All the Rage: Emotional Configurations of Anger as Feminist Politicization

Joe Curnow, University of Manitoba, joe.curnow@umanitoba.ca
Tresanne Fernandes, RadLab Scholar Activists, tresanne1152@gmail.com
Lila Asher, RadLab Scholar Activists, lila7asher@gmail.com
Sinead Dunphy, RadLab Scholar Activists, sineadvdunphy@gmail.com

Abstract: In this paper we argue that anger played an important and under-theorized role in shaping the learning ecology of the youth climate activist campaign Fossil Free UofT. Through an interaction analysis of video data collected from the Women's Caucus meetings over the course of one year, we examined how emotion, and particularly snarky rage, shaped the process of politicization. We draw on recent interventions in the learning sciences which orient to emotionality, especially Vea's approach to guided emotional participation, to show how emotion shaped the learning trajectories of youth activists. We argue that learning to be angry and express outrage through snarky humour-- was a learning process/target/outcome that enabled participants to become feminists by enabling educational intimacy and fostering politicized trust.

Learning through rage

In this paper, we examine how climate activists became politicized through their experiences in a youth activist Women's Caucus within Fossil Free UofT. While the divestment campaign focused on preventing the worst impacts of climate change by stopping institutional investment in fossil fuels, the campaign struggled internally with racialized and gendered dynamics in which people of color and women, especially women of colour, faced significant barriers to becoming recognized as leaders and meaningful contributors (Curnow & Chan, 2016). The friction that emerged from these dynamics generated two caucus spaces where those outside the dominant group could discuss shared experiences-- the People of Colour Caucus and the Women's Caucus. These caucus spaces were highly politicizing, and the Women's Caucus participants opted to record all of their meetings as part of this research process, in part because the project had provided them tools for understanding and articulating gendered and racialized grievances. In this space, participants learned to express anger, most frequently through expressions of snarky humour. Snark is a type of humour that relies on sarcasm, biting wit, irony, and, often, anger, to communicate. While some research on snark and sarcasm has argued that it is a poison pill for pedagogy (Chapman, 1948), our interaction analysis of video-data showed that snark and anger were important emotional configurations (Vea, 2018) that served as both learning targets and tools for politicizing members of the Women's Caucus (Curnow, Davis, & Asher, 2019), which built politicized trust (Vakil, McKinney de Royston, Nasir & Kirshner, 2016) through educational intimacy (Uttamchandani, 2019).

In the sections that follow, we briefly describe the emergent learning sciences literature on how relationships of solidarity are constructed and shape the kinds of joint work that collectives take on, read through the lenses of educational intimacy and politicized trust. We then leverage Vea's critique that emotionality has been underused in learning sciences research and look at research on how emotion, especially anger, can produce transformation. We then turn to the context of Fossil Fuel Divestment and the Women's Caucus to describe our methods of data collection and analysis. Our analysis is organized in 3 sections. First, we explore how anger and snarking were modeled and adopted in the Women's Caucus. We then look at how learning anger, in the form of snarky humour, enabled emotional configurations to shift. Finally, we examine how the practice of snarking build educational intimacy, where the practice of being angry and receiving affirmation generated a space of politicized trust. We argue that guided emotional participation enabled Women's Caucus participants to express and make sense of feminist anger, and through their shifting relationship to anger, they built a community of solidarity, intimacy, and politicized trust which further sustained their transformation as feminists.

Perspectives: Politics, emotion, and learning

Recent work has called on the learning sciences to centre questions of power and politics (Esmonde & Booker, 2016; The Politics of Learning Collective, 2017) even more than the foundational work on learning, culture, and equity did. In particular, there are calls for work in activist and social movement contexts, where learning is consequential (Jurow & Shea, 2015), and has the potential to shift how the learning sciences theorize the why and how of learning (Philip, Bang & Jackson, 2018; Esmonde & Booker, 2016). There is also interest in

thinking about how people learn ideology and politics (Curnow, 2013; Curnow, Davis, & Asher, 2019; Kirshner, 2008; Philip, Gupta, Elby, & Turpen, 2018), and how that learning helps us to understand why and how people engage in communities to create change across scales (Jurow & Shea, 2016)

