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ABSTRACT

Agent and Subject of Discipline: How the Novice Teacher Experiences the Techniques of Power

By

Lynn Anne Murray-Chandler

Dr. Helen Harper, Examination Committee Co-Chair
Professor of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Dr. Lori Olafson, Examination Committee Co-Chair
Associate Professor of Educational Psychology
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

This phenomenological study explored how five elementary school teachers experienced their first year of teaching as both the subject and agent of discipline. Drawing on Michel Foucault’s conceptualizations of power, discipline, and resistance, the investigator analyzed interview data that focused on questions concerning how novice teachers establish their own classroom management techniques, what norms they followed and resisted, as well as how and when they complied (or did not) in order to gain membership into their school/teacher community. Analysis indicated that, although novice teachers expressed many concerns, they largely complied with the norms established institutionally for managing student behavior, and with those affecting their own teacher behavior. However they did resist some of the norms that concerned teacher accountability.
This study and its analysis of the institutional and discursive power evident in the lives of novice teachers suggests a need for teacher education programs to better prepare student teachers for the issues of power and discipline that will mark their professional lives and those of their students.
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CHAPTER 1

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

One of the greatest problems in education is how to combine the subjection to the required discipline with the capacity to make use of one’s freedom. For discipline is necessary! How do I cultivate freedom alongside discipline? (Kant, 1899, p. 711)

Introduction

Using the phenomenological method, this study explored how novice teachers experience discipline in their first year of teaching. When using this methodology, it is necessary to state one’s beliefs and biases prior to actually “doing” the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Moustakas, 1994). Therefore, the following personal information is provided as a means to introduce the reader to this study, and to provide an account of how I came to this work.

I have had what some may call the “privilege” to teach in five different schools in the past 10 years. Each of these 10 years was spent as a regular education teacher in a large, urban school district: eight years were spent teaching in elementary school (4th and 5th grades); two years were spent teaching middle school English. Of these five schools, three were considered “At Risk,” or “In Need of Improvement;” one school received the designation of “high-achieving school” and one school was so new that its data didn’t count for making a designation. I worked with some of the poorest, most transient school
populations in the nation, as well as some of the most affluent in the area. Teaching in one of the nation’s largest school districts provided me the opportunity to compare and contrast countless pedagogical and school climate issues. During this same decade, I also worked at two universities, where my responsibilities led me into dozens of elementary classrooms and schools in two very different regions of the United States. I have experienced an array of administrators’ philosophies and socio-economic school populations.

In my experiences, one widely-varied practice is how novice teachers are inducted into these schools via different mentoring programs and levels of support. In each of these schools, I observed novice teachers who did not know what classroom management looked like in practice, and I have seen dozens of teachers quit, as early as the first weeks of their first year. It is widely accepted that a teacher who lacks strong classroom management techniques will fail. Educator Harry Wong wrote in terms of classroom management, “What you do on the first days of school will determine your success or failure for the rest of the school year” (Wong & Wong, 2009, p.3). I realized, soon, that many teachers were not prepared to manage classrooms. In contrast, when new teachers were instructed to use particular strategies for success, I wasn’t sure that a universal panacea for classroom management existed either.

After considering classroom management for years, I then started contemplating the role of the novice teacher and discipline as I completed coursework in my doctoral program. I began to suspect that teachers were affected by power dynamics flowing in at least two directions. In order to succeed, they had to establish an authority and power structure with their students in the school as agent of discipline. At the same time, they
needed to operate within the authority and power structure imposed on them by the administration, the state, the parents, the students, and the larger school community. Here, they were subjected to discipline. While teachers may have school handbooks for how to operate the alarm system or turn in attendance, there also seemed to be a hidden curriculum that teachers needed to uncover in order to survive in a school. So, in my ninth year of teaching, I took up the question of how novice teachers decipher these unwritten rules. Soon after commencing this project, I returned to the work of Michel Foucault, a sociologist/philosopher whose work I studied in several graduate courses. His work on power, discipline, and resistance helped to make sense of what I had observed as a teacher and also helped to frame this study which examined novice teachers’ shared experiences acting as both the agent and subject of discipline.

A Statement of the Problem

This study examined the experiences of novice teachers who act as both the agent and subject of discipline, with the suspicion that unsatisfactory experiences could lead to teacher attrition. The research on teacher attrition (Crocco & Costigan, 2007; Henke, Chen & Geis, 2000; Hyman, 2008) often finds that teachers leave for a host of reasons. Problems with student behavior, problems with teacher autonomy, and problems with a lack of administrative support are frequently reported. This study examined a commonality in these factors—that they are largely issues of discipline, both of disciplining the student and the teacher. Ultimately, this study concludes that understanding the dynamics of these disciplinary relationships may aid in the reduction of teacher attrition.
Research Question

To better understand how teachers are both disciplining and disciplined, I asked the following question:

_How does the novice teacher understand and experience institutional and discursive power, as he or she becomes both the agent and the subject of school discipline?_

As part of this research question, I also considered:

a) How can this knowledge impact the field of education, especially higher education, teacher attrition, and new-teacher induction programming?

b) How can this knowledge better inform my own college instruction?

Definition of Terms

_Classroom Management_: I use the definition given by Harry Wong as, “all the things that a teacher does to organize students, space, time, and materials so that instruction and student learning can take place” (Wong, 1998, p. 84). Wong’s definition was used because his work has been widely implemented in the districts where my participants are employed.

_Classroom Management Protocols_: The specific procedures that are employed by a teacher to manage the class. For instance, if a teacher decides to clap his or her hands in a specific rhythm to gain student attention, this would be one of the teacher’s classroom management protocols.

_Discursive Power_: Discursive power is a set of rules that tell individuals what is acceptable to say or do in a particular place or context (Walshaw, 2007).
**Discipline:** This definition will be elaborated on in chapter 3. Michel Foucault (1977) describes discipline as, “a kind of power, a modality for its exercise, comprising a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of applications, targets” (p. 215). Therefore, when speaking about disciplining teachers or students, I am speaking about how their bodies are being controlled by another person, institution, or entity, not just the forms of punishment typically associated with deviant behavior.

**Docility:** From Foucault (1977), a body is docile when it is “subjected, used, transformed, and improved” (p. 136). For example, Foucault wrote about the 18th century soldier whose body was “something that can be made; out of a formless clay, an inapt body, the machine required can be constructed; posture is gradually corrected; a calculated constraint runs through the body, mastering it, making it pliable, ready at all times, turning silently into the automatism of habit” (Foucault, 1977, p. 135). One example in schools occurs when students line up with arms folded, one finger placed over their lips, and walk silently in two straight lines.

**Institutional Power:** From Foucault (1977) and Jennifer Gore (1993; 1998; 2003), institutional power is exhibited through practices that discipline individuals to benefit an institution. Notions such as ranking, evaluating, monitoring, are some of the techniques employed to get individuals to be normalized to a particular institution.

**Micro Level, Macro Level:** In common understanding “micro level” refers to a limited sphere of activity; for Foucault, it means the “fringes,” the daily, episodic practices and methods of power’s exercise in the classroom. One can investigate how mechanisms of power are “invested, colonized, utilized, involuted, transformed, displaced, extended (Foucault, 1980, p. 99). Looking at these fringe power dynamics will
lead to the types of domination that are at work in institutions. Understanding the micro level made understanding the macro level possible. In this study, talking about teachers’ decisions for establishing classroom management is the micro level. The macro level aimed to explore the larger social web of exercises and practices that take place to subject teachers to discipline.

Normalization: According to Foucault (1977), normalization is the process whereby behaviors and ideas appear "normal." They are so embedded in subconscious routines, so natural, they are often unquestioned. Normalization can be achieved through proselytizing an ideology, repetition, or propaganda. Foucault uses the idea of the soldier (1977) to demonstrate both docility and normalization (see example provided in definition of “docility”). In short, the process of individuals making choices to do something or fail to do something because they believe they are following the norms of the place in which they are living or working. In the classroom, a teacher may strive to reach a point where rules and expectations are so ingrained in his or her students that productive behavior is practiced apart from conscious choice. Likewise, teachers may adapt to the overt and implied expectations of administrators to the point where the school functions like an army – unified in motion and purpose.

Novice Teachers: For the purposes of this study, novice teachers are individuals who are in their first year of teaching. In this study, novice teachers hold elementary school certification.

Power: A more complete definition will be offered in chapter 3, but the concept I subscribe to is described by Michel Foucault. “Power has at its principle not so much in a person, as in a certain concerted distribution of bodies, surfaces, lights, gazes; in an
arrangement whole internal mechanisms produce the relation in which individuals are caught up” (1977, p. 202). For Foucault, power is circulating in every action through individuals, not on them; it makes people (on their own) behave in other ways than they would have previously done (Foucault, 1980). Power underlies all social relations.

**Resistance:** Foucault stated, "There are no relations of power without resistances" (1980, p. 142). From a philosophical point of view, resistances are specific acts of will that individuals commit in order to respond to universal categories and claims about emancipation (Popkewitz, 1998). Simply stated, resistance is the act of refusing to accept directives or opposing normalizing practices.

