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This is a dissertation about emotions in Social Science teaching. As such it offers a perspective on Social Science didactics that until now has been largely neglected. Some of the most pressing concerns of our time, not least crises related to migration, the welfare state, international law and terrorism, are part of the Swedish upper secondary school subject Social Science (samhällskunskap). But while the Social Science teacher typically tries to resonate with their students in a rationality-oriented way, Katarina Blennow’s ethnographical investigation shows that the Social Science classroom is filled with often unrecognized, suppressed or withheld experiences and feelings of inclusion, exclusion, joy, anger, sorrow and fear.

With the aim to examine what emotions do in the teaching of the school subject Social Science and what the subject Social Science does to emotions, Katarina Blennow uncovers a dissonance between the role emotions are supposed to play in the teaching and the role emotions actually do play.

The examined cases of Social Science teaching seem to suffer from a traditional division between rationality and emotionality that largely has characterized political analysis in the twentieth century. A rapprochement between the students’ lifeworld and the school subject’s disciplinary analysis would benefit from an increased use of the emotional dimension and community of Social Science teaching.
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'I have experienced all of this at close quarters’, Leyla said to me as I sat next to her in a Social Science lesson in February 2015. The teacher, Rickard, had just finished a lecture on the historical development of international law, with a focus on the aftermath of the Second World War and the current war in Syria. He had shown the class pictures of cities bombed to pieces. He had talked about the difficulties of applying international law in conflict zones and how those difficulties on the states involved in the conflicts. When I interviewed her about a month later, Leyla brought up that lesson in response to my question about what she found to be emotive in Social Science teaching. She told me that she thought the teaching on human rights and international law was crap, naïve, a kind of teaching only possible in a country that has not experienced war. ‘When we talked about human rights and stuff like that, you talk about it, you say that: No, we are not going to do anything (bad) but still, when in war, it’s just, everything is just […] they do it/they are allowed to do it’. Leyla said she felt anger. But despite of that, she did not speak in class. Leyla’s reason for staying quiet was not that she found it difficult to talk about this topic, it was rather the possible reaction from other students that worried her: ‘I could say it, but if you have lived a nice life and didn’t have problems you won’t believe or feel what I am saying.’ Leyla said that she keeps quiet because if other students were to laugh at her when she spoke about her experiences of war, she would hate them.
The school subject Social Science, although sometimes perceived as ‘dry’, addresses some of the most pressing concerns of our current world, such as crises connected to migration, terrorism, international law and the welfare state. Therefore, Social Science teaching is a place of intensity and emotion, where emotional sparks are lit in the encounter between students, teachers, and the specific Social Science knowledge content. There is an intrinsic conflictuality in the subject Social Science. Conflictuality puts the Social Science teacher in a difficult position, for it forces him or her to navigate a contested emotional space that lies at the heart of the subject. Societal issues may be scary, leading to heated discussions and consequences that are difficult to resolve or address. Emotions therefore do something to/in the Social Science teaching, regardless of whether they are loudly articulated or experienced in silence. In Leyla’s case, a specific Social Science content sparked emotion which opened an opportunity for a conflictual perspective on international law in the teaching.

The discussion above raises questions about what emotions do in Social Science teaching and what the subject Social Science does to emotions. Given that Social Science teaching is impregnated with emotion, how can Social Science didactics approach the emotiveness that is specific to the subject? A further question, closely related to emotion, is: what role do collective, relational aspects play in Social Science teaching? As the example above shows, the other students seem to be decisive factors in Leyla’s decision to stay silent on the topic of international law.

1 By Social Science I mean the Swedish curriculum subject Samhällskunskap. For an overview of the subject according to the Swedish upper secondary curriculum, see appendix 1.

2 The term conflictuality is inspired by the term Konfliktnalität, which is used in German Social Science didactics (see e.g. Grammes, 2012). It is not registered in the Oxford Dictionary of English. By using the term conflictuality I mean that disagreement is a foundation of the subject. It is conflictual in its character.

3 The Swedish term Samhällskunskapdidaktik presents a problem when translated into English. In English speaking countries the term didactic has negative connotations, referring to a patronizing and persuasive form of teaching that leaves learners passive (see the entry ‘Didactic’ in the Oxford Dictionary of English). The Swedish term didaktik is closely related to the German Didaktik, meaning the theory or science of teaching and learning (See the entry ‘Didaktik’ in Duden (1996). Deutsches Universalwörterbuch). After trying out the term subject specific pedagogy, which becomes misleading for a Swedish audience, I have settled on using the term Social Science didactics, alternated by Social Science teaching and learning. For an English-speaking reader, it is essential to keep in mind that it is the German Didaktik that is meant, not the English didactics.

4 Collective is simply conceptualized as ‘done by people acting as a group’ (see the entry ‘Collective’ in the Oxford Dictionary of English). As will hopefully be clear throughout the dissertation, individuals are seen as actors in and through relationality and collectivity and the narratives and actions of individuals are thus not judged as unimportant to the study.
Addressing the questions above, this is a study of Swedish upper secondary Social Science teaching using the analytical concept of *emotional communities*. The study is based on ethnographic fieldwork conducted at four upper secondary schools in the south of Sweden between April 2014 and December 2015. The schools were intentionally chosen in order to ensure that students who have experienced migration are part of the investigation. The pluralism of values, experiences and knowledge in the researched student groups are thus to some extent related to contact with ‘other places’ in the words of Johan Sandahl (2013). This has consequences for perspectives and contestations within these groups. Sandahl’s research on students’ engagement leaves an impression of a rather homogenous student body, where Social Science perspectives are often brought into the teaching through teaching material as textbooks, documentaries and news texts. In the student groups studied in this dissertation, conflictual perspectives, sometimes stemming from contact with ‘other places’, are already present in the classroom, whether explicitly acknowledged or not.

**Purpose and research questions**

This dissertation examines the relation between emotions, specific knowledge content and symbolic boundaries in the teaching of the Swedish school subject Social Science. This relationship is uncovered through an ethnography of Social Science teaching. The focus lies on emotions, Social Science perspectives and conflictuality. The study is guided by the key theoretical assumption that the emotional dynamics in Social Science education are crucial to what Social Science teaching becomes and can become. Given this assumption, the study investigates the reciprocal relation between emotions and the teaching of the subject Social Science. The overarching research question that the study seeks to answer is: *What do emotions do in Social Science teaching and what does the subject Social Science do to emotions in pluralist Swedish upper secondary classrooms?*

To answer this question, the study deploys the analytical concept of emotional communities, which specifically targets systems of emotion in social communities, such as parliaments, neighbourhoods, schools, companies, families or, as suggested in this study, subject teaching classrooms. An emotional community is a process that is under perpetual production, it is never static (Landahl, 2015). In this process, symbolic boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’ are continuously drawn and redrawn. I will argue that those boundaries are affected by the teacher and the students and the subject Social Science. The gatekeeping of the boundaries around the
emotional community interplay with boundaries around the subject. This boundary work has social consequences.

***

This study analyses data from both classroom observations and individual interviews with students and teachers. To add rigour and consistency to the investigation, video recorded situations displaying emotions and the gatekeeping of the subject teaching were shown and discussed with the interviewees. The theoretical analysis of the data is based principally on Sara Ahmed’s (2014) work on the cultural politics of emotion and Barbara Rosenwein’s (2006) concept of emotional communities.

Analysing Social Science teaching as an emotional community where emotions are relational is an attempt to bridge subject-specific didactics with an interactionist sociological perspective. Such an analysis can help unearth the reciprocal relation between the who (individuals and groups) and the what (subject content) in Social Science teaching, and it can help us understand how emotions in that relation could be addressed in the teaching of the specific subject.

The research interest of the study includes classrooms where the composition of students includes students who have foreign background, which according to Statistics Sweden means that they either themselves or both their parents are born abroad (SCB, 2002, p. 10). (As the term foreign background, although used by Statistics Sweden, is not common in English language, I will hereafter use the English term immigrant background instead.) Teachers have expressed uncertainty in relation to teaching Social Science in heterogeneous student groups (see e. g. Jonasson Ring, 2015; Skolverket, 2005; Tväråna, 2014) regarding both the school subject as such as well as specific situations in the teaching. A particularly pressing situation is described by Karin Kittelmann Flensner, Göran Larsson and Roger Säljö in their project ‘Global conflicts with regional consequences – learning and arguing about Middle Eastern conflicts in Swedish classrooms’. Teachers in the west of Sweden contacted these scolars because they were going to teach the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in a student group where some students had relatives who had left for Iraq to fight for IS (the Islamic State), while others were refugees from that very conflict area, and others were racist. ‘We don’t know how to teach the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in that student group’, the teachers wrote, and asked: ‘Can you help us?’ (Kittelmann Flensner, 2018). An assumption in this study is that in such situations the knowledge content of the subject does something to the emotions in
the group and the emotions in the group do something to the knowledge content and the teaching.

This study does not exclusively focus on questions about migration. It has been open to emotional aspects of all investigated Social Science content and in relation to all students in the group, not just students with an immigrant background. The emotionally intense situations are not dependent only on the demographics of the student groups; the Social Science subject-specific issues dealt with are also emotive because they are pressing concerns of our time.

This dissertation will show how intensity and emotions are linked to a contestation within the subject Social Science that is in interplay with *boundary work* (Gieryn, 1983) in the group comprised of teacher and students. This dynamic is partly revealed by studying the *gatekeeping* of the subject teaching. The specific subject content and the teaching thereof shape relational *movements and attachments* among the participants. These attachments and movements are connected to emotions. An assumption in the study is that *symbolic boundaries* (Lamont, 1992) are drawn between different students and teachers through what they feel in relation to a specific subject content, and by feeling similarly or differently, they either approach or withdraw from each other. Those movements reciprocally shape what the teaching of Social Science is – and can be – in that particular group composed of teacher and students. Consequently, an important part of Social Science didactics and its related research field is to understand and address emotions in the teaching of the subject.

The collective emotional dimension of Social Science teaching deserves more attention in a field of research that has often portrayed the subject teaching as rationalist, individualistic and universal. In this study, both collectives and individuals are agents doing emotional boundary work, but findings about the collective aspects are the greater research contributions. The movements and attachments mentioned above are what Chantal Mouffe calls *the political* (Mouffe, 2008), that is, the distinction between *us* and *them*, at work. What can be more emotional than the drawing of boundaries between us and them (Goodwin, Jasper & Polletta, 2001, p. 23)?

The movement and attachment in relation to emotionally saturated knowledge content in the social science teaching are dependent on *contact* and *histories of contact*. Contact means how objects, widely defined as things, persons, topics or opinions, come into contact with each other, shaping emotions in the process. For instance, a topic could be more or less emotive when encountered in or outside of Social Science teaching. Histories of contact, which can stem from own experiences or from say the media, also shape how objects come into contact. This study looks
at the history of contact with the topic itself, in and outside of the subject teaching. But the coming into contact with the topic is also affected by the culture and history of the subject Social Science and teachers’ and students’ subject conceptions. In that sense, the movement and attachment through emotions in relation to a certain subject matter might look different depending on the school subject. There is a certain emotional community of Social Science education that presumably differs from the emotional community of other school subjects.

The scene or room where this investigation takes place is Swedish upper secondary Social Science classrooms with the particularities of the school subject and the particularities of the present participants in the teaching along with their relations with each other. The actors (and participants of interest) in this study are both students and teachers. The act investigated is the teaching of Social Science, which can also be seen as the encounter between a specific Social Science knowledge content (what) and a specific group of students and teacher (who) in a specific place – the Swedish upper secondary school. A consideration about the relation between who and what is important: Sandahl argues that Social Science teaching premised on the idea that the subject is a ‘mini science’ threatens the subject’s legitimacy:

Social Science disciplinary thinking is an important part of the subject, but without connections to the students’ lives and the society they live in, the teaching is at risk of appearing as less meaning-making than it could potentially be /…/. By extension, I argue that the legitimacy of the subject can be affected: if Social Science is a mini-version of the academic disciplines, why should students outside of the Social Science Programme study Social Science? (Sandahl, 2015a, p. 68, my translation)

Recognizing the who in teaching and the collective processes that support Social Science education offers a potential for the subject’s development to adapt to changes in society and thereby uphold its legitimacy as a compulsory curriculum subject in upper secondary school.

This study of the reciprocal relation between the who and what, with its emotional expressions and symbolic boundaries – around the Social Science teaching and in the group comprised of teacher and students – contributes to a discussion of possible ways for Social Science didactics to approach emotions, both in research and in practice.
The subject Social Science

The research object of this dissertation is the teaching of Social Science. For an overview of the school subject Social Science as presented in the Swedish upper secondary curriculum, see Appendix 1. Social Science is one of the mandatory subjects at the upper secondary level in Sweden. It has a knowledge mission, a socializing mission (how to be a good Swedish citizen) and an emancipatory mission (to be able to act in one’s own interest and not be fooled in society) (see also Biesta, 2011). The school subject was politically invented in the aftermath of the Second World War with a strong ideological rationale to foster ‘good’ democratic citizens and thereby strengthening democracy (Bronäs, 2000; Englund, 2005). The subject simultaneously carries a political (agonistic and ambivalent) character, for instance in the notion of conflictuality and the tension between the mission to foster good citizens and the mission to foster critical thinking that questions the societal order. This tension is the so-called democratic paradox (Sandahl, 2015a, p. 18; Tryggvason, 2018b, p. 11). Conflicting interests are, needless to add, inherent to the subject.

The Social Science teacher is thus teaching for both knowledge, engagement and participation (Sandahl, 2013, p. 159). It is clear that the ‘good citizen’ is an active one, but the question is what being active means (see also Olson, 2012). Sandahl poses the question of how Social Science education can help qualify the students’ engagement. He argues that Social Science teaching should aim to educate stand-by citizens, who are ready to get active if circumstances demand it and they want to (Sandahl, 2013, p. 174; for a different take on stand-by citizens, see Blanck & Lödén, 2017).

What function does the subject Social Science have in a pluralist society? If the Social Science classroom, mirroring the contemporary societal situation, is pluralist, in the sense of simultaneously containing two or more states, groups, principles, sources of authority etc.5 (see the entry ‘pluralist’, in the Oxford Dictionary of English), then some of the characteristics and content of the subject Social Science make it a crucial school subject to actively understand, engage with and protect this

---

5 Pluralism is in this dissertation is simply defined as heterogeneity; the classroom, as society at large, contains different groups with different experiences, opinions and perspectives. I am thus not referring to the body of work in political science on political decision-making through competing interest-groups (see e.g. Dahl, 2005).
plurality. Two characteristics/content stand out in relation to plurality: *Social Science perspectives* and *conflictuality*.

Sandahl (2013) brings up Social Science perspectives as one of six second order concepts\(^6\) of Social Science (the others being Social Science causality, Social Science evidence and inference, Social Science comparison and contrast, Social Science abstraction and evaluation). Referring to Rothstein (2002), he defines perspectives as the ability to refer to or apply different viewpoints on contemporary issues and the acknowledgement that only a few issues contain ‘truths’. Sandahl writes:

…trying to understand how people perceive the world in other places is crucial for understanding the issue. Working in class with role-play, debates or other techniques enable the students to scrutinise their own viewpoints and practise understanding “the other”. (Sandahl, 2013, p. 164)

One aspect of the pluralist Social Science classroom is that multiple worldviews are represented in the classroom. Sometimes, but not always, these worldviews stem from some sort of contact with ‘others’ and ‘other places’. According to Sandahl, and other researchers (Långström & Virta, 2016; Nordgren, 2017), Social Science perspectives can be provided through external material (textbooks, media, literature and so on) but also through the experiences and knowledge of students and teachers who participate in the teaching.

When Social Science perspectives are addressed in the written curriculum (the syllabus) of Social Science at upper secondary level in Sweden, the syllabus sometimes specifies what kinds of perspectives are meant, but sometimes it is unclear what the syllabus refers to. The latter case leaves open to interpretation what kinds of societal perspectives should be used.

The perspectives specified in the syllabus are either a) theoretical; then either the disciplines give the perspectivity, as in the course Social Science 3 where globalisation should be taught ‘from a democratic, economic as well as political perspective’ (Skolverket, 2011), or as more comprehensively expressed ‘theoretical perspectives’. Alternatively, they b) concern different analytical levels: ‘from local to global’, ‘historic and contemporary’. But some are also on c) a more individual level: ‘to evaluate both the own and others’ viewpoints’ (Ibid.).

---

\(^6\) Sandahl defines second order concepts as: ‘Disciplinary and procedural knowledge on how social scientists generate knowledge and how they organise, analyse and critically review societal issues’ (Sandahl, 2014, p. 22).
The syllabus contains even more vague definitions, as regarding the course Social Science 3 where it is stated that the students should account for central theories from different perspectives. Another example is the general Social Science text for the upper secondary level, which spells out perspectives as: ‘Knowledge about democracy and human rights, both collective and individual rights, societal issues, societal conditions as well as different societies’ organisation and function, from local to global level, from different interpretations and perspectives’ (Ibid).

Conflictuality is inherent in multiperspectivity. Different Social Science perspectives will inevitably clash against each other and cause disagreement. Conflictuality is at the core of Social Science education (Grammes, 2012). It has received a growing interest from Swedish researchers on Social Science education/citizenship education (see e.g. Larsson, 2018; Ljunggren, Unemar Öst & Englund 2015), inspired mainly by American research on controversial issues in education (see e.g. Hess, 2009). In her great work on controversial issues, Diana Hess defines controversial political questions as ‘questions of public policy that spark significant disagreement’ (Hess, 2009, p. 37). I have found Hess’ work on controversial issues difficult to use in this study due to her narrow definition of ‘public’ and ‘political’. I conceive of the term controversial issues in a broader sense than Hess, i.e. as relating to more than policy.

Conflictuality is explicitly addressed in only a few places in the syllabus for Social Science for the upper secondary level. It is inherent in the mentioning of oral or written debates as a form of presentation, the emphasis on the ability to express opinions, and in the central content stated for the course Social Science 2 – questions about ‘the freedom of action of the individual actor versus structural conditions’ (Skolverket, 2011).

Emotions and boundaries in Social Science teaching

Emotions have historically been seen as ‘the site in which human subjectivity crystallizes in its purest form’ (Plamper, 2015), common to all humans and an important tool in delineating the everchanging boundaries between humans and a defining ‘other’, like animals or robots. According to Sara Ahmed, emotions draw as well as perforate the lines between me and we, us and them, individual and social: ‘How we feel about others is what aligns us with a collective, which paradoxically “takes shape” only as an effect of such alignments. It is through how others impress upon us that the skin of the collective begins to take shape’ (Ahmed, 2014, p. 54).
Along that train of thought, emotions are part of the individual and collective who in the classroom, not because emotions are something we ‘have’, but because emotions play a part in shaping the individual and collective who.

Emotions thus play an important part in the boundary work negotiating the symbolic boundaries in and around the subject Social Science as well as within the student group. Symbolic boundaries are ‘conceptual distinctions made by social actors to categorize objects, people, practices and even time and space’ (Lamont and Molnár, 2002, p. 168).

Boundaries are crucial in this investigation in several ways. How the symbolic boundaries are drawn in and around the subject impacts what the subject is and the constant boundary work going on in the teaching impacts what the subject can be. The drawing and gatekeeping of boundaries is essential to ‘the political’ as conceptualized by Mouffe (2008), where the distinction between us and them is the political at work. Thus, the political demands boundary work. Boundary work is also important in Barbara Rosenwein’s conceptualization of emotional communities, where the symbolic boundary of the community is under constant production through a negotiation around the norms of emotional expression and how emotions are valued. This affects both who feels that they belong to the community and also where the boundaries between different emotional communities are drawn. At different times, the emotional community of Social Science teaching will thus more or less overlap with other emotional communities, say, the emotional community of History teaching.

Symbolic boundaries exist only if they are repeatedly defended by members of inner groups (Lamont, 1992, p. 3 citing K. Erikson ‘Wayward puritans: A study in the sociology of deviance’ p. 23). Boundary work shows the constructed nature of symbolic boundaries. Gatekeeping as a ‘patrolling of the boundaries’ of the subject Social Science is in this dissertation seen as a form of boundary work. The boundaries around the teaching and the subject can be closed (‘this does not belong here’) or open (‘let’s widen the subject’). A careful inquiry into the relations between knowledge content, emotions and gatekeeping is needed to investigate what emotions do in Social Science teaching and what the subject Social Science does to emotions.

This study, then, examines the symbolic boundaries in Social Science teaching, fastening on how they are negotiated by boundary work, and what role emotions play in that boundary work in relation to the knowledge content of the subject. In other words, the dissertation studies how individuals and groups of upper secondary students and teachers draw boundaries both around and in the teaching of the subject Social Science ‘in the process of defining their own identity, ideology and
status against other groups’ (Lamont, 1992, p. 6). This way of conceptualizing boundaries diverges from existing work on ‘threshold concepts’ (Meyer & Land, 2005) where the bounded subject is largely defined by the disciplines (to pass the threshold into the subject the student must ‘think like a social scientist’). In my study, the symbolic boundaries in and around the subject are indeed influenced by disciplinary thought, but they are also shaped by the emotional boundary work in the specific student group. This dissertation investigates how such collective processes are triggered by the knowledge content of Social Science and the character of the subject Social Science, and vice versa, and how this reciprocity interplays with the teaching. Emotions are seen as a prime marker and aspect of the boundary work in the classroom. An important assumption guiding the dissertation is that there is a gatekeeping of the symbolic boundaries of the subject Social Science that creates a reciprocal relationship between the who (participants) and the what (content) that is highly interesting to investigate but has not been extensively examined in Swedish research on Social Science teaching and learning.

Outline of the dissertation

Chapter 1 has served as an introduction to the problem space towards which the dissertation is directing its attention. This chapter has stated the purpose and research questions of the dissertation. It has also provided a brief description of the subject Social Science and its relevance to the research interest. This chapter, finally, has outlined the central theoretical concepts used in the dissertation.

Chapter 2 positions the dissertation in relation to previous research on emotion, education and Social Science didactics. It discusses the contribution it is making to that field. For the sake of clarity in a field that is partly overwhelmingly large and partly very narrow, a distinction is made between research on emotion and education, research on Social Science didactics and research on Social Science didactics and emotions.

Chapter 3 addresses the theoretical framework of the study. The central concepts discussed are emotion, relationality, emotional communities, the political, conflictuality, silence, gatekeeping and boundary work. The chapter also discusses the terms movement, attachment and contact which are extracted from Ahmed’s work on the relationality of emotion and used as analytical tools in the investigation.

Chapter 4 contains a discussion about the methodology of the study and a description of the methods used, along with ethical considerations.
Chapter 5 sets the context or stage of the investigation by presenting the schools, teachers and students participating in the study. This is done in order to be transparent regarding the context of the research. This chapter will allow readers to relate the specific empirical data of this study to their own practice or research.

Chapter 6 delves into what the subject Social Science does to emotions. It is a broad take on the dataset focusing on emotive topics in Social Science education and the gatekeeping of the subject/subject teaching.

Chapters 7, 8 and 9 detail what emotions do in Social Science teaching and how the gatekeeping of the subject is performed in heated situations. The attention to detail in these chapters is essential for a discussion on how Social Science can be taught with regard to the concept of emotional community, as well as pluralism in the classroom. To facilitate didactical thought, Chapters 7, 8 and 9 are thematically organized according to the character of the situations analysed. Chapter 7 focuses on teachers’ emotional expressions and experiences as part of the emotional community of Social Science teaching. The chapter discusses teachers’ emotionality as related to their professionalism as Social Science teachers. Chapter 8 deals with situations where what is at stake is withheld by the students in question. Chapter 9 deals with voiced tensions, i.e. situations where what is at stake is verbalized and reacted on in the classroom. What is studied here is overt resistance, as opposed to covert resistance in Chapter 8. The purpose of the distinction is to separate various kinds of situations because they have different didactical implications, and as such provide different challenges for the Social Science teacher. Teachers and students have proved particularly hard to distinguish in a study with a relational focus. Indeed, some teachers’ emotions are found in the student-focused chapters and vice versa.

Chapter 10, closes the dissertation by discussing the dissertation’s findings and their implications for the didactics of Social Science, both as a research field and as teaching practice. The final chapter also acknowledges the study’s limitations and presents ideas for further research.

---

7 I am aware that the division between Chapters 8 and 9 might give a hydraulic impression through the distinction between expressed (overflowing) emotion and restrained (clogged up) emotion. This is not what I had in mind when structuring the dissertation, as is further explained in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 2 – RESEARCH ON SOCIAL SCIENCE 
TEACHING AND EMOTIONS IN EDUCATION

This chapter situates the study within the fields of research from which it draws its inspiration, which includes an argument about the study’s contribution to these fields. Through locational literatures work, I will make the case for this study by discussing why it has been designed the way it has and which ideas in the literature I am using and transforming for my own work.

The literatures work represented in this chapter firstly approaches the research on emotions and education through the history of ideas. Research on emotion is a vast field and a limit for the review was needed. By focusing on emotions and education, a delineation was made that included various different disciplinary and methodological approaches. The approach from history of ideas is seen as necessary to understand and navigate a conflictual research field that is torn between opposing ontologies and epistemologies.

It then turns to the research field of Social Science didactics and tensions therein, which are of importance here, for instance between disciplines and politics, and between rationality and emotionality.

Finally, the chapter turns to the small amount of mainly policy/theoretical research where emotions and Social Science didactics enter into a direct dialogue with each other. This neglected strand of research (Besand, 2014; Petri, 2019), which has received increasing attention, perhaps especially in Germany where ‘Emotionen und politische Bildung’ has been a recent theme for conferences and academic writings.

The literature review does not enter the field of emotions and political science, where political psychology in particular features prominently (see for instance Marcus, 2013). The reason for that is precisely the psychological perspective that frames emotions as interior. Nor does the literature review engage with the sociology of emotions, even though it has produced highly interesting research. A
comprehensive outline of that area will not be made here, due to limitations im-
posed by a focus on emotions and education.8

The chapter concludes by describing this dissertation’s contribution in relation
to the reviewed literature.

Emotions and education

The concept of emotion has been part of western thought9 since the time of Plato,
albeit variously understood (Rosenwein, 2006, p. 202). In his work on the history
of emotions, Jan Plamper asserts that the emotional history of modernity is closely
linked to the history of science: ‘once the sciences made emotion an object of study,
they not only produced knowledge about emotions, but also had a significant social
influence’ (Plamper, 2015, p. 73).

Put roughly, western theorizing of emotions starts in philosophy, as thinkers such
as Aristotle, Descartes, Spinoza, Hobbes, Rousseau, Hume and Kant all sought to
analyse the role emotions play in the life of the mind and in life more generally.
Spinoza has recently attracted researchers studying embodiment. Theology was an-
other discipline paying close attention to emotions, where passions and affections
were metaphysically influenced. In the mid nineteenth century the dominance of
philosophy and theology gave way to experimental psychology which in turn gave
way to the neurosciences in the late twentieth century (Plamper, 2015, p. 9-10). In
the shift from theology to psychology, a reductive process took place, where differ-
ent terms for emotion, such as passion, lust, sentiment, affection etc. all merged
into the term emotion and were stripped of metaphysical associations (Ibid. p.
173).

Today, the different research fields studying emotion debate the use of the terms
emotion and affect: affect is associated with the life sciences and the body, while
emotion is defined in broader terms, but often associated with cognition.

There has been a significant increase in research on emotion in several academic
disciplines since the 1970s. Compared to sociology, psychology, the neurosciences
and gender studies, educational sciences is a latecomer to the field. According to

8 For an overview on the sociology of emotions, see e.g. Turner & Stets (2005); Wettergren (2013).
9 By writing western thought I want to draw attention to the fact that accounts of the history of
emotion often start with the ancient Greeks, who were dealing with ancient Greek emotions. I am not
stating that there are specific western emotions as opposed to something else, only that that could be
the case, a circumstance often overlooked when discussing, researching and theorizing emotion.
Reinhard Pekrun and Lisa Linnenbrink-Garcia (2014, p. 2), it is only in the last fifteen years that there has been an increase in research on emotion in education. Prior to that, the research on emotion primarily focused on test anxiety and other achievement-related emotions. Today, the field is expanding and showing an increasingly widening spectrum of research interests.

Pekrun and Linnenbrink-Garcia state the importance of systematizing emotions according to their object when considering the functions of emotions in education. According to these scholars, an object focus (i.e. attention on where the emotion is directed or what the emotions ‘stick to’) reveals if emotions are pertinent to the academic task or not. They divide emotions according to their object as follows:

Achievement emotions relate to experiences of success or failure in educational activities and outcomes.

Epistemic emotions relate to the processing of information in education, which can either be intriguing and enjoyable or, in the case of severe incongruity, disturbing.

Topic emotions, which are triggered by educational content, exemplified by political events that are dealt with in Social Science teaching or frustration over the news that Pluto is no longer classified as a planet.

Social emotions relate to other persons, like envy of a student’s higher grades or being in love with someone in the classroom.

Incidental emotions and moods relate to events outside of school, like a family crisis.


Pekrun’s and Linnenbrink-Garcia’s division of emotions in education according to their object matters to this study because it will be questioned by the results. What will be questioned is not the attention to the object of emotion but the division of these objects according to well-defined categories.

Despite the relatively limited research on emotions in education, there is no doubt that emotions have been and continue to be a fundamental part of education (Boler 1999; Nias, 1996; Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2014), from the test anxiety of a single student to the ‘prescribed’ emotions of the ideal citizen that the school is supposed to promote/foster in a certain society at a certain time. The assertion that emotions are fundamental in education comes from researchers across disciplines and methodological approaches.
Life sciences vs. human sciences

Plamper structures his book *The History of Emotions* (2015) around the division between emotion as studied in life sciences and in human sciences, especially anthropology. He identifies major problems on both sides. The life sciences constantly fail to demarcate where emotions are located and what they are (e.g. which emotions are universal, basic and unchangeable). Anthropology, on the other hand, has struggled with the constructivist perspective in that it does not allow normativity – if emotion is culturally relative, then we cannot evaluate emotional responses or ways of dealing with emotions from an ethical standpoint. Plamper further expresses worry about research in the humanities and social sciences which uncritically uses results from the fashionable neurosciences. Plamper uses the work of William Reddy as the most promising attempt to bridge the gap between emotions from a cognitive-psychological perspective and emotions from an anthropological perspective, because Reddy performs a rigorous and critical reading of research from both fields before building his own theory. Reddy asks for more interdisciplinary research on emotion (Reddy, 2001, p. 63) and tries to theorize emotions in a way that uses knowledge from both the life sciences and anthropology while trying to avoid falling into the pitfalls of each. Reddy acknowledges that revolutions are taking place in the different research fields. In psychology there has been a move away from linear models of cognition and towards models involving multiple pathways and complexity (Reddy, 2001, p. 31). Psychologists have had to drop neat dividing lines between conscious and unconscious, supraliminal and subliminal, controlled and involuntary, affect and thought. The revolution in anthropology consists of a critique of the idea of culture in relation to individual variation, resistance and historical change (Reddy, 2001, p. 35).

Studying research on emotion and education, it is indeed possible to see the same divide between the life sciences and something that is maybe not strictly anthropological, but studying emotion and power, approaches focusing on the management of emotion as a tool of power. It is striking how prominent a life-science perspective, mainly from psychology, is in the studies of emotion (see for instance a majority of the chapters in Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2014; Schutz & Pekrun, 2007; as well as Day & Qing, 2009; Neville, 2013), where appraisal theory is a major sub-field, according to which the assessment of a situation or object leads to emotion (see e.g. den Brok, van der Want, Beijaard & Wubbels, 2013), as is goal relevance theory, focusing on the relevance of an action, event or circumstance to personal goals (see e.g. Schutz, Cross, Hong & Osbon, 2007; Turner & Waugh, 2007). This correlates with Plamper’s assertion that appraisal theory has been
attractive to the human sciences because it opens up for an impact of culture and history on judgements and subsequent emotions (Plamper, 2015, p. 266). Appraisal theory is indeed useful in countering the hydraulic view of emotions, where emotion is perceived as behaving like fluids ('flowing' or 'boiling' for instance) and separated from rational thought, because it ties emotion to objects that are judged to be important to us, which most probably differs from one society to another. Magda Arnold frames this as the core of appraisal theory:

To arouse an emotion, the object must be appraised as affecting me in some way, affecting me personally as an individual with my particular experience and my particular aims. (Arnold, 1960, p. 171)

Appraisal theory is relevant to this study because the emotional boundary work going on in the teaching easily fits into Arnold’s model of perception-appraisal-emotion. Appraisal theory will not be directly used in the analysis. However, traces of appraisal theory can be found in Sara Ahmed’s rather eclectic thinking on emotions and power, and therefore it plays a supporting role in the dissertation.

Perhaps as a consequence of the focus on the life sciences, a majority of the reviewed studies on emotions in education treat emotions as universal, often claiming to study a specific emotion and describing it in essentialist terms or seeing emotions as either pleasant or unpleasant (e.g. Linnenbrink, 2007). A possible reason for the great focus on psychology and universalism in the literature on emotions in education might be that in the public debate on education in Sweden (and maybe from the National Agency for Education?) there is often a demand placed on the educational sciences to be normative, instrumental and to able to give clear suggestions to school practitioners. The seemingly simple and unambiguous results of popularized life-sciences research can be very attractive under those circumstances. This could also explain the frequent use of the word ‘effective’ in the research field, wherein attention to emotion in education (and fostering ‘safe’ and ‘productive’ emotions in particular) is assumed to lead to more effective teaching and learning (Day & Qing, 2009; James, 2011).

Regarding emotion, education and power, Michalinos Zembylas is a strong representative of post-structural and political perspectives in anthologies dealing with emotions and education. Megan Boler, whose ground-breaking book Feeling Power (1999) is often referred to by others, also belongs here. Joakim Landahl (2015) made an interesting contribution on the school as an attempted emotional community, which has impacted the teachers’ situation over time in Sweden. Landahl focuses Swedish schools in the nineteenth century, when, after a period of
mechanical learning where students studied in large groups and acted as monitors (assistants) to other students and where the teacher’s role was limited, there was a shift towards emotional schooling through an emerging focus on the teacher, who through whole-class teaching was central in the classroom. The teacher was supposed to evoke feelings in the students partly through showing emotion. There is a beautiful quote from 1889, which says that it is important that the students direct their eyes toward the teacher so that ‘the emotional strings that vibrate in the heart of the teacher, more easily can strike the corresponding strings in the children’ (Kastman, 1889, cited in Landahl, 2015, p. 108). The most important emotion in schools at the time, according to Landahl, was love. Love towards school (making the students want to attend school), love towards God and, not least, love towards the nation.

These studies perform a critical and historical analysis of emotion management rather than argue for the use of emotion management for the purpose of effectiveness. Still, many of the authors in the reviewed literature on emotion and education touch on emotion management, mostly discussing the emotion management of teachers who are navigating the complexities of teaching as well as the conditions for their work.

Several of the researchers are cautious about emotion management in schools, which they see as linked to a desire to foster effective and smooth citizens. Megan Boler sees a risk in the concept of emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995) and the associated popular emotional literacy courses in US schools in the 1990s. Emotional intelligence is characterized by knowing one’s emotions: by managing emotions in oneself (soothing, shaking off and so on) and in others (underpinning ‘interpersonal effectiveness’); and by motivating oneself (Boler, 1999, p. 63). Boler sees the promotion of emotional intelligence and EQ as a powerful tool for the management of emotion under the banner of being beneficial to the individual.

Goleman’s book is a populariser of the kind Jan Plamper warns us of (Plamper 2015).10 Boler’s highly critical analysis of Goleman’s book suggests the equation of emotional intelligence and self-control as being ‘a blueprint for male CEO success’ (Boler 1999, p. 61). Boler also directs her critique at emotional literacy courses. She asserts that they can be used as a means to make ‘difficult’ students monitor themselves through ‘responsibility’ and ‘self-control’, which is touted as cost-effective compared to paying for safety measures at troubled schools (Boler, 1999, p. 86).

After studying a range of emotional literacy curricula and teaching practices she also worries that their focus is both individualistic and universalist. For example, Boler describes exercises where students are supposed to name emotions in observed facial expressions, which bears an uncanny resemblance to Paul Ekman’s work on basic emotions11 (Plamper, 2015, pp. 147). These exercises often fail to address political and cultural differences and lack discussion. They therefore consist of a set of pragmatic, utilitarian or even prescriptive rules on emotional behaviour (Boler, 1999, p. 103). David Hartley (2003, p. 11) also comments on emotional literacy courses as a form of behavioural management, resting on an interpretation of neuro-biological research and a presumed notion of what counts as a good citizen. The topic of emotional communities and emotion management will be discussed further in Chapter 3.

Teachers’ emotionality

A large part of the literature on emotions and education centres on teachers. The research on teachers often investigates emotional management or emotional labour12 in response to educational reforms, heavy workloads, being a newly examined teacher, difficulties in relation to classroom management and so on (see e.g. Day & Lee, 2011; Newberry, Gallant & Riley, 2013).

Previous research on teachers’ emotions shows enjoyment and pride as principal emotions connected to teaching (Frenzel, 2014, p. 495). This is a conclusion drawn in important early work on teacher’s emotions including Andy Hargreaves (1998) and Dan C. Lortie (1977). It is confirmed by more contemporary research using not just interviews but a variety of methods (see e.g. Becker, 2011; Carson, 2006; Darby, 2008; Frenzel et al., 2009; Sutton & Harper, 2009; Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). Frenzel rightly calls upon caution with these results by reminding us that the teaching profession is credited with high ideals and that teachers may therefore exaggerate their experience of enjoyment (2014, p. 496).

---

11 Ekman’s work on basic emotions (Ekman, 1992; 1999) states that there are basic emotions that are universal, regardless of culture. The basic emotions are expressed physically, to be seen in the face. Ekman tried to prove his statement through showing photographs of faces expressing ‘pure’ basic emotions (on command) to people from different cultures and having them pick the right emotion word out of six to describe the expression.

12 Emotional labour is a concept coined by the American sociologist Arlie Russell Hochschild (2012).
In this study, the data on Social Science teachers’ emotions is composed of both interviews and observations, which increases the reliability compared to a study that is exclusively founded on interviews. But there is also a possibility that teachers manage their emotions in the actual teaching situation because they are expected to show positive emotions in the contact with students to create a good atmosphere in the classroom in order to enhance student learning (Schutz et al. 2007). Thus, classroom observations are no guarantee for capturing unmanaged emotional expressions.

Kunter, Frenzel, Nagy, Baumert and Pekrun (2011) make a distinction, and assert the importance thereof, between feelings of enthusiasm derived from teaching and feelings of enthusiasm derived from the subject being taught. In a quantitative study they compared mainly mathematics teachers’ self-assessment of enthusiasm related to teaching and the subject respectively, compared with students’ assessment of the teachers’ enthusiasm. The students’ ascription of enthusiasm correlated with the teachers’ reports of ‘teaching enthusiasm’ but the teachers’ ‘subject enthusiasm’ was barely observable to the students. Kunter et al. found a dependency between teachers’ enthusiasm for teaching and the characteristics of the classes they taught, whereas enthusiasm related to the subject was independent of the classes taught (Kunter et al., 2011, p. 299). In line with many studies of education and emotion, Kunter et al. assess the connection between teachers’ emotions and effectivity. They come to the conclusion that enthusiasm related to teaching is more successful than enthusiasm related to the subject. Several researchers indeed relate teachers’ emotion primarily to the relationship with students (see for instance the work of Hargreaves and Nias).

This study will make a contribution through a concrete empirical focus on teacher emotionality in relation to the teaching of a particular school subject, Social Science, in contrast to the generic approach that permeates most of the previous research on teachers’ emotions. What specific joys and perils does the subject Social Science bring to education? The next section turns to the field of Social Science didactics and probes its contribution in relation to the research interest of this dissertation.

Social Science didactics

The research field Social Science didactics is relatively small in Sweden. Moreover, due to the multidisciplinary nature of the subject the research is, compared to other subject-specific didactics, mostly conducted in the field of educational sciences or
pedagogy. Only a few research projects have been undertaken in political science and none in sociology or economics (Kristiansson, 2015, p 7).

The perspective of this dissertation, although conducted in educational sciences, leans on sociology both through the way the investigation is conducted and the theories used (although none of the main theorists are labelled as sociologists, their relational focus is indeed sociological). The sociological character of the study will make a contribution to the field, because the relational perspective is indispensable to Social Science didactics. I am aware that the conceptualisation of ‘powerful knowledge’, discussed later in this chapter, stems from educational sociology, but its socio-realistic perspective is very different from the interactionist sociological perspectives on Social Science teaching deployed in this study, as elaborated in Chapter 3.

Swedish research on Social Science teaching and learning has been criticized for being theoretically ‘shallow’. In their study of nine dissertations, Göran Bergström and Linda Ekström (2015a) found that disciplinary theories were downplayed in favour of pedagogical theories, and that few of the research projects conducted theory-driven analyses. In the cases where disciplinary theory was used, it was taken from political science. Bergström and Ekström argue that an increased focus on theory would produce a different kind of knowledge, a knowledge that is not just derived from what teachers do, but that also analyses and challenges teachers’ practice (Bergström & Ekström, 2015a, p. 114). In relation to that verdict of the field, this dissertation contributes to the field by using interactionist theory in a theory-driven analysis.

The fact that Social Science is not a discipline in academia but rather leans on a number of different disciplines contributes to a complexity and ambivalence in the subject. This complexity and ambivalence are further added to by the fact that the subject was politically invented and has a normative character which, according to many, collides with an objective, disciplinary perspective. Social Science as a school subject in both compulsory and upper secondary school as well as the subject didactical research related to it, are young compared to related, but traditional subjects such as History and Religious Education. A sometimes frustrating, but also analytically interesting aspect of the subject social science adds to the complexity: it is different in different countries, which has several consequences. The research field of Social Science didactics in Sweden has not as yet decided what term to use for the subject when translated to English. Many actors, including the National Agency for Education, are using the American term Social Studies. That is slightly misleading though, because American Social Studies is a broader subject with its emphasis on history. Civics is an English term that refers to a subject that is similar to Social
Science, but it does not include economics. In this study, the term Social Science or Social Science education is chosen for the Swedish subject *Samhällskunskap*. It is not perfect because it suggests that Social Science is a ‘mini science’, but it is the best term currently available.

This chapter outlines the research field Social Science didactics in Sweden and places the study in this complex field. The positioning of the study in relation to the field then continues with regard to a tension that I have identified through a review of mainly Swedish research on Social Science teaching and learning – namely the tension between a disciplinary and a political perspective on Social Science. The tension resides partly within the subject/subject teaching and partly in the research on Social Science teaching and learning. The tension is a theme with variations and I will approach it from different dimensions and angles: disciplines-political dimension, emotionality-relationality, syllabus-curriculum, discussion-mini science, universalism-particularism. These dualisms seem to be the lifeblood of Social Science didactics. The constant negotiation between them seems to fuel at least the research – even though research has shown that Social Science teachers do not perceive the subject as fragmented as the researchers.

Defining the research field

Among Swedish researchers there is a clear tendency to try to pin down what the subject Social Science, its didactics and the research on it is or should be. Indeed, this tendency is connected to researchers’ view of the field as disintegrated, where the attempts to define the core of the subject or what should be the requirements of Social Science subject-specific research are either to be seen as positioning of the own perspective or as an attempt to get the disintegrated field together (see e.g Blanck & Lödén, 2017; Johansson, 2016; Kristiansson, 2015; Sandahl, 2018; Schüllerkvist & Karlsson, 2015). Another reason for this boundary work is that the research field is relatively young and small, compared to related subjects like History, Religious Education and Geography.

Like all boundary work, the definition of the borders of the research field is made in contrast to something else, something that it is not (Gieryn, 1983). In other words, Social Science didactics is not the didactics of its academic disciplines, among them political science, economics and sociology, even though they are of relevance (Sandahl, 2018). It is not outside the borders of the school. It is not focusing generic pedagogical problems which can as well be studied in other subjects. Gieryn (1983) has studied boundary work in academia regarding what is
considered science and what is not. Gieryn found that the boundary work is rhetoric and to a great extent consists of contrasting proper science to non-scientific activities, such as politics (which is made responsible for undesirable consequences of research). The latter constitutes a perhaps extra pressing concern for the subject Social Science because it is seen as being politically invented. Indeed, when arguing that society and socio-analytical thinking are the core concepts of the subject social science, Schüllerkvist and Karlsson (2015) as well as Blanck and Lödén (2017) emphasize that they are ‘internal goals’ of the subject, as opposed to ‘external goals’, which are an expression of political will (for example, according to these authors, equality and democracy are ‘external goals’ of the subject). In their boundary work around the subject, these authors move away from politics and towards disciplinary analysis.

This dissertation tries to bring in some new theoretical, empirical and analytical perspectives into the field, which can be seen as trespassing some of the stricter borders around it. The research object is Social Science teaching at upper secondary level in Sweden. It is subject-specific, related to the special content of the subject, and deals with the classical subject-specific questions: why, who, what and how. It is also firmly connected to all parts of the ‘didactical triangle’, that is, the reciprocal and dynamic structural relations between student, teacher and content.

That said, the focus on emotions and social dynamics has sometimes pulled the study in a more generic direction. It has been a constant balancing act to keep the subject didactic perspective as well as sometimes letting it stretch out into the more generic. This balancing act can constructively be understood as an exploration of the boundaries of the subject and subject didactics as such.
It is possible to roughly divide the research conducted in the field in two categories: one focusing problems regarding democracy and citizenship closely related to the purpose of the subject, the other focusing the how and the what of the subject (Kristiansson 2015, p. 7). The research on democracy and citizenship through education tends to be generic, letting go of the particular subject, even when the research is conducted in Social Science teaching. It revolves more around the school’s democratic mission than on the specificities and particular knowledge content of the subject (Sandahl, 2018). Therefore, the term often used to describe the former category is samhällsdidaktik and the latter samhällskunskapsdidaktik (Florin Sädbom, 2015, p. 60). Samhällsdidaktik is of relevance for the subject but the subject is not the focus of the study. In samhällskunskapsdidaktik, the problem and purpose of the research is clearly connected to the subject. It must be added to Kristiansson’s perspective that it is not just the what and the how that needs to be addressed, but also the why and the who. In this study the who is pivotal.

Englund (2005) makes a distinction between four educational philosophies: Progressivism, essentialism, reconstructivism and perennialism. These four philosophies are still highly deployable in an analysis of the debate on schooling and teacher education in Sweden and elsewhere, but they are also useful in analysing different conceptions of the subject Social Science and the research field studying it. A dividing line in the research on Social Science didactics in Sweden seems to be between progressivism and essentialism with essentialism gaining ground partly through the critical realism of the trending concept of ‘powerful knowledge’. That does not mean, however, that a subject conception that is more focused on predetermined subject content cannot be emancipating or strengthening for the students. It is just that the emancipation occurs through a certain disciplinary content – the knowledge a student needs to succeed in society, as chosen by the teacher or researchers. According to Martin Kristiansson (2015 p. 39), who might be considered an advocate of ‘powerful knowledge’, the vital point is to what extent the teacher manages to make this knowledge available to every student.

The different knowledge domains and conflicting interests inherent in the subject are visualized in the following model by Torben Spanget Christensen:
According to Christensen, different types of Social Science teaching put a different emphasis on the four knowledge domains. That valuing of the different knowledge domains can, in turn, be related to Englund’s educational philosophies: Progressivism puts a great emphasis on the lifeworld of the students. Essentialism strengthens the subject’s relation to its scientific disciplines. Reconstructivism emphasizes the normative democratic values and also the contemporaneity in critically dealing with topical issues.

A slightly different take on realms of knowledge in the teaching of Social Science is made by Tilman Grammes, who differentiates between a) lifeworld/everyday knowledge (situation), b) Bildung/school-knowledge (task), c) disciplinary, academic knowledge (problem/structure) and d) institutional/professional knowledge (case). In each of these four realms of knowledge, differentiated subject-didactical perspectives appear (Grammes, 2012, p. 164). Grammes uses the subject matter law as an example, where the everyday knowledge is the actual conflict in question (situation). In the realm of institutional/professional knowledge, this situation is turned into a case, where a third instance takes over a situation that the parties cannot solve. This instance has to make a decision that is in accordance with the law and execute it with force. The realm of disciplinary knowledge problematizes the other realms and analyses structures. It entails for instance philosophy of law, which can explain the difference regarding what is considered right in the everyday knowledge and what is right according to the institutional/professional realm or discuss perspectives on power using sociology of law. The school-knowledge contains an inter-relational judgement that makes use of all the other realms. That is the task of the Bildung. Grammes’ lifeworld is larger than Christensen’s lifeworld. Grammes’ lifeworld contains not only the students’ lifeworld, but everyday ‘natural’ situations and experiences, no matter who the subject is. The democratic values
are not explicit as by Christensen, but are assumedly to be found in all the
knowledge domains.

The different Social Science knowledge domains and realms of knowledge are all
present and active in this investigation because it is conducted in the teaching.
Emotions appear in the relations between these domains and realms, and all are
important when discussing emotions. I am thereby questioning a division between
a ‘warm’, emotional lifeworld and a ‘cold’, rational disciplinary knowledge (e.g.
Sandahl, 2017). This distinction between hot and cold builds on a division of emo-
tionality and rationality, which is the foundation of the traditional social scientific
analysis that I see as damaging for the Social Science teaching. For some of the
participants in this study, disciplinary knowledge is exactly what sparks emotion,
as in the case of the teacher Camilla (see Chapter 5), who expresses joy over using
her ‘toolbox’ from political science.

A predetermined or an open-ended subject?

This study exists within a tension in the research field Social Science education in
Sweden: the tension runs between, on the one hand, the idea of an open subject –
focused on social issues, fostering certain abilities through democracy in the class-
room – and, on the other hand, the idea of a content-focused subject that keeps
closer to the academic disciplines that the school subject Social Science leans on.
Foundational to the more open conception of the subject is the importance it at-
taches to student participation and influence on the education. According to this
idea, the subject is to a high extent unpredictable and ought to change with a chang-
ing body of students. Agneta Bronäss and Staffan Selander serve as an example of
this dualism in their much-cited text ‘Samhällskunskap som skolämne’. Their dis-
cussion on the purpose of Social Science signals a boundary between the subject as
consisting of different kinds of disciplinary knowledge (they categorize different
content as belonging to different academic disciplines) or as acclimatization into
democratic citizenship, where the subject teaching in itself has to serve as a good

In contrast to many researchers’ view of the subject as fragmented, the teachers
in both Roger Olsson’s (2016) and Göran Morén’s (2017a) dissertations have a
view of the subject as forming a solid whole. Morén investigates the concept of
social issues using different methods. In a curriculum study, Morén and Sara Iris-
dotter Aldenmyr (2014) find a tension between an essentialist view of the subject,
focusing on specified and pre-determined content, and a progressive view of the
subject, where the teaching is problem-focused, more open-ended and the training of certain abilities constitutes the core. In survey data on 74 Social Science teachers, Morén finds that the surveyed teachers do not see a tension or conflict between social issues-centred teaching and teaching geared towards specific content. Hence, for the teachers in the survey, social issues is not a controversial concept. However, when Morén interviews seven of the teachers, a more complex picture emerges: the teachers give an impression of being trapped in the syllabus and longing for a widening of the subject, something they achieve by using social issues as a point of departure in the subject, which makes these teachers less tied to a plan for the lesson. They seldom use a textbook and several teachers refer to the curriculum, where the value-oriented goals of the school are specified, rather than to the specific content in the syllabus. The teachers in Morén’s study turn to the curriculum, rather than the syllabus, to legitimate their teaching. According to these teachers the subject Social Science is found in the democratic mission of the school, not in the syllabus.

The aim of Olsson’s study is to contribute to the understanding of the relation between teachers’ thinking about the subject Social Science and their actual teaching. Olsson examines this relation through a questionnaire about teachers’ prioritized content in Social Science, interviews with the teachers about their subject conceptions and observations in the classrooms, focusing on teachers’ use of news in their teaching. Olsson finds that the four teachers’ priorities regarding the choice of content are similar. The observations of the teaching show that the teaching is aligned with the subject conceptions of the teachers, but that the teaching is focused on internal (academic) goals rather than external (civil) goals, whereas in the interviews about their subject conceptions, the teachers signal that internal and external goals are equally distributed. Olsson’s study reveals the prevalence of a strong tradition regarding the selection of content. This tradition is strong enough to override other factors framing the teaching practice (Olsson, 2016, p. 313).

The teachers in Morén’s and Olsson’s studies seem calm about what the subject is. This calm contrasts with the researchers’ boundary work in the field described earlier in this chapter, often in relation to their own research interests or theoretical underpinnings. An example of the latter is Blanck and Löden (2017), Kristiansson (2015) and Schüllerqvist and Karlsson (2011) who all advocate for the concept society as the core of Social Science. Another example is Jörgen Johansson’s counter-argumentation using the concept politics as the core of the subject (Johansson, 2016). This shows that in the research field there is a lot of territory-watching, which I guess is an everyday feature of academic work.
I support Sandahl’s (2018) suggestion that the field of research on Social Science education needs to work on creating a stronger epistemic community. I think it would be a constructive point of departure to agree on the subject having several cores or centres, not arguing about what is the centre or the core. Considering shared questions as central to the epistemic community gives rise to a multifaceted subject/research field, sharing a joint problem space where different actors will arrive at different answers to their shared problem space’s different questions. Perhaps the practitioners’ approach to the subject can enrich the somewhat nervous academic field of Social Science didactics, since dualisms easily lead to a form of reasoning where one perspective excludes the other. Such reasoning is not seen as beneficial in the case of Social Science didactics, no matter if it is disciplines vs. democratic mission, emotionalism vs. rationalism, universalism vs. particularism or discussion vs. ‘mini science’.

Discussion or ‘mini science’?

Related to the discussion above about the boundary work and gatekeeping of the subject is the tension between disciplinary knowledge and discussion. Taken to its extremes, discussion is what Torben Spanget Christensen has called ‘värdhusdiskussion’ (pub-talk), i.e. views on social issues and politics that are not founded on analytical, disciplinary knowledge and abilities (Christensen, 2013). The other extreme is viewing the subject as a ‘mini science’, where ‘soulless analysis’ (watching society from an outside), distances the students from society. Here, the fear is not of losing a disciplinary perspective, but of losing the students’ engagement in society (Sandahl, 2013), an engagement that might be founded on the kind of pub-talk Christensen is warning us of.

This tension is inherent in the ‘threshold concept’ thinking, where students supposedly pass a threshold into liminality, after which they hopefully enter into the bounded subject, often described as ‘thinking like a social scientist’ (Meyer & Land, 2005). Meyer and Land take their conceptual framework from ritual studies (see for instance Turner, 1969) and the associations to rituals are compelling. Their theory assumes a transitional journey, through which students change by passing thresholds into the bounded subject. What do they become? What kind of transitional journey can Social Science teaching offer? Who is allowed to pass the threshold into the subject at a certain time and in a certain place, depending on how the boundaries of the subject are drawn in that moment? What gets lost when passing the threshold? Engagement? Is engagement then not part of the subject? In the
‘threshold concept’ theory, the boundaries are both enchanting and disenchanting the subject. Students strive towards the dark, mysterious areas of the subject – the Social Science thinking that they do not yet master, but if they get there, what they find might be a disenchanted disciplinary analysis that might rob them of their idealism or love of political discussion.