Within the body of work emerging to respond to questions of learning, power, and social action, there has been special attention paid to the types of relationships that enable learning in politicized spaces. From a DBR perspective, Vakil, McKinney de Royston, Nasir & Kirshner (2016) point to relations of politicized trust as a building block of the research partner relationship, one where racialized solidarity and shared political commitment animate the work and make it possible. Looking more to the relationships between community members, Teeters and Jurow (2018) theorize relationships of *confianza*, highlighting how mutual trust, respect, and commitment make it possible for scale-making and future-making in community organizing contexts. In recent work, Uttamchandani draws attention to what he calls "educational intimacy": the shared practices of collectives that create a "distinct kind of closeness which mandates vulnerability, accelerates joy, and promotes collective advancement when people learn together in especially fulfilling ways." (Uttamchandani, 2019). Each of these interventions draws the attention of learning scientists toward processes of solidarity building, exploring how groups of people collaborate to enable possible futures (Gutiérrez & Jurow, 2016).

Each of these papers gesture to the ways that social ties, rooted in emotionality, make it possible for peoples to work together in new ways and shift their collective practices, ways of knowing and being, and their identities-- to become politicized (Curnow, Davis, & Asher, 2019). Yet despite the presence of emotional bonds throughout these analyses, the impacts of emotion on learning and becoming have been undertheorized. Vea's recent work has argued that across learning sciences research, where emotionality and affect are largely un-interrogated, we lose sight of their importance for shaping learning ecologies (Vea, 2019). He argues that guided emotional participation is a "genre of activity that approaches emotional configurations as a learning target" (Vea, 2019). This work focuses on analyzing "techniques for cultivating arrangements between feeling, sense-making, and practice" (Vea, 2019) so that we understand how emotion shapes learning, how expressing particular emotions can be learning, and how emotion, cognition, and practice are entangled and co-produce each other. Vea's work centres analysis of the emotional configurations of participants, but does so using ethnographic data. Our work here complements his by bringing micro-interactional data to show how emotionality shaped learning through moment to moment interactions, and across weeks and months of engagement in the shared emotional practices of the Fossil Free UofT Women's Caucus.

In contrast to the literature on learning, politicization, and emotion, feminist theorists have long engaged with and theorized emotion (Ahmed, 2010; Hochschild, 1979; Jaggar, 1989; Lorde, 1984). For decades, feminist theorists have articulated women's emotions as a foundational component of women's politicization. Although these theorists tend not to frame anger as learning, even in instances of consciousness-raising, this work establishes the personal as political and worthy of rage, and therefore as a necessary bedrock for any analysis of politicization. In particular, feminist writing has pointed to the importance of anger in allowing women (and particularly those who are Black, Indigenous, and People of Colour, as well as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, Queer, 2Spirit, and Non Binary people) to articulate the conditions of their oppression and use that rage as a springboard for agentic interventions to change social conditions (Ahmed, 2010). While this writing is helpful in legitimizing women's anger, it does not provide the attention required to analyze when and how anger becomes transformative. Because it theorizes anger and its many causes at a cultural scale, it does not provide us with tools to understand the mechanisms through which anger becomes productive, transformative, and politicizing. For that, we need attention to learning at an interactional scale.

For this paper, we respond to Vea's call for attention to emotion in learning ecologies, and especially the ways that guided emotional participation scaffolds political transformation. We draw on feminist scholarship on rage to explore how anger is learned, practiced, and mobilized to politicize the young climate activists in our context. We explore how these shared emotional practices built politicized trust and educational intimacy, which supported their collective engagement in feminist organizing.

Context: Youth climate activism

Fossil fuel divestment was the most common student campaign to address the climate crisis in North America. The campaign worked with students on their campuses as they encouraged leadership bodies to divest their endowments from the 200 fossil fuel companies with the largest reserves of fossil fuels (Fossil Free Canada, 2015). At the University of Toronto, the fossil fuel divestment campaign was coordinated by a group of undergraduate and graduate students. From October 2014 through May 2016, Fossil Free UofT met weekly throughout the school year to coordinate the divestment campaign on campus. The group was composed of undergrads, masters and PhD students. Campaign leadership was majority white men, and white men dominated meetings and especially initially, largely directed campaign strategy and goals, while sidelining and

marginalizing people of color and white women (Curnow & Chan, 2016). These gendered and racialized dynamics sparked the formation of the Women's Caucus.

