DISCUSSION PUBLISHERS
Research Center · Open Access Edition

Literature and Theories

Jon Swain

Discussion Research ID	DPR-2026-1198
Year	2024
Field	Social Sciences
DOI	10.1007/978-3-031-69184-3_2
Author ORCID	0000-0002-3255-453X
Licence	CC-BY
Original source	Springer eBooks
Permanent link	https://discussionpublishers.com/research/989dadd6-07a5-4106-a75d-bfae4d943fe5
Publisher	Discussion Publishers discussionpublishers.com

Abstract

'Literature and Theories' published in 'Negotiating Gendered Identities in Primary School'

Republished by Discussion Publishers under the original CC-BY licence. Copyright remains with the original authors; please cite the original work.

Cite as: Jon Swain (2024). Literature and Theories. Discussion Publishers, DPR-2026-1198.

Check for updates

CHAPTER 2

Literature and Theories

This chapter discusses:

- theories of childhood;
- theories of gender, categorisations of boy and girl, masculinities and femininities;
- the body and embodiment;
- status, resources and strategies;
- identities;
- the exercise of agency;
- how schools operate;
- the aims and purposes of the two schools in this study;
- the ethos, or culture, of the two schools, and gender divisions;
- the official/formal and unofficial/informal cultures;
- the influence of the peer group.

2.1 Theories of Childhood

This book is about children and their childhood, particularly the part of it that they spend at school. Although there are many different conceptions about the institution of childhood, as a sociologist I argue it is important to remember that childhood needs to be understood as a social construction and is distinct from psychological understandings as a biological immaturity. As a variable of social analysis, it cannot be detached from

© The Author(s) 2025

J. Swain, *Negotiating Gendered Identities in Primary School*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69184-3_2

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

other variables such as social class, gender or ethnicity. In other words, there are a variety of childhoods. Two key points that we need to bear in mind about childhood are that (i) children's social relationships and cultures are worthy of study in their own right, independent of the perspective and concerns of adults; and (ii) children are not just the passive subjects of social structures and processes, but are able to exercise agency, and are active in the construction of their own social lives and the lives of those around them (James & Prout, 2015), albeit not in circumstances of their own choosing (Marx, 1963 [1852]; Messerschmidt & Bridges, 2022).

2.2 Theories of Gender

Many of my fellow academics at UCL who work in the fields of gender and sexuality are post-structuralists, who are particularly interested in language, the concept of truth and how people (in this case, children) are positioned, and position themselves, within and through various discourses. Although I sometimes draw on post-structural theories and theorists, in general I use interpretivist and constructionist theories and, rather than using the concept of discourse, I adopt the idea from Gilbert and Gilbert (1998) of localised practices and 'storylines' and 'repertoires of action' (p. 51), which are made natural or desirable within the local school cultures.

2.2.1 Categories of Boy and Girl

Before I move on to focus on theories of masculinity and gender, I want to address the two categories of boy and girl, which I use throughout this book, but which have, as Francis and Paechter (2015) argue, also 'haunted' the field of gender theory and its empirical applications. For many researchers working in the field of gender it has sometimes been difficult to get away from the dualism at the heart of the concept 'gender', and the conflation of 'sex' and 'gender' underpins much empirical work and, for some, can be problematic (Francis & Paechter, 2015). For Cream (1995), gender *and* sex are historically and geographically variable categories, which in turn means a radical questioning of terms such as 'boy' and 'girl'. However, the categories of 'men/boys' and 'masculinities' and 'women/girls' and femininities are actually inseparable. When these concepts are used by gender scholars, men/boys are used as the plural for 'man/boy' or and 'women/girls' for the plural of 'woman/girl', which usually

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

signifies a sex category, while 'masculinity' or 'femininity' refers to a gender construction. As Messerschmidt writes, 'both sex and gender grow out of the same embodied social practices in specific social settings and are thus mutually constituted' (Messerschmidt, 2023, pp. 2–3),[1] and I am viewing both sex and gender as socially constructed identities, not just gender. Through government policy in the UK (Equality Act, 2010), the conventional, and social media, awareness and discussion of trans-issues, and non-heteronormative sexualities, has been growing, and this includes in educational settings. Although I am aware that using categorisations of girl/boy, female/male, femininity/masculinity can appear to be like hegemonic binaries, and that there now exists a variety of non-binary gender and sex identities, this was the main way in which pupils were classified in their lived realities at these two schools. Although this suggests that it was difficult for pupils to explore other identities, the headteachers told me that there were no pupils in their school who identified as non-binary, gender fluid, non-conforming or trans.[2] Although Paechter (2021) maintains that a small proportion of children do identify across binary genders, young children have 'strongly held binary ideas about what is appropriate for girls and boys' (p. 618), and most have a resistance to any attempts to confront such stereotypes (Blaise, 2005; Davies, 1989; Martin, 2011). She concludes by stating that,

> the increasing prevalence of nonbinary identities among young people and adults is less likely to be reflected among younger children, particularly those in the early years of schooling. (p. 618)

As all the pupils that I spoke to appeared content to use the categories of girl and boy, I am also using gender distinctions based on sexed bodies, designated at birth. Although some researchers wish to deconstruct these binaries, this was not the focus of my research, and I did not ask the right questions to explore this theme further.

2.2.2 Masculinities and Femininities

Masculinities and femininities are, essentially, configurations of social practice that produce particular social relations and social meanings (Connell, 1995). Social constructionist theories view gender as relational, where masculinity defines itself in opposition to femininity. There are sociocultural constructions and associations attached to the two terms. For example:

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Masculine	*Feminine*
Rationality	Emotion
Strength	Weakness
Aggression	Care
Competition	Co-operation
Activity	Passivity
Independence	Dependence
Sporting	School work
Mathematics	Reading
Science	Nature/arts

Although these are a set of notional social and cultural constructions, and nobody is going to exhibit all the associative attributes listed above to the preclusion of others, these core values rest behind all constructions of masculinity or femininity and, indeed, it would be impossible to recognise or talk about any discernible masculinity or femininity without them (Francis, 2000; Gilbert & Gilbert, 1998). Of course, this is not to say that these traits are not sometimes contradictory or blurred nor that gender identity can be constructed differently by different people in different settings, cultures and social classes. Moreover, boys can display and enact qualities of feminine conduct and be bearers of femininity and vice versa. In other words, masculinity should not be tied to male bodies, and femininity to female bodies, but rather to sets of behaviours or practices. The fundamental point is that there are differences *within* the categories of 'boy' and 'girl', as well as *between* boys and girls.

Masculinity or femininity are not *a priori* ontological facts but a set of social, cultural and material practices: they are something we *do*, rather than *have* or *are* (West & Zimmerman, 1987). *Doing gender* is a recurring accomplishment and, as such, these practices are always open to contestation and/or the possibility of being expressed and performed in different ways. We have come a long way from the socialisation/sex-role frameworks which informed earlier studies of gender in primary and infant schools (e.g. Clarricoates, 1978, 1980, 1987; Delamont, 1990; Evans, 1987; Serbin, 1980). Many writers (e.g. Connell, 1995; Mac an Ghaill, 1994, 1996; Skelton, 2001) have persuasively argued that theories of socialisation and sex roles are inadequate as they ignore the complex, dynamic and frequently contradictory nature of gender. These theories of socialisation imply that there is a general social consensus about gender roles which can be used as a guide and 'learnt' in a one-way mechanical process; while sex-role theories suggest that there are a set of universal,

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

unitary male and female characteristics which have somehow been defined as normal, and on which children can model themselves. There is no single consensual model for children to internalise (Gilbert & Gilbert, 1998); instead, there are a competing and conflicting variety of styles of masculinity (or versions of being a boy) or femininity (or versions of being a girl), which change according to time and place and with the people who are involved.

Formations of Masculinity

The most notable examples of research about masculinities in the UK with this age group since the millennium (some of which include girls) can be grouped under the following headings: *academic achievement* (Francis, 2010; Skelton & Francis, 2011; Wells, 2016); *constructions of masculinity* (Paechter, 2006, 2007; Renold, 2005, 2007, 2013; Swain, 2000, 2002a, 2002b, 2003a, 2003b, 2004a, 2023); *gender relations and sexualities* (Atkinson, 2021; Hall, 2020; Renold, 2002, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2013; Swain, 2004b); *power, friendship, humour and status* (Jago et al., 2009; Schiffrin-Sands, 2021). There has also been important research about masculinities from Australia, Finland, South Africa and the US, some of which I refer to in the book (Bhana, 2008, 2013, 2016; Bartholomaeus, 2012, 2013; Bhana & Mayeza, 2016, 2018; Huuki et al., 2010; Manninen et al., 2011; Mayeza & Bhana, 2020, 2021; Messerschmidt, 2020).

Drawing on the highly influential work of Connell (1995), I am conceptualising masculinity as social construct, occupying a place in gender relations. Generally regarded (at least by sociologists) as being in the plural, masculinities are constructed, negotiated and performed, and, as I have written, are defined in relation to, and against, femininity. They are not only multiple but also fluid and contextual, with meanings of being a boy (and a man) contingent on time and place, and the relations with people involved. Moreover, because they are dynamic and not fixed, and because they are constructed in specific settings and historical circumstances, they are always provisional and therefore open to contestation and change.

