

‘Whose Game Is It?’

Understanding Exclusion

4.1 School Rules: All Play Together

As we saw in the preceding chapters, Woodwell Green emphasised the principle of harm avoidance, summed up as ‘We do not hurt others on the inside or the outside’. In this and the following chapter, I explore some aspects of ‘hurting on the inside’. I focus in this chapter on cases where specific children were excluded from the peer group. Adults at Woodwell Green generally condemned acts of exclusion, stating instead that children should all play together, allowing anyone to join in their games, without selectivity. Here is an example, taken from a year 1 classroom (5- and 6-year-olds). Following a week off school, the class teacher, Miss Hart, reminded the children of their class rules:

The children are sitting on the carpet. ‘What are the rules?’ Miss Hart asks them. Some hands go up. ‘Akash?’ ‘No hitting and no punching,’ he says. ‘That’s right,’ confirms Miss Hart, ‘No fighting.’ She chooses Nayna, who also has her hand up. ‘No kicking,’ she says. Miss Hart says that that’s also no fighting. Zain is chosen next. ‘Don’t put the chairs back cos someone will come and fall over,’ he says. Miss Hart asks if he means that people shouldn’t tip on their chairs, and he agrees. Miss Hart says that that’s true, but that it’s not the same kind of rule as no fighting, which she now homes in on. ‘How does it feel if someone kicks you?’ she asks the children. ‘Is it a nice feeling?’ ‘Noo,’ they chorus. ‘How do you feel if someone kicks you, Mahdi?’ After a slight pause, Mahdi says, ‘Sad,’ with a rising intonation. Miss Hart says that they never have any reason to hit or kick each

other, continuing: 'Do you ever need to touch anybody?' 'Noo,' they chorus. 'If you have a problem in the playground, what should you do?' Lots of hands go up. Miss Hart chooses Bobby from amongst them. 'Go to Mrs Thomas or go to Jackie' [playground supervisors]. Miss Hart agrees, then asks, 'Is it nice – how do you feel if someone on your table or in the playground, if they say, I'm not gonna be your friend. How does it make you feel?' Hands go up again, and she chooses Bikram, who says, 'Sad.' Miss Hart says that this is hurting on the inside rather than the outside, and it still makes you feel sad. She urges them to 'be kind to each other'.

At first, the children focused on the rule concerning physical aggression, and Miss Hart reiterated the school's position that all physical aggression is wrong, and that telling a teacher is preferable to retaliation (see Chapter 3). But then the teacher drew the children's attention to excluding one another, calling this an example of hurting on the inside, which is also against school rules.

Teachers of older children also reprimanded them for excluding one another. For example, when year 4 boy Daniel complained to his teacher Mrs Samson that classmate Zohraiz would not let him play with him, Mrs Samson chided Zohraiz in front of the class:

'Zohraiz, I'm only going to ask you this once,' says Mrs Samson. 'You know the routine if you lie. Were you horrible to Daniel?' 'Yes,' Zohraiz answers quietly. 'Do you think it's a nice thing to say someone can't play?' 'No.' Mrs Samson asks how Zohraiz would feel if someone excluded him, finishing with, 'Do you have something to say to Daniel?' Zohraiz turns to Daniel and quietly says, 'Sorry.' 'Shake hands,' she commands, and they do. She tells them to sit down.

Fellow year 4 teacher Miss Chahal was also concerned about children in her class excluding one another. On one occasion, I saw her brush off a complaint about exclusion. Mohamed had complained to her that Amandeep would not let him play. Miss Chahal was not the slightest bit interested. 'Save it for the playground,' she replied in a bored voice. She saw Mohamed as quite popular (a perception borne out by children's comments to me in individual interviews), and so was not concerned about this complaint (which she probably saw as an instance of gratuitous tale-telling; see Chapter 7). However, on several other occasions she expressed concerns about Paul (who we met in Chapter 3) and Sarah (who we will meet later in this chapter), who both started at Woodwell Green in her class at the start of year 4, and struggled to settle in and make friends. Here are fieldnotes

describing two separate instances when Miss Chahal tried to help Sarah and Paul by increasing their peers' awareness of exclusion.

Event 1: Miss Chahal puts children into groups and distributes a picture of a group of children standing together, with one child standing separate. She tells the class to discuss the picture, and then to act out a role play based on it. All the children I speak to interpret the picture as the group excluding the single child. Three groups act out their role plays. In one, Idris plays the excluded boy. 'Hey new boy, we don't like playing with new boys. Find your other friends,' exclaims Sarah. Miss Chahal stops them and asks the class how they think the excluded boy would feel. Suggestions include, 'Unhappy', 'Wouldn't want to go to school' and 'Cry every night', and Miss Chahal agrees that this is how she would feel. The group continues their role play. 'Jealous jellyface!' Farhan calls to Idris. 'See we're a gang,' adds Sarah. Miss Chahal gets them to freeze again, and asks the class who is in a gang. Quite a few children put their hands up. Then she asks what a gang is. 'A gang of bullies,' suggests Mohamed. Miss Chahal tells them that if you have friends like that you never know when they're going to turn on you. After some more discussion, the role play continues. The group approaches Idris saying, 'We're sorry, you can play. It's no way to treat a new person.' Miss Chahal asks them why they had a change of heart. 'Nobody will like us,' replies Sarah. Miss Chahal agrees. Sarah adds that they were jealous of him because he was clever and kind. In the ensuing discussion, Miss Chahal exhorts the children to welcome new people.

Event 2: Miss Chahal sends Mohamed, Zak, Amandeep, Anjali and Joanne out of the class with me. When we return a few minutes later, all the children are smiling. We have barely sat down when they suddenly all clap four times. This happens periodically, and is each time followed by some giggling amongst the children in the know. Mohamed and Zak ask why the others are clapping, and the children around them say, 'What clapping?' 'They've all gone mad!' Amandeep says to me. After a few minutes, Miss Chahal asks the children who were sent out how they felt. 'Interesting,' says Zak. Miss Chahal pushes him for more, and he adds, 'Interested to know what's going on'. 'It's weird,' comments Mohamed. 'They're disturbing me.' Some children laugh. 'Mohamed, you *are* disturbed,' Miss Chahal replies, smiling. She asks Anjali. 'Weird, because you don't know what's happening.'

'Imagine that (a), you're new in the school, and (b), you've got no one to play with in the playground,' says Miss Chahal to the class. She continues in this vein, then asks, 'Why do you think I've done this?' 'To make you realise how people feel?' Simran suggests. Miss Chahal agrees, and asks Mohamed again how he felt. 'Lonely,' he replies. Miss Chahal says that some children in the class don't have anyone to play with. She tells the

children that they should look after each other in the playground; the class should stick together. 'If you see a child in your class on their own, what should you do?' Several children raise their hands, and one says, 'Ask them to play with you'. Mohamed raises his hand. 'When Paul was new I asked him to play with us.' Miss Chahal says that that's good, and asks whether he still asks him. Mohamed nods. Joshua raises his hand. 'Miss Chahal, we include Sarah when we play.' Miss Chahal says that if she hears about all the children taking care of each other she'll give them a house point.

These extracts demonstrate that like Miss Hart and Mrs Samson, Miss Chahal took the problem of children excluding one another seriously. The solution she recommended was that the children actively include one another, by approaching a classmate who is alone and asking them to play. Other adults at school expressed similar views. The leader of Woodwell Green's after-school club lectured the children there more than once about leaving out certain children and not letting them play, and at a meeting with the supervisory assistants who worked on the school playground at lunchtime, the head and deputy head teachers sought to identify children who did not have anyone to play with. Teachers saw exclusion as falling within the remit of their obligation to monitor and intervene in children's affairs, and the solution they usually proposed was indiscriminate inclusion; the children should all play together, and should invite lone peers to join them.

4.1.1 Children's views of exclusion

The extracts presented earlier show that children were well aware of teachers' view that exclusion, as a form of 'hurting on the inside', was wrong and that they should include others in their play. All three role plays performed by children in Miss Chahal's class began with a group excluding a lone peer and ended with the group apologising and inviting the peer to join them. Similarly, when Miss Chahal asked her class, 'If you see a child in your class on their own, what should you do?' a child responded, 'Ask them to play with you', and two others gave examples of how they had included new children in their play. Further evidence that children viewed exclusion as wrong came from interviews I conducted with children in years 1 to 6, about a series of hypothetical playground scenarios, two of which involved exclusion. They read as follows:

1. Katie, Sani and Jasmine are in the same class. Katie and Sani are playing together in the playground. Jasmine comes up to them. Jasmine likes Sani but she doesn't like Katie. Jasmine keeps asking to

Understanding Exclusion

play with Sani on her own. Then Katie turns to Sani and says, 'If you play with Jasmine, I won't be your friend anymore'.

2. Five children are playing a game together. Then John, who is in their class, comes up and asks to play. The children don't really like playing with John because they think he's a bit pushy, bossy and rude. John asks to play.¹

One question I asked children for each scenario was, 'Has anyone in this story done something bad do you think, or have they been okay?' In the first scenario, most children (72 of 122; 59 per cent) thought that Jasmine had done wrong. When explaining their answer, children criticised Jasmine's attempt to exclude Katie, and often commented that Jasmine should have asked both children to play. In the second scenario, 71 of 137 children² (52 per cent) said that the group (or part of the group) had done something wrong. Most children who gave this answer justified it by saying something like, 'They won't let him play'. As one year 4 girl explained when I asked why she thought it was wrong not to let the lone child play, 'Because everybody's supposed to just get on and play together, and they're being like really rude and saying she's not very nice to play with'. Children giving these answers echoed teachers' exhortations to play together.³

So many, if not most, children at Woodwell Green seemed to agree with teachers that excluding a peer was wrong. Nevertheless, there was evidence that children did still often exclude one another. For each hypothetical playground scenario, I asked children whether they had ever had a similar experience. Related experiences were reported by 48 of 122 children (39 per cent) for scenario 1, and 58 of 143 (41 per cent) for scenario 2. I also asked three playground supervisors how often they came across these scenarios. Their estimates for the first scenario ranged from once or twice a week to every day, and for the second, from 'not very often' to once a week.

