Article	# The Social impact of Surveillance in Three UK Schools: 'Angels', 'Devils' and 'Teen Mums'*

Michael McCahill
University of Hull, UK. M.McCahill@hull.ac.uk

Rachel Finn
University of Hull, UK. r.finn@hull.ac.uk

Abstract

Drawing upon the preliminary findings of a broader ESRC-funded project on the 'surveilled', this paper examines the social impact of 'new surveillance' technologies on the lives of school children living in a Northern City. We conducted fifteen one-hour 'focus groups' with eighty-five 13 to 16 year-old children in three schools. The pupils were asked a range of questions designed to document their awareness, experience and response to 'surveillance' as 'school children', but also as 'regular citizens' going about their business 'outside' of the school. We show how children's experience and response to surveillance varies across 'social positionings' of class and gender, before going on to discuss the implications of our findings for the major theoretical debates on surveillance.

Introduction

> *'Children should be seen and not be heard' (Girls Comprehensive, Year 10, girl no. 3).*

As John Gilliom (2006) has pointed out, while the field of 'surveillance studies' has 'been particularly good at studying the watchers', it has not been 'so good at the necessarily messier, less institutionalized, and exploratory but absolutely crucial job of studying the watched' (Gilliom 2006: 126). Thus while Foucauldian accounts of 'panopticism' may help us understand the appeal of surveillance systems to control agents, we still know very little about the relations between 'visibility' and 'discipline' (Yar 2003). Similarly, while 'post-panoptic' accounts of surveillance have drawn our attention to the democratizing possibilities of 'surveillant assemblages' and offer an alternative account of the organisation of contemporary surveillance (Haggerty and Ericson 2000), we know virtually nothing about how the 'surveilled' as a creative group of 'social actors' may negotiate, modify or evade surveillance practices (although see Gilliom 1994; 2001). Writers working within the area of 'childhood studies' (James and Prout 1990) have also drawn attention to the different strategies of surveillance directed towards the Apollonian (innocent) child who is to be protected and the Dionysian (corrupt) child who requires more coercive forms of policing and control (Jenks 2005). Very few studies, however, have explored how children experience and respond to these different surveillance regimes. This paper begins to address these gaps in the literature by examining the social impact of 'new surveillance' technologies on the lives of school children living in a Northern City. We show how the 'subjective experience' and 'behavioural responses' to surveillance varies across 'social positionings' of class and gender, before going on to situate our findings in a broader theoretical context.

---

* 'Angels' and 'devils' are taken from Valentine (1996). 'Teen mums' was the addition of the authors.

Northern City is a relatively small English city that over the last 40 years has suffered in the decline of traditional industrialisation. As a result of this decline, the city is ranked as one of the 10 most deprived local authority districts in England. In certain wards, such as Council Estate in the North of the city, deprivation is twice the national average. In order to explore the social impact of surveillance on the lives of 'young people' living in Northern City, we selected three types of schools in which to conduct our research: Private School, a 'fee-paying' school for young people aged 8-18; Council Estate Comprehensive[1], a secondary school situated on Council Estate; and Girls Comprehensive, a secondary comprehensive day school for girls only. Fifteen one-hour 'focus group' discussions were held with 13 to 16 year-old children in each of the schools. We spoke to 85 pupils in total, including six 'focus groups' in Private School (Years 9, 10 and 11 boys and girls), six 'focus groups' in Council Estate Comprehensive (Years 9, 10 and 11 boys and girls), and three 'focus groups' in Girls Comprehensive (Years 9, 10 and 11 girls). Mirroring the demographics of Northern City[2], most of the student participants at Council Estate Comprehensive and Girls Comprehensive were white children from economically deprived backgrounds, although Council Estate Comprehensive was more uniformly deprived and white because of the area in which it is situated. Private School participants, on the other hand, were more likely to be privileged, but also more likely to be non-white[3]. Focus groups were selected as a research method because of their strength in providing insight into how understanding and consensus is generated amongst peer groups, and accessing a 'common stock of knowledge' within a social group (Bloor et al. 2001: 7). Furthermore, research using focus groups allows participants to 'steer the conversation' and enables them to focus on their own experience and perspectives without over-direction from interview questions (Morgan 1998). With these aims in mind, the pupils were asked a range of questions designed to document their awareness and experience of 'surveillance' as 'school children', but also as 'regular citizens' going about their business 'outside' of the school.

Surveying the 'Devils' at Council Estate Comprehensive

Surveillance in the school

'Council Estate Comprehensive' is the only secondary school (age 11-16) located on a local council estate in a Northern City. It is situated in an area in which deprivation is twice the national average and Ofsted (2008) reports that the proportion of students' eligible for free meals is above the national average (www.ofsted.gov.uk). At this school, a combination of 'old' and 'new' surveillance (Marx 2002) was used to provide 'spatial' and 'temporal' strategies of social control. As the Site Manager explained, one of the main functions of surveillance practices on this site was to keep pupils in the school or in the classroom. This involved the 'manipulation of space' whereby all of the main entrances and exits were gated and locked and only teachers were allowed to move freely from one part of the school to another through the use of a 'fob key'. The school also had ID cards which had photographs of students on the front along with two small circles, a green circle which indicates that they have parental permission to leave the school premises at dinner time, and a red circle which means that they are not allowed to leave the site (Caretaker). The cards are then checked by one of the teachers (not the school security) who have been assigned to 'gate duty' over the dinner-time period. These strategies were supported by the 'direct supervision' or 'focused attention' given to pupils by teachers patrolling the school with radios to keep them in the classroom/school:

---

[1] A state-run secondary school for children of all abilities living in a particular area.

[2] The 2001 Census shows that over 97.5% of the population of Northern City was white.

[3] At Girls Comprehensive, one of the year 9 respondents was 'mixed race'. At Private School, two of the year 9 boys and one of the year 11 boys were 'Asian', one of the year 9 boys was 'Black', and one of the year 10 girls was 'Chinese'. However, there was no observed distinction in the responses of 'racialized' young people when compared to white young people in the sample.

> They have what they call an 'on-call system' and basically staff which I believe aren't in lessons and haven't got a teaching period that time, they actually monitor, they walk the corridors, the outside areas looking for kids who are playing truant from that lesson and things like that or if there's an incident in a particular room they can go give assistance (Council Estate Comprehensive, Caretaker).

The school also had a network of 62 CCTV surveillance cameras (57 'fixed' cameras and 5 'fully functional') the majority of which were situated along the school corridors. While the main reason for installing CCTV cameras was to monitor pupils who are out of the classroom when they should not be (Caretaker), the system was also used retrospectively by teachers who reviewed the tapes to identify pupil misbehaviour[4]. Many pupils had 'CCTV stories' which involved other pupils getting 'caught on camera' (or more likely caught on 'video tape' after retrospective reviewing of tapes by teachers) for offences like property damage, 'nicking stuff', 'twagging' lessons (playing truant) and spitting on the floor. One pupil said that he got blamed for something that he did not do when another boy was filmed as he was about to get 'binned' (hung upside down in a bin) by a group of boys (Year 9, boy no. 6).