2.2.3 Dominant and Hegemonic Masculinity

Theories of masculinity have experienced a number of changes since the early part of the century. A major conceptual breakthrough in the field of Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities (CSMM) in recent years has

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

been the move to resolve the difference between dominant and hegemonic masculinities, which some gender scholars have used interchangeably. For example, Martin (1998) raised the issue of slippage and inconsistent applications of the concept of hegemonic masculinity, observing that some scholars equated the concept with a static type of masculinity, or with whatever form that happened to be dominant in a particular place at a particular time.[3] Building on work of Martin (1998), Flood (2002), Connell and Messerschmidt (2005), Schippers (2007) and Beasley (2008), this has been chiefly led by Messerschmidt (2018, 2019), who writes that, whereas dominant masculinity is the most culturally celebrated version of boyhood on show, and provides a blueprint of how to think and act in a particular setting, hegemonic masculinities 'legitimate an unequal relationship between men and women, masculinity and femininity, and among masculinities' (Messerschmidt, 2018, p. 75). Messerschmidt also notes that dominant masculinities can also, at certain times, be hegemonic.

2.2.4 Subordinate Masculinity

Subordinate masculinities are seen as being inferior, or lesser, to the dominant and/or hegemonic form: in other words, they are the antithesis of these expressions of boyhood (or manhood). As all masculinities are constructed in contrast to being feminine, those located at the base of the hierarchy will be symbolically aligned to femininity and prone to have characteristics of the feminine forms. The various strategies of subordination that boys use against each other are often constructed under the two generic captions of 'difference' and/or 'deficit' (or deficient) (Swain, 2003b).

2.2.5 Personalised Masculinity

There is also a more egalitarian, non-hierarchical, form of masculinity, which is outside Connell's framework and which was first proposed by myself (Swain, 2006): *personalised masculinities.* Messerschmidt (2018) refers to this pattern as part of a group of 'positive' masculinities that have the potential to become counterhegemonic. Just because there is a culturally celebrated and commanding form of masculinity in each setting, it does not necessarily mean that all boys (or men) will try to copy all, or even *some,* of its features. While there will be some boys who do not want to become involved with the leading group of boys because they lack the

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

resources to do so (e.g. they are not physically strong or quick, or skilful at, say, football), other boys will make the deliberate choice not to engage with them out of preference. They are happy to practise their own personal interests such as music, computer games or specialised hobbies. As they are no threat to the elite groups they are usually ignored, rather than subordinated, and they have no wish, or need, to subordinate others.

2.2.6 Caring Masculinity

I have also been attracted by the relatively recent and burgeoning theories of caring masculinities, which originated from the work of Scambor et al. (2014), who were interested in engaging more men in issues of gender equality (e.g. Beglaubter, 2021; Eisen & Yamashita, 2019; Elliott, 2016, 2020). Elliott describes caring masculinities as being softer, more inclusive, patterns that rebuff patriarchal domination and champion more feminine qualities of interdependence, tolerance, care and positive emotion (Elliott, 2020). Caring masculinities both embrace and critique Connell's theory (Elliott, 2016). For example, Hanlon (2012) argues that dominant and hegemonic masculinities may encourage men to eschew their need for emotional intimacy and cause embarrassment, or even shame, when they feel unable to live up to hegemonic ideals. Moreover, Seidler (2007) writes how Connell's conception of masculinities is 'locked into relations of power' (p. 12), which makes it more difficult to think about the daily lived realities of men's (and young boys') experiences and vulnerabilities and may also constraint research about how masculinities may change in practice.

Hanlon (2012) also maintains that it is crucial to explore values of care and emotion, which are intertwined, rather than appearing averse to masculine power and dominance. However, it is also important to appreciate that not all men who practise aspects of caring masculinities necessarily support gender equality (Morrell & Jewkes, 2011). Moreover, Hunter et al. (2017) suggest that, rather than viewing these newly recognised caring forms as being analytically discrete, it is also possible to view them as being subsets of the dominant or hegemonic forms. This relatively recent conception remains a contested area in the literature and, so far, has mainly been applied to middle-class, white men such as fathers (Beglaubter, 2021) and, as far as I know, has not been used with boys. I mention this concept although, as we will see, rather like Hunter et al. (2017), I argue in Chap. 9 that they form part, and are therefore a subset,

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

of my own concept of blended masculinity. Of course caring is also huge part, and an integral trait, of femininity and although specific caring aspects can be identified and applied, there may not be a need to view caring femininities as a discrete form in their own right. When I am using the term I am referring to individuals who care and show kindness *about* and *towards* others in everyday relationships (King & Swain, 2024), as many boys in this study did. However, I recognise that these issues are still being debated in the gender fields.

2.2.7 Blended Masculinity

As we will see below, comparatively recent research about femininities from the UK, the US and Europe has suggested that the traditional practices of femininity—submissiveness, docility, vulnerability, quietness and general passivity—are being superseded by contemporary feminine attributes of, for example, authenticity, attractiveness, fitness and athleticism, which are enacted particularly by adolescent girls and young women. Whilst still displaying heterosexual appeal, these individuals also present a series of more masculine markers, such as self-control, independence, determination, competitiveness and individual freedom, which produces a hybrid form of femininity (e.g. Budgeon, 2014; Gonick, 2006; McRobbie, 2009; Messerschmidt, 2018; Ringrose, 2007). In this book, I am proposing that many of the boys in the study also performed a similar form of hybrid, or *blended masculinity*, consisting of conventional, or orthodox, masculine qualities such as being athletic, strong-willed, confident, independent (and able to stand up for oneself), which were also combined with more feminine associated attributes of showing emotion, kindness, caring and sociability. As we shall see, many boys in this study also possessed characteristics of being funny, (reasonably) clever, working hard and (reasonably) sporty, which, I argue, are more gender-neutral associations.

While I am not claiming that the term 'blended' masculinity is my own, or is unique, I propose that this form that I shall present in the empirical findings is a new pattern of masculinity found in school settings. The term has occurred in the literature before, although in slightly different ways from my own conception. For instance, Sears (2014) used the expression to conceive how women musicians (band leaders) blended masculine traits into their feminine identities while teaching, while Ganapathy and Balachandran (2019) used the name of gang members in Singapore to describe a mixture of their ethic masculinities ('Malayness' and 'Chineseness').

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Of course, the term 'hybrid masculinity' is a familiar one to the field of CSMM, but this formulation is different from the concept advocated by Bridges and Pascoe (2014, 2018). While this formulation also involves the incorporation of femininity, it focuses on privileged groups' such as white, heterosexual men, which, while giving masculine hegemony a greater flexibility, actually acts to obscure and secure its hegemonic power, thus providing a new way to legitimate unequal gender relations (Messerschmidt, 2018). Some scholars (e.g., Bridges & Pascoe, 2014, 2018; Demetriou, 2001; Eisen & Yamashita, 2019) working with the framework of hybrid masculinities also argue that rather than disappearing, hegemonic masculinities have changed forms. Instead of viewing this as implying that homophobia and heterosexism have decreased, they suggest that they still persist but can be seen in more subtle or different ways (e.g. micro-aggressions, through language, jokes etc.). Thus, while building on some of Connell's (1995) main ideas, Bridges and Pascoe's version preserves her emphasis on the hierarchical and unequal relationships between men and women (boys and girls) and among men (boys).

While there is nothing especially new about understanding that boys and men can embody and enact both masculine and feminine traits (e.g. Paechter, 2007) and vice versa (e.g. Halberstam, 1998; Pascoe, 2007), and that masculinity should not be confined to male bodies, but rather to arrays of behaviours or practices, I maintain that this version of blended masculinity I am proposing is a new and specific form of non-hegemonic and positive masculinity, more analogous to an emergent hybrid type of femininity. As we will see, the boys in my study may have been relatively privileged (as the white men were in Bridges and Pascoe's (2014) study), in the sense that they were middle-class and came from economically secure families (particularly at Church Green), but they were from multi-ethnic backgrounds. Instead of being hegemonic, or concealing hegemony, it was the most common form on show.

Formations of Femininity

The most significant empirical research into primary school-aged girls this century in the UK can be grouped under the following headings: *pupil cultures* and *identities* (Allan, 2009; Archer et al., 2012; Bragg et al., 2022; Francis, 2009; Francis et al., 2017; Mannay, 2013; Paechter, 2010; Paechter & Clark, 2007, 2016; Read, 2011; Renold & Allan, 2006; Skelton et al., 2009); *friendship groups* and *popularity* (George & Browne, 2000; Jago et al., 2009; Scholtz & Gilligan, 2017); *cross-gender*

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

relations (Clark & Paechter, 2007; Schiffrin-Sands, 2021; Swain, 2004c, 2014); *online cultures and media* (D'Lima & Higgins, 2021; Gibson, 2018; Purdy & York, 2016; Willett, 2015); and *sexualised culture and body images* (Atkinson, 2020; Huuki et al., 2022; Renold, 2002, 2003, 2013).

