Introduction

School is literally the biggest club on earth without music. There are so many chances to make conversation, so many chances to make bridges with people, so many chances to make relationships. It's quite amazing … it shapes you out to be who you are in a way … you never think it will, you always think 'f**k it, it's just school', but it really does shape you to be who you are.

—Jerome, Year Thirteen

At the time of my fieldwork, if you walked through a warren of school buildings, patch-worked together over decades of expansion, and slipped to the side of the sports hall, you would find the Misfits gathered. It was here one lunchtime, that James and Michael[1] explained to me their position in the school. James, towering over us, his long hair hanging over his eyes and past his shoulders, said, 'when you have to be friends with people because no one else wants to be with you that's when you tend to find genuine friends, most of the other groups, they're not genuine friends, everyone is a bitch … it's like a blessing in disguise. I'm by no means Mr Universe, but I've got genuine friends.' Michael, white shirt gleaming and hair neatly cut in a short back and sides agreed, 'we're a group of individuals. Does that sound ironic? We don't fit in anywhere else, so we all hang out together.'

Continuing around the side of this building, you leave this enclave, and suddenly find yourself exposed, at the top of a school field, with a view past the school grounds and over the city of London, distant skyscrapers grazing the horizon line. While normally used by boys playing football or cricket, on a sunny day, the field is full of groups of students basking in the sun. It was here, on another lunchtime, that I was talking to Samiya, the

perfect flicks of her eyeliner framing her lively eyes and Tanya, her polish and maturity belying her fifteen years. This was not the usual spot of their friendship group 'the It Girls', who had a bench at the centre of the school grounds, but still, it was not a bad one for watching and being seen. They were reflecting on their history within the school and offered me some thoughts on growing up. 'In younger years,' said Tanya 'you always had to look good, otherwise people would be like "urgghh". There was a time when everyone wanted to look good, but as we got older people gave up on that. They found out there was no one to impress at the school.' 'So, what do you think people care about now?' I asked. 'Actually, still looks, kind of, in the sense of not looking good, but looking good for yourself,' answered Samiya.

This book is the story of one year group, 'Year Eleven', fifteen- to sixteen-year-olds in their final year of compulsory schooling, within Collingson School, a high school in London. James, Michael, Samiya and Tanya were all members of this year group at the time of this fieldwork. It is an account of their friendships, hierarchies and shared history, all things that mattered to them greatly. It tells of the love and care involved in many of these relationships, but also the painful and sometimes brutal ways they sought to shape each other. And it is an account of how, through these relationships, these students were coming to understand themselves as particular kinds of people. As I will argue in this book, it is through attention to these actions, relationships and reflections that we can gain insight into the way individuality, as a specific kind of personhood, is produced in practice. This is not the abstract, generic kind of individuality often evoked as a superficial counterpoint to more sustained ethnographic explorations of other kinds of personhood, but rather, historically constituted and produced through specific understandings of sameness and difference.

Some familiar dimensions of individuality, as described in the academic literature, were part of this. The above reflections from students evoked particular understandings of the appropriate way persons should be, authentic and with a hidden and essential inner self which one must strive to remain true to. As James and Michael conceptualized it, they were being true to themselves in a way many of the higher-status pupils were not. This meant that they did not fit in, but in not fitting in they found each other. As genuine selves, they were able to create genuine friendships, whereas by implication, the 'fakeness' of the high-status pupils led to bitchy, fake friendships. The appropriate self thus enabled the right kinds of friendships, premised on this authenticity, rather than superficial appearances. Samiya and Tanya drew on a similar set of ideas; it was immature to be motivated by the superficiality of what others think, growing up was about doing things, such as looking good, for yourself. However, in these examples, we can also see how evaluations of self and others were fundamentally

structuring of the way these notions of individuality come into being in everyday life. Thus, as we will see in the course of this book, every aspect of the self, including authenticity, could be evaluated (and potentially found wanting) by peers.

