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An interactional analysis of one-to-one pastoral care delivery within a primary school

Despite interactional analysis being able to offer valuable insight into the institutional workings of pastoral care practice, pastoral care delivery remains largely unstudied. This paper will contribute new knowledge to the field of counselling and education by offering an interactional analysis of one-to-one pastoral care delivery within a primary school. Theories and recommendations inform pastoral care practice, often accompanied by written guidance on how to deliver it effectively, which the pastoral carer needs to convert into talk in order to deliver the intervention as an interactional encounter. However useful these guidelines are, they do not show what the actual delivery of intervention might look like in real life. Using conversation analysis, we examined video-recordings of pastoral care delivery to reveal the ways in which a pastoral carer converts guidelines into interactional encounters that support a child’s behaviour, social and emotional well-being. The significance of the findings are that those who provide pastoral care can see in close detail what delivery looks like as a real life encounter, imparting valuable knowledge that can be applied alongside theories and recommendations to enhance professional practice.
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Introduction

Pastoral care is a school-based intervention that falls under the umbrella concept of ‘guidance and counselling’, delivered to children individually, in groups or as a whole school approach. Although both ‘pastoral’ and ‘care’ are difficult concepts to define (see Calvert, 2009), in their classic paper, Best, Jarvis and Ribbens (1977) define it quite simply as ‘the form guidance and counselling takes when it is provided by school-teachers within a particular institutional setting’ (p. 126). Although teachers have delivered pastoral care in the past, more recently it is common practice to share provision with support staff (Davies, 2010). This move has been encouraged because pastoral care predominately relates to notions of ‘care’, and as such a teaching background is no longer deemed necessary (Davies, 2010). In practice, those providing pastoral care consider their ‘caring’ role to be bound to both actual pastoral care practices and the way in which those practices are performed (Best, 2000). As such, ‘pastoral’ and ‘care’ become practical activities that are interactionally achieved, rather than concepts that are often invisible and taken for granted (see Eldén, 2012). Therefore, an interactional analysis can provide valuable insight into both what and how pastoral care practices are performed and delivered.

Pastoral carers, like many counsellors and therapists, may often be unaware of the range, or detail, of the interactional skills they use to deliver their practice. However, the skills needed to deliver successful intervention, such as the ability to build rapport and gain trust, are not invisible unknown practices, because effective practitioners use them all the time (Seligman, 2002). Yet, research rarely studies these practices in action, because many methods are unable to study interaction empirically or robustly. An interactional analysis however, allows for such examination. The primary method used to study interaction is conversation analysis (Schegloff, 2007), a well-developed tradition that has a distinct methodological and analytic procedure that is supported by a large body of research findings (Sidnell, 2013).

Conversation analysts explore what is ‘actually done in the therapeutic
interview’ (Labov & Fanshel, 1977, p. 3), to identify the practices being used to accomplish the interactional aims. Fogarty, Augoustinos and Kettler (2013) used CA to analyse investigative interviews with children about alleged sexual abuse. They identified that during disclosure rapport was maintained through the use of drawings. Drawings lessened the intensity of eye-gaze during these traumatic telling’s by giving the interactants a legitimate reason not to engage in eye contact, as they provided a third object of focus to sensitively manage the interaction. Similarly, Butler, Danby and Emmison (2011) used CA to analyse helpline telephone calls. They found that when counsellors take an opposing stance to the child they are counselling they use the child’s name to manage rapport and maintain the counselling relationship. Such findings offer insights into the ways practitioners actively manage moments of discomfort during delivery to accomplish their interactional aims. Using the same method, this paper will analyse pastoral care interactions to examine how practice is delivered to support a child’s behaviour, social and emotional well-being.