The 'manipulation of space' on this site was accompanied by 'temporal' strategies of control (Jenks 2005: 67-8) including registration and attendance systems which were all computerised. As one pupil explained this means that when pupils arrive late for class they 'put the minutes on and everything so … they have to watch the clock and see when you come in' (Year 11, girl no. 2). Another pupil said that if you are caught 'twagging' a lesson they put it on the computer and 'it comes up with a little red triangle and if you click on it, it tells where you've been spotted' (Year 11, boy no. 2). Other pupils mentioned the use of 'MSN in the attendance office' (Year 11, girl no. 4) which allowed attendance office staff to liaise with teachers in the classrooms to monitor absentees. The teachers and attendance monitoring staff also use an 'automated text messaging' system, whereby the parents of any pupil who does not get their mark entered on to the computer at registration automatically receives a text message to their mobile phone or home phone. Some of the pupils explained how this works:

> Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 9
> Boy no. 6: On your home phone it goes, 'BT text messaging service' and it goes
> Boy no. 3: 'Hi it's [names person] from Council Estate Comprehensive ...' [laughter] that's all I ever get.
> Boy no. 6: I used to like be late and like yeah whatever, and then my dad, he like he finds out and he asks me 'why were you late'? He gets text messages now … it can really land you in it.
> Boy no. 4: And it says [x] has been late 3 times this week. He will serve a detention.

Out-of-school surveillance
Knowledge and awareness of surveillance amongst Council Estate students came from direct 'surveillance encounters' on the streets. Most of the pupils live on the local estate which has an extensive network of open-street CCTV cameras in operation. Pupils said they had seen them on the streets in their neighbourhood 'moving around' (Year 10, girl no. 3); seen the 'big black ones outside the school' (Year 11, girl no. 1); seen them 'down our street' (Year 11, boy no. 5). Some said that they thought open-street CCTV cameras were used to monitor them when they asked adults to buy them alcohol from the local convenience stores (Year 11, girl no. 5). Another girl said that she had been approached by a local PCSO with a surveillance camera attached to their arm (Year 11, girl no. 2). Other pupils associated the deployment of police officers or security officers with CCTV surveillance cameras; although some of the Year 10 girls seemed unsure of how this worked in practice:

---

[4] 'Real time' CCTV monitoring also took place in one classroom for 'bad behavioural kids' (Supervisor).

>Girl No. 5: Dunt that speed camera move at...
>Girl No. 4: That big black one yeah there's one up at [names street on the council estate]
>and the coppers came before and told us to move
>RF: Oh really
>Girl No. 4: The man in [names street] can watch it or summat like that as well then he
>phones the police and they come

In the incident above, Girl no. 5 from Council Estate Comprehensive refers to a 'speed camera' (which is in fact one of the council-operated open-street CCTV surveillance cameras) situated across the road from a small row of shops on the west side of the council estate. The girls' comments suggest that they think one of the shopkeepers is able to monitor this camera and then phone the police who are deployed to the scene. Another pupil approached by the police whilst drinking alcohol on a bench was not sure if 'the cameras seen you drinking' or if the police 'drove by and just thought, "Oh, I'll have a little check"' (Year 10, girl No. 2). This pupil thought the CCTV operators might be watching you 'messing about' and 'laughing at ya', while another added, 'and then you try and think what you were doing for the last ten minutes' (Year 10, girl No. 5).

Pupils at Council Estate Comprehensive were also subject to surveillance practices in their neighbourhoods by police officers, Police Community Safety Officers (PCSOs), and Community Wardens. These encounters mainly involved Years 10 and 11 girls and included: the deployment of police cars and officers on horseback to a local public park (Year 10 girls); being followed by 'undercover' police officers near a convenience store (Year 10, girl no. 2); having their names taken and shoes checked for mud (the suspects were believed to have fled across a field) following an assault on a police officer (Year 11 Girls); the deployment of a police helicopter and two patrol cars to a local field when a group of girls had been accused of 'chucking fireworks' at gypsies (Year 11, girl no. 4); being 'moved on' by police officers after a fire had been lit in a local field (Year 9, girl no. 3); being split up when in groups of more than three after nine o'clock and taken home to their parents (Year 10, girl no. 2); and being stopped by the police and handed 'yellow tickets'[5] (Year 10, girls no. 1, 2 3 and 5). Some of the girls (Years 9, 10 and 11) said they had alcohol confiscated or 'thrown away' by the police and had their soft drinks tested for traces of alcohol:

>Even if you just have coke now, like that time there was a big gang of us near [names convenience store], they was like if you've got any bottles gi' me um and we had it in a coke bottle din't we so we give em it and they still they just poured it away anyway but it could have just been coke, like they din't know (Year 10, girl no. 2).

>And they've got them things that test your drink ... Yeah me and X had like a bottle of Dr Pepper and they were like right we need to test your drink and it goes green or summat (Year 11, girl no. 1).

The pupils at Council Estate Comprehensive expressed a degree of confusion over who was doing the policing in their neighbourhood and what powers the various policing bodies had. Some said that 'they ant got 'and cuffs, they ant got any privileges really' (Year 10 girl no. 6), while others thought that they 'are allowed to hold you down for five minutes until a copper comes' (Year 10, girl no. 1). The confusion over the new 'plural policing' arrangements are summed up by the Year 11 girls who referred to being surveyed by 'police people' (girl no. 3), 'big police people' (girl no. 5), 'community wardens' (girl no. 1)

---

[5] The 'yellow tickets' refer to the 'stop/search records' in which the police document the suspects personal details including name, address, date of birth, height, sex, clothing, and 'officer' or 'self-defined' ethnicity. There are further sections documenting the 'reason' and 'outcome' of the stop, and a section to be completed if 'stopped *and* searched'.

and the 'actual police' (girl no. 5). Many pupils resented the attention given to them by the police and CCTV operators:

> RF: What do you think? Do you agree with CCTV cameras?
> Year 9, Boy no. 4: No.
> RF: How come?
> Boy no. 4: Because like say you're having a laugh in the park and you do one thing
> wrong and that's it, they just pop up on you.

They also resented the fact that CCTV operators were likely to disproportionately target them because of how they dressed. One pupil said, 'it's your personal freedom ... you can wear what you want to wear' (Year 9, girl no. 2), while another thought that 'the Queen could wear a pair of trackies and she'd get arrested' (Year 10, girl no. 4). The pupils also spoke negatively about their experiences of surveillance at Council Estate Mall which is approximately two minutes walk from the school. Some of the school children associated security deployment practice with the use of CCTV surveillance cameras and said that they had been 'excluded' from the mall, including six pupils in Year 9 (three boys and three girls). Four different pupils said they had been 'banned' simply because they were seen in the mall with other 'known' individuals that had previously been in trouble with the security guards. Some of the Year 9 boys implied that they considered the security guards at Council Estate Mall to be working in a rundown mall on a deprived housing estate with 'cheap' shops which probably didn't warrant the level of security arrangements perhaps provided at more 'affluent' consumer spaces:

> Year 9, Boy no. 4: The security guards in the centre across the road, they, like act like
> they're guarding like a bank with like a million quid in it. But they're really not,
> Boy no. 3: They're guarding a poxy little centre on a shithole of an estate [laughing].
> Boy no. 4: They act like they're guarding Harrods in London, and they're not. And it's
> like 'keep moving lads'.