As I will argue, for the young people in this book, there was an ontological quality to individuality, understood in terms of authentic depth, separateness from others and uniqueness. Notions of persons as existing prior to social relations, independent, responsible for their actions, with a true, inner and authentic self were elaborated through a peer ethics that subjected persons and actions to persistent evaluation. As we will see, notions of appropriate personhood were interwoven in the qualitative distinctions of worth that were a pervasive feature of everyday life in school. Thus, I argue that the emergence of individuality in practice can only by understood through attention to the relationships and interactions that enable it to appear and take shape. It is through the mutually constitutive nature of separation and connection, being part and being apart, shaping and unpicking, that young people come to understand themselves as particular kinds of individual persons, in a particular place, at a particular time.

Interrogating Individuality

Anthropologists have long argued that while the individual is often taken as the self-evident, natural and universal form of personhood, the ethnographic record shows that this is not the case. Ethnography has enabled anthropologists to examine diverse forms of personhood – '[t]he full variety of ways in which humans comprehend and create themselves as self-conscious agents in the world' (Bialecki and Daswani 2015, 272). Anthropologists have thus examined the public models and concepts of personhood, observable in law, jurisprudence, religion and collective ideology (such as kinship and caste) as well as the more intimate and private processes of self-making through which actors come to understand themselves as particular kinds of persons. Personhood 'arguably extends a moral value to persons that non-persons are excluded from' (Degnen 2018, 7). As such, the processes by which humans are made into persons, including description, evaluations, judgements and commitments, can be understood as ethical, and as constituting ethical persons (Lambek 2013).

A key question this literature has explored is the ways in which persons are understood as connected to or separate from each other. When the individual, atomistic and indivisible person is taken as the starting place, relationships are imagined as external to, and happening after, the person (Lambek 2015). Key questions then become how individuals

become connected to each other. Thus, a huge amount of academic attention, across a range of disciplines, has sought to understand and explain the socialization or enculturation of children. These concepts rest on an idea of the baby as a pre-social 'bio-bundle' (Gottlieb 2004) that needs to be 'socialized' or 'enculturated' to become connected to other people. Persons are a priori individuals who need to be made social by society, with society the necessary whole that encompasses and connects individuals as units (Strathern 1992; Toren 1999, 2012). However, as anthropologists have shown, different imaginations of the person posit a completely different order of relationships and units. When relationships are imagined to precede and create persons, the notion that a child will need to be 'socialized' into relationships makes little sense (Strathern 1988).

These different models of personhood have often been characterized in anthropological debates in terms of a distinction between 'individual' (autonomous, sovereign and indivisible) and 'dividual' (relational, composite and divisible) personhood. While it would be hard to overstate the influence of this individual-dividual contrast in structuring discussions of personhood in anthropology (Degnen 2018), there has been much debate about what these distinctions describe. Individuality and dividuality, as mutually exclusive categories, have been employed to characterize whole societies, modes of life, or types of person (Schram 2015). And they join other contrastive pairs that are often mapped onto distinctions between 'the West' and 'the Rest': egocentric versus sociocentric, bounded versus relational, monist versus dualist, or autonomous versus dependent (Lamb 1997).

These dichotomous distinctions have been challenged from a number of perspectives. For example, attending to histories and flows of colonialism, missionization and capitalism, scholars have highlighted the range of individuating practices, ideologies and cultural formations that such things as nationhood, liberal democracy, civil rights, electoral politics and Christianity both rest upon and continually recreate (LiPuma 1998; Sykes 2007 and contributors; Bialecki and Daswani 2015). Others have highlighted the way logics of individuality (for example autonomous intentionality) are not unique to the West and emerge through their own histories (Course 2010; Walker 2012). Furthermore, scholars have been critical of the flattening effects of labelling all different kinds of persons as dividual/relational, without attending to the particular forms of connection and divisibility observable in specific places (Busby 1997; Boddy 1998). As such, over the last few decades it has been widely recognized that it is not possible to maintain a sharp binary between 'individuals' and 'dividuals' and instead, attention can be paid to how persons can be both, although these different dimensions of personhood may be variously foregrounded or cultural elaborated

in specific ways (Englund and Leach 2000; Smith 2012; Lambek 2015; Degnen 2018).