As with masculinities, there has also been a similar interest in femininities. Since entering the new millennium, there has been a considerable amount of debate in Critical Girlhood Studies (CGS) on issues about, for example, the degree to which types of femininities are able to incorporate masculine attributes (e.g. Francis, 2010; Paechter, 2006; Schippers, 2007; Willis, 2009); whether there can be hierarchies within femininities (e.g. Budgeon, 2014; Hamilton et al., 2019; Paechter, 2018; Schippers, 2007); and whether the notion of hegemonic femininity exists, either in wider society or in a particular, localised setting (e.g. Hamilton et al., 2019; Messerschmidt, 2020; Paechter, 2018). Messerschmidt's (2020) paper is a critique of Paecher's (Paechter, 2018) and Hamilton et al.'s (2019) conceptions of hegemonic femininity, and he maintains that the concept cannot exist because, although a particular formation of femininity can be culturally authoritative and dominant, it does not participate in the legitimation of unequal gender relations between men and women, masculinity and femininity, and among masculinities.

As I have written, gender performances are constituted within relations of power. Femininity, like masculinity, is an active construction and is about who we think we are, how we appear, what we do and how we act (Paechter, 2007). Being a girl, and the pathway to adolescence and adulthood, is an ongoing question of becoming (Hall, 1990, 1992), and girls/women, like boys/men, are active participants in repeated negotiations and performances of their gender identities. The position I am taking views gender as being relational, where feminine practices are socially defined in opposition to masculinity and other femininities, it is important to reinforce the point that this is not in a symmetrical relationship and femininity is often defined as a lack, or absence, of masculinity: what masculinity is not. Like masculinities, many feminist scholars (e.g. Allan, 2009; Blaise, 2005; Davies, 1993; Epstein, 1997; Francis, 2010; Hey, 1997, Keddie, 2005; Nayak & Kehily, 2013; Paechter, 2018; Renold, 2005; Ringrose, 2007) argue that there are multiple femininities, which are dynamic, mutable and contextual, contingent on time and place and the relationships involved, and I therefore draw also on some post-structuralist theories, particularly in the fluidity and performance of non-unitary identities.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Again, within each setting, it is generally possible to identify a form of dominant femininity Messerschmidt (2020), which is the most culturally admired, influential and accepted way of being a girl or woman. One of the most durable and widely accepted constructions of femininity that have been applied by feminist researchers to girls and women in many settings, including those with primary-aged and early-year children in schools (e.g. Bhana & Mayeza, 2019; Blaise, 2005; Kostas, 2021, 2022; Paechter, 2006, 2010; Reay, 2001), is Connell's notion of 'emphasised' femininity, which she defined as a type 'oriented to accommodating the interests and desires of men' (Connell, 1987, p. 183)—and boys. Determined through its unequal and subordinate relationship to hegemonic masculinity, emphasised femininity enables the legitimation of gender hegemony.

Some scholars have also referred to this as a type of 'hyper'-femininity (Allan, 2009), which is also a 'heterosexualised' femininity (Renold, 2005) where individuals express traditional femininity in heightened or accentuated ways, although always within Butler's (1990) 'heterosexual matrix'. A part of these typologies is the construct of the 'girly girl', where individuals both embody and overtly perform qualities that are associated with being '*too* feminine' (Budgeon, 2014, p. 327)—my italics. Francis et al. (2017) argue that 'emphasised' or 'hyper'-femininity and the construct of the girly girl are frequently applied interchangeably, often without any explanation. In this study, the term 'girly girl' was recognised and used by the schoolgirls themselves to describe girls enacting particular (stereotypical) feminine behaviours and investments.

However, as I have written earlier, recent feminist thinking has begun to embrace the relatively new conception of 'hybrid' femininity, which integrates both feminine and masculine associated attributes (e.g. Budgeon, 2014; Gonick, 2006; McRobbie, 2009; Messerschmidt, 2018; Ringrose, 2007). My study also suggests that some younger girls have also begun to embody and practise many of these qualities and, thus, increasingly, the dominant gender construction for many young girls today is a 'hybrid' femininity. This is redolent to the concept of 'hybrid-girlhood' delineated by Willis (2009) in her research with pre-adolescent girls in the US, in which she demonstrated these girls merged conventional aspects of femininity and masculinity into their gendered performances. Willis (2009) also highlighted the role of agency, which she maintains, is integral to understandings of girls' identity constructions, and I apply it in this study to mean the capability and degree to which individuals are able to 'exercise control' (Bandura, 2001, p. 11) over events and situations. (I discuss the concept of agency more fully below.) Despite individual lives

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

being always shaped by the structures and social conditions they find themselves in, I posit that hybrid femininities have a particular agentic quality and offer opportunities to perform different ways of being and *doing* girl.[4]

Some writers, such as Budgeon (2014), McRobbie (2009) and Messerschmidt (2020), argue that, at least so far, this hybrid form has not resulted in a breakdown of unequal gender relations. When it is aligned in a subordinate relationship with hegemonic masculinity, although it replaces Connell's (1987) conception of emphasised femininity, it actually becomes its own new contemporary version of emphasised femininity. Because it does not require girls to discard *all* feminine qualities, it does not threaten masculine privilege (Budgeon, 2014, p. 327) and is therefore involved in the continuing reproduction of gender hegemony. As McRobbie (2009) writes, hybrid femininities can remain 'reassuringly feminine' (p. 57).

In many ways, the concept of hybrid femininity is not new. Paechter (2006) reminds us that Stoller (1968) considered this over 45 years ago and concluded that the degree of masculinity or femininity that a person 'has' as being variable (p. 259). Paechter (2006), herself, also wrote almost 20 years ago that is important to 'understand that not all masculinities are entirely masculine, or femininities feminine' (p. 262). However, my argument is that theories of hybrid femininity are becoming increasingly debated, sophisticated and more developed.

In relation to hybrid femininity, it is also necessary to mention the work of Halberstam (1998) on female masculinity. Using queer theory, her research study has been influential in showing that gender can be separated from the gender-appropriate body and that femininity and masculinity cannot be reduced to female and male bodies. Halberstam posits that the idea of female masculinity dates back well over 100 years and that women (and girls) can take on the appearance of masculinity in ways that unearth the workings of masculinity itself (Nayak & Kehily, 2013). Halberstam argues that girls should eschew femininity, as it is commonly pathologised, and gives an example of a childhood tomboy as being an archetypal expression of female masculinity, which is 'viewed benignly as a girl's agentic desire to enjoy the freedoms associated with boyhood' (Nayak & Kehily, 2013, p. 198). Halberstam maintains that girls' freedom, and indeed, their world, narrows once they reach puberty. However, her/his work has been critiqued by academics such as Francis (2010), Nayak and Kehily (2013) and Paechter (2006). Nayak and Kehily point out that there is a 'striking lack of engagement with femininities in any

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

form throughout the text' (p. 202) and that Halberstam's writing is angled too much towards the world of masculinity, which becomes reified and viewed as a signifier of dominance and power. This means that femininity is seen as being inferior to masculinity. Paechter (2006) also questions the placement of the grammar in the term 'female masculinity', arguing that using 'masculinity' as a noun implies there is a thing being named, and suggests that masculinity is something concrete and fixed, rather than being complex and mutable, particularly when disassociated from maleness. Paechter's preferred formulation is 'masculine girl/woman' (or 'feminine man/boy'), which, she argues, 'allows for girls and young women to behave in masculine ways, without having this as their central defining quality' (p. 261). The form of hybrid femininity that I am suggesting differs from Halberstam's conception in that it is not skewed particularly towards masculinity, it contains a mixture of feminine and masculine attributes, and the girls, certainly in this study, did not try, or want to, remove femininity from their identities.

2.3 The Body and Embodiment

As I have written, neither masculinity nor femininity exists as an ontological given but comes into existence as people act (Connell, 2000); that is the social, cultural and material practices through which, and by which, the boys' and girls' identities are defined are generally described in terms of what they do with/to their bodies, and as such I embrace the concept of embodiment (Turner, 1997, 2000). Although there are a number of ways of defining embodiment, it needs to be understood as a social process (Elias, 1978). Although bodies are located in particular social and historical structures and spaces, the children in this study are viewed as embodied social agents, for they do not merely have a passive body which is inscribed and acted upon, but they are actively involved in the development of their bodies throughout their school life (and indeed for their entire lifespan). Thus, as Connell (1995) argues, we should see bodies as both the 'objects and agents of practice, with the practice itself forming the structures within which bodies are appropriated and defined', and she calls this 'body-reflexive practice' (Connell, 1995, p. 61). The pupils experience themselves simultaneously *in* and *as* their bodies (Lyon & Barbalet, 1994, p. 54) and in this respect *they are bodies* (Turner, 2000). They can be seen being consciously concerned about the maintenance and appearance of their bodies, endeavouring to make it 'the instrument of the will' (Frosh

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

et al., 2002, p. 68); they can be seen learning to control their bodies, acquiring and mastering a number of techniques such as walking, running, sitting, catching, hitting, kicking and so forth, and using them in the appropriate ways that being a boy or girl demands. Moreover, they are aware of its significance, both as a personal (but unfinished) resource and as a social symbol, which communicates signs/messages about their self-identity. The body is thus an integral part of identity and of our biographies, for the process of making and becoming a body also involves the project of making the self (Shilling, 1993; Synnott, 1993).

There was a struggle over the body between the school system and the boys which was a contestation between control against agency: whilst some of the official practices of the school attempted to regulate and control the bodies to render them docile and receptive for 'better' learning, the children in this study were full of activity and agency and, I suspect, often resisted these attempts.