Given these questions, an interesting area for research is the encounter between disciplinary knowledge and the students’ thinking. This dissertation’s focus on the reciprocal relation between the who and the what in Social Science teaching aims to strike a balance between emotions/experiences/opinions and critical analysis/disciplinary thinking, in a teaching that does not have to go to the extremes (pub-talk/mini science) but rather could use the interplay between these extremes to dare a transformation of students, teachers and subject alike through a kind of reciprocal recognition.

An important point of departure in this study, then, is that the subject can ‘do’ something in relation to the situation in the classroom. Presumably, teaching and learning a different school subject would cause divergences in the emotional community and social dynamics divergent in any given student body and teacher. What would cause these divergences is the subject specific content along with the expectations and experiences related to that subject and teaching of the subject – in short, the questions why, what, how and who. The assumption that different subjects can be researched as different emotional communities remains hypothetical in this study. An investigation comparing the emotional communities in the same student group with the same teacher but teaching different subjects would be a welcome contribution to the field.

A need for particularism

The symbolic boundaries of Social Science education supposedly vary with the composition of the group studying the subject. This dissertation positions the who as central to Social Science didactics. Placing the who centre stage inevitably leads to a trajectory of particularism as opposed to universalism in the research outcomes, what is a divergence from the universalistic perspective of ‘powerful knowledge’ currently advocated by many researchers of subject-didactics (see for instance Kristiansson, 2015; Nordgren, 2017). The impact of the composition of the group of students and teacher will in this dissertation be pinned down as critical for what the Social Science education is and can be. The hope that the academic disciplines are of use in dealing with unknown contexts and experiences beyond one’s own (Sandahl, 2018, p. 55) is
partly dependent on the pluralist who in the classroom providing those unfamiliar-contexts and experiences. By failing to relate the disciplines to personal knowledge and perspectives, they are not put into emancipating practice. Kenneth Nordgren has made an effort to combine the critical perspectives from the field of intercultural learning with powerful knowledge in the teaching of History. He refers to Young (2013) who states that powerful knowledge should enable the learner to ‘generalize their own experience and think beyond common sense’ (Nordgren, 2017, p. 669). Disciplinary powerful knowledge is then a tool that the students should apply on their experiences, but the definition of what is powerful knowledge is left to the teacher and researchers to decide. In the data of this study, we will find situations as described above, where the teacher tries to use disciplinary knowledge like Social Science perspectives in a way that Nordgren and Young are suggesting. But the situations in this study reveal that something is missing in the link between the disciplinary knowledge and the students in relation to intense emotive Social Science content. The universal disciplinary knowledge does not resonate with the students and an important task of this dissertation is to probe why that is the case.

An important contribution in Swedish research on Social Science didactics, is made by researchers at Högskolan Dalarna, who emphasize the importance of opening up for the potential of the unexpected in education, where the unexpected is seen as arising in the encounter between students, teachers and subject content (Olson, 2017, p. ii, see also Högberg, 2017; Morén 2017b; Persson & Thorp, 2017).

The who is a neglected research object in Social Science didactics, which largely has focused on teachers and curricula (Johnsson Harrie, 2011). For Englund (2005), one of the most well-known works in the field, the who in the guise of the student is absent. However, he very shortly addresses the impact of the teacher’s view on knowledge and the society as playing a part in education.

When the particularities of the students are addressed in research on Social Science education, it is most often in the form of students’ thinking as important information for the teacher in the process of structuring the education but not so much for the sake of understanding the actions of students in the classroom (see for instance Barton & Avery, 2016; Bronä & Selander, 2002). Emphasizing students’ thinking in order to make the teaching more effective resonates with much of the research on emotions in education reviewed earlier in this chapter, where affective and effective are worryingly proximate terms. A good example of a study that seeks to make teaching complex rather than streamlined is Nora E.H. Mathé (2019), which investigates Norwegian Social Science students’ perceptions of the concepts democracy and politics and makes a strong case for a form of Social
Science teaching that builds on students’ interests and values the multiperspectivity of the classroom. Barton and Avery suggest a need for more research on the dynamic between students’ thinking and the impact of instruction (and teachers’ gatekeeping), which they see as treated separately in the research (Barton & Avery, 2016, p. 1020).

A strong rationale for investigating the who is engagement – this is obvious in e.g. Sandahl (2013), where the teachers express a striking worry about a detachment between students’ engagement and their insights about the complexity and insolvability of social issues through Social Science perspectivity and analysis. The teachers experienced that the students’ engagement slackened because of the Social Science teaching. A relatively strong focus on students is found in Malin Tväråna’s (2014) licentiate thesis. Tväråna is clear about her view that school practice is formed reciprocally by all its participants and she sees the students’ perspectives as a neglected area in Swedish research on Social Science education (Tväråna, 2014, p. 15). Students’ conceptions of justice, their conceptions of civic reasoning about justice and the practice in the classroom are studied through phenomenographic analysis and content-oriented conversation analysis. An interesting observation in the study is that analysis in Social Science seems to be used mainly as an analysis of causes: if the teacher asks why? students interpret it as a question about the causes of something (a circumstance) rather than a question about reasons or arguments about different positions.

In two of the articles of his compilation thesis, Sandahl (2015a) clearly addresses the who. He investigates the tension between educating students in disciplinary thinking while maintaining their political engagement. Sandahl also introduces the concept of civic consciousness in response to the well-known concept of historical consciousness. Sandahl’s concept catches students’ orientation towards the future. Through interviews with students about their perspectives on democracy past, present and future, Sandahl finds normative stances along with a process and action orientation, which he finds useful in creating meaningful Social Science education. Sandahl discusses the importance of inviting the students into the teaching (2015a, p. 71). Sandahl, together with Tväråna, has a strong focus on the students in the classroom. Such a perspective needs more attention to complement the strong focus on teachers in the Swedish research on the subject Social Science. The particularities of the Social Science teachers are most often investigated through their conceptualisations of the subject or parts of the subject (Jonasson Ring, 2015; Lindmark, 2013; Odenstad, 2011; Olsson, 2016).

Apart from contributing with an enquiry into the particularities of the who in Social Science education, this dissertation hone in on the collective aspects of the
teaching, and is thus widening the more individualistic focus of the above-mentioned research. The emotional community of Social Science education and the Social Science boundary work are collective processes interplaying with the purpose, knowledge content and methods of Social Science. That said, individuals are not irrelevant in this study. Both individuals and collectives are indeed actors doing boundary work, such as gatekeeping in the Social Science teaching.

Gatekeeping of the symbolic boundaries

There is a dearth of research on the role of gatekeeping in Social Science education. Barton and Avery (2016) explicitly devote a section of their review of research on Social Science education to gatekeeping. The gatekeeping they write about is teachers’ instructional gatekeeping:

> In 1991, Thornton used the metaphor of “teacher as a gatekeeper” to describe teachers’ roles in deciding what and how to teach in their classrooms. This term endures because it resonates with so many social studies educators. Even in highly controlled settings – including those with nationally prescribed curricula and official school inspections – teachers make a great many curricular and instructional decisions. These include deciding what to emphasize within a unit of study, whether to encourage students’ questions (and how to respond to them), how to develop learning experiences, and how to create meaningful classroom discussions. (Barton & Avery, 2016, p. 1012)

Here, the teachers appear as the only gatekeepers in the classroom, which presents a far too simplistic picture of the dynamics of gatekeeping in the classroom. For example, the students’ watching of what social studies education is supposed to be is absent. This probably stems from single-track research questions, focusing only on the teacher and therefore missing the complexity of the classroom.

Tomas Englund’s (2005) primary research interest lies in how educational content is shaped through a struggle between ideologies. Education is therefore never neutral and school knowledge is an expression of certain relations of power. In Englund’s work there is a strong aspect of gatekeeping, manifested in curriculum codes, curricula, the goal-system, textbooks and what the teacher does (Englund, 2005, p. 137). Hence, the teacher is seen as a gatekeeper, but the teacher’s room to manoeuvre is in several ways limited from above. Englund does not see the students as gatekeepers.

Hess and Parker (2001) discuss ways forward regarding discussions in the classroom. It is striking that they see teaching and learning as controlled by the teacher,
both in terms of method and the choice of content (Hess & Parker, 2001, p. 281). Hess and Parker distance themselves from the particularities of the who in the classroom partly through focusing on teacher-predetermined teaching and partly through a narrow, disciplinary political science perspective.

In response to previous research on gatekeeping of Social Science education, this dissertation directs the attention towards both teachers and students. In doing so, the dissertation is able to capture interactive, relational boundary work. Crucially, the students will be shown to play an important role as gatekeepers of the Social Science teaching.

**Emotions and Social Science didactics**

There is also a dearth of research on emotions as a part of Social Science didactics. By using the search terms emotion, feeling, Social Science, social studies, civics and citizenship education, as well as talking to other researchers of Social Science didactics at conferences, I have found two strands of research: German and American. In Germany, the interest in emotions has grown the last couple of years, resulting in a number of academic texts and conferences on the theme of emotions and Social Science didactics. Notably, in 2019, the Bundeskongress politische Bildung, organized by among others the Bundeszentrale politische Bildung [Federal Agency for Civic Education] had the theme ‘Was uns bewegt. Emotionen in Politik und Gesellschaft’. ['What moves us. Emotions in Politics and Society. ’] This big conference is directed at German Social Science teachers and the conference theme indicates what is topical in the German Social Science didactics. Yet, the existing research states that there is a lack of research in the area (Besand, 2014; Frech & Richter, 2019).

Anja Besand (2014) traces the objective and rational policy analysis preferred by German Politische Bildung back to the aftermath of the Second World War and the notion of ‘Nie wieder’ (never again) of the German self-examination, which meant that political issues should not be dealt with on emotional ground. However, Besand effectively shows the contradiction that this safeguarding of politics from emotion is made with the help of emotionalism: ‘Nie wieder’ is an upbringing that values the feeling of shame. The advocates of a rational relation to political issues indeed use emotionality in arguing against emotionality, something that is also noted by Thomas Karlsohn in relation to the Swedish debate on education (Karlsohn, 2016b).
Besand unearths several central concepts from the subject area *politische Bildung* that have an apparent connection to emotion: *Betroffenheit* (to be touched by something), interest, motivation, empathy and not least *Politikverdrossenheit* (political apathy or disentchantment), which is seen as a threat to democracy and could be conceptualized as a lack of emotions in relation to politics (Besand, 2014, p. 378). This line of argument effectively turns the discussion the other way around and asks: is it not then an obvious task of Social Science education to systematically attach emotions to politics (re-enchant politics) rather than keep emotions out or suppress them? In her conclusion, Besand requests making the emotional dimension in politische Bildung less of a taboo, to make it a legitimate area for didactical reflection (p. 381).

In the anthology ‘*Emotionen im Politikunterricht*’ (Frech & Richter 2019), several German researchers on Social Science didactics elaborate on emotions in Social Science teaching. They all emphasize the need to attend to emotions in teaching, and all in different ways question a division between rationality and emotionality. The German perspective means a retrospect of the era of National Socialism as well as a current mobilization of the far-right, especially in the eastern parts of Germany, which has led to an intensified tendency, in e.g. politics and media, to use a division of rationality and emotionality in order to dismiss the movement as an emotional crowd. The contributions of the anthology are to a great extent theoretical and conceptual, although some are more hands-on didactical; for instance, one study advocates for an emotionally sensitive Social Science teaching that includes emotions at every stage of teacher planning (Petri, 2019; see also Petri, 2018). Importantly, the contributions implicitly or explicitly focus on the students and education for democratic citizenship. In the concluding chapter the lack of teacher emotionality is taken into consideration and a need for more empirical research that takes into account both teachers’ and students’ emotions is stressed (Massing, 2019, p. 243). That need is met in this dissertation. A further contribution of this study is the relational perspective, whereas the contributions in the anthology are mainly positioned in the realm of individuals’ relations to politics, and even in that relation the attention is on the what. The reciprocal relation between the who and the what, by contrast, is the focus of this dissertation.

Turning now to the United States, Social Studies is a subject that roughly includes civics and history. The examples of emotive content in Mark Helmsing’s article ‘*Virtuous subjects: A critical analysis of the affective substance of Social Studies Education*’ (2014) are almost exclusively taken from the history-part of the subject. Helmsing sees the encounter with America in Social Studies as the subject’s emotional core:
When we encounter America in social studies, we encounter not just a shared temporal and spatial construct, not just a political allegiance, but a set of particular feelings and the various emotions and affects that make these feelings meaningful. We learn how to feel pride, shame, fear, disgust, envy, joy, pity and sorrow for the world. (Helmsing 2014, p. 135-136)

Helmsing’s conclusion, the close relation between emotion and nation, stems mostly from a review of other researchers’ work. I would argue that it also stems from his focus on the feelings of pride and shame, where pride easily connects to patriotism and shame to injustices in the nation’s history. This is the content Helmsing raises in his article, e.g. slavery and the decision to use atomic warfare in the Second World War. Indeed, he describes the “civic dispositions” outlined by the National Standards for Civics and Government in its curriculum for Social Studies Courses, as requiring ‘taking pride in all that is American’ (Helmsing 2014, p. 133). It seems fair to argue that these feelings of pride and shame in relation to the nation possibly look different for different students.

Another review of research on emotion in social studies education (Sheppard, Katz & Grosland, 2015) shows a similar pattern. Of all the topics focused in the research, a majority would belong to the school subject History in Sweden, e.g. historical empathy and the Holocaust. Sheppard et al. are stating the ‘fragmentation of social studies into disciplines that aim to achieve objectivity and neutrality, therefore deemphasizing subjectivity and emotions’ as a reason for why emotive and controversial issues are ‘taboo’ within the subject (Sheppard et al. 2015, p. 149).

Contributions of this study

To conclude, understanding the role of emotions in Social Science didactics seems to need research that does not rely on the dualism between rationality and emotionality. Such research is beginning to grow, but the dualism of rationality and emotionality still seems to be affecting both research and Social Science teaching through a lingering idea of Social Science analysis as essentially objective and rational. This tenacious idea originates in the disciplines (maybe especially political science, as the teacher Camilla describes in Chapter 5) and possibly also, as in Germany in the reflective aftermath of the Second World War, in the fear of emotional ‘crowds’, posing a threat to democracy. Hence, this dissertation contributes to the field of Social Science didactics through firmly stating the importance of attending to emotions in Social Science teaching and also by choosing theoretical perspectives.
that bridge the divide between rationalism and emotionalism. Conducting research that does not use the division of cold academic disciplines and hot lifeworld/politicization has been of utmost importance in relation to previous research and will hopefully offer possible paths out of some of the cul-de-sacs of Social Science teaching and research.

An important contribution both to the field of Social Science didactics and the German ‘Emotionen und politische Bildung’ is the dissertation’s focus on both students and teachers through a relational perspective, which captures the emotional interplay between subject, students and teachers. It opens up for results including emotional teachers and gatekeeping students, which is something new in research on Social Science didactics. Placing the who centre stage means following a trajectory of particularism that is a needed input in a field currently very preoccupied with the universalistic concept of ‘powerful knowledge’. Bringing more theoretical depth to the field of Social Science didactics in Sweden has been a major part of this dissertation, aiming to fill the gap identified in the literature review.

So far, the contributions have concerned an extended view of Social Science teaching that supposedly bridges divides, yet when it comes to research on emotions and education, the contributions are rather made through a narrowing of the perspective. Teacher emotions, a topic only generically dealt with in research, are here investigated in relation to a particular subject and the concept of emotional communities, which has previously been generalizingly investigated on school level, is here narrowed to curriculum subject level. This investigation follows the assumption that different school subjects can be researched as different emotional communities, thereby posing different didactical challenges to teachers.

Last but not least, a contribution is made by not confining to just theoretically stating the importance of emotions in Social Science teaching, but empirically attending to what emotions do and what is specific in the Social Science teaching. In the next chapter, I will present and discuss the theoretical choices I have made, building on the analysis of the research discussed in this chapter.
This chapter establishes the theoretical framework within which the dissertation’s analysis will unfold. The chosen theories perform different functions: Chantal Mouffe’s conceptualization of the political combined with sociological interactionist theories provide an ontological background for the study. This background has consequences for the way the social phenomenon of Social Science teaching is studied - namely placing conflictuality and relationality at the core of the teaching. Sara Ahmed’s work on the relationality of emotion is operationalized to analyse what emotions do in the teaching. Barbara Rosenwein’s theorization of emotional communities serves to bridge relationality, emotions and the specifics of the school subject Social Science. Boundary work, finally, puts focus on the drawing of borders in/around the subject and in/around group identities, where gatekeeping signals the existence of symbolic boundaries. The section on boundary work elaborates on a theme that is central throughout the dissertation: that the affirmation of difference is essential in social identity building.

The objective of this chapter is to present the different theories and relate them to each other, in view of developing a theoretical perspective on Social Science teaching that contributes with something new and hopefully invigorating in the field. Apart from stating the ontological perspective, the function of the theories used in this dissertation is partly to achieve analytical consistency, and partly to make visible what otherwise would have been difficult to see, in this case primarily what emotions do in the teaching and learning of Social Science. That detailed analysis is needed in order to discuss emotions from a subject-didactical perspective.
A milestone for the shift to emotions as the main focus of the dissertation can be traced in the notes kept during the transcribing process. While transcribing the interviews from one of the schools, I noted that for both Shirin and Leyla, intensified emotion seems to have been the reason for withholding their perspectives in the teaching:

Shirin does not dare to say things e.g. because she will get pissed off. Leyla says that she is not speaking (her thoughts) because she will get pissed off. They do not want to let their feelings out in the classroom, or not show their indignation? New focus for analysis.

It seemed clear from these statements that emotion was seen as a great risk in the Social Science teaching, and so investigating the mechanisms behind this perception became central to the dissertation. The silence of Leyla and Shirin and its relation to politicization and perspectivity in the teaching was intriguing. With this new focus, emotion could be traced everywhere in the material. Initially, I used interactionist theory from social psychology/sociology (Erving Goffman, Arlie Russell Hochschild, Thomas Scheff) to try to figure out the mechanisms of the interactional orders and social bonds in the groups of students/teachers. The concept of social bonds is used in sociology to describe what keeps society or humans in society together. Thomas Scheff, for example, analyses how social bonds are built and broken in interaction between humans. According to Scheff, it is a continuous process and the bonds are inherently unstable and under threat. Feelings of pride and shame signal the condition of the social bond. If the bond is threatened, one feels shame and that gives an incentive to act to strengthen the bond. If the bond is strengthened, on the other hand, one feels pride, a sense of belonging, Scheff uses the term attunement: to be attuned is to understand each other, not only cognitively, but also emotionally, to be in tune with another person, be on the same wavelength (Aspelin, 1999, p. 39-40). Even though these interactionist theories were highly applicable to the material and provided deeper insights in the social workings of the classroom, they did not highlight the political aspects of what was happening. The relation between the political and emotional in Social Science teaching and learning had the prospect of holding a key to a forward-reaching plurality and raison d’être of the subject Social Science. This assumption leans on the perspective that conflictuality is fundamental in the subject Social Science and that a multi-polar society is fundamental to conflictuality.

Despite interactionism being an ontological foundation of the study, I needed a theory that could link relationality and emotionality to the political and also be
more historical and future-oriented than the synchronic sociological perspectives.¹³ Sara Ahmed’s *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (2014) as well as theory on symbolic boundaries seemed to be able to do just that, for reasons that will be discussed in this chapter.

**A functional definition of emotion**

Emotions are elusive. The history of the study of emotion across several scientific fields has given a plethora of definitions of what emotions are. Numerous experiments have been carried out in experimental psychology and the neurosciences in order to capture what emotions are, but none of them have been successful (for a rigorous attempt to cover the history of emotions across several scientific disciplines, see Plamper, 2015). The term emotion was constructed to cover a wide range of different types of feelings with different intensity and duration. It is convenient to use because it covers so much.

I have chosen to use the term emotion rather than the term affect because of the common perception of the latter as concerning physical, prelinguistic emotion (Plamper, 2015, p. 12). The term feeling is used synonymously with emotion to vary the text. This is in line with Ahmed and Rosenwein, but not with Mouffe who, as discussed in the next section of this chapter, narrows the concept of emotion to define the individual, which leads to the need for the term passion to define collective identities.

This study does not set out to investigate what emotions are. The centre of attention is what emotions do in relation to Social Science education. The dissertation thus sees a functional definition of emotion according to which emotions are relational and depend on contact with objects and others. Emotions involve perceptions of and orientations towards persons or objects. There is a direction in that orientation. Emotions are thus dynamic, influenced by the individual *and* the social context.

The use of the term emotion is both convenient and slightly vague. It is a catch-all term. As Rosenwein points out, many European languages have more than one word for emotion. The French make a distinction between *émotion* and *sentiment*, where an *émotion* has violent connotations and is more quick in the passing, while

¹³ By synchronic is meant that the interactionist sociological perspectives are primarily focused on what happens here and now, while often neglecting the history that the present situation is founded on and the normative ideas concerning future developments.
a sentiment lasts longer and is more delicate. The Germans make a similar differentiation between strong and irrational *Gefühle* on the one hand and subtle and contemplative *Empfindungen* on the other (Rosenwein 2006, p. 3).

The use of the term emotion, or feeling for that matter, which covers roughly the same lexical field (Rosenwein, 2006, p. 3), in this study might signal that it covers all kinds of feelings in the classroom. This is not the case. During my observations I tracked intensity, which captures the kinds of feelings close to the *émotions* or *Gefühle*, i.e. outwardly-directed emotions, often dramatic and violent. This study does not investigate low-key feelings like boredom or contentment. Similarly, in the interviews, the questions about emotiveness sparked answers about intense emotion or statements about the Social Science teaching not being emotive at all. An assumption is that the students who asserted that the education has not been emotive have not been *emotionless*, but have rather not felt passionate, intense emotions in relation to the subject.

The reason for focusing on intense emotions is that it allows me to bring out the nature and dynamics of conflictuality and its relation to the political and boundary work. Emotions play a key role in disputes. As stated in Chapters 1 and 2, conflictuality is considered to be at the core of Social Science education and has received a growing interest from Swedish researchers on Social Science education (see e.g. Larsson, 2018; Ljunggren et al., 2015). But paying attention to controversial discussion is definitely not novel. Grammes (2012, p. 112) uses Joseph Priestley (1733-1804) as an example. Priestley writes in his 'Essay for the course of liberal education for civil and active life' (1765): ‘If the subject be a controverted one, let the tutor refer to books written on both sides of the subject.’ There are aspects of controversy in the rhetoric of antiquity. If we go beyond ‘western’ culture we could probably go further back in time. Indeed, emotions are often conceptualized as if they are universal. However, looking at different cultures, such as those in Asia which are considered to be averse to conflict, one might need to consider differing *ways* of performing controversy (Grammes, 2012, p. 11).

The principle of conflictuality is concentrated in the well-known sentence ‘We agree (in principle) to disagree (about other issues)’, and it is in line with the agonistic approach to citizenship education discussed in the next section.

To conclude, the emotions investigated in this study are what some might call heated, though I am principally against a division of warm and cold, red and blue, since it is too simplistic. In Social Science didactics as well as in history didactics, a circular model is used, containing a red, hot lifeworld part, a cold blue disciplines part and a purple area where the two dimensions meet. From the perspective of this study, such a model is too simplistic, as it treats emotions in an essentialist way. We
cannot assume that lifeworld knowledge is always warm while disciplinary knowledge is always cold, or that emotions can be universally divided in good or bad, hot or cold. Instead, I frame the emotions in this study as intense and possibly outward-reaching. They signal contestation, a prerequisite for the political and hence for the movement and attachment forming different political divisions between us and them in the Social Science teaching.

The political as point of departure

Chantal Mouffe makes a theoretical distinction between the political and politics. The political is the dimension of antagonism that according to her is fundamental (or ever present) in human societies, whereas politics is the attempt to establish an order under the conflictual conditions that are marked by the political. Antagonism is thus seen as an ontological prerequisite for social life – a society beyond division and power is not possible (Mouffe, 2014).

Mouffe believes that a liberal-democratic hegemony is present in today’s society, which leads to a blurring of political dividing lines. According to Mouffe, this threatens democracy, because it excludes legitimate political alternatives. Political conflict is not a problem that should be overcome but a power that can be channelled into political commitment. What is most important is to see each other as legitimate adversaries (agonism), but not as enemies (antagonism). The ideal for Mouffe is a multipolar world rather than a consensus-based cosmopolitanism (Mouffe, 2008).

The use of the political as a point of departure differentiates this thesis from the idea of deliberative Social Science education. The past twenty years have seen an ongoing discussion between advocates of a deliberative and agonistic approach to citizenship education (Tryggvason, 2018b). At the centre of the debate are classroom discussions, where a deliberative approach focuses on respectful communication, where differing opinions can meet, but the aim is to overcome differences and conflict and form some form of collective will (see e.g. Englund 2016). The agonistic approach on the other hand stresses the political dimension of conflict, where a confrontation as legitimate adversaries is pivotal and consensus is not possible because power structures will make that consensus hegemonic, ruling out diverging opinions in the group. The agonistic aim is that different collective identities take form in relation to each other in the classroom discussion (see for instance Ruitenberg, 2009; Tryggvason, 2018b; Zembylas, 2011).
Thus, the agonistic approach, building on the idea of the political, does not try to separate the object of debate from emotions and identities, whereas the deliberative approach tries to single out the object of debate from emotions and identities. It would be wrong to conclude that emotions are rejected by the deliberative perspective. Englund (2016), for instance, advocates the importance of commitment in political debate in the classroom, which indeed involves emotion (Tryggvason, 2018a, p. 5).

Embracing the close connection between emotion and the political in the agonistic approach, it is possible to see the movement and attachment in Ahmed’s thinking on what emotions do as the political at work. More specifically, it is the constant drawing and redrawing of the boundaries between us and them. If we were to conceptualize political emotions in line with Mouffe, they can either be emotions related to politics, i.e. concerning objects belonging to the realm of politics, or related to the political, i.e. concerning objects belonging to a wider realm of contention and power-relations (see also Heidenreich, 2019, p. 29). That way of conceptualizing political emotions questions the ideas of Claudia Ruitenberg (2009) and Diana Hess (2009). Ruitenberg makes a distinction between political emotions and moral emotions and thereby excludes moral emotions from the realm of the political. Hess defines controversial political issues as regarding public policy. If we connect political emotions to conflictual-ity, moral emotions can indeed be political.

Interestingly, emotion plays an important role in Mouffe’s theorizing of the political. According to Mouffe, there is an emotional dimension in people’s political interest. If that dimension is ignored by present politics, it tends to play into the hands of populists, because the universal consensus, idealized by the current liberal hegemony is based on rationalism, in a form that excludes emotion from politics. Populists can thus channel people’s political emotions and turn them away from democratic designs.

However, diverging from Ahmed, Mouffe sees the need for using another term than emotion because she sees it as too tied to the individual:

Let me stipulate from the outset that from the perspective that I advocate it is essential to distinguish between “passions” and “emotions”. Indeed it is with regard to the political domain that my approach has been elaborated and one of its central tenets is that in that field we are always dealing with collective identities, something that the term “emotions” does not adequately convey because emotions are usually attached to individuals. To be sure “passions” can also be of an individual nature but I have chosen to use that term, with its more violent connotations, because it allows me to underline the dimension of conflict and to suggest a confrontation between collective political identities, two aspects that I take to be constitutive of politics. (Mouffe, 2014, p. 149)
Mouffe thus reintroduces the term passion, with its metaphysical connotations, which in the early nineteenth century was replaced by the more secularized and convenient concept of emotion. For Mouffe, passion is the driving force in the political field (Mouffe, 2014, p. 6).

The historical change from passion to emotion was deeply influenced by the rise of psychology as the dominant science of emotions (Plamper, 2015, p. 173). The term emotion is therefore deeply connected to psychology, but Ahmed uses the term emotion in a way that critiques and leaves behind the psychological interiority of emotion. Hence, when thinking emotion with Ahmed, Mouffe’s distinction between emotion and passion becomes irrelevant in the signalling of collectiveness. For Ahmed, collectiveness is an essential feature of emotion.

The violent connotations of the term passion would perhaps be useful in this study, as a clarifier to the sort of emotions studied, since the type of emotions studied are the intense emotions associated with the political dimension of Social Science teaching and learning. However, for the sake of consistency and to keep close to Ahmed, I have chosen to use the term emotion throughout the study.

This study uses the term *politicization* for defining when a specific Social Science content becomes political in the sense that boundaries between us and them are drawn in relation to that content. The use of the term in this study diverges from how it is often used in political science. Political science often focuses on the state stepping into and regulating practice. The Oxford Dictionary of the Social Sciences defines politicization as a ‘process through which certain issues become objects of public contention and debate, and are thereby legitimated as concerns of the state or political realm. Politicization is therefore generally a contentious process […]’ (Calhoun 2002).

The use of the concept politicization in this study is in line with the ontological perspective of the political. A point of departure is that politicization does not depend on verbal articulation. Boundaries between us and them can be drawn without verbally expressed opinions (Tryggvason, 2018b, p. 53). But in situations such as those in Chapter 8, where resistance is withheld and thus concealed, the politicization is indeed more difficult for the teacher to address and it has less potential to make the group of students and teacher *politically aware* (see the entry ‘Politicization’ in the *Oxford Dictionary*).

The topics of silence and politicization is discussed in Chapter 8 in relation to withheld emotions and opinions. Research on silence and education could be roughly divided into a) research that instrumentalizes silence in educational contexts as beneficial for reflective learning (for instance through mindfulness), beneficial for the learning environment, or as a resistance to neo-liberal pressure (e.g.
Cain, 2013; Lees, 2012; Li Li, 2005); and b) research that investigates silence in relation to power relations and exclusion, for instance in critical race studies, gender studies and history of education (e.g. Burke & Grosvenor, 2011; Castagno, 2008; Jones, 2005; Landahl, 2011; Stauber, 2017).

An analytical point of departure in this study is that silence and speech are not opposites when it comes to what they do or represent. They are different kinds of articulation. Speech is not necessarily connected to power and silence is not necessarily connected to oppression. Silence can be used as a resistance to being engulfed or rejected by a hegemonic discourse. The reaction against Mahmood in Chapter 9 is an example of a forceful rejection that can be avoided through withholding speech. Mahmood does not necessarily appear as more powerful through making his voice heard.

In her essay ‘Freedom’s silences’ Wendy Brown (2005) makes a powerful case suggesting that breaking silence is not always the best option. She warns against automatically seeing speech as the truth.

Silence and speech are not only constitutive of but also modalities of one another. They are different kinds of articulation that produce as well as negate each other. Silence calls for speech, yet speech, because it is always particular speech, vanquishes other possible speech, thus cancelling the promise of full representation heralded by silence. Silence, both constituted and broken by particular speech, is neither more nor less “truthful” than speech is, and neither more or less regulatory. Speech harbors silences; silences harbor meaning. (Brown, 2005, p. 83)

/to be invisible within a local discourse may occasion the injuries of social liminality, such suffering may be mild compared to that of radical denunciation, hystericalization, exclusion, or criminalization. (Brown, 2005, p. 87)

Brown acknowledges the silences in dominant discourses as corridors to be filled with explosive counter tales but sees speech as at risk of establishing regulatory norms and disciplinary power (p. 84). The role and position of silence in relation to Social Science teaching will be discussed in Chapter 8.
Emotional communities, emotion management and the good citizen

This section discusses two concepts that aim to capture the relation between emotion and power. They are important here since they link up with the purpose and function of the subject Social Science, as well as the relationality of emotion. These concepts are **emotional communities** and **emotion management**. The first stems from the history of emotion, while the latter is recorded in the sociology of emotion.

To discuss the conceptualization of emotional communities, it is helpful to use the concept **emotional regimes** as a point of departure. William Reddy defines emotional regimes as ‘the set of normative emotions and the official rituals, practices and emotives\(^{14}\) that express and inculcate them’. He goes on to define them as ‘a necessary underpinning of any stable political regime’ (Reddy, 2001, p. 129). Hegemonic regimes create the need for emotional refuges: organizations, relationships and rituals where the emotional norm is relaxed or even reversed.

The concept of emotional regime has been criticized for its resemblance to nation states, which historically are a relatively recent invention (Plamper, 2010, p. 242) and further because it ‘may overlook varieties and localisms’ (Rosenwein, 2006, p. 23). Barbara Rosenwein instead suggests that there are various emotional communities at any given time. Arlie Hochschild’s (2012) flight attendants for example, who we will discuss later in this section, are part of one emotional community at work and another at home. Moving between emotional communities can be painful, though not necessarily so.

An emotional community is a group in which people have a common stake, interests, values and goals. Thus, it is often a social community. But it is also possibly a “textual community”, created and reinforced by ideologies, teachings, and common presuppositions. (Rosenwein, 2006, p. 25)

\[...\] if emotions are part of daily (indeed, continuous) evaluations of weal and woe, then they must have been as much a part of intimate family constellations as of high politics. For emotions are among the tools with which we manage social life as a whole. /.../ Given this fact, let me suggest a historical approach to the emotions that takes into account the new non-hydraulic theories of emotions, focuses on more than power and politics, and

\(^{14}\) Emotives is one of Reddy’s key terms. He defines emotives as: ‘A type of speech act different from both performative and constative utterances, which both describes (like constative utterances) and changes (like performatives) the world, because emotional expression has an exploratory and self-altering effect on the activated thought material of emotion’ (Reddy, 2001, p. 128).
recognizes the complexity of emotional life. People lived - and live - in what I propose to call "emotional communities." These are precisely the same as social communities - families, neighborhoods, parliaments, guilds, monasteries, parish church memberships - but the researcher looking at them seeks above all to uncover systems of feeling: what these communities (and the individuals within them) define and assess as valuable or harmful to them; the evaluations that they make about others' emotions; the nature of the affective bonds between people that they recognize; and the modes of emotional expression that they expect, encourage, tolerate, and deplore. (Rosenwein, 2002, p. 842)

This conceptualization underlines the heterogeneity of emotions in each society. We are part of several different emotional communities and we constantly move between them. Rosenwein’s theory counters the hydraulic view of above all John Huizinga and Norbert Elias, who have argued that emotions in the Middle Ages were unrestrained, in contrast to the restraint and control of emotions that we see in modernity. According to Rosenwein, emotional communities in the Middle Ages represented different levels of restraint and unrestraint, which existed in parallel, at the same time.

Emotional communities are defined by the researcher’s focus. It is thus an analytical concept: every social community can be investigated as an emotional community if the researcher is investigating systems of feeling. The result of that investigation could possibly be that there is no emotional community because no system of feeling is discernible. The difficulty is rather to decide where the boundaries of each emotional community lie. Rosenwein has been criticized for the porousness of the emotional communities: where does one community stop and where does another start? Are they really separate when people constantly move between them (for an extended discussion of this issue, see Plamper, 2010). I would argue that defining the exact boundaries of an emotional community is impossible, because its character is elusive. The porousness is rather a characteristic of the boundaries of the emotional community and ought not to hinder research on emotional communities. They must be allowed to change, overlap and be ‘liquid’.

Following Rosenwein’s conceptualisation, it seems clear that school is neither an emotional regime nor an emotional refuge, but rather an emotional community. Still, schools are in an interesting position because they also represent the state and are involved in the fostering of democratic citizens. For these reasons, I assume that the emotional community of schools always share characteristics with an overarching emotional regime and that they therefore cannot be emotional refuges in Reddy’s sense, because they are not providing ‘a safe release from prevailing
emotional norms’. This circumstance might be at its most pronounced in the subject Social Science, because of its traditional responsibility for the democratic mission of the school system in Sweden.

A fundamental part of the subject Social Science in Sweden has been the so called ‘democratic mission’. There has been a strong focus on the role of schools in fostering democratic citizens ever since the Second World War, even though the means and ways of doing it have shifted over time: from avoiding blind belief in authority in the 1940s, to a focus on individual freedom of action in the 1960s, to socialization into predetermined democratic values in the 1990s (Dahlstedt & Olsson, 2013). The strong focus of the Swedish school system on the democratic mission has been described as being exceptional, in that more curriculum hours are devoted to it when compared to most European countries (Hakvoort & Olsson, 2014).

Landahl argues that the emotional community in school is never static, indeed never really there. It is constantly changing, and so studying the emotional community in school is studying the process (and struggle) of constructing an emotional community rather than studying an existing emotional community (Landahl, 2015, p. 106). The emotional community is a goal. I would argue that this is not exclusive for schools but could probably be said about all emotional communities: all are in a constant process of construction. What is different is that the school is commissioned to foster the nation’s citizens, something that has to affect the process of emotional community building. Landahl further argues that emotional labour is a fundamental part of teachers’ work, and in different times this labour is more or less demanding depending on the divergence or convergence between teachers’ goals and the overarching mission of the school system.

In her work on the commercialization of human feeling, Arlie Russell Hochschild (2012) uses the concept of ‘feeling rules’. Feeling rules are emotional conventions directing people’s actions. According to Hochschild, you know there is a feeling rule at work when you sense a pinch between ‘what do I feel’ and ‘what should I feel’ (Hochschild, 2012, p. 57). If that pinch is unpleasant, the person sensing it might react by doing emotional labour, including surface acting (changing one’s appearance in order not to show the feeling), or deep acting (oppressing an unfitting emotion or working to induce a fitting emotion) (Hochschild, 2012, p. 36-37). Hochschild studied above all the emotional labour of flight attendants:

For the flight attendant, the smiles are a part of her work, a part that requires her to coordinate self and feeling so that the work seems effortless. To show that the enjoyment takes effort is to do the job poorly. Similarly, part of the
job is to disguise fatigue and irritation, for otherwise the labor would show in an unseemly way, and the product – passenger contentment – would be damaged. Because it is easier to disguise fatigue and irritation if they can be banished altogether, at least for brief periods, this feat calls for emotional labor. (Hochschild, 2012, p. 8.)

According to Landahl, the emotional labour that teachers perform is not just temporary emotional labour, as for Hochschild’s flight attendants but, because of the longer time a teacher spends with a group of students, a continuous attempt at emotional community building.

Landahl describes an emotionalization process in the Swedish school system from the middle of the nineteenth century, when the teacher was in focus and was supposed to try to build an emotional community that shared love for the school linked to a love for the nation and God. The teacher (in focus in the classroom) was supposed to show feelings so as to invoke the same feelings in the students. In the middle of the twentieth century this was followed by a de-emotionalization of schooling, where religiosity and patriotism lost ground and whole-class teaching was interrupted by group- and individual work (Landahl, 2015, p. 114). Landahl traces a re-emotionalization of schooling at the end of the twentieth century, but one with an individual therapeutic focus (see e.g. Bartholdsson, 2008; Furedi, 2004).

A further argument for investigating schools or school systems as emotional communities is that the term community captures relationality in a way that regimes do not. Because of the social and relational character of the work of schools, Rosenwein’s concept is more apt, and so I chose it partly because of the social and relational nature of emotions (Rosenwein, 2006, p. 25).

Social Science education as an emotional community

As stated above, the concept of emotional communities can be used to investigate how systems of emotions demarcate the boundaries between groups. It thus has an interactionist approach, it is inter-subjective, and it is useful in investigating different kinds of institutions.

[…] the term emotional community is sometimes employed as a means for understanding the socially integrating emotional forces that can be set in motion within various kinds of institutions. (Karlsohn 2016a, p. 2)
Early on in the fieldwork I got the impression that the students perceived the experiences and emotions I was asking about as of less importance in the subject Social Science than in other subjects, most specifically in Religious Education, but also in Swedish (further discussed in Chapter 6). This forces us to nuance Landahl’s assertion that school is an attempted emotional community with the idea that the different subjects can be researched and treated as different emotional communities.

The boundaries of the emotional communities may be clearer in theory than in practice (Karlsohn, 2016a, p. 4). The borders of emotional communities are admittedly porous as they overlap and share some characteristics with each other. However, as we will see in Chapter 6, it seems clear from an analysis of the empirical material that different school subjects involve different emotional communities or systems, where what is beneficial in one subject is harmful in another, where the evaluation of others’ emotions are different as are the expressions of emotions that are encouraged, accepted, discouraged and tolerated (to use Rosenwein’s words). The maintenance of the emotional community of the subject Social Science is part of the gatekeeping going on in relation to the subject, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

From this perspective, as students go through their school day they move between different emotional communities. These communities are not only defined by the lesson/free time division; they are also marked by different expectations regarding different subjects. Landahl’s perception of school as an attempted emotional community, discussed above, is in several ways rewarding, but it is too generalizing from this viewpoint. Still, it is important to keep Landahl’s assertion that emotional communities are not static but under constant construction and that emotional communities are not fixed but constantly in the making.

Defining the ‘good citizen’

This dissertation is driven by the assumption that students in and through Social Science education develop knowledge and abilities that affect their feeling of being members of society (see also Odenstad, 2018, p. 9). Schools’ definitions (or definitions produced in school) of the good citizen or the good Social Science student affect students’ opportunities. As Michèle Lamont points out, such definitions are an exercise of social power. They create boundaries that frame people’s lives (Lamont 1992, p. 13.) There are ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ sides of those symbolic boundaries.
Social Science education inherently plays a part in defining the ‘good citizen’, in virtue of being the primary educational site for fostering citizens (Biesta, 2011, p. 31). The definition made in the Social Science teaching draws symbolic boundaries that include a division between *us* and *them*. A point of departure in this study is that this can be studied through paying attention to emotional boundary work in relation to the knowledge content of the subject.

As Biesta points out (2011, p. 32), socialization into a certain citizenship-identity (civil identity), can elicit resistance that can give rise to political subjectivity and participation. The reception of this resistance in class is crucial for boundary work that separates *us* and *them*, which is closely linked to the concept of recognition (Honneth, 1994). In Axel Honneth’s conceptualization of recognition, being viewed as an autonomous person with legal, civil and human rights (being the same as other citizens) is as important for the feeling of being a member of society as being viewed as having a potential to contribute with something specific and particular to the community and society and knowing that this contribution is valued. The tensions in Honneth’s conceptualization of recognition echo the tension between Biesta’s socialization and subjectification. These tensions are similar to the democratic paradox in the subject Social Science, which is a tension between fostering democratic citizens and at the same time adopting a critical perspective.

The constant struggle for recognition, with its transformative power (Heidegren, 2009), is closely linked to conflictuality and multiperspectivity, which I see as core features of the subject Social Science. In the subject Social Science, recognition is especially interesting because it is performed or experienced on an interactional and an institutional level, where both the school and the state can be seen as institutions. A reciprocal recognition is needed, it is not just the students who struggle for recognition, the teacher as well as the subject per se, the school and even the organization of society can be recognized or rejected. Struggles for recognition are present in this study, represented by the boundary work in/around the subject teaching as well as within the social group composed of students and teacher.

**Symbolic boundaries and gatekeeping**

Seeing the subject as bounded, at least partly distinct from other subjects, and under constant pressure to change, raises several questions: of how and why are symbolic boundaries around the subject drawn? Who watches over the borders of the subject and how? As noted in Chapter 2, the gatekeeping of Social Science education has scarcely been researched in Social Science didactics. Where gatekeeping is
addressed in the research, the teacher is positioned as the gatekeeper, though more or less limited/influenced by different framing factors. Students seem absent as gatekeepers of Social Science education. This is an interpretation that this dissertation challenges.

Researching the gatekeeping of the Social Science teaching must be performed with several tiers in mind: Who performs it is one tier. What is considered ‘in’ and ‘out’ is another. The enforced boundaries of the subject are also multi-layered. Furthermore, the character (or fabric) of the boundaries of the subject needs to be considered: are they as thresholds that are traversable? Are they massive walls that take great force to breach? Or should they rather be seen as membranes (see e.g. Goffman, 1961), where some of what is outside is allowed to seep through?

As previously noted, the division between us and them, i.e. the political, can be studied through paying attention to emotional boundary work in relation to the knowledge content of the subject. Analysing boundary work in the Social Science teaching opens up for studying the emotional community of Social Science teaching as the borders of that community are under constant negotiation. As is the case with emotional communities, symbolic boundaries are never stable and constantly under construction.

Boundary work is the never-ending process of drawing, maintaining, defending, destabilizing and re-drawing symbolic boundaries. Gatekeeping can thus be seen as one of several forms of boundary work. Other forms include ‘gate-crashing’ and the pushing of boundaries. Emotions are thereby used to both strengthen and destabilize symbolic boundaries. Emotions can be seen as signalling where an individual or group is positioned in relation to any given boundaries. You can feel the symbolic boundaries and how they move you in relation to others. Boundary work (Gieryn, 1983) is often seen as an attempt to create borders between us and them. The political and conflictuality depend on boundary work. Groups drawing boundaries around themselves or their activities have shared conceptions of themselves where fundamental norms and values they hold define the group and its activities (Riesch, 2010, p. 461). Boundary work is thus always relational and closely related to social identity building, where a group is defined through a differentiation or contrasting from other groups. Michèle Lamont defines symbolic boundaries as ‘the types of lines that individuals draw when they categorize people – and high-status signals – the keys to our evaluative distinctions’ (Lamont 1992, p. 2). When symbolic boundaries are institutionalized, they become social boundaries, which affect the distribution of resources and the possibility to act.
Boundary work is also a way of developing a sense of group membership; it creates bonds based on emotions, similar conceptions of the sacred and the profane, and similar reactions against symbolic violators. More generally, boundaries constitute a system of rules that guide interaction by affecting who comes together to engage in what social acts. They thereby also come to separate people into classes, working groups, professions, species, genders and races. Therefore, boundaries not only create groups, they also potentially produce inequality because they are an essential medium through which individual acquire status, monopolize resources, ward off threats, or legitimate their social advantages, often in reference to superior lifestyle, habits, character, or competences. (Lamont 1992, p. 12)

But boundaries are not only drawn to define people or groups, they are also drawn to categorize objects and practices (Lamont, 1992, p. 9). Thus, it is possible to study the symbolic boundaries drawn to define the Social Science subject as well as the teaching of Social Science. These boundaries can include or exclude for instance specific knowledge content, values, interactions, emotions, attitudes, abilities and methods. They can also include or exclude the participants in Social Science teaching, forming a specific we in Social Science education that is partly dependent on Social Science didactics. These processes affect the accepted perspectivity in the teaching as well as processes of recognition and their resulting sense of belonging. A specific symbolic boundary created in the teaching of Social Science is the boundary around the good citizen, as discussed earlier in this chapter. It is discursively created in the curriculum and syllabi and also in the teaching situation.

The character of symbolic boundaries is supraindividual but both individuals and groups are actors doing boundary work. Groups draw boundaries ‘in the process of defining their own identity, ideology and status against that of other groups’ (Lamont, 1992, p. 6). Thus, the symbolic boundaries in and around Social Science teaching interplay with the boundary work within a specific group of teachers/students. This can be studied in several ways, but in this study, the complexity of boundary work is studied by way of what emotions do in the interplay between specific Social Science knowledge content and the drawing of boundaries between us and them. Emotions are shown to play an important part in the relational definition of meaning and identities. Data from several situations from Social Science classrooms, gathered from both interviews and observations, can serve as examples of performed boundary work. One such situation is an attempt by a student at Granskolan to disturb the teaching by playing a distorted computer voice in class. The voice was loud and clear but the sound passed so quickly that it was hard to identify its point of origin. Neither the other students nor the teacher, Camilla paid
any attention to this incident. There were no changes in posture and no comments. There was no eye contact between the members of this group. The teacher and other students gave the impression of being a solid group, able to control its reaction to the ‘intruder’, signalling their superiority through disinterest and disregard.

Another situation is the student Gabriel’s definition of students who are quiet in the Social Science teaching at Björkskolan. He explains their silence as laziness, disinterest and lack of knowledge and thus rejects them from being good Social Science students. He fails to see the power structures discussed e.g. in Chapter 8 in this dissertation, power structures which makes it easy for him but difficult for others to speak in class.

To take a third example, the attachment between the teacher Rickard and some of the students at Helgelandsskolan, described in Chapter 7, is revelatory of an inclusive behaviour of complimenting and flattering that draws boundaries in relation to other groups.

There is continuous boundary work going on in the Social Science teaching, potentially leading to hierarchies, inclusions and exclusions. The main focus of this study are the symbolic boundaries created in the encounter between a specific Social Science knowledge content and a specific group of participants (the what and the who). The symbolic boundaries affect who is regarded as knowledgeable, who has epistemic authority in the subject and who has not (Riesch, 2010, p. 456).

Lamont asserts that the symbolic boundaries created interactively in a situation are not entirely new, they are determined by national historical traditions, culture, social codes and so on, and thus depend on a history of contact with a certain set of people, a certain culture, a certain nation. It is fair to assume that the symbolic boundaries drawn in and around the subject Social Science are influenced by national traditions as well as the Swedish school as an institution. There is an institutional reproduction of symbolic boundaries, which can be put in question by students and maybe also teachers who have a different history of contact with citizenship, education and national values and traditions. At the same time, symbolic boundaries are ‘patrolled’ by people who want to maintain a fixed positive self-identity, because the symbolic boundaries work in their favour (Lamont, 1992, p. 11).

Histories of contact and hierarchies between groups impact who can mantle the role of gatekeeper of the symbolic boundaries in/of the teaching. Sometimes the teacher has a strong position as a gatekeeper, but sometimes a group of students have a stronger one. An important methodological tool in this respect has been to interview students who are strong gatekeepers as well as those who are not.

The borders and hierarchies between different groups in the Social Science class influence what definitions of reality are held as true and what emotions and
opinions are accepted as valid. However, the knowledge content and the perspective on that knowledge content in Social Science may also affect the borders and hierarchies between different groups in the class (Riesch, 2010, p. 458).

Social Science teaching is where the groups in this study meet. An assumption guiding this study is that the boundaries drawn in and around the subject (the definitions of the activity and the content and perspectives in the teaching) can be used as a tool to differentiate between groups and self-categorizations: *These are the values that are right in Social Science teaching, this is the valid perspective on economics, this is how we do constitution, this is where we show feeling.* The strong gatekeepers play an important part in defining what the teaching is and should be. Through their strong position, they define themselves in contrast to others in class. It is, however, important to acknowledge that boundaries do not always give rise to exclusion, and that not all differentiation creates hierarchies. Some researchers investigate boundaries as sites of communication, for instance through so-called boundary objects, i.e. objects that are mutual reference points across differences (Riesch, 2010).

This study will show that the symbolic boundaries in and around Social Science teaching are patrolled, defended as well as challenged by both teachers and students. These practices are an important part of the teaching, even though they are more pronounced in some groups than others. Part of the gatekeeping of the symbolic boundaries in and around the subject is the gatekeeping of the emotional community of the subject teaching, discussed in the previous section. An important result in this study is that the students are highly active gatekeepers of the subject, an activity which is closely tied to their relations and collective identities.

Sara Ahmed: the relationality of emotions

Emotion is seen as a relational phenomenon in the dissertation, a view inspired by Ahmed (Ahmed, 2000; 2010; 2014) and the field of critical emotion studies (Seibel Trainor, 2006; Zembylas, 2016). This entails moving from the perspective that emotions are personal in order to capture the idea that they are systematic when it comes to their effects. Emotions move and place individuals and groups on either side of symbolic boundaries and they signal where you are positioned in relation to those boundaries. The focus here is on what emotions do in the teaching setting. This section spells out Ahmed’s theory of emotion, from which I am using the terms movement, attachment and contact/histories of contact. Instead of studying emotion as something that exists inside a person, something we have, or something entering a person from the outside through social and cultural practices, Ahmed
studies how emotions create the borders between me and we or individual and social. If we transfer that approach to the context of education, we can see that to become a part of the classroom’s we you must feel in a certain way. Emotions move between people and also make bodies move forwards, backwards and sideways in relation to objects. Hence, emotions align some bodies with others, and being moved in the same way creates community (Ahmed, 2014, p. 209). Emotions stick to certain objects, and these objects can be increasingly emotionally charged when they circulate between people. Seeing emotion as relational acknowledges the fact that everything we do is shaped by contact with others. The way we come in contact with others is shaped by histories of contact, which have to do with the subject’s history but also histories that come before the subject (Ahmed, 2014, p. 6).

Movement, attachment and contact

Ahmed’s thinking on emotion draws its inspiration from several different theoretical traditions, such as Marxism, philosophy, gender studies and psychoanalysis. She issues a harsh critique against cognitive psychology’s positioning of emotions as interior. Through its dominant position in research on emotion since the nineteenth century, the cognitive psychologist’s perspective has influenced common sense understanding and speech about emotion to such a degree that an everyday conversation about emotions most probably gives an impression of placing emotions in the body as something we have, perhaps threatening to boil over, but always originating from inside the body. Ahmed, in contrast, draws on theoretical traditions from anthropology and sociology that claim that emotions come from cultural and social practices. But she also directs critique against this claim for, much like cognitive psychology, but from the other extreme, assuming that emotions are something we have, only from this perspective, the emotions are in a group of people and the direction is outside-in instead of inside-out. Ahmed uses the grief following the death of Princess Diana as an example of the outside-in model:

The example of Diana’s death is useful. An outside in model might suggest that feelings of grief existed in the crowd, and only then got taken on by

---

15 Objects are widely defined: they can be things, persons, topics, opinions and more.
Ahmed sees emotions as moving between individuals and in that process producing the surfaces that delineate objects and thereby produce a social order.\textsuperscript{16} Ahmed’s attempt to bridge the divide between the psychological and the cultural by using theory from both fields resembles William Reddy’s efforts to do the same (as mentioned in Chapter 2).

What this bridging of the divide means for both Ahmed and Reddy is that they can draw connections between emotions, politics and history and that they can be normative, i.e. claim that some ways of dealing with emotions are better than others. Emotions can lead to change. They are thus avoiding the pitfalls of a strict cognitive psychological view as well as a relativist social anthropological view. Both theorists suggest the possibility of a better future, Reddy through the establishment of an emotional regime that contains the least possible emotional suffering for the individual, Ahmed through the possibility of seeing the moving and being moved by emotions as a form of labour, opening up futures of changing orientations to others:

The emotional struggles against injustice are not about finding good or bad feelings, and then expressing them. Rather, they are about how we are moved by feelings into a different relation to the norms that we wish to contest, or the wounds we wish to heal. Moving here is not about “moving on”, or about “using” emotions to move away, but moving and being moved as a form of labour or work, which opens up different kinds of attachments to others, in part through the recognition of this work as work. (Ahmed 2014, p. 201)

In order to be consistent while analysing the material in this study I have focused on the concepts of \textit{movement}, \textit{attachment} and \textit{contact} from Ahmed’s theorizing on

\textsuperscript{16} Ahmed’s thinking on emotions both relates to and contrasts with perspectives from social psychology. For Ahmed, the border between inside and outside is not objective, it changes under different contexts, hence, the question of where emotions are in relation to that border is complex and ambiguous. It is possible to find many similarities between Ahmed’s focus on the ‘in-between’ and interactionist sociological theory. Interactionism, represented by for instance Charles H. Cooley and George Herbert Mead (and in Sweden, Johan Asplund) sees humans as products of their relations. That means, to put it boldly, that individuals have no separate existence. Interaction ‘produces’ the self (Asplund, 1969), hence, only relations exist. Moira von Wright has developed Mead’s social-psychologic theories in the context of education. She states that students are not to be seen as static beings, they come into being over and over again in relation to who and what they meet in the classroom (Bosseldal, 2019; von Wright, 2003). Statements like this put Ahmed’s relational thinking in a long history of similar thought.
what emotions do. The concepts are not entirely distinct from each other; for instance, the movement towards another person through emotion might also attach you to that person. In that case the reasoning on attachment and movement in the situation are similar. But it may be complicated through a struggle not to move in that direction or being torn by attachments to other persons that are distracting the movement. Hence, while recognizing that the categories overlap in parts of the analysis, I still found it useful to apply all three of them to the empirical material. Although constantly returning to the terms movement, attachment and contact, Ahmed does not state explicitly that she uses them as instruments in her analysis. Here I have chosen to make them explicit tools for understanding the workings of emotions in my Social Science classrooms.