After stimulated recall interviews in which participants observed that a few white men regularly dominated group discussions and leadership positions, two members wondered if other women in the group felt similarly dismayed about what was going on and planned a meeting to talk about it. This first meeting led to a series of Women's Caucus meetings, which provided space for women to reflect on their experiences of gender within the group and across their lives. The five Women's Caucus meetings had between six to twelve people in attendance. Women's Caucus participants identified as women at the time but several now identify as non-binary. The group was relatively racially diverse in contrast to the majority white membership of the group overall: in Women's Caucus meetings, people of colour often made up a majority of participants, with white, East Asian, South Asian, Indigenous, and multiracial people participating consistently. Participants were mostly young-- between 19 and 22, with 2 graduate student members in their 30s.

Methodology and methods

We situate our work within militant ethnography. This approach to research extends community-based research and situates researchers within the social movements they participate in (Maeckelbergh, 2010; Scheper-Hughes, 1995). Militant ethnography prioritizes explicit, ongoing political commitment to the activist work that the research is bound to, as well as collective visioning, reflection, analysis, and distribution that supports the work of the partnering activists and their movements. This builds from feminist and Indigenous (Maguire, 1987; Wilson, 2008) research methodologies, which prioritize relationality and embeddedness in context as an epistemological intervention against Eurowestern notions of objectivity.

Participatory Action Research is based on social investigation, education, and action to share the creation of social knowledge with oppressed people (Maguire, 1987; Cammarota & Fine, 2008). In PAR, community members are actively involved in administering the research. In the process, community researchers build research skills, analyze data from their daily experience, and collaboratively develop answers to questions that are meaningful to them, in order to change the systems that impact them. This is true for our research design; several authors came into this research as participant activists. All of us participated in the campaign actively, and we are present in the video-data and transcripts as participants. We have analyzed data collectively as a process of capacity building, and jointly written the resulting analysis.

Over the course of two years, we collected multi-camera video data (Derry, et al., 2010) from every weekly meeting, rally, and action that Fossil Free UofT held. This was part of a larger project that included interviews, stimulated recall interviews, and over 15,000 minutes of video data collected from 3-4 angles (Heath, Hindmarsh, & Luff, 2010). For this analysis, we focus primarily on the Women's Caucus meetings.

To analyze this data, we transcribed the Women's Caucus meetings and inductively coded them, and watched videos repeatedly with the transcripts, making detailed notes about the ways emotion was expressed (or not), as well as the interactional dynamics (Jordan & Henderson, 1995; Angelillo, Rogoff, & Chavajay, 2007) between participants, including vocal delivery, use of space, gesture & facial expressions, and other signals that communicated tone to us beyond the talk. In particular, we coded for specific emotions, both stated and perceived through interaction, like anger, sadness, frustration, fear, and exhaustion. We attended to tonal dynamics, including snark/sarcasm, laughter. We also analyzed the content of talk.

Once we identified snark as a potentially significant phenomenon, we coded and compiled every instance using tone, speed, and talk to identify it, drawing on interaction analysis (Jordan & Henderson, 1995), and re-coded the transcripts to show the different purposes of snark, and the significance for participants. In practical terms, snark was identified through tone, body language, and facial expressions: we noted when speakers were speaking in ironic and sarcastic tones or showing facial expressions which communicated that their talk should not be taken literally. We also attended to how other participants responded, looking for laughter or other clues that talk was not being interpreted literally. Because snark and sarcasm are hard to specifically code, our reliability checks were important, and we looked for alignment between multiple reviewers and discussed all of the instances coded as snark as an entire research collective.