At the same time, however, there remains a lack of ethnographic research on personhood in 'Western settings'. Personhood in 'non-Western' locations has been examined through close ethnographic attention to the words, actions and lived experiences of interlocutors. In contrast, 'paradigmatic conceptualizations' (Sökefeld 1999) of Western personhood have been readily accepted, evidenced through reference to ideas, texts, jurisprudence or anecdote (Ouroussoff 1993; Kusserow 1999a, 1999b; Sökefeld 1999; Carsten 2004; Laidlaw 2013). As such, in the anthropological literature on personhood, recourse to the possessive, bounded Western individual can arguably still be viewed as a 'rhetoric so routine as to have become reflex' (Laidlaw 2013, 33).

This lack of attention is not trivial. Assumptions of the rational Western individual have provided the unexamined lens through which the 'other' is understood as different, and further reinforce, rather than deconstruct, longstanding (and long critiqued) notions of rational, free West versus exotic, culture-bound rest (Ouroussoff 1993; Sökefeld 1999; Laidlaw 2013). This then obscures the histories through which individuality has been produced through the abjection and exclusion of racialized, enslaved and colonized 'others' (Hartman 1997; Wynter 2003). While anthropological debates on personhood have worked to challenge and parochialize the assumptions of the universal individual, they have also reinforced this subject, by using it as the unexamined counterpoint against which contrasting ideas of relational, dividual person are elaborated (LiPuma 1998; Laidlaw 2013). Thus, I use 'West' and 'Western' with caution in this monograph, recognizing them as highly problematic terms that have shaped, and continue to shape, academic debates on personhood and conceptions of individuality (see also Degnen 2018). As I aim to explore, this category informs what is hidden in the making of persons and so requires interrogation.

As Adrie Kusserow further highlights, when attempts have been made to disaggregate notions of individualism, this often takes the form of identifying particular groups in society (such as women, or the working class) which are more 'relational' or 'sociocentric', rather than examining the actions, concepts and discourses through which differing modes of individualism may be manifested (Kusserow 1999a). Importantly then, uninterrogated and empirically unfounded notions of the individual work to reproduce understandings of the individual not only as abstract and unchanging, but as tacitly white, male, middle-class and middle-aged (Kusserow 1999; Degnen 2012).

Scholarship that does attend ethnographically to personhood and self in Western settings has produced work that highlights how dimensions

of relationality, connectedness and plurality emerge as part of Western people's concepts of themselves, and also interrogates and disambiguates manifestations and conceptions of individualism (Degnen 2018). For example, considering adoptees' narratives of searching for their birth kin, Janet Carsten argues that their articulation of their selves as 'fractured and partial … suggests a notion of personhood where kinship is not simply added to bounded individuality, but one where kin relations are perceived as intrinsic to the self' (Carsten 2004, 107). As Carsten further argues, there is a 'very ordinary quality' to this kind of relationality that is woven into Western everyday life; however, this is often obscured in the anthropological literature that draws on more 'rarefied' sources.