Movement appears in different forms in Ahmed’s thinking on emotion. She is influenced by Marx’ theory of capital accumulation when writing about affective economies, where objects of emotion are increasingly emotionally charged the more they circulate between people.\(^\text{17}\) In that sense, the objects of emotion move.

Emotions work as a form of capital: affect does not reside positively in the sign or commodity, but is produced as an effect of its circulation. I am using “the economic” to suggest that objects of emotion circulate or are distributed across a social as well as psychic field, borrowing from the Marxian critique of the logic of capital (Ahmed, 2014, p. 45).

Ahmed criticizes the concept affective contagion (see e.g. Gibbs, 2001; Probyn 2005; Sedgwick 2003). In the model of affective contagion, emotions pass between bodies, but it suggests that the feeling quite easily ‘jumps’ from one body to the next and that the feeling is unchanged. To get away from the idea of affective contagion, Ahmed turns to the solution that it is the object of emotion that circulates, not the emotion per se. Ahmed exemplifies this circulation with the figure of the ‘bogus asylum seeker’ (Ahmed, 2014, p. 46-48). Her starting point is a couple of speeches held in 2000 and 2003 by then leader of the Conservative Party in the UK William Hague and Home Secretary David Blunkett, on asylum seekers, picturing them as flooding and swamping Britain and the welfare system. This imagery in turn gives the impression of lost control over the nation, and the asylum seekers are thus pictured as a threat. In his speech, Hague goes on to separate genuine asylum seekers from bogus asylum seekers. The genuine ones are welcome, (we are

\(^\text{17}\) Ahmed’s thoughts on emotions as a form of capital can be compared with Bourdieu’s work on different forms of capital (see e.g. Bourdieu, 1986).
a generous country), but the fake ones are not, for they try to use and injure the nation. The assumption that it is hard to tell which asylum seeker is genuine and which is fake means that the threat to the nation is constant, since the bogus asylum seeker might pass by unnoticed. Anyone could be bogus. And because any asylum seeker can be bogus, all asylum seekers can be seen as potentially injurious to the country, even before their arrival. We see the bogus asylum seeker appear again and again, and so the object of our fear and hate keeps circulating, and can keep circulating because it has no fixed referent. The more this figure circulates in people’s perception and speech, the more emotionally charged it becomes. In the case of the bogus asylum seeker we can also see that the way and to which extent a topic has been dealt with in for example the media affects its affective value. Objects and emotions move in different ways; the object of emotion passes from person to person (is passed around) but emotions move in a different way – they are moving between people, not from one body to another.

Ahmed asserts that emotions move between us, and move us. It is this latter motion that is the main focus of the analysis in this study. Bodies move in relation to other bodies and objects through emotion, creating proximity or distance. Ahmed exemplifies this through the movement involved in ‘racist feelings’:

A white racist subject who encounters a racial other may experience an intensity of emotions (fear, hate, disgust, pain). That intensification involves moving away from the body of the other, or moving towards that body in an act of violence, and then moving away. (Ahmed, 2014, p. 194)

The motion through emotion can also be to approach someone or something. In relation to happiness, there is a goal of getting closer to objects that others judge as bringing happiness and further away from objects that are judged to undermine happiness. Ahmed concludes that ‘feelings in being directed toward objects become directive’ (Ahmed, 2014, p. 219).

Attachment is closely linked to movement.

Of course, emotions are not only about movement, they are also about attachments or about what connects us to this or that. The relationship between movement and attachment is instructive. What moves us, what makes us feel, is also that which holds us in place, or gives us a dwelling place. Hence movement does not cut the body off from the “where” of its inhabitance, but connects bodies to other bodies: attachment takes place through movement, through being moved by the proximity of others. (Ahmed, 2014, p. 11)
The relationship between movement and attachment may be simple; emotions move you in a way that strengthens your attachment to others, perhaps by moving you in the same way, for instance the joint movement of two people in disgust over a deviant other. But movement through emotion may also complicate attachment to others. Ahmed mentions what she calls ‘destructive attachments’. The feeling of hate, for example, shows a need for the object of hate, otherwise the emotion would not have been there and the feeling would be indifference. Hate sustains the attachment to objects. In Ahmed’s words: ‘Hatred is the negative attachment to an other that one wishes to expel, an attachment that is sustained through the expulsion of the other from bodily and social proximity’ (Ahmed, 2014, p. 55). As we will see in Chapter 8, this destructive attachment has no immediate end point. The ancient Greek emotion of hate that Aristotle contrasted to anger is a long-lasting one. So, in the case of destructive attachments, the movement is away from the object you are attached to. In other words, being moved by as a connection to (Ahmed, 2014, p. 209) does not mean that the motion is always directed toward the object you are connected to.

Contact is used in two interrelated ways: coming into contact and histories of contact. Contact is not the same as attachment, which is closer to alignment and connection. Coming into contact is a prerequisite for emotion – emotions do not just reside in objects but they are shaped by contact with objects and are thus relational. Ahmed uses the encounter between a bear and a child as an example. The child sees the bear and runs away in fear, but that does not mean that the bear is fearsome or that fear is in the child: the fear lies in the reading of the contact (Ahmed, 2014, p. 8). Through that reading, which is shaped by histories of contact, which do not have to be based on the child’s own encounters, but on say images of how the bear is represented in society, the bear is ‘filled’ up with fear and is therefore perceived as fearsome. Histories of contact make some objects what Ahmed calls ‘sticky’ in that feelings easily stick to them.

Ahmed states that contact is closely linked to impression. In contact, an impression is formed of others. The press in impression is important: through contact, objects impress on you and leave a mark on your surface. Therefore, surfaces of bodies and objects are shaped by contact. Ahmed tries to avoid making distinctions between emotion, cognition and bodily sensations through this line of reasoning. Ahmed uses the concept of impression for instance in relation to racism:

The emotions of hate and fear are shaped by the “contact zone” in which others impress upon us, as well as leave their impressions. […] The “moment of contact” is shaped by past histories of contact, which allows the proximity
of a racial other to be perceived as threatening at the same time as it reshapes the bodies in the contact zone of the encounter. (Ahmed, 2014, p. 194)

Impression is thus different from attachment. Where attachment sticks, impression changes your surface, even if the contact is brief. Ahmed’s concept of contact bears a resemblance to appraisal theory, as mentioned in chapter two, where emotions are effects of a perception of an object or situation as ‘desirable or undesirable, valuable or harmful for me’ (Arnold, 1960, p. 171). Emotions can therefore be seen as reactions in an encounter. Ahmed notes that reaction is fundamental to action:

A politics which acts without reaction is impossible. Such a possibility depends on the erasure and concealment of histories that come before the subject. There is no pure or originary action which is outside such a history of ‘reaction’ whereby bodies come to be impressed upon by the surfaces of others.

Feminism involves such histories of contact; feminism is shaped by what it is against, just as women’s bodies and lives may be shaped by histories of violence that bring them to a feminist consciousness. (Ahmed, 2014, p. 174)

The relationality in Barbara Rosenwein’s emotional communities gets into dialogue with Sara Ahmed’s theorizing of emotions. The movement, attachment and coming into contact that I use to analyse what emotions do in situations and in relation to objects could be seen as part of the process of forming emotional communities. Emotional communities also reciprocally affect the movement, attachment and contact in the classroom. Emotional communities are larger than Ahmed’s attachment, which changes more rapidly. Ahmed’s motions and attachments could mean navigating between different emotional communities. For the students and teachers in this dissertation, that navigation – and sometimes the mere discovery of different emotional communities – could be confusing and painful.

I see Ahmed’s concepts of movement and attachment essentially as Mouffe’s the political at work. As such, they are useful concepts for investigating the boundary work going on in relation to Social Science teaching, what emotions do in the context of that teaching and what the subject does to emotions. The concepts of contact and history of contact can help explain perceptions and appraisals leading to emotion. The three concepts are used analytically in the interpretation of intense emotional situations in the data. Both observational data and interview data are analysed in this way. Most often, the movement and attachment are not visible in the classroom. But sometimes they are, for instance in the physical positioning of the students in the classroom or in the direction of attention. Sometimes movement
and attachment are performed verbally in the interaction in the classroom. The interview data has been crucial for capturing implicit movement and attachment, felt rather than acted out physically. The methodological considerations of the study, for instance regarding difficulties in investigating emotions, are discussed in the next chapter.

***

This chapter has sought to describe how the dissertation’s various theoretical concepts and perspectives work together as a single, analytically useful, framework. Within this framework, the different theoretical strands have different functions. The underlying ontological perspective of the political places conflictuality and multiperspectivity at the core of the subject Social Science. Emotion is connected to conflictuality through the dissertation’s focus on heated emotions. The relationality of emotion in the teaching and learning of the subject is systematized through the concepts of movement, attachment and contact. The Social Science education is researched as a possible emotional community by examining systems of feeling in the teaching and in relation to the subject. A specific interest is directed towards the role of emotion in the teaching of the subject and also in how the gatekeeping of that subject/community is performed.
This chapter presents the research design and methodology of this dissertation. The ontological perspectives of the political and interactionism, discussed in the previous chapter as well as an epistemological perspective on knowledge as collectively produced, have guided the methodological considerations and choices made in the study.

The study started out exploratively. The initial plan was to investigate Social Science teaching in ethnically heterogeneous student groups, and to do a comparative study of Social Science teaching in Sweden and Germany. For various reasons I did not gain access to Social Science teaching in Germany. My focus on ethnic heterogeneity came to be less central than initially planned and other questions, in particular relating to the role of emotions, presented themselves through the fieldwork. The research process in its entirety affects the study. My sampling and research design stem from the initial thinking on the project, although gradually, the study has developed into something else.

In Chapter 10, we will return to some of the methodological choices and examine them critically in retrospect. For now, I will go through the methodology, by which I mean the ‘theory’ underpinning the methodological choices, the actual ethnographic methods or tools, the sampling and access, the ethical considerations and the analytical work.

Feelings are complex objects of research due to their elusive character. Therefore, a separate section of the chapter is devoted to discussing methodological considerations when studying emotions. Special attention is also directed at the use of video material.
Investigating practice

It was clear from the outset of the study that it had to be conducted in Social Science classrooms, thus capturing the creation of the subject in situ. There are three reasons for this. Firstly, because it is in the contact during actual teaching that tensions crystallizing broader backgrounds, concerns and interests arise, and if the researcher is not present in those moments, an essential dimension is most probably lost to the research.

Secondly, due to the explorative character of the project – there was no hypothesis to be tested, no previous pilot study, no similar research project to build on – the way forward, the burning questions, had to be found in the field. Thirdly, Swedish research on Social Science didactics has a tradition of conducting teacher-focused interview studies and/or curriculum studies (for a discussion of this, see Bergström & Ekström, 2015b). Such research puts teachers centre stage, sometimes totally unquestioned. It is indeed true that research checking teachers’ talk against teachers’ practice often places the teachers in an unfavourable light by showing that teachers’ conceptions of Social Science teaching do not match their practice. However, interviews can suggest what might happen in the classroom, but what the teachers say about the teaching does not equal their practice in the Social Science classroom, as shown by Lindmark (2013), Odenstad (2011) and Olsson (2016). In this kind of research, it is important to investigate the relationship between the conceptions of the subject and the interactional teaching practice, and not just monologic tests, textbooks, and so on, the latter often being the case in the above-mentioned research projects.

Essentially, a study based only on teachers’ descriptions of the teaching cannot claim to be researching the actual teaching. Emmy Jonasson Ring’s study (2015) can be seen as an example of where this becomes methodologically problematic. She discusses four important abilities in late modern society: perspective taking, critical thinking, reflexivity and independence. Jonasson Ring finds that the teachers participating in her study all relate their teaching to the four abilities. According to the teachers, an important tool to practice the abilities is using the students’ personal backgrounds, experiences and opinions as a point of departure in the education. A way the teachers say they do that is by using students’ initiatives in the classroom. According to Jonasson Ring, the teachers qualify the students’ initiatives through connecting them to subject content and disciplinary methods. Jonasson Ring’s study is problematic in that it investigates the teachers’ talk about the education without investigating how the Social Science education actually plays out in the classroom. The study gives a very positive picture of the education in
comparison with studies that include observations in the classroom or interviews with students (see for instance Larsson, 2007). There is a great leap from thinking about or discussing education to practicing education.

The combination of interviews and observations in this study is an attempt to tackle this problem, where the observations record the enacted teaching and the interviews are seen as opportunities for the participants to ascribe meaning to the teaching. Videos of the teaching have been used as an aid in that process. Consequently, an important contribution of this study is the insight into what happens in the live classroom.

The aim to investigate teachers and students in their ‘natural habitat’ led to a choice of ethnographic methods. Ethnographic methods are also needed because the teaching situation is very complex, requiring methods that are able to capture that complexity.

The social and educational world is a messy place, full of contradictions, richness, complexity, connectedness, conjunctions and disjunctions. It is multi-layered, and not easily susceptible to the atomization process inherent in much numerical research. (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011, p. 219)

Ethnography’s aim to investigate behaviour directly and address discrepancies between speech and action (Jerolmack & Khan, 2014, p. 182) is an important contribution to the research field. Since this study has an ambition to capture collective processes, it demands a research design that does not just rely on what individuals say but also what they do. Relationality, emotionality and boundary work are phenomena that are enacted by individuals and groups in interaction. Nonetheless, interviews are pivotal in addressing emotions and the meaning attached to situations in the teaching. Through this research design, thus, emotions and boundary work can be investigated relationally and discursively.

Consequently, a combination of observations and interviews have been used to research Social Science education as an emotional community. In brief, the research design unfolded as follows in actual research practice:

1. E-mail or phone call to the teacher. Short presentation of myself and the project including why I think it is important and what contribution it will make.
2. Phone call to the head teacher to get access to the school.
3. First meet-up with the teacher, more detailed information about the project. Discussion about the teacher’s plans in relation to the syllabus, considering when and for how long the fieldwork will be conducted.
4. Meeting the student group, presentation of myself and the project, including importance and contribution. Detailed account of the methods with an emphasis on anonymity, confidentiality and the use of videos. Consent/dissent forms.

5. First interview with the teacher. The plans for the content area and thoughts about how it will play out. How the teacher views the student group in question. The purpose of the subject Social Science and the background of the teacher.

6. Observations. Participant observation of the teaching regarding the chosen content area, approximately 6 weeks. The lessons are video recorded.

7. Immediately after each lesson, get a short reaction from the teacher on how the lesson went.

8. Individual interviews with about a third of the students when the observations are finished. Content and methods during the observed content area, emotions and boundary negotiations connected to the empirical questions of the project. Discussion about video recorded situations, how Social Science teaching touches students’ lives, how Social Science knowledge outside of school relates to Social Science knowledge inside school.

9. Second interview with the teacher. Reflections about the observed teaching in relation to the discussion in the previous interview and the empirical questions of the project. Discussion about video recorded situations. Discussion about issues that were brought up during the interviews with students. Debriefing.

The choice of methods is a time consuming one. The methods have generated a large and multi-layered dataset consisting of fieldnotes and transcripts. As in most ethnographic research, the quantity of data is immense. Before presenting how the methods were used, the next section briefly discusses the sampling of the schools, teachers and students. What exactly are the pluralist Social Science classrooms that the study seeks to explore? And where can they be found?

Sampling and access

The pluralism investigated in this study can be framed as different ways of responding to the Social Science teaching due to different positionings in the world. These include memories of the past, actions in the present and aspirations for the future. The main research interest is related to the plurality and changing demography in the student population, which is partly, but not exclusively, due to increased
migration. This is a narrowing of pluralism that threatens to limit the notion of plurality to a question of migration. However, I wanted to make sure that the dimension of pluralism due to migration would be a part of the investigation. Hence, for the sampling purposes, in order to trace pluralism in the classroom I have used the simplified but widely used term immigrant background, which was a discernible category in the statistics on schools’ composition of students. The definition of the term immigrant background is that either the person in question or both parents are born outside of the country of residence. The term immigrant background is used by the National Agency for Education, municipalities and several researchers (see e.g. Biseth, 2012; Bunar, 2011). The aim of the study has been to open up and complicate the notion of pluralism after the sampling, not least because positioning is a commonality of humans, irrespective of cultural background. Still, the use of the term immigrant background might have had an effect on the results of the study through inserting an emphasis on questions of migration and religion. Nevertheless, migration and religion are major contemporary social issues, which makes them heated regardless of the students’ backgrounds. We will return to this discussion in Chapter 10.

It was important to choose schools where the student body included a relatively large number of students with immigrant background, but not so large as to make up the overwhelming majority. I wanted to capture a plurality that included students without immigrant background.

For a school to initially qualify for the research project, over 50 percent of the students had to have immigrant background.18 Of the 22 existing upper secondary schools with higher education preparatory programmes in the chosen area, only three qualified for inclusion.

Because the number was so low, the inclusion criterion was revised. The new criterion made a school eligible for inclusion if over 50 percent of the students in a programme at the school had immigrant background. The revision increased the number of schools possible to select to ten. An interesting finding at this stage of the sampling was that six out of the seven schools were included because of the percentage of pupils with immigrant background at the Natural Science programme.

Consequently, in the student groups researched in this study at the time, 30-70 percent of the students had an immigrant background at the time of the research.

18 The statistics regarding the schools were gathered from The National Agency for Education (SiRiS, Skolverket).
Importantly, I did not record which students have immigrant background and which have not. To find the student bodies I used statistics from the Swedish National Agency for Education, combined with information gathered from persons who in their work have visited many schools in the studied area: persons who are or have worked with pedagogical support, research, in school administration or in the municipality. These persons gave a more complex picture of the situation at the schools studied. As an example, one person said that by choosing a certain programme at a certain school I could end up in a classroom where all of the students have immigrant background.

The fieldwork was conducted at upper secondary schools. A major reason for choosing upper secondary school rather than compulsory school has been that the age in upper secondary school (16-19) can be considered important for developing an interest in political and social issues (Mathé, 2019, p. 5). The students are approaching an ‘adult’ citizenship (even from the view that school is preparing for citizenship, in other words that the students are not-yets or becoming, that citizenship or being is near), and the fact that Social Science is a mandatory subject at upper secondary level in Sweden. Also, I have worked for several years as a teacher in an upper secondary school. I know the system and I am used to talking to pupils of that age. The advantages of knowing the field and feeling more relaxed when in contact with the pupils have been of great importance to me in the research process. I believe I am able to conduct better interviews at an upper secondary school level than with younger pupils.

At the time of sampling, there were 34 upper secondary schools in the chosen area, 10 comprehensive schools and 24 independent schools. To further narrow the sample, I have chosen higher education preparatory programmes. By doing that, the sample became more uniform and more schools qualified for the study. Of the 34 upper secondary schools in the area, 22 have one or more higher education preparatory programmes. Again, my background plays an important role. I have worked as a teacher of Social Studies in higher education preparatory programmes, and so the setting is familiar to me. Moreover, a government report states that students with immigrant background to a higher extent choose higher education preparatory programmes. According to the report, 56 percent of female students with immigrant background choose these programmes, while the figure for female students without immigrant background is 38 percent For male students the figures are 45 percent and 28 percent, respectively (SOU 2010:99, p. 95). Based on these statistics, it seems likely that there is a greater plurality in Natural Science or Social Science classrooms.
According to the statistics, the Natural Science programme has a higher percentage (53 percent) of students with immigrant background than the Social Science programme (36 percent) in the area where the studied schools are located. By researching the Natural Science programme, other schools and other types of schools would qualify for the research. Schools with a current high status in the area have more than 50 percent students with an immigrant background in the Natural Science programme, but not in other programmes.

It turned out to be harder than expected to gain access to the teaching. The initial plan was to meet all the Social Science teachers at a certain school, present the project to them and ask if someone wanted to participate. That way, every teacher would get the same information and opportunity to participate in the study. But the difficulty of getting even single positive answers by e-mail and telephone, led me to abandon that approach. The study is thus conducted with the four teachers who were willing to participate.

Three of these teachers – Anja, Camilla and Martin – are what is called ‘first teachers’, a post created by politicians to strengthen teachers’ professionalism. The possibility to become ‘first teacher’ offers an upward career path with higher wages and slightly different assignments. One of the tasks of the ‘first teacher’ is to keep track of research in their area, which has been of advantage to this study. These three teachers have been appointed ‘first teachers’ through competition, and could thus be regarded as successful in their area.

The fourth teacher, Rickard, had another objective for joining the study. He was newly examined and had only worked for a couple of months since he took his teacher exam. He said that he needed to discuss Social Science didactics with a professional.

The teachers and I jointly decided which of their study groups would be asked to participate in the study. That decision was made through a consideration of the composition of students and the teacher’s thoughts about the benefit and harm of the participation (see the section on ethics below). The sampling process produced the following samples:

- Ekskolan (Anja): Natural Science Programme, third year, Social Studies 1b.
- Granskolan (Camilla): Social Science Programme, first year, Social Studies 1b.
- Björkskolan (Rickard): Natural Science Programme, third year, Social Studies 1b.
- Lindskolan (Martin): Social Science Programme plus three students from Natural Science Programme, second and third year, Social Studies 2.
Observation

The fieldwork lasted approximately six weeks at each school, with added visits before and after the intense fieldwork period. Apart from the actual Social Science lesson time, I have spent considerable time in the schools’ corridors, libraries, staff rooms, canteens, assembly halls and other facilities.

A challenge for the observer is to understand a situation as an insider and at the same time be able to explain it to an outsider (Fangen, 2005). As an observer you have to strike the right balance. Be too much of an outsider and you will not get close enough to the participants. Be too much of an insider and you risk taking things for granted, thereby unable to explain the situation to an outsider. Fangen describes a situation where she got so emotionally involved in the situation that she forgot to take field notes (Ibid).

The right balance between insider and outsider varies with researcher, situation and participants. The role changes during the fieldwork and is not the same in relation to all participants. For instance, I am probably more of an outsider in relation to the pupils than to the teachers because of my previous appointment as a teacher. Because of that fact, I have taken measures not to be associated with the teacher: I have never arrived to a lesson together with the teacher, but waited outside or inside the room together with the students, entering the room when the students did. I also sat by the students in the middle or back of the classroom, interacting with them about everyday matters, and not just about their learning or the school’s organisation, during the breaks.

I have chosen the role of the observer as participant (Cohen, 2011, p. 457). I had no intention to apply for a job at the schools or pretend to be a teacher. Nor do I pass as a student in the researched group. I was visible in the classroom, not as an insider, but as a researcher. I also carried a video camera into the classroom, making me even more visible as a researcher. An effect of being visible as a researcher is an increased reactivity.

To my surprise, I several times passed off as a student or went unnoticed while moving around the schools. I was even reprimanded when I entered the school library at the same time as an unknown student, the alarm went off and the librarian told us off and asked if we had our library tickets at hand. Being perceived as a student has been of benefit to the study since I have often been able to move around freely in the buildings, thus feeling the everyday school vibes. On those occasions, I sometimes felt like I was ‘undercover’. However, and most importantly, for the main participants in the study I was always visible as a researcher.
However, I wanted to get closer to the participants than just observing them. Participating in everyday conversations in the classroom increases the chances for the researcher to get close to the participants and understand the situation. It also probably reduces the participants’ feeling of being studied. An inspiration for this type of participant observation has been a text by Karen Davies, who emphasizes knowledge through closeness, the body, feelings and experience as crucial, though underrated, forms of knowledge when it comes to observation. Participating in the everyday actions hopefully gives the researcher a chance to get ‘backstage’, behind the guards of the participants (Davies, 1999, p. 128). I have found that through being a participant observer, interacting with the students, I was able to build a trust that led to more students joining in as interviewees. They seemed to need to watch my behaviour and talk to me in order to decide to be interviewed.

There is an important difference between, on one hand, participating in everyday interactions and following the social order unfolding in the classroom; and, on the other hand, intervening in the educational situation. Despite my background as a Social Science teacher, I have not taught the studied students Social Science. Nor have I told the teacher what I think makes for good teaching until the very end of the fieldwork. This corresponds to the common description of the participant observer as taking part in everyday interaction but not in site-specific interaction (Fangen, 2005). One exception I made to this rule was at Lindskolan, where I held a lecture about scientific research and theory of science. The teacher Martin had asked me to do that in connection with my visit to present the project, since he would be away for the lesson. I accepted to do the lecture on the condition that I would be framed as a researcher, not as a teacher. I believed that my lecture on theory of science would benefit the project by signalling that I am a serious researcher. Performing the lecture as a form of visiting expert made the interaction less site-specific. I do not think that the students perceived me as a teacher. My lecture provided insight into what it is like to teach that group that I did not have in relation to the other groups.

According to Fangen, observations make it easier to ask good research questions. By observing, the researcher sees what is relevant and hears what the participants say when they set the topic of conversation by themselves (Fangen, 2005). Using impressions from the observations as a base for interviews, where the interviewer usually sets the frames for what is going to be said, could make the interviews more on the participant’s terms.

The relatively active role as observer meant that while I made notes during the lesson, most of the fieldnotes were written down approximately half an hour after the lesson. This was because I wanted to interact with students and also observe
movements and gestures in the room. I assumed that if I was writing all the time, my impressions would be centred too much on only what I heard. Also, writing frantically would make me more conspicuous to the students, thus possibly making them behave differently than they otherwise would.

Three empirical questions, derived from the purpose of the study, guided the observations:

- When, where, how and for whom does the Social Science teaching get emotive and what happens in the teaching when it does?
- What happens when students and teachers break through with a divergent perspective on the subject-specific content?
- When, where, how and by whom is gatekeeping of the Social Science teaching performed?

These questions were the main focus of my observations but I also made more general notes, including the content, methods, and social climate.

I will return to the difficulties in researching emotions later in this chapter. One way of investigating emotiveness was to ‘feel the room’, that is, to note when I felt intensity, a thickness in the air. But the analysis of emotiveness did not stop there. The notes guided me in choosing video clips to discuss in the interviews, which made it possible for me to cross check my impressions by means of the interviewing process.

As already mentioned, the main focus on emotionality was a result of the fieldwork. That means that some of the video clips during the fieldwork were chosen in line with the last two empirical questions stated above. Thus they do not cover the kind of heated, intense emotions that run as a theme throughout the dissertation. The situation analysed in Chapter 6, where Karim turns attention to Lebanon, was chosen because he breaks through with personal knowledge about the subject-specific content, and not because it was an emotionally intense moment. Still, the situation says something about the gatekeeping of the subject content and is therefore important for the purposes of this study.
Video as elicitation

The Social Science teaching at all schools except for Ekskolan\textsuperscript{19} has been video recorded. The videos have not been used as primary sources in the study, which means that because the field notes were to be the only primary source from the classroom, the participant observations have been carried out as if the teaching was not video recorded. The purpose of filming has been to deploy the videos as a reference for reflection in the interviews. The video material is thus used as elicitation in the interviews (Davies, 2008). The method is inspired by stimulated recall (Alexandersson, 1994), where the aim is to get the participant to recall what he or she was thinking and feeling in the observed situation.\textsuperscript{20}

The process is designed as follows. A video camera mounted on a stand was placed in the back of the classroom, with enough room behind the camera to be occupied by the students who had not consented to being visible in the videos. An initial plan to record the teaching from two angles was abandoned due to ethical considerations. Recording began as the lesson started and ended when the lesson was over. The camera used was a Canon xa-25. A body microphone was supposed to be attached to the teacher but it turned out that it was not necessary because the camera’s microphone was surprisingly effective. The files were moved from the camera’s memory card to an external hard drive. A time-indexed content log of the videos was produced within a week after the recording. Critical incidents relating to the empirical questions (Derry et al., 2010, p. 18), two to five minutes in duration were cut out. The video segments were shown to both teachers and students while they were asked with reference to the recorded situation: ‘What happens here?’

Bringing a video camera into the classroom increases the feeling of an artificial situation. However, Mikael Alexandersson, who has conducted extensive video research in the classroom, reports that artificial effects, e.g. pupils acting towards the camera or teachers acting stressed and forced, disappear quicker than expected, in most cases a couple of minutes into the recording (Alexandersson, 1994).

\textsuperscript{19} The reason why the teaching was not video-recorded at Ekskolan was that the fieldwork there was initially attempted as a pilot study where I tested out observation and interviews. However, the students and the teacher were informed that the data might still be used in the dissertation. I intended to try out videoing at one of the last observed Social Science lessons at the school and obtained written informed consent from the students, but the lesson consisted of individual work on an assignment and therefore, I did not carry out the videoing.

\textsuperscript{20} The aim of capturing the participants’ thoughts and feelings during a recorded event through stimulated recall is hard to reach (or ‘check’), but the reactions from viewing the video are interesting per se and attach meaning to the recorded situation.
Video is often used in a microscopic way in the educational sciences (Goldman, 2007, p. 45), examining details in short sequences, which risks exaggerating small details that may not have a great importance for long-term developments. As the purpose and research questions show, the aim of this project has not been to go into such detail. Indeed, if the videos were used as primary data, being transcribed and analysed as such, the scope of the investigation would have been much smaller, or the dataset would have been too large to handle in the timeframe. Also, since the teaching was only recorded from the back of the classrooms, the videos are too incomplete to use as primary material for analysis.

Consequently, the field notes and the transcribed interviews are the main data of this study. The videos are an aid in the interviews, which has several advantages. Firstly, the use of videos broadens the discussion in the interviews because it is not limited to what the interviewee remembers from the teaching situation (van Tartwijk, Veldman, den Brok & Wubbels, 2009). That partly makes up for the time that passes between observations and interviews in this study. Secondly, it adds to the consistency and rigour of the study since the teachers and students are watching the same sequences, and so their reactions can be contrasted. Thirdly, watching and analysing videos together is in line with the project’s view that the construction of knowledge is collaborative. Working with video stimulated interviews means a closer association between the roles of the researcher and the participant, since both start out from the same video and discuss it together. Both the researcher and the participant can pause, rewind or fast forward the watched sequence. Fourthly, videos show a range of social mechanisms that audio recordings miss out on, for instance where attention is directed. Fifthly, the use of videos adds to the transparency of the study. The interviewees see which situations are considered interesting.

Nevertheless, the interpretation of a situation starts with the pressing of the play button. The video is not neutral, it is recorded from a point of view chosen by the researcher. In that sense, the recording does not provide a complete representation of a situation. In this case, the placement of the camera in the back of the room, directed towards the front, frames the teacher as primary agent (Erickson, 2006, p. 178.), which can be seen as misleading in relation to the project’s focus on reciprocity. Still, the students are used to that view in the classroom, which probably means that it is harder for the teachers to watch the videos. A way of being reflexive in video-based research is to make the filmmaking visible in the material. In the films from the lessons, I am often visible, for instance while switching the camera on and off.

Another aspect of using video is that the viewer ‘constructs his or her own narrative understanding of the footage on the basis of prior experience’ (Goldman, 2007,
We are so used to watching film, but the films we are used to watching are directed with a clear focus. Faced with an ethnographic film with its abundance of details, chances are that we start creating our own storylines of meaning and thus ‘lock up’ what we see in the video. Discussing with others what happens in the video broadens perspectives.

In relation to the research interests of this study, it is also important to acknowledge that film as medium can stir emotions merely through its format, a fact connected to experiences of watching feature films. For similar reasons, the medium can also distance the viewer from what happens in the video.

A risk for the researcher using video is to overcite. Since the videos are not used as primary sources in this study, that pitfall is avoided, though I have to confess that I have turned to the videos in a couple of cases to complete or check a fragment quote in the field notes.

As already stated, the video sequences were only used as elicitation in the interviews, which lessens the risk of creating a false survey and generalizing too much from short sequences. Erickson (2006) forcefully argues that an analysis should allow readers to see not only the trees but the forest too (p. 185). That is, it is not enough for an analysis to provide rich examples, it must also provide a sense of the broader sample and of how typical or atypical the instances presented are relative to some larger corpus of data (Derry et al., 2010).

In this study, both the observations and the interviews give a larger context. Throughout the study, in particular Chapters 7 to 9, which go into detail about certain situations, I have tried to relate the situations to the larger corpus of data to render the reader ‘forest-wise’, not just ‘tree-wise’.

Interviews

There are multiple purposes behind using interviews in this study. They pave the way for capturing the thoughts and feelings of the participants, allowing me to dig deeper into the observed teaching situations, partly by representing what had not been observed. For instance, interviews can reveal that a student felt upset about a topic or perspective in the teaching but did not express that emotion, or that a student wanted to say something but refrained from doing so. The interviews also gave the participants an opportunity to interpret and elaborate on the teaching situations and the subject Social Science. And they allowed me to check my interpretation of the observations.
I have conducted a total of 37 semi-structured interviews with teachers and students, ranging between 25 and 90 minutes. Each teacher has been interviewed twice, once before the observations started and once, one or two weeks afterwards, following the interviews with the students. The students have been interviewed after the observations, beginning a couple of days after the last observed lesson, thus about six weeks after the start of the fieldwork. The reason for interviewing the teachers twice was to ask them about their plans for a certain content area, then observe the teaching of that content and then discuss what happened in the encounter with the student group. I have not made much of the before – during – after in the analysis because I did not like the idea of constantly proving that the teaching did not go according to plan, what risked putting the teachers in an unnecessary negative light. The focus has rather been on analysing what happened in the teaching and why. The interview sheets can be found as appendices to the dissertation. 20 months passed between the first and the last student interview and minor changes were made to the student interview sheets to improve the questions. The biggest change was between Ekskolan, the first school, and Granskolan, the second. At Ekskolan, I asked the students to describe the teaching of the content area I had observed, with the intention to check if mine and their impressions corresponded. That measure proved to be too time consuming, leaving little time for the specific questions about emotionality and break-ins. The question was therefore removed when the fieldwork at Granskolan started. At Björkskolan and Lindskolan, nothing was removed from the sheets, but I added questions that I had kept asking but not written out in the sheets, for instance a question about what kind of school the school in question is, and about the occupation of the students’ parents. To conclude, the foundation of the student interview sheets was the same for all schools. I have therefore added the last, most explicit and therefore representative sheet, the one I used at the fourth school, Lindskolan, as an appendix.

When it comes to the teacher interview sheets, the first interview was the same for everyone, but the second one built on the observations and reflections from the student interviews and thus the interview sheets are different for each teacher. There is only one pre-interview sheet added as an appendix, but for the post-interviews I have added all four sheets.

All students were asked to send me an e-mail if they would like to participate in interviews but I never received a sufficient number of responses for the purposes of the study. Consequently, I asked students personally during the school day. Through asking personally I was able to enlist more volunteers, but many students still declined. In retrospect, an interesting aspect of the sample is that a relatively high proportion of the students volunteering for an interview were not very verbal
during the lessons. They seemed to have a ‘need to talk’ about important issues regarding the teaching, and the interview gave them an opportunity to do just that. This also raises questions about what I as a researcher and what my project were signalling to the students. The composition of volunteers might show that I have expressed an intention to accentuate voices that are not heard in the classroom. It might also mean that the quieter students trusted me to represent them in a just way, whereas the more verbal students did not trust me for whatever reason. What does it mean for the results that many quiet students were willing to raise their voices in the interviews? A consequence may be the prominence of emotions and opinions that are not explicit in the teaching situation in the study, as highlighted in Chapter 8. That said, I also interviewed some of the most verbal students.

The interviews took place at the school, mostly in small rooms designed for groups of students or instrument practice. I aimed at conducting the interviews in a part of the school that was as far away from the teacher’s office as possible. I never encountered the teacher in question during my interviews with the students, though on some occasions other students knew who I was interviewing because they were friends.

My approach as interviewer has been what Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) call the traveller. The traveller understands the production of knowledge as collaborative. The traveller’s encounters with other people is a reciprocal process, leading to change for everyone involved, including the interviewer. In that sense, the traveller can be seen as an anthropological interviewer. The traveller is contrasted with the miner, who digs for knowledge until it is found. From the perspective of the miner, the knowledge is already there, just waiting to be found. For the miner, knowledge is collected through the interview. For the traveller, the knowledge is constructed through the interview. The epistemological perspective of the traveller invites the participants into the research process in a way that is ethically justifiable.

According to Pierre Bourdieu, a way to handle the unavoidable objectification of the participants in the study is to conduct some of the analysis at the time of the interviews, and conduct it in a way that lets the participants understand in which direction the study is heading (Bourdieu & Waquant, 1992). That has served as a guiding principle for the interviewing process and is an important part of trying to do the participants justice. More specifically, it meant revealing what I thought was particularly interesting during the observations and in the interview, as well as discussing what happened in those situations and the consequences thereof for Social Science teaching in a collaborative dialogue. It was helpful to watch videos together as a base for the discussion. By striking a balance between openness and curiosity, and of course by giving most of the interviewing time to the participant’s thoughts,
I have hopefully managed to give the participants a clear idea of where the study was heading and a chance to give a divergent perspective. This was a way of extending the process of consent from the formal written informed consent, given at an early stage of the research process, when it was still unclear where the study was heading (Miller & Bell, 2012).

I was surprised and pleased by the openness of both students and teachers during the interviews. I saw it as a sign that I had managed to build confidence and that the focus of the study seemed relevant to them. My questions about the Social Science teaching led to very personal answers on several occasions, in some cases reaching a sort of catharsis that I would hardly have captured if I had conducted focus group interviews with the students. The most off-guard interviews included the interviews with Leyla, Mahmood and Shirin, who are all central to the study. Notable was also the interview with Liridona. Her family’s asylum application was rejected during the Social Science course and the teacher Anja, together with the whole class, managed to cancel the deportation. Liridona praised Anja so much in the interview and expressed such a profound gratefulness that I found the data about the teaching difficult to use in the study because it was so overwhelmingly positive and I felt Liridona might have used the interview to symbolically ‘pay back’ Anja.

However, some interviews were unpleasant. One of the interviewees was very quiet, which led to an uncertain feeling. Another interview was unpleasant because I experienced the student’s behaviour as aggressive (in a controlled but unsettling way) both towards me and towards some students he was talking about. During the interview I concentrated on trying to understand his way of thinking about the teaching. Transcribing that interview, immersing myself in that very tense and aggressive atmosphere again, was a daunting task. I had to focus hard on making a charitable interpretation (Davidson, 2001) of the data from that interview, that is, to interpret the actions of a person as sensible. It was clear that he positioned himself against what I represented through my research interest. In that sense, a charitable interpretation of his utterances was possible through valuing the contribution he made through a conflicting perspective.

Difficulties in researching emotion

A pressing question when researching emotions is if it is possible to capture authentic emotions. No research result discussed in Chapter 2 – whether neuroscientific, anthropological, sociological or psychological – has been able to track actual emotions.
[...] no experimental procedure yet designed suggests that emotions are something entirely different from cognition, since the presence of emotions is always tested indirectly, through cognitive biases or through changes in skin conductance levels or heart rate. None of these things are “emotion” itself. (Reddy, 2001, p. 20)

In the literature on the history of emotions it seems to be agreed upon and uncontroversial that it is impossible to research authentic emotions. Rosenwein writes:

It is not possible to avoid that emotions are delivered second-hand. Also, the connection between gestures etc and emotions are always interpretations. None of these things are emotions. (Rosenwein, 2006, p. 27)

An effective example of how to conduct research on emotions despite their elusiveness is William Reddy’s ‘emotives’, which are not emotions per se. According to Reddy, emotives have a descriptive appearance, relational intent and self-exploring or self-altering effect. Emotives always fail as descriptions, but they do something that can be investigated irrespectively of the actual feelings of the person (Reddy, 2001, p. 111, p. 108). Authenticity is not important to Reddy. Direct observation of emotion is not possible.

Emotives are directly influenced by, and alter, what they refer to. /…/ Emotives are themselves instruments for directly changing, building, hiding, intensifying emotions, instruments that may be more or less successful. (Reddy, 2001, p. 105)

Penelope Gouk and Helen Hills emphasize the elusiveness of emotions in a similar manner and claim that ‘what is researched, is always representations of emotions’ (Gouk & Hills, 2006, p. 26). However, Reddy prefers the term translation instead of representation. Utterances for Reddy are feelings translated into speech. He asserts that ‘every utterance, every expressive act, can be viewed as the outcome of convergent translation tasks. Sensory, linguistic, relational, and status codes are all in play in the articulation of the expression’ (Reddy, 2001, p. 86). In the translation process, some aspects get lost, some are not correct, etc. Hence, translation is not the same as representation. Reddy describes the individual as ‘a site where messages arrive in many different languages or codes, and where some of the messages are successfully translated into other codes, while others are not’ (Reddy, 2001, p. 80). He sees cognitive research as helpful in understanding the limitations, incompleteness and imprecision of translation work.
Reddy has been criticized for focusing almost entirely on verbal expressions (Plamper, 2010, p. 241). He builds his theory of emotives from the speech act theory of J. L. Austin. Methodologically, however, non-verbal expressions are not to be seen as unproblematic when it comes to representation. They too might be what Hochschild (2012) calls surface acting, that is, changing one’s appearance in order not to show a feeling. And they too have to be interpreted by the researcher.

What this means for the analysis of the material in this thesis is that the emotions the participants express might be managed. I share the same difficulties as Reddy in that I am mainly building my analysis around verbal statements. The participants in the study might express a feeling that was not there from the beginning in order to fit in, give the appearance of a good teacher who cares about the subject, meets expectations among other things. The difficulties of knowing when an expression of emotion is managed or not create a pitfall in research on emotion. A way of working around this dilemma is to carefully investigate a certain situation or person as well as the histories of contact and emotion rules that are activated.

The teachers in my study are being interviewed as Social Science teachers, and an important and comprehensive finding, which will be discussed in the final chapter of the dissertation, is that their expressions of emotion are linked to their professionalism as Social Science teachers, their teaching goals and their ideas about classroom management. There is a looming risk that the teachers relate what they imagine a good teacher would say. Still there are hints that they are actually speaking their minds (which in itself does not mean that I am catching authentic emotions). For instance, Anja pauses several times during the interviews and then says, meta-reflectively, ‘well to be honest, […] and that is what we should be in this situation’. Martin does not comment the interview situation like Anja does but regarding the teaching about the United Nations he says, ‘well I am neutral regarding these things’, which can be interpreted as in line with the idea of the Social Science teacher as a neutral debate leader. But then Martin halts and says ‘wait, no, I am not, actually’. By saying that he is neutral he discovers that he is not. These small comments from Anja and Martin are signs that the teachers are not just managing their answers.

A critical awareness of what is possible to research when it comes to emotions is not very present in the educational research. Schutz and Pekrun, for instance, ask for tools for assessing emotions per se, along with different components of emotions, and not the representation of emotion (2007, p. 323, p. 325), even though they see the need for not concentrating on one emotion at the time.

Another pitfall is to research the emotions circulating in the room through what you as a researcher feel yourself. Ahmed points to this risk:
I have experienced numerous social occasions where I assumed other people were feeling what I was feeling, and that the feeling was, as it were, “in the room”, only to find out that others had felt quite differently. I would describe such spaces as “intense”. Shared feelings seem to surround us, like a thickness in the air, or an atmosphere. But these feelings not only heighten tension, they are also in tension. Emotions in their very intensity involve miscommunication, such that even when we feel the same feeling, we don’t necessarily have the same relationship to the feeling. (Ahmed 2014, p. 10)

Methodologically, I risk using my own feelings when observing the classroom, but only if I try to define the students’ and teachers’ emotions through what I am feeling. I think it is a different thing to use my feelings as a sign that something emotional is happening in the room, as I have been doing when I have traced intensity, in order to select situations to examine in more detail.

Transcribing and analysing the material

The interviews have been transcribed verbatim using the qualitative analysis software Transana. A detailed transcript, as used in conversational analysis, was not necessary to answer the research questions. Therefore, pauses, stresses, intonation, and so on, have not been included in the transcript. However, // has been used to mark when speech overlapped and (...) when a word or sentence was impossible to make out from the recording.

Citations from the transcripts in the dissertation have been ‘polished’, i.e. repetitions, ummmms, ahhhs and the like have been excluded. Their readability has also sometimes been improved by using written language. One specific difficulty has been translating student citations into English. That is the major loss of writing the dissertation in English. I have considered including the citations in Swedish in the text or in the footnotes, but they are too many and too extensive, and as such would drastically reduce the readability of the text. I have tried to keep to the youthfulness of the speech in the translated citations. For instance, I have translated the Swedish expression ‘skitarg’ into the English expression ‘pissed off’ rather than ‘very angry’. But I am not fluent in English youth-language, and so some aspects of the students’ ways of expressing themselves might be lost in translation. However, the dissertation text has been proofread by a professional.
The transcripts were coded in Transana using the following categories:

- Emotion
- Controversy
- Break-in
- Silence
- Subject conceptions
- Method (a meta-category that kept track of the reception of the study and its methods).

The categories reflect the research purposes. They are not mutually exclusive. In particular the category emotion was inherent to all other categories. The field notes were not coded using Transana, but through markings in the Word documents. And to make most of the time consuming transcription process I made analytical notes in a parallel document.

The codes were clustered, taking into account frequency and ‘intervening variables’ (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 555). These clusters have then been analysed through the theoretical framework of the project, specifically the conceptual triad of movement, attachment and contact as discussed above. The analysis and interpretation of the data started with the empirical questions:

- When, where, how and for whom does the Social Science teaching get emotive and what happens in the teaching when it does?
- What happens when students and teachers break through with a divergent perspective on the subject-specific content?
- When, where, how and by whom is gatekeeping of the Social Science teaching performed?

The analytical concepts of emotional communities, symbolic boundaries and movement, attachment and contact have been deployed in order to answer the overarching research question of the dissertation:

- What do emotions do in Social Science teaching and what does the subject Social Science do to emotions in pluralist Swedish classrooms?

Answering these research questions has allowed me to trace and analyse patterns, relations and contradictions in the data. Answering these questions has also meant a constant return to, immersion in and re-interpretation of transcripts, field notes
and audio files, along with presentations of and discussions about preliminary results and interpretations at conferences, seminars and meetings with my supervisors.

Ethics

The research has been designed and performed according to the ethical guidelines published by the Swedish Research Council in 2011 (Hermerén, 2011). Accordingly, the participants have been informed about the purpose of the research both verbally and in text. They have been informed by the researcher, not the teacher, to reduce the risk of control, and given their consent. The data has been anonymized already in the dataset and of course in the dissertation. Measures have been taken to ensure confidentiality and to store the data in a correct way, where the names of the participants and schools as well as the videos and audio files have been kept in a safe and away from the other material. The ethical considerations will be discussed in detail below. The guidelines from the Research Council have been clearly present throughout the research process. To deepen the discussion about ethics I have turned to Beauchamp and Childress (1994). They scrutinize ethical principles from the perspective of biomedicine. The increasing influence of ethical reasoning from medicine on human sciences has been rightly questioned (see e.g. Wästerfors, 2019), but I have turned to biomedicine because it has the most rigorous discussion of ethical principles I have found and it has for a long time been at the forefront of ethical reasoning (see e.g. Declaration of Helsinki, 1964). Conducting ethnographic research, however, demands a consideration on how the ethical principles can be adapted with the characteristics and prerequisites of that form of research in mind.

Respect for autonomy

I define autonomy as a choice that is intentional (as opposed to accidental), based on understanding and without controlling influences (see also Beauchamp & Childress, 1994, p. 104). To achieve respect for autonomy, I have visited all the schools after gaining access from the teachers and principals, presented the project to the students, and minimized the risk that the students mistake the consent-form as applying to anything else but research purposes. I have not considered it necessary to hide information about the study from the participants. However, I found it
important to describe the project in a way that did not ‘lock it up’. The description of the project given for the consent of the participants provided the important outline. That opened up for a flexibility along the way. In that sense, I agree to the view that ethics must be situationist (Cohen et al. 2011), they cannot be fixed in advance, but have to be negotiated and thought through during the entire research process. The outline presented to the potential participants was that the project is about the Social Science teaching, how it is performed and how it is experienced by the participants. I assured the participants that I would not assess the students’ knowledge or ‘how good or bad the teacher is’. I also explained that I was interested in Social Science teaching in student groups where a part of the students have immigrant background. The research methods were described in detail, including the use of video recordings.

The presentation of the project emphasized the research ethics involved: informed consent to participate, the right to withdraw from the research at any time, guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality. I particularly stressed how the video recordings would be used, namely that they would only be used in the interviews and that they would never be published or shown to anyone else.

As Beauchamp asserts, intention is either there or it is not. Understanding and control, however, are continua. To guarantee sufficient understanding of the project, I presented it in person and also included the same information in the consent form. I asked the participants if they had questions and moved around the room as they read the information about the project. Difficult terms, like anonymity, confidentiality and ethnicity were defined. I estimated that all of the students’ skills in Swedish were sufficient to understand the information provided to them.

The fact that I met the students and personally asked for consent lessens the risk of control, because I am an outsider asking them to participate in a study, not their assessing teacher. They did not have to be on good terms with me. However, as consent was given by the teacher before the project was presented to the students, and the students are dependent on the teacher, they might have felt a pressure to consent to participation because the teacher wanted to participate in the project. The teacher can thus still be seen as a gatekeeper (Miller & Bell, 2012, p. 11), because through his or her consent I was given access to the group of students. It is important to consider the differences between access and consent. In this project, there were several different ways of participating. It was possible to not be visible in the videos and not be interviewed. Consent was given several times during the fieldwork by the students who were most involved in the study. As discussed in the section on interviews, my aim was to give the interviewees an idea of where the analysis was heading and invite them to share their view on it. None of the
participants withdrew from the research despite my emphasis on the fact that the consent was not binding.

Some of the students needed further clarification to consent to the research. They were worried that they had to do things if they consented, e.g. be interviewed or be seen in the videos. Those students consented to participate in the research as long as they were not interviewed or were not visible in the videos.

Nonmaleficience

Nonmaleficience means to refrain from causing harm to the participants, and is thus a negative obligation (Beauchamp & Childress, 1994, p. 150). My intention was not to disturb the teaching or the assessment of the students, which is why I did not conduct the interviews during lessons, and consequently lost some of the students who would have consented to an interview just to escape the lesson. Thus, the decision not to harm the students by making them leave the lesson meant that I probably lost a certain category of interviewees.

I abstained from video recording students who did not want to be seen in the videos, and from recording from two angles. The recordings were thus not as comprehensive as they could have been, but since they were not used as primary data, and since I was observing the whole room, I regarded it as reasonable that some students were not visible.

A special case was a student who had a protected identity. I obtained consent from her, her parent and her mentor to carry out the research, but it was of vital importance that she was not visible in the videos and she also got a fictitious name by the teacher, which caused some confusion in the group. At one point she was worried that her hand was visible to the camera, but I examined the recording thoroughly and made sure that it was not.

Benificience

In contrast to nonmaleficience, beneficience is a positive obligation in the form of actions and attitudes that provide benefits to the participants and prevent harm.

The aim of the research is inclusive – to develop Social Science teaching that embraces the pluralist classroom and support teachers who are uncertain as to what to do in heated situations. A difficulty arising from this kind of mission is that the participants, through the presentation of the project and by being exposed to the
ideals of the researcher, may think that the research will make a greater contribution in changing Swedish Social Science teaching than is actually possible (Miller & Bell, 2012, p. 12). Thinking back on the presentation of the project, I might have given a somewhat naïve and idealistic impression of wanting to develop Social Science teaching, which was authentic in that I really felt I wanted to make a tangible difference through the research project. In some ways, I think I have made a difference. The aim throughout the process has been to strengthen the participants, making them feel rightly important in sharing their experiences and opinions. Several measures have been taken to benefit the participants.

After the final interview with the teachers I have tried to strengthen them through saying what I think they are particularly good at in the teaching as well as, without exposing specific students, bringing up some suggestions from the students, which would hopefully improve the teaching situation. I have also tried to help students asking me for help in class, although cautious of not ‘taking over’ the teaching.

The participants of the study are protected by anonymity and confidentiality. Measures have been taken, for instance, to interview the students where they cannot be seen or heard by a third party, to not reveal to other participants who said what in the study and to safely store the data and the participants’ real names either on a password-protected computer or in a safe, where the document linking the participants’ real names to their fictive ones has been separated from the anonymized material.

Another important objective has been to act in a way that does not influence other researchers’ work in a negative way. My conduct should make the participants and schools want to participate in other research projects. Treating participants with respect and curiosity also helped build their confidence in me. That confidence helped me recruit more interviewees and get deeper answers to my questions.

Justice

Justice is about treating participants fairly, equally and appropriately (Beauchamp & Childress, 1994, p. 250). In this study that means that all students had the possibility to participate in an interview if they wanted. It also means that all participants have access to the results of the study. They will receive the finished dissertation via e-mail.

Another way to promote justice in this thesis is a commitment to veracity, that is, not to make generalizations about the teachers and students, but represent them accurately and comprehensively. I have tried to pause regularly and think about the
participants reading the dissertation to see the text through their eyes. Knowing that the participants will have the opportunity to read the text has been helpful in reflecting on whether I am doing them justice with my interpretation.

Reflexivity

The presence of a researcher inevitably changes the educational situation. It is possible to imagine e.g. pupils being quieter than they normally are or the teacher preparing more rigorously for the lesson than he or she normally would. I made an effort in the interviews to ask the students how my presence affected the teaching. A surprisingly large number of the participants said that it did not affect the teaching at all. The students who said that the teaching situation changed pointed towards an increased order in the classroom due to my presence. One of them even asked if I could stay a little longer because the teaching experience had been more pleasant during the fieldwork.

In an ethnographic research project, it is important to keep the researched environment as natural as possible. A way to play down the presence is to stay in the environment for a long time. My impression is that by visiting the schools several times before the actual fieldwork, and by being present at every Social Science lesson for about six weeks, most students and teachers got used to me being there.

According to Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992), it is unavoidable to objectify the people taking part in a research project. What the researcher can do to counterbalance that is to make a participating objectification, i.e. to objectify oneself in the research process along with the people one is studying. I have been working as a teacher for several years, which means that I am bringing my own experiences from school with me and those experiences inevitably affect the way I perceive the situations I encounter in my fieldwork. I am constantly at risk of getting too familiar with the teacher, nodding in agreement and thinking; yes, I recognize that, I understand that from my own experience. I have to distance myself from the role of the teacher and not take the teachers’ thoughts and feelings for granted. At the same time, being an insider by having worked as a Social Science teacher probably affected the teachers’ decisions to participate in the study. By having been a Social Science teacher I probably gained credibility through having experienced the joys and perils of teaching Social Science and working as a teacher in the Swedish school-system. In that way I am considered to be ‘on their side’ and might understand some difficulties that an outsider would not recognize. Still, as a researcher it is important to consider the complexity of the outsider/insider positions and how
they are always intertwined (for an elaborated discussion on the complexities of being an insider and outsider see Farahani, 2010). The principal way of making familiar Social Science teaching strange in this study has been to focus on emotions and thereby acknowledge a dimension of Social Science teaching that has been neglected both by researchers and in my own teaching practice. The focus on emotions has kept me curious throughout the research process and allowed me to see dimensions of teaching that I have not been able to see before.