Surveying the 'Angels' at Private School

Surveillance in the school
'Private School', which opened in 1893, describes itself as 'Northern City's Premier School' for young people aged 8-18. Most students pay a tuition fee of approximately £2500 per term and it is expected that all sixth-form students will go on to university. 'Private School' has no local catchment area and buses bring pupils to school from many of the small villages and affluent suburbs surrounding the city. 'Spatial' and 'temporal' strategies of control in the shape of CCTV cameras and automated registers were non-existent on this site. As one student explained, keeping pupils in the classroom or in school was not an issue because 'I think there's a lot of trust here, because you could easily just walk out the gates at the front but no one does ... because they don't want to go' (Private School, Year 10, girl no. 1). As a group of primarily 'middle class' students who may eventually take their position as surveyors in the global market place, students were encouraged to respect the disciplinary power of surveillance by partaking in the 'pastoral' system of 'prefects' (two per class and one 'bus prefect'). 'Prefects' have the authority to enforce various sanctions or school norms on 'dress' and 'bodily appearance', including telling 'you to tuck your shirt in' (Year 10, girl no. 4); making 'sure that you stay outside' during breaks (Year 10, boy no. 4); reporting back to the teachers on any observed misbehaviour on the school bus (Year 10, girl no. 5). This generated some resentment amongst the pupils who thought that 'prefects take their role too seriously' (Year 10, girl no. 2) and that 'prefects are kind of like double agents' (Year 10, boy no. 2).

A central theme in the 'surveillance talk' amongst this group of technologically sophisticated and computer-literate students was the role of computers and biometrics in the schools surveillance regime. In terms of 'who' was doing the surveillance, some pupils thought that the teachers can log on to 'check what

you're doing on your computer' (Private School, Year 9, girl no. 3) or that 'IT have special software on the computers' (Private School, Year 11, girl no. 8). There was also uncertainty among the pupils in relation to 'who' was being monitored. Pupils were unsure whether it was 'everyone in the school', particular classrooms or particular individuals at any particular time. Some pupils thought that computer monitoring mainly consisted of 'blocking access' to a range of restricted websites, such as Myspace, MSN, games, You Tube, and eBay. As one pupil explained: 'when you click on Myspace it says access denied; they don't just like monitor you, it's just like blocked' (Year 10, girl no. 1). Certain words like 'girls' were also 'blocked'. Other pupils said that they were subject to 'real-time' computer monitoring which included the teachers or IT people being able to 'see what we're doing on the computer' (Private School, Year 11, girl no. 3); watching 'what you type' (Private School, Year 11, girl no. 6); watching 'what's on everyone's screen' (Private School, Year 11, girl no. 3); seeing 'who's logged on to where' (Private School, Year 11, girl no. 2); and taking 'control of your computer' (Private School, Year 10, boy no. 2):

> The teacher can see it but also the IT people can do it as well. So they can write a message like 'Get off this site.' Or they'll just say 'go see X' (Private School, Year 11, girl no. 4).

Sanctions for using the computers 'inappropriately' at Private School included 'having to see the IT teacher', 'Saturday detentions', 'accounts closed' for a period of time, 'angry letters' sent to your parents, and 'internal suspensions' which involved working in the headmasters' office (Year 10, boy no.4). One group said that the schools computer monitoring practices left little room for negotiation and that the 'blocking' of websites could have an impact on their school work:

> But, just by the touch of a button, they can shut down your computer. So your work could disappear and everything … it's just a cause of worry that you're going to get a message and he's just going to shut your computer down and you're going to lose your work. It's just a constant threat of a teacher just killing your computer (Private School, Year 11, boy no. 3).

At 'Private School', further surveillance practices were reported by the pupils who explained that they had 'biometrics' systems in use including the use of 'thumbprint' technology (at the Junior School) to allow access to the school and 'to take books out of the library' (Year 11, girl no. 3). A recent report submitted by Strathclyde University has warned about the 'uncritical' acceptance of 'biometric' technologies in schools, particularly by pupils who, the authors argue, 'are likely to regard biometric technologies as "cool" and futuristic and to be uncritically enthusiastic about them' (Naysmith 2009: 1). There was some evidence of this at Private School where pupils stated that the 'fingerprint' system was 'just a clever' and 'efficient way to get your books' (Year 9, girl no. 6). Another pupil though was sceptical of the 'efficiency' of the new 'biometrics' technology:

> But in the junior school the finger print guide, when I was in the juniors I found that it like didn't work because as soon as you put your thumb and put it on, it came up with the last persons' thumb print because theirs had been on it like still had their finger print on … They'd mixed the finger prints and they didn't come up with mine so it took me ages to sign a book out (Year 9, Boy no. 5).

Pupils at 'Private School' also used ID cards which had an account that they were to top up and use to pay for school dinners. When the card is swiped in the canteen a photograph of the pupil appears on the screen to show that they are the legitimate card-holder. This created some resentment amongst the pupils who could no longer borrow a friend's card to pay for their dinner when they had forgotten their own, or buy their friends lunch as a favour:

Yeah, that's annoying because like, if I wanted to buy my best friend something, I know she'd pay me back the next day, so it's not a concern about that. I wish they'd have something where you could be like, 'look, I'm just buying her something' (Year 11, boy no. 2).

Teacher monitoring of the pupils' behaviour at Private School also extended beyond the 'enclosed and controlled' setting of the school. As some of the pupils explained, 'the school like get involved in everything like even if it's nothing to do with the school' (Year 11, girl no. 3). Behaviour outside of the school that came to the attention of teachers included 'smoking', 'stealing a phone when not at school', getting 'hair shaved too short', having to 'wear your blazer on the school bus' (Year 10, girl no. 3), being told to 'tuck your shirt in' out of school hours on the way to a hospital appointment (Year 11, girl no. 2) and video recordings of pupil misbehaviour on the school bus being handed to teachers by the bus drivers (Year 10, boy no. 6). The main reason for monitoring 'out-of-school' behaviour, according to the pupils, was because 'it's sort of bringing a bad reputation to the school' (Year 10, boy no. 4):

I think if like, if you are giving the school a bad name, like 'Private School kids stole my phone.' Then like it's not good for the school. And that's a big thing for the school. They're really bothered about stuff like that. Because we're a private school, they need their reputation to be the best school in the area because by exams results it is (Year 11, girl no. 2).

Out-of-school surveillance
Unlike the 'devils' at Council Estate Comprehensive, none of the pupils at Private School said that they had had direct encounters with the police or PCSOs in their neighbourhood or that they had CCTV cameras in their neighbourhood. Similarly, in the wider public space of the town centre, while they were aware of the existence of open-street CCTV cameras none of the pupils said that they thought they might be targeted by these systems or that they had any encounters that they associated with CCTV operator initiated deployment practice. Many pupils said that they knew CCTV cameras were in operation but they never really thought about them or, echoing the popular cliché so often heard in the popular press and from politicians, said that:

I never notice them but I don't really mind because I'm not doing anything wrong … So, I've got nothing to be worried about (Private School, Year 9, boy no. 1).