Meanwhile, drawing on her ethnographic material from four different pre-schools in three socio-economically different neighbourhoods in New York, Kusserow argues that while individualism is a structuring discourse for parents in all neighbourhoods, and shapes their child-rearing practices in important ways, these notions are refracted through classed experiences of inequality. As such, in the two working-class neighbourhoods of Queens, parents often focused on 'the importance of moving from soft selves to hard and tough selves' (Kusserow 2004, 35). Porosity entailed danger, the penetration of negative influences from the street (e.g. drugs, prostitution). Meanwhile, parents in privileged upper East-side Manhattan described the importance of a child opening up to the world and emphasized the importance of developing 'psychological uniqueness and individuality' (Kusserow 2004, 82). Similarly, Hyang Jin Jung (2007) focused on the role of teachers, administrators and parents in shaping young personhoods in a Junior High School in Midwest United States. As Jung shows, educators sought to encourage individuality through the regulation of emotions, placing value on both self-expression and self-discipline. Students were encouraged to act as individuals, the separate and internal self being 'the source of power and locus of control in dealing with the external world' (2007, 42). As Jung further argues, the hegemony of this white middle-class way of understanding personhood and emotions, and associated interactional expectations, had important implications for students of different racial, ethnic and classed backgrounds whose self-understanding and interactional style may differ from the specific kind of normative individuality valued in school.

Thus, in contrast to the taken-for-granted way individuality has been present as a counterpoint for other kinds of personhood, these ethnographic accounts foreground and make visible the intersubjective making of particular kinds of individuality. As I will discuss further in the next chapter, individuality is so tied into standard modes of analysis that without conscious interrogation its invisible assumptions may be inadvertently

reproduced. As such, exploring individuality ethnographically, without uncritically re-inscribing individuality analytically, is one of the aims of this book.

Submitting individuality to the same kind of critical attention that has been extended to other forms of personhood, I examine how it is produced in everyday life at school, through a mutually constitutive interplay of separation and connection, continuity and discontinuity, uniqueness and sharedness. Emphasizing the ethical aspects of these dimensions of personhood, Michael Lambek has delineated 'forensic' and 'mimetic' as both ideologies of the person and dimensions of the self (Lambek 2013). Forensic dimensions encompass self-sameness, and continuity over time, and foreground the ways people are held accountable for their actions and the commitments they have made. Meanwhile, mimetic dimensions encompass continuity with other people, and the imitative, iterative and discontinuous aspects of selves and foreground the way new commitments can be made, and how what people say and do builds on, and is shaped by, the words and actions of others.

As I will argue, individuality was an important part of young people's experience and self-understanding. Although this does not exhaust the full possibilities of experience, and often we can see alternative understandings of persons and relations come into view, I contend that taking seriously young people's perspectives is also to take seriously the experience of being an individual and feeling separate from other people. Utilizing forensic and mimetic as analytical strands helps us to understand the fundamentally intersubjective nature of these processes. By paying attention to the specific nature of sociality in school, we will see how students tenaciously shape each other, and at the same time, constitute themselves and others as individually responsible for their own actions.

Taking seriously young people's conceptualization of themselves as individual persons also necessitates recognizing the ethical dimensions of these processes. As we will see, life at school was saturated with 'people's evaluative perceptions, reactions, understandings, and claims concerning subjectivities, actions, persons, qualities, and ways of life, in terms of whether these were admirable, despicable, unremarkable, or otherwise distinct in worth' (Londoño Sulkin 2012, 3). These qualitative evaluations are centrally important to how students were constituting themselves and each other as particular kinds of ethical persons according to a range of historically constituted criteria. Attending to these ethics of everyday life helps us to recognize what matters to young people and what is at stake in the making of persons.

The students in this book are centred, as reflexive people being, becoming and making sense of themselves and each other anew, in a particular

time and place. As I will explore, the pervasive ethical judgements that constituted personhood in school were shaped by both ideologies of the individual and historically constituted specificities of social difference. As I will discuss, some kinds of sameness and difference were considered by students to be particularly important to who you were as a person. Boys and girls were understood as different kinds of persons, who were legitimized in doing different kinds of things, acting in different ways and judged according to different kinds of criteria. To be a boy or girl was considered self-evident and unchanging and, as we will see, these apparently binary gendered distinctions were structuring of everyday life and held great explanatory potential for students. Reflecting the intensely cosmopolitan nature of London, where the school is situated, students traced a multitude of global 'routes and roots' (Gilroy 1993) and in these classifications and identifications of sameness and difference some people *were* [black, white, Asian, mixed race], some *were from* [a location in the world] (in addition to being from London as their taken-for-granted shared location), and some were both. These were understood as fixed aspects of persons, as well as in terms of a geographical history shared with parents, grandparents and ancestors, and they had important implications for the way persons were understood.

