, 'doing something' involves joining in, participating in formalised after-school clubs, and developing talents. All other forms of action, such as attending the community centre, are misrecognised as 'doing nothing', this action is attributed the meaning of non-action.

During the PE class, the coach sat and talked to me. He said 'Here it's like taking part or joining in takes away their street cred. It's like seen as bad to join in'. He told me that the school put on stuff for free and he thinks that's right, but it doesn't help with attendance: it's not money, it's something else.

At the end of the lesson he asked me to get up in front of the class. He asked all the kids to put their hand up if they went to the community centre – most of them did. He then asked them if they went to any other after-school clubs to put their hand up – a couple did.

The coach went along the line asking the kids what they did. Some of the boys said they went to football and one girl said she went to gymnastics, netball and swimming. When he asked Kelsey, she said ‘I don’t do nothing, I do nothing’.

The Coach said, ‘See lots of the kids do nothing’.

One boy, the Coach felt was particularly talented – he won star pupil – did nothing. The Coach said, ‘See, he is talented but does nothing’. (Sarah’s field notes, March 2014)

As Bourdieu notes, this form of domination ‘succeeds in imposing itself durably only in so far as it manages to secure recognition’ (2000: 104). The system of division becomes justified, in the sense that it is respected and honoured, through the misrecognition of the arbitrariness of its principle. Therefore, the children may only articulate their experience within the established principle of division, where the social classification of formal and informal activities becomes an academic classification of legitimate and illegitimate. This enables some children to express their participation in ‘gymnastics, netball and swimming’, whilst others confirm that they ‘do nothing’.

James (2015) suggests that misrecognition is an everyday and dynamic social process where action is not recognised for what it is ‘because it was not previously “cognised” within the range of dispositions and propensities of the habitus of the person(s) confronting it’ (James, 2015: 100). Therefore, moments of misrecognition are both formed by and formative of the habitus. Habitus may be understood as constitutive tension, it is the conceptualisation of an ontological tension, structured and structuring, and it is a ‘constructive bodily tension towards the imminent forthcoming’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 144). As an ‘active presence’ (Bourdieu, 1990: 52), habitus is a felt dynamic between the self and the social world. Accordingly, we may understand misrecognition as an ‘affective practice’ (Loveday, 2016) both in terms of its consequences, that it results in embodied experiences of shame, and its performativity, it is ‘a mechanism that feeds back into classed relationships, variously shoring up notions of (il)legitimacy by contributing to processes of valuation’ (Loveday, 2016: 1151). The field note demonstrates the co-constitution of habitus and field whereby the habitus ‘constructs the world by a certain way of orienting itself towards it’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 144) as captured in Kelsey’s response to the Coach’s questioning: ‘*I don’t do nothing, I do nothing*’.

Kelsey’s response is founded upon her sense of place. For Bourdieu, this is a practical sense distinct from ‘class consciousness’, a form of misrecognition where dominant representations are mistakenly applied to the self (Bourdieu, 2000: 185). However, unlike Bourdieu’s reading of claims such as ‘That’s not for the likes of us’ as a ‘learned ignorance’, a conceptualisation of misrecognition as an affective practice moves beyond understanding these statements as simply resignation. As such, Kelsey’s assertion that ‘*I don’t do nothing, I do nothing*’ may feed into established divisions of action and in-action, yet the very process of misrecognition foregrounds the logics of this division. Therefore, Kelsey may express resignation, but also anger and frustration in her unequal access to the formal activities recognised within the division of action and in-action.

Docility as resistance

It is the relationality of habitus and field, inherent in the co-constitution illustrated above, which forms the theoretical pessimism inherent in Bourdieu’s account of domination, as the ‘habitus contributes to determining what determines it’ (Bourdieu, 1994:195). For Bourdieu, the inscription of social

structures in bodies results in an ‘extraordinary inertia’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 172) whereby ‘resistance may be alienating and submission may be liberating’ (Bourdieu, 1994: 155). This contradiction is built into Bourdieu’s logic of symbolic domination as a dialectic of subjectivity and objectivity, where social constructions of class, gender and race are ‘inscribed in the objectivity of institutions, that is to say, of things and bodies’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 108). However, as the field note below illustrates, the inscription of objective relations is nevertheless mediated by subjective action, introducing the possibility of resistance.

Shelley and Ruby sat playing with blue tac, looking at me and smiling, while their teacher explained the task. They were not concentrating but their actions were not outwardly disruptive, they sat quietly, smiling approval at each other as they flattened and then divided, using a ruler as a cutter, their blue tac into tiny squares.