Snark appeared to serve a variety of discursive functions, including affirmation seeking, stimulating new topics, opening the conversational floor to more participants, practicing imagined responses from men, and creating humorous exaggeration. These codes were applied individually and then collaboratively discussed so we could identify instances that all members of the team agreed were illustrative. When we analyzed the consolidated snark transcripts with attention to these codes, and in relationship with the broader analytic questions that guided our coding, we came to an agreement that these constituted the core of our argument.

Findings

In this section, we analyze how Women's Caucus members from Fossil Free UofT learned through guided emotional participation, which shifted the practices of the group toward expressing snarky anger as part of a collective process of grievance construction. We show how this shift toward snark was enabled through relations of educational intimacy that facilitated the development of politicized trust. Because much of this writing depends on tonal interpretations to signal snark, we offset it through italicization.

Guided emotional participation: Practicing anger

In Vea's work, guided emotional participation describes the ways that particular emotional responses are scaffolded and encouraged through facilitated exercises, while also gesturing to Rogoff's framing of guided participation (1995), which encompasses activities that are not explicitly instructional as well. The facilitation processes analyzed in Vea's data show participants how to feel, and leverage those feelings to support particular kinds of political engagement. In the context of Fossil Free UofT's Women's Caucus, a less intentional process of guided emotional participation led participants through emotionally vulnerable discussions. In the earliest women's caucus sessions, Jade and Tresanne asked participants to reflect on "what are your life experiences around gender and feminism, and how have other aspects of your identity influenced your experiences around gender." While this scaffolded sharing personal feelings of vulnerability, reviewing the video data of this, it is audibly awkward: Turns were stilted and slow, with large gaps in between speakers, their completed turns, and the applause that each turn garnered.

However, in that first meeting, a different kind of emotional response was modeled which introduced another way of engaging—snarking. In the midst of the awkwardness, Katie got up to leave for another meeting, pausing the testimonial portion of the conversation and initiating this turn:

> Katie: Yeah, I'm going to the meeting, too, with John*. And I just want to point out that *I have issues with John in the group* (group laughter), and it's probably just more (group laughter)... I don't know if anyone's noticed, but li*ke every boy in our group has a giant crush on John, and like*... (group laughter). Seriously. They, like, compete for his--
>
> Melina: YEAH!
>
> Katie: When he-- like the end of a meeting that he's at, they, like, compete. *They like* (acts out with arms circling) *surround him*.
>
> Melina: It's so strange!
>
> Katie: And like they, I know-- I've even. Ugh. I. I. And, like, I've never had a one-on-one conversation with John.
>
> Jade: I *don't think he's ever spoken to a girl* (group nodding and laughter).
>
> Katie: I don't think he considers any women leaders in the group at all. […] Like, I feel like he must be picking up on some dynamics that are in that group already: *"Oh you don't talk to the girls"* (group laughter).
>
> Joe: Like, he's in a position where actually it would make quite a big difference if he did acknowledge
>
> Katie: RIGHT!?
>
> Joe: ...that there were women in leadership.

This turn significantly shifted the emotional participation in the Women's Caucus and had lasting impacts. Where participants' body language had been small, turned inward, and withdrawn from the table, that shifted with Katie's expression of snarky anger and humour. Throughout the rest of this meeting and the subsequent four meetings, snarky humour became a common way of expressing grievances (as opposed to the somber testimonials). Katie's venting created a model for sharing that was more fun, and which invited collaboration, where other members contributed to the distributed argumentation she initiated. We can see her turn modeling expressing anger through humour, but to communicate a substantive grievance of her marginalization.

At the second women's caucus meeting, Keara also guided particular forms of emotional participation. Here, it was snarky anger. Keara's turns were very significant for modeling anger outright. Her scorn is only thinly veiled through an ironic tone—even as we were coding there were many places where we were unsure if she was being snarky or just angry. But this had an impact on the group, enabling more people to express anger, often through ironic, snarky expressions.

> Keara: I think we need to do a lot less apologizing for guys. *Like all the time, just* (gestures in a "throw away" motion), don't apologize for them, take on them if you want to, I don't know.