Data and analytic method

The data are video-recordings of one-to-one sessions between a pastoral carer and child within a primary school. At the time of recording ‘Morgan’ (his pseudonym) was in Year 4, so aged between 8 and 9 years old. Morgan was identified by his teachers as needing regular pastoral care because of friendship troubles. However, as time went on it became clear that he also needed support because of difficulties being experienced at home. The pastoral carer, ‘Miss’ (Morgan’s chosen address term), looks after the social and emotional needs of the children that attend. Her role is quite different to that of a teaching assistant as she is not based in the classroom, but in a separate office, and the support she offers is emotional rather than educational.

Ethical approval was obtained and once Morgan, his father and Miss gave consent, six sessions (approximately 3.5 hours in total) were video-recorded over three weeks. No researcher was present during these meetings and to cause the least disruption for Morgan two video recorders were set up in Miss’s office before each session began. The recorders would then be collected after each session finished once Morgan had returned to his classroom. Miss would begin recording before she left her office to collect Morgan so that when they arrived back their time together would be as usual as possible. Likewise at the end of their session Miss would take Morgan to his classroom and then stop the recording when she arrived back in her office. The recorders were visible at all times so Morgan was aware that they were there, and on occasion spoke about them to Miss who explained they were for the research project. Morgan was also aware that he could stop recording at any time.

The recordings were transcribed and analysed using conversation analysis (see Sidnell, 2010 for an introduction to CA). A core feature of CA is that talk is action-oriented and used to do things within interaction. Analysis involves examining sequences of talk to see how turns are constructed, what a turn is being used to do, and how the next speaker responds. When using CA any analytic claims must be grounded in the data rather than imposed by the analyst. In other words, claims must be guided and shaped by what is observable and visible in the data. This is why conversation analysts stress the importance of working with real life recorded interactions, because they allow the analyst to study the interaction as it unfolds to see what actually happens. The analyst does not draw on their own assumptions to explain what is happening in any interaction, but looks to see what evidence there is of the participant’s own assumptions and understandings in the data. The analytic procedure involves producing transcripts that include details of how people talk to
each other. For example, emphasis placed on words, stretching the sound of some
letters, and silences within or between turns to show when talk begins and ends, are
all noted within the transcript. As are non-verbal gestures such as a head nod, eye
gaze, or facial expression, as analysts treat all aspects of interaction as relevant and
needed to fully understand what is being communicated and responded to (see the
appendix for transcription notations, based on Jefferson, 2004).

By using a conversation analytic approach, we are able to show that pastoral
care practice is as much about the interactional ways in which pastoral care practice is
packaged and delivered, as it is about the practices themselves. To show that pastoral
care is indeed, as Best (2000) describes, bound to both actual pastoral care practices
and the way in which those practices are performed.

Pastoral care practices
This paper will look at how two therapeutic tools, the ‘worry box’ and ‘traffic light
system’, are used in delivery to support a child’s behaviour, social and emotional
well-being. As will be seen, the use of these tools are examined to show how they are
delivered within a caring environment that is bound to pastoral practice, and that the
ways in which they were used within these interactions enabled the pastoral work to
be done. The use of these tools will also be examined to show how they support a
child’s agency and participation, behaviour, social and emotion well-being in practice.

The ‘worry box’
The worry box is quite simply a box for Morgan to store his worries, and it is a
regular feature in Morgan and Miss’s sessions. It is made from an empty A4 printer
paper box that Morgan has colourfully decorated with tissue paper and paint. As a
therapeutic tool, the worry box allows Morgan to recognise, express, share, and
contain his worries with the help and support of Miss. When a worry arises Morgan
writes it on a piece of paper, reads it out to Miss for discussion, and then places it into
his worry box for safekeeping where it remains available for discussion if and when
he wishes. The box is available in every session and can be made relevant within the
interaction by Morgan or Miss at any time, without being interruptive or in need of
explanation. This can be seen in the following extract (see appendix for transcription
notations) when Morgan announces he has a worry while silently cutting out a
drawing he has done of his sister.