Later they sat holding their breath until they turned pink and let out a burst of air. Again, their behaviour didn’t distract the rest of the class, but was a display of disinterest in the lesson. They were not approached by the teacher regarding their behaviour. (Sarah’s field notes, March 2014)

In the field note, Shelley and Ruby reject and resist the teacher’s authority to define their task. Their behaviour is a challenge to legitimate action within the classroom. Bourdieu notes that resistance may be passive and internal or active and collective, defining resistance as strategies to escape exploitation: ‘going slow, working to rule, sabotage’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 185). As such, the subjective sense of place constituted within the dynamic of habitus and field does not negate resistance. In this way, Shelley and Ruby employ strategies to avoid the imposition of the pedagogic practices of the classroom through their classed and gendered enactments of friendship formation. However, the recognition of such action as resistance requires the accumulation of symbolic capital. Therefore, resistance is a struggle for the power to impose a vision of the social world. Although Shelley and Ruby’s sociality rejects the requirements of the ‘ideal learner’, they lack the authority to valorise their friendship practices. They are restricted in their non-compliance by the explicit authority of the teacher and as such must navigate their display of disinterest without disrupting the rest of the class. In this way, their resistance goes alongside domination, there is ‘no resistance that is not some way complicitous with power’ (Lawler, 2004: 122).

Shelley and Ruby subvert the norms of the classroom in their appropriation of docility as resistance, cultivating their classed and gendered habitus through their embodied practices, playing with each other’s hair, whispering, giggling and sharing resources. Following Foucault, we may understand the discipline institutionalised within the school as producing docile bodies that may be ‘subjected, used, transformed and improved’ (Foucault, 1977: 136). Nevertheless, docility may also be understood as a means to liberate the self from such systems of domination. Bourdieu suggests that ‘in order not to naturalize dispositions, one has to relate these durable ways of being...to the conditions of their acquisition’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 122), that cultures of necessity operate precisely as a defence mechanism against necessity. Therefore, moments of resistance may be especially illuminating as sites of class formation. Understood as formed within the dynamic of the subjective and objective, this resistance is however located within the power inequities of the field. Thus, docility as a durable disposition of the classed and gendered habitus is both transgressive and reproductive of capitalist and patriarchal systems of domination.

Sociological representations of resistance must therefore explore the complex relationship between habitus and field in order to understand the dynamic formation of class within tensions of production

and reproduction. As Lawler asserts, habitus is not determining, it is generative, 'it generates the human subject *qua* subject' (2004: 112). As such, the subject cannot be pre-constituted, agency is inherent to being a subject. Lawler calls for a more expansive conceptualisation of resistance, drawing upon Fox's (1994) critique of the division between resistance and conformity. In this way, resistance may not be 'progressive', and change may be 'difficult to effect', however a focus on struggles for authority within the field enables an analysis of 'what it means to be dominated' (Lawler, 2004: 125).

Conclusion

In closing the chapter, I would like to revisit the opening field note in order to draw out the role of misrecognition in legitimising discipline within the field of education. I knew Tracey through her volunteer work and her daughter's participation at the community centre. It was my first day attending Estate Primary, and Tracey was keen to share her analysis of the 'school drop-off' with me - *The head teacher came out into the playground 'Oh look' Tracey said, 'here comes Hitler'*. Tracey is acutely aware of the power dynamics within the playground, narrating the performance of the head teacher, whose visibility she understands as an act of surveillance. Despite this recognition of the power embodied by the head teacher, Tracey mocks his authority. Through her comparison of the head teacher to Hitler, Tracey undermines his performance, she knows it is an act, that he is '*alright actually*'. Nevertheless, Tracey reflects that this overt display of authority is required at Estate Primary, that the head teacher is '*strict, but then that's what they need*'. For me, this ethnographic example captures the processes through which diversification in education is legitimised, that the intensification of corporeal discipline within Estate Primary is enabled through the structuring of consent. In this way, national discourses of diversification within state education provision are mediated through localised constructions of 'community needs'. Estate Primary may be understood in relation to structuring structures which constitute The Estate within a classificatory system which 'others' the tenure, welfare status and culture of those housed on The Estate. Thus, the school acts as a 'technology of control', reproducing classed inequality through the positioning of The Estate as valueless, and facilitates 'technologies of consent' (Jensen and Tyler, 2015), where disciplining practices are accepted as 'what these kids need'.