**Teacher Attrition:** The phenomenon of teachers leaving the teaching profession. This problem will be described in greater detail, especially in chapter 2, but teachers quitting teaching is a costly problem in education.

**Teacher autonomy:** The belief that teachers will be able to prescribe instruction and make curricular decisions at their own discretion.

**Teacher induction practices:** Administrators’ methods for organizing teachers, space, time, and materials for student learning to take place. This includes the professional development and trainings that administrators develop and execute to organize teachers, space, time, and materials.

**Teacher migration:** This is when a teacher leaves a particular school, but remains in teaching.

**Techniques of power:** This concept will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3. The phrase was described by Michel Foucault in *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison* (1977). “Generally speaking, it might be said that the disciplines are techniques
for assuring the ordering of human multiplicities” (p. 218). These techniques are the different ways power can be exercised when disciplining a body or series of bodies. Where power does not have positive or negative connotation, discipline is unique that those who knowingly use it see it as improving something; however, it is largely oppressive to those who feel disciplined.

Overview of the Theoretical Framework

Michel Foucault (1926- 1984) was a French sociologist, philosopher, and unconventional\(^1\) historian who wrote a wealth of acclaimed histories about institutions (including prisons, hospitals, military and schools), as well as about sexuality, ideas, and power. His notion of power and its relationship with knowledge and discourse has been broadly discussed, debated, and applied. He was a professor at the University of California at Berkeley from 1975 until his death in 1984.

In 1977, Foucault published *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Although the text is, on a rudimentary level, an explanation of the history of prisons and punishment, the work ascends prison walls to discuss all institutions and their axiomatic impact on modern society. Foucault’s ideas are more about the development of disciplinary technologies (Marshall, 1996) than prisons alone. Here Foucault demonstrated that disciplinary technologies have broad application to all spheres of institutional power, including prisons but extending to the military and – to a lesser extent – schools and hospitals.

Foucault’s philosophical concepts and histories have been applied to a variety of fields with multifaceted applications. His work can be found in nursing, in business, in

\(^1\) Some (O’Farrell, 2005) have argued that Foucault was not a true historian, that he didn’t “do” history right.
education, and often in cases when people want to describe power in an institution. Foucault was adamant that *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison* (1977) was not a history of schools, despite the fact that the school is considered to be the origin of some of the power techniques implemented in the prison (Simmons, 2005). Again, it is meant to be useful to see the teacher as one “tool” to describe the process of schooling. While much of Foucault’s work in this text draws upon military influences, Foucault acknowledged that it was the secondary school that developed some of the surveillance techniques later advanced by prisons (Foucault, 1977, p. 138).

Like many other researchers, Foucault’s work has been used to suit my own purposes -- that of a teacher-researcher who wants to determine how other teachers perceive their own disciplining. In chapter 3, I will describe how I use the work of Michel Foucault as the theoretical lens through which to see how teachers perceive their own resistance and disciplining. Foucault’s conceptualization of the techniques of power, disciplining, resisting, and docility will be examined at length.

Though there exists little qualitative research about teachers as subjects and agents of discipline, in recent years, the theoretical work of Michel Foucault has been used to describe the complex relationships that are fostered around discipline (Peters & Besley, 2007; Pongratz, 2007; Walshaw, 2007). I have found the work of Margaret Walshaw (2007) regarding subjectivity and regulatory practices to be invaluable. She said:

Structural processes and historical practices make up a significant contribution to the kinds of people we become. They open up discourses and practices that are available for us to take up. They shape our identities. Those who are working at becoming teachers are
positioned in relation to a range of discourses and practices.

Teaching is not simply an extension of a teacher’s personality because teachers are continually shaping and being shaped by the dynamics of practice, structure, and history. Gaining full membership into the category teacher within a specific institution requires insight into the relationships and processes that the institution endorses. Every pedagogical practice is influenced by the complex social relations that exist between teachers, students, institutional culture, and all are nested within the larger social world. Teaching turns out to be not so much an individual determined product, as a negotiation between these complex relations. (p. 111)

This quotation highlights the relevance of this study with the phenomenon of teacher attrition. Many teachers buy into these structural processes and historical practices in order to gain membership into the school culture. Those who resist, or perhaps don’t shape themselves the way the administration wishes them to be shaped, may leave the profession. While there appears to be much philosophical discussion of these normalizing practices, it seemed that little research had been conducted that included the thoughts, perceptions, and experiences of novice teachers in their own words. This study addressed the “What does this actually look/feel like?” question that I wanted to understand, bridging a gap between the current research and the importance of understanding power dynamics.
Overview of the Methodology

The purpose of this study was to answer the question, “How does the novice teacher understand and experience institutional and discursive power, as he or she becomes both the agent and the subject of school discipline?” This qualitative study used the phenomenological method and consisted of a set of interviews with beginning teachers that took place over the course of their first year of teaching. Participants were selected because they were first-year teachers and were teacher candidates in my course on classroom management and strategies. This decision was made because I had previously established rapport with them, as their professor; yet, I was no longer in an authoritative position to these individuals, as they had since graduated. In addition, purposeful sampling led me to pursue a set of subjects with the gender and ethnic identities consistent with the demographics of the current national teaching population. Furthermore, since I was not currently employed in any of the subjects’ schools or districts, I was able to conduct my research from the unique position of having insider knowledge and rapport with these participants, without an affiliation with their employers.

This study predominantly uses Michel Foucault’s concepts of “techniques of power” (1977) to develop its theoretical framework. It also uses phenomenological methodology, developed by Husserl (1931) and furthered by Moustakas (1994), to answer the research question. This study focused on two basic levels - one where the teacher is the agent of discipline, and one where the teacher is the subject of discipline.
To investigate the teacher as agent of discipline, I asked former college students about their first year of teaching, measured from the point they were hired through their first year. Foucault developed the idea that controls could operate at the ‘micro level’ rather than the ‘macro level’ and would target whole populations (Walshaw, 2007). On this micro level (term used by Foucault, 1977 and Clegg, 1989), I interviewed subjects to see how classroom management systems were established and how these individuals perceived its implementation. What texts did they employ? Whose voice was privileged by the novice teacher? Why? What did novice teachers do when a system was failing, etc.? This level was useful because it used familiar teacher language. That is, classroom management discourse is the vehicle through which I hoped to elicit something theoretical. This dissertation was not the first to examine the topic of classroom management or novice teacher attrition; however, it is somewhat unique in its Foucauldian approach. There are many more questions in this field that must be answered because schools often struggle to hire and retain educators, and many cite issues that link attrition with discipline. The subject is relevant today (Good, McCaslin et al., 2006, Peters & Besley, 2007; Walshaw, 2007), and is sensitive to all players in the educational community (students, parents, teachers, administrators). The primary purpose of this level of my research was to examine the “lived experiences” (Moustakas, 1994) first-year teachers have developing management, where these “lived experiences” refer to their everyday happenings. At this “surface level” of my dissertation, I served as a sounding board to participants. I functioned in this capacity as a veteran teacher who was not part of the subject’s school district, but could offer advice or resources.
Subject of Discipline

To investigate the teacher as subject of discipline (macro level, as described by Clegg, 1989; Foucault, 1977), I structured most of my questions to observe how teachers perceived their own disciplining. Ways that teachers may be disciplined may include being assigned to a classroom by a superior based on a particular quality of that room, for instance its size or location. Another example would occur when a novice teacher is ranked against other teachers based on test score performance. This study described the conditions of schooling that caused pedagogical difficulties and struggles for novice teachers. For instance, many schools have cameras that videotape most of a teacher’s daily interactions in the classroom. I was interested in seeing if teachers were concerned about the cameras. Did they plan or teach differently because they knew they could be watched at any time? Did they engage in practices solely because their evaluator believed in a particular practice? What directives did they resist initially? Did they “buy into” these directives later in the year? Did they believe they’ve been normalized? Although I hoped to uncover interesting and important data at the micro level of this study, this research was primarily intended to reveal perceptions of institutional and discursive power at the macro level. Interview questions were related to classroom management and addressed teachers’ own sense of autonomy and regulation; however, through them, data about discursive and institutional power were collected. Research at the macro level of this study was substantially less available. Some research (Bushnell, 2001; Gore 1993; Gore 1998; King, 1995) has been completed on the subject of disciplining teachers or students using Foucault’s unique definitions; again, most “disciplining of teachers” journal articles, newspaper articles, and texts are written by education leadership
authorities or journalists, as opposed to teachers. In most of these articles (Chen, 2006; Johnson, 1999b), the traditional notion of disciplining as punishment is employed. Articles such as these address issues such as how teachers are disciplined (here, synonymous with “punished”) when teachers commit a criminal act.