Connell (1995) suggests that the physicality of the body remains central to the cultural interpretation and experience of gender. Drawing on Bourdieu's (1986) notion of 'embodied' capital as a subdivision of cultural capital, Shilling (1991, 1993) argues that it is possible to view the body as possessing a 'physical capital', the production of which refers to the ways bodies are recognised as possessing value in various social settings. They may have power, status and/or an array of distinctive symbolic forms which are used as resources of agency and influence. Remarking on the significance of the body to human agency, and the attainment and maintenance of status, he argues that:

> the management of the body through time and space can be seen *as the fundamental constituent* in an individual's ability to intervene in social affairs and to "make a difference" in the flow of daily life. (Shilling, 1991, p. 654, original italics)

The notion of the body as a means of capital to gain status links into the next section, which discusses these themes.

2.4 Status, Resources and Strategies

One of the most powerful and urgent dimensions of school life that children have to deal with is how to gain status, which leads to a particular position in the peer group. The notion of status (Corsaro, 1979) can be

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

defined as prestige or 'social honour' (Weber, 1946), which comes from having a certain position within the hierarchy which becomes relevant when it is seen in relation to others. Weber (1963) has differentiated between *ascribed status*, which one is born with or given, and *achieved status* which one acquires through one's actions. For the pupils at school, status was not given but had to be earned through negotiation and sustained through performance, sometimes on an almost daily basis. Status can be gained in both the informal peer group and the formal culture of the school, and there is a relationship between these two areas. Sometimes this can cause a tension because, in some schools, if pupils try too hard to please their teachers they can antagonise their classmates (see Chap. 1).

The acquisition of status is interwoven with the development and construction of an individual's particular identity, and for boys and girls it is inextricably linked to the active construction of their masculinity and femininity: thus, the search to achieve status is also the search to achieve an acceptable way of being, which is also part of constructing an acceptable identity. However, although status may be acquired individually, it can also come through, and be confirmed by, the sense of collective belonging to a particular friendship group.

Status is achieved by an individual's ability to draw on and apply a series of resources and strategies which are available in any given milieu (Connell, 1998; Swain, 2004a; Manninen et al., 2011). They exist within determinate historical and spatial conditions, but some of the resources that are open will vary within different settings, and some may be easier to draw on than others at particular times and in particular places. They include the resources of *physicality and athleticism* (see Shilling in the previous section), which is often one of the most highly prized by the informal culture, but other resources include *personal resources* (e.g. being self-confident and assured, independent and able to make decisions) and *social resources* (e.g. being able to get on with people and form networks of friendships). There are also specialist forms of culturally cherished knowledge which act as a form of *cultural resources* (e.g. knowledge about computer games, being able to recite internet memes knowing and using the latest verbal expressions, which shows a person is 'modern' and adds up to a kind of 'savoir faire'). There is also a range of particular skills (e.g. in a sport) or *interpersonal* and *linguistic* skills (e.g. being articulate and able to persuade people), while another cultural strategy is using the strategy of humour to engender a laugh with friends, sometimes at the expense of a teacher. Sometimes the terms 'resource' and 'strategy' can become

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

conflated, and the distinctions blurred. Drawing on the work of Bourdieu (1986), I refer to resources as forms of capital or assets that relate to types of resources of power and strategies as the processes that individuals use to apply them. In other words, resources and strategies are the 'what' and 'how', respectively.

2.5 Identities

As we have seen, masculinities and femininities are invariably connected to identities as young boys and girls struggle to work out who they are and who they would like to become. Rather than being viewed as an unalterable, innate and unitary quality that people possess, as some, essentialised, core part of a person's personality that pre-exists them, or as something people somehow acquire at some point at a certain age, identities are, like masculinities and femininities, multiple and socially constructed, negotiated and performed. They are unstable and shifting; they are frequently contradictory; and different identities can be, and often are, adopted at different times in different social contexts. Identities are an unfinished project and always in process and, as Hall (1992) says, identity belongs as much to the future as to the past for it is a matter of 'becoming' as much as 'being', and it is also more about individuals having a series of ongoing 'identifications' by accepting, negotiating with, contesting and reconstructing meanings (Hall, 1992, p. 287), often based on particular 'key' individuals. By the time they reach the later stages of primary school, it is the children's peer group that has the greatest influence on their identity and establishes and organises the ways that enable or constrain particular activities and ways of being (Harris, 1998). Both the spoken, as well as the invisible and unspoken, group rules, codes and norms of their peer group, set the agenda about the kind of person a boy is supposed to be at a particular time and in a particular context (Hey, 1997).

However, I found it interesting that while my theories of identity may argue that it is something ongoing and is a lifelong project which is open to change, some literature suggests that identities are not properly formed until children reach secondary school. As we will see in the chapters where I present the empirical findings (Chaps. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9), I found the children who I talked to actually had a very good idea of who they were, what sort of values they had and what kind of person they would like to be in the future.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

2.6 Agency

As we have seen, masculinity and femininity are not finished products; rather, individuals 'do' gender in different ways in different, specific and situated, social situations. The children in this study are viewed as social agents who are active meaning-makers in their own lives, rather than simply the passive recipients of adult researchers' directives (Allan, 2009; Best, 2007; Fraser et al., 2004; Kehily, 2007; Maxwell & Aggleton, 2009, 2014). I also draw on the work of Giddens, and I view the boys and girls as 'skilled and knowledgeable agents' (Giddens, 1984), or agentic actors, who were able to exercise agency and were quite capable of consciously appraising and interpreting their own lives and social practices. However, this is not to say they were free human agents, and the boys and girls were not free to create their gendered selves in whatever way they chose, they were and are both constrained (and enabled) by the particular social conditions and structures available (Messerschmidt & Bridges, 2022). The children's identities were constructed through the project of the 'reflexive self' (Giddens, 1991, p. 32), that is where they are continuously working and reflecting on their identities, and where agency and structures act through each other.

The concept of agency can be viewed as complex, temporally situated and active. Although personal, or human, agency can be difficult to both define and identify, I am drawing on the definition proposed by Emirbayer and Mische (1998), who reconceptualise agency as a 'temporally embedded process of social engagement' (p. 963), informed by the past but also orientated towards the present and the future (as a capacity to imagine alternative possibilities). Essentially, I am also using the term to mean the capacity and degree to which individuals are able to act in particular ways or 'exercise control' (Bandura, 2001, p. 11) over events and situations. However, although I also recognise that the young boys and girls were 'skilled and knowledgeable agents' (Giddens, 1984), they found themselves living within the wider structural relations we have mentioned above and are only able to act as far as their structural position allows them to, or to paraphrase Marx's aphorism, individuals are able to 'make their own history, but not in circumstances of their own choosing' (Marx, 1963 [1852]). These structures mean that although the participants were able to exercise agency, their scope for their expression of agency was often limited, 'bounded' (Evans, 2002, p. 261) or curtailed. The crucial point is that there are possibilities for individuals to change under the right

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

circumstances and, as I have already argued, I found that blended masculinities and hybrid femininities have particular agentic qualities that gave the children in this study a number of choices and enabled them to make a number of decisions.

2.7 How Schools Operate

In order to understand the life of a 10–11-year-old boy and girl at school, we need to attempt to understand the purpose of schools and how they operate. Epstein and Johnson (1998) remind us that all schools contain relations of (teacher) control and (pupil) resistance, although the pupils at the two schools in this study seemed to have come to a pragmatic accommodation with the formal school regime and were largely compliant. For Bernstein (1996), schools are, essentially, regulatory institutions which attempt to control pupils, and I argue that they utilise Foucauldian techniques of discipline, surveillance, classification and normalisation (Foucault, 1977). Children are watched, judged, measured, described, compared, trained, corrected, examined and classified almost as soon as they step into the classroom on their first day, as they 'learn' to become pupils. Formalised assessments and ongoing testing in UK state schools now begin at the age of four and continue throughout a child's school life at regular intervals like an educational assembly line.

The discipline/surveillance relation is evident throughout using techniques of spatialisation, control of activity, hierarchies and normalising judgements. Spatialisation limits and shapes what can be done in certain spaces and means that pupils are taught within confined areas where everyone has to be visible, is (usually) assigned a place and keeps to it; hierarchies are created whereby each level watches over the lower ranks; and normalising and comparative judgements are made if an individual deviates from the norm, which is a far more subtle use of power that defines and classifies the individual as not only bad, but also as abnormal: a transgressor from the norm.

2.7.1 Space and Time

Massey (1993) maintains that space is 'one of the axes along which we experience and conceptualise the world' (p. 143). Pupils are positioned in multiple ways in schools, and their relations are not merely abstract relations but are enacted by bodies in space. Spaces limit and shape what is

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

being done in them, but also are shaped by these same activities. In Foucault's concept of spatialisation (Foucault, 1977), the capability of controlling space is an important constituent of power (Giddens, 1979). Shilling (1991) argues that space in schools is used as a resource to perpetuate adult domination over pupils, and notions of hierarchy are integrated into the division and compartmentalisation of the school space into areas of teaching, administration and recreation. School rules and regulations prescribe what is and what is not allowed in school which includes how bodies are to behave and how they are allowed to move and act in space (Nespor, 1997). For instance, pupils are taught to sit quietly and sit still and to put their hand up when they wish to ask a question; to line up in an orderly manner (usually in a single file, and sometimes in a prescribed order); to control their bowels and bladders; how to walk along the corridor; and how and when to eat in a narrowly prescribed time and space. In the two schools in this study, pupils were seated by gender so that boys and girls were seated alternatively.