> We feel uncomfortable, so I don't feel bad if they feel uncomfortable for a second, *they'll get over it in a minute* and we're sitting here talking about it and they're not sitting here talking about it. So there's no reason that we should have to feel uncomfortable and they shouldn't.

Reactions to Keara's angry snark were mixed in the video. One member seemed unsettled – they argued against some of Keara's comments, contesting the basic facts of what she described happening in meetings. For most of the others, the anger seemed welcome, and elicited laughter, knowing nods, and mirrored use of anger. In other member's turns, we can see them adopting a less careful way of engaging, that expressed more anger, communicated through their tone, the content of talk, and the increased practice of naming specific individuals as part of their grievances. Keara's work here set the tone, and other participants contributed in shaping the meeting to be more open in expressing anger. Ariel, Tresanne, and Joe, for example, responded to Keara's example by affirming her, and building off her turns, especially when it came to indicting several older white men who had repeatedly mansplained women's marginalization to us.

> Ariel: He gave me this really cool statistic which I didn't know about, which is that a man will apply for a job if he has 3 out of 10 of the qualifications, but a woman will apply only if she has 9 out of 10 qualifications. Um, and so he seemed pretty--, like he was engaging with this stuff. But it was *still a monologue* (group laughter), like *I wasn't part of that conversation. Like he was just spewing all this new knowledge at me.*
>
> Joe: *Wow, that was really nice of him* (laughs). Sorry…
>
> Ariel: Yeah, I know, *I need a man to educate me on that.*
>
> Joe: Like, *I have never experienced anything, please tell me*

In this sequence, and the others like it across the 2nd meeting, the tone had shifted. Keara's open anger created space in which others, like Joe and Ariel, expressed ironic anger, frustration, and annoyance with the norms of the group. Unlike the first meeting, this meeting was filled with sarcasm directed at men who were not in the room, and the line between ironic snarky humour and outright anger were much harder to differentiate based on their tone and content. This emotional configuration was both a learning target and supported cognitive and epistemic transformations toward constructing grievances around how women's experiences were regularly discounted, ignored, or told they were irrelevant and non-objective. Thus, practicing anger here, whether expressed directly or embedded in snark and sarcasm, was a process of creating space where anger was legitimate, generated learning, and led to collective problem solving.

Shifting emotional configurations

Snark and anger comprised one configuration, and when confidence built through the burgeoning educational intimacy supported the existence of those ways of feeling, it lead to new forms of practice (including emotion) in the overall group. Guided emotional participation modeled and gave people practice at being angry, a feeling which, for women (Jaggar, 1989), is often repressed and discouraged. For these participants, practicing expressing anger was a significant political step toward developing agentic solutions. At the fifth Women's Caucus meeting, we were preparing to defend the caucus itself from a white man's complaint that holding Women's Caucus meetings was mean-spirited and divisive. Joanna, a white woman in her fourth year, demonstrated how far we had come in our ability to express anger:

> I think we should also focus on the fact that it's *Not. About. Their. Feelings*. Like. I honestly don't care about their feelings. I know you all sometimes do, *which is very nice of you*, but like. This process isn't about their feelings, so let's keep it focused on ours. And what we've been saying.

Joanna was angry as she said this, but she still couched her assertion in snark, suggesting that she understood her breach of gendered expectations here. She was unwilling to hide her own feelings for the comfort of the men and the ease of the larger-group dynamics. By throwing off the expectations of "nice" behaviour that required women to subordinate ourselves to men's interests, the snark Joanna exemplified built feminist solidarity.

In this instance, Joanna's explicit instruction to Women's caucus members guided how we participated in the meeting that immediately followed. In the Women's Caucus pre-meeting where this was said, Anna said, "when I first heard about this, I was feeling… not guilty... but confused", and she expressed anxiety about if the Women's Caucus was in the wrong for meeting without inviting men. But after Joanna reframed our participation, that shifted. Joanna modeled a powerful refusal to recentre the conversation onto the white men in the group's feelings. In the following meeting, which was not a Women's Caucus meeting, but a meeting of the

larger group, women who tended to defer to the dominant white men did not, several of them raised their anger openly about men reframing the issue. Anna said she was, "frustrated and a bit scared that the framing of this discussion was once again being controlled by someone other than the people who feel they are being oppressed" with a tone that expressed anger directly. She finished saying, "When this was brought up, I did feel guilty about the meetings, but now I don't, and I'm owning that, so thank you." Sydney contributed similarly:

> You need to recognize maybe the way that women in this group feel on a regular basis within these settings, when their ideas are kinda dismissed, or not appreciated and how that can feel. So I think it was more of an opportunity to talk about that. And I think that by framing the discussion now in this way, we're once again focusing on how the men in the group feel. Not like it's not important. It's taking away from the work we were actually trying to accomplish by framing it this way, instead of us being able to present the things we were talking about.

Like Anna, Sydney's anger was only thinly veiled, and was expressed through her tone and pacing. She delivered her message in direct response to several white men who spoke immediately before her, combatting their arguments confrontationally, and reasserting the framing that Joanna had advocated in the pre-meeting.

Joanna's guided emotional participation, through modeling and her instructions, and all the work before it to enable and practice being angry, successfully guided the forms of emotional participation. These expressions of anger through snark built the collective muscle of being angry, and being angry in public. Many of these young women said they had little experience fighting for themselves and their right to participate, and so being angry, and being righteously angry was fairly new to them. They reported they did not have experience checking in with their feelings, and so often things would happen in meetings that made them uncomfortable, but they would dismiss it. The practice of being angry together, through snark, and having their anger affirmed as valid and shared made snark a strategic form of communication. It became clear that snark was useful in that the collectivized anger that was expressed through snarky humour had the potential to create change.

Educational intimacy: Building politicized trust

While the Women's Caucus guided emotional participation made rage possible to express, educational intimacy made those expressions possible, as the process of learning rage and building intimacy mutually sustained each other. Uttamchandani argues that educational intimacy is a process of building ecologies of support – emotional and political – that enable participants to fully engage in transformative work (2019). In our data, snark was a built educational intimacy; educational intimacy was co-developing alongside emotional expression learning in the group. It opened up pathways for affirmation which opened up instances of vulnerability, which enabled more sustained processes of grievance construction.

Looking again to the sequence Katie initiated in the section above, the instance is valuable in demonstrating how snark opened space. Katie initiated the sequence with a passing barb about a man in the organizing community. She was putting on her coat to leave early, and from the video it seems like she had not intended for this to open a longer conversation. Yet when she received affirmation from many women in the group (many of whom had also been ignored by John), the talk advanced. It moved from a superficial critique of how other men in the group gravitated toward John's leadership, to a more thoughtful, less glib reflection on how she had been denied opportunities for leadership development. Other women, like Jade, related to this experience, and the conversation turned into a deeper reflection on how women's leadership was not acknowledged in the group. This was the first time the critique had been made collectively, and framed the subsequent work of the Women's Caucus.

The joke here served as a warm up, a way to test the waters, and then to expand the joke, which was a flippant expression of rage, into a more raw expression of marginalization that was shared. The joke made something visible, and the making it visible made it possible to discuss and act against. This transition from rage to vulnerability was pedagogical, and modeled grievance construction, beginning from a shallow and angry description into a more carefully articulated critique of power relations in the group and beyond. It modeled the cognitive process of unpacking political ideas, and invited broader participation in scaffolding the critique. And significantly, it required intimacy that was built through sharing. The sarcastic remark and joking sequence enabled the more raw emotional expression, as it opened up space where others in the group affirmed her experience and suggested that they, too, had noticed and experienced this person's neglect. We found many instances of self-deprecating humour, sarcastic asides, and snarky jokes which built the kind of environment which allowed for members to become more comfortable expressing their own concerns and working toward solutions. Women's Caucus members were kind to each other, and took up deeper forms of support that helped validate one another's feelings in meaningful ways. Throughout our data, we see snarky comments receive affirmation in the form of head nods, laughter, or verbal continuers, which often encouraged more elaboration

on the grievance, as we demonstrated above. As these small attempts at showing anger were reinforced and validated as legitimate and funny, Women's Caucus members became more secure in their own emotions, more confident in standing up for their own views, and eventually became demonstrably unwilling to subordinate their feelings to that of the men.