In terms of which individuals or groups might be singled out by public-space CCTV operators, pupils said that it would be those who dressed in 'subcultural' attire ('hoodies', 'tracksuits' and 'trainers'):

RF: Do you think the police and security and stuff can tell the difference between the people they do have to pay attention to and the people that they don't have to pay attention to?
Boy no. 1: Yeah
Boy no. 3: Yeah.
Boy no. 5: I guess we're more confident because we know
Boy no. 4: Chavs
[laughter]
Boy no. 3: Everyone is trying to phrase it differently and [x] just says 'chavs' (Private School, Year 10).

Talk amongst the pupils concerning 'Chavs'[6] varied at the three schools, as indicated by the astonishment and amusement amongst Year 10 boys at Private School when one of the group inadvertently blurted out the word 'Chav' when the others were being careful about how they phrased their words (At Girls Comprehensive the first pupil to use the term whispered 'Chavs' to her friend). There was a very clear sense of 'Us' and 'Them' at Private School with pupils suggesting that surveillance targeting, whether in the form of 'direct supervision' from the police and security officers or by CCTV operators, was likely to be directed at 'Them' rather than 'Us'. Pupils at Private School, for example, stated that CCTV cameras are usually found 'in bad areas where people have problems with youths and stuff' (Year 11, girl no. 1). They also thought that the people that CCTV operators 'need to look out for usually dress in like track suits and caps and stuff' (Year 10, boy no. 1) or wear 'track suits tucked into socks' (Year 10, boy no. 4), whereas they wear 'smarter clothes' (Year 10, boy no. 4) and are 'better dressed' (Year 10, boy no. 6). These distinctions made between 'Us' and 'Them' were reinforced by the school's policy on pupil appearance. Commenting on a boy at Private School who was suspended for shaving his head on a 'number one', one pupil said 'he looked like a hooligan' (Year 10, boy no. 1), while another added, 'he'll have a Burberry cap next' (Year 10, boy no. 4).

While Private School pupils may not have considered themselves to be a target for CCTV operators, they (both boys and girls) were very knowledgeable about the technological sophistication and organisational context of 'open-street' and 'private' CCTV surveillance systems. Many understood the capabilities of visual surveillance technologies where cameras could zoom, rotate and record automatically. They also spoke knowledgably and confidently about the organizational context of visual surveillance including differences between public and private CCTV systems, shift patterns and communication links between different local public services like CCTV operators and police. They said that CCTV cameras in 'public places' were likely to be monitored by the 'police' or 'government' (Year 9, girl no. 4), whereas cameras in 'private buildings' were likely to be monitored by 'security' (Year 9, girl no. 5). The pupils also stated that CCTV cameras were likely to be monitored in dedicated 'control rooms' or 'surveillance rooms' in police stations' (Year 10, boy no. 4), whereas 'private' cameras would be monitored 'in the back of the shop' (Year 10, boy no. 5). They also thought that when cameras are monitored '24/7', this is likely to require 'shift patterns' with more CCTV operators working the evening shift 'because in the evening there's more crimes than the morning so they need more people to monitor crime spots or whatever' (Year 11, boy no. 3).

In 'consumer space', the majority of surveillance encounters took place with 'private security' officers at City Centre Mall, a multi-million pound consumer space with a clientele consisting mainly of 'anonymous shoppers of all ages, with a greater number of young people at the weekends who use the mall as a meeting place' (McCahill 2002). Encounters with security officers on this site included pupils at Private School being 'told not to run in the mall' (Year 9, boy no.4), asked to 'move on' (Year 9, girl no. 3), 'told to step away from the balcony' (Year 9, boy no. 4), 'followed around every single shop' on the top floor (Year 10, girl no. 5), and 'asked what we're doing' (Year 10, boy no. 3). None of the pupils at Private School associated these encounters with CCTV operator initiated deployment practices; neither did they seem unduly concerned with this attention. Other encounters took place in the mall during school time when the pupils had a 'half day' or a 'Baker's day':

> I've been pulled out of shops before by like officers, like asking me why am I not in school and if I'm bunking off school ... they have absolutely no trust that you're actually there for a reason. And I know someone who was actually asked to take their planner out,

---

[6] 'Chav' is a derogatory term used in the UK to describe members of the working class who dress in tracksuits and baseball caps. For Hayward and Yar (2006: 14) the term is also applied to members of the working class who are perceived by 'superordinate classes' to be '*aesthetically* impoverished' due to their 'vulgar' and 'excessive' consumption habits.

like their diary, because we have all the events that happen in school, and actually show them that we have a half day. And even then they were likely to call their parents or something. Which is really silly (Year 10, girl no. 3).

Other pupils however said that they could use their social position to evade surveillance in consumer space, as one boy said, 'tell them you go to Private School and everything will be alright' (Year 10, boy no. 3).

Surveying the 'Teen Mums' at Girls Comprehensive

Surveillance in the school

'Girls Comprehensive' is a Local Authority controlled institution with approximately 840 pupils aged 11-16. The school has no catchment area which means that students attend the school from all around the local area. A recent Ofsted Report (2007) found that the number eligible for free school meals is 'well above' the national average. In terms of surveillance in the school, Girls Comprehensive had a small CCTV system in operation, including 7 cameras, 5 'fully functional' and 2 'fixed' cameras. The images displayed by these cameras can be monitored by members of the Management Team from computer terminals, the caretaker in his office, and staff in the main reception area. While none of the pupils were informed by anyone about the presence of cameras, the majority of the girls (6 out of 6 in Year 10) were aware of the presence of CCTV cameras in the school. The Year 11 Girls had also been told by teachers that CCTV cameras were going to be introduced in the corridors and classrooms to watch them:

> Girl No. 6: Mrs X told me and they said that in a couple of years they will have cameras in the corridors and classrooms to keep an eye on us. Stuff like that.
> Girl no. 2: Like big brother.

Like Council Estate Comprehensive, this school also had an 'automated text messaging' system, as the Year 11 girls explained:

> Girls Comprehensive, Year 11
> Girl no. 3: Yeah it's really bad. If you don't have a mobile, they text your house phone.
> Girl no. 4: Or like sometimes teachers they forget their, they mark you down wrong. And then they send it home and then your mum is like fretting 'where are you'?
> Girl no. 3: Yeah, my mum would worry. If like she got
> Girl no. 4: But they don't text you back and say it was a mistake.
> Girl no. 3: 'She's here now'.

As the extract above illustrates, some pupils felt that the 'automated' attendance system left little room for negotiation. Pupils said that the school 'panic too quick' (Year 10, girl no. 6) and that this caused the parents to worry unnecessarily because they do not text back and say it was a mistake. The pupils also mentioned a range of practices designed to monitor their performance, including the government SATT's tests and local monitoring systems set up by the school. Others spoke of a 'traffic light' target system which works as follows: 'Like dark green if you're above target, light green if you're on target, amber if you're below target and red if you're dangerously below' (Year 11, girl no. 2).