4.1.2 Understanding exclusion on the playground

The prevalence of exclusion despite the official school line encouraging inclusion suggests that as with boys' physical aggression, children are orienting to other concerns that conflict with the obligation to prevent exclusion by including peers indiscriminately. There are many reasons why children exclude one another, and this chapter does not attempt to cover them all. Instead, I focus on cases of exclusion that do not resemble the way that teachers talked about exclusion in the classroom. Note how, in event 1 in Miss Chahal's class, described above, exclusion is depicted in a very

specific form. A group of children is seen as uniting to exclude one lone peer, who is seen as blameless, excluded because of being clever and kind. In other role plays performed by class members, children were excluded because of being new, a geek (defined by the teacher as someone who likes, and is good at, studying) and wearing glasses. Consistently, the reason for excluding the isolated child is presented as trivial and silly. The group, in contrast, is described as 'a gang of bullies', cruel people who could turn on each other at any moment. Culpability is laid firmly at the door of the group as a whole. Similar views were expressed by many children at Woodwell Green in interviews about the hypothetical scenarios.

My data suggest that many exclusion events look rather different from this archetypal image, such that class exercises like those of Miss Chahal may have a limited impact. This chapter explores several ways in which exclusion can differ from the standard scenario portrayed in class. The first of these is the role of power in exclusion processes. Children's peer relations are often portrayed as 'horizontal', lacking the power asymmetries that characterise children's relations with family members (Pellegrini and Blatchford 2000, p. 33). In the section below, we will see that this is not so.

4.2 Exclusion and Power

4.2.1 'Whose ball is it?' Exclusion from boys' football games

In a survey I asked 70 boys and 80 girls in years 1 to 6 to name their three favourite playground activities; 83 per cent of the boys (and 16 per cent of the girls) named football (soccer), making it easily the most popular playground occupation for boys at Woodwell Green. However, space on the playground for football matches was scarce. The junior playground was marked out with two pitches, woefully inadequate given that 12 classes used this playground, and one pitch was usually used by two classes playing each other. Children also commandeered smaller spaces in other parts of the playground, creating makeshift goals from lunchboxes and coats. But this still left a lot of children wanting to play football but lacking the necessary space, creating competition to enter groups that did have space to play.

So how did groups decide who could join in and who could not? Boys at Woodwell Green adhered to a simple rule: whoever owned the ball decided who could play. The school did not provide footballs to the children, but a few children regularly brought in their own balls, marked with their initials. In the year 4 class I spent most time with, Faizel (Pakistani Muslim) and Pavandeep (Afghanistani Sikh) were the two

Understanding Exclusion

boys who most often brought in a ball. The boys' rule meant that all the others abdicated responsibility for exclusion to them. Hence when their teacher asked Mohamed and Farhan why they would not let their classmate Paul play football (see Chapter 3), the two boys replied in unison, 'It's Faizel!' This abdication of responsibility to the ball owner has also been noted at other schools (Evans 1989; Sluckin 1981).

The importance of hierarchy

Actually, things were not quite as simple as this. The boys did adhere to the rule that the owner of the ball decided who could play, but this rule said nothing about whether an excluded boy would accept the ball owner's decision. When told that they could not play, some boys continued to play anyway. For example, when interviewing Idris, a classmate of Faizel and Pavandeep, about the hypothetical scenario in which a group is approached by a disliked child who wants to play with them, I asked him whether he had ever had a similar experience.

RW: Has anything like this ever happened to you?

IDRIS: That was, that was in the game, girls and boys were playing. I always usually play with those boys, Miss you know, Ali, Faizel. But there was a girl captain and the boys wouldn't let me be in their team cos sometimes they don't, and the girls wouldn't let me play cos they think I'm too rough, but I'm not too rough.

RW: Why wouldn't the boys let you play, do you know?

IDRIS: Cos they're copying the girls!

RW: So what did you do then?

IDRIS: I just joined in anyway. I always do that but because they wanna be bossy with the ball they say oh you can play anyway. I can't explain it.

So when boys like Idris were excluded from football games, they proceeded to play anyway, an act which amounted to a challenge to the ball owner's authority. How did ball owners respond to this challenge? One possible response is submission, allowing the invading boy to have his way, as Idris noted above. This was the path taken by Pavandeep. During an interview in year 4, I asked Pavandeep who he had the most arguments or fights with at school. Here is the discussion that followed:

PAVANDEEP: Miss I used to have a fight with Sam and Ali and Idris and Faizel [all fellow year 4 boys]. But Miss Sam and Ali don't beat me now, they used to, but Idris and Faizel still do, they still beat me up. Miss Sandeep says when someone beats you up don't let them play but I still let Idris play.

RW: Why do you still let him?

Children's Moral Lives

PAVANDEEP: Cos he just does innit. He just comes.

RW: Um, hang on, do you mean Idris just plays even if you tell him not to?

PAVANDEEP: Yeah Miss.

[Later in the interview]

RW: So what about, with Idris and Faizel, after you've had a fight with them do you make friends?

PAVANDEEP: Miss I never be friends with them. Miss but we still play with each other. Miss he just plays with me without asking me.

RW: Who does?

PAVANDEEP: Idris and Faizel.

RW: How does that make you feel?

PAVANDEEP: [pauses] Miss nothing. I said they can play.

In this extract, Pavandeep claimed that even though Faizel and Idris were aggressive towards him, he let them play with his ball, because they ignored any attempt on his part to stop them. So even though he is officially in control of who can play, he found his decisions overruled. In contrast, when the boys played with Faizel's ball, the evidence suggests that Faizel was much more likely to ensure that his decisions were respected. In interviews, two children during year 4 and three during year 5 commented that Faizel excluded them from football. Faizel himself also told me that he challenged children who tried to join in football games without his permission. I interviewed Faizel when he was in year 5 about the hypothetical situation in which one child (John) approached a group and asked to play. 'Have you ever been in this situation?' I asked Faizel. 'Which situation?' he asked, gesturing separately to John and the group in the simple picture I drew to accompany the scenario. 'Either, it doesn't matter,' I replied. 'Probably that,' he said, pointing to the group, 'Not that,' he added, pointing to John. 'Probably once, someone asks – actually it happens nearly all the time, someone joins in the football and I say you can't play who said you can play and they say a name but they're lying.'

Faizel gave a similar answer later in year 5 during a group interview I conducted with him and three classmates (including Zak and Idris). I presented them with the following scenario: 'You are playing a game with your friends, and someone you don't really like comes and asks to play. You say no, but they join in the game anyway. What do you do?' Faizel opened the discussion:

Understanding Exclusion

- FAIZEL: You – go – and, well Miss that happened today, twice.
- RW: Okay so this is
- FAIZEL: Miss that happened today, honestly.
- RW: All right then, so what happened?
- FAIZEL: [interrupting] Miss, Mandeer I think his name was, he came and played with us, and then I said go away you're not playing
- RW: This is playing football yeah?
- FAIZEL: Yeah Miss and then he came again yeah, Miss, and then even though I, then I told Mrs Thomas [playground supervisor] yeah, Miss, and then Mrs Thomas said go yeah, and then, he never listened, he still carried on yeah. Then Miss afterwards I just said get lost, I moved, I threw his, I never really threw it I just moved his pack lunch, I said [inaudible] your pack lunch and go, Miss and then he just went.

These extracts suggest that Faizel's decisions to exclude were accepted while Pavandeep's were sometimes overruled. The key seems to be the relative dominance of the ball owner and the intruder – and as we saw in Chapter 3, a central component of boys' dominance at Woodwell Green was physical aggression. In Chapter 3, I described evidence that Faizel was physically aggressive on the playground. During his interview about the hypothetical scenario describing a lone child seeking to join a group, his classmate Amandeep (Indian Sikh) told me how Faizel was prepared to use physical aggression to enforce his decisions:

- RW: Have you ever been in a situation like this?
- AMANDEEP: Yeah. Once, Faizel didn't let us, me and Farhan, play football, and once I brought my football in and Faizel said let us play and I said no why should I? You didn't let me play! [laughs]
- RW: [laughs] And do you know why Faizel wouldn't let you play?
- AMANDEEP: No. But he won't ever let us play, he says no you're crap, you can't play. And Sam. We just play anyway.
- RW: What happens when you do that, does Faizel try to stop you playing?
- AMANDEEP: Yeah, but I just go I'm playing I don't care. Farhan just says come on man let's go, and I say no man don't do nothing. Farhan gets scared, he always says come on let's play something else. Cos Faizel and Sam try and beat him up and he gets really angry.

So Faizel was willing to resort to physical aggression to ensure that as ball owner, his decisions about inclusion and exclusion are adhered to.

In contrast, Pavandeep was reluctant to use physical aggression. He complained to me about this when I was interviewing him in year 5: 'I was playing football, thingy, and it was Faizel's ball, and he said no you can't play, because I scored for the other team. Miss *I'm* gonna let him play with my ball.'²⁴ A little later in the interview I asked Pavandeep why he thought Faizel behaved in this way towards him. 'Miss I don't know, he hates me,' he replied. 'Cos he starts fighting with me sometimes. When I like tackle him, he say you foul me, and he start pushing me and that.' He continued: 'Miss sometimes I think I might have to start a fight with him. Cos he tries to fight with me every day. But I'm afraid I'll get told off that's why.' Pavandeep's reluctance to resort to physical aggression, which seemed to be based on his respect for his teacher's authority, meant that he was lower in status than more aggressive boys who overturned his decisions.