(1)
School 3:1a:11.04 ‘Miss I got a worry’

1      (2.6)  (Morgan is cutting out his drawing))
2   Morg: Miss I got a worry.
3       (0.2)
4   Miss: You’ve got a worry,
5   Morg: Yeah.
6   Miss: Write it down then.  ((finds piece of paper))
7   Morg: .HH it (   )
8   Miss: There we go.
9       (33.9)  (Morgan writes his worry down, covers with
10          his hand as he writes, looks at Miss and
11          smiles, goes to put it in the box but stops)
12  Miss: That’s it.
13  Morg: Cut it and cut it.  ((Starts to cut his worry out))
14  Miss: Yeah you can cut that.
15      (2.4)  (Morgan continues to cut))
16  Miss: Is it something you want to read to me
The extract shows how Morgan’s agency and participation are supported through the collaborative nature of the interaction. The sessions are not rigidly structured or lead by Miss (although she organises an activity to begin each session) but flexible enough to include whatever is happening in Morgan’s life. Morgan makes his worry interactionally relevant by announcing, ‘Miss I got a worry’ (line 2). Miss finds Morgan some paper and tells him to write his worry down. As Morgan writes he can be seen placing his hand in front of the paper so Miss cannot read it, looking up now and then as he writes to check Miss is not looking. Miss keeps her eyes averted. Morgan’s actions appear light-hearted, as he can be seen smiling in the recording, showing a positive, relaxed, playful side to their relationship. Morgan goes to place his worry in the box, which Miss encourages with ‘that’s it’ (line 12), but instead he retracts and starts to cut the paper out around the worry to make it smaller, which he explains on line 13. Miss continues to support Morgan’s agency by asking him if he would like to read his worry to her later or if he just wants to put it into the box, presumably because of Morgan’s playful attempts to hide it from her while he wrote it down.

The worry box allows Morgan to suddenly announce he has a worry without it being a major event, and it seems this might not be possible without such a tool. The worry box also allows Morgan to decide how he shares his worries, because the box allows him to manage how much time and attention his worries are given. As the extract shows, it is Morgan who decides when, and how, to express and share his worry with Miss, and the way in which this is done. Morgan is displaying agency through the way he is able to select, construct and regulate the telling of his worry. It is Morgan who controls the interactional course of action, which Miss supports throughout.

Morgan uses the box to keep safe two different types of worries. The first are his ‘big’ worries that are constant and cannot be fixed by Morgan or Miss: ‘I want my mummy to live with me’. The second are more transient, fixable worries that arise within his everyday life: ‘Bradley was hitting my worry box’. The worry box serves two functions then, to keep safe the constant worries in Morgan’s life, and contain his everyday worries until they are no longer troubling him. In the following extract Miss initiates a review of Morgan’s worries.

(2) School 1:2:19.42 ‘What shall we do with this worry’

1  Miss:  Is there anything sweetheart that you want to put in your worry box: =
2  Morg:  =No.
3  (0.9)
4  5  Miss:  Not today,
6  (1.2)
7  8  Miss:  What did we have in our worry box= We had two things: ((takes worries out))
9  (0.6)
10  11  Miss:  One was,
12  (2.0) ((shows Morgan the first worry))
13  14  Morg:  I want my mum to: live with me.
15  (0.8)
Miss: And the second was, (0.7) ((shows Morgan the second worry))
Morg: Bradley was hitting my worry box,
(10 lines of off topic talk omitted)
Miss: So what shall we do with this worry.
(1.2)
Morg: Tell him (. ) to stop it.
Miss: Tell him to stop it. Did this happen a little while ago does it- is it still worrying you though Morgan. Or are you not worried about it anymore.
(0.2)
Morg: Not worried about it anymore.
Miss: Not worried about it?
Morg: [Circle this: ((draws a circle round worry))
Miss: Yep. (0.4)
Miss: That’s right.
(1.7) ((Morgan puts a cross through his worry))
Miss: That’s right.
(5.4) ((Morgan scrunches his worry up))
Miss: Good boy.
Miss: Do you want to throw it away or put it back in there, have you finished with it=
Morg: =Yeah where’s bin. (0.3)
Miss: The bin is over here=
Miss: =Let me throw it away ((holds hand out to take worry))
Morg: (Over where.
Miss: It’s over there, ((turn and points to bin))
(0.8) ((Morgan throws it in the bin))
Miss: Good throwing (. ) fantastic.
(0.3)
Miss: What about this one.
(0.6) ((Morgan silently reads the first worry))
Miss: Shall we still put that back in the worry box (0.2) till we know (0.9) about mummy says,
Morg: [I’ll put this ((0.5) IN
((Morgan takes worry, puts it in box))
Miss: The worry box (. ) fantastic.

