

PERMISSION (NOT) GRANTED: REGULATION OF PUBLIC CHILDREN’S SPACES THROUGH SPACES AS CODING MACHINES*

Abstract

The space of an elementary school is expected to regulate the bodies of the children within its fences. While the space of the school does this as expected, it also exerts regulation on adults inside and outside of the school space. I engage in formal participant observation of a public street and public school over three days, alongside an immersive ethnography. Formal observation allows participants to remain affectively unaffected, while community membership lends the project benefits of immersive ethnography, like context. I rely on Deleuzian concepts of coding machines, facialization, and affect to address how space codes and recodes bodies through their interactions with boundaries and Manning’s notion of “leaking” affect. I pose the school space as leaky and argue that the space touches bodies both inside and outside of its boundaries and is affectively touched by those bodies in return. This project identifies four particular kinds of bodies affecting each other: the school itself, the children-students, the adults, and the unaffiliated bodies outside the school. I argue that bodies interacting with the school are constantly negotiating permissions: some, like children and teachers, may enter; some may leave. These negotiations extend even to gaze; some may look into the yard, while others (particularly adult men) must actively look down or away. This article considers the conceptions of acceptable bodies in

* **Taryn Hepburn**; PhD candidate, Carleton University. Contact: tarynhepburn@email.carleton.ca.

particular places and the processes, formal and informal, which allow some bodies into space and deny others, framed through an understanding of overcoding, legibility, and affect.

Keywords: School, Regulation, Deleuze, Permission, Children

Résumé

L'espace d'une école primaire (c.-à.-d. l'espace à l'intérieur de ses clôtures) régule le corps des enfants. Il exerce également un pouvoir régulateur sur les adultes à l'intérieur et à l'extérieur de l'espace scolaire. Ce texte présente les résultats de l'observation formelle de participants dans une rue publique et une école publique pendant trois jours, parallèlement à une ethnographie immersive. L'observation formelle permet aux participants de ne pas être affectés affectivement, tandis que l'appartenance à la communauté apporte au projet les avantages de l'ethnographie immersive, comme le contexte. Cette analyse s'appuie sur les concepts deleuziens de machine à codes, de visagété et d'affect pour aborder la manière dont l'espace code et recode les corps à travers leurs interactions avec les limites imposées. Elle utilise également la notion de « "leaking" affect » de Manning. Le texte désigne l'espace de l'école comme fuyant (« leaky »). En effet, ce document soutient non seulement que l'espace touche les corps à l'intérieur et à l'extérieur de ses limites, mais aussi qu'il est touché affectivement par ces corps en retour. Ce projet identifie quatre types de corps qui s'affectent mutuellement : l'école elle-même, les enfants-étudiants, les adultes et les corps non affiliés à l'école opérant à l'extérieur de son espace. La présente recherche affirme que les corps qui interagissent avec l'école négocient constamment des permissions : certains, comme les enfants et les enseignants, peuvent entrer, d'autres peuvent sortir. Ces

négociations s'étendent même au regard ; certains peuvent regarder dans la cour, tandis que d'autres (en particulier les hommes adultes) doivent baisser les yeux ou regarder ailleurs. Cet article examine les conceptions des corps acceptables dans des lieux particuliers et les processus (formels et informels) qui permettent aux corps d'entrer ou non dans l'espace. Cette analyse est effectuée en s'appuyant sur les notions de surcodage, de lisibilité et d'affect.

Mots-clés : École, régulation, Deleuze, permission, enfants

INTRODUCTION

March 28: The earliest child walks into the school alone at 8:44 a.m.; he wanders back and forth from the snowbank to the back door. When three other children, who appear his age, arrive at 8:48 a.m., he runs to the open main gate to collect them but does not cross the fence line. An adult man jogs past the school gate at 8:50 a.m.; he looks down the duration of his run past schoolyard. Parents began to arrive - they get out of their cars and collect their children from backseats, who sling on backpacks and head for the schoolyard. The parents divide into two categories: those who leave the cars and walk their children to the door and those who stay in the running vehicle, watching their children cross the school boundary before pulling away. The parents who walk their children to the door follow a strict pattern with few deviations. The adult walks the child through the main gate, up the cement walk, and waits on the walk while the child leaves to the door their class will enter through. Once the child leaves, the parents walk back down the walk, through the gate, climb into their car, and pull away. Once inside the boundary, the children leave their backpacks near doors and form themselves into groups, leaving few children alone. A second

adult man walks past at 8:54 a.m.; he is looking down at his cellphone and continues to do so until he reaches the crosswalk. As more children arrive, the noise permeating my window increases. A bell rings at 8:58 a.m. and an adult supervisor exits the school through the main door and begins to wander through the schoolyard. Children move around the adult, avoiding interaction, leaving ample space between themselves and the adult supervisor as they move around the yard. The second bell rings at 9:12 a.m. and the children become quieter and hurry towards the doors where they have left their backpacks. At the door, the children form flexible, moving clumps in a rough line. The clumps stabilise with the second bell at 9:13 a.m., as the adult supervisors open the doors to let in the children. As the children begin to move, they draw themselves into a cohesive line.