'What if it isn't your ball?' Dominant boys playing by the rules

So the relative dominance (expressed mainly as physical aggression) of boys was an important factor in who was allowed to play football. What is surprising is that other members of the group respected the rule that the ball owner made the decision, even when those decisions were routinely overturned. This created a frustrating situation for dominant boys in the group who would be willing to enforce the decision themselves but were not in a position to do so because they did not own the ball.

During the interview about the hypothetical scenario in which John asks a group to play, I asked Zak, 'Have you ever been in a situation like this?' He replied, 'Sam's John, Sam's too rough, Sam's always rough, we don't want him to play football with us. But the person, the person, Pavandeep always brings the ball, it's Pavandeep's ball yeah. Miss at playtime, Sam kicked Pavandeep's ball away. At lunchtime, Pavandeep let him play again!' Zak was exasperated because Pavandeep would not stand up to Sam, a boy in another year 5 class who was notorious for his aggressive and confrontational behaviour (recall Paul's experiences in Chapter 3). Yet because Zak respected the rule that the ball owner made decisions, he felt he could not do anything about it. On another occasion, Faizel raised the same problem during a discussion group with Idris, Zak and another boy. We were talking about a question I posed: What would they do if someone they disliked joined in their game despite them excluding him? After some discussion, Faizel asked:

Understanding Exclusion

- FAIZEL: What, what if it isn't your ball?
IDRIS: Exactly!
FAIZEL: And then Pav, if it is Pavandeep's ball, what if he says yeah
IDRIS: [interrupting] A-All the time, I play –
FAIZEL: [interrupting] And you don't wanna, you don't wanna?
RW: So does that happen sometimes?
FAIZEL: Yeah Miss it does, Pavandeep says yes and I say no. And what would you do then?
IDRIS: I'd stay playing like I usually do.
FAIZEL: No, if someone else came and you didn't want them to play but Pavandeep was saying yes, let 'em play.

Like Zak, Faizel felt frustration when Pavandeep failed to enforce exclusion, knowing that he himself would be willing and able to do so. Zak and Faizel both seemed to want the responsibility that Pavandeep struggled with. Yet despite their desire and frustration, they did not simply take charge themselves. Rather, and despite the problems it sometimes created for them, they showed great respect for ownership of the most crucial resource of all, the football. In so doing, they reluctantly abdicated responsibility for exclusion to just one child in the group. Thus, the archetypal image of a group uniting to exclude a specific peer did not accurately describe the process by which exclusion took place in playground football matches.

4.2.2 Dominance struggles: 'Holly tries to take over from me as leader of the gang'

What about when groups of children play together without a key object owned by a particular child? Do children in such situations still hand over responsibility for inclusion and exclusion to a single peer? And if so, how is that child selected? I attempt to answer this question via a case study of a group of girls who attended the after-school club at Woodwell Green. This group was an interesting case study for dominance and exclusion because two girls in the group both sought to be dominant. These two girls were Manpreet (year 5) and Holly (year 4). The group they both sought dominance over comprised Rachel (year 4), Leanne (year 3, Rachel's sister), Jasmeen (year 3, Manpreet's cousin) and Nita (year 1, Jasmeen's sister and Manpreet's cousin), plus a few others who joined the group sporadically. Manpreet, Jasmeen and Nita were all Indian Sikhs. Rachel and Leanne were labelled on school records as mixed ethnicity and not religious. Holly was English and Christian.

The girls at the after-school club often enjoyed making up dances together. However, Manpreet frequently excluded Holly from this activity. Here is a typical example:

Manpreet, Rachel, Leanne and Jasmeen practise a dance on the stage with two girls in year 6. Holly and Roshni lean on the table nearby watching. Jasminder [who runs the after-school club] and I get out the pens and paper, and Holly, Roshni and Nita sit down to draw. I ask Holly and Roshni why they aren't in the dance. Holly says that she is in 'the band', but Manpreet says she can only be a background dancer, and if she wants to be in it properly she has to make up a dance for them all and can't join in the current one. She seems sulky about this. Nita disagrees and claims that Holly can join in this one. Holly insists she's right, so Nita approaches Manpreet and asks if Holly can join the dance. Manpreet says no. When Nita returns, I suggest that Nita, Holly and Roshni do a dance together, but none of them pursue this. Later on, after Manpreet has gone home, Rachel, Jasmeen and Nita are drawing and colouring. 'So why doesn't Holly wanna do the dance?' I ask them. 'She does wanna do it but she can't,' says Jasmeen. 'Why not?' I ask. Rachel and Jasmeen seem reluctant to comment but Nita says, 'Cos Manpreet doesn't like her.' 'Oh, they don't get on?' I say, and the others murmur agreement.

While Manpreet often excluded Holly from dance groups, she allowed her to join in some other activities, such as talent contests. Why was this? The answer became clear when I witnessed Manpreet arguing with the girls she usually played with at the after-school club.

Manpreet, Rachel, Leanne and Jasmeen had been putting a dance together. However, one day the other girls did not want to practise the dance, and ended up arguing with Manpreet. When I arrived at the after-school club, Rachel, Leanne and Jasmeen were chatting and laughing with Holly. At snack time, there were not enough chairs so these four girls shared three chairs between them. Manpreet's resentment was obvious; as the girls tried to work out who should sit where, she snapped, 'Leanne can sit where she wants, Holly'. After their snack, Holly and the other three girls played a game together at the other end of the hall. Manpreet approached first Jasmeen, and then both Jasmeen and Rachel, at one point kneeling down and begging them to rejoin her group.

Despite her efforts, Jasmeen and Rachel returned to Holly and Leanne, and the four began to practise a dance together. Manpreet sat at the other end of the hall looking glum. When I asked if she was all right, she replied, 'Yeah', in a half-hearted way. Then she explained how she had fallen out with Rachel, Leanne and Jasmeen, and 'Now they've gone off

Understanding Exclusion

with Holly'. When I suggested that all five did a dance together, Manpreet pulled a face and looked unimpressed. 'Holly tries to take over from me as leader of the gang,' she said.

Shortly after this conversation, Manpreet spoke with Jasmeen again, and this time her efforts paid off as all the girls began to play games together, and harmony appeared to be restored. I attended after-school club again two days later, and saw Manpreet dancing with Rachel, Jasmeen and another girl (Leanne was not dancing). I asked Holly, 'Are you not doing the dance with the girls anymore?' She told me that they left Manpreet's group to come into hers, but then left hers and returned to Manpreet's.

Manpreet was explicit in this sequence of events about why she excluded Holly: because she threatened her position as 'leader of the gang'. Being leader was important to Manpreet, so in activities where there was room for only one leader (like making up and practising a dance), she did what she could to exclude her rival, Holly, and hence maintain her own leadership position. She did not attempt to exclude Holly from some other activities in which more than one child could take on a leadership role. For example, I observed the girls playing a talent competition in which Manpreet and Holly each led a different team, and when they played houses, the two girls each had a separate 'house'. Dominance struggles could still arise though. For example, when Manpreet suggested that they all play 'had',⁵ Holly was not keen and suggested a couple of other games, which Manpreet turned down. 'Why do we have to play had, had's boring,' complained Holly. But Manpreet insisted. 'I won't play then,' countered Holly. 'Fine then,' replied Manpreet. Thus, Manpreet had to work hard in various situations to maintain her dominance, but it seemed a particularly pervasive issue when the girls practised dances.

How submission produces dominance

As with the boys in their football games, the more submissive girls at the after-school club assigned almost complete responsibility for decisions about exclusion to the leader, Manpreet. In an interview with Rachel, Holly and Leanne a year on from the above events, I asked them about the dance they were currently doing. They told me that Manpreet, Rachel, Jasmeen and Nita were in it.

- RW: [to Holly and Leanne] Why aren't you two in the dance?
HOLLY: That's just the way it's always been, we're not allowed.
RACHEL: Leanne was in it.
HOLLY: Yeah but I didn't have anyone to play with.

Children's Moral Lives

LEANNE: Yeah she was the manager.
RACHEL: And she quit.
LEANNE: Yeah she was so bored.
HOLLY: I was fed up.
LEANNE: She was bored.
HOLLY: And I was fed up.
RW: How do you decide who is in the dance?
HOLLY: We don't, that's the end of it. We're not allowed that's the end of it.
RACHEL: No it's basically, whoever the group leader likes can be in the dance.
LEANNE: Yeah so if Manpreet likes us we can be in it.
RW: Why is it Manpreet who gets to decide?
HOLLY: Um, because she's the leader. Anyone she hates, we're never allowed in the band it's as simple as that.
RACHEL: No, you don't know if she hates you.
HOLLY: She does.
RW: Why is Manpreet the leader?
RACHEL: She's the best singer.
HOLLY: Yeah and it's not fair because me and Leanne can't join in.
RACHEL: Why don't you just ask her?
HOLLY: No because she'll say no.
RACHEL: You could ask Jasmeen.
LEANNE: I asked Jasmeen and she let me in.
HOLLY: She only lets her friends in and her relatives, it's as simple as that.
RW: So let me just check, Rachel, you think Manpreet is the leader because she's the best singer?
RACHEL: And dancer. She's the best singer and dancer, and she's the oldest.
HOLLY: And the only people she lets in are her best friends and her relatives.
RW: Why don't you guys
HOLLY: [interrupting] She'll never let us.
RACHEL: [to Holly] And Nita hates you.
HOLLY: Yeah Nita hates me.
LEANNE: And me. She just pretends to like me.