Once my data were collected with audiotapes, I generated transcripts, analyzed these data, and then sent the findings to participants for member checking. This process helped explain how the interview data revealed a phenomenon and it helped uncover themes and patterns. Upon completion of personal interviews and transcriptions of tapes, I developed a rudimentary coding scheme that extracted all comments made about discipline. Data were then subdivided into instances where the teacher was acting as subject or agent. Significant statements were then used to build meaning by finding commonalities in the experiences. Finally, clustering based on the techniques of power was compiled. From these matrices, similarities and differences between novice teachers' perceptions of discipline for themselves and their classroom management pedagogy became clear. These are discussed in the “Findings” section of this document. This research examined and exposed some of the “lived experiences” (Moustakas, 1994) that novice teachers may resist, in an effort to explain the phenomenon of teacher attrition.

Limitations of the Study

As with any research, a certain amount of subjectivity affects a study (Merriam, 1998), and it would be inaccurate to deny a connection between my personal experience and the research I conducted. Walshaw (2007), states:

The thing to remember is that a researcher’s own knowledge always privileges particular interests. That is because what the researcher
sees or hears must pass through the filter of biography, and social
determinations, such as race, class, construction of reality is actually
what is really out there. And because of that, the stories they create
are in a sense, imaginings of what is happening, and are just as much
about the researchers as they are about the research participants.

(Walshaw, 2007, p. 150)

As Walshaw indicates, a researcher’s experiences will often influence research. I
have first-hand knowledge of these participants’ college experiences regarding classroom
management, as I was one of their professors. I was a teacher in a school district where
some of participants are now employed, and was subject to the rules that they were
required to follow during the course of my research. This study was strengthened by the
unique role I played in having in-depth knowledge of these candidates and of their
workplace. Admittedly, under such conditions, objectivity is less likely to be achieved.
The issue of subjectivity is especially important, as phenomenological studies often
require investigators to “bracket²” all their preconceived notions.

And just as experiences may influence the kinds of questions I generate, or the ways I
interpret participants’ comments, it is conceivable that doing this research has influenced
the subjects themselves. Toll and Crumpler (2004) call these interactions between
researchers and subjects “dangerous acts,” not because they are “bad,” but rather that
interviews have the potential to be harmful. They stated that in interviews a researcher
wants to “know” another person, to produce truths about them. “While it is not inherently
dangerous to want to learn more about someone else, there is potential danger in such an

² Creswell (1998) defines bracketing or “epoche” as suspending all judgments about what is real the
“natural attitude”—until they are founded on a more certain basis. The term was coined by
phenomenological founder E. Husserl in 1931.
endeavor because one risks constructing the other as an object of one’s own perceptions” (p. 386). Therefore, the questions posed to participants as well as ensuing conversations have the potential to influence participants’ perceptions and decisions.

Finally, for some, a limitation of the study may be that I used the early work of Foucault as my theoretical framework. Foucault, although widely referenced, is also largely criticized. Current research still employs Foucault’s work from *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, but Foucault’s conceptualization of power changed in his later work, and much of his power work took on the terms “governmentality” and later “bio-power.” Elizabeth St. Pierre (2004) stated that Foucault can be interpreted broadly, and in a number of disciplines. Some theorists argue against his applications in these broad fields. Additional criticisms of Foucault’s work are explained at the end of chapter 2.

**An Overview of the Dissertation**

According to Creswell (1998) there are four central parts of a phenomenological narrative report: They are: Chapter 1- Introduction and statement of topic and outline; Chapter 2- Review of the relevant literature; Chapter 3- Conceptual Framework of model; Chapter 4- Methodology; Chapter 5- Presentation of the Data; and Chapter 6- Summary Implications and outcomes (p. 176). Using Creswell’s framework as a guideline, the structure of this work is as follows:

*Chapter 1: Statement of the Problem, Outline of Study*

In this opening chapter, I explained how I became interested in this work. As is common with phenomenological studies, I have had experiences prior to this research in the areas teaching, classroom management, and discipline. As a teacher, student, and
professor, I have had the unique perspective of seeing several power dynamics operating and conflicting concurrently.

Chapter 2: Novice Teacher Discipline, Attrition and Classroom Management: A Review of Related Literature

This chapter is subdivided into two sections. The first section discusses teacher attrition, including recent statistics and reasons teachers report for why they left the classroom, including lack of preparation in classroom management and issues that stem from being the subject of discipline. These issues link directly with teacher disciplining; teacher attrition is the paramount problem that makes this study especially relevant in today’s schools.

The second section of the literature review examined the history of classroom management, which may also be called a history of student disciplining. This section provides background useful for understanding the historical significance of the teacher as agent of discipline.

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework: Michel Foucault

This chapter explains several key Foucauldian terms that have aided in developing both a theoretical and methodological perspective. In-depth discussion of Foucault’s philosophies regarding power and discipline are found in this chapter. This is followed by contributions by several later theorists who used Foucault’s work to create a methodology, as well as descriptions of the work of other researchers who have used Foucault’s work in similar ways.
Chapter 4: Methodology: A Phenomenological Study

Chapter 4 describes the qualitative approach and phenomenological tradition, as well as my application of it. Site selection, participant selection, and interview questions are described in this chapter. This is followed by an explanation of the issues surrounding validity and reliability of the data.

Chapters 5 and 6: Findings

Because of the large amount of data and phenomenology’s requirement to report exhaustively, the findings were separated into two chapters. Chapter 5 discusses the teacher as agent of discipline; chapter 6 discusses the teacher as subject of discipline. These chapters describe the analysis of data I collected on both classroom management decisions (macro level) and disciplining structures that affect the schooling of novice teachers (micro level). The structure is guided by the categories developed using the work of Foucault and Gore, as well as phenomenological method. I have privileged novice teachers’ voices, as the objective of this work is to find the essence of these lived, and often shared, experiences.

Chapter 7: Summary, Implications and Outcomes

In this final chapter, the findings of this study are explained in the context of teacher attrition, classroom management pedagogy, and the disciplining of teachers. The study informs not only these fields of education, but also demonstrates a need to revisit the aims of democracy and what it means to be a “professional.” Recommendations were made to suggest how educators can be more conscious of their own disciplining powers. Finally, I considered how this research will impact both my school teaching and my university instruction.
Summary

This study sought to describe what happens when teachers are disciplined and disciplining; my hope is to assist in ultimately lowering teacher attrition rates. It used the concepts developed by Michel Foucault to describe power relations and the docile body as its theoretical framework. The study functioned on two levels. On the macro level, it was a series of conversations between five novice teachers and one doctoral student who has been teaching for 10 years. On a micro level, it describes how novice teachers were inducted and disciplined by the dynamics of power that encapsulate their school career. The study used the phenomenological method and consisted mainly of interviews between researcher and subjects that took place in the teacher’s first year of school.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

*We seem to have nothing to say to teachers or the public about how the competing traditions of classroom discipline construct the self, shape social meaning, or present power.* (Butchart, 1998, p. 167)

Introduction

This study addresses a topic in education that draws from several large fields within curriculum and instruction. The two fields that predominantly inform this work are classroom management and discipline. Studies in teacher attrition, authority and teacher empowerment also help to explain the power dynamics prevalent in schools. This review of the literature incorporates these concepts. Therefore, this chapter is subdivided into three parts. Part I gives a brief synopsis of the current research on teacher attrition. Part II addresses classroom management and discipline; Part III highlights how modern educational researchers utilize Foucault in their work.

Teacher Attrition and the Novice Teacher

There are simply not enough teachers to accommodate the students who attend American schools. Over 1 million working teachers in the country will be retiring in the next 10 years, sparking the need for more than 2 million new teaching professionals. (Hyman, 2008, ¶2). In poverty-blighted areas alone, the Nebraska State Education Association reported, more than 700,000 teachers will be needed by 2017 (2008, ¶2).
The August 22, 2006 Seattle Times reported over 200,000 national teaching vacancies at the beginning of the 2006 school year. While these statistics may sound appealing to a college senior just finishing a degree in education, these numbers are not generated exclusively by the creation of new positions and retirements. Rather, many of these job openings are the results of teachers who have abandoned their position (Crocco & Costigan, 2007; Gonzales, 2007, Hammond & Bransford, 2005).

Retaining teachers is a significant problem in the field of education. Based on recent trends, half of all novice teachers will quit within first 5 years, and those who leave will tend to be among the “best and the brightest” (Henke, Chen & Geis, 2000). The phenomenon of abandoning teaching for another line of work is known as teacher attrition. According to the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, the teacher attrition rate has risen by 50% over the past 15 years (Gonzales, 2007) with a current turnover rate nationwide that has grown to 16.8 % annually. While this is a national statistic and it includes all teachers, statistics maintained exclusively on novice teachers are more startling. On a national level, 25% of novice teachers leave in the first 3 years, and of those teachers who work in urban areas, 50% leave in the first 5 years (NGA, 2002). In Clark County, Nevada, about one-third of beginning teachers “planned to leave as soon as possible” and the average work-span of a Clark County teacher was 1.9 years in 2003-4 (Pytel, 2007, ¶3). Similarly, in Los Angeles, one of every three new teachers is expected to quit in the first three years (Colvin, 1998).