Following her enquiry, Morgan informs Miss that he doesn’t have anything to put in the box today (line 3). Miss then initiates a review of the worries already in his box (line 7-8) using the collective references ‘we’ and ‘our’ to display togetherness (see Bradley and Butler, 2015). Miss holds up the first worry and Morgan reads it out, ‘I want my mum to live with me’ (line 12), and then the second, ‘Bradley was hitting my worry box’ (line 16). Miss asks Morgan what they should do with his second worry (line 20) and Morgan offers a way to fix the problem, ‘tell him to stop it’ (line 22). It is agreed that this incident happened a while ago and that it is no longer a worry for Morgan, so he draws a circle around it, puts a cross through it, and writes something over it before scrunching it up.

There is something quite therapeutic and liberating about the way the worry box helps Morgan deal with his worries. In the case of Bradley hitting his box, the worry is treated objectively, writing it down on a piece of paper to externalise and get out his emotions about this troubling situation. His subsequent act of discarding the
worry, the highlighting (circling), erasing (crossing out and writing on it) and
dismissal of it (scrunching it up), enact that he is now free of it. He has taken charge
of what might seem like a minor transgression to some, but for Morgan who started to
see Miss because of his angry ways of dealing with friendship troubles this is a great
achievement. Miss recognises this and encourages his actions, ‘yep that’s right’ (lines
31-33), enthusiastically praising him ‘Good bo:y’ (line 37). She then asks Morgan if
he wants to throw the worry away or put it back into the box (lines 38-39).

Morgan confirms he wants to throw it away with, ‘Yeah where’s bin’ (line 40). Morgan rejects Miss’s offer to throw it away for him by asking her again where
the bin is. This shows how Morgan’s agency is supported once more. As an active
participant Morgan can determine the interactional course of action. It again shows
the relaxed, playful atmosphere that has been collaboratively formed, as Morgan
throws the paper across the room into the bin. This would seem inappropriate in the
more formal setting of a classroom where control is actively managed by the teacher
to keep order. Here, Morgan is much freer and ‘agentic’ in his relationship with Miss.
He throws his worry in the bin and Miss congratulates him, ‘Good throwin:g ()
fantastic’ (line 47), to endorse his playful act.

Miss then asks Morgan about his other worry, ‘I want mum to live with me’,
and while he reads it to himself Miss suggests he put it back in the box until they
hear what mum has to say (lines 51-53). This refers to an earlier part of the session
when Morgan wrote his mum a letter to tell her that he wanted her to come home.
Despite Miss suggesting what Morgan might do, Morgan takes control once more by
taking the worry from Miss assertively announcing, ‘I’ll put this IN’ (lines 54).
Morgan’s response is more than an agreement of Miss’s suggestion. The ‘I’ll’ takes
total control to verify this is a personal course of action. Miss continues to support and
collaborate these moves by completing his turn (see Lerner, 2004) with, ‘the worry
box’, before praising him once more, ‘fantastic’ (line 56), for his actions.