What I find most intriguing about this interview is the girls' almost complete surrender to Manpreet's (and, to a lesser extent, Jasmeen's) will. Even Rachel, who was a good friend of Holly's, did not seem to take any responsibility for her exclusion. Of course, it was this very submission that allowed Manpreet to dominate, and prevented Holly from being included and becoming leader. This was particularly apparent on another

occasion, when some of the children played an imaginative game they called 'Queens and Princesses'. At the start of the game, Holly was in charge, but by the end, Manpreet had managed to take over. Here are my fieldnotes of the game:

Holly, Leanne, Roshni and Larry start to play 'Queens and Princesses'. Leanne is queen, Holly is her daughter and a princess, Roshni is a guest and Larry a servant. Manpreet, Rachel and Jasmeen wander up. 'Are you guys playing?' asks Roshni. Manpreet hesitates, and then says, 'Yeah, can I be the queen?' 'No cos Leanne never gets to be the queen,' Holly replies. 'No, let Manpreet be the queen,' Leanne says, electing to become a servant. Jasmeen joins Holly as a princess.

The children dress up and prepare for the queen to make a grand entrance for the ball. Rachel, who is not playing, announces the queen's arrival, and everyone stands. Manpreet walks grandly to her throne and sits down. Then she announces, 'Let the ball begin! Now, will you please get into partners of two. Who's gonna do the music?' Holly offers to, and everyone gets ready to dance. Manpreet gets up from her throne and then exclaims, 'Wait wait wait I forgot to do something. Before I dance I have to take off my crown. Can somebody get a special mat for me to put it on?' A couple of the children scurry around so that she can lower her imaginary crown onto a bench.

During the ball, Manpreet collapses dramatically. She lies on the floor, and says she's going to die. Holly leans over her and asks if she can be queen when she's died, but Manpreet says no, Jasmeen will be. Holly notes that she [Holly] is older, but Manpreet retorts that in the *game*, Jasmeen is older. Holly leans back exclaiming, 'It's not fair!' 'Don't play then,' says Manpreet. 'You can't do that, it's not your game, it's my game!' Holly protests. Manpreet reverts to her queen role, and orders imperiously, 'Go away.' Holly gets up and goes to the stage, where she takes up her 'throne' and talks with Jasmeen in hushed tones. 'It's not fair,' I hear her say. There follows a general discussion about what will happen next, and in the end Manpreet does not die, and they have a ball to celebrate, at which Holly sings. Manpreet comments on how beautiful Holly's voice is, and instructs Jasmeen to be jealous of this. 'Lovely voice isn't it?' she says to her.

Leanne starts to take her outfit off, calling, 'Manpreet I don't wanna play.' She goes to do crochet at the other end of the hall. Holly tries to persuade her to play again, but to no avail. Then she recruits Manpreet's younger brother, Jagpal. He agrees and she calls out triumphantly, 'Manpreet, Manpreet, Jagpal's gonna play!' He gets dressed up. 'Jagpal, you're gonna be my son,' Holly says. The children continue the game.

This extract demonstrates both Manpreet's skill and determination to dominate, and how the other girls enabled this through acts of submission. The shift began very early on, when Roshni invited Manpreet to play,

rather than leaving her to ask the game owner, Holly. Then, despite Holly's resistance, Leanne gave up her role so that Manpreet could be the queen. Once in the most dominant role in the game, Manpreet made decisions about the other players, for example that Jasmeen would become queen after she died. When Holly protested that it was her game, Manpreet cleverly overruled her by switching back into imperious queen role, in which she was undeniably dominant over Holly who was her daughter and only a princess. By the end of the game, both Leanne and Holly had deferred to Manpreet. Leanne told Manpreet, not Holly, that she was quitting the game, and Holly jubilantly reported to Manpreet that she had persuaded Jagpal to join in. Similar examples of children deferring to a dominant peer during pretend play have been documented by several ethnographers of childhood (see Goodwin and Kyratzis 2011 for a review).

Power, exclusion and responsibility

By bowing to her wishes, Rachel, Jasmeen, Leanne and Nita often allowed Manpreet to exclude Holly. Although they may not have seen themselves as responsible for this exclusion, Holly did. I discovered this one evening at the after-school club, when Holly had an argument with Rachel and another child, and the three exchanged 18 notes before eventually making friends. In response to Rachel's note asking, 'Are you my friend?' Holly wrote: 'When Manpreet shut me out of the band you did not care so I don't know from Holly.'

Holly's resentment towards Rachel for failing to act when Manpreet excluded her is evident. This example shows that although they may not see themselves as responsible for what their 'leaders' do, submissive children like Rachel may still be held responsible for their leaders' actions by those on the receiving end of exclusionary processes. It also suggests that the negative effects of exclusion loom larger for the excluded child than for a peer who is an accepted part of the group. Killen et al. (2006) found that American children who had been recipients of discrimination were more likely to consider exclusion as a moral issue (using domain theory criteria; see Chapter 1 for more detail on these), while those who had not were more likely to see it as a personal issue. Similarly, Horn (2003) found that American adolescents in low-status peer groups saw exclusion as more wrong than did those in high-status peer groups, perhaps because the former had had more experience of exclusion than the latter.

There was tentative evidence that Woodwell Green children's judgements of exclusion were related to their experiences of it, from the interviews about

Understanding Exclusion

Table 4.1 Judgements of wrongdoing in exclusion scenario broken down by experience of children

<i>Role of child in own experience</i>	<i>Who child blamed in hypothetical scenario</i>				
	<i>Lone individual</i>	<i>Group or part of group</i>	<i>Individual and group</i>	<i>No one</i>	<i>Don't know/other</i>
<i>Lone individual (n=34)</i>	2	22	4	6	0
<i>Member of group (n=18)</i>	4	9	1	4	0
<i>Individual and group (n=3)</i>	1	2	0	0	0
<i>No experience (n=82)</i>	12	31	2	34	3

the hypothetical scenario in which a child asks a reluctant group of peers if s/he can play. We saw earlier in this chapter that 41 per cent of children reported having had a similar experience to this scenario. As noted earlier, one of the questions I asked children about this scenario was, 'Has anyone in this story done something bad do you think, or have they been okay?' Table 4.1 breaks children's answers to this question down according to the type of experience (if any) they reported.⁶

Table 4.1 shows that of the 55 children who reported an experience, 34 (62 per cent) described themselves as the lone child who was excluded from a group. The majority of these children (26 of 34; 76 per cent) said that the group had done wrong. Only six (18 per cent) said that the individual child was in the wrong. Eighteen children (33 per cent of those reporting an experience) described themselves as a member of the group. Ten (56 per cent) blamed the group and five (28 per cent) blamed the individual child. Of the 82 children who claimed not to have had a similar experience, 33 (40 per cent) attributed blame to the group, and 14 (17 per cent) blamed the individual. Many (41 per cent) thought that no one had done wrong.

Based on previous research finding that children's judgements of harmful acts are related to their previous experience of those acts (Horn 2003; Killen et al. 2006), I hypothesised that children who had experience of being excluded would be more likely to blame the excluders than would children who did not have such experience. Similarly, I hypothesised that children who had experience of excluding would be more likely to blame the excluded child than would children without such experience. Statistical tests found that there was indeed a relationship

between children's experience and their tendency to blame the group (but not their tendency to blame the excluded child).⁷

There are some limitations to these results. Firstly, the group does not actually exclude the individual in the scenario, although many children assumed that they had or would do so. So children who did not blame the group might have reached this verdict either because they thought that exclusion was acceptable, or because no act of exclusion actually occurred. However, this does not explain why children's blame differed according to their experience. Secondly, researchers of moral development have debated how to word questions to ensure that they tap children's *moral* view of a specific situation (Shweder et al. 1987; Turiel et al. 1987). In this case, the word 'bad' might be used by children to refer not only to moral wrongdoing but also to transgressions that they might not consider morally wrong, just wrong in the sense that there is a rule against them (such as talking in assembly). Thirdly, the method relies on children's ability and willingness to recall and reveal what may be quite sensitive incidents, which may lead to under-reporting.

In spite of these limitations, the data provide tentative evidence that, as researchers have found elsewhere, children at Woodwell Green who had themselves been excluded saw acts of exclusion as more wrong than other children did. My observations may provide a concrete example of these processes in practice, as Holly condemned her friend Rachel for allowing Manpreet to exclude her, while Rachel showed few signs of taking responsibility for this. What my interview scenario did not take into account, however, is the role of power in these processes. Rachel's lack of concern seemed to stem not (or not only) from her lack of experience of exclusion, but from her relatively submissive role in relation to Manpreet, whom she held responsible for excluding her friend Holly. Thus, power relations may influence the way that children experience potentially harmful acts such as exclusion, and consequently affect what they learn from them.

4.3 Exclusion for Game Maintenance and Success

We have seen that power dynamics were an important factor complicating the simple exclusion scenario discussed in class. Another complicating factor was children's concerns with game maintenance and success. Some games have criteria that can lead to exclusion, such that a group leader might exclude but not necessarily out of cruelty or dislike. For example,

children playing football required a (roughly) equal number of players on each team, the right number of players overall for the size of the pitch, players who were motivated and able to play the game according to the rules, and some stability of membership. Gatekeepers, in this case children who owned the ball, needed to place some limits on inclusion to enable the game to take place. For example, once when Idris (year 4 boy) told me that he was not allowed to play football, I called Mohamed (who was playing) over. He shook his head and insisted that Idris could not play, because it would not be a 'fair game' (since they already had the same number of players on each team).