But it is not only in the analysis that it is vital to ‘shake off’ the own teacher role. It has also been important not to appear as a teacher in relation to the students. It is easy for me to adapt to the school environment in a way that makes me appear as a teacher. The teacher invites the researcher into the classroom and therefore the researcher and the teacher are easily associated by the students. Lack of clarity regarding the researcher’s role upon entering the classroom gives rise to serious questions among students. Is the researcher a friend of the teacher? Does she tell the teacher what I say to her? Does she assess me? In this study, being explicit that there is no evaluation of individuals’ performances has hopefully minimized such reactions. Making clear that the purpose of the study is to gather different perspectives on the teaching has hopefully led to a more relaxed situation. Similarly, it is important that the researcher is not tightly linked to the principal. The principal is the gatekeeper of the school, and so entrance into the field inevitably goes through him or her. However, there should be no doubt that the researcher does not report to the principal.

Despite making all this clear, I could still be considered an authority in the field of education, someone who knows what is right and wrong, good and bad teaching. One way of handling this dilemma has been to enter the field not as an expert but as a person wanting to learn. According to Hägerström’s (2004) study of the construction, change and reproduction of us and them in Swedish adult education, entering the field as a beginner, someone who wants to learn something, is a way to avoid to (re-)hegemonize the participants as them (Ibid, p. 41).

There is also a possibility that the teacher sees the researcher as a colleague and turns to her both inside the classroom and outside of it with questions about teaching. This was sometimes the case at Björkskolan, where Rickard appeared interested in what I thought about teaching and how I would have taught the subject matter in question. If the questions are about educational content, for instance a question about possible explanations of the term prejudice, I see no problem in answering the question. If the question regards the teaching, e.g. appropriate ways to handle a situation in the classroom, a problem emerges because the answer might change the way the teacher conducts the teaching. The solution followed here was to kindly
decline to answer the question there and then and instead offer the teacher a post-
research debriefing session, where the teacher can ask questions and talk about the
research. Accordingly, I ended the second interview with the teachers by comment-
ing on the teaching, highlighting what had impressed me. To further reduce the
notion of collegiality, it has been important for me to choose schools for my re-
search where I do not know the teachers or principals.

I am a part of the ethnic majority in Sweden while many of the participants in
my research belong to minorities and marginalized groups. I do not, for instance,
share experiences of migration or feelings of being marginalized. I have had to work
hard to gain credibility among the students, credibility that I can mediate their
experiences in a sensitive way. Fangen (2005) writes that because of the fact that
the researcher might symbolize a repressing system in the eyes of the participants,
it is vital to gain the participants’ trust. As discussed in the section on interviews, I
seem to have built that confidence in the relation to students who are ‘marginalized’
in the teaching through not speaking their minds, although they have strong feel-
ings and divergent perspectives on the teaching and the Social Science content. In
retrospect, I experienced confidence from both students and teachers, sometimes
to an extent that surprised me. The questions about different perspectives on the
teaching and what was emotive sparked very personal and also emotional answers
that indicates trust.

Despite the effort to include both students with and without immigrant back-
ground in the investigation, questions related to migration turned out to play a
prominent part in the study. There are many reasons for the strong presence of
migration; migration is a pressing concern in society and does not depend solely on
personal experiences to spark emotion. The subject matter dealt with during the
fieldwork at Björkskolan and Lindskolan has opened up for questions about migra-
tion and globalization at large. But it is also probable that my research interest as
well as my personal history as a part of the pro-asylum movement in Germany and
Sweden and as a volunteer teaching Social Science to newly arrived refugee women
have made me maintain a strong focus on the topic of migration both in the inter-
views and in the analysis. I am convinced that scholarly products are to some degree
personal through various choices and interests, despite all attempts to maintain an
‘academic distance’ (Farahani, 2010, p. 127).

I have reflected on whether the fact that I am a woman has influenced the study.
I have not noticed any gender-based difference underlying who consented to being
interviewed by me as both male and female students have been willing to talk about
teaching in a personal and emotional way. Gender has not been a special focus of
the study. The questions posed in the interviews are not about gender. Perhaps my
insider/outsider position in relation to gender would have been of more importance if the focus of the study was explicitly focused on gender.

One implication of the methodological choices taken in this study is that the size of the sample had to be small, which raises questions about generalisability. In such a small study, generalizations can be made through the comparability and translatability of the study. The prospect of generalization through this route requires the researcher to be clear and careful when describing the participating groups and their contexts (discussed in the next chapter), and when describing the methods used in the analysis of the material. By successfully doing so other researchers and readers will be able to compare the study to other groups and analytical categories as well as translate the study’s results to other situations (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 222). Apart from that empirical generalizability of the study, which is to be seen as explanatory but not predictive, there is also a possibility to make a theoretical inference (Davies, 2008, p. 103), because the study is generalizable in the context of the theoretical debate both on emotions in education, where tensions exist between for instance instrumentality and a critical perspective, as well as on Social Science didactics, which seems to be stuck in a separation of rationality and emotionality.

***

This chapter has served to present the research design of the project and discuss it methodologically. The strengths and weaknesses of the methods used in addressing the research questions have been made clear. Chapter 10 returns to a methodological reflection on the benefits and limitations of the chosen methods. Now we turn the attention to place and culture, as Chapter 5 situates the study by presenting the four schools and the teachers’ understanding of Social Science. As already mentioned, this presentation is crucial for the purpose of ensuring the comparability and translatability of the study. Another major aim of the next chapter is to aid the reader in keeping track of the different contexts and participants.
In this chapter we enter the scene of the study: the schools where the fieldwork was conducted. The character of the scene affects what takes place there. The school culture (Persson, 2003) and the particularities of the participants are considered of vital importance to the teaching investigated in this study, as the positioning sites of the *who*. Thus, the questions posed in this chapter are:

How can we understand the four schools?
How can we understand the four Social Science teachers?

Hopefully, the chapter will help the reader to familiarize himself or herself with and keep track of the different schools and teachers when the analysis of emotions and boundary work starts in the subsequent chapters. The space is too limited to give an individual account of the participating students, but they are nonetheless part of the chapter, both in the presentation of the schools and in the teachers’ reasoning.

This chapter is also important because it adds to the transparency and translatability of the study, as discussed in the previous chapter. By being explicit about the context and the agents I hope to make the study more usable both by researchers and school-practitioners. Researchers and practitioners can, for example, compare the context of this investigation to another context. To make that comparison possible, the reader needs to know about the particularities of this study.

This chapter serves as a contextual bridge to the empirical chapters. But this chapter is not merely a description of the schools and the teachers. It is based on the field notes and interview material and is analytical in that it to some extent analyses the school culture and subject conceptions of the teachers. The analysis has been made post-fieldwork, which means that it is based on all the empirical material. The analysis shows differences and similarities that impact the teaching. It also
shows the scope of the investigation, capturing different kinds of upper secondary schools and different kinds of Social Science teachers.

The school context

To introduce the four schools in the study, inspired by Gerd Baumann and Thjil Sunier (Schiffauer, 2004) I will begin by spelling out the similarities. The schools are all material spaces governed by laws and regulations. They are influenced by roughly the same conventions regarding access, use, spatial organization and internal hierarchies. Due to the Swedish free school choice model all schools are somehow rivals on the market, developing pedagogical profiles and media strategies to enrol students (maybe they even compete for the ‘right’ or desirable students; see Malmström, 2019). All four schools have a social agenda that provides space for leisure, a café, and optional extracurricular activities. They also negotiate a border between the school and the society that surrounds them.

The representativeness of these schools is found in some of the above-mentioned features. No school is exactly like another school but they all share common features that are part of a common experience of what a school is, including its limits and opportunities.

The main focus of the chosen schools is educational programmes that prepare students for higher education. This focus gives the schools a higher social status than vocational schools. It also attracts a specific type of student. Still, none of the schools has the highest status among the upper secondary schools in the area. The admission points required to enter the schools are lower than for some of the other schools in the area. Like a majority of the upper secondary schools in the area, the four chosen schools are located centrally in the city.

Granskolan

The impression of Granskolan from the outside is that of a complex of magnificent old buildings. The buildings are tall but the effect is somewhat diminished by the school being narrowly surrounded by other grand buildings. The school buildings surround a sheltered schoolyard, but the impression is that it is more of a space between the houses than a place shaped for a purpose.
There is no doubt from the way it looks that Granskolan is a school. However, it is not a closed off area. The gates leading to the premises are open and the doors are not locked. It is possible for anyone to walk into the school buildings.

Once inside, the impressive features of the outside facade disappear. The inside consists of narrow corridors with doors to staircases on either end. The reception and the porter’s office are at the entrance floor, but hidden behind one’s back when one enters the building. There are several entrances to each building and as a first-time visitor, it is hard to know which is the main building, or if there is one. Apart from small ‘glass cages’ meant for group study, the teaching takes place behind opaque doors and is not visible to the visitor until he or she enters the classroom. It is necessary to knock to enter an active classroom, because the doors to the classrooms are locked. If students are late to one of the Social Science lessons investigated in this study, they have to wait for ten minutes outside of the classroom by the door before the teacher lets them in. This rule notwithstanding, the students who are locked out often knock at the door several times during those ten minutes.

The walls of the corridors are sparsely decorated. By contrast, the social studies classroom, the home classroom of the teacher Camilla, has a homely feel with a reference bookshelf, curtains, informative posters on the walls explaining scientific research and students’ posters on Swedish political parties.

Granskolan is segregated according to programme: each of the four school buildings is home to different programmes and the impression is that the students as far as possible stay in their ‘own’ building, where their lockers are and where their teachers’ offices are located. The segregation is at its clearest at the part of the school where the fieldwork was conducted, which is home to a special Social Science programme. Several of the interviewed students say that they would not study at Granskolan if it was not for that special programme. They picture the other parts of the school as noisy and with less aspiring students. In class, a student referred to the other parts of the school as ‘ordinary Gran’.

A majority of the seven interviewed students have chosen the special programme because they get extra time for physical activity (sport) in the curriculum, something they say helps them get through the school day. They do not have to sit still for as long as other students during the day.

There is a relatively high percentage of students with immigrant background at Granskolan. At the time of the fieldwork 60 percent of the student body had an immigrant background. The special programme diverges with its 40 percent (Siris/Skolverket, February 2016). When the special programme was first launched, there was an aim and effort to increase the number of female students and students with immigrant background, but according to Camilla there are no longer such
efforts in the marketing of the programme. Of a total of 24 students in the studied class, only six are female.

Granskolan prioritizes order and safety and there is a book of rules that the students and their parents receive at the beginning of their first term at the school. The book is also present in Camilla’s classroom. The rules have been worked out by school staff, and there seems to be an alliance between the principal and the teachers in maintaining them. If the teacher confiscates a student’s computer during class, the student has to go to the principal’s office to get it back. Once during the fieldwork, Camilla took a good 20 minutes of a lesson to go over the classroom rules with the students because she thought the preceding lesson had been unruly. She asked the students to cite the motivation behind each rule and several of the students were quick to raise their hands to explain why the rule was in place. Camilla tightened the rules in response to the chaotic lesson. As a result, apart from standing up and greeting each other at the beginning of class, the students now also had to stand up next to their tables at the end of each class, and they were not allowed to leave the room during class. Visiting the bathroom or blowing one’s nose, according to the rules, should be done during the breaks. In the interviews, several students expressed appreciation of the order in the classroom created by the rules, but some students were upset by the rules because they only applied to the students and not the teachers.

The focus on rules and obligations and the notion of an alliance between the teachers and the principal suggest a school culture dominated by compulsion (Persson, 2003). What the school expects a student to be is more evident at Granskolan than at the other schools due to the explicit rules. The compulsion is compounded by a camaraderie among the teachers that I observed in the building where the fieldwork was conducted. Camilla cites a warm atmosphere and good discussions with the colleagues when describing what makes a good place of work. Unity is a feature of a compulsion-oriented school culture. However, as Persson, Andersson and Nilsson Lindström point out, school cultures are always multifaceted (Persson, 2003, p. 51). One of the school’s profiles is to be on the cutting edge of technology. Indeed, the observed education at Granskolan makes more frequent and systematic use of computers, digital tools and virtual learning environments than the other schools in the study.
Björksskolan

Björksskolan is a large municipal school with an Arts profile, attracting pupils who are above all interested in music and theatre. The school also profiles itself as an environmentally conscious school. The school sports partly new facilities, with a reception that puts on display new flowers every week from the city’s best known fair trade and ecological flower shop. The canteen at the school is called the food court where the students choose between five different healthy meals. The aim is to keep the students from leaving the building and eating unhealthy fast food for lunch.

The teacher Rickard describes Björksskolan as characterized by its Arts profile. The students’ opinions are mainly left wing and they dress casually ‘hipsteresque’. Rickard mentions a playful atmosphere. Often there is something going on at the open stage in the food court and students often play their instruments in the corridors. However, Rickard adds that this atmosphere stems from the students. The teachers at Björksskolan do not give the same playful impression.

Several of the interviewed students describe the school as a place where there is a high acceptance for difference, where students are allowed to ‘be themselves’. The typical student described as being different and accepted is the nerd, someone who does not go with the flow of what is trending at the moment in terms of fashion, music and so on. The nerd is someone who does not conform to dominant social behaviour. However, according to some of the interviewed students, this accepting atmosphere is slowly changing.

The observed class started their education at a school located away from the city centre, but two years into their programme that school was merged with another upper secondary school and the students moved to a very old school building in the city centre (but as mentioned, some of the premises were new). Some of the interviewed students describe the move as a move away from the accepting atmosphere at the old location. One student even made a connection between the worn-premises at the previous school building and the open, allowing atmosphere. The ‘tip top’ condition of the new premises brought with it an incentive to shape up, adjusting to the new environment.

Also, the school became more attractive, which led to the admission points surging, which in turn, according to some of the interviewees, led to a more homogeneous student body in the lower forms. Several of the interviewed students mourn their old school and the relaxed, accepting atmosphere there, but a few of the students appreciate the higher status of the new place and the central location, making contact with friends at other centrally located schools easier.
With reference to the move, the teaching posts at the school were advertised, which led to the replacement of some teachers. From talking to teachers at the school and in the area, I got the distinct impression that an important criterion in the recruitment of teachers to the ‘new’ school was that they should have ‘in-thing’ ideas about education. According to the teachers, the most ‘in-thing’ at the moment of the recruitment was a method called the ‘flipped classroom’.

There is a great contrast between the old and the new premises of the school. The old part has opaque doors and high ceilings; the new part has walls of glass and a modern feel. The main entrance and reception are located on the new premises, giving the impression that the new part of the school is what the school wants to ‘show off’ to a visitor.

Gauged by the number of student-produced posters on the walls, about student societies (often with a left wing or feminist emphasis) and student activities, Björkskolan seems to be a school where the students are highly active. The Twitter account of the principal suggests an alliance between the principal and the students, which is characteristic of a school dominated by a knowledge-oriented school culture (Persson, 2003, p. 51). The fact that Björkskolan sorted out ‘traditional’, ‘old-school’ teachers in the recruitment for the new school confirms this dominance.

Apart from the main entrance, where the reception is located, the entrances to the school are locked and one needs a key card to get in. An outsider managing to slip inside together with a student cannot move freely once inside the building. He or she would need a key card to get from one part of the school to another. Several corridors have locked doors. The doors to the classrooms are locked to an outsider but the students can enter the rooms with their key cards. Therefore, students in the studied class were sitting inside the classroom waiting when the teacher arrived. However, there were always latecomers too, quietly entering the classroom, finding a place when the lesson had begun.

Different from the traditional classroom furnishing at Granskolan, Ekskolan and Lindskolan, the desks at Björkskolan are grouped with the students facing each other rather than the teacher.

Lindskolan

A person passing Lindskolan would probably not think that he or she is passing a school. The only sign of school activity are occasional small groups of students standing on the sidewalk, chatting and smoking. The school is relatively new and located in a big, anonymous grey office block in a cul-de-sac. To get inside, you
have to pass two locked doors using a key card. Once inside, you are met by a reception and a windowed office. Teaching assistants often keep an eye at the entrance. One really starts to feel one is in a school when one climbs a staircase, passing by the windows of the principal’s and her assistant’s offices and entering a café area where students sit in groups. From there on the school unfolds: four floors of long corridors stretching out on each side, giving a different impression from the one you get from the outside. The school is quite big once you have passed the needle’s eye.

There is a feeling of being secluded at Lindskolan. What is most evident is that the school watches over the students and there is a strong border between the school and the surrounding society. But there are also windows to the offices and classrooms that make the activities going on inside them visible to those looking in. Hence, no one can really hide in this school. Being in the school means being visible, no matter if you are a student, a teacher, a cleaner or a principal.

According to the teacher Martin, there have been some problems with violence among students in the past but the situation at the school has improved a lot since then. Still, on one of the first days of the fieldwork at Lindskolan, I noticed an intensity of feelings. I met agitated students the moment I walked through the first locked door. The staff I met in the corridors seemed reserved. It turned out that a student had drawn a knife on another student earlier that day due to an escalated conflict. Martin commented that you suddenly become aware of how calm the school usually is when something like that happens.

Lindskolan is a private school. The school started off with a small student body, then it grew, and then the number of students shrunk again. The changes in size brought with them several reorganizations. Also, the school tried different pedagogical profiles to attract students: the school had a sort of ‘freedom of choice’ profile for several years, offering as many different courses as possible, which led to organizational difficulties. At the moment, the school has no explicit profile. According to Martin the school focuses on good quality education. According to his substitute teacher at a lesson, staff representatives had gathered to formulate a new motto for the school but failed to agree on what the core of the school is. At Lindskolan, there has been a frequent shift of principals through the years. Martin says that with the current principal the leadership has improved because it is closer to the school practice. Martin clearly signals that he has not been pleased with some of the past principals.

Students chose this school for several reasons. Beata for example, moved there because she did not fit in at her former school. Another student, Ali, chose Lindskolan because he wanted to attend the Natural Sciences programme but did not
have the grades to be accepted at high status schools. Still, some of the students chose the school because they knew someone who attended it or because it is seen as a small school with a friendly atmosphere, where it is easy to get to know other students. The interviewed students seem to agree that as a student at Lindskolan you are not as anonymous as at other schools, which is perceived as a good thing.

Ekskolan

Ekskolan is a grand old single school building, but with rounded features that presents a softer and more beautiful image than other schools from the same era. From the outside, there seems to be only one entrance that everyone has to pass through, which lies up the stairs and through a massive door. At Ekskolan, I had the feeling of being watched by the staff, I could not move around without being noticed. The inside staircase keeps the promise of grandeur as does the assembly hall. Some of the teachers’ offices are in the attic in snug, cosy, secluded rooms with small windows. Those offices give the impression of rooks’ nests with teachers nesting near the roof above the activity downstairs, leaving their nests when descending to teach or attend meetings.

The classrooms are bright with large windows and traditional furnishing: students sit in rows or pairs facing the teacher. During the fieldwork, the teacher Anja and the students used three different classrooms, but the most frequently used room had several roll down maps in the ceiling, adding to a feeling of old style teaching. Anja used such maps several times during the fieldwork, but she also used PowerPoint slides and streamed videos.

Of the four schools studied, Ekskolan is the only one that has a feeling of tradition and history embodied in the work and activities and not only in the buildings. Which is probably because it is old, has not gone through major changes and has a slightly higher status than the other schools, a status that builds on its history. I got the impression that the relatively high status of the school, combined with lower admission grades than the ‘highest’ status schools, attracted students who aimed high, some under pressure from their parents, but struggled to get into the ‘best’ schools.

Anja talked about a worry at the school – namely that it is seen as monocultural, thus not modern, thus not attracting a modern body of students, thus missing out keeping up with modern social changes. She stated that worry as a motivating reason to participate in the study, that is, to show that the school is indeed pluralist and needs strategies to accommodate that pluralism.
Still, the researched group of students diverged from the average composition of students at Ekskolan. Anja said that she experienced that people asked her if the group was a language introductory group, which meant that they were perceived to look different from other student groups at the school.21

Ekskolan is a relatively small upper secondary school and that is used in advertisements to attract students. These advertisements promise prospective students that they will be seen, and that at this school we take care of each other. This promise is referred to as the traditional ‘Ek spirit’, which Anja described as a worn out cliché. However, during the fieldwork there was a flyer passed around at the school, urging students to turn their backs to a representative from the Sweden Democrats (SD), the xenophobic far-right party in the Swedish parliament, in a debate and show solidarity with fellow students who are negatively affected by SD’s politics, which can be seen as an expression of the care for one’s fellow students that the Ek spirit promises.

Four Social Science teachers

The experiences, interests, personal history, personality and second subjects of the four teachers participating in this study affect how they frame the subject Social Science and the choices they make in the teaching. An investigation of these topics could expand into another dissertation, but here, the aim is to give an outline of the four teachers as professionals by mainly focusing on their justification of Social Science teaching. The teachers in the study each express their justification of the subject teaching in the interviews, discussing what they wish should come out of it. Investigating the teachers’ justifications of the subject makes it possible to relate them to the justifications of the subject that guides the dissertation project as a whole. The teachers are of course both similar to and different from each other. Hopefully, this presentation will aid the reader to keep track of who is who in the empirical part of the dissertation.

21 Since the fieldwork, Ekskolan has introduced a language preparatory programme, directed at newly arrived immigrant students.
Camilla (Granskolan)

Camilla has been working as, among other subjects, a Social Science and History teacher for 16 years. She has worked at Granskolan for the last three years. Already as a student in school Camilla considered herself to be an analytical person, something she says could have led her in the direction of science, but instead, she was intrigued by the analytic dimension of Social Science and History. Camilla separates Social Science and its related academic disciplines from other disciplines. She sees Social Science as close to natural science by emphasizing its analytical dimension, coevally distancing Social Science from the humanities. Camilla relates:

Social Science does not belong to the humanities, after all it belongs to the social sciences. Possibly, it has a stronger focus on structures. I don’t want to say that it is more scholarly, because it gives the impression that I am disissing the other subjects, that’s not what I mean, but still, it kind of has concepts, structures and models /…/ Take the more downright humanities-subjects, like for instance the languages – there you have a kind of different flow, closer to you, more personal. I remember that when I studied political science in Lund, exactly at the department of political science, they were clearly marking distance to the humanities: ‘We – we are more scholarly, more structured, we study other aspects of humanity, we are not like them, we are not that fuzzy’. They did not put it that way but that was what they meant. I think it has shaped me.

Also, Camilla’s planning of the education in modules – such as law, economy, constitution – rather than reflecting major social issues is close to how academic disciplines teach and is a direct expression of how her understanding of the subject as a ‘mini science’ carries over into her teaching practice.

According to Camilla, the most important thing for the students to learn from Social Science is to gain general knowledge about society, to understand how its institutions work and to be able to understand what they see, hear or read in the news. Another important thing is to be able to see through the surface, to avoid being deluded or cheated by someone or something in society. The right facts seem to be the best defence against being cheated and the threat of cheating comes chiefly from ignorant people and populists.

Camilla: Many misconceptions and prejudices about important things circulate out in society. You can hear students say that you should not abstain because those votes will go to the Social Democrats. Then I just think ‘oh no’ but then you realize that there are people who do not vote because they believe it is like that.
The ambition to inform the students in order to make them participate or believe in the democratic system is also apparent in the second interview, where Camilla explains that she showed the students a list of all the public bills written by Swedish politicians that year in order to counter an opinion she claims to meet frequently among students; namely that politicians do not do anything.

Another way of being cheated in society according to Camilla comes from persons in politics or media ‘playing the game’.

Camilla: What I find really exciting right now, exciting in a nasty way but still, is what is happening right now with the violations of Swedish waters, if it is a violation and who it is. What is it, who is it, why, why now and so on. I find it really exciting to reflect on that, and the intriguing in politics and international relations. Trying to see what’s behind it, and to some extent teach the students that things are not always what they seem. People, politicians and political parties don’t act randomly.

Camilla relates a specific situation where she and the students were watching an admiral talk about what the military had observed and what they had not. She had asserted that he deliberately chooses what to say and what to not to say in order to be able to analyse reactions from abroad. Camilla says she teaches the students not to ‘take everything at face value’.

The general knowledge about society that Camilla advocates is not a passive form of knowledge. The type of knowledge she teaches should lead to action in the form of well-informed decisions. In a situation where Camilla due to lack of time always has to choose what to give priority to in a Social Science course, she chooses to teach the structure and concepts of the Swedish constitution and sacrifices student discussion.

Camilla: I think all teachers are stressed, I mean Social Science, you could discuss as long as you like, I would have loved to have spent two lessons discussing one of these bills /…/ But then again, I always feel this stress, you have to find the time for the structural bit, you have to find time for the important concepts. Alas, there is no time to allow a digression from that.

Camilla sees a problem in that way of structuring the teaching. If she is lecturing about the structures and concepts of the Swedish constitution, the students might get the impression that the Swedish political system is God-given, which would be a one-track education. Still, she thinks that the structures and concepts are the most important content.
Rickard (Björkskolan)

Rickard is a recently graduated teacher. The fieldwork was conducted when Rickard did his first semester at his first job after passing his teacher’s exam, although he had been working part-time as a teacher of various subjects during his teacher education. His subjects are Social Science and History, the subjects he himself thought were the most fun to study in school. Rickard thinks History and Social Science go well together and that he benefits from being a teacher of both. Observing Richard in the classroom I noticed that he frequently voices a historical perspective on current events, for example when he talked about the bombings of Dresden during the Second World War in relation to the contemporary bombings of Kobane.

Justifying the subject Social Science, Rickard expresses an idea of the subject as making it possible for the students to realize themselves in society by feeling well and acting as democratic citizens.

Rickard: To be able to follow societal debates or the flow of information in society, you have to have some idea about basic societal concepts. Take media for instance, it does not have an explaining function but uses complicated concepts, above all when it comes to economy and finance. Those problems surely exist in relation to every part of Social Science. I think if you don’t understand what is being said, you lose interest in trying to participate and make a difference. So, it is above all a kind of plan for the individual, it facilitates self-realization, through feeling well and being a democratic citizen. That’s what I find most important in Social Science teaching and learning.

Rickard says that it is hard to analyse a situation or act upon it and achieve something if you do not know how society works. Acting as a democratic citizen is a prerequisite for self-realization. The Social Science education is, according to Rickard, not just a preparation for life in society, it is also part of, or an arena for, current self-realization and self-identity. He also sees the subject as preparing students for higher studies.

Katarina: So, the teaching is somehow at the prospect of that self-realization?

Rickard: Yes, or part of it. It starts at its strongest when you reach upper secondary level, you start finding your identity, you get interested in things. So hopefully, the self-realization is part of the teaching and learning, but still they are attending a preparatory program, when they leave here, they are supposed to be able to choose what they really want to do. And that is
important in Social Science, that the students who want high grades are able to get an education where that is possible.

In Rickard’s view, the most important purpose of the subject is to enable action, change and self-realization, within the borders of the democratic system. He emphasizes the importance of facts and conceptual knowledge as a basis for that citizenship-focused and transformative understanding of the subject. Knowing how society works to be able to engage in society.

Speaking about Social Science education, Rickard refers to the syllabus more frequently than the other teachers in the study, which might be due to his recent entry into the world of teaching. He explains what the subject is by referring to what is to be examined according to the syllabus. In Rickard’s eyes, the syllabus makes the subject an analytical and theoretical one and hence the subject is determined ‘backwards’, the examination determines the teaching. Because of that, he argues, discussions in Social Science education have to be analytical discussions. The students have to be able to analyse causes and consequences and see phenomena from different viewpoints.

Rickard: When you get to Social Science at upper secondary level, it is a lot about understanding structures, what is a system and what is a theory /…/ then to ask, like, what do you think? [laughs], that does not really belong here /…/ The subject is supposed to teach the students things they do not know and how you can see things in other ways, which they normally don’t see. But at the same time, it is a contemporary subject, it should be of immediate interest and regard what they do, it is a tough nut to crack.

Martin (Lindskolan)

Martin has been working as a Social Science and Religious Education teacher for six years, mainly at Lindskolan. In line with the other teachers in the study, herefers to his experiences at school as a reason for his choice of subjects. He attended the Natural Sciences programme but found Social Science more interesting as a school subject. Martin has always been close to religiosity through his nearest relations, he says that the choice of Religious Education thus ‘came naturally’ to him. Martin believes that Social Science is a wider subject than Religious Education, History and Geography, which appealed to him.

In answer to my question about synergies between Religious Education and Social Science education, Martin says that there are elements of religion in Social Science, and that religion has increasingly become a part of the public debate on social
issues. In the classroom, though, he tends to detach religion from social issues, concentrating on politics instead. This focus suggests that Martin does not see religious questions as politics. When the students see religion as a cause of political conflict where he himself rather sees political causes underlying those conflicts.

For Martin, the purpose of the subject Social Science is to give the students general knowledge about society, to arouse their curiosity about society and to make them want to learn more, both now and in the long term.

Martin: To what extent can you influence students, how many facts can you drum into someone? My main goal is that they, when it is over, have developed tools to keep exploring the world. For the rest of their lives. /…/ To give them tools to work on it systematically. Social Science is a theoretical subject, everyone cannot be theorists and immerse themselves in that in the future, but everyone should bring along a future-reaching interest in knowing about society from the teaching.

Talking about the subject, Martin also emphasizes the importance of understanding the two-way relation between individuals and society as a fundamental part of Social Science education.

In comparison to the other teachers in the study, Martin is more explicit about the values when talking about the subject. He thinks that Social Science pulls the heaviest load when it comes to the democratic mission of the Swedish school system, despite the fact that it is a responsibility for all subjects (Hakvoort & Olsson, 2014). Martin sees a difficult task in realizing a value-focused Social Science education in the current school situation and apart from that, dealing with democratic values only in Social Science teaching and not comprehensively in school is too fragment.

Martin: You have to be interested in understanding what happens in the present moment. But the long-term goal of the teaching is important. We only have the students here a couple of years, a restricted time, some hours every week. So, to bring along something from the teaching, something about values too, not just knowledge. Our role in school is as much about fostering, there are values we have to talk about and make them reflect upon. Sometimes their view on torture and death penalty scares you, well, youths are less nuanced. Sometimes they have opinions that I don’t think are sustainable, but I think I sow seeds, they have to think about these things. I guess that is something that is dangerous today, people just blurt things out, hear things and believe in them without reflecting on what it means, where it comes from and what happens if I use this information. /…/ We cannot just talk about democracy; we have to be democratic, and that is a problem.
because at the same time we have a very square box in which to work. It’s much about ‘you have to be here, you have to do what we tell you now’. I have to take a line to the steering documents and a situation in school where they are supposed to behave in a certain way, where there is not much democracy. The big challenge is to be able to show how democracy works in practice, not just talk about it.

Martin plans his teaching according to the knowledge requirements in the syllabus. In contrast to the other three teachers in the study, Martin teaches Social Studies 2, a continuation course. Social Studies 2 is not packed with central content. Martin says that he does not have to speed through as much content in Social Studies 2 as in Social Studies 1b.

Anja (Ekskolan)

Anja is a teacher of Social Science and Geography. She has been working as a teacher for 14 years. She has worked at Ekskolan for 11 of those.

According to Anja, the greatest contribution the subject Social Science should make to students’ lives is to give them the tools to develop an attitude towards the world. She mentions knowledge about sources criticism, political systems, agents and structures, causes and effects and the democratic system as increasingly important parts of the subject.

Perspectivism is important to Anja’s teaching. She mentions the ‘threat of the single story’, which is another way of saying that people, ideas and places should always be represented in a ‘thick’, multi-layered way. Anja also emphasizes the increasing significance of a focus on language in Social Science education. The students need support to be able to develop a subject-specific language, something, which Anja sees as fundamental in the process of developing an attitude towards society.

At the time of the study, Anja taught Social Science at the Natural Science programme and talked about the planning of her teaching in relation to that specific group of students. Anja reveals an analytical understanding of the subject.

Anja: To simplify slightly, my experience is a bit that the students make conclusions – “this is the way it is”. And when you complicate things and discuss them, talk about different perspectives and analyse in a nuanced way, then it is like, “What? But it is like that! Tell me what it is like!”. Well, I can’t, and then we spend much time practicing analysis and discussion, reaching one’s own conclusion. Your own opinions, what are they founded on?
Teaching Natural Science students, who presumably tend to look for the right answer rather than analyse different perspectives, Anja has to bring up a meta-perspective on the teaching of the subject, bringing to the fore analysis and discussion as a base for forming one’s own opinions.

Conclusion

To conclude, we have seen that the schools are different when it comes to history (here understood as ‘age’), size, organization, aims, priorities and student body composition. It is a strength of the dissertation that the findings stem from a broad scope of schools, because it indicates that emotions and gatekeeping impact the Social Science teaching at very different schools and with very different teachers. It is not a particularity of a specific kind of school or a specific kind of Social Science teacher. The fact that the schools are different also indicates that it would be hard to find four schools that are alike.

But the data does not just suggest differences. If the four teachers were to be introduced to each other to discuss the justification of the subject Social Science, they would probably agree with one other. All four assert that knowledge about society is the foundation for being a democratic citizen and that Social Science teaching should provide such knowledge. The teachers would presumably disagree more if I showed them videos of each other’s teaching, because they have different teaching styles and their conceptualization of Social Science teaching is less clear when observed in their practice, which again highlights the importance of researching practice. Again, the step from talking about teaching to practising it is a great one.

Notably, conflictuality and perspectivism are not put at the core of the subject Social Science by the teachers. Anja is an exception: she emphasizes the importance of multiperspectivity and complexity in the teaching of Social Science, to counteract single stories and quick answers.

The context described in this chapter is important to keep in mind as the dissertation, beginning with the next chapter, moves on to the central empirical part of the study, examining the emotional dynamics in and gatekeeping of the investigated Social Science teaching.
CHAPTER 6 – EMOTIVE TOPICS
AND GATEKEEPING

This chapter will start examining Social Science teaching as an emotional community. This is an empirical chapter but it also paints a bigger picture that is needed to situate the subsequent, more fine grained, chapters. Specifically, this bigger picture of the data leads to the choice of situations that are analysed in depth in the following chapters. Chapters 7, 8 and 9 show in detail the relationality of the emotions in the Social Science teaching through movement, attachment and contact. Thus, a way of making this chapter distinct from the others is to say that it unearths what the subject Social Science does to emotions, whereas the subsequent chapters also reveal what emotions do to Social Science teaching. That distinction is not mutually exclusive or exhaustive but it is a way of approaching the structure of the dissertation.

Firstly, this chapter deals with the question of what topics are emotive in Social Science education as found in the empirical material. This is an important piece in investigating the teaching as an emotional community. At face value, we are dealing with topic emotions (Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2014). Indeed, the finding that most students connect emotionality in Social Science teaching to different topics conforms to appraisal theory (see Chapter 2), where the object of emotion is highly important. The students appraise the topics as affecting them in some way, an appraisal that Magda Arnold (1960) situates at the core of the appraisal approach. As we have seen in Chapter 2, appraisal theory opens up for the impact of culture and history on emotions, and it is this study’s intention to investigate the relations of emotions that make up the emotional community that is Social Science teaching. Thus, what gets emotional is not the most important part of the study. What is most important is what the emotions do in the education and how the emotional community is made up. Using the theory of Sara Ahmed reveals this
more complex picture. Still, the object of emotion and the way it gets charged with emotion is an important piece in that work.

Secondly, this chapter describes the gatekeeping of the subject and subject teaching as multi-layered through discussing situations, recorded in the data, where different kinds of boundary work create tensions in the classroom. As discussed in Chapter 3, boundary work is an important aspect of the constant production of emotional communities, and the gatekeeping is in itself emotional as it draws boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’. An assumption in this chapter is that the tensions cutting through the gatekeeping show that the ‘borders’ of the subject are contested and that the subject could have been created differently in that moment, what is in line with the focus on conflictuality that runs through this study. Research on boundary work posits the principle that boundaries only exist when they are repeatedly defended (Lamont, 1992, p. 3), what they assumedly are when they are somehow contested.

In sum, the present chapter paints the bigger picture of the subject teaching, making sure that it is emotional business, whereas Chapters 7, 8 and 9 go into detail into the workings of emotions in different kinds of situations. We will analyse the teaching as an emotional community, bearing in mind from the discussion in Chapter 3 that this community is not static, it is under constant construction, that its borders are porous, more like membranes than thick walls, and overlapping other emotional communities.

This study uses Barbara Rosenwein’s definition of emotional communities as discussed in Chapter 3. The researcher studying emotional communities looks specifically at what communities ‘define and assess as valuable or harmful to them, the evaluations they make about other’s emotions, the nature of the affective bonds between people that they recognize, and the modes of emotional expression that they expect, encourage, tolerate and deplore’ (Rosenwein, 2002, p. 842). Researching emotional communities involves investigating what role emotions are supposed to play as well as what role they do play. An assumption is that emotions play a part in how social order is created, which means that emotions can challenge power structures. As Joakim Landahl points out, this dynamic means that power has often involved managing emotions (Landahl, 2015, p. 105).

As discussed in Chapter 3, this assumption has recently led to an increase in theories in the study of history. William Reddy has developed a theory of emotional regimes, which are maintained by prescribed emotives and create a need for emotional refuges where people can find greater emotional liberty. Rosenwein has developed the concept of emotional communities to show that in any society at a certain time and place, there are different emotional communities existing parallel
to each other. These communities sometimes overlap and people move between them with varying degrees of ease or tension.

Landahl (2015) has argued that the school is an emotional community in Rosenwein’s sense. There is a strong connection in the post-industrial world between more jobs where interaction between people is important on the one hand, and emotional labour being seen as part of professionalism on the other. According to Landahl the teaching profession ‘might be seen as one of the first jobs where interaction with other people, and the concomitant emotional labour was evident’ (Landahl, 2015, p. 105). He asserts that the emotional community of the school is not static, but under constant construction (Ibid, p. 106). The emotional community aimed for is at different times more or less in line with the goals of a single teacher who, in relation thereto has to perform a varying extent of emotional labour. And the attempt of creating a community has always provoked resistance.

Drawing on the material in this study, I argue that the picture of the school as an emotional community can be further nuanced by explaining the teaching and learning of different school subjects as different emotional communities. Different subjects are perceived differently by the students, the teacher and by policy, which leads to a divergence in what is defined as valuable and harmful, how others’ emotions are evaluated, the affective bonds in the group and the modes of emotional expression that are expected, encouraged, tolerated and deplored, to use Rosenwein’s words.

The analysis of the whole dataset in this study shows that when asked about emotions in Social Science teaching, the students regularly refer to Religious Education as a subject where emotions and personal knowledge are to a higher extent expected, encouraged and tolerated. Another school subject that some students bring up as emotionally charged is History. Fang at Granskolan, who says that the subject Social Science is not emotive, adds that History can be emotive for him, especially when it deals with antisemitism.

Fang: No, not Social Science, I would say History, when we deal with antisemitism, when the Jews were slaughtered and so on, because I went to Poland with a group and we visited concentration camps and looked at a lot of stuff. It was awful. Yes, we saw lots of real burnt shoes, which were still there, I mean, there were loads of them, they fucking covered a whole house.

Fang connects the emotionality around antisemitism to his experiences of visiting a former concentration camp. The finding that History allows and evokes more emotion is supported by the scarce literature on emotions in Social Studies Education from the US, reviewed in Chapter 2. The examples of emotive content in
Helmsing (2014) and Sheppard et al (2015) are almost exclusively taken from the history-part of the subject.

A lesser degree of emotion seems to be expected in the emotional community of the subject Social Science compared to the emotional communities of the subjects Religious Education and History. The emotionality in relation to Social Science is, in the first response to the interview questions, defined by not being as strong as in Religious Education or History. But lingering on the specifics of the subject Social Science in the interviews, emotionality can certainly be discerned.

Emotive topics in Social Science teaching

A lasting impression when analysing the material is that in answer to the question about what is emotional in Social Science education, the most common answer refers to a certain content in the school subject. Fabian at Lindskolan explicitly addresses a distinction between content and method. He repeatedly emphasizes that it is the content that makes him upset, not the teaching. Only one of the 29 interviewed students refer to the teaching method. Karim at Granskolan finds the constant repetition that is part of Camilla’s didactics trying and annoying. It is not always obvious which content becomes emotive, as we will see in Chapter 7 regarding economics.

The subject matter most recently dealt with in class certainly influences the students’ answers. At Ekskolan, where the subject matter taught during the fieldwork was economics, the students bring up personal finance as emotive. At Lindskolan, dealing with international relations, many students bring up war and violence.

But importantly, some students say that nothing in the Social Science subject matter is emotive and they cite different reasons. It is mostly students at Granskolan, where the subject matter taught during the fieldwork was the constitution, which, connected to Camilla’s teaching style, might explain their perceived lack of emotionality. Gabriel at Björkskolan says that not even politics becomes emotive for him because the expression of political opinion in the classroom is meant to help students learn about politics in Sweden and not to oppose each other; therefore, the content is cut off from the personal realm and does not stir any emotion. Mahmood, also at Björkskolan, says that Social Science education does not turn emotive because it lacks visuals. Just talking about things does not stir emotions for him. Johan at Lindskolan states that he does not get emotional over things connected to human beings, but if the teaching would have been centred around animals, it would have been a different matter. Anton at the same school says that he
does not get emotional, yet he shows a great deal of emotionality in the interview, especially anger and contempt directed at other students' behaviour in class. That said, the chapter now turns to the emotive Social Science topics brought up by the students in the study, clustered according to similarity. The presentation below does not represent a hierarchical order regarding the frequency of these topics. The teachers' opinions are analysed in Chapter 7.

Politics

Unsurprisingly, a subject matter that several students mention as emotive is politics, defined as party politics. Some of the students assume that revealing your political preferences might be sensitive and emotive. Even not revealing your political preferences, when living in a certain area, can be sensitive. One student, Erik, relates his feelings of being associated with the conservative party (*Moderaterna*) in Sweden, because he grew up and lives in a wealthy part of the region:

Erik: I live in Frisby, that is in the municipality of Ersholm so it is kind of well off. I get to hear that sometimes, “do you live there, well then you must be rolling in money”. You get picked on because you’re supposed to be a snob.

Katarina: What is that like? Is it put as a joke?

Erik: Yes well, but I don’t care, I get along OK in Frisby but I would much rather move to [the municipality where the fieldwork was conducted], because I feel that I am not the typical Frisby inhabitant.

[…]

Katarina: Did it happen when you were studying politics and parties?

Erik: Yes, politics gets a bit like that; you are supposed to be able to have your different political preferences, but then there is this fuss, about me living in Frisby. Many suppose that I am conservative /*...*/ you’re supposed to want to earn a lot of money and be rich and vote for the conservative party.

[…]

Katarina: Yes, that is interesting, what you feel in the classroom depending on where you come from.

Erik: I think like that myself: even though you know it is not really like that, in Lövnäs 33 percent voted for the Sweden Democrats, then you think that everyone there is racist, but of course it is not like that. It gets kind of divided,
if you are a woman in [the municipality where the fieldwork was conducted], you are supposed to be feminist.

Erik chose to commute to an upper secondary school that is not the closest to his home so he could get away from his former peers, because he did not conform with the norms of the wealthy municipality, in which his old school is situated, but upon arriving at Björkskolan, with its liberal or leftist norms, Anton was accused (albeit jokingly) of being conservative because of his geographical background. This makes the subject matter politics an emotive topic for him.

Sweden Democrats (SD)

In the field of party politics, SD is held as an emotive topic by several participants in the study. Karim at Granskolan expresses that he feels anxiety whenever SD is brought up in the teaching. When the teacher Camilla showed a map of Germany during class Karim made an association between Germany and SD:

Karim: She mentioned Germany once.
Katarina: Yes, I remember that.
Karim: /Or maybe it was something else, she brought up, then she wrote about the map with it/
Katarina: /she talked a bit about federal states/
Karim: Then I, we all, the whole class, thought […] I wrote it in our chat forum, we have a chat in there but she doesn’t know about it, really.
Katarina: What? (laughs) What did you write then?
Karim: Is it just me or do you see SD’s map in front of you? And that was how it was evident. That is how it is on the point of becoming now.
Katarina: What do you mean, how it is on the point of becoming in Sweden, because SD is a part of
Karim: It is on the point of becoming […] they are surging, exactly the way the Nazis were surging. I wrote that. Is it just me who sees SD’s map, and half of the class just […] “no, we see it too”, so everyone was thinking the same thing. And that was it, I was not the only one thinking about it /…/ Everyone else was also thinking about it.

Karim is certain that the whole class is against SD and that they are making the same associations that he is. The fieldwork at Granskolan took place just over a
month after the general elections in Sweden, where SD had strengthened their position in the Swedish parliament. In the aftermath of the elections, the topic of SD circulated in the media and was talked about a lot, making it an emotionally charged topic. In that sense the topic of SD is ‘sticky’. Perhaps that is why SD stirs Karim’s feelings swiftly and why he also thinks that the whole class shares his feelings.

During the fieldwork at Ekskolan, conducted during the run-up to the election for the European Parliament in May 2014, there was a stir and action around a political debate about the EU that the school had arranged. It took place in the assembly hall, with representatives from all political parties represented in the Swedish parliament, including SD. A couple of days ahead of the planned debate, a flyer circulated at Ekskolan, urging the students to attend the debate and quietly show resistance against SD and support for the students who are threatened by SD’s politics by standing up and turning their backs against the SD representative when she made her introductory and final statements. This flyer was given to the teacher Anja during a Social Science lesson on the same day that the debate was going to take place, 5 December 2014, but she did not bring it up during the lesson. She did discuss the flyer with another teacher in the staff room later in the afternoon though and calmly expressed that she thought the school should not interfere in the planned student action because it would not silence the SD representative. The teacher Anja talked to expressed a greater worry about the action causing turbulence such as booing.

SD’s presence at the school stirs emotions and gives students a possibility to visually choose sides, which worries some teachers but not Anja. During the debate, about a third of the students turned their backs at the SD representative, while three students applauded her, and the rest did not take visual action in the room.

Caroline at Björkskolan also brings up emotiveness in relation to SD, describing intensity in the classroom when SD’s election results were discussed.

SD seems to play an important role for the emotional community of Social Science education all schools except Lindskolan, where the topic did not surface during the fieldwork. SD is an emotionally charged object and aversion towards SD is used to build community. Karim at Granskolan assumed that his whole class is against SD. There seems to be a general expectation in the examined Social Science education to feel antipathy towards SD and similar parties. Such feelings were expressed openly in the classrooms.
Injustice and powerlessness

Two of the students at Björkskolan, Caroline and Linda, express similar emotionality albeit in relation to different topics. They feel powerlessness in relation to injustices and frustration over the difficulties in dealing with them. In both cases, being privileged seems to play a part in the emotions. For Caroline, this was pronounced during an assignment about the United Nations’ Millennium Development Goals:

Caroline: We were divided into groups. Each group was supposed to present a Millennium Development Goal in class. Infant mortality rates and allowances and stuff like that; what the goal was, and how far they have come. And it didn’t look good for many of the goals, because 25 billion, no, million, no, I am not sure, it was a big amount of money that was supposed to be given to Africa as aid, but not even eleven million had actually been given. And that was in 2005 or something but it hasn’t developed that far. And then there is the issue about gender equality, and everything in the world, it just seems that the Goals are not doing well.

Katarina: So you felt bad about it then?
Caroline: Yes, yes, kind of, yes.
Katarina: Why do you think it felt that way?
Caroline: I don’t know […] because we are well off in Sweden. And it was the thing about the aid money, only five out of all the countries in the world had contributed and that feels unfair. We used a webpage where we could compare Sweden with another country, and we compared with Ethiopia. The poverty there was extreme, while we are comfortable in Sweden, and yes that stuff feels bad.

Katarina: Yes because of the inequality.
Caroline: Yes and then there is nothing you can do about it /…/ At least not I as myself.

Caroline describes what Andrea Fraser calls the ‘painful position’ (Andersson, 2010, p. 269) realizing one’s own privilege and the responsibility that comes with it. Linda brings up an assignment on migration politics as emotive.

Linda: Well, it is less emotional for me than for many others in class, because I am not directly affected by it. I will always be in a way outside of it. But still, it is about the life of human beings, and how you are supposed to […] it is difficult […] you want to save everyone and you want everyone to be
okay, you really do. /…/ It is such a complex topic, there is so much […] oh God, it is so difficult. I am torn in different directions all the time, and in relation to this topic it feels so […] my dad can see a logic in that you have to limit the number of refugees you take on and I am just nooo, you can’t do that I don’t think that is possible, but then again, I understand that you have to unravel the system. I don’t get what they are doing, the politicians. If we can sit down and see that the integration is the problem. It is difficult, many blame the refugees and say that they don’t do anything, they just live on social security. But some people haven’t got a choice, but of course there are people who uses the system, but still, I think many really want to come here and create a life for themselves, start working and so on, but it takes a year before they are even allowed to get out into society, and when they do, everyone thinks that they take our jobs. And I am like, I can’t solve the problem, because (laughs) I haven’t got a […].

Katarina: Yes, one of the questions [of the assignment] was about that.

Linda: Yeah, like how can we solve all this, because it is a problem, and I don’t know what to do. That feels frustrating, not to have a clue, and then you think it is the task of the rulers of the country to solve it. But maybe it isn’t easy for them either, but still, they have to try.

The discovery of the complexity of these social issues and the difficulties for politicians to address them (in the case of Linda, a discovery enhanced by the assignment to come up with a solution to the ‘migration crisis’ in the Mediterranean) leads to frustration. In this situation, the Social Science teaching risks hindering political action, in a similar manner as for the students in Sandahl’s study (Sandahl, 2013). The risk is losing political engagement while gaining knowledge about complex social issues in a way that evokes a feeling of powerlessness.

Fabian at Lindskolan gets angry at what he calls the hypocrisy of the United Nations (UN) and the European Union (EU), something we will return to in Chapter 9, where the UN is defined as a ‘sticky’ topic, both for teachers and students.

Standing in contrast to the feelings of powerlessness and painful position that Caroline and Linda relate is Bashir at Lindskolan. He is active in an organization that supports refugees and he discusses aid organizations as an emotive topic but connected to pride and joy, because he knows that he is doing something and he knows a lot about aid work. Overall, more students at Lindskolan volunteer and express a desire to find a job that allows them to help others, e.g. as a social worker or assistant to students who are in need of extra support. Again, the timing of the fieldwork could impact the feelings evoked in the Social Science class. The fieldwork at Lindskolan was conducted in the autumn of 2015, when a large number of migrants arrived to Sweden. During the winter 2015-16, the Swedish
government implemented a restrictive migration policy in order to deter and hinder migrants entering the country, reducing the number of asylum applications drastically. Some of the students in class were volunteering at the central station of the city, receiving the migrants and helping them with practicalities. This ‘window of action’ can have contributed to a feeling that it is possible to make a difference.

Personal finance

At Ekskolan, the subject matter covered during the fieldwork was economics, which includes personal finance, and the students completed a task about their present finances as well as their finances when leaving their parents’ home. Four out of six interviewed students brought up personal finance as an emotive topic. The reasons they expressed for the emotiveness was anxiety about adult life (‘how can I get a job and earn money’), shame over the way they use their money or because of the insight that their parents pay almost everything, envy at others who can buy expensive things and different emotions related to financial injustice.

War and violence

Especially at Lindskolan, where the subject matter during the fieldwork was international relations, war and violence came up as topics stirring emotions. The source of this emotional dynamic seems to have been a documentary about the conflict between Palestine and Israel, dealing with past and present violence. Bahar and Ali expressed shame over the fact that humans kill each other, Bashir said he is frustrated and sad that history keeps repeating itself.

As already mentioned, at Björkskolan Mahmood, who says that Social Science teaching does not get emotional, mentions war and violence as a possibly emotive topic but only through visuals, such as film. This chimes with how the documentary at Lindskolan stirred emotions. Mahmood says that violence does not become emotional for him because in his class they only talk about it, and as such the emotion is too far away. According to Mahmood, moving images would have brought the students closer to reality. Mahmood’s reasoning around proximity and distance touches on one of the tensions regarding gatekeeping, analysed later in this chapter.

It is also important to mention Leyla’s distress in relation to the topic of international law and human rights, which is analysed in depth in Chapter 8.
Minorities and terrorism

Bashir at Lindskolan traces an injustice when it comes to what draws attention in the Social Science teaching, referring to the extensive coverage of the terrorist attacks in Paris in November 2015 and the silence around a terrorist attack in Beirut just a couple of days earlier. That is something that makes him angry.

The topic of terrorism is also related to anxiety, as in the case of Beata at Lindskolan, who worries about the possibility of an attack in her city and talks to her friends about not visiting the big shopping centre because it is risky.

Bashir also gets emotional when ethnic minorities are ridiculed or subject to stereotypes, which happens in the teaching and learning at Lindskolan, as we will see in Chapter 9. The same goes for Shirin at Björkskolan, who gets angry and disappointed at generalizations about Muslims in relation to the terrorist attack in Paris in January 2015.

Gatekeeping of Social Science teaching

As we saw in Chapter 2, the gatekeeping of Social Science education has not been given the attention it deserves in the research on Social Science teaching and learning. When it has been examined, it is the teacher, affected or unaffected by context, who is seen as the gatekeeper. This study will show that the students are highly active in the gatekeeping of the subject and that the actions they take in guarding the borders of the subject are closely tied to the students’ relations and collective identities.

Emotions are signs of proximity or distance to groups. It is possible to feel your way, i.e. perform emotional labour, in attaching yourself to a certain group, be at the ‘right’ side of a boundary or justify yourself as part of a desired group (which may go unnoticed by others). Theorizing Social Science teaching as an emotional community means that there is a great deal of gatekeeping going on in relation to that community. Some of that gatekeeping seems to go on as a kind of inner dialogue, for example when students do not express feelings because of their idea of what is relevant in Social Science education.

Some boundaries are visible in the classroom. At Björkskolan, the three tables the students sat at delineated three social groups with a clear hierarchy in the teaching: one table for the verbal pop students, one for the quieter but studious classical musicians and one table that I noted as the ‘migrant table’, where students who did not have Swedish as their first language sat. It was obvious that the students
entering the room late squeezed in at ‘their’ table regardless of whether there was a place for them and they avoided free seats at the other tables. At Lindskolan, I noted that the right side of the classroom was all white and the left side was not white at all; several students made generalizing comments about ‘those on the other side’ in the interviews. These are visually perceptible boundaries. The regulated seating at Granskolan, changing every four weeks or so, blurred visual divisions, but the teacher Camilla spoke about predictable patterns of boundary drawing, stating that speaking Swedish with or without a foreign accent is decisive, which made accent an important asset to play up or play down depending on your preferred attachments. At Ekskolan, no clear pattern was discernible.