At the same time as I seek to hold steady the way young people are active, critical and reflexive meaning-makers, and attend closely to their conceptual work, I also seek to locate them within the wide and deep global histories through which they draw meaning. As I will explore in more depth in the next chapter, understandings of individuality, and gendered and racialized/ethnicized repertoires of understanding, have been constituted through and are bound up with processes of capitalism, colonialism and racialization.

The claim of this book is not that this exploration of personhood among young people in London can somehow speak for a Western personhood, but rather can speak to it: revealing the processes through which particular kinds of individuality are constituted and come to appear as self-evident in a particular time and place. Thus, this book joins a long history of critical scholarship in anthropology and beyond, that engages in the task of defamiliarization, making visible what appears or has been made to appear as natural, self-evident and given in the nature of things. The focus on young people in the process of growing up offers a valuable way to study processes by which understandings of persons and individuality, which subsequently come to appear as self-evident, are learnt (Toren 1999). It centralizes young people as worthy of being listened to, granting them determination of their own conceptual understandings at the same time as these are traced historically.

The Importance of School

School emerges in ethnographic accounts as a particularly intense site of sociality for young people. Their institutional organization into narrow age-specific groupings enables a compression and thus intensification of peer relations (Amit-Talai 1995). Classmates are often with each other seven hours a day, five days a week. As such, school is the locus of many important relationships, friends, ex-friends, love interests and enemies. Even forty years after graduating high school, Sherry Ortner found that her respondents – fellow classmates of the class of '58 – recalled its friendships, cliques and hierarchies so vividly, they were 'burned like a tattoo' on their memories (2002). This recognizable patterning not only emerges in personal histories, but in the cultural imagination of Euro-America, for example in the many influential high school movies made over the last five decades (Bulman 2015).

As I argue in this book, by paying attention to peer relationships and everyday life at school, we can recognize the way these are deeply implicated in the production of personhood. This book focuses on everyday life in school, rather than other sites of young people's lives. Whilst recognizing the partial nature of this exploration (as I will discuss further in Chapter 2), school represents an intense site of action and investment. While the focus of this book is what happens at school that is not formal education, formal education also shapes understandings of individuality and its invisibility in numerous ways (Jung 2007; Winkler-Reid 2017).

The focus of this book is one year group in particular, Year Eleven, fifteen to sixteen-year-olds preparing to take their GCSE national exams at the end of the year. The students in this book joined the school aged eleven and progressed reliably through each school year together.[2] As many students would leave to continue their studies at other schools or colleges, Year Eleven students were approaching the end of their time together as a group in its existing form. Over these years together the young people had created and maintained relationships, friendship groups and a hierarchical social order through the sheer force of their actions. They engaged in manifold acts of judgement and evaluation, love and care, punishment and recrimination, and they actively and tenaciously shaped themselves and each other according to particular ideas of what it means to be an acceptable person. It is these relationships and actions that are the focus of this book.

While the students disagreed upon many things, the importance of having friends in school was not one of them. Friendship could provide love, belonging and security, but was also a public requirement. Friendship in school was both contingent on being assessed as an acceptable person and a necessary pre-requisite for being viewed as acceptable. Being friendless

was not only a lonely and isolating experience, but also an unequivocal sign of social failure. Likewise, a person with only one friend might be suspect, positioned perilously close to the boundaries of acceptability. While the quality of friendships was also judged by students (for example, having lots of friends but no close friends might lead to judgements of 'superficiality'), friendships offered clear evidence of acceptability. Thus, as we will see throughout this book, there was a lot at stake in friendships. To reject others shaping of you as an appropriate person was to risk sacrificing the pleasures, rewards and securities of friendship.