Another reason for exclusion was competence. Again, football is a good example. Children wanted to win; their reactions to scoring were jubilant, and they argued over events largely because it mattered to them who won. So they wanted the best players possible on their own team. This of course means that those who were seen to be bad at football tended to be excluded. For example, recall Amandeep's comment that Faizel justified his exclusion of Amandeep and Farhan from football with, 'You're crap'. During the interview about the hypothetical scenario in which a group excludes a lone peer, a year 6 boy commented that he had seen this happen to a boy who wanted to play football. I asked why they did not want him to play, and he explained, 'It's because he never passes. When he gets the ball he doesn't pass it and he gets tackled by the other team and loses the ball and they get a goal and we lose the match'.

When combined, concerns with game maintenance and competence resulted in particular children being repeatedly excluded from football matches. This is what happened to Erickah, a Black African Christian girl who started at Woodwell Green in Miss Chahal's class halfway through year 4. Erickah had some problems making friends, and when she was in year 5, was identified when the head teacher asked playground supervisors which children seemed lonely on the playground. Soon after Erickah joined Woodwell Green, most of the girls in her class began to play football, first against their male classmates, and later in all-girl matches against another class. Erickah enjoyed football but often found herself excluded from these games. Here is a typical example from my fieldnotes:

Erickah and I stand watching the football match and chatting. I ask her if she'd like to play, and she says yes. Zena runs over to us, says she's having a quick break to go and get a drink. I ask if Erickah can play while she's away. She says Erickah can play all the time and runs off for some water. 'Come on Erickah!' she calls on her return. Erickah looks at me and I nod and smile, and Zena pulls her by the sleeve onto the pitch. The game continues

all the while. Erickah stands a bit separate and doesn't join in properly, and after a couple of minutes she returns to me saying 'I'm too shy'. Zena sees and comes over, and I encourage Erickah to have another go. She and Zena go off again, but soon after they are talking with Simran [captain of girls' team], and Erickah comes away again. She says that Simran said that there are eight players on each side so Erickah can't play. Harpreet is nearby and I ask if Erickah can be a substitute. She agrees readily and makes to run off, so I ask who she is going to substitute. 'Not me, because me and Simran are the boss,' she replies, and runs off. Navneet and Zena refuse too. Zena tries to persuade Maria to swap, but she won't, and Erickah retreats to my side again.

The following week, I saw Erickah sitting watching the football on two separate occasions. On the first, Simran told me that she had told Erickah she could join in but she failed to do so. On the second, Harpreet told me that Erickah, Navneet and Maria were all excluded because the teams for the day had already been chosen. Three weeks later, Erickah, Maria, Navneet, Zena and I were sitting together in the canteen, when the following exchange occurred:

The girls are talking about football. Farah comes over to our table and tells Erickah she can only be 'in it' if she joins 5B's side [the opposing team]. Erickah refuses point blank and insists she wants to play for her own class, 5S. Zena and Navneet start to defend Erickah, asking Farah why she can't be on their team, but Farah replies that 5B have one less player than 5S, so it's either join 5B or not be in it. Zena and Navneet accept this and draw back, and Erickah says she won't be in it. 'Fine then,' says Farah and reports back to her table. I try to persuade Erickah to play for 5B but she refuses. She complains about Simran to me in a cross voice, pounding her fist on the table as she speaks. 'Why does Simran always have to be the boss of everything and she never lets me play. When Simran's the boss of the game I'm never gonna play.' Zena laughs at Erickah's words and actions and asks her to do it again, pounding her own fist on the table, but Erickah refuses. After Maria and Erickah have left the table, I ask Navneet why it is Erickah who can't play. She says that she was playing before, but they had to get rid of one player and Erickah is allegedly the worst.

Game maintenance requirements contributed to Erickah's exclusion on several occasions. And competence was also important; according to Navneet, the reason that it was Erickah specifically who was excluded was that she was the worst player – perhaps because of the reticence I witnessed on earlier occasions. Of course, there may be other factors involved as well. Erickah was the newest girl in the class, rather shy, and I witnessed Navneet (though not Simran) attempting to exclude her on other

occasions. Nevertheless, the extracts presented above suggest that game maintenance and success were important. It is possible for repeated exclusion of one child to result from the combination of game maintenance and success pressures without any malice. Exclusion of this form does not fit representations of exclusion that teachers and children tended to assume in their discussions of the topic. Indeed, adults were in favour of children engaging in structured activities like football, and so tended to be sympathetic with the need to exclude for the sake of the game. For example, according to Faizel (quoted earlier in this chapter), a playground supervisor reprimanded a boy who joined their game without consent. Of course, the difficulty for adults is in identifying whether exclusion is purely the result of concerns with game maintenance and success, or whether other reasons are also important. Working this out is particularly difficult because children understood that it was more acceptable to exclude a peer for the sake of a game than for more personal reasons (see Chapter 7 for further discussion of strategies that children used to construct blame when narrating events to teachers).

4.4 Exclusion Without an Excluder

Not only could exclusion occur without malicious intent on the part of the excluder, it could also emerge without an active excluder at all. This was the predicament faced by Sarah, an English Christian girl who started Woodwell Green in Miss Chahal's class in September at the start of year 4. In class, Sarah was happy. She was enthusiastic, often putting her hand up to answer questions, and was an excellent actress, performing star roles in class assemblies. Out of the classroom was another matter, however. She played with different children in the playground but did not settle into friendships with specific peers, and sometimes spent playtime or lunchtime alone. For example, one lunchtime in October, I came across her sitting alone on a bench. I asked her how she was and she said that she did not have many friends. In November, during a religious education class, each child wrote an updated version of the ten commandments. Certain commandments appeared in many children's lists, such as not to pollute the earth, to respect one's parents and not to be racist. However, only Sarah included two pertaining specifically to exclusion: 'To let people play if they have not got anyone to play with' and 'Don't make secret and make people feel left out'.⁸

Sarah's teacher, Miss Chahal, tried several times to help Sarah make friends. In January, a new girl, Louise, joined the class. Miss Chahal sat

her next to Sarah in the hope that the two might become friends. This did not work and in February, Sarah's mother told Miss Chahal that Sarah did not have any friends, and in addition, that two boys in the class were calling her names. Miss Chahal told me that she wanted to help but was not sure how. She observed that she could stop the boys being horrible to Sarah, but could not make others be friends with her. Later the same day, she carried out the clapping exercise with her class, described at the start of this chapter, which she hoped would make the children more aware of Sarah's predicament. In February, another new girl, Maria, joined the class, and Miss Chahal asked some of the other girls who were friendly to her to 'back off' so that Sarah could 'have a go'.

Despite her teacher's endeavours, Sarah continued to feel isolated. In fact, Miss Chahal's efforts to link her up with new girls may have backfired, because Sarah's classmate and occasional friend Joshua (see below) told me that Sarah did not want to 'look after' the new girls and tried to evade this perceived responsibility. While she did play with classmates sometimes, I continued to see her alone in the playground quite often. In February, I interviewed her about her friendships (I interviewed every child in the class during the year). When I asked which children in her class she liked the most, she told me that she did not have any friends and dreaded coming to school for this reason. Three months later, in May, Sarah told me that she still did not have any friends. The following week, her mother contacted Miss Chahal again, who spoke to the class:

Once the class is settled and quiet, Miss Chahal says, 'I've received a letter from a parent whose daughter still hasn't settled into the school.' She asks, 'Out of the girls, who plays Indian games out in the playground? Who tells children they can't play because it's an Indian game?' Many of the girls look round at each other curiously. 'Who calls children names?' she adds. Miss Chahal continues that she wants such behaviour reported, and she wants the new girls, 'Maria, Erickah, Sarah, Louise,' to be made welcome. Anjali raises her hand. 'Miss, Louise and Maria play with us sometimes, Louise most of the time.' 'Good. You need to make sure that Louise and Maria and Erickah and Zena and Sarah [all girls who had arrived at the school since the start of the academic year] all play with you.' 'They do,' Anjali replies quietly.

In July, Sarah still claimed not to have any friends, and she was given permission to stay in and read during lunchtime instead of being on the playground. July heralded the end of the school year and the end of Sarah's time at Woodwell Green; the following autumn, she did not return to the school. This rather depressing story of isolation raises the

question: Why? How was it that for a whole year, Sarah did not make friends and remained excluded? My data suggest that this was a case of what we might call 'accidental' exclusion.

4.4.1 Three's a crowd

When I saw Sarah sitting on a bench alone in October, I asked her who she would like to be friends with. She named Joanne, the only other girl in her class of English ethnicity. Joanne was particularly friendly with Joshua, an English boy in their class. They spent some time as a twosome, and some time integrated into a large, loose, mainly female group that included Simran, Harpreet, Navneet, Sarina, Ayesha, new girls Maria, Zena and Erickah, and one boy, Sohaib. Joanne was quite often absent from school, and then Joshua would usually play with this large group.

Sarah did gradually become closer to Joanne and Joshua. I often saw her with one of the pair when the other was absent from school. When the absent child returned, sometimes they continued as a threesome, and other times Joanne and Joshua formed a pair, with Sarah alone again.

Joanne was positive about her friendship with Sarah. When I interviewed her about her friendships in April, she named Sarah as one of the children she liked most in the class. When I asked her if she thought Sarah had settled in by this time, she asserted firmly that she had. She also told me that she and Sarah lived on the same street and sometimes knocked for each other (i.e. went to each other's houses to see if the other wanted to play). Sarah even stayed over at Joanne's house one weekend.