In these first 45 minutes of the day, I observed the four phenomena that emerged in this project, embodied in the four bodies interacting within the school space. First, the children move in groups, self-organising throughout their time in the schoolyard, and demonstrate an affective change when moving between the schoolyard and school building. Second, the adults acting as supervision cross the boundary of the schoolyard and are treated as acceptable but “other” by the children. Third, the parents appear to negotiate with themselves how much they can enter the institutional space which, while public, is intended for children. Finally, unaffiliated members of the public who pass by the school are in a constant negotiation of permissions for their gaze; some may look into the yard, while others must look down or away.

This article uses Deleuzian concepts of coding machines, affect, and facialization to

address how space codes bodies, through their interactions with boundaries and “leaking” affect.² I demonstrate the way space is in a constant process of making social meaning and how the assemblage of the school affects dispositional change on the surrounding bodies. An elementary school yard in Ottawa and the surrounding sidewalk was the site of data collection composed of observing bodies interacting with and giving meaning to space through participant observation.³ I consider how navigating boundaries refigure and recode bodies and how the space pulls out an affective disposition in the bodies with which it interacts.⁴ Boundaries serve as a form of modulating control enacted on different bodies in different and changing ways.⁵ As the body crosses or approaches boundaries, the body is marked and coded, as a means of making the body legible in the new space. A form of a modulating control, these spaces are not entirely separate and “leak” into one another; the open spaces of the gates and doors of the school limit the ability of the school space to contain itself, making it “leaky”.⁶ By posing the school space as leaky, I argue that the space touches bodies inside and outside of its boundaries and is affectively touched by

² Erin Manning, ‘What If It Didn’t All Begin and End with Containment? Toward a Leaky Sense of Self’ (2009) 15 *Body & Society* 33.

³ Gary Schwartz and Don Merten, ‘Participant Observation and the Discovery of Meaning’ [1971] *Philosophy of the Social Science* 279; Gillian Evans, ‘Practising Participant Observation: An Anthropologist’s Account’ (2012) 1 *Journal of Organizational Ethnography* 96; Annette Watson and Karen E Till, ‘Ethnography and Participant Observation’ in Dydia DeLyser and others (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Geography* (SAGE 2009) 121; Sarah Pink, ‘Mobilising Visual Ethnography: Making Routes, Making Place and Making Images’ (2008) 9 *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* np.

⁴ Peta Malins, ‘City Folds: Injecting Drug Use and Urban Space’ in Anna Hickey-Moody and Peta Malins (eds), *Deleuzian encounters: studies in contemporary social issues* (Palgrave Macmillan 2007).

⁵ Gilles Deleuze, ‘Postscript on the Societies of Control’ (1992) 59 *October* 3.

⁶ Manning (n 1) 33.

those bodies in return. These affective connections are seen in the four phenomena listed above.⁷ This understanding poses the school space as a multiplicity,⁸ a piece in any number of assemblages at once,⁹ as the school is in a constant state of becoming along with all of the bodies with which it interacts. As parties to relations of becoming, the school space works affective changes on the bodies, and the bodies deterritorialize and reterritorialize the space.¹⁰

This article offers insight on how the coding and recoding of bodies, children and adult, in a space impacts the understanding of social space, in turn, illustrating regulation at a micro or local level. Making the roots of micro-level regulation in children visible allows researchers to better understand the “becoming-child” and the effects of such regulations.¹¹ By observing the engrained regulation of adults in social spaces, I contribute to literature of regulation the concept of navigating permissions and demonstrate *how* public spaces are spaces in which people navigate their own internal regulations. I offer a further contribution on how the affect of a space can leak past boundaries and cause dispositional and comportment changes in bodies outside of the barriers.

This article is presented in four sections. I begin by introducing the research methods,

⁷ Brian Massumi, *The Power at the End of the Economy* (Duke University Press 2015).

⁸ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (University of Minnesota Press 1987) 26; Karl Palmås, ‘Predicting What You’ll Do Tomorrow: Panspectric Surveillance and the Contemporary Corporation’ (2011) 8 *Surveillance & Society* 338.

⁹ Manuel De Landa, *Assemblage Theory* (Edinburgh University Press 2016).

¹⁰ Christopher Stanley Stanley, ‘Spaces and Places of the Limit: Four Strategies in the Relationship between Law and Desire’ (1996) 25 *Economy and Society* 36; Malins (n 3); Andreas Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, ‘Atmospheres of Law: Senses, Affects, Lawscapes’ (2013) 7 *Emotion, Space and Society* 35.

¹¹ Manning (n 1); Brian Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (Duke University Press 2002).

passive participant observation. The following section, the theoretical framework, outlines my Deleuzian approach. Next, I discuss the findings of the research. Finally, I offer discussion and conclusion, including the limitations of the research.

Methods This paper relies on formal and informal passive participant observation of an Ottawa public school. In her video-ethnographic observation of a classroom, MacLure demonstrated the power of participant observation as a mode of observing dispositional changes caused by affect.¹² Participant observation lends itself well to studies of affect, as affect studies recognise that all bodies in a space leak affect.¹³ By remaining distanced from the participants, they remain affectively unaffected by my observations.¹⁴ I completed the formal observation through the front window of my home across the street from the school over three full days from 8:30 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. that took place over a two-month period, two on weekday and one on a weekend. This passive observation is informed primarily by visible interactions and secondarily by collective noise.

As a resident of the neighbourhood, I have informal observations to provide context. While the informal observations resist the possibility of being organised and coded, they still constitute valuable data.¹⁵ Being a member of the larger community lends this study some of the attributes

¹² Maggie MacLure and others, 'Animating Classroom Ethnography: Overcoming Video-fear' (2010) 23 *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 543.