The making and maintaining of friendships required continual effort of action and exchange, and a commitment to share time and space. The mundane routine of the school day and institutional organization of students in year groups, form groups and class groups were the institutional skeleton upon which the intensity of these interactions and relationships were created in, around and sometimes against. In Collingson School, students were divided into different form groups (where they met for registration at the beginning and end of the day) and different class groups, according to the subjects they were studying and academic 'ability'. Students moved from classroom to classroom, making their way through the narrow corridors and stairways at the same time. As the bell rang at the end of each lesson, empty corridors suddenly become full of students, as if a cork had been popped, and the next five minutes were an intense proximity of bodies jostling and jostled, pushing and pushed, squashing and squashed, an experience similar to travelling on a rush hour train.

From the moment they met their friends, in all possible moments between the school bells and up to and often over the point at which a teacher claimed the space for formal learning, students talked, joked and laughed. They put a huge amount of time and energy into creating and maintaining their relationships with each other and the results of these efforts were impressive. Through their actions – the constant talk, the joking and laughing, the hugging and holding hands, the football and play fighting – they created friendships, friendship groups and a hierarchical social order.

The year group was understood by the students as a hierarchy, where those at the top were 'seen and known', while those at the bottom were 'seeing' and 'knowing'. These processes contributed to the tacit orchestration by which some high-status students were allowed to exert their will over others, while low-status students were expected to maintain invisibility and a compression, rather than extension, of their selves. Moreover, through these actions and interactions, as I will explore through the course of this book, students not only created different kinds of relationships with each other, they also judged, evaluated, reflected and ultimately shaped each other and themselves into particular kinds of people.

There was a lot at stake for students in the 'practice' of living; to act or to not act both involved risks, and the consequences of misjudging these were exclusion, isolation, insult, punishment or no longer being considered an acceptable person. Readers may be dismayed by the stories of the pain students inflict on each other, the often rigid ways they defined what it meant to be an acceptable and appropriate person, the riven nature of social differences, and the histories of inequality and oppression upon which these drew. While this was certainly an important and painful part of the school experience, as I also hope to show in this book, love, understanding, care, and forgiveness were also important and ever-present. School was a lively and fun place, full of friendship and laughter. There was something joyous about being with your friends every day, a pleasure many adults have long left behind. It is these aspects of school life, all the interactions and relationships that go on within, around and between the adult structured demands of school and formal learning, that form the fabric from which this book is constituted.

Structure of the Book

In the next chapter, I offer a wider and longer perspective on the ideas, concepts and experiences that emerge ethnographically in the remainder of the book. Firstly, I trace the long history through which ideas of the individual have developed, fundamentally shaped by intersecting regimes of colonialism, racism, patriarchy and capitalism amongst other inequalities. Secondly, I identify the ongoing presence of individuality as an important, yet often invisible ordering logic in Western sense-making practices. Finally, I situate the arguments within literature on youth and life-course, schooling and systems of inequality, and the anthropology of morality and ethics.

In Chapter 2, I situate the students and their school within a particular time and place, starting with an exploration of the history and present of the global city of London before introducing the neighbourhood and school. In this chapter I also discuss my fieldwork process and finding my place in Year Eleven. Finally, I consider both change and continuity in the lives of young people in London since I conducted the ethnography in 2007–2008.

The history of Year Eleven is explored in Chapter 3. Students' narration of their shared history enabled them to constitute themselves as a 'good' group which has grown together, despite past wounds. This history highlights both the pain students inflicted on each other – the brutality and force by which they seek to shape each other into particular kinds of persons – but also, the love, care and forgiveness they extended to each

other. Finally, this chapter introduces the four friendship groups at the heart of this monograph and examines how these groups enabled students to define themselves as particular kinds of people in relation to those around them, structured by hierarchical relations which both connected and differentiated them.