The two extracts so far have shown that the worry box is a tool that helps
Morgan recognise, express, share, and contain his worries, which is a valuable
resource in itself. However, by looking at the ways in which the worry box has been
utilised within the interaction not only have the theoretical underpinnings of this tool
been explored, a number of other affordances have been identified. Morgan playfully
and positively discussed and managed his worries within a caring environment that is
bound to pastoral practice, to further enhance that caring environment and facilitate
the pastoral work being done. The way Miss packaged her questions as suggestions
(for example, ‘shall we put that back in the worry box’), allowed Morgan to take
charge of the interactional course of action, showing how his agency and participation
were supported in practice. Through supporting Morgan’s agency and participation
Miss encouraged him to make his own decisions, so Morgan could display his own
expertise and ability to deal with his worries. It is through examining how the worry
box is used within interaction that this tool is seen to accomplish so much more than
just be a safe place for Morgan to store his troubles.

The ‘traffic light system’

The traffic light system is another tool used by Miss to help Morgan manage his
friendship troubles. In same way that the worry box was examined, the following
discussion will show the interactional affordances of this tool in practice – how it is
delivered within a caring environment bound to pastoral practice to facilitate the
therapeutic work being done, support Morgan’s agency and participation, and his
behaviour, social and emotional well-being. Miss introduced the system when Morgan was first referred to her as a way of monitoring how he is feeling when troubles arise, so he can manage his emotions and behaviour to prevent him from having angry outbursts and getting into trouble. The system is a narrative that provides Morgan (and other children) a scripted description of actions in three steps: green, orange, and red. Each colour is linked to an assessment that describes different stages of emotion, along with socially appropriate behaviours and actions. The following two extracts come from discussions that explain when, why, and how the system should be used. In the extract below, Miss shows Morgan the traffic light image and he recites, ‘green means carry it on, orange is be careful, and the red is stop it and walk away’.

(3)

School 1:4.13 ‘The traffic light system’

1 Miss: Fantastic. You are doing so well. I’m so proud of you Morgan.
2 (0.7) ((Morgan nods, drops his eye gaze and smiles))
3 Miss: I am so proud of you. Let's just go round it again.
4 (0.7) ((Miss’s finger circles the green light))
5 Miss: Green (.) means: (0.5) great carry on,
6 (0.9) (Miss does thumbs up))
7 Miss: You’re doing whatever you’re doing (.) its beautiful.
8 (0.8)
9 Miss: And you’re doing it (.) really really well.
10 (0.8)
11 Miss: hh yellow or orange (.) means (0.4) hh
12 Morg: Careful.
13 Miss: [Be careful,
14 (0.2)
15 Miss: Umm: (.) need to think a-
16 Morg: [And reds: stop.
17 (1.0)
18 19 Miss: If you're feeling red (.) if you're feeling inside red
20 *grrrrrr* (.) you just need to calm yourself down (.) hands in pockets (0.7) walk away to somebody.
21 (0.5)
22 Miss: But make sure you’re (.) always >always< always (.)
23 where an adult can see you.

Miss assesses Morgan’s recital, ‘fantastic’ (line 1), before praising him and telling him how proud she is (lines 1-2). The enthusiasm in her voice can be seen in the transcript and Morgan responds non-verbally with his head nod, dropped eye gaze and smile (line 3), to acknowledge Miss’s assessment and display his emotional response. Miss then proposes they go over it again, using positive affirmations to describe Morgan’s pro-social behaviours, ‘great’ (line 6), ‘beautiful’ (line 8), ‘really really well’ (line 10). Miss provides a more extensive narrative for when Morgan is ‘feeling inside red’ (lines 19-24) to describe what he should do when he starts to feel angry. It is this stage in the system that specifically modifies behaviour to prevent it from being problematic. Therefore, if Morgan follows the system as a scripted narrative he can begin to recognise, monitor and control his emotions and behaviour by developing his self-awareness, self-control and ‘what to do’ knowledge. These developments are essential because as children grow they are increasingly held responsible for their

1 This is a growly sound that denotes feeling angry.
own behaviour (Mowat, 2012). So, children need to develop their social skills, and tools like the traffic light system promote such development.