¹³ Manning (n 1); Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual* (n 10).

¹⁴ MacLure and others (n 11).

¹⁵ Ken Gale, *Madness as Methodology: Bringing Concepts to Life in Contemporary Theorizing and Inquiry* (2018)

<<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=1734452>> accessed 7 April 2019.

of an immersive ethnography,¹⁶ but the distanced observation and lack of interaction leave the specific context of each event undefined.

PART 1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Deleuze and Guattari understand the concept as a rhizomatic creation of philosophy, each unique concept connected by a range of linkages on the plane of immanence, with each connection a line of flight to connect things in a new way, without requiring the uptake of the entire world view.¹⁷ This paper relies on three concepts of Deleuze and Guattari to understand the interaction of body and space: coding machines, affect, and facialization.

Coding Machines. Machines are the mechanisms that break the flows of the previous machine to further flow of production.¹⁸ The machine “functions as a break in the flow in relation to the machine to which it is connected,” producing a “continuous, infinite flux” as everything in the social-material world is made through break-flows and the “welling up” of desire.¹⁹ Stored in every machine is a code, dependent and inseparable from how the code is recorded and transmitted and from the relations of the connections that record and transmit it.²⁰ The code plants meaning onto and into the thing in its ongoing chain of interactions with the machines. As the thing moves through and breaks from machines, it is continuously recoded within itself and by those observing

¹⁶ Pink (n 2); Watson and Till (n 2).

¹⁷ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* (Columbia University Press 1994).

¹⁸ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Penguin Books 2009).

¹⁹ *ibid* 36–37.

²⁰ *ibid* 38.

it in an assemblage of breaks and flows.²¹ Coding segments everything into binaries: adult-child, school-not school, all segmented “according to its... assigned purpose.”²² The more heavily coded a thing is, the more rigidly it fits within certain relations. Codes can themselves be coded, or overcoded, with further meaning; in *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari describe tribal signals that code a body within one group being overcoded by the empire to mean something new and different simultaneous with the signals’ initial meaning. Segmented space is linear and is overcoded with purpose, and thus, striated; Deleuze and Guattari describe the school as telling individuals, “You’re not at home anymore.”²³

Each such segment is “underscored, rectified, and homogenised in its own right, but also in relation to the other [segments]”,²⁴ in which codes give meaning equally through what they are not. Bogard demonstrates this in his depiction of perfection as smoothness, and thus perfectly unsegmented;²⁵ any marking gives meaning by striating and coding the body. The coded body makes visible and legible the process of the machinic construction of meaning-making.²⁶ Guattari saw coding machines as “affective object[s]” or “affective events,” that produce subjective and collective subjects through flows of desire.²⁷ The bodies coded by their interactions with the school space are thus subjects of affect.

²¹ William Bogard, ‘Smoothing Machines and the Constitution of Society’ (2000) 14 *Cultural Studies* 269.

²² Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7) 208. See also Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual* (n 10).

²³ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7) 209.

²⁴ *ibid* 211.

²⁵ Bogard (n 20).

²⁶ Judith Butler, ‘Foucault and the Paradox of Bodily Inscriptions’ (1989) 86 *The Journal of Philosophy* 601.

²⁷ Félix Guattari, ‘On Machines’ (1990) 6 *Journal of Philosophy and the Visual Arts* 8, 8; Bogard (n 20) 287.

Affect. Affect defies definition; not an action or emotion, but rather an imperceptible cause of a dispositional change, only known by knowing what the body does.²⁸ Affect is not separate from the material world, as it is linked to sensory experience, experienced in the body, and caused by experience in the material world.²⁹ An emotional response follows the affect as a conscious response.³⁰ The body is capable of affecting and being affected, which defines the individual and can be mapped to show how the capacity for becoming reaches other bodies relationally.³¹

A distinction between internal, individual experience and the external world is a false distinction; both internal and external worlds are pieces of and affected by atmosphere.³²

²⁸ Jamie Lorimer, 'More-Than-Human Visual Analysis: Witnessing and Evoking Affect in Human-Nonhuman Interactions' in Rebecca Coleman and Jessica Ringrose (eds), *Deleuze and research methodologies* (Edinburgh University Press 2013) <<http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=1168196>> accessed 8 February 2019; Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos (n 9); Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick and Adam Frank, *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity* (Duke University Press 2003); Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7) 257.

²⁹ Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos (n 9) 36; Jen Tarr and Helen Thomas, 'Mapping Embodiment: Methodologies for Representing Pain and Injury' (2011) 11 *Qualitative Research* 141; Wanda S Pillow, 'Exposed Methodology: The Body as a Deconstructive Practice' (1997) 10 *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 349; Nichola Wood and Susan J Smith, 'Instrumental Routes to Emotional Geographies' (2004) 5 *Social & Cultural Geography* 533.

³⁰ Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual* (n 10); Brian Massumi, 'EVERYWHERE YOU WANT TO BE: Introduction to Fear' in Brian Massumi (ed), *The Politics of Everyday Fear* (University of Minnesota Press 1993); Jo Labanyi, 'Doing Things: Emotion, Affect, and Materiality' (2010) 11 *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 223.