Although pupils and teachers spend most of their time sharing the same space, some spaces are more open than others, and different social groups have different access to particular spaces. Opportunities to find private space for pupils are rare, as space in school is generally strictly controlled, regulated and surveyed. Pupils are usually not allowed into the school building at breaktime, and certain rooms are forbidden to them such as staff rooms, adult toilets and gym cupboards. However, breaktimes are times and spaces when pupils can have greater freedom and autonomy, and spaces (which are usually outside the school building) can seem more open and offer more possibilities for expression and movement. During breaktime at these two schools different groups of pupils were engaged in different activities which took place in different spaces: for example, some played football on the main playground, others, at Church Green, were also engaged in a range of other sporting activities (e.g. table tennis, cricket, hockey, netball, tennis), while others at both schools sat/stood and watched or talked in small groups or played made-up informal playground games.

Like space, time in schools is also a variable to be managed, regulated and controlled. Movement is mapped out and controlled at specific times: pupils and teachers have to be at certain points in space at prescribed moments of time. Schools stipulate when the school day starts and ends, when the pupils are supposed to enter and leave the classroom, the times of assembly, breaktimes and lunchtimes, curriculum activities are

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

prescribed and controlled by being timetabled and so on. Massey (1993) proposes that time and space are not discrete entities but form an amalgamated fourth dimension of space-time. In schools time and space are interconnected in time-space paths, and pupils follow these pathways which become routinised through repetition. However, this is not to say that pupils are not able to exercise agency and, as will see, although the underlying intention of schooling is to produce 'docile bodies' (Foucault, 1977, p. 136), the pupils in this study could sometimes negotiate their own meanings, modify and thus resist some of these attempts.

2.8 The Ethos or Culture of the Two Schools

Pollard (1985) describes the 'rather intangible "feel" of schools as organisations' (p. 115), choosing 'culture' ahead of 'ethos' or 'climate' to describe the formative nature of schools because of its necessary association with power and influence (Prosser, 1999). As we will see below, he differentiates between the formal and informal culture of a school. Donnelly (2000) describes ethos as a formal expression of the aims and objectives of an organisation. In the world of education, a school's ethos exerts a certain amount of power to condition people to think and act in an 'acceptable' manner (Donnelly, 2000).

Schools do not exist in a vacuum but are interconnected to wider, surrounding structures and cultures. An important influence that shapes the practices of the two schools' formal culture came from parental attitudes, their dispositions and the choices available to them. Parents make a difference and so does social class, for class is power and gives rise to better opportunities. The middle classes have recognised the link between examination success and improved career opportunities and generally have high expectations of academic accomplishment.

In many ways, the two schools had more similarities between them than differences (see Chap. 10). Both were concerned with teaching and learning, and all the pupils that attended told me that they were proud of their school and they enjoyed most of their learning in lessons and wanted to do well academically and achieve top grades. It was obvious that the pupils whom I met had formed a pragmatic and compliant accommodation with the formal school regime. Encouraged by supportive parents, they understood that examination success leads to increased career options and material remuneration, and therefore, they used the school as a resource which provides a means to an end.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Church Green could not be described as a community school in the sense that many of the pupils came by car from a few miles/kilometres away; moreover, as one of a number of fee-paying schools in the area, the parents had many choices of where to send their children. Parents had less choice at Wood Vale than the parents at Church Green, but although there were still a limited number of other accessible schools that could be used as an alternative, most children attended the school in their local, mainly middle-class, catchment area, which meant that Wood Vale was more integrated into the local community.

Educating the nation's children used to be seen as a public good, but since the 1980s, state schools have been placed in a competitive, neoliberal, marketised, accountability-driven system, which has been well documented (Ball, 2017; Keddie, 2016, 2017; Simkins et al., 2018), and education is now seen as a service. Schools are infused with discourses of corporate management, accountability, regulation and surveillance (the National Curriculum, Ofsted inspections,[5] league tables and SATs). The Key Stage 2 SATs (taken by children aged 11) have been used since the 1990s, but they have evolved with different governments' priorities and preoccupations, such as the current aim of requiring schools to teach grammar formally. The current assessments in place since 2016 include test papers in Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar (SPaG), Reading, and Mathematics (an arithmetic and reasoning paper and a further reasoning paper). Bradbury et al. (2021) document the pressure this puts on the teaching staff, and there is a yearly pressure to improve on the results which can cause a great deal of anxiety. State schoolteachers are now told *how* to teach as well as *what* to teach, and school budgets are largely based on pupil numbers meaning that local schools need to compete with each other. The academic reputation and performance at Wood Vale was (and is) primarily based on its SAT results.

Although independent, private, schools have less regulation and surveillance, and many have their own, arguably, less exacting inspection regime—the Independent Schools Inspectorate (ISI)[6]—they have own pressures. Parents pay a substantial amount of money with the primary aim of ensuring their children gain academic advantage, leading to places at prestigious universities and securing highly paid jobs and careers. Thus, these schools live and die by their results. Parents pay for success, but also to buy into contacts and networks concerning future university places and intern and employment opportunities, and basically, by sending their children to fee-paying schools, they are trying to ensure their children gain a

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

seat at the top table.[7] Walford (1984) also maintains that the particular ethos of the public schools encourages pupils to have good morals, be well behaved and work consistently hard.

Private, independent, schools have huge advantages over state schools and the gap between private and state schools in per-pupil resources has doubled since 2010 (Sibieta, 2021). The IFS (Institute for Fiscal Studies, 2021) found that the average private school pupil had £6500—or 91.5% more—spent on them during the 2020–2021 academic year than the average peer at a state school. They have far more resources in terms of space (e.g. for music rooms and libraries)' more spacious playing fields, equipment, more peripatetic staff (e.g. teaching music) and specialised teachers (Church Green had dedicated teachers for science, music, art, PE and games), greater curriculum freedoms (they do not have to follow the national curriculum) which enable them to create a broader and more balanced curriculum, less interference with pedagogy and lower teacher-pupil ratios (class sizes at Church Green were, on average, 22 compared to 30 at Wood Vale), and they can also ask pupils who are not performing well academically to leave. The impression conveyed at both schools was that they strove to produce empowered, confident, independent, but also kind and caring pupils, who were successful in a number of areas—be they academic or sporting (Wardman et al., 2010). However, I would argue that Church Green emphasised additional qualities of creativity and high moral values moral and social ease.

2.8.1 Gender Divisions

Gender binaries are built into the structures of the formal school culture (Bragg et al., 2022) and can be seen in school uniforms and sport and in differentiated practices such as having separate lists on the registers for girls and boys, lining up and classroom seating arrangements where girls and boys generally sit together alternatively in rows (as they did at both schools). There are also the architectural features, such as separate toilets for boys and girls, while playground spaces may also help reinforce gender differences, with more of girls' interactions tending to take place around the margins (Dyment et al., 2009; Thorne, 1993). However, the after-school clubs at both schools were, apart from rugby at Church Green, all open to pupils of either sex and, in the informal culture at both schools, boys and girls joined in together in all the playground sporty games such as the large daily games of football.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

2.9 The Two School Cultures: Official/Formal and Unofficial/Informal

An important analytical feature is the dual existence of a school's official/formal culture and the pupils' own unofficial/informal culture, which have also been identified (amongst others) by Connell et al. (1982), Pollard (1985) and Gordon et al. (2000) and which inform each other and work in relation to each other. The formal school culture is laid out in documents of the school and includes the management, policy/organisational and administrative structures, the teaching and learning, the pedagogy, the curriculum, the disciplinary apparatus and sport/games. The informal school culture is not intended to be in binary opposition, for it is different from, rather than a reaction to, and is in a continual negotiation with, the formal school culture. Although it also has its own particular hierarchy, rules, codes and criteria of evaluation and judgement, and many of its parameters are set by the formal regime, it has a whole life and meaning all of its own: it includes not only the relations and interactions between the pupils, but also the informal relations between pupils and teachers outside of the instructional relationship.

2.10 The Power of the Peer Group

Interaction with peers has long been acknowledged as playing a vital role in children's social and psychological development (Rogers & Kutnick, 1992). Another main argument in this book is that the construction of masculinity and femininity is a collective enterprise and that the pupils' own peer group is one of the most important features of any school setting. Each peer group has its own identity and series of cultural norms, and these are a key influence on the formation of the pupils' identities, which has been well documented in sociological research (e.g. Adler & Adler, 1998; Connell, 2000; Connolly, 1998; Gilbert & Gilbert, 1998; Harris, 1998; Jago et al., 2009; Manninen et al., 2011; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Pollard, 1985; Renold, 2005; Swain, 2004a; Woods, 1990).