Morgan’s knowledge and understanding about how the system will help him is what will enable him to use this tool as a real life method, to regulate his emotions when difficult situations occur so he can improve his behaviour and friendships. In the following extract Miss tests Morgan’s knowledge and understanding.

(4) School 2:8.00 ‘How is it working for you’

Miss introduces the discussion with a positive assessment asking Morgan to tell her how the system is working for him (line 1-5). Morgan explains the green and orange colours and their associated behaviours (line 6 and 9), which Miss affirms (line 7 and 10) to encourage his answers and display attentiveness. Miss then asks Morgan what he would do if he has to ‘stop’ (line 12) and ‘where do you walk to’ (line 15), as this is where the system helps him control his angry outbursts. With each prompting question Miss invites Morgan to explain what he should do. These collaborative turns allow him to display his knowledge and understanding, and show that he understands how he can better manage his anger and behaviour.

The theory behind the system seems to be that by developing self-awareness Morgan will in turn be able to self-regulate. However, without agency and motivation these goals are not possible as it is not enough to simply tell a child how to behave. The interaction shows that Morgan can display his understanding of the system, so as a conceptual lesson the teaching that has taken place can be seen as successful. Yet, understanding a concept does not mean that a child will transfer newly learnt skills from a controlled environment to a real life scenario when it is actually needed to manage strong emotions being experienced.

With this in mind, the next extract shows how Morgan tells Miss how he has used the system outside of their sessions to manage real life conflict. In the following interaction Morgan and Miss are looking at expression cards to talk about his feelings. Morgan selects the ‘angry’ card to describe a situation that occurred between him and a peer in school. Miss treats Morgan’s telling as an example of how he has transferred his knowledge of the traffic light system into a real life method to control his anger.
School 6:2:6.57 ‘I didn’t do anything back’

Morg: Angry (. .) angry as well. (points to the angry card)
(1.0)
Miss: Why angry.
Morg: Because (0.2) Rory put his mis- finger up and I got angry= But I didn’t do anything back.
Miss: Well done. I am so impressed with you.
Morg: [Jus told a-
told a Miss.
(0.4)
Miss: I am so impressed- you have come’n so far= You’ve done so well haven’t you,
(0.6) ((Morgan nods, looking at cards))
Miss: Yes.
(0.6) ((looking at cards))
Miss: Because it’s not been easy for you has it,
(1.3) ((Morgan shakes his head))

Morgan chooses the ‘angry’ card and when asked ‘why angry’ he recites a time when another boy cursed him and he did not retaliate (lines 4-5). Miss praises Morgan’s actions in her tribute and Morgan adds, ‘jus told a told a Miss’ (lines 7-8) to explain what he did to manage the situation. Miss recognises that Morgan not doing ‘anything back’ is an achievement in contrast to his previous behaviours, and why the traffic light system was introduced to help him manage his anger. Morgan himself has been in charge of this change. He decided not to do ‘anything back’, despite feeling angry, instead he ‘just told a Miss’. Morgan’s telling displays how his self-awareness and self-control have developed to help him know what to do when facing difficulties with his peers. Miss repeats once more how impressed she is with him, the changes he has made, and the effort this has taken (lines 10-15).

The extract shows how Morgan practiced a new way of dealing with friendship troubles, communicated this to Miss and received positive feedback. This demonstrates that outside of the time Morgan spends with Miss, he can effectively control and manage his emotions and behaviour to deal with real life conflict. However, it was not just the system that allowed Morgan to do this, it was the way in which the system was delivered by Miss. The teachings were positive and solution-focused and Miss took the time to ensure Morgan understood how and why the system would help him regulate his emotions and behaviour. The final extract shows how Miss promotes Morgan’s choices by using the comments of others in the school to further reinforce his pro-social behaviour.