³¹ Rebecca Coleman and Jessica Ringrose, 'Looking and Desiring Machines: A Feminist Deleuzian Mapping of Bodies and Affects', *Deleuze and research methodologies* (Edinburgh University Press 2013) <<http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=1168196>> accessed 8 February 2019; Gilles Deleuze, 'Ethology: Spinoza and Us' in Jonathan Crary and Sanford Kwinter (eds), *Incorporations* (Zone 1992) 625.

³² Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos (n 9).

Describing a “rose-smelling room,” Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos illustrates affect as atmosphere, illustrating how it permeate the space and infiltrates every body the space holds, just as the smell of the rose permeates the air of a room.³³ As one moves through space, “our bodies traverse different level and spatial intensities,” opening the body up to dispositional changes as the atmosphere affects the body in “corporeal and incorporeal ways”.³⁴ Open to affect, the body is “leaky”³⁵ and, thus, collective;³⁶ affect spews from and permeates into the porous surface of a single body, connecting it in an affective assemblage in which the body is always a becoming-body characterised by multiplicity.³⁷

While affect connects bodies into a collective,³⁸ affect also “has a power over difference,” as it makes difference resonate with value.³⁹ Each difference is segmented and drawn into a phenotype – affective investment entrenches each segmentation.⁴⁰ The act of looking has an affective dynamic that “inscribes bodies” with meaning by placing the body into a phenotype, and thus, triggers the body to be facialized.⁴¹

³³ *ibid* 36.

³⁴ Malins (n 3) 159.

³⁵ Manning (n 1).

³⁶ Erin Manning, ‘Always More than One: The Collectivity of a Life’ (2010) 16 *Body & Society* 117.

³⁷ *ibid* 118.

³⁸ Manning (n 35); Massumi, *The Power at the End of the Economy* (n 6); Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual* (n 10).

³⁹ Stanley (n 9) 40.

⁴⁰ Brian Massumi, ‘Fear (The Spectrum Said)’ (2005) 13 *positions: east asia cultures critique* 31; Arun Saldanha, ‘Reontologising Race: The Machinic Geography of Phenotype’ (2006) 24 *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 9, 20.

⁴¹ Coleman and Ringrose (n 30); Lorimer (n 27).

Faciality. Flows and segments run over a body, which “[trace] [their] signs directly on to the body,” making the body territorialised and knowable.⁴² The body is coded in an event-space, subject to increased intensity by “the bodily force and energy given over to [its] significance”.⁴³ Faciality understands the body, specifically the face, as a site where the axes of significance and subjectification meet; significance serves as the “white wall” onto which markings are made; subjectification is the “black hole” which contain consciousness and passions.⁴⁴ Deleuze and Guattari describe faciality as a “white wall” and “black hole”: the white wall is the surface the emits signifiers (i.e., ‘school – home’, ‘work – play’), while the black hole absorbs the signifiers into the subject.⁴⁵ The abstract machine of faciality “constructs the wall” as a frame or screen for the signifiers to bounce off of to make meaning and “digs the hole” that consciousness and passion require to break through.⁴⁶

Overcoding is an operation that is the essence of the despot, the State – overcoding places all desires as the desires of the State.⁴⁷ The despot, as the concrete form of power, triggers the abstract machine of faciality.⁴⁸ The abstract machine gives meaning to decoded things by overcoding them with the meaning of the face. All pieces of the body become coded to the face when triggered and classify the body into a combination of units.⁴⁹ Phenotypes are a clump of

⁴² Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus* (n 17) 145.

⁴³ Jasbir K Puar, “I Would Rather Be a Cyborg than a Goddess”: Becoming-Intersectional in Assemblage Theory’ (2012) 2 *philoSOPHIA* 49, 60.

⁴⁴ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7) 167.

⁴⁵ *ibid.*

⁴⁶ *ibid* 168.

⁴⁷ Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus* (n 17) 192–199.

⁴⁸ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7).

⁴⁹ *ibid* 169–176.

bodies classified into a like unit; once the body is classified into a unit (i.e., the student), it collects with like units (i.e., other students) to define a phenotype.⁵⁰ A child is known as a child because the meaning overcoded onto the child-body is informed by the sticky unit characterised by age and the decision of the faciality machine that says such as body “passes” as a child.⁵¹ As other bodies observe the facialized body, the facialized body intakes affect while it serves as an affective trigger itself;⁵² the child’s facialized body make invoke a protective response, demonstrating some affective change in the observing body, but the observing body leaks affect back towards the child, who may feel safer or annoyed.

PART 2. FINDINGS

Over the time I observed, affective interactions occurred between bodies and the school building. The human bodies self-organised into four distinct kinds: children, adult supervision, adult parents, and unaffiliated member of the public. Nearly all members of the public were adults, with a few teenage members, and formed a distinct group from adults affiliated with the school. Each group navigated the faciality of each other and the school and served as conduits and receivers of leaked affect.

The school. Faciality is not limited to the face on a body. So too it is not limited to human bodies; the school building is a face and is facialized by interacting bodies. The school building is a white wall, coded and given meaning by those who look and interact with it; the school is a space

⁵⁰ Saldanha (n 39).

⁵¹ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7) 177.