Masculinities and femininities are socially organised and are a collective endeavour, and what children value most in school are opportunities for interaction with peers, for as Sutton-Smith (cited in Adler & Adler, 1998, p. 7) maintains, 'peer interaction is not just a preparation for life, it is life itself'. Harris (1998) points out that a child's primary goal is not so much to become a successful adult but rather a successful child and, therefore, the most important people at school are the other children for 'it is their

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

status among their peers that matters most to them' (Harris, 1998, p. 241). She further argues that the peer group has more influence on children than their parents in the formation of their identity, of who they are now and who they will become, and is the main conduit by which cultures are passed from one generation to another. Each peer group has its own cultural identity which can be said to refer to a 'way of life', or 'shared guidelines' (Dubbs & Whitney, 1980, p. 27), providing boys with a series of collective meanings of what it is to be a boy or girl. In some ways peer groups can be regarded as structures, representing Giddens's organised sets of rules and resources (Giddens, 1984), for they can be both enabling and constraining, and there are constant pressures on individuals to perform and behave to the expected group norms.

Notes

1. There is a succinct summary and discussion of the current debates around the categories of 'gender' and 'sex' written by James Messerschmidt (2023, pp. 2–4), which readers can turn to if they wish to understand more about this debate.
2. However, it needs to be admitted that headteachers are unlikely to know if children were gender fluid, non-binary, non-conforming etc. Only a very small proportion of children identify across binary genders at this age (Paechter, 2021). Most children either don't know or don't use these terms and are reluctant to talk about such matters.
3. I must admit that I had such an understanding of hegemonic masculinity in my own PhD research, which was published in 2001 (Swain, 2001).
4. This agentic quality also applies to the form of blended masculinity, of course.
5. OFSTED stands for the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills and is a non-ministerial department of His Majesty's government, reporting to Parliament. State schools and some independent schools are visited by a team of inspectors. Schools are given a rating or grade. A school can be judged either outstanding, good, requiring improvement or inadequate. When OFSTED has judged a school to be good or outstanding, inspectors will then normally go into the school about once every four years to confirm that the school remains good or outstanding and that safeguarding is effective. They will visit other schools more frequently.
6. About half of independent schools also have OFSTED inspections (Gov. UK). https://www.gov.uk/types-of-school/private-schools.
7. Only around 7% of the population attend independent schools, but they represent 74% of senior judges, 71% of high-ranking officers in the armed forces, 67% of Oscar winners and 50% of cabinet ministers (Verkaik, 2018).

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

References

Adler, A., & Adler, P. (1998). *Peer Power: Preadolescent culture and identity*. Rutgers University Press.

Allan, A. (2009). The Importance of Being a 'lady': Hyper-femininity and Heterosexuality in the Private, Single-sexPrimary School. *Gender and Education, 21*(2), 145–158.

Archer, L., DeWitt, J., Osborne, J., Dillon, J., Willis, B., & Wong, B. (2012). Science aspirations, capital, and family habitus: How families shape children's engagement and identification with science. *American Educational Research Journal, 49*(5), 881–908.

Atkinson, C. (2021). They don't really talk about it 'cos they don't think it's right': Heteronormativity and institutional silence in UK primary education. *Gender and Education, 33*(4), 451–467. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2020.1773410

Ball, S. J. (2017). *The education debate* (3rd ed.). Policy Press.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 1–26.

Bartholomaeus, C. (2012). 'I'm not allowed wrestling stuff': Hegemonic masculinity and primary school boys. *Journal of Sociology, 48*(3), 227–247.

Bartholomaeus, C. (2013). Colluding with or challenging hegemonic masculinity?: Examining primary school boys' plural gender practices. *Australian Feminist Studies, 28*(7), 279–293.

Beasley, C. (2008). Rethinking hegemonic masculinity in a globalising world. *Men and Masculinities, 11*(1), 86–103.

Beglaubter, J. (2021). 'I feel like it's a little bit of a badge of honor': Fathers' leave-taking and the development of caring masculinities. *Men and Masculinities, 24*(1), 3–22.

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. Taylor & Francis.

Best, A. (2007). Introduction. In A. Best (Ed.), *Representing youth: Methodological issues in critical youth studies*. New York University Press.

Bhana, D. (2008). 'Six packs and big muscles, and stuff like that.' Primary-aged South African boys, black and white, on sport. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 29*(1), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690701728654

Bhana, D. (2013). Kiss and tell: Boys, girls and sexualities in the early years. *Agenda, 27*(3), 57–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2013.834677

Bhana, D. (2016). *Gender and childhood sexuality in the primary school*. Springer. http://www.springer.com/in/book/9789811022388

Bhana, D., & Mayeza, E. (2016). 'We don't play with gays, they're not real boys … they can't fight': Hegemonic masculinity and (homophobic) violence in the primary years of schooling. *International Journal of Educational Development, 51*, 36–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2016.08.002

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Bhana, D., & Mayeza, E. (2018). 'Cheese boys' resisting and negotiating violent hegemonic masculinity in primary school. *NORMA International Journal for Masculinity Studies, 14*(1), 3–17.

Bhana, D., & Mayeza, E. (2019). Primary schoolgirls addressing bullying and negotiating femininity. *Girlhood Studies, 12*(2), 98–114.

Blaise, M. (2005). *Playing it straight: Uncovering Gender discourses in the early childhood classroom*. Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. Greenwood Press.

Bradbury, A., Braun, A., & Quick, L. (2021). Intervention culture, grouping and triage: High-stakes tests and practices of division in English primary schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 42*(2), 147–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2021.1878873

Bragg, S., Ringrose, J., Mohandas, S., Cambazoglu, I., Bartlett, D., Barker, G., i Gupta, T., & Merriman, J. (2022). *The state of UK boys: Understanding and transforming gender in the lives of UK boys*. DC, Equimundo.

Bridges, T., & Pascoe, C. (2014). Hybrid masculinities: New directions in the sociology of men and masculinities. *Sociology Compass, 8*, 246–258.

Bridges, T., & Pascoe, C. J. (2018). On the elasticity of gender hegemony: Why hybrid masculinities fail to undermine gender and sexual inequality. In J. W. Messerschmidt, P. Martin, M. Messner, & R. W. Connell (Eds.), *Gender reckonings: New social theory and research*. New York University Press.

Budgeon, S. (2014). The dynamics of Gender Hegemony. *Sociology, 48*(2), 317–334.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.

Clark, S., & Paechter, C. (2007). Why can't girls play football? Gender dynamics in the playground. *Sport, Education and Society, 12*(3), 261–276.

Clarricoates, K. (1978). 'Dinosaurs in the classroom': A re-examination of some aspects of the 'hidden curriculum' in primary schools. *Women's Studies International Quarterly, 1*, 353–364.

Clarricoates, K. (1980). The importance of Being Ernest…Emma…Tom…Jane: The perception and categorization of gender conformity and gender deviation in primary schools. In R. Deem (Ed.), *Schooling for women's work*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Clarricoates, K. (1987). Child culture at school: A clash between gendered worlds. In A. Pollard (Ed.), *Children in their primary schools*. Lewis, Falmer Press.

Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power*. Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities*. Polity Press.

Connell, R. (1998). Masculinity and globalization. *Men and Masculinities, 1*(1), 3–23.

Connell, R. (2000). *The men and the boys*. Allen & Unwin.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society, 19*(6), 829–859.
Connell, R. W., Ashenden, D. J., Kessler, S., & Dowsett, D. W. (1982). *Making the Difference: Schools, families and social division*. George Allen and Unwin.
Connolly, P. (1998). *Racism, gender identities and young children: Social relations in a multi-ethnic, inner-city primary school*. Routledge.
Corsaro, W. A. (1979). Young children's conceptions of status and role. *Sociology of Education, 52*(1), 46–59.
Cream, J. (1995). Re-solving riddles: The sexed body. In D. Bell & G. Valentine (Eds.), *Mapping desire*. Routledge.
D'Lima, P., & Higgins, A. (2021). Social media engagement and Fear of Missing Out (FOMO) in primary school children. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 37*(3), 320–338.
Davies, B. (1989). *Frogs and snails and feminist tails: Pre-school children and gender*. Allen & Unwin.
Davies, B. (1993). *Shards of glass: Children reading and writing beyond gendered identities*. Hampton Press.
Delamont, S. (1990). *Sex roles and the school* (2nd ed.). Methuen.
Demetriou, D. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and Society., 30*(3), 337–361.
Donnelly, C. (2000). In pursuit of school ethos. *British Journal of Educational Studies., 48*(2), 134–154.
Dubbs, P. J., & Whitney, D. D. (1980). *Cultural Contexts: Making anthropology personal*. Allyn and Bacon.
Dyment, J., Bell, A., & Lucas, A. (2009). The relationship between school ground design and intensity of physical activity. *Children's Geographies, 7*(3), 261–276.
Eisen, D., & Yamashita, L. (2019). Borrowing from femininity: The caring man, hybrid masculinities, and maintaining male dominance. *Men and Masculinities, 22*(5), 801–820.
Elias, N. (1978). *The history of manners: The civilising process, Volume I*. Basil Blackwell.
Elliott, K. (2016). Caring masculinities: Theorising an emerging concept. *Men and Masculinities, 19*(3), 240–259.
Elliott, K. (2020). Bringing in margin and centre: 'open' and 'closed' as concepts for considering men and masculinities. *Gender, Place & Culture, 27*(12), 1723–1744. https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2020.1715348
Emirbayer, M., & Mische, A. (1998). What is agency? *American Journal of Sociology, 42*(4), 962–1023.
Epstein, D. (1997). Cultures of schooling/cultures of sexuality. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 1*(1), 37–53.
Epstein, D., & Johnson, R. (1998). *Schooling sexualities*. Open University Press.
Equality Act. (2010). Legislation.gov.uk. www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Evans, K. (2002). Taking control of their lives? Agency in young adult transitions in England and the New Germany. *Journal of Youth Studies, 5*(3), 245–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/1367626022000005965

Evans, T. (1987). *A gender agenda: A sociological study of teachers, parents and pupils in their primary schools*. Allen & Unwin.