Replacing teachers is also costly. In 2005, a conservative national estimate of the cost of replacing public school teachers who have dropped out of the profession is $2.2 billion a year (National Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005, ¶1). If the cost of replacing
public school teachers who transfer to different schools is added, the total reaches $4.9 billion every year. For individual states, cost estimates range from $8.5 million in North Dakota to over half a billion dollars for larger states such as Texas (2005, ¶8).

**Causes of Attrition**

In most research on teacher attrition, descriptors tend to show that the novice teacher was embarrassed, ashamed, or disheartened by his or her performance. Researchers (Colbert & Wolff, 1992; Henke, Chen & Geis, 2000; Weiss, 1999) have found that in the first years of teaching, only the most resilient teachers do well. Even the most talented found teaching frustrating, unrewarding, and intolerably difficult (Colbert & Wolff, 1992).

One common factor cited for teacher attrition centers around problems with “classroom management” (Dollase, 1992, p. 86). This has been shown to be one of the most common concerns of both pre-service and experienced teachers (Johns, MacNaughton, & Karabinus, 1989; Weinstein, 1996; Weinstein & Mignano, 1993). The Alliance for Excellent Education reported that 53% of teachers left their school because of student discipline (2005). In Florida, 43% of first-year teachers reported being “minimally prepared” or “not prepared” to manage a classroom (NGA, 2002).

A second factor that may be responsible for novice teacher attrition is a perception of a lack of administrative support. This can include a lack of mentoring programs, confusion regarding what teachers are supposed to be doing, and difficulty in finding resources (Bolich, 2001). Bolich found that a perceived lack of administrative support was the leading cause of teacher attrition in North Carolina. In fact it was cited as the
number one reason in 63% of exit interviews administered there. Twenty percent of the teaching workforce cited it as their reason for leaving in a Texas study (NGA, 2002).

What some teachers may call a lack of support may also manifest itself in a third related issue, that of limited teacher autonomy. Teacher empowerment has been studied regularly for the past 20 years, (Dee, Henkin, & Duemer, 2003; Sumson, 1994). This movement is geared at allowing teachers more autonomy in decision making, yet many teachers find they are without such freedom. That is, novice teachers may enter their classroom believing that they will have a say in what they will be doing—that they are, in fact, the “boss” of their classroom. An empirical study by Dee, Henkin, and Duemer (2003) found that empowered teachers exhibited higher levels of organizational commitment, and ultimately stated that in order to engage teachers in pedagogical reform, one must give them some control over their own work and let them influence the reform process. Yet despite the body of research informing teacher empowerment, many teachers have not found such freedom in their decision making. Donald Myers (2007) reported authority and autonomy for teachers has declined in the last 25 years. When novice teachers find out they must adhere to very specific curriculum demands, they can be disheartened. Crocco and Costigan (2007) call this aspect the “narrowing of curriculum” (p. 513), and define it as “the notion that testing pressures associated with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, entitled No Child Left Behind (NCLB; U.S. Congress, 2001), have increased time devoted to reading and math at the expense of other subjects“ (p. 513). Crocco and Costigan (2007) also concluded that “curriculum narrowing has had a negative effect on beginning teachers’ perceptions about their opportunities for developing a satisfying teaching practice” (p. 514). E. Wayne Ross
(1990) wrote that it was “paradoxical that a situation which has led to the slow erosion of teachers’ control over their jobs has been combined with the rhetoric of increased professionalism” (p. 11). The paradox Ross writes of became may have become more apparent with the mandates of *No Child Left Behind*. Closely related to this lack of autonomy was another phenomenon that affected teacher satisfaction, that of accountability. Only one year after NCLB was mandated, Tye and O'Brien's (2002) survey of teachers found the top-ranked reason for resigning from teaching among those who had already left the profession was "accountability." This includes the increasing use of high-stakes standards-based testing with the associated prepackaged curricula that goes with it. In a study on authority, Myers (2007) stated that teachers view themselves as professionals who have expertise that laypersons do not possess. When teachers do not perceive they have authority in their position, they may leave the field.

There is little concrete information about the specific demographics of teachers (gender, ethnicity, race, grade level, etc.) who leave the profession in greater numbers than those of other statistically-relevant categories (Gonzales & Sosa, 1993). That makes it difficult to draw conclusions about whether a particular demographic segment is more vulnerable to the factors that lead to attrition. Although some researchers (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Ingersoll, 2002) have consistently found that younger teachers have a higher rate of attrition, there is some disagreement as to why this is the case (Ingersoll, 2002). Another study (Boe, Shade, Garner, & New, 1998) indicated that teachers who exhibit the highest rate of turnover are in the fields of special education, mathematics, and science. These novice teachers are usually less than 30 years of age, and hold a provisional teaching certificate and a bachelor's degree (Devane et al, 1992).
Themes Emerging from Novice Teacher Attrition

This review of the literature revealed that there are several reasons why teachers leave teaching. Relatively small percentages leave for non-professional reasons. Most who leave are frustrated by: (a) a lack of classroom management preparedness to deal with issues including student behavior, and discipline; (b) not having the disposition to conform to school rules or to work without autonomy, depending on which role was required for success in a particular school culture and; (c) having to complete work that they didn’t foresee being duties of teachers. The cost of these teachers leaving is great, as is the need to find teachers who will stay beyond 5 years. In terms of this study, participants addressed each of these issues, and they will be discussed in chapters 5 and 6.

Classroom Management and Discipline

Two centuries of bending disciplinary power to the service of the marketplace have yielded no gains in classroom order. They have however, blunted the potential for teachers and students to reimagine educational relationships more consonant with the imperatives of democratic life and human dignity. (Butchart, 1998, p. 181)

Introduction

The focus of this section of the literature review focuses on classroom management, followed by a discussion of the history of discipline. LePage, Darling-Hammond, and Akar (with Gutierrez, Jenkins-Gunn, and Rosebrock) (2005) found that teacher candidates repeatedly report that classroom management is one of the most important topics to be taught, and is also the most often ignored. Brophy (1988) broadly defined classroom management as the actions taken to create and maintain a learning
environment that supports instructional goals. Often, classroom management is only considered as organizing classroom routines and addressing student behavior, though many researchers (Brophy, 1988; LePage et al, 2005) argue that classroom management has much larger aims. In addition to arranging desks and flipping cards for behavior, LePage et al. (2005) define classroom management as:

…many practices integral to teaching, such a developing relationships; structuring respectful classroom communities where students can work productively; organizing productive work around a meaningful curriculum; teaching moral development and citizenship; making decisions about timing and other aspects of instructional planning; successfully motivating children to learn; and encouraging parent involvement. (p.327)

Like LePage et al. (2005), McEwan (1998) found classroom management a topic “fraught with more curious contradictions in the form of moral dilemmas and a desire to make the right decision all the time” (p. 135). Making this “right decision” calls into question whose morals, whose right decision? Is the “right decision” the one that benefits the child, or that saves face for the teacher, or is the mandate of the school? LePage et al. (2005) state that the goals of classroom management include: “academic achievement, social and emotional development, collaboration, and character development” (p. 327). These goals appear to be subject to interpretation, and the current study examined how these goals are carried out at several different educational institutions. This study examined how teachers are the agents of discipline by asking teachers about their experiences in establishing discipline and classroom management protocols. In this part
of the literature review, the data presented reflect the history and transformation of the term “discipline” as well as the evolution of classroom management.

Many teachers report learning about classroom management in an on-the-job capacity (LePage et al., 2005), and those teachers who exhibit competencies with classroom management often persist in their teaching careers (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). LePage et al. (2005) state that there has been a paradigm shift from a focus on intervening by recognizing and punishing student behaviors, to one of prevention, aimed at establishing norms where academic routines can promote student work. Early foundations of classroom management focused on the importance of providing specific stimuli to produce particular behaviors, with some pedagogy using Pavlov’s classical conditioning and reinforcement (LePage et al., 2005), though Lewis (2001, in LePage et al., 2005) found that “controlling behavior often leads to resistance rather than buy-in” (p. 331). In addition, researchers like Alfie Kohn (1996) have found that the constant offering of extrinsic rewards decreases intrinsic motivation, and that these students come to expect to be rewarded for doing what is expected, thereby altering their moral compass.

LePage et al. (2005) found that there are five basic indicators that describe what teachers should know in order to manage a classroom well. They include:

1. Creating meaningful curriculum and engaging pedagogy to support motivation,
2. Developing supportive learning communities,
3. Organizing and structuring the classroom,
4. Repairing and restoring behavior respectfully, and
5. Encouraging moral support. (p. 332)

*Engaging Pedagogy*
Within “Engaging Pedagogy”, children must be motivated to learn specific material. The National Research Center on English Learning and Achievement (1998) stated that “the teachers with the most engaged and best performing students were superb classroom managers, with the result that there were few disciplinary encounters because the students were so engaged with academics” (Hammerberg, 2004, p. 370). Teachers should know that students will be motivated to learn when they have interesting tasks, expectations that they can be successful, and appropriate support for learning, and instructors should know how to construct these conditions (LePage et al, 2005). A strong body of research (Kohn, 1996) seems to suggest that a reliance on extrinsic motivators causes students to lose their self-determination.