⁵² Saldanha (n 39) 10.

intended for children in the role of students, a school is a place of production and, thus, of “machineries of desire”.⁵³ Foucault considered a school a space of discipline,⁵⁴ which Deleuze points to as a holdover from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries’ disciplinary societies.⁵⁵ As such, the school is intended to discipline the unruly subject into a productive subject within an enclosed environment; fences and walls contain the subject within the school just as they would within a factory.⁵⁶ While the comportment of the children in the lines outside the door demonstrate they are self-regulating and thus, the disciplined subjects of an enclosed environment, the change in the children’s comportment between the school yard and building demonstrate changing intensities of regulation.⁵⁷ Further, the regulation of the adults outside the school demonstrates Deleuze’s conception that “the enclosures are *molds*... but controls are a *modulation*.”⁵⁸ While adults are no longer the intended recipients of the control, the school affects change within the adult’s bodies, but the form that change takes has shifted and reformed to new shape and intensity. The control is not constant.

Modulating control segments the space of the school from other places, and thus, the school is a heavily striated space; it is a space that is “clearly delineated and arranged.”⁵⁹ The yard

⁵³ Alecia Youngblood Jackson and Lisa A Mazzei, *Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research: Viewing Data across Multiple Perspectives* (1st ed., Routledge 2012) 92; Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus* (n 17) 1–9; Gilles Deleuze, ‘Desire and Pleasure’ in David Lapoujade (ed), *Two regimes of madness: texts and interviews 1975-1995* (Semiotext(e) ; Distributed by MIT Press 2006).

⁵⁴ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (2nd Vintage Books ed, Vintage Books 1995).

⁵⁵ Deleuze, ‘Postscript on the Societies of Control’ (n 4).

⁵⁶ *ibid.*

⁵⁷ *ibid.*

⁵⁸ *ibid* 4.

⁵⁹ Malins (n 3).

is separated from the sidewalk by a black fence, there are concrete paths where one is intended to walk, and demarcated playgrounds where one is intended to play. These spaces themselves are markers on the white wall of the school, designating meaning and intention to segments within the schoolyard, indicating to all the kinds of assemblages it will make with kinds of bodies, indicative of the black hole of subjectivity in the desires embedded in intentions. The school's name marks the school building on multiple sides, another mark on the white face of the school.

As a piece of the urban city assemblage, the space around the school is equally striated;⁶⁰ the roads are gridded; the sidewalk is clear and maintained, even in the winter; there are crossing guards to direct the flow of traffic around the walking children and adults. The State apparatus institutes these striated spaces, different in nature from smooth spaces.⁶¹ The school space is not intended to have smooth spaces as the place of potential.⁶² The way the bodies navigate prescribed entries and exits from the yard demonstrates the intentions of the school space; I observed a girl wave to a vehicle parked outside a half-closed gate before running around to the main gate and back down the sidewalk to the vehicle. The half-closed gate had been closed and latched all day, and was only unlatched at the end of the school day. Despite being unlocked, the child would not leave through the previously latched gate and instead took a longer path around to the main gate. The main gate, as the prescribed entry and exit, is marked by different meanings and thus, different intentions and permissions.⁶³ Notably, the children and adults occasionally deviate from the intentions of the striated space and deterritorialize the space, even just briefly. These

⁶⁰ Stanley (n 9); Malins (n 3).

⁶¹ Ian Buchanan and Gregg Lambert (eds), *Deleuze and Space* (University of Toronto Press 2005).

⁶² Stanley (n 9).

⁶³ Lorimer (n 27).

momentary breaks into smooth space are opportunities to reflect on how bodies make space meaningful – find further discussion of this in the next sections.

The children-students. The children navigate the affective changes of boundaries more than any other cluster of bodies interacting with the school. The children cross boundaries not crossed by most adults and take on different markers as boundary-crossing recodes and overcodes their bodies with sticky, aggregate clumps, such as ‘child’, ‘friend’, ‘student’, and a ‘member of a parent-child unit’. These markers affect dispositional change in the child, which causes a change in the child’s comportment.⁶⁴ Often, the affective change was visible in the children’s self-organising, in both social groups and on an individual basis. Consider this particular moment in which a child is the subject of coding machines and affect:

March 28, 9:13 a.m.: A young girl walks up the sidewalk with a man, holding his hand. He is carrying her backpack. The bell rings, and the girl turns, takes her backpack, and swings it onto her back. She says something to the man before running up the rest of the sidewalk and through the gate... She does not look back as she places herself in line with her assembling classmates.

In this event, the young girl and man are breaking from the parent-child assemblage, as the young

⁶⁴ Malins (n 3); Anna Hickey-Moody and Peta Malins (eds), *Deleuzian Encounters: Studies in Contemporary Social Issues* (Palgrave Macmillan 2007).

girl crosses the barrier to become a student in a student-school assemblage.⁶⁵ As she crosses the barrier, she is decoded from the child belonging to the man and overcoded as the student belonging to the school.⁶⁶ The observed change in the girl's comportment indicates a change in affect and, thus, reflects the results of overcoding; outside of the gate, she presented as affectionate, relaxed, and connected to the man. Even after hearing the bell, she spoke to him animatedly. Inside of the gate, she continued past the barrier at which the man stopped, and prioritised the performance of student over the performance of daughter,⁶⁷ as she self-organised into her place in line without turning back and became focused on clumping with her classmates. In this instance, the girl is child-becoming-student.⁶⁸ This same kind of shift was seen in reverse for students-becoming-children as they leave the school grounds; once outside of the school space, the children were much more willing to touch each other and to touch the outside of the fence.