While girls' at all three schools expressed a concern about the potential voyeuristic use of surveillance systems, this theme dominated discussions amongst the pupils at Girls Comprehensive. One girl said that in her previous infants school there was a CCTV camera 'looking into the girls' toilets but there was no camera at all looking into the boys' toilets' (Year 10, girl no. 1); another girl wondered if they had a CCTV camera in the changing rooms (Year 11, girl no. 1); one said she would not want them in the classroom because 'we sometimes get changed for PE' (Year 11, girl no. 6); and another did not want

them in the classroom in case 'they can see down your top' (Year 11, girl no. 3). The concerns expressed by pupils in relation to the use of cameras in such places stemmed partly from fears over the 'voyeuristic' use of surveillance, but also because of their expressed desire to have a 'backstage' area of 'emotional release' (Westin, 1967: 34). Or as one pupil put it, in relation to the use of CCTV cameras in toilets or changing rooms, 'Why won't they let you sort yourself out, your face and stuff? ... It's somewhere where I can sort myself out' (Year 10, girl no. 2).

Out-of-school surveillance

Encounters with the police officers or PCSOs in wider 'public space' did not figure so prominently in the girls' talk about surveillance, although some pupils said that they were often stopped by the university security staff on the way home from school (the university is adjacent to Girls Comprehensive) and asked 'where are you going'? (Year 11, girl no. 5). Pupils at Girls Comprehensive also had surveillance encounters with private security officers at City Centre Mall who asked them to 'move on' if they were 'messing about' (Year 11, girl no. 7) and that they will 'be watching you' and 'follow you' (Year 11, girl no. 2), especially 'if there's a few of you' (Year 11, girl no. 4). Pupils explained how they were also approached and asked to remove their hoods:

> In City Centre Mall it was raining, so we had our hoods up. And they made us take off our hoods and walk back in the rain, again, and then walk back in, so the camera could see our faces (Year 9, girl no. 4).

> I always go with like, I don't even mean to, but if I have my hood up; I'll still just walk in there. And if someone just comes up to me like 'can you get your hood down please?' I'm just like yeah whatever. Because surely they know you're not going to do anything (Year 9, girl no. 2).

Year 10 and 11 girls, meanwhile, complained that they had been subject to 'staring' and 'mucky looks' in City Centre mall from adults who had mistaken them for 'teen mothers':

> Year 11, girl no. 1: Did you hear about – I think it was quite a while ago – in City Centre Mall where you take your pictures in and get your baby done and everything like that – There was cameras there. And there was a couple of people who were against pregnancies in young women and young children and all that ... And my baby cousin was approximately two weeks old, and I was babysitting for her, and I went to take her to get her photo taken, and she started crying. And they are pathetic when they cry? Aren't they? I had to pick her up, and I sit there on the bench, holding her and feeding her ... This woman with her big stand, saying: 'Contraception!' came up to me and said, 'Do you know what it means?' Pointing at it, and I went, 'Yes!' And she said, 'What? What is this?' I said, 'This is a baby'. She said, 'Yes I know what it is…Ahhh!' Then, she shrugged her shoulders and walked off. And I thought, if you had taken the time to ask me whose baby this was, I would have said, 'This is my niece'. But she didn't. She accused me of having a baby, and I felt so belittled.

> Year 10, girl no. 3: It's like when old ladies 'tut' at me and comment about the news and young mothers and that. I was like, 'Do I look like I had a baby at 11 years old?'

As we have already seen, one of the main themes to emerge in the 'surveillance talk' at Girls Comprehensive School was a concern about the potential 'voyeuristic' use of visual surveillance technologies. Some said that they had heard stories making an explicit connection between 'surveillance' and 'voyeurism', including firemen in helicopters using cameras to go around gardens looking at ladies sunbathing (Year 11, girl no. 6) and police officers radioing each other to say 'oh there's a MILF over

here, come over here' (Year 11, girl no. 3). Meanwhile, concerns about the 'voyeuristic' use of CCTV surveillance systems were, for one Year 10 Girls Comprehensive pupil, based on first-hand experience of open-street CCTV monitoring and deployment practice:

> I was at [names public gardens in city centre], and there's cameras pointed at [names public gardens in city centre] now, because we hang around there. I'm not a bad person. I promise you.
>
> RF (Laughs) I don't think you are.
>
> It was like proper hot. There was like a heat wave this summer. All the lads were with their tops off because it was like boiling. I thought, 'I got a bikini top on. I will be alright, so I will just lay on my belly, so it's alright'. And I laid on my belly and my top and that, and the police came and said, 'You got to put your top on'. I said, 'Why?' And they said, 'We've just seen you on the camera take your top off'. I went, 'There are boys that have their top off that have bigger things than me. Then, why should I have to put my top on if they don't have to do it'. They said, 'Well, you just have to. We just saw you on camera. You just have to'. I was like, 'Ugh' (Year 10, girl no. 2).

Another central theme identified in conversations with Girls Comprehensive pupils revolved around the issues of 'celebrity culture' and 'media portrayals of women's bodies' which was seen as directly related to the wider development of a 'surveillance society'. Some spoke of the 'voyeuristic' surveillance of female celebrities such as Britney Spears by the paparazzi searching for 'bodily imperfections' like 'the tiniest little paunch' which are then displayed 'synoptically' so that 'your full bodies on TV' (Year 10, girl no. 5). Other pupils summarised the complexity of the 'hierarchies' of surveillance involved when the public consume images of celebrities that have been covertly captured by the paparazzi and displayed synoptically in magazines:

> Year 10, girl no. 3: I saw on a caption on a magazine that said, "Celebrity so and so's picture was taken by a man in the bushes that they have never been seen before."
> Year 10, girl no. 1: So somebody was taking a picture of the celebrities, whilst taking a picture of the man in the bushes. So it's awkward really.
> Year 10, girl no. 4: Everyone's watching each other. And they're all trying to make us all perfect.

The dialectics of surveillance and disguise

For some pupils surveillance had a 'chilling effect' in that it made them acutely aware that their actions were being monitored and led them to change 'legitimate' forms of behaviour or activities due to a concern that their actions could be misinterpreted by the 'surveyors'. Some, for example, were 'nervy' when using the school computers (Private School Year 10, boy no.1) while others said that when they were in shops and supermarkets they sometimes wondered whether their actions could be misinterpreted by CCTV operators (Private School, Year 11, girl no. 3). However, there were many examples of pupils actively seeking to 'avoid' or 'resist' surveillance in the 'school', 'virtual space', 'consumer space', 'public space' and 'domestic space'.

Strategies of 'avoidance' in the schools included pupils walking out the main gates at dinner time without having their ID cards checked by the teachers (Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 11 girls and Year 11 boys); carving out 'free spaces' (e.g. 'fields', 'toilets', 'portable classrooms', 'youth centre') for smoking and other activities outside of the view of the school's internal CCTV cameras (Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 10 and 11 girls; Year 9 and 11 boys); using 'blocking' tactics, like putting 'chewy

and stuff over cameras' on the school buses (Private School, Year 9, boy no. 3); and putting 'up your hood' to avoid being recorded by the school's CCTV cameras 'because you don't want them to see your face when you're twagging' (playing truant from school or a lesson) (Year 9, boy no. 2). Some parents also helped their children to avoid computerised surveillance by refusing to give the school their mobile phone numbers so that they didn't receive the 'automated text messages' sent out concerning pupil 'absence' and 'behaviour' (Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 10, girl no. 5; Girls Comprehensive, Year 11, girl no. 7).