Developing Supportive Learning Communities

According to the research gathered by LePage et al. (2005), an effective classroom learning community develops respectful relationships between teachers and students, and among students themselves. Empirical research has determined that students who perceived their teachers cared about them were more likely to follow rules and procedures (Bohlin, Durwin & Reese-Weber, 2009). Contemporary researchers (Kagan, 2009; Kohn, 2007) have built on Lev Vygotsky’s ideas about learning as a social construct and have developed principles of effective pedagogy that focus on opportunities where teachers create engaging tasks, show how they are related, are cognitively challenging, and favor critical thinking to memorization and recall. Cooperative learning opportunities provide better student learning than individualistic situations with regard to reasoning, the generation of new ideas, and transfer, including how students perform on standardized tests (LePage et al., 2005).
Organizing and Structuring the Classroom

Though this is only one piece of classroom management, it is often perceived as the only function of classroom management (LePage et al, 2005). Bohlin, Durwin, and Reese-Weber (2009) provided 30 years of research on the impact of the classroom environment on student mood and behavior, discussing the term environmental competence as a skill that teachers ought to possess. And though it is erroneously considered the only part of classroom management, it is an important piece. In 1977, Jacob Kounin conducted interviews in 80 different classrooms to observe how teachers monitor classroom behaviors and interactions. Kounin found that effective teachers had “eyes in the back of their head,” a phrase he later used to define withitness, or an alertness to what it occurring (Bohlin, Durwin, & Reese-Weber, 2009).

Time is another function of classroom management that falls within the category of organizing the classroom. Researchers have found that teachers who start their years by teaching rules and procedures have better managed classrooms. Evertson (1997, in LePage, 2005) conducted 27 in-depth observations of elementary classrooms and deduced that those teachers who were clear about rules and routines had fewer problems than teachers who were not clear.

Repairing and restoring behavior respectfully, and encouraging moral support

According to LePage et al., novice teachers often search for a specific way to discipline students.

When students behave in ways that are counterproductive to the goals and norms, teachers need to know, first, that there are many strategies to choose from and second that their decisions should be based on several
factors, including the students’ particular learning situation and needs, the history of the student’s behavior, the context of the class, the severity of the problem, and school policy. (p. 344)

Research suggests that misuse of authority tends to reinforce a sense of weakness, passivity, subordination, and victimization among children (Lewis, 2001). After interviewing 21 elementary and 21 secondary students, Lewis found that students who were frightened by coercive discipline were distracted from their schoolwork (Cohen, 2001; LePage, 2005). Based on the work of Brophy (1996; 1998), it appears that teachers who focus on being authority figures or disciplinarians are less successful than those who focus on establishing communal learning environments.

In terms of misuse of authority, other researchers (for example, Gore, 1998; Hammerberg, 2004; King, 1995) question the ways classroom management is currently constructed. Popkewitz (1998) distinguished between two senses of management: “teaching as management, which focuses on the organization of lessons and classroom behavior, and teaching as managing the personality, attitudes, and beliefs of individuals, which forms part of the grid of ‘reason’ for the teacher” (p. 66). This second half of the definition may refer to cases where individuals question classroom management in general. Classroom management today, according to Hammerberg, has to do with the acknowledgement that students attend school with multifaceted personalities and attitudes, and that some student behaviors “have to be curbed” (Hammerberg, 2004, p.371). Ludwig Pongratz (2006) wrote that classroom management is actually synonymous with punishment and that it was renamed to make it sound less like
controlling with power. In the following paragraphs, a history of the transition is provided.

*History of Classroom Management and Discipline*

Classroom management and discipline have been used synonymously and the meanings of these two words are broadly interpreted. Phillipe Aries (1962, cited in Marshall, 2004) noted that in medieval schools, the teacher was not responsible for discipline over students. “This changed for a number of reasons related to parents’ concerns and demands, the demands of the society, the requirements of mass education, and changing knowledge about childhood. Discipline is now an accepted aspect of modern schooling” (p. 268). To understand classroom management historically is to understand discipline, as the need to shape student behavior was evident in America’s first classrooms. Therefore, to better understand the historical significance of American discipline and punishment, it is necessary to examine the history of classroom management.

The first documented cases of teaching in the Early National period (starting in 1789) suggests that most teaching was done via the use of tutors. In fact, much teaching was done on an individual basis or in small groups (Butchart, 1998). These students were constantly monitored, and teachers prescribed recitations to the students, using force and fear (Gatto, 2006). For example, Phillip Freneau (1752-1832) was a disheartened tutor on Long Island in 1788. Freneau expected to be able to use these disciplinary techniques and have autonomy in his classroom, but was upset when told otherwise. In terms of teaching his students, he was to take all directives from the parents, including:
…the art and mystery of teaching is to play them into knowledge with marbles, nine-pins, shuttlecocks, and whirligigs—that many children from her [the wife’s] own knowledge have been taught to read merely by playing cards and dice, and that constraint of any kind has nothing to do with education. (Cohen & Scheer, 1997, p. 25)

It can be hypothesized that Freneau was upset because he would not have much authority and his expertise would be ignored. His belief that he was an expert because he studied education was stifled by the rules the parents set forth as a requirement for his employment. This is the primary reason he cited for being unable to make the students “proficient.” He was ultimately fired after months of teaching without compensation of any kind.

By the 1830s, concerns about the urban population led to the development of a strategy for reforming the poor. This reformation would be achieved through an apparatus—the school and a technology of observation and examination (Jones, 1991). Strategies were developed that provided only a minimal role for the teacher. The urban school teacher was “at best an unqualified drill master and at worse a purveyor of corrupt values” (Jones, 1991, p. 58). In 1840, a group calling itself the Massachusetts School Committee, often led by Horace Mann, discussed the deterioration of family life with the recent decline in agricultural opportunities (Gatto, 2006). The family was seen as “giving way to widespread institutional serfdom” (Gatto, 2006, p. 119). These families were becoming materialistic and Mann believed that morality could no longer be taught by such families. Rather the school would have to teach students morality. (Gatto, 2006).
Throughout the 19th century, many accounts of students being punished physically and publically were documented. Andero and Stewart (2002) state that corporal punishment, while used in colonial times, is traced back to England, which is the only European country still permitting the practice. In the 1860s, teacher-trainers were reporting that too much was expected from the urban school teacher (Jones, 1991). The teacher was expected to “moralize the urban slum” (p. 66). By 1868, teacher inability to reform the slum was considered a failure and the government began to evaluate teachers (Jones, 1991). In America, Joseph Lancaster is credited with making the first school discipline reform when he moved to institutionalize schools in urban centers. Butchart (1998) says of Lancaster, “In place of discipline flowing from external, personal, patriarchal authority, as in the traditional teacher-student relationships, he developed a disciplinary power that transformed the relationships between teachers and students” (Butchart, 1998, p.169). In addition, Lancaster is credited with prescribing corporal punishment, and was known to motivate students using systems of rewards, prizes, and promotions (Butchart, 1995). One of the ultimate promotions was for students to become monitors themselves. Students were ranked with other classes and physically sat according to rank. Humiliation was used to get students to behave in particular ways. Without naming Foucault’s techniques of power, Butchart stated:

Lancaster devised a disciplinary pedagogy that altered the nature and locus of authority and the angle and frequency of surveillance, but that also embedded new and elaborate disciplinary technologies in structures, procedures, rituals, and processes, what I shall call here disciplinary structures (Butchart, 1998, p. 170.)
These disciplinary structures, which Foucault calls “techniques of power,” will be addressed again in chapter 3. Cohen and Scheer (1997), after compiling much historical documentation and literature from this time about teaching, wrote that most of a teacher’s time was spent trying to maintain discipline. When teachers failed to maintain the attention of the students, many teachers began to employ the rod rather liberally. Many accounts by both teachers and students included instances where the teacher was truly sadistic, where the teacher took pleasure in creating new and damaging physical torments (Cohen & Scheer, 1997). For example, the Rules of the Stokes County School where Wm. A. Chaffin was master (in Gatto, 2006), provided a chart that gave the number of lashes a child would receive for any specific offense. At this school, if boys and girls played together, they would receive 4 lashes, fighting earned 5 lashes, playing at the mill or creek earned a child six lashes, and playing cards at school yielded 10 lashes.