Moments like this one happened continually through the time of my observation, as the children crossed boundaries of one kind or another. For instance, it was uncommon for any children to move around the yard alone during recesses; they would break off of one group to move over to another group, but would only be alone for the time in which they moved between

⁶⁵ De Landa (n 8); Saldanha (n 39); Jessica Ringrose, 'Beyond Discourse? Using Deleuze and Guattari's Schizoanalysis to Explore Affective Assemblages, Heterosexually Striated Space, and Lines of Flight Online and at School' (2011) 43 *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 598.

⁶⁶ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7).

⁶⁷ Butler (n 25); Sedgwick and Frank (n 27).

⁶⁸ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7); Sarah Dyke, 'Disrupting "Anorexia Nervosa": An Ethnography of the Deleuzian Event' in Rebecca Coleman and Jessica Ringrose (eds), *Deleuze and research methodologies* (Edinburgh University Press 2013) <<http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=1168196>> accessed 8 February 2019.

groups. In the movement, the child broke from a relational assemblage with one group to move into a relational assemblage with another group, recoding one notion of ‘friend’ with another. The child’s absence from one assemblage and presence in another assemblage infiltrates affect into both friend groups.⁶⁹

There was one spatial exception to this trend – a set of benches were positioned in the corner of the yard and would be occupied nearly every recess with a child who was alone and separated from any social group. In these cases, the child has crossed a boundary into a space signified by being not for groups and is embodying the affective ‘aloneness’ of the space of the benches.⁷⁰ In the two instances where children left the benches during the recess, it was to join groups, demonstrating that the affective quality of the rest of the yard is one of ‘togetherness.’ While the children did not abide entirely by the State apparatus-imposed striations on the schoolyard⁷¹ (i.e., far more children played on the remains of a snowbank in the back of the yard than on the playground), the children navigated their own striations of space-meaning.⁷² The benches were for children alone, the cement pad was for playing with the basketball and soccer ball, and the children do not touch the fence from the inside.

The adults. There were two clusters of adult bodies associated with the school, demonstrating two different relationships adults had with the school boundaries. The adult-supervisors were those adults who inhabited the schoolyard, entering and exiting the schoolyard

⁶⁹ Sedgwick and Frank (n 27); Labanyi (n 29); Manning (n 1).

⁷⁰ Tarr and Thomas (n 28); Pillow (n 28); Ian Buchanan, ‘The Problem of the Body in Deleuze and Guattari, Or, What Can a Body Do?’ (1997) 3 *Body & Society* 73.

⁷¹ Deleuze, ‘Postscript on the Societies of Control’ (n 4).

⁷² MacLure and others (n 11); Lorimer (n 27); Jamie Lorimer, ‘Moving Image Methodologies for More-than-Human Geographies’ (2010) 17 *cultural geographies* 237.

via the school building. Most adult-parents did not cross the edge of the path demarcating the walk to the door from the schoolyard and only interacted with their children on the walk or the sidewalk. The two clusters offer the first demonstrable instance of navigating permissions; modulating control causes the different clusters of adults to understand their relationship to the school in different ways.⁷³ While each group is forming an adult-school assemblage, it allows for different permissions and thus, different boundary-crossings.

The adults-supervisors are in an assemblage with the school that expects them to be within the school and schoolyard. It also expects them to enter and leave the school in particular ways; for instance; on the two weekdays I observed, the teachers entered the school before my observation began in the mornings and exited around 5:30 p.m. from the door closest to the parking lot. The location of the door and parking lot leads to the adult-supervisors navigating one path onto and off of the school space, striating that space as the place to cross boundaries.⁷⁴ During school hours, the adult-supervisors use the main school doors to access the schoolyard.

In the schoolyard, the adult-supervisors are accepted bodies within the fence, but they are other from the children, as they do not go through the same kind of visible affective change in crossing from school building to yard. The adult-supervisor is coded as such inside and out; the adult-supervisor displays themselves as a supervisor the entire time they are visible within the school space. The behaviours displayed by the adult-supervisor include slow pacing of the yard, watching child-student groups, and responding to child-student needs. The overcoding of otherness arises from the affective change in the relationship between the adult-supervisor and

⁷³ Deleuze, 'Postscript on the Societies of Control' (n 4).

⁷⁴ Stanley (n 9); Malins (n 3).

the children. The adult-supervisor cannot have the same kind of assemblage with the body coded as 'child' as they might have the body coded a 'student'; thus, the adult-supervisor must have a different kind of control and a different relationship to the bodies inhabiting the space.⁷⁵ The clearest demonstration of the modulation of control enacted by the adult-supervisor is in the affective changes the presence of the adult-supervisor enacts on the child and the child-becoming-student. Consider two events:

March 28, 11:45 a.m.: A group of three boys are running across the cement pad towards the far corner of the snowbank. An adult woman is monitoring the yard from the middle of the space, standing along the edge of the cement pad. As the boys approach her, they slow down and jog around her, leaving a bubble between themselves and the woman. Once past, the boys speed up again and race to the end of the snowbank.

March 28, 12:04 p.m.: The first bell rung a minute ago, and the children have all formed lines outside of their doors. The door on the back of the school has three distinct lines, each a mass of still moving clumps. In the furthest line, two boys push another boy out of the line and continue to push him back towards the edge of the cement pad. I can hear a girl from that line yelling at the three boys to "Come back!" At 12:05, two adult-supervisors open the doors from the inside. The three boys immediately race back to the end of their line. The lines stop moving, and the clumps negotiate out into a single-file line.