But while Joanne seemed happy with the status quo, Sarah and Joshua were unhappy. Even when the three were together, Sarah felt excluded. For example, one day in April, the three approached me together in the playground. While Joanne and Joshua were out of earshot, I asked Sarah, 'How are you doing now? Are you feeling more settled in yeah?' 'Sort of,' Sarah replied, pulling a face. Later the same day, she confided, 'I don't really like Joanne all that much', complaining that when the three were together, one of them would say that they wanted to speak to the other one on their own, and she suspected that they were talking about her. In May, the three children fell out with each other. During this dispute, Sarah approached me in the playground saying, 'I don't think Joshua and Joanne wanna be my friend'. I asked why she thought that, and she complained that Joanne was her friend when Joshua was not around, but Joshua 'takes her away from me'.

Sarah's view was mirrored by Joshua's. During this same dispute, I interviewed him about his friendships and he did not name Joanne or

Sarah as among those he liked. 'What about Joanne – and Sarah?' I asked. Before I added Sarah's name, Joshua had already started to reply. 'Yeah but we've fallen out now. We've known each other for ages but Sarah's been turning her against me.' When I asked how she did this, he recalled an occasion when he asked Joanne and Sarah if he could join a dance they had made up, and Sarah replied that he could not because he was a boy. 'But now she got nobody to play with because Joanne's away and I don't wanna play with her,' he added. I asked why he thought he and Sarah did not get along, and he suggested that it was because he and Sarah's cousin, who was also in their class, 'hate each other'.

Months later, when he was in year 5, I interviewed Joshua about the hypothetical situation in which Jasmine approached Katie and Sani, who were playing together, and tried to make Katie go away (see earlier in this chapter). My first question asked how Katie was feeling. Joshua replied, 'Angry because she's, Jasmine's trying to take Sani away from her. And I felt like that before because Sarah always used to take Joanne away from me. When I used to go up to Joanne and Sarah and ask to play, Sarah would say no Joshua it's only a girls' game!' When I asked if anyone in the scenario had done anything wrong, Joshua singled out Jasmine, who he equated with Sarah. Joshua's involved recall shows that the situation with Sarah (who had by then left the school) had an enduring impact on him.

The three continued to sometimes play together until Sarah left at the end of the school year, but at other times Sarah was alone. In July, I saw her sitting with her cousin on a bench in the playground, while all the other year 4 children went to the canteen for lunch. They both complained of having no friends, and Sarah added with feeling, 'I especially hate Joshua and Joanne. They're acting like they don't even know me, even though we were best friends', going on to criticise Joshua in particular.

The problem seemed to be mutual dislike and rivalry between Sarah and Joshua over Joanne's friendship.⁹ It seems that Sarah's isolation resulted partly because Joanne, the peer she most wanted as a friend and with whom she played happily out of school, was already in a stable pair with Joshua. This dyad incorporated Sarah to some extent, to become a chronically unstable triad, in which Sarah and Joshua grew to dislike each other, each perceiving the other as a threat to their own friendship with Joanne. Although this predicament was never completely resolved, by the end of the school year it seemed as though Joshua and Joanne had returned to their twosome, and Sarah remained isolated. Yet aside from Joshua and Joanne, there were 27 other children in the class. Why did none of them become friends with Sarah?

4.4.2 Ethnic identity and friendship

With notable exceptions (like Joanne and Joshua), cross-gender friendships are rare among children in this age group (Maccoby 1990). So let us rule out the 15 boys in the class as potential friends for Sarah. That still left 13 girls. Sarah did play with these girls sometimes, yet did not succeed in creating meaningful friendships with any of them. One possible reason for this is the role of ethnic identity in the girls' friendships. None of the remaining 13 girls was of English ethnicity. Seven were Indian, three Pakistani, one Black African, one Black Caribbean and one 'other ethnic group'. At Woodwell Green, children named more friends of their own than of other ethnic groups (Woods 2005). Children's preference for peers of their own racial or ethnic group is very common and has been observed in the USA (Hallinan and Teixeira 1987; Shaw 1973), Canada (Aboud et al. 2003), the Netherlands (Baerveldt et al. 2004) and the UK (Boulton and Smith 1996; Davey and Mullin 1982). In some cases, children of a dominant ethnic group actively marginalise members of other ethnic groups (García-Sánchez 2011), but ethnicity can impact on integration in more subtle ways also, as I show below.

I realised that ethnicity might have something to do with Sarah's difficulties when Miss Chahal received a letter from Sarah's mother and spoke to the class about exclusion as a result. Recall Miss Chahal's rhetorical questions to her class: 'Out of the girls, who plays Indian games out in the playground? Who tells children they can't play because it's an Indian game?' Presumably Miss Chahal, who was herself of Indian ethnicity, asked these questions because of accusations made in the letter she had received. I spent a lot of time with the girls in this class out in the playground and never saw them playing an 'Indian game'. However, I did often hear them speaking in what they called 'Indian' (usually Punjabi, sometimes Urdu). In particular, children often swore at each other in 'Indian' during the types of playfully aggressive verbal exchanges described in Chapter 2, as well as during genuine disputes. In addition, the girls sometimes made up dances to songs from Bollywood films, as well as discussing recent Bollywood releases and the actors and actresses who appeared in them.

The largest single ethnic group at Woodwell Green and in the local community was Indian. It is not surprising, then, that Indian cultural expertise, such as knowledge of 'Indian swear words' and Bollywood films, was a valuable commodity. Those who did not have this knowledge were not able to understand or participate in some interactions. For example, in a game of Red Rover between year 5 boys and girls,¹⁰ the

girls chanted for Amandeep (Punjabi speaker) to come over. Amandeep hesitated, so Farah (Urdu speaker) shouted, 'Come on you budha, are you a wimp?' The Indian and Pakistani girls shrieked with laughter, and one translated the term for my benefit as 'old man'. Without the linguistic knowledge, a child would be excluded from this joke.

To aid my integration among the children of Woodwell Green, I learned a couple of 'Indian' words, watched the latest Bollywood film and bought the soundtrack. Some children who, like me, were not Indian or Pakistani pursued the same tactic. For example, Anjali ('other ethnic group') did not speak Punjabi but acquired an impressive vocabulary of 'Indian'. She used this knowledge to banter with her friends and to exclude classmate Sohaib (who was Pakistani but did not speak Urdu), by recruiting 'Indian' words as secret passwords. Zena, a Black Caribbean girl who joined Woodwell Green during year 4, also made efforts to learn about Indian language and music. Here is an example:

Zena and Farah [Urdu speaker] begin a playful aggressive exchange with each other. Zena says 'Koota!' and Farah replies with something that I don't catch. Zena retorts with 'Koota!' again. I ask them what this word means. At first, Farah claims not to know. Zena says it is swearing at your mother. Then she changes her mind, claiming that it means a female dog, and Farah corrects her, stating that it is any dog. Farah starts to walk away, and I ask Zena, 'How do you know Indian words?' She replies in a lilting Indian accent, 'Cos I can speak Indian! I can dance Indian, look!' She puts her hands and arms to her sides, and moves them forward and backwards. Farah sees and comes back over, saying that Zena's efforts are not Indian. 'She's trying to do Bhangra,' she comments in amusement. I ask Farah if she can do Bhangra and she says yes, and I ask her to show me. At first she refuses, but then agrees to show me in a secluded part of the playground, without Zena present. After demonstrating Bhangra to me, she tells me that her two-year-old sister is learning to dance, and can already sing a song from the latest Bollywood film.

Zena used her rather partial knowledge of Bhangra and 'Indian' to good effect in this playfully aggressive exchange with Farah. We saw in Chapter 2 that these playfully aggressive exchanges were an important component of friendship among children at Woodwell Green. So Zena's willingness to learn how to participate in these may have contributed to her popularity; two girls (one Pakistani, one Indian) wanted to be her best friend (see Chapter 5), and at the end of year 4, she was named by six of her classmates (including Farah) as one of their four closest friends.

Zena and Anjali demonstrate that even children who are not Indian or Pakistani can acquire sufficient knowledge of language and culture to

interact competently with peers. Yet I never witnessed Sarah, Joanne or Joshua ‘speaking in Indian’ or referring to Bollywood films. My field-notes suggest that it was quite rare for English children to demonstrate knowledge of Indian language or culture (but it occasionally occurred; see, for example, the extract in Chapter 2 in which English boy Paul used an ‘Indian swear word’ during a playfully aggressive exchange with Amandeep). This may be because children at Woodwell Green (and their parents) subscribed to a view of ‘Indian’ and ‘English’ as opposites. English and Indian children alike used these terms in a polarised way to label particular foods (roti as Indian, chips, pizza, pasta as English), clothes (jeans or tight clothes as English, saris as Indian), hairstyles for girls (short hair as English, long hair in plaits as Indian), religions (Christian or non-religious as English, usually Sikh as Indian) and languages (English versus ‘Indian’, which usually meant Punjabi). This opposition may result from the fact that in the space of only one generation, the local area had transformed, the largest ethnic group changing from English to Indian. Thus, English ethnicity had become a local minority whilst remaining, of course, a national majority. English and Indian ethnic identities were the dominant ones on the scene, but in tension with one another.

Apparently in response to this opposition, children policed peers who engaged in activities associated with the opposite ethnic group. For example, I heard one Indian girl teasing another over the fact that her family ate spaghetti bolognese and pasta rather than roti, calling her ‘an English girl’. When an English boy told his peers that he had made roti at home, an Indian boy laughed and said, ‘He can’t make roti, he’s English!’ A Welsh girl told me that she had watched Bollywood films at the house of an Indian Sikh friend and wanted to go to the Sikh festival Vaisakhi with her, but that she did not want her big brother to know, ‘Cos he will make fun of me cos he will say like *you’re* an India, that’s what he says when I sing Indian song. He tells me to go back to India cos that’s my country’. I myself was not immune to this policing; Anjali told me that some of her Indian friends disapproved of me, an English person, going to watch Bollywood films.