Drawing on Bourdieu's conceptualisation of habitus, the chapter explored the formation of the self within moments of encounter within the field of education. Following Loveday (2016), I argue that habitus formation is an 'affective practice', that everyday processes of inscription are visceral and not easily 'forgotten'. Focussing on three moments of 'making through marking' (Skeggs, 2004), the chapter considers the interplay of discipline, misrecognition and resistance in the construction of habitus within Estate Primary.

I argue that the implementation of the pedagogic package of Performance Based Learning within the school has resulted in the intense regulation of embodied practice, with the body reified as the site of learning. In this context, ontology and epistemology are collapsed so that being is assumed to determine knowing. As a consequence, particular classed, raced and gendered bodies are positioned as the 'impossible learner' (Hollingworth, 2015: 1241). This process of attributing meaning to action is embodied as an 'attention' (Bourdieu, 2000: 144) to the social order of things. Distinction does not go unnoticed, rather anticipated judgement is formative and incorporated into the habitus. Through an analysis of 'doing nothing', I argue that misrecognition is an 'affective practice' (Loveday, 2016), producing embodied experiences of shame and reproducing the moral economy of systems of classification (Skeggs, 2009). It is through an attention to misrecognition as an entanglement of habitus and field that we may foreground resistance. A focus on the processes by which objective relations are incorporated within subjectivities may enable an analysis of 'what it means to be

dominated' (Lawler, 2004: 125). Thus, resistance is entangled with domination. Through an analysis of docility, I argue that durable dispositions of the classed and gendered habitus may be both transgressive and reproductive of capitalist and patriarchal systems of domination.

References

- Adkins, L. & Skeggs, B. (2004). *Feminism After Bourdieu*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Allen, K., Tyler, I. & De Benedictis, S., (2014). 'Thinking with "White Dee": The gender politics of "austerity porn"', *Sociological Research Online*, 19(3), pp.1-7.
- Archer, L., Halsall, A., & Hollingworth, S. (2007). 'Class, Gender, (Hetero)Sexuality and Schooling: Paradoxes within Working-Class Girls Engagement with Education and Post-16 Aspirations', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28(2), 165-80.
- Back, L. (2009). 'Researching Community and its Moral Projects', *21st Century Society: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 201-14.
- Ball, S.J. (2016). *Education, Justice and Democracy: The Struggle Over Ignorance and Opportunity*. In Montgomery, A. and Kehoe, I. (eds.) *Reimagining the Purpose of Schools and Educational Organisations*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Benson, M., Bridge, G. and Wilson, D. (2015). 'School choice in London and Paris—A comparison of middle-class strategies', *Social policy & administration*, 49(1), 24-43.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1996). 'Cultures in Between' in *Questions of Cultural Identity*. Hall, S. and Du Gay, P. London, Sage Publications.
- Bhattacharya, B. (2013). 'Academy Schools in England', *Childhood Education*, 89:2, 94-8.
- Bottero, W. (2005). *Stratification: Social Division and Inequality*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bottero, W. (2009). 'Relationality and Social Interaction', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 60(2), 399-420.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. (trans. Nice, R.) California: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1994). *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology* (trans. M. Adamson). Cambridge. Polity
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Stanford University Press, California.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (Vol. 4)*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L.J. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brent, J., (2004). 'The desire for community: Illusion, confusion and paradox', *Community development journal*, 39(3), 213-23.