⁷⁵ Deleuze, 'Postscript on the Societies of Control' (n 4); Saldanha (n 39); Malins (n 3).

In these two instances, the children and adult-supervisors interact in two distinct moments of coding. In the first, the three boys are each coded as ‘child’, which separates the child from the adult-supervisor and places them into an assemblage with less affective intensity.⁷⁶ They do not belong to any child social group and do not have meaning against the child in the yard outside the position of other, causing the adult supervisor to be overcoded by the children-students as trespasser, object, or point of safety. These meanings are all demonstrated in how the children interact with or avoid the adult-supervisor: children keep a bubble of uninhabited space around the adult-supervisor that moves as the adult-supervisor moves; the children use the adult-supervisor as a barrier in a game of tag; a child waves over the adult-supervisor for assistance getting down from a slippery area of the snowbank. Outside of the school building, the adult-supervisor is a white wall onto which the children place meaning.⁷⁷ At the moment in which the three boys slowed down, the adult-supervisor has the capacity to scold or interrupt the boys’ play through the modulating control signified onto them by their standing in the school. Stanley indicates that interruptions in flows expose every piece of coding machinery, thus understanding the adult-supervisor as an interruption in the flow of the boys’ movement exposes both the adult-supervisor and the boys as pieces of coding machines.⁷⁸ As an interruption, the adult-supervisor is truly other; the boys and the adult-supervisor are separate machines, connected affectively through desire and production, in assemblage through their relations, but *different* from each

⁷⁶ Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual* (n 10); Labanyi (n 29); Ringrose (n 63).

⁷⁷ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7).

⁷⁸ Stanley (n 9); Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus* (n 17).

other.⁷⁹

Later, in the second instance, the adult-supervisor is in assemblage with the children-becoming-students. As the children occupy the boundary and are in the process of being recoded from 'child' to 'student' in their own bodies and for the legibility of the adults and school, the adult-supervisor is in a comfortable assemblage with the student, which intensifies the closer the student comes to the classroom space.⁸⁰ As the adult-supervisor is more legible within the school building as a disciplinary figure of an enclosed institution,⁸¹ the children display more willingness to comport themselves diffidently when they recognise the subjectivity of the adult-supervisor in the building.⁸² Thus, even without visible prompting from the adult-supervisor, the children self-organise into a single-file line to enter the school.

Counter to the adult-supervisors being more legible within the school building, the adult-parents are legible outside of the schoolyard. During the morning arrival recounted in the introduction, the parents remain in their vehicles or on the walk. Only two parents entered the schoolyard throughout the period of my observation, which demonstrates that the adult-parents were interacting with the boundaries of the school space entirely differently from the adult-supervisors. There is no prescribed path for the adult-parents to navigate into the school space, which leads to each interaction with the school space to be a navigation of permissions. For whom is the space intended? How far into the space can the adult-parent enter? What does it mean to

⁷⁹ Deleuze, 'Desire and Pleasure' (n 52); Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7); Coleman and Ringrose (n 30).

⁸⁰ Maggie MacLure, 'The Refrain of the A-Grammatical Child: Finding Another Language in/for Qualitative Research' (2016) 16 *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies* 173.

⁸¹ Foucault (n 53); Deleuze, 'Postscript on the Societies of Control' (n 4).

⁸² Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7).

enter further?

Each of these questions is indicative of the faciality of the school building.⁸³ The intent of the school outlines the passions and desires of the space as a building and institution, and thus, the space's subjectivity. In the process of forming a distant assemblage with the school space as the adult-parents bring and retrieve their children, the adult-parents are affected by the productive desiring machine of the school and use that to define the limit of their permissions.⁸⁴ Those parents who did enter the schoolyard momentarily deterritorialized the space by interrupting the school space's meaning and intent.⁸⁵ This space is promptly reterritorialized as more adult-parents remain on the outside of the boundary and re-entrench the meaning of the space.

Bodies outside the school. It is the outside, unaffiliated bodies that demonstrate most clearly the leaking of affect beyond the striations of the fence and sidewalk.⁸⁶ Uncontained affect leaks away from the body of the school to permeate the bodies of members of the public who inhabit the sidewalk, making the bodies inhabiting the city assemblage collective.⁸⁷ The affect works changes in the bodies that navigate the sidewalk, subject to their own set of permissions. Consider the two adult men who walked and jogged past the school in the first account. As the adult men who were not adult-parents or -supervisors passed the school, they both looked down or ahead. This same pattern was readily apparent throughout my observations, both while the

⁸³ *ibid.*

⁸⁴ De Landa (n 8).

⁸⁵ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7); Stanley (n 9).

⁸⁶ Manning (n 1).

⁸⁷ Manning (n 35); Manning (n 1).

children are outside and while there are no children in the yard, demonstrated in these three instances:

March 28, 11:52 a.m.: An adult man walks past on the far side of the street, walking along the school fence. His posture is very straight, and he looks ahead in a way that appears very purposeful. There are children in the schoolyard.

12:27 p.m.: An adult man crosses the street at the start of the school fence, jaywalking to get to the sidewalk opposite the school. He continues along the sidewalk without making eye contact with the school. There are children in the schoolyard, including one boy seated on one of the benches in the nearest corner.

3:07 p.m., An elderly-appearing adult man walks past the school with a dog. The dog is very interested in sniffing the bottom of the fence, but the man looks down at the sidewalk as he passes the school. The schoolyard is empty.