The gatekeeping going on in the classroom shapes what the subject and the teaching of the subject become. This chapter does not attempt to be comprehensive, I will not offer a list of different types of gatekeeping in Social Science education. An analysis of my material shows that the gatekeeping is multi-layered and that tensions emerge between different kinds of gatekeeping. Two such tensions are in focus in the remaining sections of this chapter. The different layers of gatekeeping relate to each other; sometimes they are in conflict and sometimes in harmony. They are hard to disentangle. All of them can be performed by the teacher and the students. Sometimes the teacher and the students are on different ‘sides’ using different kinds of gatekeeping and sometimes the students are on different ‘sides’. The tensions that will be analysed in the following sections I call moral gatekeeping versus the syllabus and gatekeeping in relation to proximity and distance.

The syllabus and moral gatekeeping

A tension in how the subject is created in the classroom and what is kept out of and let into the teaching and learning regards what we could call a moral gatekeeping versus the syllabus. The moral dimension of teaching has been investigated in different ways by several researchers, for instance Fenstermacher (2001), Högberg (2015), Irisdotter (2006), and Jackson, Bostrom & Hansen (1993). Often, the moral dimension is situated as parallel to the didactical dimension of teaching. Sören Högberg describes how the moral dimension of teaching (he uses a Swedish concept that could perhaps be translated as teacherhood) follows every teacher’s and student’s action, because every action excludes another action in a concrete situation (Högberg, 2015, p. 41). The choices made in the classroom demand moral considerations about what are the right actions in different situations. Sara Irisdotter uses the term ‘double tracks’ when writing about teachers’ work. One
track makes it possible for students to express opinions and participate in democratic processes, while the other is responsible for the ethics in pedagogical situations (Irisdotter, 2006). That is a difficulty often raised by Social Science teachers, it is not exclusive for Social Science teaching but it is a particularly burning question in Social Science because of the democratic paradox, referred to in Chapter 1.

The two situations where a moral gatekeeping is in action are different; in the first situation, which is analysed more thoroughly in chapter nine and therefore only mentioned in passing here, the teacher Martin cuts off a sarcastic reaction when the Kurds are mentioned at a lesson at Lindskolan. Martin has talked about an increasing trend of students making snide remarks about ethnic groups at school. His quick hushing in the classroom can be seen as a form of moral gatekeeping: the sarcastic reaction is potentially hurting students with a Kurdish background. Hence, it is cut off, leaving several students unsure about what the reaction was about. Here, the moral gatekeeping supersedes a didactical perspective where the reaction might have been allowed and analysed in the teaching, tying it to the subject matter of international relations taught at the time of the incident. The action Martin chooses is hushing the verbal reaction, which is in line with his worry about students’ snide remarks about ethnicity. But at the same time, he cuts off the possibility to approach the situation didactically and make sense of it in relation to the content of the teaching. That could have amounted to ‘international relations’ in the classroom.

Högberg defines the didactical perspective in the moral dimension of teachers’ work as meaning ‘that the interaction between teachers and students concerns relational processes that are of importance for the content of the teaching as well as the students’ meaning making’ (Högberg, 2015, p. 53, my translation). Martin is focusing the responsibility of the teacher to safeguard respectful interaction in the classroom. It could be questioned whether the moral dimension and the didactical dimension are separate and whether there is a choice to be made between them. Can they not work together? In the situation at Lindskolan, and for Martin, that does not seem to be an option.

The second situation of moral gatekeeping of Social Science education occurred at Ekskolan. The situation consists of a threat of deportation of a student, which disrupted the teaching according to the syllabus. Here, the moral choice seems to work didactically and in relation to the syllabus for some students. For other students and for the teacher Anja, there is a clash between the ethical choice of acting to stop the deportation and the subject as represented in the syllabus. Anja’s plan for the Social Science course was interrupted when one of the students in the study group, Liridona, got the notice that her family’s asylum application had been
refused by the Swedish Migration Agency. Both Anja and the students in the group reacted with surprise as they did not know that Liridona, who had attended the school for two years now, lacked a right to reside in Sweden. In the interviews, several of the students observe that Liridona speaks such good Swedish and are upset about the time it has taken the Migration Agency to make the decision. The teacher Anja had received an e-mail about the decision and chose to tell the students about it during a Social Science lesson. Several students approached her after the lesson and asked her if they could do something to counteract the decision. The following lesson, Anja noted suggestions on what could be done to counteract the decision on the whiteboard and the students got to form groups depending on what they were interested in working with. That way, teams formed. The teams had different tasks: to communicate with the Migration Agency and the Migration Court; to create and manage a Facebook page; to contact media, and to collect signatures against the decision. The students designed the work with support from the teacher and they used Social Science lesson time to work on their mission. Thus, during several months, the Social Science teaching consisted of work against the rejection of Liridona and her family’s asylum application.

The teacher Anja said that the choice to work against the rejection of the asylum application contradicted the syllabus for the subject Social Science but that it would have felt strange shrugging it off as ‘oh well, so your application was refused’. Anja shows compassion in her statement. She cannot just stand and watch when a student is threatened by a deportation. Anja says ‘I couldn’t have acted differently’. The compassion in this case leads to political action. Anja feels a moral obligation to act. And through this moral obligation, her teaching plan and the content prescribed in the syllabus are put on hold.

The initiative to counteract the rejection initially comes from students in the group, but the teacher and later on also the headteacher, who writes a letter to the Migration Court, take a stand and act to change the decision. The school thus takes the side of the student against the Migration Agency (the state). There is a tension here between on the one hand the school as a national project, with a citizenship-fostering mission, and on the other hand the school as counteracting a state decision. The democratic paradox is indeed at work here. The school is stepping outside of itself in a way and its anti-racist mission gets an extra dimension: apart from counteracting racism in students the school is also counteracting racism in bureaucracy and policy. The idea of the best interests of the child seems to be influencing the school’s stance. Halleli Pinson, Madeleine Arnot and Mano Candappa (2010) have conducted fieldwork at schools in the UK and concluded that the teachers’
relation to the state are redefined in their work with students who do not have permanent residence.

Witnessing the politics of immigration first-hand redefines the relations of teachers to the state. Teachers are involved in protecting asylum-seeking youth. The strategies they use to encourage their abilities and help them settle into the school, however, are seriously disrupted by the actions of a government attempting to reduce asylum-seeker numbers rather than help them integrate into society. The schools we visited were clear about their professional ethic – they adopted an ethos of inclusion and integration which was very different from that of central government. (Pinson et al, 2010, p. 192)

It should be noted here that both migration politics and the discourse on migration in the UK was harsher than in Sweden during the time of Pinson, Arnot and Candappa’s study. But the situation in Sweden has hardened considerably since then, partly through a more restrictive migration policy.

All the interviewed students in the group at Ekskolan expressed that it is obvious that you want to help a friend. Their ‘moral compass’ tells them so. But they diverge when it comes to the question if acting against the rejection of the asylum application is related to the subject Social Science or not. Sofia says that the best motivation to learn is when something real is at stake, as in this situation. As Sandahl (2013) observes in one of his studies, there is a tension between engagement and distanced Social Science analysis in the subject teaching. The teachers worry about students losing their belief that they can change the world in their encounter, through the subject teaching, with the complexity of social issues. Here, the opposite case for some students, who gained confidence, engagement and political awareness by acting on the rejection of Liridona’s asylum application. Sofia wishes every Social Science study group could have a real situation as a point of departure.

Sofia: It shows how much you can influence if you just want to. I have learnt a lot from that.

Katarina: Do you feel that it was a part of the Social Science education?

Sofia: Yes, we were dealing with democracy and the political arena, and then this came up, but I think we addressed a lot, we should have had media, but we will miss that, but we have still addressed it, we wrote to the newspapers, so now we know how we can be influential and that feels nice. I was one of the students in charge of the Facebook-page so I learnt a lot about how to express myself, what you can or cannot write.

Katarina: It seems like the teaching got vivid.
Sofia: Yes, because if we hadn’t done anything, Liridona wouldn’t be here today, we can really see how influential we have been. I hope and think and want that every group studying Social Science will have the possibility to do something similar, even though I don’t want many people to be deported. I think many groups don’t have the possibility to do that so I think it is really nice that we had the opportunity.

Pinson, Arnot and Candappa’s study gives similar examples of how students come to life as they enter the political arena to ‘rescue’ a classmate (see e.g. Pinson et al., 2010, p. 200). The students get the feeling that they can influence and control the situation.

But in the group at Ekskolan there were also students who grew frustrated about what happened to the teaching and learning as prescribed by the syllabus. They referred to the curriculum and expressed worry about the teaching when it diverged from the original plan of the teacher and the curriculum. As summer approached, it became stressful to cover all the central content from the course’s syllabus and so the teacher Anja made the decision to shorten and even leave out some of the content areas. Ivan says that he thinks that the work against the rejection of the asylum application could have been done parallel to more regular Social Science teaching. Jacob feels concern about the fact that some of the content in the syllabus was rushed through or omitted:

Jacob: Well it took away a pretty big part of our time. In the end, that is probably the reason for the shortage of time for this last assignment. We had a look at the syllabus, all the different criteria, and saw that after half a year we had only accomplished about a quarter of them. So, we had to shift up a gear the second semester.

Katarina: Has the tempo felt much higher?

Jacob: Yes. We have had a test about EU and then this assignment and there have been many swift run-throughs of for example how the law system in Sweden has developed, about gender equality and how women grew into society and stuff like that.

Katarina: But what you did last autumn, did it feel like part of the teaching or like something separate?

Jacob: It wasn’t necessarily part of the education, it was more helping a classmate and getting the possibility to do it in school.

The opinions in the group differ regarding whether the campaign against the Migration Agency’s decision was part of the subject Social Science. Some students are
more inclined to believe that proper Social Science is dictated by policy documents and planned teaching.

The time spent on the counteraction was also perceived differently by students in the different work groups. Students from the group with responsibility for social media, which maintained a Facebook page, said in the interviews that they had not learned much Social Science content through their political work and that the time had passed pretty slowly. Of all the groups, the group who had responsibility for the contact with the Migration Agency and the Migration Court were believed to have acquired the most Social Science knowledge.

In the situation at Ekskolan, the teacher opens up the subject when the rejection of Liridona’s family’s asylum application becomes known. This can be seen as ethical gatekeeping: ‘I couldn’t have acted differently’. Anja is clear in stating that this is not really Social Science education for her because she is leaving the syllabus and her teaching plan. Again, we see the division being made between the moral dimension of teaching and the subject. The subject gets reduced to the syllabus. Some students are very aware and worried about leaving the syllabus, but the ethical task of helping a friend means that they are not complaining about it. Instead, their worries are kept to themselves. Nevertheless, they would have liked to keep the campaign for Liridona separate from the teaching, i.e. keep the borders of the subject closed to such involvement.

In conclusion, these situations clearly demonstrate that moral gatekeeping is an important part of Social Science teaching. But in both cases, the moral perspective is not ‘taken in’ as part of the subject, a tension echoed in the discussion on the school’s democratic mission, which is often treated as something separate from the school’s knowledge mission. The knowledge mission is explicitly formulated in the policy documents. The democratic mission and fundamental values, by contrast, are vaguely formulated and stated and in the general curriculum, but not in subject syllabi. Therefore, the knowledge mission is more tangible, thus more in focus (Hakvoort & Olsson, 2014).

What about Beirut? Proximity and distance

I have found tensions regarding gatekeeping in relation to proximity and distance, that is geographical and cultural gatekeeping. The syllabus is not used by the participants to argue about this tension as the gatekeeping is not with or against any policy. Rather, the gatekeeping takes the form of a justice argument.
There are two clear examples of gatekeeping in relation to proximity and distance in the dataset. Both situations by accident relate to Lebanon. One situation unfolded at Lindskolan, where the fieldwork started just after the terrorist attack in Paris in November 2015. An argument erupted over the Paris attack getting all the attention when just a couple of days earlier there was a terrorist attack in Beirut. At Granskolan, the second situation revolved around how Karim’s references to the Lebanese government makes the teacher Camilla direct her attention to Belgium.

Again, the timing is of vital importance. The situation at Granskolan unfolded during two lessons in November 2014. The general elections had taken place two months earlier, resulting in a minority government composed of a coalition between the Social Democrats and the Green Party. During November and December, the government in Sweden was on shaky ground. Already in October there was uncertainty around state budget – which was to be voted out in parliament on 3 December. Would the Sweden Democrats defeat the government’s budget and vote for the opposition’s alternative budget? Would the Prime Minister resign if that were to happen? Would the government be forced to execute the opposition’s budget proposal? Would a new general election be announced?

In this turbulent time, the class at Granskolan was learning about the constitution. The teacher Camilla took a comparative perspective in her lectures and compared the Swedish and US constitutions. She drew a table on the whiteboard, wherein she added important terms from the Swedish and American constitutions. The students constructed similar tables on their laptops. This subject area was concluded by an individual assignment where the students were supposed to compare the Swedish constitution with that of another country of their choice.

The situation unfolded as follows. During a couple of weeks, Camilla had lectured about the electoral system, the legislative process and parliamentarianism. The lesson where the situation happened addressed vote of no confidence and electing a new prime minister. I noted that the atmosphere in the classroom got livelier and livelier. From a passive atmosphere, where the students were mainly copying what the teacher wrote on the whiteboard, answered rote questions, watched movies, played games or used Facebook, a wind of engagement and curiosity emerged.

Camilla: What is the first thing that happens when a country loses its government?

Emilia (raises her hand and gets to answer): They have to elect a new one.

Marcus (simultaneously, but louder): Anarchy.
Camilla: Yes, they have to come up with a new government. When the government resigns the initiative lands with the parliament.

Student: It’s like in *The Purge,*22 we can do whatever we like in the meantime.

Camilla: (laughs) no, let me put it like this: some countries have gone through such deep political crises that the administrative systems have collapsed. But that is highly unlikely to happen in Sweden. (Camilla walks to the whiteboard and starts writing on it).

Karim: Especially in Lebanon. They haven’t even got a government. (He says something that I did not catch)

Camilla: Where? (she still stands with her back towards the class)

Karim: In Lebanon.

Camilla: Well they have got a government but it is not very effective. (Turns towards Karim). But there are other countries or areas in the world where they have neither parliament nor government.

Karim: They had, it was for about three months they had nothing.

Camilla: No, yes, but it was the same in Belgium.

Karim: They are back now but they haven’t done anything.

Camilla: No, in Belgium I think it took a year before the parliament in Belgium managed to appoint a government. They lived without a government for that long.

At this point, Camilla continues her lecture where she left off. At the Social Science lesson the next day, she returns to the topic of Lebanon and Belgium:

Camilla: [...] and it is not good for a country to be without government. Karim, you mentioned Lebanon, that they had been without government for a long time, right? Yes. And what it means is that nothing happens in a country without government, because it is the government that puts forward proposals and also executes what has been decided. There is no development, it is negative. Belgium, to pick a country that is closer to us, Belgium is a very divided country. You have two different languages, two different religions and the different parts of the little country are very different all the same so it is a very divided country. And because of that the parliament is also divided. And it took them months, a year or more, I actually don’t remember, but definitely several months to negotiate about a government. And during that time, there was no change in Belgium. No new decisions

22 *The Purge* is a feature film that was shown in the cinemas at the time.
were made, no agreements were made with other countries, no reforms could be executed. So, it is very negative for a country not to have a government. So, if Löfvén’s budget is defeated in the parliament, Sweden is going to have a small political crisis, because then we will be without government for a while. (To Karim who has raised his hand) Yes?

Karim: They have got a government now but no one does anything, it is just the military that holds everything in place there.

Camilla: Yes, because governments can have different amounts of power. In some countries there can be a government, but there are other centres of power in society, for instance the military or religious communities who have more power than the government has.

In this situation, Karim breaks into the lecture with a contribution that indeed has to do with the theme of the lecture, but he also directs attention to another part of the world. Camilla appears not to welcome Karim’s contribution. She initially stands with her back against Karim, turning around fairly late into the conversation. As she does not catch which country Karim is talking about, she asks ‘where’ in a voice that is almost irritated, as if his contribution disturbs her lecture. I wrote in the field notes that Karim had to stick up for himself. Firstly, Camilla makes a generalizing statement about there being many countries where the constitution does not work, then turning attention to Belgium. In both cases, Karim continues to make statements about Lebanon. There is a tension between Karim’s statements about Lebanon and Camilla’s statements about Belgium.

Camilla has probably followed the media reports about the political crisis in Belgium and sticks to Belgium because she knows more about that country. But she also makes a statement about Belgium as a country that is ‘closer to us’, which signals that Belgium is more relevant to Social Science teaching and learning and the students in class than Lebanon.23

In the interview she brings up the situation with Karim before I mention anything about it. She had been thinking about it a lot because she associated it with my research interest and thought I would ask about it. Despite identifying the situation as relevant for the research, she did not seem to be able to change it as it happened. She only thought about it retrospectively.

23 An alternative interpretation of Camilla’s choice of talking about Belgium rather than Lebanon proposed by my discussant at the 90percent-seminar, Johan Sandahl, is that Belgium is more relevant to talk about in relation to Sweden because they are both well-functioning democracies, whereas Lebanon is not. Camilla’s choice is then a way to keep the line in the lesson by talking about what happens when a functioning democracy loses its government.
Camilla is self-critical, feeling she missed an opportunity and tried to make up for it later. She says she should have seized the situation in a different way, with the Swedish expression that she should have ‘caught the ball’ Karim was throwing her. The situation with Karim was chosen as a video sequence that was shown to all interviewees. Camilla gives a nervous impression prior to watching the clip, but afterwards she seems relieved.

Katarina: What do you think now that you saw it?
Camilla: I think the same way as I did then; wait a minute, it went too fast, of course I should have picked up the thread when there was a personal interest. But I am, [...] not proud, but it still felt good that I remembered it later, that we could reconnect to it.

Katarina: Did you think about it between the two lessons?
Camilla: Not much, but I thought about it. I had it in the back of my mind somehow that if I got a chance, I would repair it. That has to do with Karim as well, he is a student who has not really landed in the group and at this school. I felt this was an opportunity to strengthen him as a person, through remembering what he had said, through noticing something about him.

Talking about the situation, Camilla expresses that she should have acted differently, she should have caught Karim’s personal interest more clearly in the teaching. The argument she states for doing that is to strengthen Karim both academically and relationally in the study group.

Camilla thinks that she recognized Karim as an individual by returning to his statements the following lesson. But in retrospect she says that she could have taken a more balanced approach towards Belgium and Lebanon:

Camilla: I realize that what I could have done differently was to check both Belgium and Lebanon.
Katarina: Yes, I wondered if you had done that between the lessons.
Camilla: No, I did not. It got lost. It is a typical thing; you think “yes, I will”, but then the lesson continues and then the lesson ends. Then you teach another subject and then two or three days pass and then “whoops”, you stand there, “oh I should have checked it but I didn’t”. It struck me now that I watched the video that I could have mentioned that there are similarities between Lebanon and Belgium. That they are divided countries, with religions and people and regions. That didn’t really strike me then.
Interestingly, when the video sequence with Karim was shown to the interviewed students, they did not spontaneously comment on the teacher turning the attention from Lebanon to Belgium. Several of them frame Karim’s contribution as something negative, something that disturbs the teaching and learning. They believe that showing them the video sequence was meant to capture that disturbance. Olle and Marcus both initially tried to smooth it over, saying ‘But that was not that bad was it?’ And ‘From my point of view it is not the end of the world when that happens’. Despite my efforts not to appear to take sides with the teacher during the fieldwork, they seem to position me as a teacher or at least as a representative of the subject Social Science, with an interest in not allowing the teaching to be disturbed by a personal contribution from a student, which diverges from the teacher’s lesson plan.

As the interviews unfolded it became clear that there was a common opinion in the class that students’ personal contributions were, in general, irrelevant. For instance, Olle relates how he views personal contributions as an opportunity to take a break and rest his attention in class:

Olle: It happens like once every lesson.

Katarina: What happens with the teaching then?

Olle: Well, there is a small interruption that makes the brain stop for a while and think about something else, and then get back. It is rather nice actually, it is a break in the monotony.

Katarina: Ok, so you think it is nice that there is a break.

Olle: Mm

Katarina: But does that mean that you don’t listen to what is being said in that break?

Olle: Yes.

Olle signals that what Karim addresses is not interesting or important for him by not listening to what Karim says. Karim’s impasse is thus outside of the symbolic boundary that Olle draws around the Social Science teaching. Emilia says that there are sometimes comments made by students but that they are often not relevant. Fang says that he concentrates on himself and does not listen to what other students say. Fang says that Karim would have to hit him or scream at him to make him listen.

What disturbs Camilla’s main thread is seen by all the interviewed students except for one as something that disturbs the teaching and learning. Thus, the symbolic boundaries are precisely drawn in this group. Marcus is the only one who,
after watching the clip, talks about Karim’s intervention in positive terms, saying that students’ personal knowledge can sometimes be very exciting and interesting. The teacher’s reaction to Karim’s contribution is to turn attention away from Lebanon and towards Belgium, marking that Belgium is more proximate to the classroom. But why she thinks in these terms is not made clear by her and is thus open for interpretation. The students, on the other hand, are performing another kind of gatekeeping, one that has nothing to do with where in the world something has happened, and everything to do with excluding anything that is not in line with the teacher’s plan. This seems to have affected Karim when he talks about the situation in retrospect. He seems to feel a need to defend himself for making a contribution to the teaching:

Karim: Well, there is a pause from her and then we start talking about it. But there ought to be some time for that too? You cannot just count that she can say what she has got, there has to be some little time for us as well.

The teacher Camilla has a lot of power in drawing the boundaries around the subject teaching in this group, since what she signals is ‘part of the track’ or part of the subject teaching is listened to. She is a strong gatekeeper.

The second situation regarding proximity and distance took place at Lindskolan. On 13 November in 2015, at the beginning of my fieldwork at Lindskolan, a terrorist attack occurred in Paris. The attack, targeting the music venue Bataclan, several restaurants and Stade de France, took place a week before the class at Lindskolan started a new subject matter: international relations. The first lesson on international relations was held seven days after the attack. The teacher, Martin, lectured on actors on the international arena listing states, intergovernmental organizations, NGOs, ethnic groups and terrorist organizations. He did not bring up the Paris attack. Twice during the lecture, I heard students talking amongst themselves about the attack in Paris and a police hunt for an alleged terrorist in Sweden.

When I spoke to Martin after the lesson, he said that he was under pressure because he was struggling to get the teaching done on time. He told me that the mentors at the school had been urged to ask their students about how they felt about the attack in Paris. Martin himself had been on sick leave that week and had not been talking to his students. He said that referring to and commenting on burning questions takes time away from the original teaching plan, though you have to do it now and then. In the lesson of that day, he focused on the structure of international relations and hence kept the boundaries around the subject close to the syllabus.
The following week, Martin was away and I asked the substitute teacher about the principal’s instructions regarding the aftermath of the terrorist attack. She read the e-mail aloud and it said that the attacks in France and Lebanon (referring to an IS attack on civilians in a Hezbollah-friendly neighbourhood in Beirut the day before the attack in Paris) should be discussed both individually and together. The substitute teacher herself had been discussing the attacks in class in a Psychology course connecting to subject matter such as social psychology - more specifically, the power of fear. She described a situation where she, as soon as she mentioned Paris, got the reaction from a group of students saying ‘but what about Beirut?’. The reaction disturbed her. She described it in a bantering voice and told me that she tried to explain why the Paris attack was more important to discuss because of France’s cultural proximity to Sweden. I asked her if she thought that the students had a connection to the area in or around Lebanon and she answered that she thought they had.

The boundary work in this situation is multi-layered. The symbolic boundaries the students are drawing differentiate them from the school, represented by the teacher. They use the perspective of the school as a contrast, thus strengthening the attachment within the group. The boundaries the teacher is drawing are cultural, stating a cultural proximity between France and Sweden, though on a more generalizing level than in relation to the individuals in the classroom. This boundary work clearly marks a distance.

The gatekeeping in the two situations has to do with proximity and distance. What is close and what is far away, geographically, structurally, politically and culturally, is assessed differently by students and teachers, which leads to a tension between students and teacher, where the students want to open up the subject and include content that is closer to them while the teacher wants another focus.

Camilla’s assertion that Belgium is closer to ‘us’ is not explained, but could mean any of the following: mere geographical proximity, closer to her knowledge, a perceived similarity in the character and history of the two political systems. In the classroom situation she turns from Lebanon to Belgium, but in retrospect she sees a possibility to approach Karim by emphasizing the similarities between the two countries.

The substitute teacher at Lindskolan explicitly argued with the students about Paris being closer to ‘us’ culturally, and so it is not unjust that the Paris attacks get more attention in Sweden. The teacher’s account of the situation is partly banter, which shows that she is distanced from the students in question through her feelings about the event. If her account of the students’ behaviour is correct, they were
also moving away from her by recurrently asking ‘but what about Beirut?’ when she talked about Paris.

Proximity and distance are ‘produced’ in the boundary work performed in the teaching. If the borders around the subject as well as between different groups had been drawn differently, what is regarded as close or distant would have most likely changed. The tension and contention in these gatekeeping situations show that if the gatekeeping actions had been performed differently, the subject could have been something different. This means that there is, importantly, a potential to change the direction of the teaching and learning.

Conclusion

This chapter has started the dissertation’s empirical investigation of Social Science teaching as an emotional community. A picture has emerged of Social Science education as an emotional community that differs from the emotional communities of other subjects. One reason for this difference is the specific Social Science content, which gives rise to specific emotions and boundaries. Another reason are the expectations and conceptions related to the subject Social Science in contrast to other subjects, influenced by a history of contact with the subject teaching. The students’ account of emotive topics in Social Science education shows that the subject is undoubtedly emotive, although other subjects, like Religious Education and History are framed by the students as more emotional.

The account of the students’ view of emotive topics in Social Science does not take into account the relationality of emotion. The following three chapters therefore analyse the relationality of emotion in Social Science teaching. However, some important conclusions can be drawn from the students’ account of emotive topics in this chapter and a couple of patterns are discernible in the topics suggested by the students. Timing and specific events appear to be important triggers of emotions in relation to Social Science content. A topic that circulates a lot in everyday conversations and the media becomes emotionally sticky and is thereby more likely to stir emotion in the Social Science teaching. Further, ethics seems to play a part in making content go emotive. Several of the students react against injustices. Being passive and powerless, despite privilege, evokes shame, while being an ‘active citizen’ evokes feelings of pride in relation to Social Science teaching. The subject and the teaching seem to signal being an active, democratic citizen as a strong norm, in line with the political demand on the subject. So much so that shame and pride come into play in the teaching.
The emotionality related to the topics accounted for in this chapter, and the attitudes towards them are part of the emotional community of Social Science teaching. The topics are all firmly nested, and therefore expected in the teaching of the subject. Some of the emotional expressions are also expected, as in the case of the expressed aversion towards SD. Feelings of pride regarding active citizenship, even outside of formal institutions, seem to be encouraged.

What is tolerated and what is deplored? We will return to which feelings are deplored in the more detailed empirical chapters. Importantly, those chapters will show that the topic emotions are also social, i.e. that there is a relationality through emotion, forming an important part of the attempted emotional community. There is a reciprocal relationship between boundary work and the object of emotion. Which objects get sticky (attracting emotion) is a process influenced by the relationality. Sometimes an object of emotion is needed to secure attachments in the group. An object can be made emotive to do something to the relations, as in the reaction against Mahmood in Chapter 9. Sometimes an emotive object transposes the attachments in a group in a way that surprises the involved students, as for Shirin in Chapter 8.

This chapter has taken a broader look on boundary work and gatekeeping, focusing on situations where the boundaries of the teaching are contested. The contestation regards what is valuable and harmful in the teaching, making that sort of boundary work a constant feature in the construction of emotional communities. The boundaries in and around the subject interplay with boundaries dividing ‘us’ from ‘them’. A conclusion is that the moral dimension of the teaching is not framed as part of the subject - at Ekskolan, for example, the subject is strictly framed by the syllabus. The separation of the emotive action against the deportation of a student from the Social Science syllabus suggests that the syllabus is of no help in that and similar situations. At least it is not put to use. The teacher Anja herself says that they stop following the syllabus and thus does not bridge the situation and the subject syllabus. This is particularly interesting because the first part of the chapter showed that students’ moral compasses play a part in which Social Science content becomes emotive. Could the old divide between rationality and emotionality be at work here?

Another conclusion about boundary work is that proximity and distance ‘produced’ through boundary work in the group and around the subject seems to be an especially emotive form of gatekeeping. It was acted out in a particularly emotional way at Lindskolan, where a substitute teacher and a group of students ‘battled’ over whether Paris or Beirut deserves more attention in a way that clearly distanced the teacher and the students from each other. The situation at Granskolan, where
Karim brought up the political situation in Lebanon, did not include the kind of intense emotions that the dissertation fastens on, but it still serves as a clear example of the complexities of the boundary work around the subject.

The following three empirical chapters will be more specific about the relation between emotions and boundary work in the Social Science teaching and what the Social Science teaching is and can be as a result thereof. The analysis in these more detailed chapters deploys Ahmed’s concepts of movement, attachment and contact. These detailed accounts, accompanied by a systematization of different kinds of situations, will serve as a fruitful base for a discussion about what emotions do in Social Science teaching and what the subject Social Science does to emotions. The next chapter turns towards the teachers and their experiences of emotions and boundary work related to specific Social Science knowledge content and the Social Science teaching. The students might place the teachers outside of the complex boundary work in the group, but that does not necessarily mean that the teachers are not entangled with it.
CHAPTER 7 – EMOTIONAL TEACHERS

This dissertation project started out with a strong focus on the students, but as the fieldwork was progressed, the teachers turned out to be of too great importance for the emotional community to play second fiddle. As we will see, when talking about emotions, teachers focus students’ feelings. Teachers’ emotionality in relation to Social Science teaching seems to be neglected, hidden or absent. So much so that it begs for attention. This chapter, the first of the detailed empirical chapters, examines the teachers’ emotions. The distinction between students and teachers serves a clarity in the representation and facilitates a comparison of the conditions of teachers and students. Though in the emotional community, as indeed in the didactical triangle, teachers, students and content are intertwined to the extent that it is impossible to disaggregate them entirely. This chapter, then, is not devoid of students’ emotions, which bolsters the relational approach of the study.

The teachers are part of the emotional community in the teaching. The emotional movements and attachments in the classroom most certainly both affect and are affected by them. Still, Social Science didactical research on emotions focuses students’ emotions, as if the teachers’ emotions do not interplay with them (see e.g. Frech & Richter, 2019). Teachers’ emotions are something dealt with in more generic research, examining teachers’ emotional situations in a broader perspective. Accordingly, it appeared crucial for the rigour of this study to include the teachers’ expressions of emotionality and to analyse what teacher emotions do in the Social Science education as well as what the subject Social Science does to teacher emotions. A comparison between teachers’ and students’ movements and attachments in relation to emotions will, in the conclusion of the thesis, show that the teachers occupy a special position in the emotional community, a position that bears within it a potential for transformative action.

When asked about what could get emotional in Social Science education, the teachers in the study all responded from a student’s perspective. They had to be asked again and this time in explicit terms, about their own feelings. Despite an
apparent lack of habit in reflecting on what they feel regarding the subject content, it is clear from the material that teaching Social Science is emotional business. It is also clear that the teachers’ emotionality differs from that of the students. The difference does not necessarily lie in the area of content that is emotive, but rather in the fact that the teachers in the study express emotionality in relation to a professional dimension. This chapter sets out to discuss what that means in relation to the emotional community and boundary work of the Social Science teaching.

First, the chapter surveys the material to see where, when and how the teachers express emotionality. It then analyses in detail Anja’s teaching of economics at Ekskolan and Martin’s teaching about the UN at Lindskolan. These two in depth situations are chosen because they both show the relation between the specific Social Science content, emotions and political boundary work. This makes them stand apart from other findings regarding teacher emotionality accounted for in this chapter, findings that are not closely related to a specific content area. These situations also open up for a discussion about the politicization and gatekeeping of the teaching due to their political character, i.e. the drawing of boundaries between us and them. Finally, the two situations reveal that so called topic emotions (Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2014) are at the same time social emotions, which is a general result of this study.

The focus on teachers’ emotions can create new opportunities to didactically use emotions in teaching, because the teachers have more direct access to what they feel compared to what the students feel. Still, the teacher is perhaps as much as the students involved in the collective emotional dimensions of the Social Science content, and it is thus no simple task to address emotions in the teaching. What is more, we will see that teachers’ conception of the ‘professional Social Science teacher’ also impacts the opportunities to use their emotions in the teaching.

The joy and despair of teaching Social Science

What is noteworthy when briefly assessing my data on teacher emotionality as an analysed corpus is that the emotionality the teachers express is to a large extent related to what they represent as teachers of Social Science and their professionalism.

The data includes interviews, where the teachers were first asked what they thought would be emotional in the teaching, and then what they thought became emotional in retrospect. But there are also field notes from my observations of the
teaching, which importantly document intensities in the classroom and gestural and facial expressions of emotion. All of the data in this study, except for a student who starts to cry during the interview (as related in Chapter 8), are verbal, gestural and facial expressions that can be seen as voluntary. For instance, the participants tell me how they feel, smile, move enthusiastically. The expressions can therefore be conceptualized as Reddy’s (2001) ‘emotives’, that is, a kind of speech act that can be descriptive, but also managerial and exploratory. Reddy argues that when one expresses emotions, one attempts to ‘feel what one says one feels’ (Plamper, 2010, p. 240). If one succeeds, one has managed one’s emotions, but if one does not succeed one discovers something unexpected about what one feels, and the expression is therefore exploratory. What this means for the analysis of the data is that the emotions, which the participants express could be managed. They could express a feeling that was not there from the beginning in order to fit in, give the appearance of a good teacher who cares about the subject, meets expectations and so on. The difficulties of knowing when an expression of emotion is managed or not create a pitfall in emotion research, as discussed in Chapter 4.

The teachers were interviewed as teachers of Social Science, and importantly, their expressions of emotion are linked to their ideas about professionalism as Social Science teachers, their goals regarding the education and their ideas about classroom management. As discussed in chapter four, there is a hanging risk that the teachers relate what they think a good teacher would say. Still, there are signs in the material that they are actually speaking authentically. Anja pauses several times during the interviews and says, ‘well to be honest, […] and that is what we should be in this situation’. Martin says, concerning the UN, ‘well I am neutral regarding these things’ but then he halts and says ‘wait, no, I am not, actually’. In that moment Martin’s speech act gets exploratory, in line with Reddy’s emotives discussed above. By saying that he is neutral Martin discovers that he is not. These small comments from Anja and Martin are signs that the teachers are not strictly managing their answers.

It is important to bear in mind that the data stemming from the interviews alone, as in the case of the teaching of economics at Ekskolan, cannot be used to account for what actually happened in the classroom. For a discussion of this position, see Chapter 4.

---

24 Reddy’s conceptual framework is discussed in more depth in Chapters 3 and 4.
Joy and pride

The analysed data documenting teacher emotionality shows primarily feelings of joy and pride. This is in line with previous research on teacher emotion that shows enjoyment and pride as principal emotions connected to teaching (Frenzel, 2014, p. 495). Frenzel rightly calls upon caution with these results, reminding us that the teaching profession is credited with high ideals and the teachers may therefore exaggerate their experience of enjoyment (2014, p. 496). This is an area where Reddy’s emotives could be strongly at work, then. In this study, the data on teacher emotion stem from both interviews and observations, what increases the reliability compared to a study that is exclusively founded on interviews. But, as discussed in chapter two, classroom observations are no guarantee for capturing unmanaged emotional expressions because the teacher could be performing emotional labour.

Several researchers relate teachers’ emotions primarily to their relationship with students (see for instance the work of Hargreaves and Nias). The teachers’ feelings of joy in this study are either tied to the relations with the students in the teaching or to aspects of the subject Social Science. This is in line with Kunter, Frenzel, Nagy, Baumert and Pekrun (2011) who make a distinction between feelings of enthusiasm derived from teaching and feelings of enthusiasm derived from the subject being taught.

In this study, the latter type of enthusiasm is most pronounced in the case of Camilla at Granskolan. She expresses joy and pride in scientific analysis and describes herself as a ‘boxes and arrows person’, which she associates with Social Science as opposed to the humanities.

The joy of scientific analysis was encouraged and strengthened during her studies of political science and seems to be strong in what she represents as a teacher. Systematization and analysis are her ideas of disciplinary Social Science knowledge and are something that she may need to negotiate in the classroom. However, Camilla’s style of teaching with a strong sense of control allows her to design the teaching in a way that confirms her joy as she gets to do a great deal of analysis and working with boxes and arrows in the teaching.

Another joyous part of teaching for Camilla is her excitement and interest regarding certain current topics:

Camilla: What I find really exciting right now, exciting in a nasty way but still, is what is happening right now with the violations of Swedish waters, if it is a violation and who it is. What is it, who is it, why, why now and so on. I find it really exciting to reflect on that, and the intriguing in politics and international relations. Trying to see what’s behind it, and to some extent
teach the students that things are not always what they seem. People, politicians and political parties don’t act randomly.

The interest in current topics seems to be mirrored by the students in her class. The field notes show an increasing engagement in the group when it comes to current topics like the submarine chase or the governmental crisis taking place in Sweden at the time of the fieldwork at Granskolan. This reciprocity between teacher and students increases a feeling of joy and pride, which leads us to the interrelation between joy and social bonds.

That teachers experience purpose, agency and resilience in or through teacher-student relations and the ability to contribute to students’ progress is well documented in research on teachers’ emotions (see for instance Day & Qing, 2009; Nias, 1989). This attitude is often put forward as that which makes teachers cope with negative emotions regarding organizational change and heavy workloads. The clearest examples of joy in teacher-student relations in this study were observed at Björkskolan, where the field notes show several situations of social bonding between the teacher Rickard and a group of pop-interested liberal-leftist students, described as ‘the good mob’ in Chapter 9. It is possible to object that the comparatively weaker social differentiation between Rickard and the students makes their relation less a student-teacher relation and more of a peer-relation and that the teacher’s joy decreases with an increasing differentiation from the students. However, Jonas Aspelin (1999) gives several examples of under-differentiation that is perceived as very problematic for the teacher.

As we will see in Chapters 8 and 9, the interactional order in Rickard’s classroom is dominated by a group comprising roughly a third of the students. The group is interested in pop music and express liberal and leftist opinions in the classroom. The group includes most of the students who are verbally active, raising their hands and wanting to speak in class. They are quick to answer questions and one student who did not belong to the ‘pop group’, Karoline, said her impression was that the teacher had become so used to the same people talking in class that he, maybe for the sake of time efficiency, increasingly over the year had directed questions to the same students, according to Karoline perhaps because he knows that he will get a quick, good answer back.

As related in Chapter 3, the concept of social bonds is used in sociology to describe what keeps society or humans in the society together. Building social bonds is a continuous unstable process. If the bond is threatened, one feels shame and the shame provides an incentive to act to strengthen the bond. If the bond is strengthened, one feels pride, a sense of belonging. To be attuned is to understand each
other not only cognitively, e.g. to understand what someone is saying, but also emotionally (Aspelin, 1999, p. 39-40).

Several times during my observations Rickard and the dominant group of students were strengthening their social bonds through short remarks about music or politics. On one occasion, while role-playing about the EU, a student from the dominant group exclaimed ‘Meat is Murder’ whereby the teacher made a comment that it was a quote from (the pop artist) Morrissey, followed by an exchange of smiles. On another occasion the teacher was wearing a T-shirt with the feminist slogan ‘Cats against cat calls’, and one student from the dominant group said aloud in front of the class ‘Nice T-shirt, Rickard’. Rickard smilingly replied: ‘Thank you!’.

Such short comments strengthen the social bond and the feeling of pride and attunement between the teacher and the dominant group of students in class. Attunement affects who talks and who does not and what type of comments and opinions are considered to be acceptable in classroom interaction. In his work, Aspelin (see for instance Aspelin, 1999; 2010) uses Scheff’s theory of social bonds and attunement in micro-studies of classroom interaction. Through his work, Aspelin shows that the feelings of shame and pride and the sense of attunement affect classroom interaction. The sense of attunement and pride opens up for raising one’s voice in the classroom. But reversely, those students whose social bonds to the teacher are threatened fall silent.

Both Rickard and Anja express compassion in relation to teaching – Rickard says that he avoids asking students direct questions and adds that he vividly remembers the anxiety he felt at school during his own French classes every time he had to say something. Anja expresses compassion regarding the impending deportation of a student, as narrated in detail in Chapter 6.

Insufficiency, antipathy and disappointment

As related above, the data shows a predominance of positive emotions related to the teaching of Social Science. But there are also negative emotions.25

The feeling of insufficiency can be traced in all four teachers. Martin is worried because he does not have time to learn and prepare new content for his courses as

---

25 As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, parsing emotions as essentially positive and negative is impossible due to their complexity. What is meant here by positive and negative is that they are perceived or expressed as such by the participants.
he spends all of his preparation time figuring out methods to make sure that the students reach the assessment criteria. As we saw in Chapter 6, Camilla describes the feeling of ‘missing a chance’ when Karim brings up a personal interest and she fails to recognize it in class. Anja expresses feelings of insufficiency in relation to the syllabus, worrying that she will not have enough time to cover all of the central content of the course and that her students will realize that. Rickard’s insufficiency is related to being the focus of research and within the study realizing that he could have conducted his teaching differently. But he expresses it in a positive way, as a possibility for him to design his teaching differently in the future.

Camilla brings up her antipathy towards the Sweden Democrats as something that gets tricky in the area of politics and the constitution (this correlates with the fact that at least one of the students in her class also mentions the Sweden Democrats as an emotive topic regarding constitution):

Camilla: The topic of SD is troublesome. Personally, I feel an antipathy to at least several of the representatives. At the same time, I have actually read some of the party programme and it is house-trained, and then it ends up with that I don’t like the outlook on people that several of the representatives and supporters seem to stand for. On the other hand they are democratically and legally elected to the parliament and you have to respect that. /…/ And sometimes it is brought up /…/ ‘why do people vote for SD’ asked a boy with immigrant background. Then I tried to explain, it is not so much a vote for something but a vote against something. There is a dissatisfaction about the way society has developed, you feel less secure, you feel the competition at the labour market in times of depression, and it is like, there is a competition about the jobs. And that is different from the world you grew up in.

Camilla seems to manage her negative emotions regarding the Sweden Democrats as a Social Science teacher by emphasizing that it is a legitimate parliamentary party.

Another negative emotional expression from Camilla, relating to classroom management, came during and after a lesson which she found messy. At the subsequent lesson she spent 20 minutes going over the classroom rules and showed disappointment with the students. Now it is time to turn to the two in depth situations, which address the relation between the knowledge content of Social Science, emotions and boundary work in the teaching.
Anja: the teaching of Economics

In response to my question about emotive topics in Social Science education, Anja said that for her, Economics is an emotive subject matter to teach. Her reasoning is as follows. Firstly, Economics is where Anja says she is most dependent on the textbook:

Katarina: What are your thoughts on methods, how is the teaching to be done? What suits the content area of Economics?

Anja: I am sorry to say that economics is one of the areas where, according to my experience, it is, you are, I am often pretty tied to the textbook. Because the first time the students study Economics, they think it is very abstract, they want something to focus on. So, yes, I think it becomes more tied to the textbooks than other content areas.

Katarina: So it is much for the sake of the students?

Anja: Yes, I think they are unassured if they haven’t got the textbook. Then they make the subject more difficult for themselves than it is.

Secondly, at the same time the subject area of Economics is where Anja finds the textbook to be most ideologically single tracked (free market liberal):

Anja: Then I am also thinking of the textbooks; they have market economic aims in view. Well, how did that happen? That’s something to reflect upon. With pricing, where they address the invisible hand and the supply and demand curve and so on. On the whole I think those chapters are very liberal in most Social Science textbooks. Then you have to step in and show alternatives as a teacher.

Katarina: Compensate that picture.

Anja: Yes, but if that is the norm, if that is seen as the normal, do they then think that I fob something else off on them? Yes, that can be emotional.

Katarina: Have you discussed the perspectives of the textbooks?

Anja: Not that much with the students, it is mostly we the teachers who have tried to talk about it.

Katarina: Yes, and it is extra important if […] because you said that you are using the textbook a lot in this content area. And it is an area where you think the textbook is pretty single track.

Anja: Yes well, we’ve got a problem.
Anja’s solution to this problem is to compensate the perspective in the textbook by offering another perspective. In that process she feels awkward because she thinks the students find her thoughts strange in contrast to the textbook. This is a form of boundary work where the textbook represents the ‘normal’ and the teacher offering a different perspective feels awkward because she is not perceived to be on the ‘inside’ of the ‘normal’ bounded subject. According to Anja, the students do not seem to recognize the teachers’ effort to widen the theoretical perspective. They stick to the textbook and oppose Anja. But that does not keep Anja from opposing the textbook. Important questions arise here: where is the subject Social Science perceived to located, in the textbook or in the teacher? How does that perception impact the emotional community?

Anja narrates the teaching of Economics from her own point of view. It is not clear from her story if the students actually did anything or said anything deprecative in the situation. Several appraisal and attribution theorists investigating causes and effects of emotion suggest that emotion stems from a person’s judgement about a situation rather than from the situation itself (Scherer et al., 2001; Weiner, 1986). What is important in this study is that there is movement through emotion in the situation related to the object of Economics. The feeling of awkwardness moves Anja away from the students irrespectively of whether they are openly rejecting her or not.

Two things are striking about Anja’s story. Firstly, she emphasizes Economics as an emotional subject matter, I did not expect that answer. Secondly, she imagines the students taking a stand against her perspective and that she cannot move them or influence their attachments when it comes to Economics. The feeling of awkwardness signals that the subject matter is contested in a way that distances Anja from her students.

The feeling of awkwardness that Anja relates is social – it stems from the reaction she gets from or imagines in her students. She does not account for it as an emotion induced by economic topics per se. This is in line with Frenzel’s (2014, p. 498) argument that the feeling of shame (which Scheff explains as a sign that the social bond is threatened) is connected to the potential threat of being negatively judged by an audience, something that is topical and pressing for teachers (Hargreaves and Tucker, 1991; Zembylas, 2003).

In what follows, Ahmed’s theorizing of emotion is used to provide an interactionist analysis of what emotion does in the situation. As in the remainder of the dissertation, the concepts of movement, attachment and contact act as guides.
Movement

According to Anja, the students reject her perspective on Economics. The textbook is the normal. Anja is the abnormal, strange. Her feeling of awkwardness signals an ‘othering’ from the students and the awkwardness moves her away from them. But in the situation that she describes, Anja does not ‘run after’ the students. She does not try to narrow the distance, but persists in her counter position. In that sense there is stability in her position that contrasts with the motion in the situation. The perceived lack of recognition (in the sense that she is making a legitimate contribution) from the students does not keep Anja from doing what she intended to do. Anja’s awkward feeling does not stop her from modelling a perspective on Economics that contests what she imagines the students see as the ‘normal’ view on Economics. Anja is probably performing emotional labour in order to be able to stay in the counter position despite the awkwardness. She is probably not showing her feeling.

Attachment

Anja experiences an awkward feeling in relation to teaching Economics. In the boundary work regarding the teaching of Economics she is on one side of the boundary and the students and textbook are on the other. Anja perceives herself as positioned outside of the Social Science subject. Why do the students attach themselves to the textbook rather than to the teacher? Is the textbook to a greater extent connected to the discipline when it comes to Economics? Is that why Anja is dependent on the textbook here? According to Anja, the Social Science teachers at Ekskolan discuss the contents of the textbook and how they as teachers can handle the single track representations of Economics. So perhaps by detaching herself from the textbook and the students she strengthens her bonds to the Social Science teachers. Despite her experience of being placed outside of the subject through the boundary work of the students, she repositions herself inside the subject through her colleagues. It seems that she is confident that what she does is what a Social Science teacher should do. Her attachment might be what makes her stick to modelling a different perspective despite the feeling of awkwardness. This negotiation of teacher professionalism does not seem to catch on with the students if they rather stick to the textbook. What does that do to her as a representative of the subject Social Science and its disciplines? When diverging from the textbook and the hegemonic perspective on Economics in society, Anja seems to weaken her position as
a representative of the discipline of economics, despite her attempt to adopt a critical perspective that is regarded as a core feature of social scientific thinking.

It is not clear from the material if the perspective Anja is modelling is her personal view on Economics or not. She accounts for the situation as if she sees the necessity of adding a perspective to avoid a single representation of Economics in the teaching. Personal or not, the feeling of awkwardness signals a detachment from the students and probably from the hegemonic view of economics in society. Here, the content of Social Science clashes with the perceived purpose of Social Science teaching. The Social Science perspectivity is apparently not working in the teaching of Economics at Ekskolan. Anja is not able to make the subject into what she wants it to be. Her classroom goals do not align with the behaviour of the students (Frenzel 2014, p. 506). Despite her detachment from the students she sticks to her idea of what Social Science teaching should be. The modelling of a divergent perspective stems from Anja’s idea about the purpose of Social Science education as supporting students to acquire an approach to the world that involves approaches to democracy, source criticism, analysis and dealing with the dangers of a grand narrative or single story. The mentioning of the single story is unique to Anja, among the four teachers. The term single story was coined by Chimamanda Ngosi Adichie as she devoted one of her (very famous) TED talks to the danger of the single story. Ngosi Adichie argues that if we only hear a single story about a person or a place, we risk a major misunderstanding. We need nuance and complexity.

So that is how to create a single story, show a people as one thing, as only one thing, over and over again, and that is what they become. Power is the ability not just to tell the story of another person, but to make it the definitive story of that person. /…/ The single story creates stereotypes, and the problem with stereotypes is not that they are untrue, but that they are incomplete. They make one story become the only story (Ngosi Adichie, 2009).

The term single story is originally about persons and places, but it is transferrable to all sorts of topics. When it comes to Economics, Anja has identified a single story regarding a discipline in the textbook and tries to nuance it with an alternative perspective.

---

26 For an account of Anja’s personal justification of Social Science teaching, see Chapter 5.
Contact

The textbook has great significance in relation to the teaching of Economics in this case. There is an interesting contradiction between Anja’s statement that Economics is where she is most dependent on the textbook and the fact that Economics is the subject matter where the textbook is the most ideologically narrow. The textbook is very important to the students as they align themselves with the book rather than with the teacher.

Monica Reichenberg states that students take on literary texts in a more active way than texts from Social Science textbooks. According to Reichenberg, a reason for that discrepancy could be that the students have developed active reading of literature, starting during their early school years, while text discussions are not that common in Social Science education. The students see the authors of textbooks as more anonymous. They do not think of questioning the text and the text itself has a more closed character (Reichenberg, 2006, p. 220-221).

In the field of Social Science didactics, reading is connected to citizenship and active participation in society. Thus, the students should not merely read to understand, in the sense of gathering information and understanding the message. The reading should also give students opportunities to respond to different kinds of (societal) texts. The students have to practice to critically scrutinize and appraise different kinds of texts to be able to make an argument and act based on their analyses (Blennow & Karlsson, 2018; Långström & Virta, 2016).

A 2003 national evaluation of the elementary school system in Sweden showed that the Social Science teachers used textbooks to a lesser extent compared to 1992 (Skolverket, 2005). Other investigations show that textbooks are less essential to Social Science teachers than to teachers of other school subjects (Odenstad, 2014) and that textbooks are used in relation to some of the knowledge content of the subject while other content is provided by internet sources and news texts (Skolverket, 2005).

Could it be that in the case of Economics, the textbook more than anything else represents the discipline? There is a tradition in the discipline to use models that is probably a strong part of how both Anja and the students have previously come into contact with the discipline. It is therefore hard to deviate from that tradition. It is also possible that Anja is dependent on the textbook because she is not confident in the teaching of Economics. Or maybe the discipline is to a large extent dependent on models and figures that are presented in the book? Maybe the students come into contact with the textbook as in ‘we suddenly use the textbook
because Anja is not an expert in this area’, which could lead to a scepticism about her view?

Anja breaks the repetition in relation to the teaching of Economics. She does that in order to broaden the single-track perspective on Economics. The widening of this perspective becomes emotional. In another sense, Anja does not break the repetition in relation to the teaching of Economics: she does not give up the textbook.

United Nations as a ‘sticky’ topic

At both Björkskolan and Lindskolan the UN was taught during the fieldwork of the study. In the field notes, a lot of activity is registered in relation to this topic: increased background noise and an increase in explicit comments and questions from the students.

An example are the notes from Björkskolan where the teacher Rickard, in line with his overall tendency to bring in historical perspectives, focused on teaching the history and organization of the UN. The field notes from one of the lessons show activity from a specific group of students that sits at the table right in front of the teacher. Already at my first visit to the class I noted ‘segregated’ seating at the three large tables in the room, as mentioned in Chapter 6. At the table in question I wrote that I associated the students with Middle-Eastern background. This ‘segregated’ seating prevailed throughout the fieldwork. Leyla from Chapter 8 and Mahmood from Chapter 9 both sit at this table.

The lesson started with a repetition of UNs history and organization. The table where Mahmood sits together with several other students who seem to be of Middle Eastern background posed several questions about what UN does if a country does not follow its recommendations and which forcible means UN can use against that country. One student mentioned the US invasion of Iraq compared to other invasions where the UN put in its forces. The teaching came to a halt there. Rickard responded that the UN has got problems because it is founded on the sovereignty of the member states and it has not got its own military, but it is still forceful if a majority of the states of the world turn against a single state’s actions.

There were lots of talking going on among the students during Rickards teaching, sometimes it was hard for me to catch what he said.
Here, the UN is questioned by a group of students that I positioned as having Middle Eastern backgrounds and who imply that the UN is unjust when it comes to its interferences in conflicts.

This contrasts with the action in the classroom at Lindskolan, where a group of students also questioned the work of the UN. At Lindskolan, it was a group of solely male students, also occupying the front right side of the classroom, that criticized the UN from an ideological perspective, claiming that ‘the idea’ of UN does not work. This is the same group of students that in Chapter 9 opposes the ‘unruly foreign students’ (sic) on the left side of the classroom.

From the empirical material, it is not possible to derive if the UN stirs the students more than other emotive topics, but the topic is one that seems legitimate to criticize: more students are ready to speak out in the classroom against the UN.

The teacher as defender of cooperation for peace

At Lindskolan, the teacher Martin initially gives an answer about the students when asked about what is emotive in the education. He gives the impression of not being used to thinking about teachers’ emotions. When asked more specifically about himself, Martin’s initial response considers emotions connected to relational issues.

Katarina: Do you think something will be emotional for you in some way when you teach?

Martin: Hmm. No, I don’t think so, not content-wise, it is rather the relations in the classroom, which I […]

Katarina: depending on what happens in the group?

Martin: Yes, how they react at it. There is a chance that someone relates something […] but, well, there is nothing that I feel will get emotional, for me. I am not sure if I understand the question?

When given more time to reflect in response to a direct question about ‘positive’ feelings, Martin talks about his own topic emotions. He sees topic emotions and social/relational emotions as separate.