**Rules**

Lancaster’s monitorial schools tended to move toward a second reform called, “New England Pedagogy” in the middle of the 19th centuries, and many of the methods employed here would not be soon forgotten (Butchart, 1998). “New England Pedagogy” was a response to the emphasis on physical discipline, according to Butchart, and an attempt to develop “deep structural transformations of the moral order and was championed by Protestant reformers” (p. 171). These schools wanted to take the fear out of instruction, and to replace it with a deeper sense of conscience (Butchart,1995). They not only wanted to prevent negative behavior, but they wanted to encourage appropriate behavior through positive motivation and by helping students take more interest in their education.
One account of this period comes from Emma Hart Willard (1861), a pioneer in women’s education. She wrote in her *Memoirs as a Woman Teacher* how students would not respond to her when she took over a new school. She was told by her life-long friend Mrs. Peck, that the only way to command student attention was to hit them. Mrs. Peck’s son brought in five rods that Willard slammed on her desk with little effect on the students. In her memoir, she wrote about the process, stating:

For a few moments the children were silent; but they had been used to threatening, and soon a boy rose from his seat, and he was stepping to the door. I took one of the sticks and gave him a moderate flogging; then with a grip upon his arm which made him feel that I was earnest, put him in his seat. Hoping to make the chastisement answer for the whole school, I told them in the most endearing manner I could command, that I was there to do them good—to make such fine boys and girls of the them that their parents and friends would be delighted with them, and they would be growing up happy and useful; but in order to do this I must and would have their obedience. If I had occasion to punish it would be more and more severely, until they yielded, and were trying to be good. But the children still lacked faith in my words, and if my recollection serves me, I spent most of the afternoon in alternate whippings and exhortations, the former always increasing in intensity, until at last, finding the difference between capricious anger and steadfast determination, they submitted. (in Cohen and Scheer, 1997, p. 44)
This admission by Willard provides insight into how being the agent of discipline affected her teaching. Willard’s experience ultimately turns out well (to her satisfaction that is), in that she does eventually command the respect of students and their interests are fulfilled without further use of the rod. But in terms of discipline, the goal was not to scare students, rather to champion deep affection for the students. The purpose of punishing students publically appeared to be two–fold. First, the punishment would make students obedient and useful. Second, the public display of punishment was, like the prison’s function, to make an example of the unruly student for everyone else to witness. Elizabeth Palmer Peabody wrote of teacher Bronson Alcott’s method in “Record of a School: Exemplifying the General Principles of Spiritual Culture” (1835) that Alcott even spoke to his students about why disciplining was important.

They [students] all very cheerfully agreed, that it [discipline] was necessary, and that they preferred Mr. Alcott should punish them, rather than leave them in their faults, and that it was his duty to do so. (Cohen & Scheer, 1997, p.74)

Peabody’s account of Alcott’s teaching reaffirms the notion of building conscience and building emotionally intense, sentimentalized affection because students took part in discussions about discipline. Peabody suggests that there was democracy here, that students were in agreement that disciplining the body was an effective way to help make them “better.” Though the underlying religious sentiment may not be directly stated in Peabody’s assessment, the moral implications of New England pedagogy are certainly a part of this classroom environment.
By the end of the 19th century, capitalism and industrialism characterized the economy which ran counter to the strong moral mission of the schools. In *Wealth of Nations* (1910), Adam Smith argued that education was too important to be left to voluntary, religious bodies. Bentham and the “education mad” party of the 19th century viewed this monitorial school as the machinery through which government could scientifically inculcate habits of morality. “The school as an engine of instruction could manufacture a disciplinary society” (Jones, 1991, p. 58). Progressive ideology stemmed from the desire to make better the civic order and relationships between business producers and consumers. Butchart (1998) stated that no one had studied a progressive form of classroom discipline at the time, but that progressive teachers in the early 1900s constructed a new form of authority that came from a hierarchical professional/client relationship. He also stated that though there could still be kindness in the classroom, teachers were to become less emotional. They needed to be more composed and professional in their judgments. A vivid description of this transformation came from Angelo Patri (1877-1965) who went through the transition to progressive educator early in his teaching career. His text, *A Schoolmaster of the Great City*, recorded this transition that occurred around 1917 in New York City. As a novice teacher, Patri questioned the discipline system in his New York City school. He stated that marking punishments and rewards puts students on the “lowest possible plane” (in Cohen & Scheer, 1997, p. 205). He concluded that children must have the freedom to move about the classroom, as opposed to sitting obediently. He also stated that the child must make mistakes and not be a carbon copy of the teacher. Rather, for Patri, the student must “be the moving passion of the teacher” (p. 205).
An excerpt from his text demonstrates though that many novice teachers come to believe that they know how to manage a classroom because they were students in school who were themselves subjected to discipline. When Patri is thrown into a room of 66 students who have gone through substitute teacher after substitute teacher, a student asks him if he will return for another day. The insinuation here is that his administration was still subscribing to the Lancasterian method. Patri’s insight here shows the shift from these movements toward Progressivism.

My strong point was discipline…Had I not been kept after hours to study my lessons, slapped for asking a neighbor to borrow a pencil, made to kneel for hours for absenting myself from school, for defending my rights to the teacher? Had I not been marked, rated, percented, all the 10 years of my life in school? Discipline was the basic idea in teaching. You made pupils do what you wanted; you must be the master. Memory, and those who ought to have known, preached discipline. It was the standard for judging my work as a teacher. My continuance in the profession depended upon discipline (Cohen and Scheer, 1997, p. 206)

Initially, the school was very pleased with Patri’s disciplining of students. At this point, he applied fear to gain success. Patri was given classes of students who were not wanted by any other teacher. Yet, Patri says discipline failed because he ran up against students and families who were willing to defy discipline. Patri then moved to bribing, offering entertaining stories in exchange for good behavior and work completion. This new form of disciplining for Patri was disciplining through bargaining, and it seemed to
work. Then, several months later, the administration walked through the school and was
disheartened by the variance in classroom practices. A method book was constructed, and
every teacher was told to teach the exact same way. Patri tried to resist, but said it was no
longer a question of teaching. “It was simply a question of getting the better supervisor.”
Patri returned to college, and after encountering several professors, he found one who
taught John Dewey’s “Ethical Principles.” It changed his life and his entire educational
philosophy. Patri stated he came to believe that students need to be individuals, that they
should move when they need to, and they should no longer be carbon copies of what the
teacher wants. Prior to this transformation, Patri had been “Teaching in the black box.”
This phrase coined by T. Tetsuo Aoki (1992) refers to a point where assessment and
measuring ignores all humanity in education (p. 26). When Patri resisted his own
disciplining, he found the only way for him to teach was to switch schools and find a
principal whose mantra was “I serve children” (p. 26).

Patri’s work seemed to fuel the Progressive era, and others who shared his
philosophical vision seemed to be able to teach through methods where the child, not the
teacher, was the center. Progressive schools took the recitation out of instruction, and
more learning-by-doing and self direction became the pedagogical mainstay (Butchart,
1995). Students were freed from “artificial restraints” and were allowed to learn about
what interested them.

While this methodology incorporated the motivation of students as did New
England pedagogy, this newer pedagogy was more focused on science than religion, and
some students’ moral health fell to the wayside in lieu of concern for students’ physical
health, comfort, and well-being (Butchart, 1995). Science presented itself in many ways
during this time period. Classroom management techniques were studied and developed during this time to make the classroom run more efficiently and routines were established. One branch of progressive educators was also credited with creating standardized testing, report cards, grading for promotion or retention, and compulsory attendance laws. It appeared that some progressive educators provided some of freedom from physical disciplining, but seemed to have provided new ways to discipline. Ludwig Pongratz (2007) argued that while the pre-modern tools of punishment had been abandoned, other more silent and unconscious modes of punishment had taken their place. These methods were no less effective than the physical punishments that preceded them. I believe that it is here where many of the new ways to exercise technologies of discipline were born.

The Progressive era in education ended around the 1940s, and a post-progressive era brought about new changes in classroom management. Classroom management theorist Frederic Jones stated that, in 1969, the term "classroom management" had not yet been coined. "Classroom discipline" as a field of study did not exist. He stated, “Teachers were told in their methods courses that, ‘You will figure it out once you are in the classroom” (Jones, 2009, p.1). No longer were philosophies of discipline generated, but rather strategies and models prevailed to provide short-term classroom order. Many of these systems advocate for utilizing rewards as they are used in much behaviorist psychology (Butchart, 1995). In the early 1970s, researchers started to use the work of behavioral psychologists like B.F. Skinner, William Glasser, and even Pavlov to apply to the classroom. As mentioned earlier, Jacob Kounin (1977) sought to determine whether settings and environmental conditions influenced behavior (Conte, 1994). He also
identified a set of teacher behaviors and lesson characteristics, including *withitness*, smoothness, momentum, overlapping and group alerting (1994). These characteristics described a teacher who knew what was going on at all times in the classroom and could handle multiple issues or problems at one time. Kounin (Conte, 1994) thought teachers who could be that "aware" would be better managers of children in the classroom. Management shifted from disciplining deviant children to managing a class using preventative strategies (Conte, 1994). The physical force of the teacher’s voice and manner alone would “command and sustain, without coercion, the attention of a school of even 60 or 80 children” (Jones, 1991, p. 63). The shift from religious influence to scientific influence seemed to be complete, and seems to be where we are today. During this same period of time, Lee and Marlene Canter (1976) wrote that:

(a) Teachers do not receive the respect from parents that they once did.

(b) More students come to school with behavioral problems than ever before.

(c) Teachers are not sufficiently trained to deal with today's behavioral problems.

(d) The myth of the "good" teacher discourages teachers from asking for the assistance they need.