Chapter 4 focuses on girls' friendships, developing the argument that friendships are implicated in the production of individuality. While boys were legitimated in 'acting big' and exerting their will across the year group, this chapter focuses on girls' friendships as offering them an intimate and legitimate means to exert their will and shape each other into acceptable selves. This chapter details the ways these friendships entailed both the maintenance of a separate, authentic and forensically responsible self, and recognition of interconnectedness with friends: for example, how a friend's 'bad reputation' can taint those around them.

Chapter 5 focuses on the ways students constituted themselves as both similar and different to one another in racialized and ethnicized ways. In the context of London as a global city, mirrored in the many 'roots and routes' of students in the school, 'where are you from?' was a key question students asked each other. This spatial history shared with parents and grandparents was joined with simplified categorizations of 'black, white, Asian, mixed race', and understood as a fundamental, unchanging aspect of what kind of person you are. At the same time 'blackness' and 'whiteness' were understood as mutable descriptors that could be shared with friends. Thus, the understanding of persons as both forensically distinct, and mimetically connected to each other, is exemplified in these student understandings.

Chapter 6 describes the way a powerful sexual ethic constituted by students entailed evaluations of sexual practices and scrutiny of the qualities of persons involved. In these interactions students were constituted as different kinds of people who were legitimated in acting in particular and highly gendered ways: for boys, this pivoted round a pursuant and active expression of sexual desire, while for girls, sexual desire needed to be carefully guarded and safely contained within a committed relationship. These sexual ethics ascribed boys and girls with different kinds of responsibility and manifested gendered relations of connection and disconnection. Sexual practices evaluated as 'wrong' not only put the reputation of individuals at risk, but also jeopardized the reputation of the friendship group and year group. This chapter in turn explores the policing and work that went into maintaining the year group as 'good' and 'worthwhile', against such risks.

In Chapter 7, I consider the ethics of individuality which were observable in school. As I argue, this ideological valorization of the individual person emerged in different ways, including through the virtue of authenticity.

Made visible in evaluations between friends and peers, we see the ways in which relationships worked to constitute individual persons of a particular kind.

Finally, to conclude, I move beyond everyday life in high school, arguing for the importance of displacing the generic, abstract and rarefied 'straw individual' in anthropology with full-blooded accounts of how individual personhoods are constituted in everyday life, intertwined with ethics and through relations with others. I also demonstrate the importance of displacing individuality thinking and interrogating individuality when working with young people by focussing on the project I co-founded, Girl-Kind North East, which was developed from the ethnographic research presented in this book.

Notes

1. All names of people and places are pseudonyms.
2. It would be very unusual for a student to repeat a year; most students progress through school regardless of their academic achievements or failures.

References

Amit-Talai, Vered. 1995. 'The Waltz of Sociability: Intimacy, Dislocation, and Friendship in a Quebec High School1', in Vered Amit-Talai and Helena Wulff (eds), *Youth Cultures: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 144–65.

Bialecki, Jon and Girish Daswani. 2015. 'What Is an Individual?: The View from Christianity', *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5(1): 271–94. https://doi.org/10.14318/hau5.1.013.

Boddy, Janice. 1998. 'Afterword: Embodying Ethnography', in Andrew Strathern and Michael Lambek (eds), *Bodies and Persons: Comparative Perspectives from Africa and Melanesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 252–73.

Bulman, Robert C. 2015. *Hollywood Goes to High School*. Duffield: Worth Publishers.

Busby, Cecilia. 1997. 'Permeable and Partible Persons: A Comparative Analysis of Gender and Body in South India and Melanesia', *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 3(2): 261–78. https://doi.org/10.2307/3035019.

Carsten, Janet. 2004. *After Kinship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Course, Magnus. 2010. 'Making Friends, Making Oneself: Friendship and the Mapuche Person', in Amit Desai and Evan Killick (eds), *The Ways of Friendship: Anthropological Perspectives*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 154–73.