Pupils at Private School said that they had managed to find ways of getting round the 'blocking' mechanisms on school computers which were designed to deny access to 'virtual space'. One pupil said that 'you can get a special code that you can put in that unblocks it' (Private School, Year 10, girl no. 1). Other pupils said they used 'proxy' websites which allowed them to access restricted information. One pupil, for example, claimed that 'you can log into the German Google or something and you can use that to go into the site and it doesn't block it' (Year 11, boy no. 3). Another pupil said that he logged on from the 'music lab computers' because the teachers 'don't have any control over those computers' (Year 11, boy no. 5). A Year 9 girl said that she had found a different version of 'computer game' that had been 'blocked' (Year 9, girl no. 3). Others said that if they were 'banned' from using the computers they could 'ask a friend if they can use their account and they just log on as them' (Year 10, boy no. 1). The 'dialectics of surveillance and disguise' in relation to computer monitoring are summed up by the following pupil who said 'it's just like a race between how fast you can get another site and how fast they can block it' (Private School, Year 11, boy no. 4).

Outside of the school, in their roles as 'consumers', pupils sought ways of 'avoiding', 'blocking' or 'masking' surveillance technologies (Marx 2003). In the mall one pupil tried not to 'raise the red flag' by avoiding walking 'round wiv my hood up … even if it's raining because they [security guards] look at you real dodgy' (Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 10, girl no. 3), while another said 'if I've got my hood up and I go into a shop, I'll take it down before' (Girls Comprehensive, Year 9, girl no. 5). Others said they would avoid 'the security guard that caught ya' (Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 11, girl no. 3) because the other ones 'don't really pay attention' (Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 11, girl no. 1). Pupils were also aware that they were less likely to be subject to the attention of 'private security' officers if they were with 'non-deviants' or 'adults':

> I went one day, and it was chucking it down, and I sat with like a load of mates on this bench, and they told me to move. I went with my nanna the next day – the weather was even worse – and I sat down with my nanna, and they didn't even look at us. And I was like, 'Eh? Today, you've changed your mind then' (Girls Comprehensive, Year 11, girl no. 1).

Pupils at Council Estate Comprehensive said that they tried to find ways of avoiding the 'face-to-face' surveillance of police officers and 'community safety officers'. Some said they would go to 'parks', 'fields', 'under arches', or basically 'places where police don't go' (Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 11, girl no. 5). As one pupil explained, 'they know where they expect people to be but the kids have like realised that they go there so they've changed the place to go' (Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 11, girl no. 3). Meanwhile, some of the Year 11 girls said they would 'avoid' the gaze of open-street CCTV cameras by, for example, asking adults to purchase alcohol outside the view of CCTV cameras:

> Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 11
> Girl no. 4: Yeah there's something like those people know where the cameras are
> Girl no. 5: But then it's like it's not you that would be getting into trouble it's the people that go in
> Girl no. 2: But then you don't ask outside the shop do ya?

Girl no. 5: You don't, you move away from the camera.

From 'surveilled' to 'surveyors'

In the domestic space[7] of their neighbourhoods and homes several school children said that they had relatives who had installed cameras to monitor their own premises. These included an auntie who installed CCTV cameras in the shop she owns (Private School, Year 9, girl no. 1); a Grandma who installed CCTV in her back garden because 'her cars been broken into' (Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 10, girl no. 7); a Grandad who installed a CCTV camera because 'he's obsessed with solar lighting he doesn't want no one to nick em' (Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 10, boy no. 2); and a Grandad who put a camera on his house. Two other pupils meanwhile stated that their parents had installed CCTV cameras in their family home. One pupil lived in a house with a CCTV camera 'trained' on the driveway 'because the car is always getting broken into and stuff' (Girls Comprehensive, Year 11, girl no.2), while another described how a CCTV camera installed at her house had the desired ('panoptic') effect:

> We've got one, it's up in my bedroom because like we went on holiday and there's some people in our, some unsavoury characters in our village and we were going on holiday, and they go around and they burst people's car tyres. So like in the back, we had like a camera and then we used to have it in the front because they used to sit on the pavement outside our house and then like burst tyres on the car and stuff like that. So we just put it up for security. But we made it really obvious that it was there. So in the end, we don't have to use it. It's just like there and they know it's there so they don't do anything. It's not switched on but they think it is (Private School, Year 11, girl no. 1).

Pupils also used technology in the home to conduct surveillance. One pupil 'set up a camera' to record her mum's 'password on the laptop' (Private School, Year 11, girl no. 2), while some of the pupils at Girls Comprehensive said that they use 'three-way telephone calls' which allows them to surreptitiously listen in to telephone conversations. This could be used as a convenient way for three people to arrange 'to meet up' (Year 11, girl no. 3), or to listen in to telephone conversations when they had asked friends to 'dump' a boyfriend: 'X used to do it all the time and I would finish her boyfriend for her. She used to be on the other line' (Year 11, girl no. 4). Meanwhile some of the 'techno-boys' (Holloway and Valentine 2003) at Private School used their knowledge of ICTs to monitor their peers and teachers. Some of the girls, for example, said that pictures of themselves sent via mobile phones to their boyfriends had ended going 'around the whole year' with all the boys using it as 'as their wallpaper' on mobile phones (Year 10, girl no. 2). Another girl said, 'yeah if you're not careful and there's a photo of you out there, sometimes it's just going to spread everywhere' (Year 10, girl no. 6). This had happened to one girl after a school trip:

> I can like, I went to Colorado on a school trip and one of the boys has a picture of me and you down in the pools in our bikinis and we didn't want to go in with all the boys and we waited until afterwards and we went down and one of the boys had taken a picture and he's got it on Myspace … but that's when I was a bit like affronted because it's me in my bikini and I don't want that to go around school and stuff and it was like, there's like someone people that like that send like photos, like private photos that were only going to go to some people and like recently it's become more of a problem and like photos are going around school. But like some are more serious (Year 10, girl no. 2).

Other boys created a 'hate site' (under the name of 'PRIMEDIA') which 'synoptically' displayed negative information about teachers on the internet including 'serious accusations' and things 'that would have gotten the teachers in trouble that wasn't true and stuff' (Year 11, girl no. 5).

---

[7] In her research on children's use of 'domestic', 'neighbourhood' and 'civic' space, Helen Wooley (2006) defines 'domestic spaces' as those that include 'housing areas, private gardens, community gardens and allotments' (2006, p. 48).

Conclusion

The most influential, but also contested, description of the 'social impact' of surveillance was provided by Michel Foucault when he said that the major effect of the 'panopticon' was 'to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power' (1977: 201). The techniques that provided these means of control were first generated in institutions like the army and monasteries but soon began to take place in other institutions like the school. We could certainly find many examples from our 'surveillance talk' with school children to provide some support for Foucault's proposition. At Council Estate Comprehensive, the strategies of 'spatial enclosure' maintained by CCTV cameras, locked gates and teachers patrolling with radios led one pupil to say that the school was 'like a prison' (Year 11, boy no. 3). But the 'panopticon' involves more than 'direct supervision' in an enclosed and controlled institutional setting. It requires 'drills that train the body, regimes that closely regulate schedules of activity, and swift interventions that punish deviations from the prescribed norm' (Norris and Armstrong, 1999; quoted in Yar, 2003, p. 256). At Council Estate Comprehensive, CCTV monitoring was accompanied by an 'automated attendance system' that enforced a 'micro-penalty of time', teachers patrolling the corridors to provide a rapid response to monitored non-compliance, a classificatory system with 'bad behavioural kids' subject to real-time CCTV monitoring in the classroom (Security Manager), and the retrospective reviewing of tapes to punish any deviations from the prescribed norm.