(e) Relevant curriculum content is not always enough to motivate students to behave as once thought. (Canter & Canter, 1976)

These maxims, coupled with the work of Stow (1971) and Kounin’s desire for more preventative strategies (in Conte, 1994), may have led to an entire market for classroom management pedagogy. There are programs that offer low-, medium-, and high-control
strategies (LePage et. al, 2005). *Assertive Discipline* is considered one of the high-control programs because it emphasizes the teacher’s rights to reinforce desired behaviors and establish consequences (LePage et al, 2005). The quick-fixes Butchart (1998) specified were afoot. It is here where token economies, Canter’s *Assertive Discipline* (1976), or Wong’s “Give Me 5” strategies (2009), are taught as short-term solutions to have students behave in a manner consistent with norms that have been set by someone in a position to name what learning looks like. Butchart (1998) also states that these strategies ignore the conception of a democratic social life. Rather, they seek to:

…establish norms for the educational community that are developed by people in a dominant position. At present they appear to be the goals associated with a consumer society, one that privileges leisure, encourages debt, urges immediate gratification, promotes dissatisfaction, and treats human labor as a mere means to the end of consumption. (Butchart, 1995 p. 179)

Other programs are considered low-control methods because they come from a philosophical belief that students should monitor their own behavior, and make decisions on their own, with minimum guidance (LePage et al, 2005). *Teaching with Love and Logic* (Fay & Funk, 1998) is one of these programs, as it argues for shared control with students. In my personal experience, novice teachers, if trained at all, tend to be given high-control paradigms with which to work.

Using Butchart’s assessment to gauge current norms, it is apparent that those who are novice teachers were also taught and disciplined as students in this same time period. A
cycle of quick fixes seems to be running anew. Aoki (1992) provides analysis of this phenomenon:

In our busy world of education, we are surrounded by layers of voices, some loud, some shrill, some that claim to know what teaching is. Awed, perhaps by the cacophony of voices, certain voices became silent and, hesitating to reveal themselves, conceal themselves. (in Pinar, 1992, p. 17)

If certain voices are to become silent, it appears there is a prescription for which ones are silenced. Modern classroom management pedagogy emerged from 30 years of research where the goal was to establish norms and expectations for behavior. “Skilled teachers socialize their students to the student role through instruction and modeling of desired behaviors” (Bohlin, Durwin, & Reese-Weber, 2009, p). Seating arrangements, room arrangement, norms, routines, and expectations are so mechanized that the classroom is run like a predictable script, rather than a place for individualizing, questioning, and preparation for a democratic society.

In terms of corporal punishment, which was a regular occurrence in colonial times, as of 2006, Weinrich reported that 23 states still permit “reasonable” corporal punishment as a disciplinary technique in public schools, though the majority choose not to use it even when the law permits (Mason, 2000). Andero and Stewart (2002) note that school is the only public institution that still allows physical punishment. Corporal punishment has been banned from prisons, military institutions, homes for the mentally ill, hospitals and other government institutions (Firmin & Castle, 2008).

Some research supports the influence of the techniques of power as being present in schools, especially with regard to student teachers (Ballard, 2002; Walshaw, 2007). There
is a substantial amount of theory that utilizes the work of Michel Foucault to explain the forces of discipline in institutions (Gore, 1998; King, 1995), especially schools. However, research did not yield many studies where discipline was examined specifically as a phenomenon of first-year teachers. As researcher, I used the phenomenon of experiencing these techniques of power with first-year teachers to better understand what happens to these individuals as they experience discipline from both the perspective of the subject and agent of the discipline.

*Themes Emerging from the Review on Discipline*

This review on discipline demonstrated that the teacher has always been in the dual role of agent and subject of discipline. For instance, Phillip Freneau in 1788 was subjected to teaching in a manner consistent with how the tutee’s parents requested. That is, his agency was subject to the rules of the house. When he couldn’t “make them proficient” to the standards set forth by the parents, Freneau was released. When Angelo Patri would not discipline or instruct students the way his administration desired in the early 1900s, he was forced to leave his position and find employment elsewhere. While it may be convenient to suggest that *No Child Left Behind* is the most forceful instrument to date for conforming teachers to a narrow curriculum based on high stakes tests, there have always been outside forces that constrain the way that teachers want to teach.

As one cycles through the major eras of discipline reform, it becomes obvious that despite religious or business influence, the question of teaching students using their own motivations is something that fluctuates frequently. There seems to be a pendulum that swings through education, causing major paradigm shifts. Another trend that emerged in the literature was that the paradigm shift from educational philosopher to educational
practitioner has caused teachers to neglect incorporating the aims of democracy in education. Many, I suspect, do not see a relationship between child development and learning. Rather, they are given tools and use them to keep order in their classroom. For the past 50-60 years, the rate of teacher attrition has grown (Gonzales, 2007); I believe this is due in part to the lack of philosophy imparted to teachers. Thomas Popkewitz wrote, “The purpose of education is “to save the child for (democratic) society and to rescue society through the child” (p. 91), yet society seems to have been left out of the equation in current pedagogical models. Teachers are given only short-term solutions to keep students sitting, walking, and behaving to norms that have been set by the school or the district. Freedom and individuality have been restricted. Educationally, we have moved back toward a Lancasterian model, but we use mental discipline rather than physical. The loss of freedoms is exactly what Michel Foucault commences dialogue about in *Discipline and Punish, the Birth of the Prison* (1977). Foucault’s work constitutes the theoretical framework of this study, and at this juncture, it is important to state some of what Foucault believed about discipline’s effects on the body.

**Foucault in Educational Research**

In chapter 3 of this dissertation, the work of Michel Foucault is used to generate a theoretical framework to explain the lens with which I have come to this phenomenological study. For the purposes of this literature review, it is necessary to briefly state how Foucault’s work is used among educational researchers, primarily to demonstrate and validate the use of his work in this study, and secondly, to see how this man’s work is utilized in diverse approaches.
Foucault died in 1984 of an AIDS related illness, and only one year earlier, showed no signs of the illness. He is said to have written a letter stating that he did not want any works of his to be published posthumously (Rabinow, 1994). Ten years later, the 3,000 pages of *Dits et Ecrits* was put together with all of his published writings and interviews not published in his books. Though he died, Foucault’s name and influence still persists. Within the past ten years, his work constitutes volumes of work in educational research. A short list of volumes in the past ten years includes: *Foucault’s Challenge: Discourse, Knowledge, and Power in Education* (Popkewtiz & Brennan, 1998); *Why Foucault? New Directions in Educational Research* (Peters & Bresley, 2007); *Dangerous Coagulations: The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education* (Baker & Heyning, 2004), each text possessing a dozen or more essays adapting Foucault’s work to examine schools, school policy, and those individuals who are part of the educational community. Beyond this, literally hundreds of essays and dissertations have been published bearing Foucault’s name in the last decade. Baker and Heynings (2004) found that there are four forms of writing that typically use the work of Foucault. They are:

(a) analyses around one work or concept give by a scholar; (b) extended investigations around one work or concept by multiple scholars; (c) extended investigations around select works or concepts; or (d) an extended introduction to reading of the breadth of his work by individual scholars (p. 15).

Based on the research I have gathered, the work generated using Foucault tends to be qualitative or philosophical in nature (Baker & Heynings, 2004; Peters & Bresley, 2007; Walshaw, 2007). Foucault may be best known for analyzing power relationships in
institutions, and the school is certainly one of these sites. Foucault’s text, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* has been used (and is used in this study) to draw parallels between schools and prisons (see Ball, 1991; Gore, 1993; King, 1995; Pongratz, 2007). The text is concerned with how individuals are constituted in distinctive ways so that they fall under the tutelage of parents, teachers, other adults, the state and its institutions (Marshall, 2004). In much early writing on Foucault in education, discovering sites where disciplinary power resides was seen as a form of liberation (Marshall, 2004). Dussel (in Baker & Heynings, 2004) writes about the fashioning of self through uniforms; Ball (1991) writes about classroom management and Foucault; Kenway (1991) used Foucault to talk about right-wing discursive politics in schools. The approaches are varied, but all relate back to institutional and discursive power.

Following *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault began to write about finding freedom in power, rather than being oppressed by it (Wain, 2007). He wrote about the *History of Sexuality* in three volumes (1984), and the solution to this tutelage was to take some responsibility in the choices one makes, to care for oneself to attain a certain mode of being (p. 282). The rise of Foucault’s concept of governmentality also took rise after 1991, and work in education began to examine invoking democracy (Olssen, 2007), understanding social movements, ethics, truth, and morality (see Peters & Bressley, 2007). Jennifer Gore, who wrote *The Struggle for Pedagogies* in 1993, has used Foucault’s work for the past decade or so to describe power relationships in the teacher education arena, and has constructed a methodology using the techniques of power. Gore’s work helped to inform the structure of this study. This investigation operates from an assumption that the “care of the self” is hindered in the schools as the teachers’
ability to self-regulate or resist is hindered with the knowledge that failure to comply may result in termination from the job. Nonetheless, the work of Foucault tends to evolve though the man himself has not made a published contribution to education in over 25 years.