Katarina: Well it is put broadly, just where you feel. It could be positive emotions, as when you feel happy because you are teaching certain things, which you feel extra for.
Martin: Yes, that happens, and some content can be difficult too. When you talk about it there are surely some organisations you are more passionate about. I, for example, think that the UN is very important, despite noticing their shortcomings and many students have a very negative perspective on the UN, very frustrated, “they don’t do anything, they just make things worse”. It is probably obvious which actors I sympathize with and which I do not. But I think I have a rather objective view on them all. Eh, wait […] no I have not, but at least I am aware of it.

Katarina: Well it is a step in the right direction to be aware that you are favourably disposed to some, and that it shows.

Martin: Exactly, you are rather drilled to talk about pros and cons of organizations. Speaking of EU and UN, both have democratic problems, but the purpose is a good one. It is the same when you talk about a nation’s right to a state and where that border should be drawn. I try not to take a stand. Instead I talk about what the different perspectives on an issue are. […] It is a good question […] You often forget to reflect on it, on what you talk about, because you just think about the emotions that are created in a group-situation and that you have to work on them.

In this interview section Martin associates emotionality with the students. Then, when reflecting on himself, he stumbles upon what Reinhard Pekrun and Lisa Linnenbrink-Garcia categorize as social emotions (2014, p. 5; see also Chapter 2), that is, emotions, which are related to other persons. Martin describes these as emotions that are created in a group situation. Only after a specified question does Martin talk about topic emotions, that is emotions ‘triggered by the contents covered by learning material’ (Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia 2014, p. 4). However, when analysing the lesson where Martin addresses the UN in his teaching on international relations, it becomes clear that the topic emotions are also social/relational emotions. Through the topic emotions a boundary work starts: the bodies in the classroom are moved and positioned in relation to each other in a way that has social consequences. Thinking with Ahmed (2014), the topic is the object of emotion and the UN, in Ahmed’s words, is a ‘sticky’ object: feelings stick to it and the more the object circulates the more emotionally charged it becomes. This could be why the activity and sound level increase in the classrooms when the topic of the UN comes up: it is emotionally charged to the extent that the intensity in the room is immediate. Both teachers and students have come into contact with the UN in emotionally charged ways before. Therefore, I would like to contest the view, implicit in the psychological perspective of Pekrun and Linnenbrink-Garcia, that topic emotions are individual. Topic emotions are social because relations form
them and because they form relations. And crucially, the political is at work through them. Martin’s positive feelings towards the UN are contrasted against the students’ negative view. The feelings about the UN create an emotional geography where Martin and the students who express their opinions in the classroom are on different sides.

Considering the statements from Martin in the pre-interview it is striking that, in the field notes from the lesson on international relations, Martin does not stand out as a defender of the idea of peace through collaboration. It is true that he himself brings up the UN as an example of an idealism that works, an example that the countries of the world can cooperate. But he is also quick to argue against that idealism. This is an excerpt from the lesson in question:

Martin: Do we have any other such signs?
Student: Signs of what?
Martin: That cooperation actually can work.
(Silence)
Martin: The UN can be mentioned. For the first time in world history we have a big organization after the Second World War. They tried before, after the First World War, it didn’t work, then many people said, well, we realists are right and liberalism was pretty out of fashion. But after the Second World War they managed to get an organization together that got most of the countries of the world together. So maybe the UN is a sign that we are on our way to how the world can cooperate.
Student: No.
Martin: But what does the realist say then?
Student: There will always be a threat because humans are greedy.
Martin: Yes.
The same student: Eventually someone will do something stupid to gain more power.
Martin: It will still look like that despite the cooperation.
Student: The UN has not been able to stop the different genocides.
Martin: We have many failures, where it has become apparent that the UN can’t do anything about the situation.
Student: What keeps the UN together is a fear of terror.
Martin: Eh, elaborate.
The same student: Because we simply feel more secure and the UN are a good way for the countries to communicate.

Martin: And the fact that we actually cooperate is a sign that we actually can do it. Not just with like-minded states, it is a cooperation between all sorts of different states. Yes.

Student: Isn’t Saudi-Arabia chair of human rights in the UN?

Martin: Yes. That is also a criticism. The UN have agreed but they budge on many all-important regulations, for example, every member state has to acknowledge and sign the declaration for human rights and still many countries do not follow parts of the statutes.

Martin gives the same impression when talking about realism as when talking about idealism. He reads from the PowerPoint, then asks the students of proof that the ideology works, then gives counterarguments irrespective of which ideology they are dealing with. When Martin returns to the question of emotionality and the UN in the interview after the fieldwork, he concludes that the teaching did not become very emotional for him and that he could have made his case for idealism clearer.

Katarina: In retrospect, do you think something was emotional for you?

Martin: Right.

Katarina: Positively or negatively.

Martin: No, not that I can remember, I don’t know, it is hard to know about emotions. It feels (laughs), well it is so vast because you are always guided by emotions, in your reactions, all the time.

Katarina: So, nothing stood out?

Martin: No.

Katarina: Well, there was something else that you talked about in the last interview and that then actually happened. About the UN and EU and /the idealism and realism/

Martin: /the criticism against/

Katarina: At the lessons, it seemed as the students were realists and you had to argue in favour of the UN. You had to keep to that line and there were many counter-arguments. That was something you predicted might get emotional for you.

Martin: Yes, yes, I become a defender of the liberal line of argument. Then again, I felt that I didn’t say much, anyway. Not as much as I thought I would say. I could have preached more about the importance of cooperation.
But the UN-roleplay centres on the importance of cooperation and that it actually works, so we will return to that question.

Martin ends up nuancing all perspectives, which seems to be his accustomed way of working as a Social Science teacher, instead of advocating for collaboration for the sake of peace. He seems to regret this afterwards.

Movement

Martin’s feelings about the UN move him away from the students prior to the classroom teaching because of his experiences of students having a negative attitude towards the UN. Thus, he enters the classroom already distanced from the students. It is unclear if the students know or notice this distance. At the same time, there is a group of students who remain quiet. If they had voiced their opinions, they would have moved closer to Martin through the expression of emotion. What remains clear is that emotions stick to the topic of the UN, and so the teaching about the UN affects the emotional geography of the group. Interestingly, Martins take on the professionalism of the Social Science teacher seems to move him away from his own emotionality regarding the UN, which creates a dissonance.

Attachment

Martin’s feelings detach him from the students who are verbally active during the lesson. However, the students might not notice this detachment because Martin’s behaviour in the classroom does not let it show. During the lesson, a group of students verbally signals that they are realists with a strong dislike of the UN. Students from that group express the same attitudes when individually interviewed. Fabian, for instance, expresses anger in relation to the teaching about the UN and the EU in response to the question of what becomes emotive in Social Science:

Fabian: It was mostly when we talked about the UN and EU and all that. I am not very positive regarding those things. I think they do good things, but I also think that it is a lot of hypocrisy /…/ for example that Saudi Arabia presides over human rights. I mean, Saudi Arabia – the country that persecutes the same amount of people as the Islamic State.

Katarina: Yes, I remember you said something about that at the lesson.
Fabian: I think it is sheer hypocrisy to talk left, right and centre about being progressive: Saudi Arabia is representing human rights, which is just bullshit.

Katarina: What kind of emotions do you feel then?

Fabian: Like anger, I don’t get all red in the face but […].

Katarina: Yes, I see, but you can still feel.

Fabian: Yes, you feel ’what the fuck is this’, you get faintly upset about it, that something claiming to be very progressive, and well, then Saudi Arabia for human rights, it doesn’t work, you know. And then we have the EU for example, well I am not a great fan of the EU. As we talk about them being progressive, I think about certain things that are not exactly progressive.

Katarina: But is it like that when you sit in class at the lessons? Do you feel like that in relation to the way the UN and the EU are described in the teaching?

Fabian: Well, it grows by us talking about it. “Now we are going to talk about the EU” […] then the thoughts grow, that I am not a great fan of the EU. But it has got nothing to do with the teaching, he just wants to teach us what the EU is and what they do. It is the same thing with the UN. So, it has got nothing to do with the teaching. /…/ It is just thoughts coming to the surface when a topic is addressed.

To Fabian, the UN and the EU are emotive topics but he does not recognize Martin’s positive attitude when it comes to the UN. His impression is that Martin just wants to teach them what the UN as an organization is and does. That means that his view on the contention in the situation is that it is not a contention between actors in the classroom.

Anton on the other hand does not say that he is emotional but he talks about the UN in an irritated tone. He expresses interest in the theories regarding international relations. The teaching inspired him:

Anton: No, I haven’t got much feelings. When he talks about international relations and to have it one’s own way in /…/ I have just felt a bit motivated.

Katarina: Motivated to do what?

Anton: Well, to cheat on people.

Katarina: How?

Anton: And like benefit myself.

Katarina: OK, to be your own realist or something like that.

Anton: Yes.
Katarina: But nothing has been controversial or emotional for you?

Anton: No, not for me personally.

However, in the interviews it is also clear that several other students who are quiet during the lesson share Martin’s positive feelings towards cooperation and peace building in general and the UN in particular. Martin acknowledges their feelings in the interview after his lesson:

Katarina: As I observed the teaching I thought “oh the students are realists”. But then, when I interviewed students, several of them expressed positive emotions connected to ideas about cooperation for peace. It did not show in the teaching though.

Martin: I think the students who got the space to speak in class are generally the most sceptical and black and white thinking, so I am not surprised. I think generally, most people still believe that humans can cooperate. /…/

When you are square, you’re more aggressive, you pursue your line of argument. When you are open to collaboration, you’re more expectant, you listen. That is my simple analysis of the fact that it didn’t come up in that discussion. It is much more difficult to explain why collaboration works, because cooperation is never without friction, whereas it is much easier to say cooperation does not work.

Since Martin did not advocate his view openly in his teaching that day, the positive students did not get the chance to attach to him. Similarly, Martin was not able to attach to some of the positive students because they remained quiet.

Part of Martin’s plan for the teaching after the Christmas holidays was a role-play about the UN, which he had used for several years. This is something he seems to place at the centre of the course, talking about how he has rearranged the other parts of the course to fit better with the role play, worrying that the other participating school would not be able to make it at the time he had designated.

Anton also looks forward to the UN role play. But his hopes and wishes seem to be centred on being ‘the bad guy’ of the UN.

Anton: The roleplay about the UN next semester will be such a diplomat-bomb.

Katarina: What do you mean by diplomat-bomb?

Anton: Well, we guys in class, we like to discuss.

Katarina: Yes, what will happen, will there be lots of discussion?
Anton: Probably. I am not sure if the others will cope with it, but we seem to be politically active all of us. So, there will be some political debates. Especially if one of us gets to be Russia. The aim is that one of us gets to be Russia.

Katarina: Someone surely gets to be Russia.

Anton: Hell, I hope it will be me, Fabian, Krille or Oscar, because the aim is that we have to be Mother Russia.

Katarina: Why is it entertaining to represent Russia?

Anton: Because everyone hates them and they are the strongest.

Katarina: Do you really want to be them then?

Anton: It is entertaining because then you can be a real Putin and put the blame on someone else all the time.

Anton hopes that he or ‘one of his boys’ (the group of boys sitting in the front of the classroom and who raise their hands a lot) will get to be Russia, and therefore able to throw a spanner in the works of the negotiations.

This group of boys that does almost all the talking during the teaching about the UN strengthens its attachment through raising hands and falling into/embellishing the group members’ comments. The anger politicizes them and fills them with information and energy (Lorde, 1984 p. 127).

Notably, in the quote from Anton, the political is expressed as something joyful. The greater the divide between us and them in the UN role play, the happier Anton would be. Especially if he is on the side that shows that collaboration for peace does not work. The strong division between good and bad is typical of the students’ talk about the UN. So is being upset about abstract issues and the positioning of human rights as something distant that concerns people far away. Some students seem to be upset because the UN is supposed to represent ‘the good’.

Contact

It could be the case that the students have come into contact with a positive view of the UN in their prior schools. Swedish schools have a history of paying respect to the UN, partly through activities on UN Day (in October). The United Nations Association of Sweden has been influential in providing educational materials, including roleplays, as well as certifying certain UN schools and handing out awards such as the ‘UN-teacher of the year’ (Nilsson, forthcoming). The group of students
expressing negative opinions about the UN could have a history of contact with the UN in schools, a history that makes them want to go into opposition when the topic comes up in the teaching. Their adversary is the Swedish school system. This could be a reason for why Martin in his role as a teacher has positive feelings about the UN despite the fact that he also realizes the problems and limitations of the organization. He might view his role as a teacher and his ideas of fostering democratic citizens as the core of the subject. He might also believe in the idea that collaboration leads to peace. With these views and ideas, he creates strong bonds with a history of Social Science education in Sweden, and with the history of the Swedish educational system.

Martin seems to have a history of coming into contact with students over the UN where the students express negative opinions about the UN, since that is what he expects of the students prior to the teaching. This means that when he comes into contact with the students, he is already distanced from them, which probably creates a contradiction with his positive feelings about the UN. This seems to happen despite the fact that he, in the post-teaching interview, says that he thinks that most students are idealists. In the pre-teaching interview, he mentions that he gets scared sometimes when students express anti-democratic opinions, for instance regarding the death penalty. He then goes on to explain that this behaviour is typical of adolescents, and that those views tend to alter when students get older.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has unearthed how teachers are part of the emotional community of Social Science teaching. They are moved by emotions; they move others through emotions; and they are attached to and detached from others through that emotional boundary work. Teachers negotiate what is valuable in the teaching and which emotional expressions are encouraged, tolerated or deplored. The students do the same.

But it is also clear that the teachers’ emotionality involves a dimension that deviates from the students’: the dimension of teacher professionalism, more specifically the professionalism of the Social Science teacher. That means that when Anja tries to widen the perspective on Economics, she does not stand alone despite her

---

27 An exception from this anchoring in teacher professionalism is evident in Rickard’s emotional expressions at Björkskolan, which could be due to the fact that he is a newly examined teacher. That might also be the reason why he is to a greater extent bonding with the students. He is probably still in a liminal phase between student and teacher. He is the youngest of the four teachers.
detachment from the students. She stands together with her colleagues with whom she has discussed the shortcomings of the textbook.

The dimension of professionalism affects the boundary work in the cases of Martin and Anja. What they represent as Social Science teachers seems to affect their stand and what they do even in an emotive situation. In Anja’s case, her representation makes her stick to her position in the teaching of Economics despite the feeling of awkwardness in relation to the students. Martin, on the other hand, automatically lands in nuancing and countering all perspectives, despite his positive attitude towards the UN and idealism. His professionalism is a ‘neutral’ one that seems to make him manage his emotions in the classroom.

Anja’s teacher professionalism makes her redraw the boundaries of the subject. Her judgement is that the narrow content of the textbook needs opening up through a counter perspective. Anja represents the teachers, not the discipline. She gets into opposition against the hegemonic disciplinary narrative. In this endeavour she experiences a gatekeeping response from the students, despite Social Science perspectivity being at the core of the subject. So, in the situation as experienced by Anja, there is a contestation between bringing in a new perspective and sticking to the perspective of the textbook. To the students, the subject-specific knowledge content lies squarely in the textbook. Anja performs Social Science boundary work through modelling a diverging perspective. She experiences that it is met by resistance from the students. Either the students step in as gatekeepers of the subject or Anja perceives them as gatekeepers. The boundary work that Anja performs thereby moves her away from the students through the feeling of awkwardness.

The emotional community of Martin’s teaching about the UN and about ideological perspectives in international relations seems to open up for criticism and close positive attitudes towards UN, despite Martin’s own positive emotions about the UN. The way Martin seems to distance himself from his feelings in the actual teaching situation through his Social Science teacher professionalism affects the boundary work in the group. There is thus a dissonance between Martin and ‘the professional Martin’, which can also be interpreted as a dissonance between what he says in the interview and what he does in the actual teaching situation. The question remains: what would happen if Martin in some way expressed his feelings of pride in relation to the idea of collaboration for peace? And if he did express pride, how would the symbolic boundaries in/around the subject and in the student group be redrawn?

This chapter suggests that despite their special position in the emotional community, teachers are not seen as having the ‘sole right’ to the subject (similar to the pre-modern view that priests are the only vehicles to God). Even in the teaching at
Granskolan, where Camilla has strong authority, students (as for instance Karim in Chapter 6) claim influence over the boundary work around the subject.

The chapter demonstrates that what Pekrun and Linnenbrink-Garcia call topic emotions (see Chapter 2) are also social and relate to the teaching. The UN and Economics are topics, or Social Science subject-specific content, which the teachers express as emotive. This chapter, finally, has shown that those emotions impact the movements and attachments of the teachers and the students. If we see the UN and Economics as objects of emotion, we recognize that emotions stick to them, circulate through them and that those emotions also affect the relations in the classroom. These objects of emotion are integral parts of Social Science education. Depending on how they are handled and depending on the gatekeeping of the teaching in the situation, the circulating emotions could help widen the boundaries of the Social Science teaching through conflictual perspectivity and heated analysis. But that is not solely up to the teacher and the teachers’ professionalism. In the relational perspective of this study, the students’ emotions and boundary work are of great importance. That is why the following two chapters deal primarily with students’ emotions. In Chapter 8 we will turn to withheld emotions and antagonisms, thus issuing a different kind of challenge to Social Science didactics than Chapter 9, where the challenge will come from explicit and expressed tensions.
This chapter examines the withheld perspectives and feelings that relate to the Social Science teaching. The idea that multiperspectivity and conflictuality are at the core of Social Science means that restraint turns out to be a missed chance of contention and debate over issues and topics in the subject; it also means that counter-voices are lost. In what follows, emotions, especially anger, are shown to both enable and hinder politicization\textsuperscript{28} in the Social Science teaching. The political is at work in the observed situations. However, because it is not articulated it does not lead to conflictual Social Science perspectives being dealt with in the teaching. Thus, the specific knowledge content of Social Science gives rise to emotions, while the opportunity to use those emotions in the teaching, from a subject-didactical perspective, is slim.

To demonstrate the mechanisms of restraint, the chapter will take its point of departure in an overview of speech and silence in the researched teaching, and then move on to an in depth analysis of two specific cases that show unarticulated politicization.

The data analysed in this chapter is comprised mainly of interviews with students, but observations and conversations with students during lesson time have also been used. Some of the findings would not have been possible without participant observation, that is, sitting down next to the students in class and talking to them. Accounts of restraint have come up in relation to my questions about certain intense situations in the classroom, but they have also come unsolicited from the students themselves, relating to both specific situations and Social Science education in general. In the interviews I posed questions about whether everyone who wants to can make their voices heard in the classroom, which allowed all of the

\textsuperscript{28} As explained in Chapter 3, politicization occurs when boundaries between us and them are drawn in relation to a topic or issue.
interviewees in the study to reflect on silence and speech. In contrast to the previous chapter, where teachers’ emotions took centre stage, this chapter hones in on students’ emotions, which by no means implies that the teachers are absent as actors.

An analysis of two situations, both at Björkskolan, forms the core of the chapter. The first situation is Leyla’s rejection of the teaching on human rights and international law. The second situation is Shirin’s anger with expressions about Islam and Muslims in the teaching. Neither Leila nor Shirin speak out in class, thus withholding their perspectives and emotions. This chapter suggests that the movement and attachment the emotions bring with them are at work despite this restraint; indeed emotions can even be understood as the reason for the restraint. Furthermore, it is not the educational topic per se that is the crux of the matter, but rather the connection between emotion and relations in the group. This connection overshadows the ambition to intervene in the teaching of Social Science. In the two cases the emotions show that there is a politicization of the discussed topic, but the politicization is not articulated because of the restraint.

The predominant emotion at work in both Leyla’s and Shirin’s situation is anger. What anger does cannot be explained in strictly negative terms. In *The art of rhetoric*, Aristotle specifically addresses anger as able to produce pain and pleasure. The pleasure in anger, for Aristotle, is found in the hope of revenge (Plamper, 2015, p. 14). Aristotle also defines anger as directed towards individuals, which is indeed the case for Shirin but not necessarily for Leyla. Finally, Aristotle sees anger as having an endpoint, while hatred does not.

Audre Lorde addresses anger in her keynote presentation at the National Women’s Studies Association Conference in 1981. Similar to Aristotle, she puts forward the positive qualities of anger, qualities that can be very useful, for Lorde, however, it is not revenge that is useful but the potential of channelling the energy inherent in anger to work for change. This is an anger that reaches forward, into the future.

But anger expressed and translated into action in the service of our vision and our future is a liberating and strengthening act of clarification, for it is in the painful process of this translation that we identify who are our allies with whom we have grave differences, and who are our genuine enemies.

---

29 As noted earlier, it is important to remember that Aristotle’s reflections regard ancient Greek emotions, which might be different from how that feeling is understood today. His reflections are nonetheless helpful in thinking about emotions.
Anger is loaded with information and energy. (Lorde, 1984, p. 127)

According to this view, anger bears within it the potential for change. It is a reaction that can lead to action. Shirin’s and Leyla’s anger bears the potential for a ‘new’ politicization in the subject Social Science because from or through their anger, they start a system-analysis, a critique. But the information and energy in their anger do not inform the teaching. Letting the anger move towards the future is not an option for them, and so the anger is withheld. This chapter will try to untangle some of the mechanisms of restraint in order to point at possible ways forward for the Social Science teaching.

Ahmed defines anger as being against something. Depending on how that something is interpreted, different forms of action are possible. For Ahmed, a constructive way forward lies in a reading of the ‘relation between affect and structure or between emotion and politics in a way that undoes the separation of the individual from others’ (Ahmed, 2014, p. 174). Thus, she emphasizes the collective dimensions of emotions analysed in this dissertation as a key to the way forward.

Speech does not fix everything, as Suzanne deCastell (2005) points out, but politicization is dependent on articulation of some kind. The two cases in this chapter open up for a discussion of whose responsibility (and burden) it is to speak out against simplistic and/or hegemonic representations in the classroom and work to widen the perspectives in Social Science teaching.

Silence and Social Science teaching

Wendy Brown’s argument that silence is not always the best option, as discussed in Chapter 3, may easily be transferred to the Social Science classroom. It may be a reason why all four teachers in the study are reluctant to ask the students about their backgrounds and stories, because the visibility that breaks through with speech might harm the students. Still, there is a strong emphasis on democratic dialogue in the subject Social Science, an emphasis that demands speech.

A fundamental part of the school subject Social Science in Sweden has been the so called ‘democratic mission’. There has been a strong focus on schools’ role in fostering democratic citizens ever since the Second World War, even though the means and ways of furthering this mission have shifted over time, from avoiding blind belief in authority in the 1940s to a focus on individual freedom of action in the 1960s, to a socialization into predetermined democratic values in the 1990s (Dahlstedt & Olson, 2013). The Swedish school system’s strong focus on the
democratic mission has been described by Hakvoort and Olsson (2014) as being exceptional, in that more curriculum hours are devoted to it when compared to most of the other European countries. They thus position the Swedish democratic mission in contrast to other countries:

First, Sweden refers to this educational mission as democratic, whereas other countries generally refer to civic or citizenship education. This emphasis on the democratic underscores a commitment to democracy over all other forms of governance. Second, Swedish educational policy specifies three components of democratic education: the development of fundamental values including respect, equity, and safety (SFS 2010:800); the promotion of knowledge about the structures and processes of political democratic governance including elections; and the advancement of civic competencies such as the abilities to voice one’s opinion and to contribute to social development (Skolinspektionen, 2012, p. 18). Educators are required to integrate these three components into every subject at every grade level from primary through upper secondary school. (Hakvoort & Olsson, 2014, p. 532-533)

The integration of the democratic mission in every subject at every grade level is unique to Sweden. But despite the policy which emphasises that all subjects are responsible for working towards fulfilling the democratic mission, it is the subject Social Science that is seen by practitioners as well as some researchers as the most ‘natural’ place for promoting the mission (Englund, 2005; Sandahl, 2015a)\(^3\), a view confirmed by the teacher Martin in this study: as we saw in Chapter 5, Martin thinks that Social Science pulls the heaviest load when it comes to the schools’ democratic mission.

The ideal for Social Science teaching in Sweden, both in research and policy, has been to prepare the students for active citizenship, participation in society. The aim has been (and still is) that the students become good, democratic citizens. Since the 1990s, schools’ role in fostering democratic citizens has been increasingly geared towards shaping the forms of work in line with democratic values. For example, around the year 2000 deliberative dialogue appeared as the preferred method to strengthen democracy (Dahlstedt & Olson, 2013). Through this kind of democratic dialogue, students will presumably undertake the most rational actions and their understanding of other people’s perspectives will increase. As Tryggvason

---

\(^3\) A further example of the ‘placing’ of the democratic mission in the subject Social Science is the Swedish Schools Inspectorate’s evaluation of schools’ work on the democratic mission. The evaluation is supposedly not tailored to a specific subject, and yet all the classroom observations are of Social Science teaching (Pantzare, 2018).
(2018b) points out, the meaning of becoming a good, democratic and active citizen will be different depending on if you deploy a deliberative perspective on democratic dialogue or an agonistic one. However, both perspectives stand out as dependent on voice.

The key idea in contemporary praise of dialogue in education is voice – or speech – which is set in opposition to silence. We are exhorted to “hear the voices” of those who have previously been silent. /…/ Thus democratic dialogue is far more than an opportunity for the exchange of ideas, or gathering interesting information about other people’s lives. It is an explicitly political event because it attempts to shift the usual flow of power in order to un-marginalize the marginalized. (Jones, 2005, p. 58-59)

Democratic dialogue has been a strong field in Swedish research on Social Science teaching and learning (see for instance Almgren, 2006; Larsson, 2007; Liljestrand, 2002; Ljunggren et al., 2015). But this research has also been criticized for not taking into account the power relations affecting what can and cannot be spoken in the classroom dialogue; and for putting too much hope into what Suzanne deCastell calls the talking cure:

/…/ important for my purposes is the presupposition too often made with respect to the talking cure – the insistence that hearing silenced voices, by that of course we mean people talking – fixes everything. I am not even sure whether talking fixes anything – but certainly talking does not “fix” social injustice even within the microcosm of the classroom, let alone fixes what is at root a political – administrative and not an ethical or an educational problem. (deCastell, 2005, p. 54-55)

If we take into account the great emphasis on dialogue as a tool to strengthen democracy, groups who are actively silent or withdraw from democratic dialogue could invoke anger or frustration in teachers and students who strive for a socially just Social Science classroom and society:

The loss of the ideal of democratic dialogue and its promise of social cohesion is a serious one; it suggests loss of the basic fantasies on which western democracies are built. Therefore, those with sincere and benevolent desires for a unified and egalitarian classroom and society are likely to identify as threat any apparently contrary practice such as the withdrawal or active silence of some groups. (Jones, 2005, p. 62)
Considering the strong position of the democratic mission in the subject Social Science along with the importance of speech in being a good active citizen, we can see that speech and silence become exceptionally emotionally charged in Social Science teaching. Analysing the data on silence and speech in this study, it is indeed obvious that silence is troubling in relation to Social Science teaching to some students. The trouble the students express is not connected to democracy on a societal level, but rather to epistemological questions. Their conception of the subject Social Science is that it is built around speech. Silence is a threat to being a ‘good’ student of Social Science. Being a ‘good’ student of Social Science thus seems more pressing than being a ‘good’ citizen. Lina says that in Social Science lessons ‘It is not so good if you don’t say anything’. Later in this chapter we will see that for Shirin, Social Science is very much about talking, and since she does not talk in the whole-class teaching, she has to find other ways of expressing herself. The speech both Lina and Shirin talk of and struggle with is expressing thoughts and opinions, not answering factual questions.

Another attitude expressed by some of the students in this study is that Social Science teaching helps students with immigrant background to learn about, and adjust to, Swedish society. In this conception of the subject, talking about their own experiences and views is not relevant in relation to the education, as expressed here by Amina at Björkskolan:

Amina: It feels like you have to adapt to the country. Sweden hasn’t got the same rules as another country, outside of Europe.

Katarina: So, you think Sweden’s rules are the Social Science?

Amina: Yes.

Katarina: Yes, that is interesting because then it is as if there is a we in Social Science, we in Sweden for instance, and then there might be students who don’t feel that things belong there, do you think it is like that?

Amina: Yes, well, many come from countries which have experienced war and stuff and there, it is not like in Sweden. Countries that are not democratic. /…/ I think they just want to know how it works in Sweden, so they can adapt to the country they live in.

Leyla, who we will learn more about later in this chapter, has a similar view of the subject, that is, as instrumental in learning about Swedish society. But, as will be shown, her attitude towards the education cracks when hitting on certain content in the Social Science course.
Reasons for silence

Analysing the students’ statements about silence and speech, the four different schools give slightly different impressions. To be sure, at all four schools students state that the fact that other students raise their hands and speak is a reason to keep silent by reasoning along the lines of ‘someone else is doing it, the space is already taken, there is no use of me trying’. This is most pronounced at Björkskolan where one student, Karoline, said that her impression was that the teacher had become so used to the same people talking in class that he, maybe to be efficient with time and get quick answers, increasingly over the year had directed questions to the same students. Similarly, at Granskolan, Marcus talked about different student roles; some students are ‘the answering kind of students’ and some are not.

Another general finding is that some students do not dare to speak in class, either because they are afraid of other students’ reactions or because they need to be 100 percent sure of the answer before they say something. The latter is most pronounced at Ekskolan, where a large group of students does not speak in class. Whether that has to do with the fact that Ekskolan has the highest status among the four schools in the study remains unclear, but it is probable that the students there experience a higher pressure to perform well.

At Björkskolan, four of the eight interviewed students say that students are silent because their opinions or answers diverge from what is usually said in the classroom.

Lina: If someone raises their hand, the one who is called upon to speak first says something and many in the class agree, then you don’t dare to raise your hand and say no, I don’t think so.

Mahmood: Sometimes you don’t agree with the majority in class but you don’t want to show because many will fly at you if you do.

Amina: If someone says something and the majority of the class agrees, the others do not say that they disagree. It is just, it is all the same, we leave it alone.

Through students’ strong sense of which expressions are accepted in the Social Science teaching and which are not, we can infer a boundary work going on in the teaching at Björkskolan. This boundary work apparently keeps some perspectives and emotions silent. Importantly, this gatekeeping is performed by students, not by the teacher.

As we shall see in the case of Shirin later in this chapter, she keeps silent since she feels she is awkward, because her view diverges from the rest. In contrast, capturing
the more ‘open’ climate in the classroom at Lindskolan, discussed in Chapter 9, Bahar mentions having a divergent view on the topic as a reason to speak in class. At Lindskolan and Granskolan, where silence in the classroom is not seen as a great problem, students praise the teachers for how they ‘pick up’ students’ remarks. Martin, in particular, is said to be good at showing interest through remembering what the students say in class, returning to their statements hours after they were uttered.

Another striking finding at Björkskolan is that Erik and Gabriel (who both perform well, are verbal in class and fluent in Swedish) are seemingly unaware of their privileged situation. They analyse the silence of other students as lack of interest, laziness or as indicating that they have no objections.

At Lindskolan and Björkskolan, students see language as affecting speech and silence in the classroom. Most often, the students mention a lack of confidence in the Swedish language as a hindrance. Leyla and Erik at Björkskolan also bring up a lack of background in the subject Social Science as a barrier. They believe that students who have attended the Swedish school-system from day one have come to know about what is considered to be Social Science knowledge and what is expected from a ‘good’ student of Social Science, which gives them verbal confidence. For students who do not have such meta-understanding of the subject, or are not confident speaking Swedish or ‘Social Science’ Swedish, it might be impossible to say what they think because they do not know how to say it. That corresponds to van Manen’s (1990) conceptualization of epistemological silence which, like Polanyi’s (1967) tacit knowledge, occurs when we know something but for some reason are unable to articulate it.

In the field notes, articulation through speech and silence is frequent. During the observations at Björkskolan, one incident was especially striking. In a lesson about migration and European policy around migration, the teacher Rickard asked the students: ‘If you were a migrant, would you rather apply for asylum in a country where you could get permanent residence permit or where you get a temporary one?’ The student raising his hand and elaborating on the question was Gabriel, who usually took up lots of space talking in the classroom. He most certainly did not have an immigrant background. Students, who might have immigrant background kept silent, even though I noticed Mahmood and another student whispered something to each other. So, Gabriel became the voice of the migrant in the classroom. Because of its potentially emotive character, the situation was chosen as a video clip and shown in the interviews, where Mahmood remarked that it was nothing to get upset over, because the answer to Rickard’s question was obvious:
everyone would have answered like Gabriel did, they would have chosen a country where you could get a permanent residence permit.

Gender and silence

In both cases analysed in this chapter, the students withholding speech are female (in other parts of the study several of the students speaking out, like Mahmood and Karim, are male). Importantly, that does not give a full or representative picture of the material as a whole or the situations in the classrooms. The study is not designed to include a gender analysis of speech and silence. At both Björkskolan and Lindskolan, female students are verbally active in the teaching and in many situations, for instance in the role play about the EU at Björkskolan, they dominate the discourse.

This deceptive picture of speech and silence related to gender stems from the sampling of the interviewees. In each class, I sampled about a third of the students for interviews. I deliberately sampled students from different peer groups in the class in order to get a broad range of perspectives. I also strived for a balanced gender mix. However, it is impossible to force oneself on students who do not want to participate in an interview. As discussed in Chapter 4, I observed that the students who were eager to be interviewed were the ones who did not speak out in class. Maybe they saw it as a chance to say something. This was especially true of Shirin in this chapter who seemed to long to speak about plurality and tensions in Social Science education. She expressed gratefulness after the interview. My gratefulness to her for letting me interview her was drowned out by her gratefulness.

This said, in the case of Leyla and Shirin, there are probably mechanisms at work that have been analysed by scholars of gender studies, particularly those who conduct research at the intersection of critical race studies and gender studies, as both students are female and both state in the interview that they have an immigrant background.

A well-documented mechanism of the response to black feminist anger (see for example Lorde, 1984; hooks, 1989) is pointedly expressed by Ahmed:

To speak out of anger as a woman of color is to confirm your position as the cause of tension; your anger is what threatens the social bond.

The figure of the angry black woman is also a fantasy figure that produces its own effects. Reasonable thoughtful arguments are dismissed as anger (which of course empties anger of its own reason), which makes you angry, such that
your response becomes read as the confirmation of evidence that you are not only angry but also unreasonable! To make this point in another way, the anger of feminists of color is attributed. So you might be angry about how racism and sexism diminish life choices for women of color. Your anger is a judgement that something is wrong. But in being heard as angry, your speech is read as motivated by anger. Your anger is read as unattributed, as if you are against x because you are angry rather than being angry because you are against x. You become angry at the injustice of being motivated by anger, which makes it harder to separate yourself from the object of your anger. You become entangled with what you are angry about because you are angry about how they have entangled you in your anger. In becoming angry about that entanglement, you confirm their commitment to your anger as the truth ‘behind’ your speech, which is what blocks your anger, stops it from getting through.


What speaking out and showing emotions would do to women might align itself with a history of contact with the separation of rationality and emotionality. In this separation, women are strictly confined to the emotional side of that boundary.

The pleasures and freedoms of silence

If our intention is to silence silences in the classroom, it is important to ask what we are doing by silencing silence. One answer is that we are reaffirming the (western) primacy of speech (Li Li, 2005, p. 82).

When speech in Social Science teaching is about suffering, as in the case of Leyla’s experiences of war, the students risk being captured and paralyzed by the suffering, without the chance to overcome it. Given such a poor outlook, silence might be a desirable option. When questioned about why students with immigrant background do not talk about their experiences in the Social Science teaching, Amina said that her parents’ experience of migration is not something they talk about even at home.

It raises important questions about whose responsibility (and burden) it is to speak and react against single track perspectives in education. Scholars and teachers that advocate for more dialogue across differences in classrooms (see for example Boler, 1999; Ljunggren, Unemar Öst, & Englund, 2015) often overlook the pressure on marginalized students to expose and thereby put themselves at risk in the
classroom. Alison Jones (2005) describes how non-white students in her teacher-training classes clearly refuse to be the voice of the ‘other’, to teach their white peers, despite the white students’ desire to learn from them. Their silence in that case can be seen as a form of resistance. Wendy Brown asserts that silence, while it is produced within discourse, can also function as ‘that which discourse has not penetrated, as a scene of practices that escape the regulatory functions of discourse’ (2005, p. 88). However, for Leyla and Shirin, there is certainly no such sense of freedom when they talk about the situations discerned in this chapter.

Furthermore, what is unique to Leyla’s and Shirin’s cases, compared to the more general reasons for not speaking stated earlier in this chapter, is their reason for not speaking: emotion evoked by the Social Science teaching risks intensifying, thereby threatening Leyla’s and Shirin’s social bonds to other students. At the same time, the emotions are clearly related to, in Leyla’s case, the teaching of the subject matter international law, and in Shirin’s case, statements in the discussion on a burning question in the teaching.

I have experienced all this: international law\textsuperscript{31}

On 3 February in 2015 at Björskolan, the teacher Rickard had come back from a ten day long parental leave. In his absence, the class had a substitute teacher and two assignments to solve: one about the Millennium goals and one about international law. Rickard had planned student presentations of the assignment about international law during the lesson on 3 February, but it turned out that only a few students had completed it. Instead, Rickard lectured for 15 minutes about the historical development of international law. Among the slides in his PowerPoint were two photos of cities bombed to pieces. The first one was of Dresden, Germany in 1945; the second one of Kobane, Syria in 2015. Rickard lingered at the picture of Dresden – he had himself been to Dresden a couple of years earlier. He talked about how beautiful the city is, recommending students to visit it. In the case of Kobane, no voice was raised to make it beautiful in contrast to the devastation rendered in the picture. The teacher told the class that he was using the picture of Kobane to

\textsuperscript{31} This situation has previously been analysed in a paper in \textit{Journal of Social Science Education} (Blennow, 2018).
show that it is hard to realize international law, because it depends on the states involved in the conflict.

For the remaining part of the lesson the students were given time to finish their assignments. I was circulating around the classroom, observing and talking to the students. As I approached Leyla, she was using a web tool to translate Swedish text into Arabic. Beside her on the desk was a dictionary. I had not spoken to her before. I took a seat beside her and asked her if it was difficult to find the information requested in the assignment. In response, she told me that she has experienced war: ‘I have experienced all this at close quarters’. The question about the assignment, an epistemic question, did not get an answer. Instead, Leyla talked about her experiences of war in a way that gave the impression that she had waited for someone to sit down beside her so she could tell her story. It is unclear what Leyla meant by the sweeping expression of having experienced ‘all this’. Did she mean all of the content in the PowerPoint presentation? She described the situation in her country of origin: her family just staying inside a room with some food for several months. She said something about how it was totally different to be in it, to be at the centre of it, than to look at pictures of it.

As she and her family fled, Leyla had almost finished upper secondary school. She describes herself as a top student, getting prizes and advantages because of her achievements. But on arrival to Sweden she had to start all over again, studying Swedish for one year, and then trying to pass enough subjects to qualify for upper secondary school. Leyla studies hard and wants to continue studying at the university. In the interview, there is a sense of fatigue when she talks about trying to master well known subjects in a new language. She says that she has no experience of Social Science. She has studied for only one year what most of the other students have studied for nine years. They have a meta-knowledge of the subject, knowing what it is and what one can expect from it. This is a more pressing question for the subject Social Science compared to other subjects because if it exists as a subject in other countries, it is organized very differently than in Sweden and it has a relatively complicated subject-specific language, something that is confirmed by the official Swedish government investigation on newly arrived students (SOU 2017:54, p. 127; see also Odenstad, 2018).

The teacher Rickard talked to me about Leyla several times as an example of a potentially high achiever where there is a language barrier. He said he avoids pushing her verbally by asking her questions:
Rickard: She strives for a lot and she is clever, really, but I think it is not fair to approach her with a verbal question /…/ but when she raises her hand it is OK and in private it is OK.

Leyla’s view of Social Science teaching is that it helps her learn about Swedish society in order to improve it. She sees Rickard’s teaching as trying to create a mini society in the classroom, where everyone is interested in everyone else’s views. Leyla tries to learn as much as she can and says she is very content with the teaching, but when it comes to education about the UN, human rights and international law she rejects the education. There is a change in her way of expressing herself: suddenly she calls the education crap. When I interviewed Leyla a month after we spoke to each other in the classroom, she returned to that lesson. It came up in response to the question of whether something had been emotional for her in the Social Science teaching during my observations:

Leyla: Yes, it was when we were sitting and writing about it and you came to me and helped me, it just… when you talk about it, it just feels [...] well some people don’t feel well. But when you have experienced it yourself, then you know what it feels like, you know how hard it is.

Leyla recognizes that feelings circulate in the classroom because of the topic of war; maybe particularly because of the pictures the teacher put on display. But she makes a distinction between the feelings of the people who do not feel well and her own feelings.

Leyla: When we talked about human rights and stuff like that, you talk about it, you say that: “No we are not going to do anything [bad]” but still, when in war, it’s just [...] they do it, they are allowed to do it [...] Even now, you know, ISIS /…/. So, when they talked about Human Rights, I thought it was just crap /…/.

When they sit in the EU, when they sit in the UN, when they sit talking about everything, they just [...] “Yes no one is going to fare badly” [...] but in reality, it is not like that. In reality, many people die.

Leyla says she thinks the views held by her and some other students in the teaching group who have experienced war might develop the discussion in the classroom. But they do not intervene. The topic of restraint is something that recurs on several occasions during the interview.

Leyla gives different reasons for withholding speech in the classroom; a lack of confidence regarding whether she would be able to express her thoughts in Swedish
and the risk of boring the other students by taking a long time to formulate her thoughts. When talking about the lesson on international law, she adds a previously unmentioned reason for her withholding of speech: the risk of hatred.

Leyla: That’s why I am not speaking during the lesson; it is because when I speak during the lesson, what should I say? Should I tell the things I have told you? Maybe it takes time, and then it is the self-confidence. [...] I could say it, but if you have lived a nice life and haven’t had problems you won’t believe or feel what I am saying. Because what I am going to say, it feels, well it is difficult, so if someone would laugh, then I would just hate him or her, because it gets real so I just, I can’t cope.

In Leyla’s case, the politicization of the subject matter international law could have been used to bring ‘new’ conflictual perspectives to the teaching. Leyla says that she could have developed the discussion if she had shared her thoughts. The emotion of anger that she relates shows that the teaching is contested.

Movement

Emotion is the reason for Leyla’s withholding of her speech in this situation. The threat of anger intensifying into strong dislike or hatred stops her from intervening in the teaching. This reason is compounded by her other reasons, reasons that seem to motivate her actions no matter what the topic is. So, emotions stick to the topic of international law. But what stops Leyla here is not the topic but a risk that is relational – she speaks about the teacher trying to create a mini society in the classroom and how being rejected or distanced from that society would be unbearable. Hatred would make Leyla move away so fast from the other students that it might be difficult for her to stay attached to them.

In order not to move away from the other students Leyla seems to need to witness on her terms, but she fears not getting a just hearing. But getting a just hearing could be complicated because of Leyla’s belief that her view is the truth and generalizing expressions that ‘I know all of this; I know what it is like’.

It is up to the students to ‘save’ Leyla’s positive relation to the subject Social Science. Her belief that there is a risk of not getting a just hearing puts a block in that process. Consequently, she does not even try to apply her perspective in the teaching.
Attachment

Leyla tries to avoid anger turning into hatred or strong dislike. This attempt is important in relation to attachment: the distinction between hate and anger is temporal, as Aristotle argued. Anger has an endpoint, whereas hatred does not (Plamper, 2015, p. 14). As such, it would be relationally wise to avoid hatred as hatred would in the worst case scenario disqualify the relation for ever. Leyla is clearly trying to stay attached to the other students in class by not speaking.

Voicing a counter perspective in education is a task that extends over time: to get the message through and to be recognized, one probably has to stick to the task for some time. What is of importance is how one is heard by the others. If this hearing is initially blocked, then one has to repeat the statement. To Ahmed, the prolonged task, the repetition of exposure, is both an emotional and a political struggle:

The work of exposure is not over in the moment of hearing: often such testimonies have to be repeated, again and again. Doing the work of exposure is hence both political and emotional work. The demand for recognition can risk exposing too much, and “defences” against “hearing” the claim are often already in place (which can include guilt, shame and anger as well as denial and indifference), and those defences can, but do not always, block the message. Political struggle is about learning to deal with such blockages, and finding ways to get through. (Ahmed, 2014, p. 200)

Also, when you speak out, you get attached to the role of someone who speaks out, which raises expectations on you to keep speaking out. For Leyla, who expresses doubt about coping with speaking out once (‘It gets real, so I just, I can’t cope’), this prolonged task might be overwhelming.

In this situation, where Leyla risks getting detached from the other students, there is another process of attachment going on in the classroom, which actually leads to detachment. There are emotions circulating in class from the way other students attach themselves to the situation of being in war. Regarding the pictures of Dresden and Kobane, Leyla assumes that feelings about the photos circulate between students in the teaching group. She says ‘some people don’t feel well’. When she adds that she knows what it feels like, it is as if she thinks that other feelings that circulate in the teaching group because of the pictures encroach on her feelings. We cannot settle with feelings of pity or compassion, because they are not true. She claims she knows what it feels like, she knows how hard it is.

The telling is also about witnessing, which makes demands on others to hear, but which does not always get a just hearing. Responses to testimonies of
injury can “cover over” the injury, for example, by claiming it as ‘our own’ (appropriation). (Ahmed, 2014, p. 200)

For Leyla, this happens without her making a statement. She assumes that the other students attach their feelings to the object of war, especially through seeing pictures of devastation. She rejects their feelings as untrue.

This view of ‘real’ versus ‘fake’ feelings corresponds to a reflection made by the teacher, Rickard. When talking about the education on migration, human rights and international law after the teaching has taken place, he says that he has been operationalizing his own ideas about how students with immigrant background might feel:

Rickard: I feel it is tricky because it is obvious that I should have asked if there is someone who wants to recount his or her experiences of this. I should have. But then at the same time I feel a bit frightened about it, actually it is my own presupposition that maybe you don’t want to give an account of this, it is not a nice experience to expose to others. And if you ask them about it you put pressure on them – I am a refugee, I am pointed out as a refugee, and now I have to recount it as well. You want to cut that off […] but it is a bit strange if you cut off experiences of life so it just becomes a theoretical perspective.

So, Rickard tries to attach himself to Leyla and other students with experiences of war and migration by imagining what it would be like to be asked to expose those experiences. Rickard’s ideas about how it might feel to have a background as a refugee and then be asked to tell your story keeps him from bringing up students’ experiences in the teaching despite his notion that it is strange to cut off the life world from the theoretical perspectives. But in this particular case, as we have seen, it is not actually telling the story or the story itself that acts as hindrance for Leyla. What worries her is how she would come across to other students and what the emotion in the situation would do to their relationship.

Contact

An interesting contradiction in Leyla’s narrative is that the perspective she advocates, the one she thinks is missing from the teaching, is actually addressed by the teacher during the lesson. Rickard is telling the students that he is using the pictures of Dresden and Kobane to show that international law is hard to realize and that the degree of success or failure depends on the involved states, which coheres with
Leyla’s view. Leyla’s account of the perspective in the teaching is that it is naïve and overly relies on the power of negotiation and the will to ‘do good’. Leyla either does not catch or does not acknowledge this nuance in Rickard’s teaching. Her picture of the teaching is therefore one-dimensional.

Why does she not acknowledge that the teacher is approaching her? Despite her short experience of the subject Social Science, she seems to have established a picture of what it is through her brief contact with the subject. This history of contact means that she misses some aspects of the teaching that actually works in her favour. As in the case of Mahmood in Chapter 9, the emotionality seems to render it difficult to catch and remember the teacher’s reasonable intake of perspectives.

Leyla makes a truth claim that she knows ‘all this’. That is how she would come into contact with the other students and the teacher if she spoke up in class, and that would possibly make it difficult for her to interact with the other students. If the politicization of the topic of international law is to become a part of teaching, there is pressure on the teacher to intervene in how the students come into contact over it.

How can they say something like that?
Generalizations about religiosity

On January 7-9 in 2015, attacks on the satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo and a kosher shop in Paris killed 17 people. The attacks were carried out by three gunmen claiming they were part of al-Qaida and avenging the Prophet Muhammad. At the first Social Science lesson after the event, the attacks were brought up by the students. The teacher Rickard had not planned to spend time discussing the attacks, though it had crossed his mind that it might be brought up by the students. It was a heated situation.

Shirin is a student belonging to the third of the students in class who are neither the verbal pop-interested group nor the group at the ‘migrant table’, but rather a quieter group. Several of the students in this group attend the natural sciences programme with a music profile, playing classical instruments.

Shirin’s parents arrived to Sweden in the early 1980’s. Shirin attends the natural sciences programme with a music profile. In class, Shirin is relatively quiet during whole class teaching but talks a lot during breaks and when working in smaller groups. In the interview, Shirin says that she always has a lot to say in class, but she seldom says anything, partly because other students are raising their hands and partly because she feels that her thoughts are strange and different.
Shirin: Well, I’ve always got lots I want to say, but then again, I kind of never say things. Either because when I raise my hand, several others do it as well, and then of course, I can’t always be the one who gets to answer the question. So partly because of that, and partly because I feel that what I say is really awkward. I mean, don’t say anything […]

Katarina: Do you feel that when you are saying it: ‘oh, I put this a bit awkwardly’?

Shirin: No, not like that, it’s more like maybe my thoughts are awkward.

Shirin says that when it comes to rote learning, repetition and what she calls factual questions, it is not a problem to raise her hand and answer the question. She strives to get high grades in school and her strategy is to talk to the teacher after the lesson, send him e-mails and try to write as much as possible in written tests. She sees the ability to express opinions as a pivotal part of Social Science teaching and learning and hence it is troublesome for her that she does not express her opinions in class.

Shirin: But in all the assignments I write everything I think, because OK, the teacher has to know that I have got opinions (laughs). Because that is important in Social Science, that is what it is all about really/…/ Or else it feels like you are not really functioning, or know how it works, in a way, if you cannot see the positive and the negative.

Katarina: But why are you not voicing your opinions during the lessons?

Shirin: Well, I think it might be because my opinions are different from everyone else’s.

Shirin brings up the discussion about the Charlie Hebdo attack as an example of a situation where she does not speak in class because she feels awkward. In the discussion about the attack, she felt upset and disappointed with some of the classmates who she regards as her friends because they were making generalizations about Muslims, for instance connecting violence with Islam.

Shirin: My parents have lived in Muslim countries, they have like grown up Muslim, but they are not that, or, they are faithful (sic) but they don’t let that influence anything/…/ I am not faithful at all, but you know they still have taught me a lot, what Islam means. And then I heard someone in class say that Muslims kill people, and I, I just got pissed off, because I have parents who have grown up like that, I feel like what the hell […] (starts crying).

Katarina: What happened in the teaching then? When, do you remember? You got angry and upset, but what happened in […].
Shirin: Well, I got pissed off, I was just: how can they say something like that? Because they are the same persons who have told me that they are anti-racist.

Shirin starts to cry at this point in the interview. She also says that she felt disappointed with some of her Muslim classmates, because they did not oppose the generalizations. Shirin herself did not say anything in the discussion about the attack on Charlie Hebdo and the kosher shop, because she was afraid that she would get too upset and say too much.

Shirin: [...] and I get really angry, like, I don’t want to say anything because I will get pissed off and like, say lots of stuff, so I just keep away from it.

Shirin describes how she tries to control the feeling of anger by keeping quiet, implying that if she started talking she would not be able to prevent herself from saying too much, which in this case seems to be synonymous with showing her feelings, showing too much feeling and getting even angrier. She avoids putting herself in a situation where her feelings would grow in strength and intensity.

An interesting aspect of Shirin’s reactions is that she is upset with practising Muslims in class who do not react against stereotypes. She implicitly assumes that they have a greater responsibility to react than she has.

Shirin: What shocked me the most was that there are some people in class who are believing Muslims. And they say, like, they agree /…/ I think it is really strange when I, who am not a believer, think that it is stupid that someone says something like that.

Importantly, this statement from Shirin is put into question by Rickard’s account of the situation. He states that another student said that she is a Muslim, but she does not care about what they paint, they can paint whatever they want, she is still strong in her belief. But that she was the only one who spoke up in that way, apart from Mahmood, who ‘said what you couldn’t say’.

Shirin is also disappointed with some students who she calls her friends and who she thinks approach religion as a cause of conflict, even when it is not. She recalls an incident at a Religious Education lesson.

Shirin: Our teacher started the lesson by asking what religion is. Then some girls in my class said “oppression”. /…/ and I was like: I want to know; it was Elin and Anna who said it. Well I have nothing against them, we are good friends, but I just wanted to know what they meant, then they said in
Islam it is like this and women and I got really sad about the opinions some people have, and that is because others, we are talking Social Science teaching right, that is why some political parties, like the Sweden Democrats, get support from the citizens, and that is wrong. So, I am sad, I am really sad that some have formed the wrong opinion.

As in the case of Leyla, Shirin makes a truth claim based on her experience. According to Shirin, the other students issue false statements. In the case of Shirin there is a lot of motion through emotion, leading to multi-layered attachments. Shirin expresses anger, disappointment and awkwardness. These emotions move her in relation to other students in the group, especially some of her friends and practising Muslims, but also in relation to the teacher, the subject Social Science and her parents.

Movement

In Shirin’s statements, it is clear from a relational perspective that she tries to avoid moving away from some of the other students. Through the feeling of anger, she seems to sense a distancing from them. She consequently avoids an intensification of the emotion that would lead to a faster movement away from others in class. ‘I don’t want to say anything because I will get pissed off and like, say lots of stuff, so I just keep away from it.’ Perhaps expressing the anger explicitly would lead to rejection from a group of students Shirin wants to be attached to. In Shirin’s words, it seems as if talking in itself would intensify the emotion. And the intensified emotion would lead to more talking in a vicious circle.

An interesting tension appears in relation to the subject Social Science. Through not expressing her opinions and thoughts, and thereby preventing further distancing from other students, Shirin is simultaneously distancing herself from her idea of what is at the core of Social Science teaching and learning: applying different perspectives and testing different judgements about right and wrong. This leads to a sense of not functioning/performing in relation to the subject. Shirin has to work around that by contacting the teacher separately and using tests and assignments to make her opinions clear to the teacher. So, what happens in class also distances her from the teacher and the subject: she has to approach him in other ways, in other places. Shirin relates a conception of the subject that diverges from most other interviewed students – where most other students in this study place analysis and knowledge about systems at the heart of the subject, Shirin places opinion and argumentation. Shirin says that the other students have not understood the subject:
Shirin: I think most people in my class expect that Social Science is just about learning about different systems and things like that. They don’t understand that it is actually connected to how we view different things.

Apart from the anger in the discussion about the Charlie Hebdo attack, Shirin relates a feeling of ‘being awkward’ that is always there in relation to the Social Science teaching. In the interview, she goes from saying that her thoughts are awkward to saying that she thinks differently than other students. The Social Science education seems to constantly detach her from her fellow students, but her attachment to the teacher Rickard does not seem to be threatened by and through that feeling.