I have argued elsewhere that the reason for this policing is that the children of Woodwell Green saw eating, appearance, leisure interests and religion as partly constitutive of ethnicity (Woods 2007). In other words, by participating in the activities of another ethnic group, children believed that one to some extent took on the identity of that ethnic group. This was particularly problematic in the case of Indian and English because these terms were seen as mutually exclusive and opposite, so to become

more Indian was by definition to become less English. Therefore it is possible that learning about Bollywood films and 'Indian swear words' was more difficult for an English girl like Sarah than for a Black Caribbean girl like Zena, because for Sarah this knowledge challenged her own sense of identity and, moreover, the identity ascribed to her by others, including her own family.¹¹

Friendships between Indian and English children did exist at Woodwell Green. For example, we will see in Chapter 7 that English boy Robbie was good friends with his Indian classmate, Soraj. And Joanne and Joshua were friendly with the large, loose group of mostly Indian and Pakistani girls in their class. They sometimes played with them in the playground, and in the individual friendship interviews I conducted during their time in year 4, Joanne and Joshua both named three Indian children, and were named by four and three Indian children respectively, as someone they liked in their class.

Nevertheless, ethnic identity may still have been an issue for Joanne and Joshua. When Kosovan girl Kanina joined their class, Joanne approached me in the playground to excitedly tell me that the new girl was white. Joshua's mother complained to his teacher that he had to wear an 'Indian' costume for their class assembly (see Chapter 6). This does not necessarily mean that Joshua himself objected, but he was probably aware of his mother's concerns.

To conclude, many studies have found that children find it a bit harder to develop friendships with peers of other ethnic groups. I have argued that this is partly because of the shared knowledge (such as language and cultural references) that same-ethnicity children are more likely to have. This in itself may explain why Sarah did not achieve a stable friendship with any of the other (non-English) girls in her class. In addition, because children saw 'English' and 'Indian' as mutually exclusive opposites, it may have been particularly difficult for English children, like Sarah, to participate in 'Indian' activities. Such a barrier need not be insurmountable, but could be enough to deter Sarah from creating a close friendship with any of the ten Indian and Pakistani girls in her class.

4.4.3 Distorted perceptions

In addition to ethnic differences, ethnic identity processes and a problematic dynamic with two English children in her class, another possible contributor to Sarah's exclusion was her own perception of her situation. We have already seen that Sarah saw herself as friendless; she told me several times that she had no friends. Yet my sociometric data actually suggest that she was well liked by her classmates. In individual interviews

Understanding Exclusion

conducted during year 4, seven classmates (three Indian, two English, one Pakistani, one Black African) named Sarah as someone they liked. Here are the reasons they gave:

- ‘I want to be with Sarah because she hasn’t got any friends and I want to play with her.’
- ‘She’s kind and, um, she helps me with my homework, and when she’s alone I play with her. She looks after me all that.’
- ‘She’s kind as well.’ [like previously named child]
- ‘When I play with Joshua, she comes to play with us.’
- ‘She was friendly, she was nice to people.’
- ‘She plays with me and she doesn’t say anything bad and stuff, the same as the other people, and she sticks up for me sometimes, and I stick up for her. Cos we get called names a lot that’s why we go to Mr Gardner’s [head teacher] room to read sometimes.’
- ‘Same’ [as previously named child, about which this child said, ‘She is good from her heart and she’s a good girl, and she always hug me.’].
RW: ‘Exactly the same?’ ‘Yeah. But Miss, one thing of Sarah I don’t like yeah, she does help me but she doesn’t help me, she does help me but she doesn’t play with me; when I go to her she just makes faces ... In the playground, when I go to her she moves.’

The first two children in the list above alluded to Sarah’s friendlessness in their reasons for liking her. Both were interviewed soon after Miss Chahal carried out the clapping exercise with their class (described near the start of the chapter) to increase the children’s awareness of exclusion. So it is possible that although the friendship interviews were confidential, they were influenced by this exercise to assert friendship with Sarah. Nevertheless, the children’s reasons overall convey the impression of a girl who was seen as friendly and kind by her peers. This impression was sustained at the end of year 4 when children completed questionnaires listing their four best friends at school. Five children nominated Sarah, three of whom had also named her in friendship exercises during the year, suggesting that the liking she received was enduring.

Yet Sarah did not seem to be aware of this liking. Indeed, there is some evidence that she may have pushed others away. Firstly, the last peer in the list above who named Sarah as someone she liked in her friendship interview gave a caveat: ‘She doesn’t play with me; when I go to her she just makes faces.’ Obviously this is the claim of just one child, but it might indicate that Sarah did not want to be friends with some of the children who liked her. Secondly, once when I saw Sarah alone in the playground, I asked her why

she did not join the big group of mainly girls in her class, who were playing 'had' nearby, and she replied that she did not like running around.

It is of course perfectly legitimate for Sarah not to want to participate in particular activities or to play with specific children, but this reluctance may have contributed to her exclusion. It is possible that over time, Sarah's perception of herself as friendless became self-reinforcing, leading her to underestimate her status among her peers and to make less effort to integrate. This process arguably culminated in her regularly spending lunchtimes in the head teacher's office (as noted earlier) rather than in the playground, further reducing opportunities to make friends.

4.5 Exclusion as Reciprocity

This book is full of examples indicating that reciprocity or justice was important to the children of Woodwell Green. The principle is discussed further in Chapters 3 and 7. Here I describe a case study in which children excluded a peer in retaliation for harmful acts that peer carried out. It concerns Michael, a boy who came to the UK from eastern Europe and joined Woodwell Green in September, at the start of year 6. I began fieldwork in his class of 10- and 11-year-olds in January. On my second day with the class, the children had a science lesson in which they worked in groups allocated by the teacher, Miss Lock, who asked me to work with one group of seven children (one of whom was Michael). Here are my fieldnotes describing what followed:

The table around which the group is working has only six places, all of which have already been taken when Michael attempts to draw his chair up to one of the corners. Paula resists this move, commenting, 'You ain't gonna have enough room to put your book.' Another girl adds quietly, 'And you can't sit here either, because [inaudible name]'s book goes there.' So Michael sits well back from the table, unable to participate in conversation about the experiment. Eventually, after another attempt to join the group is rebuffed, he moves to an empty desk nearby and sits on his own there. I ask him why he's not sitting with the group. 'They say there ain't any room,' he says. 'But I think there is,' he adds in a softer voice.

I go over to help the main group. Once they have gathered the results (which are written on one piece of paper), they all need to transfer the data to their individual books. I tell a girl in the group that she will need to make space so that Michael can do this. 'There ain't room,' Paula replies. 'Well how's he supposed to get the results?' I ask, annoyed now. But Michael seems distressed by my intervention and says that he'll borrow the

sheet after everyone else has finished writing up. I am dissatisfied with this solution since he cannot start to do any work until he has the results, so I tear a piece of paper from my notebook and write them out for him. 'It's only cos there ain't room,' Paula says, but I don't reply.

Several members of the group continued to exclude Michael for the rest of the lesson. Bemused, at lunchtime I asked Miss Lock why the children were excluding him. She explained that Michael had made racist comments to at least two children in the class, one of whom was very popular (and a friend of Paula's). Since then, the whole class closed ranks against him. Miss Lock worked hard to challenge her class's behaviour, lecturing them on more than one occasion about including and accepting each other. Yet her efforts were at best partially successful; in the playground more than a month later, Paula told me that Michael still did not have any friends, which she attributed to his making fun of people all the time.

In some respects, this example of exclusion fits archetypal school representations more closely than the other examples I have described in this chapter: it was deliberate, and while some children seem to have been more active than others, nevertheless many group members united in excluding Michael. However, it does not fit the archetypal image insofar as the children were (at least partly) motivated by widely accepted values (harm avoidance and reciprocity) to exclude. We will see in Chapter 6 that children and adults alike at Woodwell Green took racism extremely seriously. In a sense, then, it is not surprising that the children in this year 6 class wanted to retaliate and punish Michael for what they saw as very offensive and hurtful behaviour. Children might also exclude on the basis of other values, not only reciprocity. For instance, Evaldsson (2007) describes how 11- and 12-year-old working-class girls of various ethnicities at a Swedish elementary school excluded a peer on the basis of her alleged moral inadequacies, including disloyalty and dishonesty. The possibility that children might be motivated to exclude for principled reasons is not acknowledged in standard school discussions of exclusion.

4.6 Implications for Schools

4.6.1 Mismatches between classroom representations and playground reality

Woodwell Green provided a clear stance on exclusion. It was seen as wrong, a type of 'hurting on the inside'. Teachers sought to minimise exclusion by urging children to play together and to invite lone peers to

join them. They also sometimes carried out exercises to help increase children's awareness of exclusion. These exercises and incitements to play together tended to assume that exclusion took a particular form: a group uniting to exclude an innocent lone peer. Almost everyone agreed in this simple scenario that the children in the group were in the wrong and the single child was the innocent victim – recall children's role plays in Miss Chahal's class, all three of which depicted a mean group excluding a peer for trivial reasons like being new, wearing glasses and being clever.

If such discussions and exercises are to be genuinely beneficial in increasing children's awareness of exclusion and empathy with excluded children, they need to be realistic. They need to be sufficiently similar to children's own experiences of exclusion on the playground for children to recognise the latter as exclusion. While exclusion sometimes resembles this archetypal scenario (Adler and Adler 1998; Goodwin 2006), this chapter has demonstrated that at other times, it looks quite different.