Degnen, Cathrine. 2012. *Ageing Selves and Everyday Life in the North of England: Years in the Making*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

———. 2018. *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Personhood and the Life Course*. New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Englund, Harri and James Leach. 2000. 'Ethnography and the Meta-Narratives of Modernity', *Current Anthropology* 41(2): 225–48.

Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. London and New York: Verso.

Gottlieb, Alma. 2004. *The Afterlife Is Where We Come From*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hartman, Saidiya V. 1997. *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jung, Hyang Jin. 2007. *Learning to Be an Individual: Emotion and Person in an American Junior High School*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kusserow, Adrie Suzanne. 1999. 'Crossing the Great Divide: Anthropological Theories of the Western Self', *Journal of Anthropological Research* 55(4): 541–62.

———.1999. 'De-Homogenizing American Individualism: Socializing Hard and Soft Individualism in Manhattan and Queens'. Ethos 27 (2): 210–34. https://doi.org/10.1525/eth.1999.27.2.210.

———. 2004. *American Individualisms: Child Rearing and Social Class in Three Neighborhoods*. New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Laidlaw, James. 2013. *The Subject of Virtue: An Anthropology of Ethics and Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lamb, Sarah. 1997. 'The Making and Unmaking of Persons: Notes on Aging and Gender in North India', *Ethos* 25(3): 279–302. https://doi.org/10.1525/eth.1997.25.3.279.

Lambek, Michael. 2013. 'The Continuous and Discontinuous Person: Two Dimensions of Ethical Life', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 19(4): 837–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.12073.

———. 2015. 'What's Love Got to Do with It?', *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5(1): 395–404. https://doi.org/10.14318/hau5.1.018.

LiPuma, Edward. 1998. 'Modernity and Forms of Personhood in Melanesia', in Andrew Strathern and Michael Lambek (eds), *Bodies and Persons: Comparative Perspectives from Africa and Melanesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 53–79.

Londoño Sulkin, Carlos David. 2012. *People of Substance: An Ethnography of Morality in the Colombian Amazon*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Ortner, Sherry B. 2002. '"Burned Like a Tattoo": High School Social Categories and "American Culture"', *Ethnography* 3(2): 115–48. https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138102003002001.

Ouroussoff, Alexandra. 1993. 'Illusions of Rationality: False Premises of the Liberal Tradition', *Man* 28(2): 281–98. https://doi.org/10.2307/2803414.

Schram, Ryan. 2015. 'A Society Divided: Death, Personhood, and Christianity in Auhelawa, Papua New Guinea', *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5(1): 317–37. https://doi.org/10.14318/hau5.1.015.

Smith, Karl. 2012. 'From Dividual and Individual Selves to Porous Subjects', *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 23(1): 50–64. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1757-6547.2012.00167.x.

Sökefeld, Martin. 1999. 'Debating Self, Identity, and Culture in Anthropology', *Current Anthropology* 40(4): 417–48. https://doi.org/10.1086/200042.

Strathern, Marilyn. 1988. *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia*. The Gender of the Gift. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520910713.

———. 1992. *After Nature: English Kinship in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sykes, Karen. 2007. 'Interrogating Individuals: The Theory of Possessive Individualism in the Western Pacific', *Anthropological Forum* 17(3): 213–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/00664670701637669.

Toren, Christina. 1999. *Mind, Materiality and History: Explorations in Fijian Ethnography*. London and New York: Routledge.

———. 2012. 'Imagining the World That Warrants Our Imagination: The Revelation of Ontogeny', *The Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 30(1): 64–79. https://doi.org/10.3167/ca.2012.300107.

Walker, Harry. 2012. *Under a Watchful Eye: Self, Power, and Intimacy in Amazonia*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Winkler-Reid, Sarah. 2017. '"Doing Your Best" in a London Secondary School: Valuing, Caring and Thinking through Neoliberalism', *The Sociological Review Monographs* 65(1): 137–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/0081176917693553.

Wynter, Sylvia. 2003. 'Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation – An Argument', *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3(3): 257–337. https://doi.org/10.1353/ncr.2004.0015.