This 'totalizing vision' of 'panoptic' power, however, does not pay sufficient attention to the 'contextual dynamics within which the surveillant gaze either finds, or fails to find, a normalizing effectiveness' (Yar, 2003: 268). Outside of the school, for example, while children in all fifteen groups stated that they were 'aware' of the presence of surveillance technologies like public space CCTV cameras, for many they comprised the 'seen but unnoticed ... background features of social reality' (ibid: 263). As one pupil explained, 'sometimes, you notice them out of the corner of your eye, but ... it doesn't click in your brain. You don't really notice them' (Girls Comprehensive, Year 9, girl no. 5). However, for many of the pupils at Council Estate Comprehensive, the '*conscious registration* of being observed' (ibid: 261) was part of their everyday encounters in the school and public space. They were told on a regular basis that they were 'being watched' by teachers who said 'I'll just check the CCTV'. In wider 'public space' they lived in an environment with an extensive network of open-street CCTV cameras in operation and had direct encounters with the police and PCSOs on a regular basis. They were also subject to 'harder' or more 'coercive' forms of surveillance including having drinks confiscated or tested for alcohol, being on the receipt of 'yellow tickets', and being taken home by the police to their parents. They also found themselves in 'specific interactional contexts and social scenarios' where attention to CCTV cameras was required (Yar 2003: 264). They were approached by police officers with cameras attached to their uniform and questioned by police officers who 'popped up' out of the blue following CCTV operator deployment practices. In contrast, none of the pupils at Private School said that they had direct encounters with the police or PCSOs or had CCTV cameras in their neighbourhood. While they were 'aware' of public space cameras and had extensive knowledge concerning the technological capacity and organisational context of such systems, they did not consider themselves to be 'under surveillance'. For these pupils the monitoring practices of CCTV operators were not directed at 'Us', but at 'Them', the 'devils' in Burberry caps.

These findings suggest that it may be useful for future research, including our own, to situate the 'subjective experiences' and 'behavioural responses' of the 'surveilled' in a wider context by drawing upon sociological theories on 'identity formation' in 'late modernity'. In recent years, a number of theorists have examined the interplay between 'identity', 'gender', 'class' and new forms of 'social control' in 'late modern' consumer societies. Much of this literature draws upon the work of Bourdieu (1977) and his notion of the 'habitus' which he uses to explain how class identities become inscribed not only on the mind, but also on the body and includes 'a way of walking, a tilt of the head, facial expressions ... a tone of voice, [and] a style of speech' (Bourdieu 1977: 85–7). Nayak, for example, has

shown how the 'body capital' of young working males in Newcastle has led to their exclusion from clubs and bars in the city centre (2006: 64). Nayak refers to how the so called 'charvers' draw the attention of the authorities not only because they dress in 'subcultural' attire, but also because of the way they 'hold their head' and 'arch their backs when walking' (cited in Rodger 2008: 64). Those responsible for operating open-street CCTV surveillance cameras have also explained how they use 'new surveillance' technologies to target young working class males who have their 'head up, back straight, upper body moving too much', or those who were 'swaggering, looking hard' (Norris and Armstrong 1999: 122). For these young working class males, and those at Council Estate Comprehensive, the body becomes both a 'performance' *and* a 'straitjacket' (Shilling 2003) as the 'subcultural' attire and demeanour designed to convey resistant impressions leads to further surveillance and exclusion from the 'new spaces of consumption' managed by public-private security networks.

For pupils at Girls Comprehensive the 'conscious registration of being observed' (Yar 2003: 261) did not require 'awareness' or 'knowledge' of 'new surveillance' technologies such as public space CCTV cameras. For these pupils, 'surveillance' was something that permeates the wider culture of 'late modern' society and can be witnessed on a daily basis through the 'synoptic' display of 'celebrities' and 'women's bodies' by the mass media. For these pupils, such developments were intimately bound up with the emergence of a 'surveillance society' and directly shaped their views on, and experience of, surveillance. At Girls Comprehensive, whether it was through the 'hate stare' directed at them from members of the public who suspected that they were 'teen mums', or concerns about the potential for 'voyeuristic' use of CCTV surveillance by male operators, or the 'synoptic' display of female 'celebrities' by the mass media, surveillance was intimately connected with the 'gendered body'. For some pupils these processes could lead to 'self-policing' of the 'body'. As one girl explained, 'CCTV just encourages – you know - beauty, and everyone wanting to be perfect ... Like everybody wanting to be size 8 or really skinny and really, really, beautiful' (Year 10, girl no. 3). The emergence of a 'surveillance society' reminded some of the pupils of a 'futuristic' school play they had recently performed called 'The Perfect Generation'. 'The cameras', as one girl explained, 'are trying to control us and make us perfect' (Year 10, girl no. 4).

Some of our findings suggest that we should perhaps look 'beyond the panopticon' to make theoretical sense of the children's experience of surveillance. Drawing on Deleuze's (1992) suggestion that 'disciplinary societies' have been replaced by 'societies of control', a number of writers have drawn our attention to 'post-panoptic' developments in surveillance regimes (Bogard 2006; Lianos and Douglas 2000). With these regimes surveillance of 'real bodies' is 'replaced by computer simulations constructed from the data trail ... which permits their automated inclusion and exclusion from access to spaces, goods, [and] services' (Yar 2003: 257). In the school, for example, these forms of control were evident with the introduction of 'computerised registers', 'automated text messages', 'cashless' dinner programmes, and 'blocking' systems on the computers. These technologies were not about 'soul training' and 'normalization'; instead they deny or allow access to 'spaces' and 'services' and 'marshal subjects around the building as "efficiently" as possible' (Youth Rights UK 2009). In terms of the 'subjective impact' of these systems, some children explained how they impacted on patterns of 'sociation' or 'face-to-face' interaction with parents, teachers, and their peers. There was 'no negotiation', for example, with the teacher for 'late arrivals'; pupils could no longer buy their friends dinner due to the introduction of the 'cashless' dinner programme; and the 'automated text messages' could 'really land you in it' with parents.