These affirmations of shared experience were built in and through the context of educational intimacy. That participants trusted each other made it possible for them to express their anger and vulnerability, and that trust was also a collective accomplishment. For the context of the Women's Caucus, educational intimacy enabled the participants to identify their shared experiences of patriarchy, and to orient to them differently, forming the basis of a politicized trust. This was a "politicized trust" (Vakil, McKinney de Royston, Nasir & Kirshner, 2016), where shared experiences of marginalization laid the foundations for solidarity. Educational intimacy and politicized trust were consequential in the Women's Caucus and beyond. The relationships of solidarity that were forged made it possible for learning to deepen beyond (and through) rage, to develop the substantive grievances and situate them within larger systems of heteropatriarchy, and to experiment with challenges to their marginalization in the larger campaign. The sense of solidarity and shared experience emboldened and made other futures possible. And through the experience, Women's Caucus participants learned what solidarity felt like. Solidarity, educational intimacy, and politicized trust became emotional configurations that were experienced affectively and became part of the collective sense-making process that led to collective action.

Conclusions and significance

Guided emotional participation scaffolded opportunities to learn which emotions to express—angry snark– and what that snark meant – the collectivized grievances. Being angry and snarky were sense-making processes, where anger was both a learning target as a practice to master, and a tool for mediating the collective learning process. The guided emotional participation reshaped the emotional configurations of the community, introducing new configurations and emotional practices into Fossil Free UofT. The emotional configurations of the Women's Caucus enabled educational intimacy. Through the sharing, joking, snarking, and kvetching, the group deepened relationships and built trust. This wasn't just any trust, though. It was forged in the collective struggle of naming, problematizing, and resisting the gendered and racialized dynamics of Fossil Free UofT. This politicized trust made it possible for Women's Caucus members to take their concerns to the larger group, and sustained them through the contentious debates that followed.

In this paper, we have used Vea's theory of emotional configurations to show how those relationships of trust were built through guided emotional participation. The relationships that emerged through this process were consequential in shaping the learning of the Women's Caucus participants, and shaping their identities as politicized feminists. Expressions of shared anger, often expressed through moments of joy-filled snark built the community where trust and solidarity could be built and tested. Our data illustrate how women's rage, and in particular, their snark, was an important learning process implicated in building educational intimacy and guiding emotional participation. Our analysis confirms Vea's claims that emotion both shapes the learning field, and is itself a learning target. Participants in the Women's Caucus learned to express anger and snark as part of their learning, they collectively validated anger as an appropriate, useful, and even sometimes fun expression, and they learned through their anger, constructing grievances. This process of emotional guided participation and expanding emotional configurations created the conditions for educational intimacy and politicized trust to develop. This social solidarity was significant in laying the groundwork for participants' identity development and larger political interventions within Fossil Free UofT

For the learning sciences, this case is useful in theorizing how emotion shapes spaces of learning and politicization. Without theorizing emotion and its roles in learning ecologies, we cannot understand the larger sense-making processes that unfold or their power to shift identities as well as social relations. Much more work will be required to theorize emotions as simultaneous learning targets, tools, and practices, but this analysis demonstrates how critical it can be to invest attention in understanding how emotional configurations shape learning, shift practices, and sculpt new, shared identities as politicized participants.

With the Women's Caucus, emotion was fundamental to their learning experiences, opening opportunities to interrogate social phenomena, recasting how they felt and what those feelings signified. Anger made learning possible and necessary. Anger was a shifted practice for these activists, and it further shifted their practice toward feminist and anti-racist approaches to organizing. Being angry was the proof of learning and also the process of learning. Being angry sustained the learning. And being angry built the community in which transformed practices, ways of knowing and being, and feminist identities could become possible and desirable.