Flood, M. (2002). Between men and masculinity: An assessment of the term 'masculinity' in recent scholarship on Men. In S. Pearce & V. Muller (Eds.), *Manning the next millennium: Studies in masculinities*. Black Swan Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Penguin.

Francis, B. (2000). *Boys, girls and achievement: Addressing the classroom issues*. Routledge/Falmer.

Francis, B. (2009). The role of The Boffin as abject Other in gendered performances of school achievement. *Sociological Review, 57*(4), 645–669.

Francis, B. (2010). Re/Theorising gender: Female masculinity and male femininity in the classroom? *Gender and Education, 22*(5), 477–490. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250903341146

Francis, B., Archer, L., Moote, J., de Witt, J., & Yeomans, L. (2017). Femininity, science, and the denigration of the girly girl. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 38*(8), 1097–1110.

Francis, B., & Paechter, C. (2015). The problem of gender categorisation: Addressing dilemmas past and present in gender and education research. *Gender and Education, 27*(7), 776–790. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2015.1092503

Fraser, S., Lewis, V., Ding, S., Kellet, M., & Robinson, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Doing research with children and young people*. Sage.

Frosh, S., Phoenix, A., & Pattman, R. (2002). *Young masculinities: Understanding boys in contemporary society*. Palgrave.

Ganapathy, N., & Balachandran, L. (2019). 'Racialized masculinities': A gendered response to marginalization among Malay boys in Singapore. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 52*(1), 94–110.

George, R., & Browne, N. (2000). 'Are you in or are you out? An exploration of girl friendship groups in the primary phase of schooling. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 4*(4), 289–300.

Gibson, P. F. (2018). *Young girls' lived experiences of 'going online': An exploration into the relationships between social media used and well-being for primary age girls*. Doctoral in Education, thesis. Oxford Brookes University.

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradictions in social analysis*. Macmillan.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of a theory of structuration*. Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Polity Press.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Gilbert, R., & Gilbert, P. (1998). *Masculinity goes to school*. Routledge.
Gonick, M. (2006). Between 'girl power' and 'reviving ophelia': Constituting the neo-liberal Girl subject. *NWSA Journal, 18*(2), 1–23.
Gordon, T., Holland, J., & Lahelma, E. (2000). *Making spaces: Citizenship and differences in schools*. Macmillan Press.
Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinity*. Duke University Press.
Hall, J. J. (2020). 'The word gay has been banned but people use it in the boys' toilets whenever you go in': Spatialising Children's subjectivities in response to gender and sexualities education in English primary schools. *Social & Cultural Geography, 21*(2), 162–185. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2018.1474377
Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and the diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference*. Lawrence and Wishart.
Hall, S. (1992). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held, & T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures*. Polity Press.
Hamilton, L., Armstrong, E. A., Seeley, J., & Armstrong, E. M. (2019). Hegemonic femininities and intersectional domination. *Sociological Theory, 37*(4), 315–341. https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275119888248
Hanlon, N. (2012). *Masculinities, care and equality: Identity and nurture in men's lives*. Palgrave Macmillan.
Harris, J. R. (1998). *The nurture assumption: Why children turn out the way they do*. Free Press.
Hey, V. (1997). *The company she keeps: An ethnography of girls' friendships*. Open University Press.
Hunter, S., Riggs, D., & Augoustinos, M. (2017). Hegemonic masculinity versus a caring masculinity: Implications for understanding primary caregiving fathers. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 11*(3), e12307.
Huuki, T., Kyrölä, K., & Pihkala, S. (2022). What else can a crush become: Working with arts-methods to address sexual harassment in pre-teen romantic relationship cultures. *Gender and Education, 34*(5), 577–592. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2021.1989384
Huuki, T., Manninen, S., & Sunnari, V. (2010). Humour as a resource and strategy for boys to gain status in the field of informal school. *Gender and Education, 22*(4), 369–383.
IFS (Institute for Fiscal Studies). (2021). The growing gap between state school and private school spending. https://ifs.org.uk/articles/growing-gap-between-state-school-and-private-school-spending
Jago, R., Brockman, R., Fox, K., Cartwright, K., Page, A., & Thompson, J. (2009). Friendship groups and physical activity: Qualitative findings on how physical activity is initiated and maintained among 10–11-year-old children. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 6*(4), 10.1186/1479-5868-6-4.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

James, A., & Prout, A. (2015). *Re- presenting childhood: Time and transition in the study of childhood* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
Keddie, A. (2005). On fighting and football: Gender justice and theories of identity construction. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 18*(4), 425–444.
Keddie, A. (2016). Children of the market: Performativity, neoliberal responsibilisation and the construction of student identities. *Oxford Review of Education, 42*(1), 108–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2016.1142865
Keddie, A. (2017). Primary school leadership in England: Performativity and matters of professionalism. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 38*(8), 1245–1257. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2016.1273758
Kehily, M. J. (2007). A cultural perspective. In M. J. Kehily (Ed.), *Understanding youth: Perspectives, identities and practices*. Sage in Association with The Open University.
King, B., & Swain, J. (2024). Trajectories in and exits out for young men involved with violence on an inner-city housing estate. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2024.2387195
Kostas, M. (2021). Discursive construction of hegemonic masculinity and emphasised femininity in the textbooks of primary education: Children's discursive agency and polysemy of the narratives. *Gender and Education, 33*(1), 50–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2019.1632807
Kostas, M. (2022). 'Real' boys, sissies and tomboys: Exploring the material-discursive intra-actions of football, bodies, and heteronormative discourses. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 43*(1), 63–83.
Lyon, M. L., & Barbalet, J. M. (1994). Society's body: Emotion and the 'somatization' of social theory. In T. J. Csordas (Ed.), *Embodiment and experience: The existential ground of culture and self*. Cambridge University Press.
Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling*. Open University Press.
Mac an Ghaill, M. (1996). What about the boys?: Schooling, class and crisis masculinity. *The Sociological Review, 44*(3), 381–397.
Mannay, D. (2013). 'If it's Pink, Scrape the Pink Off': Negotiating acceptable 'tomboy' femininity in the playground. *Women in Society* (5), ISSN 2042-7220 (Print); ISSN 2042-7239 (Online)
Manninen, S., Huuki, T., & Sunnari, V. (2011). Earn Yo' respect! Respect in the status struggle of Finnish school boys. *Men and Masculinities, 14*(3), 335–357.
Martin, B. (2011). *Children at play*. Trentham Books.
Martin, P. (1998). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Reflections on Connell's masculinities. *Gender and Society, 12*(4), 472–474.
Marx, K. (1963) [1852]. *The eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. International Publishers.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Massey, D. (1993). Politics and space/time. In M. Keith & S. Pile (Eds.), *Place and the politics of identity*. Routledge.
Maxwell, C., & Aggleton, P. (2009). Agency in action - young women and their sexual relationships in a private school. *Gender and Education*. First Article. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250903341120.
Maxwell, C., & Aggleton, P. (2014). Agentic practice and privileging orientations among privately educated young women. *The Sociological Review, 62*(4), 800–820.
Mayeza, E., & Bhana, D. (2020). Boys negotiate violence and masculinity in the primary school. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 41*(3), 426–443.
Mayeza, E., & Bhana, D. (2021). Boys and bullying in primary school: Young masculinities and the negotiation of power. *South African. Journal of Education, 41*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v41n1a1858
McRobbie, A. (2009). *The aftermath of feminism: Gender, culture and social change*. Sage.
Messerschmidt, J. (2019). The salience of hegemonic masculinity. *Men and Masculinities, 22*(1), 85–91.
Messerschmidt, J. (2023). Interrogating 'political masculinities. *European Journal of Politics and Gender,* 1–16, Online ISSN 2515-1096. https://doi.org/10.1332/251510821X16897800306124.
Messerschmidt, J., & Bridges, T. (2022). *A Kaleidoscope of identities: Reflexivity, routine and the fluidity of sex, gender and sexuality*. Rowman & Littlefield.
Messerschmidt, J. W. (2018). *Hegemonic masculinity: Formulation, reformulation, and amplification*. Rowman &Littlefield.
Messerschmidt, J. W. (2020). Becoming a super-masculine 'cool guy': Reflexivity, dominant and hegemonic masculinities, and sexual violence. *Boyhood Studies, 13*, 20–35.
Morrell, R., & Jewkes, R. (2011). Care work and caring: A path to gender equitable practices among men in South Africa? *International Journal for Equity in Health*. https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-9276-10-17
Nayak, A., & Kehily, M. J. (2013). *Gender youth and culture: Young masculinities and femininities (2nd ed)*. Palgrave.
Nespor, J. (1997). *Tangled up in School: Politics, space, bodies, and signs in the educational process*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Paechter, C. (2006). Masculine femininities/feminine masculinities: Power, identities and gender. *Gender and Education, 18*(3), 253–263. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250600667785
Paechter, C. (2007). *Being boys, being girls: Learning masculinities and femininities*. Open University Press.
Paechter, C. (2010). Tomboys and girly-girls: Embodied femininities in primary schools. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 31*(2), 221–235.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Paechter, C. (2018). Rethinking the possibilities for hegemonic femininity: Exploring a Gramscian framework. *Women's Studies International Forum, 68*(May), 121–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2018.03.005

Paechter, C. (2021). Implications for gender and education research arising out of changing ideas about gender. *Gender and Education, 33*(5), 610–624. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2020.1798361

Paechter, C., & Clark, S. (2007). Learning gender in primary school playgrounds: Findings from the Tomboy identities study. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 15*(3), 317–331.