School 5:1:9.08 ‘That’s why we’ve got the traffic light system’

Miss: Do you know what I was hearing about (. .) the other day,
(1.6) ((Morgan colouring, shakes head))
Miss: From your class teacher.
(1.0) ((Morgan shakes his head))
Miss: How far you’ve come in the past (0.9) twelve months.
(1.7) ((Morgan smiles, looking at drawing))
Miss: How really really proud everybody is of you,
(1.7)
Miss: And how well (1.0) you are settling in (0.6)
at school.
(2.4)
Miss: Huge improvements (1.0) on (2.2) your friendships.
Miss tells Morgan how his teachers have reported the progress he has made in the last twelve months to improve his friendships in school. The talk is widening the extent of Morgan’s progress by reporting how others have noticed a change in his behaviour. This reporting works to maximise and reinforce the changes that Morgan has made. Miss asks Morgan to describe his friendships before the system (lines 17-20) and he responds ‘angry’ (line 22). By questioning and inviting Morgan’s version of events his agency and participation are supported in practice. Miss does not assume to know more about Morgan’s life than him, rather she positions Morgan as having the authority to describe his friendships and confirm (head nod on line 25) this is why they have the traffic light system.

Miss then asks Morgan to evaluate the changes in his friendships and he responds, ‘I’m a bit angry a bit not’ (line 28), and in so doing displays his ability to form his own meaningful evaluation. Miss marks this change as something she can also assess and confirm, ‘Exactly’ (line 29), before praising Morgan highly, ‘You have moved on SO much’ (line 29), to reveal her own, and Morgan’s teacher’s, evaluation of his change (line 37-40). The sequencing of these evaluations with Morgan being positioned first continues the work being done by Miss within the interaction to support Morgan’s agency and participation.

The traffic light system is tool that allows Morgan and Miss to engage in pastoral care work. However, it is the way in which it is delivered (via invitations to do self-assessment – lines 17-24) that Morgan can both verbalise and hear how well he is doing in changing the way he manages his friendships. The extract shows how Miss explicitly constructs a positive version of Morgan’s self within the interaction, ‘you have become a really really fantastic friend t’so many people’ (line 36-37). By internalising the positive assessment revealed by Miss, the teachers, and Morgan
himself, ‘bit angry a bit not’ (line 27), Miss offer’s Morgan a positive self description to support his behaviour, social and emotional well-being.

**Conclusion**

This paper has analysed pastoral care interactions to examine how pastoral care practices are delivered to support a child’s behaviour, social and emotional well-being. Two therapeutic tools were examined to show how they were delivered within a caring environment that is bound to pastoral practice, and that the ways in which they were used within these interactions enabled the pastoral work to be done. The delivery of these two tools also showed how agency and participation, and behaviour, social and emotion well-being were supported. This was evidenced through the extract discussions that revealed the ways Morgan chose to use the worry box and share his worries; and his putting into action the traffic light system to display his ‘what to do’ knowledge of how to resolve real life conflict.

By using an interactional analysis, we have shown that pastoral care work is indeed bound to both actual pastoral care practice and the way in which that practice is performed. So, the therapeutic power of pastoral care provision is as much about the interactional ways in which tools are packaged and delivered, as it is about those tools themselves. The significance of these findings is that those who provide pastoral care, and others working with children in therapeutic roles, can see how important the interactional landscape is in ensuring children feel safe enough to share their experiences and engage in the therapeutic work being done.
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**Appendix**

Transcription conventions (adapted from Jefferson, 2004)

(0.2) Timed silence

(.) A micro-pause, less than 0.2 seconds

: Preceding sound is stretched

Wor- A dash represents a cut-off before completion

Word Underlining shows stress or emphasis

word* Degree signs show the word is quieter than surrounding talk

WORD Capitalisation shows increased volume

£word£ Word spoken with a smile

. A full stop represents a falling, final intonation

, Comma shows a slightly rising, continuing intonation

? Shows a rising, questioning intonation

>word< Rushed speech

[ ] Square brackets represent overlapping talk

= Speech that is latched onto the prior turn without a beat of silence

.hh In-breath

((head nod)) Description of non-verbal actions

( ) Inaudible talk is represented by empty brackets