Totalizing visions of 'panoptic' power also tell us very little about how people situated in different 'social positions' respond to monitoring by 'new surveillance' technologies. For some writers, 'post-panoptic' developments are said to be creating a 'rhizomatic' levelling or 'democratizing' of surveillance (Haggerty and Ericson 2000). Once again though this is an uneven process and is shaped by existing social positions of 'class' and 'gender'. This was evident in our study, particularly at Private School' where a number of pupils (mainly boys) used their mobile phones and the internet to 'survey' others, including their fellow pupils and teachers. Some of the boys videoed a girl and were 'sending it to each other via Bluetooth' so

that eventually 'the whole school had it' (Private School, Year 11, girl no. 5). Others created a 'hate site' (under the name of 'PRIMEDIA') which 'synoptically' displayed negative information about teachers on the internet. At Council Estate Comprehensive, on the other hand, 'resistance' strategies comprised mainly of 'avoidance' tactics, with students buying alcohol outside of the view of CCTV cameras; wearing hoodies up when 'twagging' school; avoiding the guards in the mall that had 'banned' them; drinking alcohol in 'parks', 'fields', 'under arches', or basically 'places where police don't go'; and drinking alcohol before the police arrived so they could not tip it out. Other pupils, on finding themselves in the presence of CCTV cameras, would 'return the gaze' in a form of 'distanciated interaction'. For the majority this was seen as 'fun' and occurred when entering retail stores and supermarkets that display the images produced by CCTV cameras on TV screens at the store entrance. When asked why they behave like this when they see their image displayed on the screens they replied that 'they kind of fascinate you' (Girls Comprehensive, Year 9, girl no. 4) or that 'it's exciting' (Girls Comprehensive, Year 11, girl no. 3) and that 'it's like mesmerising' (Private School, Year 9, girl no. 2). Council Estate pupils, on the other hand, returned the 'stare' at CCTV operators; 'threw stones' at the cameras; and 'swore at the cameras' (Council Estate Comprehensive, Year 9, boy no. 2).

In the 'childhood studies' literature it has been argued that there are 'key differences in children's use of public spaces as linked to variations of age, gender and ethnicity', leading some to argue that there is no such thing as a 'unitary public child' (Philo 2000: 250). As we have seen in this paper, we can support this statement by saying that there is no such thing as a 'unitary surveyed child'. The 'social impact' that surveillance may have on children's lives is highly dependent upon existing social relations, identities, and cultural traditions. While all the students stated that surveillance in the school was used to enforce discipline and appropriate behaviour, their experience and reading of surveillance practices in public and semi-public space began to diverge. More specifically, the privileged position of the 'angels' at Private School enabled them to perceive themselves as immune to much of the surveillance targeting that they perceived to be directed at 'Them' (e.g. 'criminals', 'Chavs' and 'drunks'). In contrast, the 'devils' at council estate experienced a range of surveillance practices that monitored, confronted and punished them for working class-based leisure activities currently described as 'anti-social' (i.e. loitering and public drinking), or for simply dressing in a style that they considered was likely lead to surveillance. Finally, the students at Girls Comprehensive experienced a voyeuristic surveillance regime that reaffirms their positioning as 'gendered' subjects of surveillance. In short, the various surveillance practices directed towards the 'angels', 'devils' and 'teen mums' reaffirmed young people's social positionings as 'privileged', 'marginalised' and 'gendered'. At the same time, however, the children were not passive subjects of social structures and technological processes (Jenks 2005). By evading, negotiating and resisting surveillance regimes, the children also shaped surveillance practices and technologies in novel and unanticipated ways.

Acknowledgements

References

Bloor, M., Frankland, J., Thomas, M. & Robson, K. 2001. *Focus Groups in Social Research* (Sage Introducing Qualitative Methods Series), London: Sage.

Bogard, W. 2006. 'Welcome to the Society of Control: The Simulation of Surveillance Revisited', in Haggerty, K. D. and Ericson, R. V. (eds.), *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deleuze, G. 1992. 'Postscript on the Societies of Control', *OCTOBER*, Winter 1992, 59: 3-7.

Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, London: Allen Lane.

Gilliom, J. 1994. *Surveillance, Privacy and the Law: Employee Drug Testing and the Politics of Social Control*, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Gilliom, J. 2001. *Overseers of the Poor: Surveillance and the Limits of Privacy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gilliom, J. 2006. 'Struggling with Surveillance: Resistance, Consciousness, and Identity, in Haggerty, K. D. and Ericson, R. V. (eds.), *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gilliom, J. 2008. 'Surveillance and Educational Testing: No Child Left Behind and the Remaking of American Schools, in M. Deflem (ed.), *Surveillance and Governance: Crime Control and Beyond*, Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.

Haggerty, K. D. and Ericson, R. V. 2000. 'The Surveillant Assemblage', *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(4): 605-622.

Hayward, K. and Yar, M. 2006. 'The "chav" phenomenon: Consumption, media and the construction of a new underclass', Crime, *Media Culture: An International Journal*, 2(1): 9-28.

Holloway, S. A. and Valentine, G. 2003. *Cyberkids: Children in the Information Age*, London: Routledge.

James, A. and Prout, A. 1990. *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood*, London: Falmer.

Jenks, C. 2005. *Childhood*, New York: Routledge.

Lianos and Douglas. 2000. 'Dangerization and the End of Deviance: The Institutional Environment', in Garland, D. and Sparks, R. (eds.), *Criminology and Social Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lyon, D. 2003. *Surveillance after September 11*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Marx, G. T. 2002. 'What's New About the "New Surveillance"? Classifying for Change and Continuity', *Surveillance and Society*, 1: 9-29.

Marx, G. T. 2003. 'A Tack in the Shoe: Neutralizing and Resisting the New Surveillance', *Journal of Social Issues*, 59(2): 369-390.

McCahill, M. 2002. The *Surveillance Web: The Rise of Visual Surveillance in an English City*, Cullompton: Willan.

Morgan, D. 1998. Focus Groups as Qualitative Research (*Sage University Paper Series on Qualitative Research Methods*, 16, London: Sage.

Nayak, A. 2006. 'Displaced Masculinities: Chavs, Youth and Class in the Post-Industrial City', *Sociology,* 40(5): 813-831.

Naysmith, S. 2009. 'Don't sleepwalk into Big Brother surveillance, schools warned', *The Herald*, 13 January, at: www.theherald.co.uk/features/otherfeatures/display.var.2481176.0.Dont_sleepwalk_into_Big_Brother_surveillance_schools_warned.php (accessed 30 April 2009).

Norris, C. and Armstrong, G. 1999. *The Maximum Surveillance Society*, Oxford: Berg.

Philo, C. 2000. 'The Corner-Stones of my World', *Childhood*, 7(3): 243-256.

Rodger, J. 2008. *Criminalising Social Policy: Anti-Social Behaviour and Welfare in a De-Civilised Society*. Cullompton: Willan.

Scott, J. C. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Shilling, C. 2003. *The Body and Social Theory*, London: Sage.

Valentine, G. 1996. 'Angels and devils: moral landscapes of childhood', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 14(5): 581-599.

Valentine, G. 1997. '"My Son's a Bit Dizzy." "My Wife's a Bit Soft": Gender, Children and Cultures of Parenting', *Gender, Place and Culture*, 4(1): 37-62.

Ward, C. 1978. *The Child in the City*, London: The Architectural Press Limited.

Westin, A. 1967. *Privacy and Freedom*, New York: Atheneum.

Wooley, H. 2006. 'Freedom of the City: Contemporary Issues and Policy Influences on Children and Young people's Use of Public Open Space in England', *Children's Geographies*, 4(1): 45-59.

Yar, M. 2003. 'Panoptic Power and the Pathologisation of Vision: Critical Reflections on the Foucauldian Thesis', *Surveillance and Society*, 1(3): 254-271.

Youth Rights UK 2009. 'Biometric surveillance in Britain's schools: An essay about fingerprinting children in schools', March, http://www.justinwyllie.net/essays/biometric.pdf (accessed 30 April 2009).