Paechter, C., & Clark, S. (2016). Being 'nice' or being 'normal': Girls resisting discourses of 'coolness'. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 37*(3), 457–471. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2015.1061979

Pascoe, C. J. (2007). *Dude, You're a Fag: Masculinity and sexuality in high school.* University of California Press.

Pollard, A. (1985). *The social world of the primary school.* Holt, Reinhart and Winston.

Prosser, J. (1999). *School culture*. Paul Chapman.

Purdy, N., & York, L. (2016). A critical investigation of the nature and extent of cyberbullying in two post-primary schools in Northern Ireland. *Pastoral Care in Education, 34*(1), 13–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/02643944.2015.1127989

Read, B. (2011). Britney, Beyoncé, and me - primary school girls' role models and constructions of the 'popular' girl'. *Gender and Education, 23*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540251003674089

Reay, D. (2001). 'Spice Girls', 'Nice Girls', 'Girlies', and 'Tomboys': Gender discourses, girls' cultures and femininities in the primary classroom. *Gender and Education, 13*(2), 153–166. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250120051178

Renold, EJ. (2002). Presumed innocence—(hetero)sexist and homophobic harassment among primary school girls and boys. *Childhood, 9*(4), 415–4324.

Renold, EJ. (2003). 'If you don't kiss me, you're dumped': Boys, boyfriends and heterosexualised masculinities in the primary school. *Educational Review, 55*(2), 179–194.

Renold, EJ. (2005). *Girls, boys and junior sexualities: Exploring Children's gender and sexual relations in the primary school.* Routledge.

Renold, EJ. (2006). 'They won't let us play … unless you're going out with one of them': Girls, boys and Butler's 'heterosexual matrix' in the primary years. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 27*(4), 489–509.

Renold, EJ. (2007). Primary school 'studs'—(De)constructing young boys' heterosexual masculinities. *Men and Masculinities, 9*(3), 275–297.

Renold, EJ. (2013). *Boys and girls speak out: A qualitative study of children's gender and sexual cultures (age 10–12)*. Cardiff University, NSPCC and Children's Commissioner's Office for Wales.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Renold, EJ., & Allan, A. (2007). Bright and Beautiful: High achieving girls, ambivalent femininities, and the feminization of success in the primary school. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 27*(4), 457–473. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596300600988606

Ringrose, J. (2007). Successful girls? Complicating post-feminist, neoliberal discourses of education achievement and gender equality. *Gender and Education, 19*(4), 471–489.

Rogers, C., & Kutnick, P. (Eds.). (1992). *The social psychology of the primary school.* Routledge.

Scambor, E., Bergmann, N., Wojnicka, K., and Belghiti-Mahut, S., Hearn, J., Holter, Ø. G., Gärtner, M., Hrženjak, M., Scambor, C, & White, A, (2014) Men and gender equality: European insights. *Men and Masculinities, 17* (5), 552–577. ISSN 1097-184X

Schiffrin-Sands, L. (2021). He said he said: Boysplaining in a primary classroom. *Gender and Education, 33*(6), 661–675. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2020.1831442

Schippers, M. (2007). Recovering the feminine other: Masculinity, femininity, and gender hegemony. *Theory and Society, 36*(1), 85–102.

Scholtz, J., & Gilligan, R. (2017). Encountering difference: Young girls' perspectives on separateness and friendship in culturally diverse schools in Dublin. *Childhood, 24*(2), 168–182. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:148265443

Sears, C. (2014). The persona problem: How expectations of masculinity shape female band director identity. *GEMS (Gender, Education, Music, & Society), 7*(4), 4–11. https://www.academia.edu/26815066/The_Persona_Problem_How_Expectations_Of_Masculinity_Shape_Female_Band_Director_Identity

Seidler, J. (2007). Masculinities, bodies, and emotional life. *Men and Masculinities, 10*(1), 9–21.

Serbin, L. (1980). Teachers, peers and play preferences: An environmental approach to sex typing in the preschool. In S. Delamont (Ed.), *Readings on interaction in the classroom*. Methuen.

Shilling, C. (1991). Educating the body: Physical capital and the production of social inequalities. *Sociology, 25*(4), 653–672.

Shilling, C. (1993). *The body and social theory*. Sage.

Sibieta, L. (2021). The growing gap between state school and private school spending. *Institute for Fiscal Studies*. https://ifs.org.uk/articles/growing-gap-between-state-school-and-private-school-spending.

Simkins, T., Coldron, J., Crawford, M., & Maxwell, B. (2018). Emerging schooling landscapes in England: How primary system leaders are responding to new school groupings. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 47*(3), 331–348.

Skelton, C. (2001). *Schooling the boys: Masculinities and primary education*. Open University Press.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Skelton, C., Carrington, B., Francis, B., Hutchings, M., Read, B., & Hall, I. (2009). Gender 'matters' in the primary classroom: Pupils' and teachers' perspectives. *British Educational Research Journal, 35*(2), 187–204.

Skelton, C., & Francis, B. (2011). Successful boys and literacy: Are 'literate boys' challenging or repackaging hegemonic masculinity? *Curriculum Inquiry, 41*(4), 456–479.

Stoller, R. J. (1968). *Sex and gender: On the development of masculinity and femininity*. Science House.

Swain, J. (2000). 'The money's good, the fame's good, the girls are good': The role of playground football in the construction of young boys' masculinity in a junior school. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 21*(1), 91–109.

Swain, J. (2001). *An ethnographic study into the construction of masculinity of 10-11-year-old boys in three junior schools*. PhD thesis. Institute of Education, London.

Swain, J. (2002a). The right stuff: Fashioning an identity through clothing in a junior school. *Gender and Education, 14*(1), 53–69.

Swain, J. (2002b). The Resources and strategies boys use to establish status in a junior school without competitive sport. *Discourse, 23*(1), 91–107.

Swain, J. (2003a). How young schoolboys become somebody: The role of the body in the construction of masculinity. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 24*(3), 299–314.

Swain, J. (2003b). Needing to be 'in the know': Strategies of subordination used by 10-11-year-old schoolboys. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 7*(3), 1–20.

Swain, J. (2004a). The resources and strategies that 10-11-year-old boys use to construct masculinities in the school setting. *British Educational Research Journal, 30*(1), 167–185.

Swain, J. (2004b). Masculinities in Education. In M. Kimmel, J. Hearn, & R. W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of studies on men & masculinities*. Sage.

Swain, J. (2004c). Sharing the same world: Boys' relations with girls during their last year of primary school. *Gender and Education, 17*(1), 75–91.

Swain, J. (2006). Reflections on patterns of masculinity in school settings. *Men and Masculinities, 8*(3), 331–349.

Swain, J. (2014). Resisting Dominant Discourses of Femininity in a Working Class Junior School. *Studies in Sociology of Science, 5*(2), 1–11.

Swain, K. (2023). Popular boys, the ideal schoolboy, and blended patterns of masculinity for 10- to 11-year-olds in two London schools. *British Education Research Journal* (online), 1–18. https://bera-journals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/berj.3936

Synnott, A. (1993). *The body social: Symbolism, self and society*. Routledge.

Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender Play: Girls and boys in school*. Rutgers University Press.

Turner, B. S. (1997). What is the Sociology of the Body? *Body & Society, 3*(1), 103–107.

Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198

Turner, B. S. (2000). An outline of a general sociology of the body. In B. S. Turner (Ed.), *The Blackwell companion to social theory* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
Verkaik, R. (2018). *Posh Boys: How English public schools ruin Britain*. Oneworld Publications.
Walford, G. (1984). *British public schools: Policy and practice*. Taylor & Francis.
Wardman, N., Hutchesson, R., Gottschall, K., Drew, C., & Saltmarsh, S. (2010). Starry Eyes and subservient selves: Portraits of 'well-rounded' girlhood in the prospectuses of all-girl elite private schools. *Australian Journal of Education, 54*(3), 249–261. https://doi.org/10.1177/000494411005400303
Weber, M. (1946). Class, status, and party. In H. Gerth & C. W. Mills (Eds.), *From Max Weber*. Oxford University Press.
Weber, M. (1963) [1922]. *The sociology of religion* (E. Fischoff, Trans.). (London: Methuen).
Wells, J. (2016). *Primary school boys, academic achievement in literacy and hegemonic identities: A qualitative study*. (EdD thesis, University of Keele).
West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society, 1*, 125–151.
Willett, R. (2015). Children's media-referenced games: The lived culture of consumer texts on a school playground. *Children & Society, 29*(5), 410–420.
Willis, J. (2009). Girls reconstructing gender. agency, hybridity and transformations of 'femininity. *Girlhood Studies, 2*(2), 96–118.
Woods, P. (1990). *The happiest days?* Falmer.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.



Discussion Publishers edition DPR-2026-1198