Attachment

As previously stated, Shirin’s actions in the Social Science class seem to be strongly associated with her wanting to stay attached to a group of students who she calls her friends. The students she mentions belong to the high status group in class, the group that is referred to as the pop group (because of their popularity as well as their interest in pop music), has strong bonds to the teacher and a lot of space in the classroom. It is in relation to this group that Shirin tries to stop the distancing through emotion. A way of seeing Shirin’s actions (or her reluctance to act) in the situation is that she seeks an advantage in relation to the dominant group of students, some members of which she calls her friends. If she reacted openly against these students, she would risk detaching herself from them, which could lead to her loss of status in the group. She would definitely threaten her social bond to those students.

What contributes to Shirin’s anger with these students is the fact that anti-racism seems to be an important part of their self-image, which Shirin sees as contradicted by their utterances about religion. She seems to have had greater hope in those students, or put differently, she seems to have felt an attachment to those students through a shared anti-racism, an attachment that is threatened or even dissolved through their statements in the Social Science teaching.

Shirin’s attachment to the teacher Rickard seems unthreatened. Shirin does not seem to have a problem with expressing her views of society to him. The feeling of awkwardness does not arise in her when she relates to Rickard. The awkwardness comes from the clash between what is expected in Social Science teaching on the one hand, and the attachment to other students, on the other. It seems fair to state that in the case of Shirin, the subject Social Science does something to her: because of her expectations of what constitutes ‘good’ Social Science teaching and learning
and a ‘good’ student of Social Science, Shirin’s attachment to other students is put at risk. The subject Social Science places a demand on Shirin to talk during lesson time. But she chooses not to speak in order not to lose her attachment to the other students, which in turn puts her in a position where she has to perform alternative forms of work to prove herself a ‘good’ student of Social Science.

When speaking about the situation, Shirin places a great responsibility to speak on practising Muslims in class. Through that moral gesture, Shirin is detaching herself from them. They become ‘others’ and they, according to Shirin, ought to be more affected by the statements about Islam and Muslims than she is. Another way of seeing Shirin’s view on the practising Muslims’ greater responsibility is that she does not see them as risking their attachment to the group of students saying those things, because they are already detached from them. Another attachment that plays a vital role here is Shirin’s strong bonds to her parents, as we will see in the next section.

Contact

Shirin recurrently refers to her parents and what she has learned about religion, history, life and society from them. At one point in the interview she says that both her parents have read a lot, especially her father: ‘he kind of knows everything, at least in the way you are supposed to know it, and then he has got opinions about everything, but he tries to teach me and then I can have my own opinions and then we discuss’. She refers lovingly to both parents and also depicts her mother as a good Muslim and a good person: calm, kind, the opposite of the picture of Muslims that some of the students in her class draw. According to Shirin, her own contact with practitioners of faith gives her true knowledge about religiosity.

Shirin: I know that it is not like people say, that’s why I get really upset when people say that I am wrong about it, I am one of those who ought to know it well because I have actually seen people who are believers here and I have seen what normal and good humans they are.

Another contact that seems to influence Shirin’s thoughts in the moment is the way Middle Eastern countries and Muslims are pictured in American popular culture and media. She brings up the movie *American Sniper*, shown in Swedish cinemas at the time of the interview, as an example of an unjust depiction of who is a hero and who is a villain.
Shirin: Now a new film is out, what is it called [...] *American Sniper*, it’s so much propaganda and I get surprised, I get so sad and really feel bad because they portray it like we should pity the invading American soldiers. And I just: but it is they who maybe want to colonize the whole of the Middle East or something. It is so sad, the way some people are influenced by that picture.

Shirin explains other students’ views as affected by what she calls propaganda, as in the movie *American Sniper*. She thus perceives them to have a history of contact with Muslims and the Middle East through prejudiced media.

As shown above, there is a contradiction apparent when Shirin speaks about students in her class. Some of them are her friends or former friends, who have presented themselves as anti-racist, yet her history of contact with them makes Shirin surprised and disappointed with them when she hears about their views of Islam and Muslims.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has analytically probed situations where students’ emotions and opinions are withheld. Starting with a more general discussion of silence and speech in Social Science teaching, the chapter then proceeded to narrow the analysis to the cases of Leyla, whose experience of living in a country at war made her upset about the teaching on international law, and Shirin, who was angry about generalizations about Islam and Muslims. This chapter has illuminated the palpable interconnectedness between emotions and politicization in relation to the Social Science knowledge content, showing that emotions are a vital part of politicization in both teaching and learning. The relation between the two is contradictory. On the one hand there is a clear link between emotion and politicization, at its clearest in relation to the feeling of anger in the cases of Leyla and Shirin. Their anger regarding how a specific content is taught is the start of (or a part of) a systems analysis that is political. There is a judgement through emotion: the anger means that something is wrong. Again, emotions interplay with Social Science content because the content generates work drawing emotional boundaries between us and them. The political is indeed at work here. On the other hand, emotions seem to stand in the way for using politicization in teaching and learning. Leyla and Shirin avoid speaking because they believe it would lead to an intensification of anger. Leyla furthermore avoids turning anger into strong dislike or hatred, while Shirin avoids escalating her anger. Both believe that the intensified emotions would do something to their relations in the group. Anger reaches forward in the writings of Lorde and
Ahmed, but for Leyla and Shirin the way forward is relationally dangerous. That
danger affects the perceived conflictuality in relation to the specific Social Science
content that Leyla and Shirin encounter. For Leyla and Shirin, the conflictuality is
obvious, but it might pass by unnoticed by other students and the teacher.

Importantly, Leyla’s and Shirin’s silence is not interpreted here as a form of re-
sistance a la Wendy Brown or Alison Jones. Their silence does not respond to a
demand for speech. The other students, the teaching and the teacher do not crave
for their views or their witnessing. The initiative comes from Leyla and Shirin.
There is urgency in their anger. This makes the dynamic in these situations differ-
ent from the literature discussed at the beginning of this chapter, a literature pro-
poning the idea that the dominant group demands that marginalized groups open
up their territory for exploration.

The two cases suggest that it is not the topic per se, in this case international law
and religion, that restrains the students’ speech, but rather the fear of what emo-
tions and stances in the teaching will do to Leyla’s and Shirin’s relations. The po-
litical character of these situations creates this dilemma. This is a counter argument
to the teachers who, like Rickard, might think that the students do not want to talk
about certain topics. Damaging their social bonds to other students in class seems
to be the worst possible scenario for both Leyla and Shirin. We may ask ourselves
if it is only through the refusal of the social bond that their anger can reach forward?
A relevant professional-ethical question is if we can demand of Leyla and Shirin
that they risk their attachments to other students in order to politicize some content
in a Social Science course.

Surprisingly, neither Leyla nor Shirin mention the teacher or the relation to the
teacher as restraining their speech. Notwithstanding the fact that he could be seen
as the representative of the subject and the teaching of international law that Leyla
thinks is crap, she does not worry about his reactions to what she would say. Her
focus is on the other students. Similarly, Shirin does not have any apprehensions
about mediating her views to the teacher: she does so in ways that do not expose
her views to the other students. By not being seen as involved in the movements
and attachments through emotion in these cases, the teacher could be the key to a
way forward. This is an important finding in relation to subject didactics, discussed
in Chapter 10. The withheld emotion in the two cases means that the emotional
community of the Social Science teaching is not put to the test: we do not know
how the community would react to the anger, we just know how it is perceived by
Leyla and Shirin.

A task for Social Science teaching would be to pave the way for the forward-
reaching emotion of anger. Such a way could be paved by fastening on to the
systems analysis and the politicization, both of which are inherent in the anger in
the classroom. But that task is impossible if the anger remains unarticulated. How-
ever, by attempting to pave this way the teacher would perhaps draw attention away
from the relational level in the classroom and thereby decrease the social risks of
speaking that Leyla and Shirin experience. Framing emotion and symbolic bound-
ary work as part of the subject, as a desirable conflict, could be a relief. Another
way of paving the way for emotions, requested by some of the students at Björk-
skolan, could be to organize part of the teaching as group discussions, where the
boundary work between groups of students is on a smaller more informal scale, and
then discuss the topic in whole-class teaching. If the Social Science teaching could
be visionary and take the lead in treating anger as a creative force that leads to new
politicization, it might dissolve some of the restraint similar to the types of restraint
experienced by Leyla and Shirin.

Why should Leyla and Shirin speak? Not to fix the injustices in society or even
in the classroom, for that would be wishful thinking, but to politicize some of the
content in the Social Science course. The alternatives to speaking are Leyla’s pierc-
ing insight about the teaching of international law as dependent on no experience
of war (even when several students in the room have experienced war); and Shirin
walking out of the room at the end of the lesson in anger without the teacher and
other students noticing it (and starting to cry in an interview a month later).

The subject matter human rights and international law as well as the topic of
religion scream for politicization in the group at Björkskolan. Anger is the start of
a systems analysis and politicization that would benefit the Social Science teaching
through providing conflictual perspectives and heated analysis.

In the wish to open up for students’ experiences in the Social Science teaching, it
is pivotal to simultaneously move away from the notion of experience as unques-
tionable truth. Joan W Scott addresses the dangers of using experience empirically
– by using experiences as empirical material you widen the picture, you ‘render
historical what has hitherto been hidden from history’ (Scott, 1992, p. 23) but at
the same time you risk losing sight of the mechanisms or hegemonies that have
formed the experience of that person. We need to explain the experiences of per-
sons, otherwise the narrative just affirms the otherness.

Experience is at once always already an interpretation and is in need of inter-
pretation. What counts as experience is neither self-evident nor straightforward; it is always contested, always therefore political. (Scott, 1992, p. 37)
Both Leyla and Shirin make truth claims. The stances they take on the teaching or other students’ views give off a generalizing and unreasonable impression. By withholding speech, they might be missing a chance of not just widening the perspectives in the Social Science education, but also of transforming their own relation to norms permeating the teaching or to other students.

To conclude, this chapter presents a complex dilemma for the Social Science teacher: specific Social Science content spark emotive, conflictual perspectives but those perspectives are not expressed in the teaching. To put it boldly, the anger bears a potential to help students acquire Social Science knowledge. But the finding that it is not the topic per se but relational aspects that hinder the expression of conflictual perspectives means that the challenge for the teacher lies in framing emotions and symbolic boundary work as part of the subject Social Science. In so doing, the teacher can increase the possibility of using emotions in the teaching. The teacher is in a special position, in some ways cut off from the relational threat that the students perceive. In that position, the teacher might actually be enabled to do something about the emotional community of Social Science teaching that affects the opportunities to use emotions in the educational setting.

This chapter shows that the withholding of emotional expression is a complex problem in the Social Science teaching. For the reader, this finding might evoke a longing for emotions and opinions to be expressed in the classroom. The next chapter takes a closer look at such situations, where tensions are voiced and palpable and where both students and teachers notice them. What happens in Social Science teaching following expressed emotional intensity? Do the situations analysed in the next chapter provide solutions to the problems posed in this chapter? How do the students and teachers react and thereby draw the boundaries of the emotional community of Social Science teaching?
This chapter centres on two specific situations where an intensity can be traced in the Social Science teaching, almost like a thickness in the air. In contrast to the previous chapter, these are situations where feelings and attitudes are not withheld but where intense, emotional reactions are expressed verbally in the classroom. The verbal character of the situations leads to action from teachers and students. Such situations presumably provide a good opportunity to use subject-didactical strategies in relation to the emotions circulating in the situations because the emotive tension is expressed and therefore palpable. However, in both situations a learning seems to be lost, for what stays with the students does not concern the specific Social Science content. Such is the case, possibly, because in both situations, albeit in different ways, the teacher does not go into or capture the feelings and boundary work in the teaching. The small scale boundary work in the classroom could be connected to a large scale boundary work that is at the core of the content dealt with in the teaching, namely international relations and terrorism. As in Chapter 8, students’ emotions are placed centre stage, which is a shift in focus away from teachers’ emotions as analysed in Chapter 7. However, both students and teachers are agents performing boundary work. The teachers are thus markedly present in the chapter.

The two situations I have chosen to focus on in this chapter stand apart because they contain intervention as well as emotionality (intensity). There is a tension in relation to some content and this tension is voiced, which leads to a reaction from the teacher and other students. In one of the cases students step in as gatekeepers of the Social Science teaching, while in the other the teacher steps in.

The chapter thus serves several purposes in relation to the overarching aim of the study: it shows the relation between the political, emotions and boundary work. It also shows how the specific knowledge content of Social Science gives rise to emotion and an opportunity to subject didactically use it. Importantly, it also shows what emotions can do to the subject teaching.
The chapter first looks at student interventions in the material at large, in order to be able to relate the specific situations to the bigger picture and motivate the choice of the two situations. The chapter then examines the two situations separately. The chapter ends with a discussion of what the situations tell us in relation to the overarching aim of the study.

Voiced tensions and interventions

In my classroom observations at the four schools, I noted that student interventions are exceptions to the rule. Despite my focus on interventions, I have only noted 20 situations where the students intervened in the teaching by challenging it, that is, they did not just answer the teacher’s questions and did not talk about what they ‘are supposed to’ talk about. It is clear that timing of the lesson coinciding with burning topics in the media and public discourse, the teacher, the composition of students and the subject area all impact the frequency of interventions.

The student interventions can be categorized into different kinds. The most frequent kind is that of positioning or opinions in relation to the teaching content. This is especially so at Lindskolan, where students sometimes even question the facts the teacher brings up, but it also appears at Björkskolan during a lecture about the UN where a group of students questioned the justness of present or absent UN interventions.

It is of no surprise that the in depth situations were observed at Björkskolan and Lindskolan because interruptions from students at those schools are more frequent than at Ekskolan and Granskolan. It is striking that teaching style, as well as the degree of authority, impact the frequency of student interventions. On one end of the authority continuum is Granskolan, where the students ‘follow’ the teacher Camilla, who is seen as knowing her stuff. As discussed in Chapter 6, students believe that what other students bring up during class is irrelevant to the teaching and learning. At Lindskolan, on the other end of the continuum, students intervene the most in the teaching, sometimes even correcting the teacher. At this school, the teacher Martin listens carefully and comes back to what the students say later during the lesson, which is seen as an invitation by the interviewed students.

---

32 The expression ‘follow’ stems from Bo Hejlskov Elvén’s assertion that you are not a leader unless someone follows you (Hejlskov Elvén, 2014).
A problematic variety of this type of intervention is found in two cases of conspiracy theory voiced at Lindskolan: one regarding 9/11 and one regarding the ‘Jewish conspiracy’. These conspiracy theories are not treated as such in the teaching. Remarkably, there is no perceived emotional intensity in the situations where they are brought up. It is unclear whether they are discharged or seen as obvious.

Some of the interventions are initiatives to bring up topics of immediate interest, such as current, often dramatic, news, like a terrorist attack or a submarine hunt. Other are associations evoked by the teaching: Karim’s contribution about the government in Lebanon during a lesson about the Swedish constitution in Chapter 6 is an example of that kind of association, as is another student’s association to the movie *The Purge* during the same lesson.

Yet another type of intervention are attempted disturbances, which I only noted at Granskolan. Considering the authority of the teacher Camilla, it is of no surprise that these small attempts at anonymous resistance can be found there – as the saying goes, ‘where there is power there is also resistance’. Twice, students in Camilla’s class played a distorted computer voice that uttered the teacher’s name or ‘Somali pirates’. In both cases, Camilla acted as if it did not happen.

A totally different kind of ‘breaking into’ the teaching is the situation at Ekskolan discussed in Chapter 6. In this emotional situation, when it became known in class that one of the students had been informed that she and her family would be deported, some students asked the teacher if they could do something to try to stop the deportation. In response, the teacher digressed from her teaching plan for several months. In this case, the acute personal situation of a student broke into the teaching to the extent that some of the participants experienced the teaching as turned upside down in relation to the syllabus.

In relation to the situations discussed above, the two situations chosen for in depth analysis in this chapter stand out because they address several of the points of interest in this study: they are clearly related to a specific Social Science content, they are emotive, they are collective and they involve boundary work. What is more, they tell us something about the aftermath of the situations, suggesting that a different didactical approach or handling of the situations would be of benefit to Social Science learning.

The material used in the following sections differs in character. At Lindskolan, the situation has been video recorded and shown to the eight students and the teacher in their respective interviews. There is a rigour of sorts that stems from the fact that the participants have just watched the recorded situation when they talk about it. In the case of the discussion about the terrorist attack at Björkskolan, there is no more or less to gather round than the memory of what happened. However,
that situation is important because it stands out. It remained with the students two months after it occurred and was still perceived as urgent. They brought it up despite the fact that the main focus of the interviews was the lessons I had observed and recorded. The teacher saw it as a rare occasion when feelings were running high in the group. I experienced intensity in the interviews when the discussion about the Paris attacks came up, an intensity that stands apart from the other material. The memory is vivid in the minds of the students and the teacher who talk about the situation in the interviews. Perhaps because of that vividness, the situation appears clearer to me than the more confused situation revolving around international relations.

International relations

On a gloomy Friday, on 20 November in 2015, Martin was lecturing about international relations to the student group at Lindskolan. He was using a PowerPoint and had turned the lights off in the room. It was the first lesson about international relations and the PowerPoint went through different actors on the international arena: states, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, multinational corporations, media, ethnic groups and terrorist organizations. The lesson lasted for two hours on a Friday afternoon and Martin told me earlier that he was concerned that the students were running out of steam on the last (long) lesson of the week. I noted that everyone, Martin included, gave the impression of being tired, a state perhaps compounded by the darkness in the room. Even I suppressed yawns, despite the fact that I found the teaching interesting.

The PowerPoint was structured according to the spaced learning method, something Martin had learned at a lecture at the university. Following this method, he went over the PowerPoint twice. The first time, important terms were marked red, while the second time the red words were left out and the students were supposed to raise their hands to fill them in. Between the two presentations the class played hangman for ten minutes to make the students focus on something other than the content of the teaching. There was a time limit – Martin took 20 minutes to go through the PowerPoint each time. He had set an alarm that sounded when the time was up. He had trouble keeping the time because he entered into dialogues with the students, answering and asking questions. Later he told me that he does not believe in strict methods. He believes that they need to be broken up to work with and fit the demands of the situation.
A couple of times during the lesson I noted intensity in the room, a change in atmosphere. The peak of intensity, perceived almost as a thickness in the air, occurred when Martin was lecturing about ethnic groups.

Martin: An ethnic group is a group that shares religion, language, culture and history, to put it simply. In most states there are several different ethnic groups. In a nation state there is one big nation, one ethnic group that builds .... [Martin pauses to look hard at a student who is talking] that builds the nation. But in most countries there are several ethnic groups. This is a map of the different ethnic groups in China. I think there are 21 different officially recognized groups in China, but many consider that there are more. Their power lies primarily in the struggle for an internationally recognized state. We have for example; can you suggest some large groups that do not have their own state today?

Student: The Kurds.

Martin: The Kurds.

Several students scattered around the room: öhōhōhōh/wooooh/laughter.

Martin: Schhh.

Student: Palestine.

Student: Palestinians.

Martin: Palestinians. Those are the two most well known. But there are many other groups.

Student: Gypsies.

Martin: We have Uighurs, I think they are called Uighurs, in China, they are the big Muslim minority, and we have the Chechens in Russia and so on. There are more ethnic groups than there are states in the world. They can become important actors in the system.

The moment the Kurds were mentioned, there was a quick reaction from several students. It sounded like laughter, chuckle, scorn and cheer. The sound was spread out in the room, surrounding me, and it was hard to tell who was making the noise. It was a quick and intense moment that was cut off by Martin’s equally quick, sharp hush. As another student uttered ‘Palestine’, without any similar reaction occurring (just another student correcting Palestine to Palestinians), the intensity was broken and Martin continued his lecture, but there was still the sound of whispers and some students continued to talk quietly among themselves.
A different soundscape was formed after the Kurds were mentioned. Several students were talking to each other despite the fact that Martin had continued the lecture. The atmosphere was fuzzy. But as we will see, which emotions were at work here is not entirely certain, even after interviewing eight of the students about the situation. To me, the reaction at first meant Schadenfreude – the narrative that is built around the Kurds has a tone of ‘Haha you have no country’, while the one built around the Palestinians has a tone of seriousness. It is clear that the situation did not just move me as a researcher, it also moved the classroom. But I cannot use my own feelings here to say something about how other people feel. As discussed in Chapter 4, shared feelings are not about feeling the same way. Even the same feeling would be different because of a different history of contact with that emotion. However, it is clear that the situation was emotively intense.

Analysing the eight interviewed students’ reactions and explanations after viewing this sequence of events, it is clear that they have diverging views on what happened and why. A dividing issue is whether it is a positive or negative reaction and also whether Kurds or other students in the classroom are making the noise. The two students who understand the reaction as positive are Beata and Anton:

Beata: Maybe it is because there are many Kurds in this student group. They laugh. I think it was them. /…/ They feel like it’s me! It is about me!

Anton: They are Kurds, I don’t know. They scream. Maybe they suddenly feel that they are important. But I have no idea; I haven’t spoken to them at all.

Ali gives the most elaborated view of the situation:

Ali: They said Kurds, and then everyone laughed, /…/ because it is known to us Arabs, especially to us Arabs, that Kurdistan is not a state. And it is always this question where do you come from: if the answer is Kurdistan you usually laugh and ask for example where is Kurdistan? You can’t point it out you know. It is not a geographically bounded area. /…/ It is a negative reaction. /…/ The Kurds get a bit upset actually. But most of them don’t take it seriously or personally.

Ali also explains why he thinks that there is no similar reaction when the Palestinians are mentioned in class:

Ali: I think it is because Palestine was once a state. Everyone knows who the Palestinians are, and you know it is holy ground among Muslims. If you are an Arab, no matter which country you are from, the moment you hear
Palestine it is something big, because it is holy ground to us all, not just to the Palestinians. That’s why they get more respect. Than Kurds, you know.

Fabian, a student sitting on the right side of the classroom, speculates about a possible connection to countries with a Kurdish minority:

Fabian: I don’t know if it has got something to do with the fact that Kurds live in Turkey and Syria and places like that and maybe there is someone with Turkish or Syrian background reacting because ‘Well we oppress them in our homeland’, something like that. Not that I believe they mean to oppress, but maybe it brings back memories, maybe they have talked about it a lot at home or granddad spoke a lot about it.

Two of the students have a less dramatic view of the situation, connecting it to friendly joking. Mona says ‘our friend is a Kurd; we always mess with her’. Bahar studies at the Natural Sciences programme and attends only the Social Science lessons in this group. She observes what is happening from the outside:

Bahar: I think many of the students here are Kurds. Some students natter and say jokingly that Kurds have no country and stuff like that. /…/ That group; they’re in the same class and they mess with each other all the time, about religion and everything. They have joked about something earlier and when it, when he said it, it struck them and they laughed.

According to Bahar, the teaching might touch upon something that has been funny outside of the classroom, something that throws the students back in time to that funny moment. They re-connect with that situation through a word or topic in the teaching, hence the laughter.

The student group seems to be torn in different directions. Some of them give the impression of being very sure about the situation but several students express uncertainty, as Johan for example:

Johan: I have no idea why. I have no idea if they are Kurds or not.

Katarina: But has the reaction got to do with the fact that there are Kurds in the group?

Johan: Probably, maybe or I don’t know. Because I have heard people say that they have got a state. But then again, they haven’t, and then there is just some very strange tension.
From this analysis of the material, it is impossible to see a pattern in who represents which opinion. What remains clear is that several students have no idea what happened or why.

**Movement**

The reaction in the classroom appears not to be directed towards the teacher but rather towards one or more students in the room. The mentioning of the Kurds triggers a movement. The students making noise attach themselves to each other, but it is unclear to me as an observer if the movement is away from or towards the targeted students, i.e. how the place is shaped in the process of movement (Nilsson Folke, 2017, p. 45). Although felt, the direction of the movement is not visible to the observer and can accordingly be interpreted in different ways. As we will see later in this chapter, the students do indeed interpret the direction differently.

Another thing that is unclear is whether Martin, by sharply hushing the students, is halting the movement in the classroom or not. His reaction clearly stops the loud sounds, but a quieter, fuzzier sound insists on lingering in the classroom. Most probably, the movement thus continues or freezes at the point where it is at when Martin hushed. From the interview material it is clear that by hushing the students, Martin positions himself as the teacher, and thereby moves away from the students. The students appreciate this position. They seem to want a distinct teacher.

**Attachment**

Emotions shape boundaries in the room when attachment is built. In this case the situation can be used in several different ways to draw boundaries. It could be to reject one or several students with a Kurdish background. It could also be the case that boundaries are being drawn between those ‘on the inside’ who understand what is happening and what the situation is about on the one hand, and on the other, those ‘on the outside’ who do not understand it, or see it as just a disturbance in the classroom. Maybe there is pride in the reaction because it strengthens the attachment of those who are ‘in the know’. In that kind of boundary work, to keep the attachment to your ‘own’ group, to defend the boundary, it is important to keep the ‘others’ from understanding the situation. If that is what is happening in this situation, the teacher could do something to (move) the boundaries and attachments by openly investigating what happened and why.
I chose to show the recording of this situation to the participants in the interviews because, in my view, it contains the most intense, heated seconds of the fieldwork in that student group. Martin and the eight individual students watched the short sequence in their respective interviews and then answered the question: what happens here? Anton, the student who raises his hand and says ‘The Kurds’ in the sequence, comments the situation in a clearly polarized way:

Katarina: What do you say, what happens here?

Anton: Well, it’s like this: These are my lads (points at the computer screen), and we sit quietly and listen and when he asks a question one of us answers. In this case it was I. /…/ But they, when I say something, they just yell and she (points at the computer screen), Mona, starts to scream in an awkward way. /…/

Anton: They are misbehaving during the lesson, I can’t respect them; they are just irritating all the time.

Katarina: Okay, so you don’t want to talk to them because of things that happen during the lesson?

Anton: What would I get out of talking to them? Eh? Plus, I am not interested in sitting there with my mobile phone up and gossip and shit like that. These are my lads (points at the computer screen).

Anton is clearly pointing out symbolic boundaries in the room. Through his comments and where he points at the computer screen, he identifies the visual division of the room between the right side, where he is sitting, and the left, (‘immigrant’) side. He places disturbance, misbehaviour and nonsense on the left side and order as well as Social Science knowledge on the right. In his account the misbehaviour on the left side strengthens the attachments on the right side. That symbolic boundary is then attributed to the background of the students:

Anton: Well, the ones with immigrant background they are thick every one of them.

Katarina: What do you mean by that?

Anton: Well, it’s Mona and the whole gang, they just sit with their mobiles, they are not really taking part in the lesson at all, so I don’t know why they would suddenly say something clever.

Katarina: They could though, couldn’t they? Aren’t some of the students in your group of immigrant background?
Anton: Ok, (points at the screen and defines his friends’ different national backgrounds).

Katarina: But do you count them to the stupid ones?

Anton: No, because they are in my gang.

Katarina: Exactly, I think you were generalizing a bit.

Anton: No, its personal.

Katarina: Because they are close to you or what?

Anton: Ok, I will correct myself. /…/ The ones in the class who have immigrant background from outside of Europe are thick. And I am not saying that generalizingly about all immigrants. I am just saying that those in this class who have [immigrant background from outside of Europe] are stupid. It is personal.

Katarina: And by thick you mean that they show no interest in the teaching?

Anton: Well, they are not the smartest, you noticed it when they just stood there and started screaming in class and stuff like that. And they just sit with their mobiles all the time. They are not really participating in the lesson.

Later in the interview, what is insinuated here becomes clear: Anton does not understand why there is a reaction when the Kurds are mentioned in the teaching. He fits it into his narrative about unruliness and disturbance on the other side of the classroom. Maybe the strong boundary he draws between ‘his lads’ and the left side of the classroom would change character if the teaching scrutinized the tension in relation to international relations.

Contact

What remains clear in this situation is that the word ‘Kurds’ is charged with emotion, charged to the extent that something happens by the mere mention of the word in the Social Science teaching. The object ‘Kurds’ has probably been circulating among students (and elsewhere) in a way that shows the relevance of Ahmed’s thoughts on the affective economy. According to her, and as related in Chapter 3, the more objects circulate the more they accumulate affective value (Ahmed, 2010, p. 38). Ahmed argues that the sociality of emotion does not mean that we share the same emotion. We do not feel the same way, but we share feelings towards an object. Ahmed’s affective communities do not necessarily feel the same way, but they
share feelings towards an object. As this or that object circulates it is increasingly charged with emotion.

The figure of the Kurd apparently has circulated a lot in the perception and speech of some of the students in the group and has thus been charged with emotion. In that group, the reaction is seen as either a joke or an insult. As we have seen in this chapter, Bahar says that the mere mentioning of the Kurds in the teaching brings back memories of something that has been funny outside of the classroom. The reaction comes from a content that reminds them of jokes they have made or heard.

But there is another group of students in the room that is confused by the reaction or maybe interpret it as pride. The Social Science teaching could make a difference through dealing not just with the situation of the Kurds but also what ‘sticks’ to the object Kurds and how those attachments are used to draw boundaries between groups. The history of contact with the ‘Kurdish Question’ affects the way the verbal reaction is interpreted by the students, which is clear in the interviews.

Turning attention to the teacher, in the first interview with Martin, before the teaching on international relations began, I asked him about possible emotive and controversial topics or situations related to international relations. First he mentioned teaching about terrorist groups, where he fears that students will connect terror solely to Islamism and make remarks that spark conflict in the classroom. He then adds that the risk of snide remarks is also great in relation to the topic of ethnic groups:

Martin: It can also happen when you talk about ethnic groups. We have talked about making snide remarks a lot in this group. They belong to different ethnic groups and some ethnic groups are, how shall I put it, acknowledged as suppressed in the Swedish view, so you have to be attentive that there are no discussions or snide remarks. You also have to be very clear: What is ethnicity, what is nationality, what is a nation state, what is a state.

Katarina: Is it facetious?

Martin: Yes it is facetious, but if you don’t bring it up and discuss it, it can slip and degenerate from starting as a joke, then someone takes offence and then it continues. We encounter that a lot now, you have to keep your ears open to listen to what they say to each other. It is rather common now to use ethnic groups as an insult; it has become more common the last years. One can trace a clear polarization and tension among the students.

Martin thereby predicts the reaction in the classroom when the Kurds are mentioned. He knows that the naming of ethnic groups could trigger snide remarks.
Martin: They make jokes about it all the time. They have asked a lot of questions; how can it be that you have not got a state, what is a state, who decides and so on. I think it is internal [internt]that they make jokes about it, but I don’t think they feel how emotional it can get.

Martin comes into contact with the students knowing that there might be snide remarks about ethnic groups. That might explain his quick silencing reaction when it actually happens. He puts a lid on the reaction. He does not let snide remarks enter the teaching. In that moment he is drawing a boundary around the subject teaching.

The hush of the professional teacher

The students comment on Martin’s reaction after viewing the video. Of the eight students, two say that he hushes to keep the order in the classroom, one says that he hushes to keep the main thread in the lecture, one says that he hushes to stop the students from insulting each other and two do not comment on it.

Two students, Ali and Anton, connect Martin’s action to the role of the teacher:

Ali: He hushed us. Because he has to.
Katarina: Why does he have to do that?
Ali: He has to react as a teacher. /…/ The laughter shows a depreciation of the Kurds, and it is… I think it is racist, is it racist? /…/ if he just continues then the other students can understand it as ‘it is okay’. But if he says something or hushes or whatever he does, if he just opposes it, it shows that he cares.

According to Ali, it does not matter that much what Martin does in the situation, as long as he does something, and that he does it as a teacher. Anton is lyrical about the reaction:

Anton: He reacted immediately, shhhh, it was no bullshit. /…/ That is how you want a real teacher to be, a just teacher. This is Martin at his finest, as it should always be; he spoke loud and clear, everyone could follow him, he asked a good question and when someone started screaming, he told that person to be quiet.

The students are positively disposed towards what Martin does in the classroom. They seem to believe that no more is needed than a hush. If the hush is seen as
boundary work, then the gatekeeping of the Social Science teaching is accepted, and two of the students see a distinct teacher in the gatekeeping, which is something that they appreciate.

In the situation, Martin reacts quickly and sharply in hushing the students. Then he continues lecturing. After watching the sequence, he says that he had not prepared how to handle the situation, despite the fact that he predicted that it would happen.

Martin: I am probably focusing on getting this [the content of the lecture] through and making everyone focus on where we are and not on the reactions /…/ I do not actively prepare how to handle the situation. I know they will chat but that is probably just what makes me try to break off the reaction.

In the interview Martin relates what he thinks could have been done differently in the situation.

Martin: You should really have an assignment there (in between) and sit down and think about this. One should have a bit more focus on each international actor and reflect on their strengths and weaknesses, what role they have, and then have more of this discussing, /…/ I think what would be dangerous here is if you should approach a student, like why are you laughing? I do that sometimes and I have noticed that it is seldom a good thing because then the focus is on that student and you expose that student to the group: What were you thinking? /…/ I think it is better to break it off, focus on what we are doing and then return to the situation and deal with it later. But I didn’t do that. (laughs).

What does the boundary work performed by the teacher do to the subject teaching? In putting a lid on the reaction in the classroom and not returning to it, Martin leaves students uncertain about what happened. What would careful investigation into the particularities of the ‘who’ (Skeie, 2015) and the boundary work going on in the classroom allow the group to do in this situation?
A discussion about a terrorist attack

The situation involving Mahmood takes place in the emotionally charged discussion on the terrorist attack on the satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo and a kosher shop in Paris in January 2015. This event was also at the centre of the tension connected to Shirin’s restraint in Chapter 8. During the discussion, Mahmood said that ‘you have to expect a negative response if you provoke someone’. In response, he was met with a strong reaction from a group of students in the teaching group, defending freedom of speech. Two months later, in an interview, the response he received from a group of students was still vivid in his mind, and there is a sudden intensity that emerges in his narrative:

Mahmood: Everyone was like, no, you can’t think that way, it is not Sweden. I was like, yes I can think that way, because it is the way I think. If you’re going to do something in the first place, then you have to expect something back, so you get some shit back. You won’t get flowers back.

The teacher describes the reaction in a similar generalizing way as the whole teaching group turning against Mahmood, like a mob, defending freedom of speech. Later in the interview, Mahmood nuances what happened by saying that some of the other students in class were ‘on his side’. They just did not let it show in class:

Mahmood: So I was the only one that like, okay, I didn’t think it was okay that they were murdered, but I thought they [the editors of Charlie Hebdo] were wrong. There were others who agreed with me there and then, they said it in Arabic, but they never let it show.

In this situation the students reacting against Mahmood are performing boundary work. They are showing that his utterance is not accepted in the Social Science teaching in this group. The powerful concept of freedom of speech is at the centre of their reaction. At the same time, they are drawing a symbolic boundary around themselves as a group and situate Mahmood on the outside of that boundary. It is not entirely clear whether the attachment in the group or the gatekeeping of the subject teaching has the highest priority for them. A possibility is that they are

---

33 I have previously analysed this situation in a paper in *Journal of Social Science Education* (Blennow, 2018).
34 I will hereafter refer to this group as ‘the good mob’.
making a topic in the Social Science teaching emotive in order to do something to the relations in the group, a possibility further examined later in this chapter.

In the heated situation in the classroom, the teacher Rickard paid attention to what Mahmood said and the overt reaction he experienced from other students. He then started talking about different perspectives on the attacks and expectations on Muslims to apologize for what happened. Rickard’s main focus was to nuance the view on Islam and violence: ‘a religion cannot be made responsible for the deeds of three individuals’.

Rickard: I have my own opinion but I turn to the views the school has on these things. You have to respect that there can be anger because you feel insulted, but there is nothing that justifies violence. You can think that the people at Charlie Hebdo are complete idiots, I think we spoke about that, but there is nothing that justifies that they should die because of their opinions. But the focus in the teaching was more on the importance of not seeing this as an act of the religion Islam.

According to Mahmood, Rickard tried to calm down the situation:

Mahmood: He tried to explain what I meant, so that they would not get it wrong. /…/ He is on no one’s side, he just tried to fix the situation, and he did not want the class to be a mess. Because that is his job. /…/ He does not want to be on someone’s side, he does not want to show.

Katarina: Why not, do you think?

Mahmood: Well because if he was, it would be an insult of the other side. Because he is a teacher. He is not supposed to be on someone’s side, he should explain. He should explain why they are wrong, not just say that he is on this or the other side. He is trying his best.

Mahmood is referring to the role of the teacher in his comments on what Rickard did in the situation. As a teacher, he should get the class to calm down.

In the heated situation, the teacher uses an analytical Social Science approach. In the interviews conducted six weeks later, Mahmood and his fellow student Shirin remember that the teacher did try to widen the perspectives in the teaching group, but they do not remember the content of what he said. What remains with the two students is what other students said in class and their emotional reaction. The teacher did not break through to the students with the disciplinary analysis he conducted. The motion through emotion in the classroom was not affected by the teacher. So, the emotion here aligns some students to others; expels Mahmood (and other students who remain silent) from that community despite the fact that
Mahmood is needed as a trigger for the movement; and renders traditional Social Science analysis effete.

Mobilization of unity: movement and attachment

A number of feelings could be at work in this situation: disgust, fear, pride and love. Disgust involves moving away from an object, a movement of repulsion. As we have seen, according to Ahmed (2014, p. 195) emotions align some bodies with others, and they attach different figures together by the way they move people. Analysed from this theoretical angle, Mahmood’s utterance in the classroom threatens the community of disgust over the terrorist attacks. By a reaction of disgust against Mahmood, other students re-attach disgust to the terrorist attacks and thereby entrench the symbolic boundaries both around the Social Science teaching, ‘closing’ it, and between different groups in the class.

Ahmed interprets responses to terrorism as emphasizing a need for showing community, a need to ‘stick together’. She describes an idea of good citizenship in the aftermath of terrorist attacks that involves being alert, being vigilant, reacting against suspicious ‘others’, as well as defending the values of a ‘global community of free nations’ (Ahmed, 2014, p. 78). According to Ahmed, this defensive reaction is driven by fear for the future and aims at survival. It is directed towards imagined others who can appear anywhere, anyhow and maybe (the horror of horrors) pass by unnoticed.

The defensive reaction from a large group of students in this case can be seen as an instance of such ‘good citizenship’: the students stick together, defending freedom of speech, reacting quickly and therefore unable to take in what Mahmood is actually saying. While Ahmed sees fear and anxiety as driving forces in such defensive reactions, there is also the possibility of a feeling of pride or even love in showing unity against ‘the other’, the intruder. In the classroom, could the ‘good mob’ be seen as driven by love of itself and/or of a love of the ‘global community of free nations’?

In relation to the above, it is clear that Mahmood is needed as a trigger for the mobilization of unity. By moving away from him, the ‘good mob’ strengthen their

---

35 By traditional Social Science analysis is meant the rationalistic, structural and organizational models that have dominated academic political analysis during the latter part of the twentieth century (Goodwin, Jasper & Polletta, 2001, p. 1; see also Besand, 2014 on the relation between rationalism and emotionalism in German Politische Bildung).
position as representatives of the ‘good citizen’ and thereby take the lead in the gatekeeping of Social Science teaching.

Another example of movement is performed by the teacher Rickard. At a point in the interview, he tries to approach Mahmood (or the attackers?) through a reflection about his own feelings as a football fan.

Rickard: You will thread on somebody’s toes if you think that your task as a teacher is to widen the perspectives and not take sides, at the same time as you have to follow the democratic mission. Because I respect […] I would also be pissed off. I am interested in football; if some sports writer would write something bad about my football team or write in a way I don’t agree with, then I would almost feel insulted and get cross and want to send some angry remark. So I can really understand it.

Katarina: In the situation with the football team one can imagine that you wouldn’t have cared much if a teacher was standing beside you explaining the bigger perspectives.

Rickard: No, you wouldn’t because you are emotionally engaged; it is not analysis you are after, not then. Still, analysis is a principal part of the subject and it is required for the higher grades that you are able to reason; on the one hand, on the other hand.

Through his love of football Rickard is trying to approach Mahmood, not in the actual teaching situation but in his interview with me. What would have happened if he made that connection in the Social Science teaching? Would the students remember his choice of perspective? Or would they see it as an irrelevant reference? Rickard’s attempt to approach Mahmood and ‘translate’ emotions relating to religion into emotions relating to sport may very well move him away from the students he is attempting to approach by, in their view, missing the point or banalizing it. This is all speculative because he never tried it in the teaching.

What Rickard suggests by toying with the idea of bringing up his love of football is the possibility to use his own private experiences and feelings to somehow bridge a gap between students’ understandings of the reactions in the teaching. Later in the interview, Rickard considers the possibility of using emotions didactically to nuance the discussion about the attack.

Rickard: You could have discussed that everyone has something that is holy to them, an artist you like or something, where it is hard to be put in question for what you like, it can almost be on a par with religion. It is a thin line between being angry and to really hate someone and do something bad, but
it is still not right to do it. You could have discussed it so that more people could have acquainted themselves with Mahmood’s situation.

Rickard focuses on Mahmood in this situation, maybe because of the strong othering of Mahmood performed by ‘the good mob’. Rickard’s focus is on the outsider rather than on the reaction that makes him an outsider. Interestingly, Rickard, just like the students, seems to interpret Mahmood through a narrative that connects Mahmood to the attackers. When he talks about the situation, Rickard slips from Mahmood to the attackers and then slips back again. In talking about using his love of football as a way of understanding insult for example, it is not clear if it is a feeling of insult in Mahmood or the attackers he is referring to. This probably leads to Rickard’s conclusion that what he could do with emotions in the situation is to attach himself emotionally to Mahmood/the attackers and in doing so contribute to a greater understanding of their perspectives. He does not contemplate getting into the feelings of the students reacting against Mahmood in the classroom in his teaching, even though he in another part of the interview reflects on their attitudes. Through his hypothetical didactic strategy, Rickard would perform boundary work by emotionally attaching himself to the other side of the boundary drawn by the ‘good mob’. As a representative of the subject Social Science, this would probably affect the borders of the subject and the related conception of ‘good citizenship’ related to those borders. Another way of putting this is that he would change the emotional community of Social Science by changing some feelings from deplored to tolerated and thus also changing what emotional expressions are expected in the teaching. He would additionally introduce a novel actor who is allowed to express emotions in the teaching: the teacher.

It seems as if Rickard’s closest reference to religious identity is his interest in football. By bringing up his own strong feelings regarding football, he would make himself vulnerable, not only through being personal but also through making a comparison that could possibly upset some of the students. Can Rickard as teacher put himself in a situation where he risks being met by the same objections from students in the class as Mahmood was? Is Rickard somehow separate from what is going on in the group or can he be at risk himself? How strong is his position as a gatekeeper of the subject teaching?
Contact

Analysing what Mahmood said in the classroom (which could be summarized as: the editors at Charlie Hebdo are wrong and it is not surprising that they were attacked), it is striking to discover that his utterances are not extreme. He is, as he puts it in the interview, not saying that attacking the magazine’s office was right. He nonetheless receives a strong emotional reaction from a large group of students, expressing a massive unity. Seen from the outside, there is a gap between Mahmood’s statement and the group’s reaction. What makes the gap possible in the moment could be something that lies outside of the moment – namely, the history of contact which shapes the students’ perception of the moment, as discussed by Ahmed (2014, p. 194) and in Chapter 3.

The quick mobilization of unity, making Mahmood’s utterance seem more extreme than it is, could be shaped by past histories of contact, or rather an established narrative about the other. He is heard through that narrative, either by some ‘sticky’ word or phrase that he actually says, setting off a chain of associations; or just by saying something in a ‘brutal’ way (as the teacher Rickard puts it), that is, coming in contact with the other students in a way that triggers them. The students reacting against Mahmood may well be hearing more in his statement than was uttered due to the narrative through which they interpret him. Another possibility is that the ‘good mob’ makes the topic emotive in order to draw symbolic boundaries in class. Through the emotive reaction, the group of students strengthen their attachments and claim influence on the emotional community of Social Science teaching. To do so they need a contrast, something to define themselves against. Mahmood is that contrast.

Conclusion

The analysis of voiced tensions in this chapter reveals that tensions can provide opportunities to use emotions in pluralist Social Science teaching and learning, exactly because they are voiced and therefore palpable. Tension here means that there is a quick, voiced reaction that the teacher has to respond to in a concerted manner. There are also clear indications that the knowledge content of the Social Science teaching interplays with collective dimensions of emotions. There are emotional movements and attachments in relation to a specific topic: in the first case the Kurds as an ethnic group without a nation and in the second one a terrorist attack. The definition and enactment of the ‘good citizen’ underlies the emotional
The mobilization of unity in the situation at Björkskolan. The ‘good citizen’ is supposed to feel in a certain way about specific topics in the teaching.

The two situations analysed in this chapter are in some ways similar. The content of the subject Social Science gives rise to emotions and boundary work. Thus, social attachments are created or consolidated in and by Social Science teaching. In other words, emotions, expressions of the political and boundary work are all in interplay. The boundaries drawn are meaningful and powerful because they are laden with emotions. Emotions, in turn, can be seen as dispositions to act (e.g. draw boundaries) in a certain way, as we have seen at Björkskolan, where Mahmood’s statement is used to strengthen the attachments of the ‘good mob’. The political, the inherent antagonism of social life, may not always be based on opinions and reasoning. People might as well join a side of the argument because they feel affection towards that group, as in the situation at Lindskolan, where the snide remarks against the Kurds could be strengthening the attachments between Kurds in the class and their friends.

Importantly, Social Science education loses opportunities for learning in both situations. However, the reason for the lost learning differs. In the situation at Lindskolan learning is lost because the teacher does not pause or halt in the situation. The reaction is effectively silenced and the teaching goes on as if it has not happened. That might be beneficial from a moral perspective, but afterwards the students are confused about what the reaction was about. In the situation at Björkskolan the teacher attends to the voiced tension in the classroom. Despite doing that, the students talking about the situation in the interviews do not remember the content of what the teacher said, while the emotive reaction from students has stayed with them.

The argument that heated emotions are obstructive to learning, supposedly because they draw attention away from what the teacher says, is contradicted by the material. In the case of Lindskolan, we find that Social Science knowledge is also lost through just putting a lid on an emotional reaction, leaving students confused and prone to draw diverging conclusions about what actually happened and why.

A question that arises given the results of this chapter is: can teachers affect the emotional geography of the classroom? If so, would it be a good thing? To discuss this question, I will turn to Cicero’s conceptualization of movere, one of the three duties of the orator (docere, movere, delectare: to teach, move and delight) (Hellspong, 2011).

If Rickard would have expressed his love and anger related to football he would turning to the vocabulary of rhetoric, have made a contribution of authenticity: he
would have tried to move the students through his genuine emotions. Would that have enabled him to intervene in the emotional geography of the student group?

In relation to Ahmed’s theorizing of emotions as relational (moving bodies and objects away or towards each other, shaping a place (Nilsson Folke, 2017, p. 45), and thereby creating emotional geographies that legitimize certain practices of inclusion and exclusion), rhetoric’s movere appears as something imminently dangerous, far from playing a bit on the listeners’ feelings. In fact, turning to Cicero, the concept of movere appears rather violent, semantically connected to siege, persuasion and power. In Cicero Orator 69, movere finds itself in company with violent connotations: to move someone belongs to the category of victory because it is the only concept (of the three) that is capable of attaining the most when it comes to winning an argument (Cic. Orat. 69). This is also the case in Cicero Brutus 185 where movere appears as moveatur vehementius, to be moved forcefully or violently (Cic. Brut. 185).

Movere in this ancient Roman sense seems close to the concept of emotion management, techniques where emotions are used as a means for fulfilling the aims of policymakers, principals, administrators or teachers (Karlsohn, 2016b, p. 136; See also Illouz, 2007; Oplatka, 2009).

Using emotions in education inevitably balances on the brink of emotion management. There is a rightful fear of teachers having an influence over students by means of emotion management, which is a form of power exertion (many a leader has known how to use emotions to get followers to accept actions they otherwise would not). But having an influence over students is inevitable in education. This influence would not disappear if we were to ban emotionality from teaching. Rhetoric’s movere could, then, be a useful tool in Social Science didactics, if stripped away from its more violent connotations and geared towards encouraging curiosity. Divergent from the kind of violent emotion management mentioned


Ty han ska vara vältalig ... som på Forum och i civilrättsmål skall tala så, att han (be)visar, att han behagar, att han berör. Att bevisa tillhör nödvändigheten, att behaga tillhör älskvärdheten, att beröra tillhör segern - ty det är det enda av alla (de tre) som förmår allra mest för att vinna en argumentation/ett mål. Men lika många sorters plikter som en talare har, lika många är sätten att tala: noggrant vid bevisande, enkelt/måttligt vid behagande, och våldsamt/kraftfullt vid berörande.

(I wish to express my gratitude to Associate Professor Anna Blennow at Gothenburg University for helping me investigate Cicero’s conceptualization of movere by interpreting the primary sources.)
above, Rickard’s boundary work through attaching himself to the students, the topic and emotions in a new way could widen the possibilities and legitimate new perspectives in Social Science teaching. In that way, Rickard would also change the emotional community of Social Science teaching. He would be testing the community through redrawing its boundaries, in this case making the widening of emotional expressions an integral part of the Social Science teaching.

Acknowledging that emotions are not just to be analysed on a micro level, but also in relation to a macro level, opens up for recognition of their importance and use in Social Science teaching. The feelings circulating in the classroom in relation to a topic connect to larger social structures and perspectives, not just by working in line with them, but sometimes by turning them on their head.

This chapter has argued that the explicitly emotional situations, where tensions are voiced, are no less complex than the withdrawn expressions analysed in Chapter 8. The next and final chapter will summarize the results of the study, discuss why they are relevant and which practical implications can be drawn out from them.
In this dissertation project I have studied what emotions do in Social Science teaching and what the subject Social Science does to emotions in four different Swedish classrooms. Both students’ and teachers’ emotions have been in focus, as have the symbolic boundaries they draw and patrol in Social Science teaching. I have chosen to investigate the teaching through the lens of the analytical concept ‘emotional communities’ and deployed the terms movement, attachment and contact to capture the relationality of emotions. The research design has consisted of a combination of observations and video-stimulated interviews.

In this final chapter of the dissertation, I will elaborate on the meaning of the findings. Thereby, I will emphasize the main theoretical and empirical contributions of the study. Finally, I will look ahead and propose some suggestions for future research.

**Emotions and learning**

A major finding in the study is that in emotionally intense situations in the teaching, the teachers’ attempts to broaden perspectives or nuance the discussions do not stay with the students. In the discussion about Charlie Hebdo, the teacher’s analytical broadening of perspectives does not stay with Shirin and Mahmood. The emotionality is what they remember. The same goes for Leyla, who in her anger about the teaching on international law does not catch the teacher’s attempt to nuance the perspective in the teaching. In the emotionally intense situations, the teachers cannot capture the attention of the students with a ‘traditional’ systematic and rationalist Social Science analysis (Besand, 2014).
This finding suggests that it would be a good subject-didactical measure to ban emotions from Social Science teaching, as implied in the use of the concept of emotional intelligence, discussed in Chapter 2. According to this concept, distracting emotions should be suppressed and controlled while emotions effective for teaching/learning or earning money should be invoked. But that would be a hastened conclusion, for the emotions in this study are connected to a specific Social Science learning: conflictual perspectives that relate to both the who and the what in the teaching. A better suggestion in relation to the study’s findings is that a solely rationalistic view on Social Science is a shortcoming.

This leads to the conclusion that something important is missing in the ‘powerful knowledge’ theorized by Young (2013). As discussed in Chapter 2, researchers have tried to frame powerful knowledge as a means for students to think beyond common sense. Powerful knowledge is, then, a tool to generalize from one’s own experience. But in this study the connection between disciplinary knowledge and the experiences of the students did not work. A conclusion from this finding is that such a connection cannot be made without acknowledging and using emotions. The problem, which the teachers in Sandahl’s (2013) study experience; of students’ loss of engagement when they acquire the skills of Social Science analysis, might not be an unbridgeable divide. My results suggest that it is possible to bridge the divide between engagement and disciplinary Social Science analysis by framing and performing disciplinary analysis in a way that embraces emotionality.

Friedrich Heidenreich is on the same trail when he argues that Social Science education needs not only to approach political emotions in the teaching, it also needs to teach about emotional politics (Heidenreich, 2019, p. 28). Dealing with the role of emotion in politics potentially renders emotion as worthy social scientific attention.

Based on the observed loss of learning in the data, one way for Social Science didactics to approach the emotions arisen by the Social Science teaching is to approach them on the terms of the heated situation and not through a ‘traditional’ social scientific analytical strategy. The second order concepts37 of Social Science perspectivity, Social Science analysis and so on (Sandahl, 2014) are alone not sufficient for this purpose.

---

37 As stated in Chapter 1, Sandahl defines second order concepts as: ‘Disciplinary and procedural knowledge on how social scientists generate knowledge and how they organise, analyse and critically review societal issues’ (Sandahl, 2014, p. 22). Second order concepts are contrasted with first order concepts, which constitute the core knowledge content of the subject.
The subject Social Science seems to still suffer from the same divide between emotionalism and rationalism that has characterized academic political analysis during the twentieth century (Besand, 2014; Goodwin et al., 2001). The Social Science analysis performed by the teachers in the study seems to be a form of rationalist analysis which denies the importance of emotions in political reasoning and decision-making, which more recent research tries to shed light upon. If we were to develop that analysis and perspectivity into one that does not separate rationality and emotionality, an important question would arise: would Social Science analysis then catch the attention of the students even in heated situations like the ones discussed in Chapters 8 and 9? Could Social Science analysis be heated? Could Social Science perspectivity be an emotional or even conflictual perspectivity?

A legitimate question is whether it is possible to learn or be taught something when simultaneously having the feeling to be under attack (Grammes, 2019, p. 74). My answer, drawing on the theoretical framework and empirical analysis, is that the risk of feeling under attack exists also in a classroom where emotions are dismissed as irrelevant to the subject. When emotions are withheld, it is very difficult for the teacher and other students to deal with them in a constructive manner. Thus, a conflictual perspectivity and heated Social Science analysis could help destigmatize emotion in Social Science education and recognize emotions as part of Social Science.

A further question is whether the teaching has to connect to the emotional geography and symbolic boundaries of the specific classroom. If it does, there is a balancing act, recognized and feared by Social Science teachers, which is necessary in order not to hurt students by making them simplified representatives of opinions or groups. Geir Skeie has addressed this question in Religious Education and asserts that conflicts over religion in the classroom can be addressed through a careful investigation into the particularity of the ‘who’. Such an investigation includes nuancing what individual students represent when positioning themselves in the classroom interaction. Skeie emphasizes that the teacher should chair and monitor that investigation, which indeed demands courage (Skeie, 2015). That would mean connecting the micro level of the Social Science teaching situation with a societal macro level and thus creating a learning through that connection. As mentioned in relation to ‘powerful knowledge’, making such a connection seems to have to be made through also approaching emotions in the teaching.
Teacher professionalism and ‘student professionalism’

The wish to widen perspectives, which can be found in all the specific situations analysed in this study, is different when it comes to the teachers. They act as representatives of the subject Social Science, as professionals with a clear idea of what they are doing. Somehow, they negotiate their ‘teachership’. This puts them in a rather different situation than the students, whose who (how they appear in the classroom) is often grounded in their experiences rather than a professionalism. This difference gives a possible answer to a question posed in Chapter 9: can the teacher be put at risk in the same way as the students? The teachers’ anchor in professionalism, maybe at its clearest in Anja’s teaching of Economics as discussed in Chapter 7, makes them less vulnerable than the students. The teachers’ grounding in professionalism can thus make them useful catalysts for a possible transformation of the subject. Drawing on Chapter 7 and 8, we can conclude that the teachers seem to have that potential. Whether Rickard’s idea to use his love of football to broaden the tolerance of a certain emotionality in the Social Science teaching would turn out well we can only speculate about. At least it would be an attempt to redraw the boundaries of the emotional community of Social Science teaching, using the special position of the teacher.