For one thing, at Woodwell Green it was not usually the group as a whole who carried out acts of exclusion (although there are exceptions, such as the year 6 class uniting to exclude Michael). Rather, children generally abdicated responsibility for inclusion and exclusion to one group member. Children who were not allocated this responsibility seemed willing to leave those decisions entirely to the group leader, and as such may not have seen *themselves* as excluding at all (although the excluded child may have seen things differently – I return to this issue shortly). In the examples I have described, one child in the group generally took responsibility for exclusion, but researchers have described other configurations also, such as two dominant girls, colluding with a third, to exclude a fourth (Svahn and Evaldsson 2011). There is a need for more research to understand when and how particular distributions of power develop within children's peer groups.

For another thing, exclusion was not always carried out with malicious intent. Even adults at the school seemed sympathetic to the need to exclude children for the sake of game maintenance (a game of football cannot operate if there are too many children and is not seen as fair if one team has more players than another). Children also excluded those they perceived to be incompetent at specific games, because of a desire to win. While this was undoubtedly unpleasant for the excluded child, and could be used as a ruse to cover a more malicious reason for exclusion, it was not in itself malicious.

Extending this idea of non-malicious exclusion, sometimes children ended up isolated apparently through an unfortunate combination of events. In the case of Sarah, her English identity may have acted as an

obstacle to her integration into a predominantly Indian peer group, and her isolation was exacerbated by the fact that the English girl she most desired as a friend was already in a stable dyadic friendship with another child who felt threatened by Sarah. The exact reasons for such cases of incidental exclusion are likely to vary; for example, the resistance among English children to Indian activities likely arises from the specific situation in Woodwell Green, where there were many more people of Indian ethnicity than English, despite English being the majority group nationally. Nevertheless, ethnic identity is likely to be an issue in any multicultural school (Aboud et al. 2003; Baerveldt et al. 2004; Boulton and Smith 1996; Davey and Mullin 1982; Hallinan and Teixeira 1987; Shaw 1973), children lacking locally valued knowledge and skills are likely to be marginalised, and any new child entering a pre-existing group has to grapple with the fact that desirable peers may already be in exclusive friendships. Schools might consider how they could support children coping with these issues.

Even when children's exclusion was malicious, it could be motivated by other values. We saw in the case of Michael that children were willing to exclude a peer as a form of retaliation to what they saw as a serious act of harm (racism). This is a rather different situation from one in which children exclude a peer for trivial reasons relating to appearance or academic competence.

Like the standard depiction of exclusion, the standard solution provided by teachers – to all play together – is also limited in several ways. First, it is arguably unfair to expect children to spend all their free time at school affiliating with someone they may not even like. Teachers were, of course, somewhat selective about who they spent time with in the staff-room. Why should children be any different in this regard? Second, this chapter suggests that having someone to play with and having a *friend* are not quite the same thing. Having a reliable friend may be a guarantee of having someone to play with (provided they are not absent from school, of course), but the converse does not necessarily apply. In Sarah's case, she sometimes played with children in her class, but this association did not lead to enduring friendships, and ultimately, it was her lack of friends, rather than her aloneness in the playground, that she lamented. It might be useful for schools to consider what they are aiming for with their interventions; to enable children to build up meaningful friendships, or to avoid being alone on the playground. If the former, then simply encouraging children to play together may not be enough. We may need more active interventions, based on an understanding of what friendship means to these children. Third, as we saw with Sarah, Joanne and Joshua,

asking children to play altogether is likely to challenge concepts of loyalty held by many children (see Chapter 5).

The most important practical implication is that schools need to broaden their representations of exclusion, to make them more relevant to children's playground lives. Many children clearly had experience of various types of exclusion and the complex issues they raised, yet they never mentioned them during classroom role plays, exercises or discussions about exclusion. There seemed to be an unspoken agreement about the intrinsically negative nature of exclusion, and hence no space for children to acknowledge its complex and varied form. The result was that classroom discussions ignored key motivations for exclusion, and hence were not genuinely enlightening to either teacher or children. To acknowledge these motivations would make such discussions more complicated, with various possible perspectives rather than a simple black and white judgement upon which everyone could agree. But at least they would become real discussions, allowing genuine learning and innovation to arise.

4.6.2 Power, status and accountability

We have seen in this chapter that one member of the group usually took responsibility for decisions about who can join the group. In football matches, this was the ball owner, while among the girls of the after-school club it was usually Manpreet, who was assertive, the eldest, and also perceived by some as the best dancer and singer. These responsible children weighed inclusion against other concerns, including status and dominance maintenance. Thus, Faizel (but not Pavandeep) asserted his dominance over defiant excluded peers, while Manpreet sought to exclude Holly in an effort to maintain her own dominance at the after-school club.

We have also seen that the other members of the group usually allowed the group leader to include and exclude on their behalf. Relatively dominant children contested or struggled with the group leader's decision (whether as the excluded child, e.g. Idris and Holly, or as a group member without decision-making powers, e.g. Zak). But more submissive children in the group allowed the group leader to exclude without challenging them. These children may not have wanted the responsibility associated with leadership and decision-making, or may have been afraid that standing up to the group leader would result in their own exclusion.

Previous research has demonstrated that perpetrators and victims experience exclusion and other harmful acts differently, with victims tending to see the acts as more serious and harmful than perpetrators do (Horn 2003; Killen et al. 2006; Wainryb et al. 2005). My own analyses of children's responses to a hypothetical scenario about exclusion also pointed to the same conclusion, with those who had experienced exclusion blaming the group significantly more often than those who had not experienced it.

The case studies of boys playing football and the girls at the after-school club show that perspectives on acts of exclusion differ not only between victim and perpetrators, but also between perpetrators, in the sense that not all members of an excluding group take responsibility for the act. Rather, group members' experiences vary as a function of their dominance within the group. For instance, group decision-makers may tend to blame the excluded child for their exclusion (e.g. Manpreet might blame Holly for trying to 'take over' her dominant position), while other more submissive group members may tend to blame their group leader, whom they assign responsibility for exclusion. However, excluded children may not always differentiate between group members in this way and may hold them all responsible for their exclusion, as seemed to be the case with Holly, who criticised her friend Rachel for not intervening when Manpreet excluded her. These varying experiences and perspectives on responsibility may have contrasting implications for moral development, a possibility I consider further in Chapter 8.

These insights into power dynamics suggest a new direction for schools concerned about exclusion: encourage submissive group members to take more responsibility for decisions made by their leader. It is probably unrealistic to aim to remove this abdication of responsibility to a leader altogether (it would make management of large stable games like football very difficult). But we could perhaps aim for a more weakly stratified peer group, in which everyone's voice counts, and in which all children accept a sense of responsibility for decisions that affect the whole group. Perhaps classes could try out semi-formal mechanisms for exchanging opinions and reaching decisions in groups that do not rely on complete abdication of responsibility to one person. Children could then be encouraged to transfer these skills in group decision-making to the school playground. By the same token, children who often lead groups could be encouraged to think about how they could share that responsibility and also to critically assess the competing values, such as dominance and status, that lead them to exclude in some instances.

Notes

1. There were two versions of each scenario. For the first scenario, half the children heard a version involving three girls, Katie, Sani and Jasmine, and the other half, three boys, Adam, Matthew and Hinesh. For the second scenario, the composition of the group (as depicted in an accompanying picture) remained the same, but for half the children, the lone child was a boy, John, and for the other half, a girl, Joanne.
2. The reason that more children answered questions about scenario 2 than 1 was because year 1 children found scenario 1 too confusing so I omitted it from their interviews. A total of 143 children were interviewed about scenario 3, but due to experimental error, the question about blame was omitted from six interviews.
3. Note that in the second scenario, the group does not actually carry out the act of exclusion, although most children assumed that that was what would happen. This omission may explain why 44 children (32 per cent) said that no one had done anything wrong in scenario 2.
4. Note that according to Pavandeep, Faizel is unfair insofar as he plays with Pavandeep's ball but does not allow Pavandeep to play with his ball. We saw in Chapter 3 that fairness was important to Faizel in many situations, but Pavandeep's comment is a reminder that there may have been situations in which Faizel prioritised other concerns over fairness.
5. 'Had' is a game in which one child (who is 'on') chases the others. When he or she touches another child, that child becomes 'on' and the former chaser becomes one of the chased. The game continues indefinitely in this way.
6. Although I interviewed 143 children about this scenario, I accidentally omitted the question about blame from six interviews. Therefore I focus here only on the 137 children who answered all questions for this scenario.
7. I used two χ^2 tests of association to assess whether there was a relationship between the role of the child in their own experience (either as excluded individual, member of group, or no experience reported) and whether they blamed, firstly, the individual excluded child, and secondly, the group. I found a significant association between child's experience and blame of group, $\chi^2(2)=12.766, p=.001$ (one-tailed). Children who had experience of being excluded blamed the group much more often than did children who had experience of being in the group. Children without relevant experience blamed the group least often. There was no significant association between experience and blaming of the excluded child.
8. Spelling mistakes have been corrected for the sake of clarity.
9. The experiences of Sarah, Joshua and Joanne as an unstable triad were very common at Woodwell Green. Children's expectations of loyalty and exclusivity of specific peers often created tensions. See Chapter 5.

Understanding Exclusion

10. In Red Rover, two teams stand in lines opposite each other, holding hands. Teams take turns to call for one person on the other team to run over and attempt to break through the line of children holding hands.
11. See also Chapter 6, where I describe how English parents felt threatened by their children's participation in 'Indian' practises, like dancing to Bollywood songs, at school.