- Burgess, S., Greaves, E., Vignoles, A. and Wilson, D. (2011). 'Parental choice of primary school in England: what types of school do different types of family really have available to them?', *Policy Studies*, 32(5), 531-47.
- Burke, P.J. & Crozier, G. (2012). *Teaching Inclusively: Challenging Pedagogical Spaces*. York: Higher Education Academy.
- Cerwonka, A. & Malkki, L.H. (2008). *Improvising Theory: Process and Temporality in Ethnographic Fieldwork*. University of Chicago Press.
- Department for Education. (2019). *School, Pupils and their Characteristics*. Available online at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/812539/Schools_Pupils_and_their_Characteristics_2019_Main_Text.pdf
- Exley, S. (2012). 'The Politics of Educational Policy Making Under New Labour: An Illustration of Shifts in Public Service Governance', *Policy & Politics*, 40(2), 227-44.
- Featherstone, M. (2013) 'Being-in-Hull, Being-on-Bransholme: Socio-economic Decline, Regeneration and Working-Class Experience on a Peri-Urban Council Estate', *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action*, 17(2), 179-96.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. (trans Sheridan, A) New York: Vintage Books.
- Fox, P. (1994). *Class Fictions: Shame and Resistance in the British Working-Class Novel 1890–1945*. Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Gewirtz, S. (2002). *The Managerial School: Post-Welfarism and Social Justice in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Gibson, M.T. (2015). 'Ethos and vision realization in sponsored academy schools', *Management in education*, 29(1), 9-13.
- Grenfell, M., & James, D. (with Reay, D., Hodkinson, P., & Robbins, D.) (1998). *Bourdieu and education – Acts of practical theory*. London: Falmer Press.
- Hall, S. and O'Shea, A. (2013). 'Common-Sense Neoliberalism', *Soundings: A Journal of Politics and Culture*, 55(1), 8-24.
- Hill, J. and Wright, G. (2003). 'Youth, Community Safety and the Paradox of Inclusion', *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(3), 282–97.
- Hockings, C. (2010) *Inclusive learning and teaching in higher education: a synthesis of research*. York: Higher Education Academy.
- Hollingworth, S. (2015). 'Performances of Social Class, Race and Gender Through Youth Subculture: Putting Structure Back in to Youth Subcultural Studies', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 18(10), 1237-1256.
- Ingram, N. (2011). 'Within School and Beyond the Gate: The Complexities of Being Educationally Successful and Working Class', *Sociology*, 45(2), 287-302.

- James, D. (2015). How Bourdieu bites back: Recognising misrecognition in education and educational research. *Cambridge journal of education*, 45(1), 97-112.
- Jensen, T. and Tyler, I. (2015). “Benefits broods”: The Cultural and Political Crafting of Anti-Welfare Commonsense’, *Critical Social Policy*, 35(4), 1-22.
- Lane, J.F. (2012). ‘From “Amor Fati” to “Disgust”’: Affect, Habitus, and Class Identity in Didier Eribon’s *Retour à Reims*’, *French Cultural Studies*, 23(2), 127-40.
- Lawler, S. (2004). ‘Rules of engagement: Habitus, power and resistance’, *The Sociological Review*, 52(2), 110-28.
- Leaney, S. (2018). ‘Habitus as foregrounded history: theorising affect in the social formation of embodied practice’, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1-18.
- Loveday, V. (2016). ‘Embodying deficiency through “affective practice”’: Shame, relationality, and the lived experience of social class and gender in higher education’, *Sociology*, 50(6), 1140-55.
- Lupton, R & Hempel-Jorgensen, A. (2012). ‘The importance of teaching: pedagogical constraints and possibilities in working-class schools’, *Journal of Education Policy*, 27:5, 601-20.
- MacDonald, R., Shildrick, T. and Furlong, A., (2014). “Benefits Street” and the myth of workless communities’, *Sociological Research Online*, 19(3), pp.1-6.
- Mair, J., Kelly, A.H. and High, C. (2012). ‘Introduction: Making Ignorance an Ethnographic Object’, pp. 1-32, in High, C., (ed). (2012). *The Anthropology of Ignorance: An Ethnographic Approach*. USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McKenzie, L. (2015). *Getting By: Estates, Class and Culture in Austerity Britain*. Policy Press.
- Morrin, K. (2018). ‘Tensions in Teaching Character: How the “Entrepreneurial Character” is Reproduced, “Refused”, and Negotiated in an English Academy School’, *Sociological Research Online*, 23(2), 459-76.
- National Audit Office. (2010). *The Academies Programme*. Ireland: The Stationary Office.
- National Statistics. (2018) *Pupil Population in 2017-2018*. Available online at <https://www.gov.uk/school-performance-tables>
- Parsons, C. (2012). *Schooling the Estate Kids* (Vol. 7). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Pelletier, C. (2009). ‘Rancière and the Poetics of the Social Sciences’, *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 32(3), 267-84.
- Power, S. & Frandji, D. (2010). ‘Education Markets, the New Politics of Recognition and the Increasing Fatalism Towards Inequality’, *Journal of Education Policy*, 25(3), 385-96.
- Raisborough, J. & Adams, M. (2008) ‘Mockery and Morality in Popular Cultural Representations of the White, Working Class’, *Sociological Research Online*, 13(6).
- Reay, D. (2000). ‘Children’s Urban Landscapes: Configurations of Class and Place’, in Munt, S. (ed.) (2000). *Cultural Studies and the Working Class: Subject to Change*. Cassell, London and New York.