References

Ahmed, S. (2010). Killing joy: Feminism and the history of happiness. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 35(3), 571-594.
Angelillo, C., Rogoff, B., and Chavajay, P. (2007). Examining shared endeavors by abstracting video coding schemes with fidelity to cases. *Video research in the learning sciences,* 189-206.
Cammarota, J., & Fine, M. (2008). Youth participatory action research. *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion*, 1-12.
Chapman, P. E. (1948). Sarcasm: Pedagogical Poison. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *23*(4), 219-220.
Curnow, J. (2013). Fight the Power: Situated Learning and Conscientisation in a Gendered Community of Practice. *Gender & Education*. *25(*7), 834-850.
Curnow, J. & Chan, J.R. (2016). Becoming an "Expert": Gendered Positioning, Praise, and Participation in an Activist Community. In Looi, C. K., Polman, J. L., Cress, U., & Reimann, P. (Eds.). (2016). *Transforming Learning, Empowering Learners: The International Conference of the Learning Sciences 2016, Volume 1* (pp. 146-153). Singapore: International Society of the Learning Sciences.
Curnow, J., Davis, A., & Asher, L. (2019). Politicization in Process: Developing Political Concepts, Practices, Epistemologies, and Identities Through Activist Engagement. *American Educational Research Journal. 56*(3*)* 716-752.
Derry, S. J., Pea, R. D., Barron, B., Engle, R. A., Erickson, F., Goldman, R., ... & Sherin, B. L. (2010). Conducting video research in the learning sciences: Guidance on selection, analysis, technology, and ethics. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19(1), 3-53.
Esmonde, I. & Booker, A. (Eds). *Power and privilege in the learning sciences*. Routledge.
Fossil Free (n.d.). Fossil free: A campus guide to fossil fuel divestment. Retrieved from www.gofossilfree.org
Heath, C., Hindmarsh, J., & Luff, P. (2010). *Video in qualitative research*. Sage Publications.
Hochschild, A. R. (1979). Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American journal of sociology*, 85(3), 551-575.
Jaggar, A. M. (1989). Love and knowledge: Emotion in feminist epistemology. *Inquiry*, 32(2), 151-176.
Jordan, B., & Henderson, A. (1995). Interaction analysis: Foundations and practice. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences,* 4(1), 39-103.
Jurow, A. S., & Shea, M. (2015). Learning in equity-oriented scale-making projects. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 24(2), 286-307.
Kirshner, B. (2008). Guided participation in three youth activism organizations: Facilitation, apprenticeship, and joint work. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 17(1), 60-101.
Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches.* Trumansburg, NY. The Crossing Press.
Maguire, P. (1987). *Doing participatory research: A feminist approach*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.
Philip, T. M., Bang, M., & Jackson, K. (2018). Articulating the "how," the "for what," the "for whom," and the "with whom" in concert: A call to broaden the benchmarks of our scholarship.
Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In J. V. Wertsch, P. del Río, & A. Alvarez (Eds.), *Sociocultural studies of mind* (pp. 139–164). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Teeters, L. A., & Jurow, A. S. (2018). Relationships de Confianza and the organisation of collective social action. *Ethnography and Education*, *13(*1), 84-99.
The Politics of Learning Writing Collective (2017). The Learning Sciences in a new era of US nationalism. *Cognition and Instruction, 35*(2), 91-102.
Uttamchandani, S. August 2019 "More Happy Endings and Fluff": Educational Intimacy, Prefiguration, & Learning in an LGBTQ+ Youth Group's Advocacy Efforts. Hosted by the CU Women and
Gender Center, CU Denver – Denver, CO.
Vakil, S., McKinney de Royston, M., Suad Nasir, N. I., & Kirshner, B. (2016). Rethinking race and power in design-based research: Reflections from the field. *Cognition and Instruction*, *34*(3), 194-209.
Vea, T. (Under review). The learning of emotion in/as sociocultural practice: The case of animal rights activism.
Vea, T. (2018, April). Learning how to feel: When affect is the practice in interest-based learning. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting 2018, New York, NY
Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Winnipeg: Fernwood.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the members of the RadLab who have collaborated in analyzing this data and providing feedback, including Jody Chan, Amil Davis, Keara Lightning, Jade Wong. Thanks to Justin Fraser for transcription and coding, Anjali Helferty, Andrew Kohan, Suraj Uttamchandani, and Tanner Vea for feedback.