But we have also seen that in some cases, the teacher professionalism shuts down emotionality. This is the case with Martin’s ‘objective’ discussion about advantages and disadvantages of idealism and realism, and Rickard’s Social Science perspective-taking in the discussion on the Charlie Hebdo attack.

There are also hints of a ‘student professionalism’ appearing in the data, connected to what it means to be a Social Science student. The perception of student professionalism appeared most clearly in response to questions about speech and silence in the interviews with the students. It is their idea of what is desired and expected in Social Science teaching that constitutes the ‘good Social Science student’, as active, outspoken and opinionated. However, as we saw in Chapter 8, the idea of the ‘good Social Science student’ as outspoken and opinionated does not give a sufficient shelter from harm connected to boundary work within the group of students.

To conclude, the teachers have a specific position in the emotional community of Social Science education through the dimension of teacher professionalism and also because they are not as vulnerable as the students in relation to boundary work in the teaching. That said, all the teachers in this study belong to the majority population. The results might have been different with another composition of
teachers. In any case, the Social Science teachers’ professionalism is not automatically of benefit to the emotional community of Social Science teaching. To be of benefit, and bridge the dissonance between the role emotions are supposed to play in Social Science teaching and the role they do play, it must be a teacher professionalism that introduces, approaches and embraces emotions in Social Science teaching. Drawing on the results of this study, that would be a way for the teachers to use their specific position in the emotional community of Social Science teaching to make a contribution thereto.

Social Science teaching as an emotional community

The analytical concept of emotional communities has been used to investigate what emotions do in Social Science education and what the subject Social Science does to emotion. This concept helped me to discover things that I otherwise would not have been able to see. A comprehensive result of the study, therefore, is that it has been fruitful to deploy this concept in the area of Social Science education, revealing the investigated Social Science teaching as a distinctive emotional community defined in contrast to other communities. In this section I will summarize what I have learnt by using the concept of emotional communities, which can also be read as an attempt to describe the emotional community of Social Science teaching.

Emotional dissonance

A distinct finding in the study is that Social Science teaching is emotional business, to both students and teachers. This is a finding that is in line with previous research investigating emotions in education, clearly demonstrating that education is impregnated with emotion. Therefore, the finding that Social Science teaching is emotional was expected, and so the main aim of the study has not been to prove that emotions exist in Social Science teaching. The main aim has rather been to scrutinize how emotions work in the teaching and what Social Science does to emotions.

38 It would be interesting to investigate the emotional community of Social Science education related to the nation and the ‘good citizen’ in groups where the teacher has an foreign background. Would the boundaries in/around the subject and within the group of participants be drawn differently than in this study?
A characteristic trait of the emotional community of Social Science education studied in this dissertation is that there is a divergence between the role emotions are supposed or expected to play and the role they actually do play. In the dataset of the study, this means that emotional expressions are withheld and the teachers do not approach feelings in their teaching. Both students and teachers give the impression that they are not used to talking about feelings in Social Science teaching (in the interviews, they have to be asked again and again; several students start talking about other school subjects when asked about emotionality). Emotions are not seen as an integral part of the subject. Yet they are there, often evoked by the knowledge content of the subject and they undoubtedly do something to the teaching and learning.

Students and teachers express a conception of the subject that has a bearing on how emotional expressions are valued and dealt with in the teaching. The subject Social Science is conceived of as less emotional than both History and Religious Education. This means that the students and teachers enter the Social Science classroom expecting less emotional expressions than in certain other subjects, and withholding their own reactions and emotional expressions in the Social Science teaching. A result of this study is that the emotional community of Social Science is not perceived as very emotional, i.e. emotions are not expected to be expressed as often in the subject compared to other subjects.

This dovetails the conclusion that several students in this study describe how they express feelings and opinions to friends outside of the classroom after the Social Science lesson. For example, students at Ekskolan tell each other to get a job and earn some money and express anxiety about being able to do that after the lessons on personal finances. To take another example, students expressed their support to Mahmood after the discussion about the attack on Charlie Hebdo in Chapter 9. To take a final example, Shirin’s account that she cannot express her opinions in the teaching provides the intriguing detail that it is not the teacher that is a hindrance, since Shirin tries to express her thoughts and opinions to him after and outside of class. Using William Reddy’s theory, the ‘outside’ of Social Science lesson time or the groups of friends can be seen as a refuges from the emotional regime of the school or the subject teaching. Barbara Rosenwein would see this dynamic as composed of two different emotional communities that the students move in and out of. Some seem to move between these communities effortlessly, while others experience more of a dissonance both inside and between communities. The difference between being inside and outside the classroom is perhaps very different depending on the subject studied and the statements from students that they
express emotions and opinions outside of the Social Science teaching signal a clear boundary between the Social Science teaching and other social spheres.

The reciprocal relationship between emotions and subject, where both impact each other, runs as a theme throughout this study. I see it as damaging to the subject that it still appears heavily influenced by a division between rationality and emotionality. An important task for the Social Science teaching is thus to develop its emotional community in a direction that bridges that divide and accordingly reduces the dissonance between the role emotions are supposed to play and the role they do play in the teaching. This study suggests that the role emotions are supposed to play in Social Science teaching is widely considered to be small, but the role emotions do play in Social Science teaching is in fact great. This dissonance is probably harmful to the subject.

Topic emotions as social/relational emotions

Specific Social Science topics or Social Science content, such as party politics, international relations, injustice and migration spark emotion. In Chapter 6 we saw that the students constantly referred to topics when asked about what becomes emotional in Social Science teaching. An interesting exception from that pattern is the teacher Martin who, in Chapter 7, instantly refers to social emotions and emotions tied to relations in the student group as potentially emotive for him. Not until asked directly about the content of the subject does he speak about his topic emotions. For Martin, the relations in the student group seem to be the most pressing concern, something that occupies him because of his role as a teacher.

By investigating what emotions do in the teaching in more detail through using the concepts of movement, attachment and contact in Chapter 7 to 9, it is obvious that making a division between emotions according to their object (as Pekrun and Linnenbrink-Garcia do) simplifies a very complex phenomenon. This study suggests that topic emotions are also social. As discussed in Chapter 6, there is a reciprocal relationship between boundary work and the object of emotion. Which objects/topics get ‘sticky’ (attracting emotion) is influenced by relationality. Sometimes an object of emotion is needed to secure attachments in a group – the object is demonstratively made emotive to do something to the relations, as in the reaction against Mahmood in Chapter 9. Sometimes an emotive object transposes the attachments in a group in a way that surprises the involved students, as for Shirin in Chapter 8.
This study thus challenges attempts to categorize emotions according to different kinds of objects. It shows that the object of emotion is indeed important, but that classifying different kinds of objects and thereby narrowing the view on emotions is counterproductive when investigating the workings of emotions in education.

Conflictuality and perspectivity

Emotion in Social Science teaching in this study is connected to perspectivity and conflictuality. The intense emotional situations in the data are linked to an either articulated or implicit contestation in the teaching and not ‘moral shocks’ where the whole group reacts emotionally at something perceived as unjust or wrong.

This means that emotionality in Social Science teaching is closely linked to the political, the drawing of boundaries between us and them. It is perhaps too drastic to say that the knowledge content of Social Science draws borders within the student group, but it is possible to state that boundaries between us and them are drawn in relation to the knowledge content of Social Science. Thus, the subject does something to the relations in the group. The boundary work and subsequent power relations in the groups then impact who are ‘legitimate’ gatekeepers of the bounded subject, which leads to the conclusion that there is a reciprocal relationship between what the Social Science teaching does to emotions in the group and what emotions do to the Social Science teaching. Defending boundaries is an important part of the Social Science teaching. The specific set of ‘Social Science tools’ affects how the emotional boundary work can be addressed in the teaching. The boundaries drawn in the teaching take shape because of, or at least in relation to, a specific content, which means that those boundaries would be drawn differently had the content been different or been taught in another way. This is important in relation to the work on ‘threshold concepts’, which, as discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, has gained interest from Swedish Social Science researchers lately. The subject is seen as bounded in threshold concepts theory, and the students pass a liminal phase before they can enter the subject, but the boundaries are defined by the Social Science disciplines, often defined as ‘thinking as a social scientist’. In this study, the bounded subject is also shaped by the emotional boundary work in the specific student group, which shows a reciprocal relationship between the didactical who and what. An important result of this study is that the students are active gatekeepers of the Social Science teaching, which makes a contribution in relation to previous research that has centred solely on the teacher as gatekeeper. What does the bounded subject look like when the students and teachers are acknowledged as
gatekeepers? This study contributes with a relational and particularist suggestion, which questions the universalism of the threshold concepts theory.

To conclude, a result of the study is that emotions in Social Science are connected to conflictuality and perspectivity because they signal contention. The specific group of students and teacher become crucial here: how the boundaries are drawn is not universal. However, a methodological reflection is pertinent here. The fact that the study has focused on intense emotion impacts this result. If the study would have highlighted a broader range of emotion including low-key emotions such as boredom or moods such as contentment, the connection between emotion and contention would probably be more ambiguous.

The contemporaneity of the subject

During the research process I have been asked about what would happen if I studied the same group of students (and teacher) in the teaching of another subject. That is a question I can only speculate about due to the fact that I have not conducted that kind of comparative investigation. Still, it is possible to make an educated guess: the subject taught affects the emotional community to such an extent that it is possible to investigate different subjects as different emotional communities. This is due to the specific subject content, supported by the finding that students, when asked about what becomes emotive in the teaching, consistently refer to the knowledge content of Social Science. Some of this content overlaps with other subjects. War, for instance, is dealt with in History, religion of course in Religious Education. But there is a contemporaneity specific for Social Science that seems to give rise to emotionality. As will be discussed in the methodological reflections in this chapter, pressing contemporary concerns and dramatic societal events affect what becomes emotional in Social Science teaching. This is supposedly particularly evident in Social Science, which is considered to be dealing with the contemporary (Mathé & Sandahl, 2019; Sandahl, 2015a).

It is clear that some of the Social Science knowledge content sparks emotion in the kind of pluralist student group researched. This content includes migration, international law, party politics, personal finance, the rights of minorities and religion. However, the results regarding emotive topics cannot be explained solely by a composition of students where 40-70 percent have an immigrant background. Topics like migration, international law and the Sweden Democrats are pressing concerns of our time, circulating in society, becoming ‘emotionally charged’ or ‘sticky’ in Ahmed’s words. Thus, they are not solely dependent on students’
personal experiences of the topic discussed. However, the pluralism of values, experiences and knowledge in the researched student groups is to some extent related to contact with ‘other places’, as Sandahl puts it (2013). This means something to the perspectives and contestation in these groups. The sampling process in this dissertation, targeting schools where a substantial part of the students have an immigrant background, makes a contribution to a field that has not to a great extent critically examined the *who* in the Social Science teaching. Sandahl’s research on student engagement leaves an impression of a certain, rather homogenous student body, where the Social Science perspectives are often brought into the teaching through the teaching-material. In the student groups studied in this dissertation, conflictual perspectives, sometimes stemming from contact with ‘other places’, are already present in the classroom.

**Lovers of the democratic constitution**

As the critique against the theorizing of emotional communities stresses, it is difficult to draw a definite line between different communities since their borders are porous. There is definitely a national emotional community, similar to Reddy’s emotional regime, and there are definitely many different emotional communities tied to social institutions. In the case of Social Science education, there are probably traces of a national community connected to the democratic mission in the attempt to create an emotional community in the subject. The subject Social Science has traces of what Landahl (2015) describes as part of the schools’ mission in the later part of the nineteenth century, namely conveying the feeling of love, in this case to the democratic constitution.

The emotional community of Social Science teaching is constantly under production and its borders are under negotiation, which involves boundary work. The data in this study suggests that there is a lot of gatekeeping going on in relation to ideas about the ‘good citizen’. Students like Bashir, Caroline and Lina in Chapter 6 express feelings of pride and shame in the teaching in relation to being active or passive citizens in relation to injustices, which signals that to them active citizenship is good citizenship and that this ideal is brought to the head in the Social Science teaching. The ‘good mob’ reacting against Mahmood in Chapter 9 seem to do so with the firm belief that they are good citizens acting correctly by defending freedom of speech. According to Mahmood, they said ‘you can’t say that, it is not Sweden’. An interpretation of this situation is that love of the democratic constitution, which seems to be perceived as a form of love of the nation, is crucial in the
drawing of symbolic boundaries in and around the Social Science teaching. There is a lot of emotionality in relation to that boundary work and the borders seem to be strengthened when someone can be placed on the other side of the border, as in the case of Mahmood, and also in the case of Shirin. The gatekeeping of the boundary connected to the ‘good citizen’ needs a constitutive other and the process of creating that other person or group in the teaching process can be quick and rather generalizing. The individuals and groups who are detached from being a good citizen in that way express strong emotions connected to their experience of being excluded.

Accordingly, the ‘good Social Science student’ is active and outspoken, thus fulfilling a democratic ideal. Students throughout the study worry about not being outspoken enough and frame it as extra harmful in the Social Science teaching. Silence thus seems to be seen as harmful in the emotional community of Social Science teaching. A boundary is drawn that distances the silent students from the norm.

Possibilities and limitations of emotions in Social Science teaching

That emotions are abundant in Social Science education, as shown in this study, does not mean that they are unproblematic. Insisting that emotions should be embraced without acknowledging problems arising by and from emotions in Social Science teaching would be unfair to school practitioners, who wrestle with the question of where to draw the line regarding which emotional expressions are acceptable and which are not.

Researchers on Social Science teaching and starting to see neglected emotions everywhere brings with it a risk of being blind to a negative side of emotions in Social Science teaching as well as parts of the teaching that are not emotional. The fact that emotionality for such a long time has been considered as having no place in Social Science teaching might lead to an overemphasis on its benefits. All political feelings are not per se desirable in Social Science teaching that fosters democratic citizens. However, as discussed earlier in this chapter, feelings (those of both students and teachers) must be acknowledged in order to be put under critical scrutiny. Only then can the process of deciding if they are up to the mark set by a democratic political culture begin. Thinking with Plamper (2015) and Massing (2019), it is fruitless to list specific emotions as democratic or not, because emotions are complex and elusive to the extent that it is impossible to capture their essence.
Massing suggests that we look at which forms of emotionality are beneficial for democracy and which forms are not (Massing, 2019, p. 241). Which forms of emotionality render themselves subject to democratic justification? How do they fare in that process? In sum, the feelings are there and only by acknowledging and approaching them, we can critically examine them, challenge them and didacticize them. One important role of Social Science education is then to make emotions an object of teaching, and thereby provide a space where emotions can be systematically dealt with on a structural level (which can be difficult for an individual to grasp only in the light of their own experiences). That level is lost in the cases of Leyla and Shirin in Chapter 8. They both make truth claims based on their own experiences, but they do not get to deal with questions about how their feelings appear, nor how they can develop and change. In an emotionally sensitive Social Science education (Petri, 2018) both the participants and the subject teaching change and connect to each other through emotionality. In the didactical triangle, emotions are present and dynamic in every relation.

Not all research on symbolic boundaries treat them as disuniting. There is also the perspective which holds that boundaries are where we meet. This is perhaps a perspective that can form and inform the mission for Social Science subject didactics: to turn boundary work performed in the Social Science teaching towards borders where people meet or try to create that kind of borders. Ahmed emphasizes that being moved by emotions also means being moved into a different relation to the norms we wish to contest, which is not by definition something bad:

> Indeed, feeling better for some might involve expressing feelings of anger, rage and shame, as feelings in the present about a past that persists in the present. The emotions that have often been described as negative or even destructive can also be enabling or creative, often in their very refusal of the promise of the social bond. For example, /.../ anger against injustice can move subjects into a different relation to the world, including a different relation to the object of one’s critique. (Ahmed, 2014, p. 201)

Can the Social Science teaching support students who experience emotionality in relation to the specific Social Science content to move outwards, responding to the world through a reading of the ‘relation between affect and structure or between emotion and politics in a way that undoes the separation of the individual from others’ (Ahmed, 2014, p. 174)? To do that, associations or connections between the object of e.g. anger and broader patterns or structures are needed, an interlinking of the micro and macro levels.
Not only have feminists created different names for what they are against, but they have also recognized that what they are against does not have the contours of an object that is given; it is not a positive entity. Anger hence moves us by moving us outwards: while it creates an object, it also is not simply directed against an object, but becomes a response to the world, as such. (Ahmed 2014, p. 176)

The students do not perceive emotions and speech as negatively impacting the professional assessment performed by the teacher. In the cases of Leyla and Shirin in Chapter 8 it is rather the other way around. The emotional community of the subject Social Science is in tension or conflict with the symbolic boundary work between students or groups of students. Hence Shirin, who strives for high grades in the subject, has to approach the teacher outside of the lesson time to prove herself as a ‘good’ student of Social Science.

But there are important parts of Social Science teaching, which are not emotional. It can be the case, as suggested by Besand (2014), that in some cases it is the task of the Social Science didactics to make a certain content emotive. In relation to impending political apathy, Social Science teaching could, regarding its objective to foster democratic citizens, be considered an important agent in invoking emotionality in relation to politics.

The scope of the theory

Throughout the research process, I have had the impression that the different theories deployed in the study ‘come together’, that they are attuned, that they do not undermine each other. All of them emphasize relationality. They have been complementary to each other when it comes to their function in the dissertation. Some of them, as the concept of the political and interactionism, are used as comprehensive ways of viewing the world while others, such as Ahmed’s movement, attachment and contact, the theory of symbolic boundaries and emotional communities – have been used to go into detail into the workings of emotions in the Social Science teaching. It has been fruitful to investigate the political dimension of Social Science teaching through boundary work and movement, attachment and contact. It has also been fruitful to study the particularities of Social Science teaching through the lens of emotional communities.

None of the theories stem directly from the field of education. It has been my task to bring them into school to see what happens. This means that I have not had much educational research to lean upon. Landahl and Zembylas have used
Rosenwein’s and Ahmed’s frameworks, respectively, and their work has been an inspiration. It also means that my research will hopefully make a contribution to research on Social Science didactics by bringing more theory into the field.

But bringing theory from other research fields into education might mean that I miss some characteristic features of teaching and school life that pedagogical or subject didactical theory would have captured. Gert Biesta’s work on the purpose of education using the concepts qualification, socialization and subjectification, for example, is widely used in educational research in Sweden. Using his concepts, developed for the specific context of education, in relation to emotions in Social Science teaching could have placed emotions in certain parts of the purpose of education. Hypothetically, approaching emotions in education would have contributed to subjectification, but emotions also play an important role in socialization. But on the other hand, Biesta’s concepts miss the relationality of emotions, which plays a great part in explaining what emotions do in the teaching.

Methodological reflections

The aim of choosing an ethnographic research design using a combination of observations and interviews was to study emotions and boundary work in Social Science teaching in situ. In hindsight, the combination of methods has worked out well in the sense that I could not have come to the same conclusions using only one of the methods. The observations have been pivotal to investigate the collective dimensions of the teaching and also to ‘feel the room’ and use the impressions from the observations as a base for the interviews. The findings on what emotions do in the teaching are indeed dependent on interviews. Prominent situations like the ones involving Shirin, Mahmood and Anja, which have become core situations in the empirical chapters, would not be present at all in the dissertation if it were not for the interviews. In that sense, the interviews have widened the spectrum of situations analysed in the study and also caught situations pertinent to the study, which would have been lost using only observations. The methods have captured symbolic boundaries as both discursive and relational, which is a strength of the study.

However, the mix of methods has also provided some difficulties, ironically due to the fact that the analysed data sometimes stem from different methods. While most situations accounted for originate from both observations and interviews and are covered by an attempt at rigour by showing videos in the interviews, some situations stem solely from interviews or observations. The consistency of the study is thus affected, and a way to address that difficulty has been to be transparent,
noting in the text if the findings stem from interview data alone. The contribution through the use of different types of data has been judged to be greater than the benefits of full consistency.

Ethical considerations have been vivid and discussed throughout the research process. The aim of the study has never been to gather and deal with sensitive personal data, but in the interviews, statements were made that can be interpreted as sensitive personal data, which raised the demands on the research process to carefully consider research ethics. During the research process I have thus four times met senior researchers who are seen as experts on research ethics to discuss the data management and which sensitive data is motivated as of fundamental importance to the study. These discussions and reflections have led me to remove some statements from the final text because they were interpreted as sensitive but not of great scientific relevance considering the objective of the study. I have also raised the demands on anonymity, for instance changing the names of the four schools from names that were made-up but somewhat suggestive to names that are neutral (dead names instead of vivid ones) as well as leaving out students’ made up names in some situations where it was not seen as of importance who was making the statement.

Again, a key result of the study is that emotions in Social Science are connected to conflictuality and perspectivity because they signal contention. As discussed earlier in the chapter, the fact that the study has focused on intense emotion impacts the result. If a broader range of emotions, including low key emotions such as boredom or contentment, would have been investigated, the connection between emotion and contention would have been more ambiguous. An exception from the heated emotions in the study is the situation where Karim brings up the Lebanese government in response to a lecture about what happens when a country does not have a government. That situation was chosen for in depth analysis because a student raised a divergent perspective and it has something to say about boundary work in the Social Science teaching, not because of an intensity of emotions (see the empirical questions stated in Chapter 4).

Besand acknowledges the problematic tendency to linger at emotions that are perceived as negative when considering politics and emotions: hate, jealousy, anger and rage, often related to National Socialism (Besand, 2019, p. 87). Emotions in the political realm are then easily dismissed as destructive and unsupportive instead of positive and possibly solidarity-shaping. In hindsight, the emotions analysed in this dissertation are mainly the kind of negatively connotated feelings that Besand claims are a fixation of researchers studying political emotions. The prevalence on a ‘negatively connotated’ register of emotions became clear to me gradually during the fieldwork, which led to explicit questions about ‘positive feelings’ at
Björkskolan and Lindskolan, school three and four in the chronological order of the fieldwork. However, the study’s focus on conflictuality makes the positively connotated emotions less pertinent, although not irrelevant, in the analysis.

Another methodological conclusion regards the timing of the fieldwork at the four schools and the project at large: timing is decisive for what becomes emotive in the Social Science teaching, which confirms a strong connection between contemporaneity and the political (see also Mathé & Sandahl, 2019). Topical, contemporary conflicts can thus be seen as the place where the students meet the political (see also Grammes, 2019, p. 69). Given the circumstance that the fieldwork was conducted at one school at a time over a period of almost two years, between April 2014 and December 2015, different topics and even whole content areas became emotional at the investigated moment. Constitution at Granskolan, for instance, is a heated area because of the contemporaneous turbulence in the Swedish parliament. At Björkskolan and Lindskolan, the fieldwork was conducted in the wake of major terrorist attacks. A conclusion drawn from the results of the study, then, is that it is impossible to generalize from the study because it is so tightly tied to a certain moment in time. However, I claim that the study indicates something that is indeed timeless, since it confirms the subject Social Science and its teaching as contemporary, and thus emotional through the connection between contemporaneity and the political. That is part of the character of the subject and it has to be dealt with by Social Science teachers, regardless of the point in time.

While at the topic of timing, the results concerning the perception of the political party Sweden Democrats as harmful in the emotional community of Social Science teaching needs to be discussed in the context of time. The last segment of the fieldwork, at Lindskolan, was conducted in the autumn of 2015, at the peak of what has been called the ‘refugee crisis’, when a large number of refugees fleeing mainly the wars in Syria and Afghanistan entered Sweden. This was the autumn when Angela Merkel said ‘Wir schaffen das’ (we can do it), meaning that Germany had the capacity needed to receive the refugees seeking protection. The Swedish Prime Minister, Stefan Löfvén, travelled to Berlin to meet Merkel, because the two countries perceived themselves as connected by their approach to the reception of the refugees. Every day, large groups of refugees arrived to Sweden, and their reception was organized by authorities, NGOs and volunteers, some of them students participating in this study. In the winter of 2015/2016, following the fieldwork, a somewhat drastic change occurred when the Swedish government implemented a restrictive migration policy in order to deter and hinder migrants to enter the country. The policy reduced the number of asylum applications drastically. If the fieldwork of this study would have lasted through that shift in public discourse and
policy, it would have been possible to investigate if the emotional community of Social Science teaching would have been transformed. In the data of this study, aversion against SD is a strong part of the emotional community. The claim that this has changed is only hypothetical and needs to be thoroughly investigated. However, it is intriguing to ponder if and how the emotional community of Social Science teaching changes through such a change in public discourse and asylum politics. The case of Liridona at Ekskolan, who was threatened by deportation and ‘saved’ by her Social Science class, suggests that the emotional community of Social Science education can encourage resistance and aversion against a decision by a state authority. But in the case of a changing debate climate, where SD is slowly gaining acceptance in Swedish politics, what will the balance between continuity and change look like in the teaching? Are the symbolic boundaries drawn differently now as compared to the time of the fieldwork of this study?

By chance, two of the four fieldworks started just after major terrorist attacks in Paris. Inevitably, this led to tensions and affected the Social Science teaching at the two schools, albeit differently. At Björkskolan, the attacks were brought up and discussed. At Lindskolan, the attacks were not discussed in the Social Science, but in a separate Psychology class. To be sure, concern was present in the room but it was not addressed by the teacher. The fact that dramatic societal and political events took place in connection to the fieldwork surely has affected the results of the study. Some of the situations chosen for in depth analysis, notably the cases of Shirin and Mahmood, arose in the aftermath of the attacks and made the studied emotional boundary work possible. The dissertation is thus a ‘child of its time’, but again, I would reiterate that each time has its pressing and dramatic issues and situations, sparking emotional boundary work in the Social Science teaching. Therefore, the results of the study will continue to be relevant, whether more terrorist attacks occur or not.

An important contribution stems from the investigation of both students’ and teachers’ feelings, often in relation to one another. Research on teacher emotions is often generic, addressing the situation of teachers at large. The subject-didactic research on emotions consistently focuses on students’ emotions. If the relations in the didactical triangle are seen as emotional, and reciprocal, it makes perfect sense to examine emotions in relation to teachers, students and subject (content) in the same project, to be able to analyse the interplay between them. The relationality that is emphasised is a step further from addressing emotions as a relation between individuals and politics, which is common in research based on political psychology.
The end: now what?

An important conclusion in this dissertation is that emotions need to be approached and framed differently than they currently are in Social Science teaching. The dissonance between the role emotions are expected to play and the role that they do play in the teaching leads to situations where Social Science perspectivity and conflictuality are withheld and placed outside of the teaching. In consequence, students lose learning potential. Emotions have a didactical value, either as signals that something is wrong, as an object of study per se or as a means to create a form of learning in heated situations.

The subject Social Science has been framed in this study as dependent on politicization because of the conflictual perspective of this thesis. Consequently, politicization through emotions in the teaching needs to be recognized by students and teachers as an integral part of the subject.

It would be interesting to continue researching what contemporaneity does to Social Science as a school subject. The societal discourse about migration has changed since the fieldwork of this study was conducted. To what extent has the discourse in Swedish Social Science teaching changed in relation to that bigger picture? Does Social Science teaching ‘follow’ the societal discourse or is there a resistance to this discourse inherent to the subject and the professionalism of the Social Science teacher?

Another question which announces itself is why the divide between rationalism and emotionalism persists in Social Science teaching and where this perception of the subject comes from. Is it due to the syllabus? Or the students’ earlier experiences of Social Science teaching? Is it perhaps because of the teachers’ education, which is probably heavily infused by political science?

I highly recommend using the analytical concept of emotional communities, and would gladly pursue investigation on the emotional communities of other school subjects. I have often been asked what the teacher should do with emotionality in the Social Science teaching. The persons who pose that question might not be entirely satisfied with an investigation on what emotions do in the teaching and what the subject does to emotions. I leave it to the reader to take appropriate action in relation to the results and suggestions of my dissertation. The complexity revealed in this study indeed adds to a notion of Social Science teaching as both difficult and joyous, demanding a certain amount of courage. The challenges make it worthy of more consideration, which acknowledges the breadth, complexity and tensions in the Social Science teaching.
SAMMANFATTNING

Den här avhandlingen handlar om vad känslor gör i samhällskunskapsundervisning och vad samhällskunskapsämnet gör med känslor. Trots att samhällskunskapsämnet ibland betraktas som "knastertorrt" så är några av de mest pressande frågorna i dagens samhälle, kopplade till kriser rörande migration, folkrätt, terrorism och välfärdsstaten en del av ämnet. Det betyder att samhällskunskapsundervisningen är full av intensitet och känslor, och den gnistan tänds i mötet mellan elever, lärare och ett specifikt ämnesinnehåll.

Urvalet av skolor har gjorts för att medvetet inkludera elever som har migrationsbakgrund och därigenom fånga en pluralism av erfarenheter, kunskaper och värderingar som åtminstone delvis beror på kontakt med "andra platser". Tidigare forskning har hävdat att olika samhällskunskapsperspektiv kan föras in i undervisningen genom olika former av läromedel, men jag ville genomföra undersökningen i klassrum där olika konfliktladdade samhällskunskapsperspektiv är närvarande i klassrummet genom mångfalden i elevgruppen. Därav har jag använt mig av den statistiska termen utländsk bakgrund (i Statistiska Centralbyråns betydelse att antingen individen i fråga eller båda dess föräldrar är födda utomlands) i urvalet av skolor.

Den emotionella, kollektiva dimensionen av samhällskunskapsundervisning förtydligar mer uppmärksamhet i ett forskningsfält som oftast har fokuserat ämnesundervisningen som rationalistisk, individualistisk och samtidigt universell. Ett antagande i avhandlingen är att lärare och elever fungerar som grindvakter av samhällskunskapsundervisningen. Detta sker i en ömsesidig relation mellan vad:et (ämnesinnehållet) och vem:et (deltagarna) som är mycket viktigt att undersöka och är underbeforskat i svensk samhällskunskapsdidaktisk forskning.


Teoretiskt bygger avhandlingen på Barbara Rosenweins konceptualisering av emotional communities (känslogemenskaper). Begreppet används för att analysera system av känslor i sociala gemenskaper och fokuserar på vad dessa gemenskaper bedömer vara värdefullt eller skadligt, hur de värderar andras känslor, karaktären på de känslosamma banden mellan deltagarna samt vilken sorts emotionella uttryck som förväntas, uppmuntras, tolereras och förkastas (Rosenwein, 2002). Utgångspunkten i den här avhandlingen är att olika skolämnen kan undersökas som olika känslogemenskaper som påverkas av det som är specifikt för just det
skolämnet, i det här fallet samhällskunskap. Känslomemenskapen är under ständig konstruktion och gränserna för gemenskapen dras hela tiden i relation till något annat. Denna gemenskap omgärdas alltså av symboliska gränser (Lamont, 1992), och dessa gränser blir en del av de symboliska gränserna kring ämnet samhällskunskap. Hur dessa gränser dras i relation till ämnesinnehållet och den specifika gruppen lärare/elever påverkar vad samhällskunskapsundervisningen är och kan vara. Ett viktigt resultat i avhandlingen är att de symboliska gränserna i/runt samhällskunskapsundervisningen bevakas av både lärare och elever.


I undersökningen har fältarbete genomförts på fyra svenska gymnasieskolor, där varje samhällskunskapsundervisningsgrupp har följts under ca sex veckors tid. Intervjuer genomfördes med respektive lärare både innan och efter observationerna och med ungefär en tredjedel av eleverna i gruppen efter observationerna. För att kunna undersöka känslor i samhällskunskapsundervisningen föll valet på etnografisk metod eftersom den skulle kunna fånga både vad deltagarna säger och vad de gör i undervisningen. Samhällskunskapsundervisningen sker i interaktion och det är därför inte tillräckligt att undersöka den genom intervjuer. Samtidigt är individuella intervjuer viktiga för att fånga känslor och åsikter som inte uttrycks öppet i undervisningen. Följaktligen har undersökningen genomförts genom klassrumssobservationer och videotimulerade intervjuer, där deltagarna fått titta på och diskutera videofilmede klipp från undervisningen. Den insamlade datan har sedan transkriberats och kodats samt analyserats med hjälp av de teoretiska verktygen.
Känslosamt kunskapsinnehåll och gränsvaktande


Känslosamma samhällskunskapslärare

När samhällskunskapslärarna tillfrågades om känslor kopplat till samhällskunskap handlade deras svar i första hand om elevers känslor. Först i andra hand berättade de om sina egna lärarkänslor. Lärarna uttrycker glädje och stolthet både i förhållande till ämnet samhällskunskap och relationerna till eleverna. Men de uttrycker också känslor av otillräcklighet på grund av tidsbrist i relation till det centrala innehållet i ämnesplanen samt hur de har möjlighet att genomföra undervisningen rent praktiskt.

Två situationer analyseras djupare; dels läraren Anjas undervisning i ekonomi, där hon upplever att eleverna behöver läroboken för att känna sig trygga med ämnet, men att läroboken samtidigt är enkelspårigt marknadsliberal. Anja försöker
vidga perspektivet på ekonomi genom att ta upp alternativa perspektiv men känner sig obekväm för hon tänker sig att eleverna ser läroboken som det normala och att hennes perspektiv därigenom blir avvikande.


Återhållna känslor och perspektiv

Tal spelar en viktig roll i idén om ”den goda samhällskunskapseleven”. Samhällskunskapen verkar vara mer knuten till att uttrycka sina åsikter än andra skolämnen. Det gör att elever som inte uttrycker sina åsikter i samhällskunskapsundervisningen upplever det som ett bekymmer.

Under fältarbetet uppstod flera situationer där ett specifikt samhällskunskapsinnehåll väckte starka känslor och konfliktladdade perspektiv men där dessa perspektiv och känslor inte uttrycktes i undervisningen. Två situationer som berör tillbakakahällenhet analyseras djupgående i avhandlingen. Den ena handlar om Leyla, som känner sig arg över hur ämnet folkrätt och mänskliga rättigheter behandlas i samhällskunskapsundervisningen kopplat till hennes egna erfarenheter av krig. Hon menar att hon skulle kunna bidra med ett fördjupat perspektiv på folkrätt men säger ingenting för att hon är rädd att hennes ilska skulle intensifieras om de andra eleverna reagerade negativt på hennes inlägg, vilket skulle skapa ett långvarigt avståndstagande från dem.
Den andra situationen handlar om Shirin, som blir mycket upprörd i en diskussion om terrorattacken mot den satiriska tidskriften Charlie Hebdo. Anledningen till att hon blir upprörd är att andra elever i gruppen, hennes vänner, uttrycker sig generaliseringe om muslimer genom att förknippa islam med våld. Trots starka känslor ger hon inte uttryck för dem i undervisningen för att undvika att känslorna ska eskalera och att hon ska räka säga ”för mycket” och öppet ta avstånd från de andra eleverna. Hon är förvånad över deras uttalanden eftersom de tidigare framställt sig som antirasister.


Uttryckta spänningar

När känslor och åsikter uttrycks öppet i undervisningen finns det en mer konkret möjlighet för lärare och elever att reagera på dem och ta in dem i undervisningen. Trots det framkommer ett uteblivet lärande i de båda verbala situationer som analyseras i avhandlingen. I båda uppstår en spänning kopplat till ett specifikt samhällskunskapsinnehåll, den spänningen uttrycks öppet och leder till gränsbevakande från både lärare och elever.

Den ena situationen handlar om en situation som uppstod under en lektion om internationella relationer. Läraren Martin föreläste om olika internationella aktörer och när han ställde en fråga om etniska grupper som inte har en egen stat och fick svaret ”kurderna” utlöste det en verbal reaktion som lät som skratt, fniss, förakt och uppmuntrande tillrop. Det var en emotionellt intensiv situation där det var tydligt att symboliska gränser drogs mellan olika grupper av elever. Martin hyssjade snabbt ner reaktionen och fortsatte med föreläsningen. I efterintervjuerna framgår att eleverna har mycket olika uppfattningar om vad det var för en reaktion. Vissa tolkar det positivt, som att kunder i klassen blir glada när de nämns, andra tolkar det negativt som att vissa elever häcklar kunder. Ytterligare andra förstår inte alls varför det blir en reaktion. Det finns således ett samhällskunskapslärande i situationen som kopplar till lektionens innehåll och går förlorat genom att läraren snabbt lägger locket på situationen och går vidare.

I båda situationerna finns ett uteblivet lärande. Anledningen till det skiljer sig åt; i den ena situationen uteblir ett lärande för att läraren lägger locket på den emissionella reaktionen. I den andra situationen uppmärksammar läraren den emotionella reaktionen och svarar med en klassisk samhällskunskapsanalys, men den knyter inte de känslomässiga eleverna till sig.

Slutsatser

Ett viktigt resultat av studien är att i emotionellt intensiva situationer i samhällskunskapsundervisningen stannar lärarnas försök att nyansera innehållet och bredda perspektiven inte kvar hos eleverna. I de situationerna räcker det inte med en klassisk samhällsvetenskaplig analys för att skapa ett samhällskunskapslärande hos eleverna. Det skulle kunna leda till slutsatsen att det vore bra för lärandet att förvisa känslor från samhällskunskapsundervisningen. Men avhandlingen visar också att det finns ett specifikt samhällskunskapslärande som är kopplat till känslomässiga perspektiv i undervisningen. I situationen där läraren stänger ner en emotionell reaktion fanns en möjlighet att lära sig internationella relationer i klassrummet som uteblev på grund av att reaktionen trycktes bort.

Den undersökta samhällskunskapsundervisningen tycks därför fortfarande lida av den traditionella uppdelningen mellan rationalitet och emotionalitet som har kategoriserat disciplinär politisk analys under 1900-talet (Besand, 2014; Goodwin et al., 2001). Ett närmande mellan elevernas livsvärld och en disciplinär samhällsvetenskaplig analys behöver ta hänsyn till och kanske också göra användning av känslodimensionen i undervisningen. Samhällskunskapsanalys behöver då också tillåtas vara känslomässig och samhällskunskapsperspektiven vara konfliktfyllda.
Ett annat viktigt resultat är att lärarna har en speciell position i samhällskunskapsundervisningens känslogemenskap. Lärarnas vem i klassrummet är tydligt kopplat till deras samhällskunskapslärarprofessionalism, vilket gör att de inte är lika utsatta i en känslös situation där symboliska gränser dras runt ämnet och därigenom också mellan deltagarna. Även i en situation som läraren Anjas, där hon upplever att eleverna tar avstånd från henne så har hon stöd i sin samhällskunskapslärarprofessionalism. Eleverna refererar ibland till något som skulle kunna kallas en ”elevprofessionalism”, kopplat till deras idé om ”den goda samhällskunskapseleven”. Men det ger dem inte skydd i undervisningssituationen, även när elever tycker att det är viktigt att uttrycka åsikter i undervisningen gör de relationella anknytningarna inom elevgruppen att de inte uttrycker känslor och åsikter. Denna skillnad mellan upplevelsen av utsatthet gör att lärarna har en viktig position genom att de kan tänja gränserna för emotionsgemenskapen utan att känna att de därigenom tar en stor risk.
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Source material in Latin

Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Brutus*.

Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Orator*. 
APPENDIX 1 – SOCIAL SCIENCE IN THE SWEDISH UPPER SECONDARY CURRICULUM

Social Science is a compulsory subject in Swedish upper secondary education. Attending upper secondary education is not compulsory, although most people in Sweden do. The syllabus defines the subject Social Science as interdisciplinary, with its roots mainly in Political Science, Sociology and Economics. It also states that the subject has a historical perspective. The aim of the subject as stated by the syllabus is to help students broaden, deepen and develop knowledge about people’s living conditions based on different social issues, power, democracy, gender equality and human rights, working life, resources and sustainable development. The teaching should provide an opportunity for the students to develop a scientific approach to social issues, including a critical perspective, and create conditions for active participation in society.

Teaching in the subject of Social Science should further give students the opportunities to develop the following:

1) Knowledge of democracy and human rights, both individual and collective rights, social issues, social conditions, as well as the function and organisation of different societies from local to global levels based on different interpretations and perspectives.

2) Knowledge of the importance of historical conditions and how different ideological, political, economic, social and environmental conditions affect and are affected by individuals, groups and social structures.

3) The ability to analyse social issues and identify causes and consequences using concepts, theories, models and methods from the social sciences.

4) The ability to search for, critically examine and interpret information from different sources and assess their relevance and credibility.
5) The ability to express their knowledge of Social Science in various types of presentation.

The table below provides an overview of the courses in Social Science in Swedish upper secondary school according to the written curriculum GY11.
The Swedish school subject Social Science at upper secondary school according to the written curriculum GY11 (syllabus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Core content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 1a1+1a2 or 1b (50+50 or 100 credits): Basic knowledge. Course 1a1 and 1a2 together equals course 1b. Depending on programme studied, either course 1a1 or 1b is compulsory for all students in Swedish upper secondary school.</td>
<td>Democracy and political systems at local, national, and EU level. International and Nordic cooperation. Distribution of power and opportunities for exerting influence. Political ideologies and their linkages to social structures and welfare theories. Human rights and international law in armed conflicts. The labour market, labour law and the working environment. Group and individual identity, relationships and social living conditions based on social categorisation of people which creates both a sense of community and exclusion. Economics: economic structures and flows in Sweden and internationally, personal finance. Mass media and information technology in society, contents of media, assessing news.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 2 (100 credits): Advanced knowledge</td>
<td>Economic theories and their impact in the light of historical conditions and conflicts, including issues concerning growth, power, influence, a sustainable society, the environment and allocation of resources. Contemporary political developments based on historical ideological conditions, such as human rights, nationalism, colonialism and gender equality. Distribution of power and economic conditions, freedom of action of individuals versus structural conditions. Specialised thematic studies into social issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies 3 (100 credits): Advanced knowledge</td>
<td>Globalisation and its importance from a democratic, economic and political perspective, as well as for individuals, groups or nations. Introduction to the philosophy of science. How scientific concepts used in societal debates affect individuals' views of themselves, others, and the surrounding society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International economics (100 credits): Advanced knowledge</td>
<td>International trade relations and their players. The importance of culture in forming business relationships between companies. Currency exchange policy interventions. Global allocation of resources. Economic integration processes within the EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International relations (100 credits): Advanced knowledge</td>
<td>Different actors, their goals and instruments, and how these interact with foreign and security policy. Different theoretical perspectives on international relations. The importance of the World Wars and the subsequent period in the establishment of international institutions. Organised cooperation between countries and its relation to political and economic development. Causes and consequences of cooperation and conflicts. International law. Opportunities and difficulties in safeguarding the rights and securities of states and individuals. The importance of globalisation. Opportunities and challenges regarding the environment and allocation of resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2 - INTERVIEW SHEET FOR STUDENTS

Efterintervju elever

Berätta lite om dig själv.

Hur skulle du beskriva skolan du går på? Vad är det för någon skola?

Vad tror du var lärarens mål med undervisningen om ekonomi/stats-skick/EU/FN/internationella relationer? Vad är det som får dig att dra den slutsatsen?

Motsvarade samhällskunskapsundervisningen i detta område dina förväntningar?

Hur påverkades undervisningen av att jag var där? Hur påverkades undervisningen av klassen/gruppen?

Fick du (alla) göra din röst hörd, komma till tals? Fick elever med olika bakgrund (eller du själv)”utrymme” i undervisningen, pratade ni om olika bakgrunder och erfarenheter? Hur? Hur gjorde läraren för att…

Hur tror du att läraren anpassar undervisningen efter just denna gruppen?) Vad var det som gjorde att du har en känsla/inte har en känsla av det?

Tycker du att du kunde påverka/förändra undervisningen och på vilket sätt?
Finns det ett ”vi” i undervisningen? Var känner du dig i förhållande till det viet? (videoklipp: Kommentera det du ser och hör. Vad händer här?


Vad lär du dig från samhällskunskapsundervisningen? Hur tycker du att samhällskunskapen berör dig och ditt liv? Handlar den om dig?

Gränsen mellan privat och offentligt, skola-privatliv? Använder du ditt privatliv i skolarbetet?

Något om vad ämnet kan bidra till i hur man lever sitt liv (sen).

Vilka andra sätt än i skolan lär du dig samhällskunskap? Hur förhåller det sig till skolkunskapen?

Följdfrågor – kan du ge exempel från undervisningen? Kan du berätta lite mer om det? Menar du att…
Förintervju lärare

Berätta lite om dig själv. Hur länge har du jobbat som lärare, har du jobbat på många olika skolor, hur länge har du jobbat här, vilket/vilka andra ämnen har du?

Hur skulle du, kort, beskriva skolan vi är på?


Vad tror du kommer att bli svårt, vad kommer att bli lätt? Var finns svårigheterna i det här området?

Varför tycker du att det är viktigt att lära sig om detta? Vad vill du att eleverna ska få med sig från undervisningen?

Hur tar du hänsyn till elevgruppen när du planerar undervisningen i detta område? Vad är det du tar hänsyn till?

Känner du till elevernas bakgrunder? Hur har du fått reda på det?
Vad, inom detta område, tror du eleverna är mer eller mindre intresserade av? Vad är det som gör att du tror så?

Vad tror du att kan bli kontroversiella/känslomässiga frågor/ämnen/situationer?

Vilka är dina övergripande mål med din undervisning i samhällskunskap? Vad tycker du är viktigast att eleverna får med sig från samhällskunskapsundervisningen?

**Efterintervju Anja, Ekskolan**


Variationen. Fanns en röd tråd trots vikarier, någon elev uttryckte det som skönt att vikarien höll sig till sitt ämne, att det blev mer fokuserat än med ordinarie lärare.

Första fokusfrågan

Utveckla detta om att du inte vill ta reda på etnicitet. Från förintervjun: ”inte känt något behov att veta. Då tror man att eleverna automatiskt har jättemycket kunskaper om det eller förståelse för det området som de kanske inte har för de har levt helt annorlunda liv än det jag tillskrivit dem”

I vilka syften kan det vara bra att veta?

Koppla till vad eleverna har sagt om detta: Flera elever har uttryckt att det inte är några problem för dem att prata om etnicitet, att de vill göra det ”folk vet ingenting om XXX”, vill att andra ska veta. En elev sade att etnicitet inte spelar någon roll, alla har samma förutsättningar, men kopplade det till resultat och bedömning. (liberal) Eleverna knyter gärna undervisningen till sig själva. En elev tyckte att uppgiften i ekonomi borde ha handlat om Sverige för det är närmast honom.

Någon tycker att det är mer lämpligt att ge utrymme för etnicitet i religionsämnet, hur ser du på det? Är det mer befogat där?

I piloten skedde detta hela tiden på elevernas initiativ. Lyckas skapa ett klimat där det är ok.
Eleverna uppfattar inte att Anja frågar om bakgrund. Men är öppen för initiativ. Neutral. (men incidenten med en kille som argumenterade för att kvinnor ska vara hemma? Menade eleven det som att slå ner mot kulturskillnader?)

Men om det ska komma fram på elevernas initiativ, vilka elevers initiativ blir det då? Elever med större självförtroende?

Andra fokusfrågan
Undervisningens genomförande – vad som upplevdes som känsligt, tydligt att det är olika i klassen, men det var också vad pengar används till. Håller du med om att du tar hänsyn till Könstillhörighet, klass men inte etnicitet? Är det någon skillnad i hur lärare i allmänhet förhåller sig till dessa, varför tror du?

Tredje fokusfrågan
Hur ser du på gruppen? Grupperingar etc. Vem som utmärker sig, vem som inte utmärker sig. Om alla fick utrymme, vilka som inte får det.
Utjämnning mellan eleverna (expertskap) ökat självförtroende. (Diskussionen om vad som ingår i undervisningen och varför, – marknadsekonomi, liberalism - förä den diskussionen med eleverna också).

Arbetet mot utvisningen - de flesta såg det som en del av undervisningen, vissa tyckte att det tog lång tid, gjorde att det blev stressigare under våren och att det blev olika mycket undervisning beroende på vilken grupp de hamnade i. Alla såg kopplingen med samhällskunskapen i detta att påverka, hur man kan påverka etc. Levande undervisning, alla borde ha något sådant i undervisningen. Tydligt att olika elever är olika bundna vid ämnesplanen, vissa elever är inne på att kursen är något man ska klara av, beta av, och få betyg.

Efterintervju Camilla, Granskolan

Reflektioner om undervisningsmomentet.

Hinder? Var det något som gick över förväntan?

Arbetet med uppgiften. Något om hur undervisningen förändrades av klassen eller anpassades till klassen. Vet inte var eleverna kommer ifrån. Planerar inte undervisningen med det i åtanke (?) Varför?

Jämförande uppgifter; elever tar ofta ett land eleven har anknytning till. ”Använda de formaliserade orden för att beskriva” på situationen i andra länder. Är det extra svårt när det gäller dessa länder man har koppling till? Kanske för att man är van vid att prata om det på ett annat sätt eller annat språk. Kan handla om språkkunskaper i allmänhet. Svårt steg att läsa på ett annat språk och sen ”översätta” till rätt termer på svenska. ”Men de vill gärna göra det”. Hur blev det den här gången?

Situationer när elevers erfarenheter och bakgrund får plats i undervisningen. Klipp och kommentera.

Avbrott i undervisningen – väljer vad plocka upp eller vad inte plocka upp, hur går den utsättningen till, vad händer i ditt huvud i de här situationerna?


Elever säger att det inte finns en vilja från elever att ta upp något personligt Varför? men att det inte skulle finnas motstånd om det skulle ske.


ha svaren framför sig kanske inte leder till mer aktivitet om man vet att de andra också har det.

Elever som slutat – resonemang om varför?


Efterintervju Rickard, Björkskolan

Reflektioner om undervisningsmomentet.

   Hinder? Var det något som gick över förväntan?
   Arbetet med uppgiften del 1 del 2. Något om hur undervisningen förändrades av klassen eller anpassades till klassen. Varför?

Situationer när elevers erfarenheter och bakgrund får plats i undervisningen.

   Detta att det inte kommer upp. (Eller gör det det?) Klipp om ni var en flykting. Koppling folkrätt. Asyl, flykt. Hur tänker du i förhållande till elevernas erfarenheter?
   Samhälle är inget ämne där man snarar om åh det här har jag varit med om. Det är ngt man pratar om utanför skolan. Erfarenheter mer kunskap, vad man har lärt sig innan.
   Hur blev det i uppgiften?

   Det måste hända något i gruppen, inte bara att läraren står och försöker få fram olika perspektiv, det är som att det inte riktigt räknas – om inte många perspektiv kommer fram i gruppen. Verkar som att ett perspektiv slår ut de andra.
   Syns det i skrivuppgifter, syns det i denna uppgiften.
Man ska anpassa sig efter landet, lära känna hur Sverige går till för att kunna anpassa sig till landet.


Lärare mer fokuserad på att lär ut saker.

Vissa har mer erfarenheter än andra, t ex om man varit med i krig, man vet vad sorg är etc. men där i klassrummet, man kan inte visa, man kan inte säga det. Det skiljer, det gör en starkare, de andra skulle reagera starkare. Största skillnaden är att man vet att våld kan hjälpa.


Rickard har börjat anpassa sig till vem som brukar prata nu, var annorlunda i början (är det vem som samarbetar bra, vet vem som kan vad, har gett upp att få fler att prata?)


Har du tänkt på var du befinner dig i förhållande till grupperingarna?

Knyter mer sociala band till vissa?

Vi i undervisningen: Använder man rätt så ofta. Signalrar det avstånd? Eller öppnar det upp? Ser från utsidan?

Samhällskunskapsämnet karaktär. Av 8 intervjuade elever är det bara 1 som har en syn på samhällskunskapsämnet som ett diskussionsämne. Kopplat till religion (där snackar man ofta om sig själv) och svenska t ex. Ämnets användning – sen. Vad

Koppla till förintervjun – något som händer sen men också nu – hur?
Elever säger att det inte finns en vilja från elever att ta upp något personligt Varför?
EU rollspelet, roligt vilket var förvånande i samhällskunskapsämnet. Till slut blev det samhällskunskap. Samhällskunskap läsa jättemycket, skriva jättemycket inte så mycket diskutera.

Aktuella händelser, t ex orättvisor i USA kommer upp i sociala medier men i samhällskunskapen handlar det mer om struktur, inte något realistiskt (det gör att det i skolan blir tråkigt, handlar om ingenting)
Har tänkt att det handlar mer om moral, rätt och fel, olika system.


Uppmuntrar till att prata (men det gör ingen skillnad) Han gör på bra sätt så vi kan lära oss (språk).
Han är ganska neutral men lär oss olika perspektiv. + jämförande, samband
Han frågar dem som vill prata. Vill inte tvinga någon.

Uppgifter i grupper men inte diskussioner i gruppen. Det hade varit bra med mer diskussioner i grupper. Han kan utveckla det så fler pratar.

Efterintervju Martin, Lindskolan

Reflektioner om undervisningsmomentet.

Hinder? Var det något som gick över förväntan? Något om hur undervisningen förändrades av klassen eller anpassades till klassen. Varför?
Elever verkade tycka att det blev intressant just detta området och att det hjälper dem att se bakom nyheter etc. Flera har varit engagerade i teorin: realism-idealism (öppet dolt, vem pratar) Mitt intryck på lektionerna jfr intrycket i intervjuerna.

Situationer när elevers erfarenheter och bakgrund får plats i undervisningen.


Lärare – att hänga med när man inte kan lika mycket om ett område som eleverna (eller är osäker)


Känslor i undervisningen-Har du märkt att det hettar till? konflikter våldnyheter (utanför och inuti undervisningen) Film. Stolthet kopplat till ursprung och biståndsarbete. Dina egna känslor, realism, idealism

Förintervju: Pratar om att det som kan bli kontroversiellt är terrorism och också etniska grupper och säger att det kan vara glirningar, och att det gäller att vara uppmärksam så att det inte blir glirningar och diskussioner i samband med det. Och ger sen en kunskapsattityd på hur läraren ska agera – att lära ut skillnaden mellan etnicitet, nation, stat etc.

Pratar om att glirningar mellan elever kopplat till etnisk tillhörighet har blivit vanligare. Det har blivit mer polariserat. Intressant varför och polariserat på vilket sätt?

Klassens uppdelning.

Hur påverkar det vem som pratar och vem som inte pratar

Har du tänkt på var du befinner dig i förhållande till grupperingarna?

Knyter mer sociala band till vissa?

Samhällskunskapsämnets karaktär.

Något om Martin som lärare.

Duktig på att lyssna, accepterande, återknyter, fångar uppmärksamheten, elevspråk, intressanta exempel, gillar att diskutera.
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