- Reay, D., (2002). 'Shaun's story: troubling discourses of white working-class masculinities', *Gender and education*, 14(3), 221-34.
- Reay, D. (2007). 'Unruly Places: Inner-city Comprehensives, Middle-class Imaginaries and Working-class Children', *Urban Studies Special Issue on The Geography of Education*, 44(7), 1191-1203.
- Reay, D., Crozier, G. and James, D. (2011). *White Middle Class Identities and Urban Schooling*, London: Palgrave.
- Reay, D. and Lucey, H. (2000). "'I don't really like it here but I don't want to be anywhere else": children and inner city council estates', *Antipode*, 32(4), 410-28.
- Leaney, S. (2019). 'The Council Estate and "Being Placed": Everyday Resistances to the Stigmatization of Community', *Housing, Theory and Society*, DOI:10.1080/14036096.2019.1624387
- Lucey, H. and Reay, D. (2002). 'A market in waste: psychic and structural dimensions of school-choice policy in the UK and children's narratives on "demonized" schools', *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, 23(3), 253-66.
- Robertson, D. (2013). 'Knowing your place: The formation and sustenance of class-based place identity', *Housing, Theory and Society*, 30(4), 368-83.
- Skeggs, B. (1997). *Formations of class & gender: Becoming respectable*. London: Sage.
- Skeggs, B. (2001). *Feminist Ethnography* in Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, J. and Lofland, L. (eds.) *Handbook of ethnography*. London: Sage.
- Skeggs, B. (2004). *Class, Self, Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Skeggs, B. (2005). 'The making of class and gender through visualizing moral subject formation', *Sociology*, 39(5), 965-82.
- Skeggs, B., (2009). 'The moral economy of person production: The class relations of self-performance on "reality" television', *The Sociological Review*, 57(4), 626-44.
- Skeggs, B., (2014). 'Values beyond value? Is anything beyond the logic of capital?', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 65(1),1-20.
- Skeggs, B. (2015). 'Introduction: Stratification or Exploitation, Domination, Dispossession and Devaluation?', *The Sociological Review*, 63(2), 205-22.
- Skeggs, B. and Loveday, V. (2012). 'Struggles for value: value practices, injustice, judgment, affect and the idea of class', *The British journal of sociology*, 63(3), 472-90.
- Skeggs, B. & Wood, H. (2012). *Reacting to Reality Television: Performance, Audience and Value*. London: Routledge.
- Steedman, C. (1986). *Landscape for a Good Woman: A Story of Two Women*. London: Virago Press.
- Thornham, H. and Parry, K. (2014). 'Constructing communities: the community centre as contested site', *Community development journal*, 50(1), 24-39.

Vincent, C., A. Braun and S.J. Ball. (2008). 'Childcare, Choice and Social Class', *Critical Social Policy*, 28(1), 5-26.

Walkerline, V. (2010). 'Communal Beingness and Affect. An Exploration of Trauma in an Ex-Industrial Community', *Body and Society*, 16(1), 91-116.

Warrington, M. (2005). 'Mirage in the Desert? Access to Educational Opportunities in an Area of Social Exclusion', *Antipode*, 37(4), 796–816.

Weis, L. and Fine, M. (2012). 'Critical Bifocality and Circuits of Privilege: Expanding Critical Ethnographic Theory and Design', *Harvard Educational Review*, 82(2), 173-201.

Wetherell, M. (2012). *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*. London: SAGE.

Wright, A. (2012). 'Fantasies of Empowerment: Mapping Neoliberal Discourse in the Coalition Government's Schools Policy', *Journal of Education Policy*, 27(3), 279-94.

Zirkel, S., Bailey, F., Bathey, S., Hawley, R., Lewis, U., Long, D., Pollack, T., Roberts, Z., Stroud, R. & Winful, A. (2011) 'Isn't that what "those kids" need?' Urban schools and the master narrative of the "tough, urban principal"', *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 14:2,137-58.

ⁱ The council estate, the primary academy school and the participants of the research are referred to with pseudonyms.

ⁱⁱ Performance Based Learning is a pseudonym for a whole school pedagogic package implemented within UK primary schools. There are currently twenty-six advocate schools across the UK.

ⁱⁱⁱ Benefits Street is a British documentary series broadcast in 2014 following the lives of welfare benefit claimants. The series has been criticised for legitimising austerity policies (Allen et al, 2014) through the reproduction of the myth that there are 'benefit ghettos' where unemployment is a 'lifestyle choice' (MacDonald et al, 2014).