While I observed adult women, who passed the school without looking at the school, the adult men as a kind appeared to the author more attentive to the act of not looking. This distinction in the gaze points to the affective changes the faciality of the school brings about in the body of the unaffiliated member of the public. Each member who is touched by the school's leaky affect is navigating permissions over their gaze;⁸⁸ can they look at the school or must they look away? For

⁸⁸ Manning (n 1).

some, including young teenage boys or women pushing strollers, the permission is granted – both kinds of public member looked into the school space casually. For others, particularly adult men, self-permission is not granted, and the affective change in their body appears as purposefully looking forward or down.

By considering the despot as concrete power,⁸⁹ this permeating affect can be interpreted as a result of the school's faciality. The school space is intended to produce educated and disciplined children. Thus, written onto the white wall of the school face is its meaning as a place for children. Looking into such a space is to look in at children. Andrea Doucet demonstrates the tension of the male body in "estrogen-filled" spaces, such as those associated with child care;⁹⁰ she points to the way male bodies are understood in hyper-masculine places as acceptable and normal but are in tension with typically feminised spaces. Often, fathers in those spaces speak of feeling "a watchful eye on them."⁹¹ The watched male body in a feminised space explains the adult men who look purposefully away from the school area; the despot has triggered the abstract faciality machine to overcode the meaning of the man looking with the "pedophilic gaze".⁹²

The "pedophilic gaze" has been an ongoing discussion in academia⁹³ and has crept into

⁸⁹ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7).

⁹⁰ Andrea Doucet, "Estrogen-Filled Worlds": Fathers as Primary Caregivers and Embodiment' (2006) 54 *The Sociological Review* 696.

⁹¹ *ibid* 703.

⁹² Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus* (n 17); Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (n 7).

⁹³ Peter Coviello, 'Poe in Love: Pedophilia, Morbidity, and the Logic of Slavery' (2003) 70 *ELH* 875; Ara Osterweil, 'Reconstructing Shirley: Pedophilia and Interracial Romance in Hollywood's Age of Innocence' (2009) 24 *Camera Obscura: Feminism, Culture, and Media Studies* 1; Gunter Schmidt, 'The Dilemma of the Male Pedophile' (2002) 31 *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 473; Gaylyn Studlar, 'Oh, "Doll Divine": Mary Pickford, Masquerade, and the Pedophilic Gaze' (2001) 16 *Camera Obscura* 196; Gail Hawkes and R

public discourse.⁹⁴ The term refers to the conception of a sexualised gaze directed at children and often poses the gaze as necessarily existing in any public space children occupy.⁹⁵ It is often used to justify restrictions on space and bodies as forms of protection of the children.⁹⁶ In the instance of the men purposefully averting their gaze from the school - affectively being denied permission - the men are exhibiting the “movements [that] are moral,” or “in concert with public expectations”.⁹⁷ The reactions of the bodies who look away and those who look into the yard demonstrate that unaffiliated individuals are navigating permissions as clearly as the adult-parents’ navigate permissions on the cement walk. Likewise, the reactions demonstrate modulation of control,⁹⁸ as different bodies are subject to different permissions.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The interactions of different bodies and differently coded bodies with the school space allows researchers to make visible the underlying affect that leaks out of space and permeates the bodies with which it interacts. By focusing on permissions and boundaries, I expose the instances in which limits or boundaries overcode individual bodies and examine how coding manifests reactions through comportment. This article uses passive participant observation to illustrate the

Danielle Egan, ‘Landscapes of Erotophobia: The Sexual(Ized) Child in the Postmodern Anglophone West’ (2008) 12 *Sexuality & Culture* 193.

⁹⁴ Perry Chiaramonte, ‘Cops Bust Seven Men Playing Chess in Upper Manhattan Park’ *New York Post* (New York, 18 November 2010) <<https://nypost.com/2010/11/18/cops-bust-seven-men-playing-chess-in-upper-manhattan-park/>> accessed 4 December 2018.

⁹⁵ Osterweil (n 92).

⁹⁶ Chiaramonte (n 93).

⁹⁷ Doucet (n 89) 703.

⁹⁸ Deleuze, ‘Postscript on the Societies of Control’ (n 4).

movements of bodies through the school space, and the roles affect and meaning play in the movement. I observe and analyse four primary phenomena. Children self-organise throughout their time in the schoolyard and undergo an affective change of child-becoming-student when moving between the schoolyard and building. Adults-supervisors can cross the boundary of the schoolyard and are treated as acceptable but “other” by the children. Adult-parents negotiate with themselves and the control exerted by the school building the degree to which they can enter the school space and largely remain outside of the schoolyard’s boundary. Unaffiliated members of the public passing the school are in constant negotiations with themselves regarding permission for their gaze. This research offers insight into the affective consequences of space in urban city assemblages; despite being ‘public space,’ the elementary school poses affective boundaries through its faciality, boundaries which code and recode the bodies that cross them with meaning.

This study was subject to three primary limitations: time, weather, and access. As a project happening over two months, the time in which observation could happen was limited. As such, all of the time spent doing formal observations were done in winter months. As there is more traffic on the school grounds outside of school hours during warmer weather, observations over a longer period would allow for richer data presenting the events of the school over time. Further, while distanced observation is useful in the study of affect, it is limited in the amount of context-specific information that can be gleaned precisely due to its distanced nature. Future research could consider the observation findings in context with interviews with members of the school or recordings of the space to provide context.