**Criticisms of Foucault’s Work**

Though Foucault has widespread credibility, he has also been frequently criticized. Foucault has been criticized by Morel and Quetel (1985) and others that he frequently misrepresented things, got his facts wrong, extrapolated from insufficient data, or simply made them up entirely. Jacques Derrida’s criticism of Foucault’s interpretation of Descartes’ *Meditations on First Philosophy* led to a break in their friendship and marked the beginning of a fifteen year-long feud between the two (Howe, 1994). When challenged about the historical accuracy of his work, Foucault wrote, “I am well aware I have never written anything but fictions,” (Foucault, 1980, pg. 193). Foucault often said that his works were intended to bring about political change rather than convey some sort of truth about the past (1980).

Historians were predominantly critical of Foucault’s work. The main critique is that Foucault is not concerned with the behavior of individuals, but rather of groups of individuals belonging to a particular institution. Jacques Leonard criticized *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, the key theoretical text of this study. Leonard (in Howe, 1994) wrote that Foucault ignored critical historical elements like the French Revolution, where Leonard states that public spectacle was still being utilized though Foucault stated Damiens was the last case of public spectacle some sixty years earlier. A second critique in Howe’s (1994) work was Foucault’s inability to distinguish between
difficult classes of prisoner: prostitute, murderer, political prisoner. A third critique of Leonard (in Howe) is that Foucault omits the idea of agency.

Who if any group was behind the transformations? Who benefitted from them? Who lost out? … Leonard ‘hits the nail on the head’ when he says: “One does not know for certain whether M. Foucault describes a machinery or a machination” (Howe, 1994, p. 107).

Though, even in Howe’s text Punish and Critique, she acknowledges the value and mass appeal of Foucault’s work when examining the penal system. “To keep one’s critical credentials intact, one does not step out today and discuss the penal question without being able to cite Discipline and Punish at will” (p. 6).

Others have argued that Foucault moved from the idea of ‘docile bodies’ to ‘subjectification,’ that we are not passive victims of social agents; rather, we are active agents capable of intervening and transforming the settings and institutions within which we live and work (Walshaw, 2007). I maintain that Foucault’s influence and concepts developed in Discipline and Punish (1977) are still relevant and useful in the educational arena. The fact that texts reflecting his work with Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (1977) are still being published annually attest to his staying power in education and demonstrate that the technologies he writes about are ever-present in institutions.

The purpose of this study was not to simply state that there are differences in each of the participants’ views, but rather to describe those lived experiences as a means and of understanding and rethinking classroom management, discursive power, and institutional power. What the novice teacher learns over time, resists or eventually accepts, helped to
describe the “essential invariant structure” (Creswell, 1998) and the role discipline plays in first year teaching experiences.

Summary and Implications of the Literature Review

This literature review was subdivided into three sections. The first section discussed the current status of teacher attrition; this study makes the argument that much attrition results from teacher disciplining. The second section is a literature review of classroom management and an examination of the history of discipline and classroom management as we know it today. This literature is relevant for considering the ways teachers are the agents of discipline. The third section provides some detail into how Foucault’s work is currently utilized in education.

The numbers of teachers leaving the field has increased in the past 20 years, and the number of people being adequately trained to fill these classrooms is dwindling (Gonzales, 2007; LePage et al., 2005). These issues may stem from administrators ignoring the needs of certain teachers who may feel that their freedoms are being stripped from them. In the studies cited here, themes demonstrate that many novice teachers are underprepared for their roles with respect to classroom management.

With respect to the second part of this literature review, the past two centuries have shown little change in terms of how students are disciplined. This chapter reviewed current literature on teacher attrition, paying particular attention to discipline and classroom management. This review helped inform the central focus of this study, which was to examine the dual role of teachers as both subjects and agents of discipline by providing significant context for the study.
Finally in the third section of this literature review, I provided a brief synopsis of how Michel Foucault’s work is utilized in educational research. After researching the current literature on discipline, I turned to the theoretical underpinnings of Michel Foucault, a renowned sociologist, philosopher and quasi-historian who addressed the notions of power and discipline in institutions because the historical context, while informative and descriptive of the circumstances of classroom management and discipline, does not provide a theory of the nature and working of power which is critical to this dissertation. Relevant excerpts from Foucault’s theory will be explained in chapter 3.
CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: MICHEL FOUCAULT

Perhaps what is needed is a study entitled ‘Discipline and Punish: the birth of the school,’ which would provide a unique analysis of the use and refinement of power-knowledge in the modern school in the cause of governance. (Ball, 1991, p. 23)

Introduction

Though Ball’s quotation is somewhat dated, the prison-school analogy applies just as poignantly nearly 20 years later. Ball’s call for academic work that analyzes the birth of the school has been answered, but it is very much an ongoing conversation. This study takes part in such a conversation by addressing the experiences of the novice teacher as both the subject and agent of discipline. The purpose of this study is to share novice teachers’ lived experiences as they serve in the dual role of agent and subject of discipline. The key theory for this research came directly from Michel Foucault’s work on power, discipline, and resistance. This chapter provides the theoretical underpinnings associated with this study. It highlights the work on power and discipline set forth by Michel Foucault in Power-Knowledge (1980) and Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (1977), by giving accounts of power, discipline, and the techniques of power. To better understand his work as it is applied to education, the work of Jennifer Gore (1993, 1998, 2004), Margaret Walshaw, (2007) and others is described here.
Power

Most traditional concepts of power state that power is repressive; it is hierarchical, possessed by a dominant individual, a class, a people. However, Foucault’s definition contrasts with traditional thought (1980). Power, for Foucault, is a relationship between two or more entities. Within this relationship, entities struggle and maneuver for position and advantage; each entity has its own power, and both entities affect each other. Foucault’s conceptualization of “power” was unique in that power is found at every level of society; it is linked, continuous, and embedded in every social relation (King, 1995, Walshaw, 2007). Power and knowledge are produced in discourses and social practices. Power, for Foucault, does not belong to one social group. That is to say, power is not inherently hierarchical. The individual is an effect of power, and at the same time, or precisely to the extent to which it is that effect, it is the element of articulation. “The individual that power has constituted is at the same time its vehicle” (Foucault, 1980 p. 98).

There are opportunities and constraints for each entity. In Power-Knowledge (1980), Foucault wrote:

What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted is simply the fact that it doesn’t weigh on us a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things. It needs to be considered a productive network which runs from the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose focus is repression. (p. 119)

In terms of this study, the principal, the teacher, the student, the bus driver, the parent, all constitute the social network and all have power. The decisions one person makes can
affect the others, and will force reactions. These points of intersection produce a particular kind of student. Foucault suggested that power should not be explained in terms of intentions, motives, aims, interests, or obsessions. Rather, for Foucault, looking at the effects of power was more crucial than the explanations for its exercise (Walshaw, 2007). Foucault said, “Power never ceases its interrogation, its inquisition, its registration of the truth: it institutionalizes, professionalizes and rewards its pursuit” (Foucault, 1980, p. 93) where for the purpose of this study, the truth is determined by the kinds of discourses individuals construct and take part in, in particular institutions. And while the effects of power are the prime focus of this study, Foucault has provided elements of a definition that I pieced together and cultivated in this chapter. To Foucault, power is always circulating; it is capillary, circulating in webs of power dynamics. In addition to this basic definition, Foucault alluded to three distinct modes in which power operates: dividing practices, scientific classification, and subjectification (Foucault, 1977). The focus of this study will be on subjectification.

In subjectification, Foucault describes power as the way that people actively constitute themselves (1980). In this study, this would be the decisions and relationships participants make to construct their definition of an effective teacher. This study focused specifically on subjectivities because it is here where other factors such as disciplinary power (institutional and discursive) are housed. Using Foucault’s conceptualizations of subjectivities, this study sought to describe how the mechanisms of power have been “invested, colonized, utilized, involuted, transformed, displaced, extended” (Foucault, 1980, p. 99); it also demonstrated how this has led to teacher dissatisfaction and ultimately teacher attrition. To sum up, power functions in the construction of
knowledge, the construction of relations among participants, and the construction and maintenance of particular subjectivities (Gore, 2004). Power can be repressive, possessed, productive, circulating, exercised, and self imposed (Gore, 2004).

Beyond the distinctions of power already alluded to, there are other ways to categorize power that need to be addressed to better understand the goals of this study. Within subjectivities, institutional power and discursive power make apparent who gets to say and do what in a particular institution or context. As stated previously, discursive power is a set of rules that tell individuals what is acceptable to say or do in a particular place or context (Walshaw, 2007). Institutional power is exhibited through practices that discipline individuals to benefit an institution (Foucault, 1980; Gore, 1993).

**Disciplinary Institutional and Discursive Power**

Within the strand of subjectivity, one way Foucault categorized power was through the development of disciplinary power. Disciplinary power aims to target the individual through involvement in groups and institutions. Within disciplinary power, is institutional power and discursive power (Foucault, 1977; 1980). In simplest terms, discursive power is a set of rules that tells individuals what is acceptable to say or do in a particular place or context:

Though [these rules] intersect with a whole suite of discourses at cultural crossroads, all trying to get hold of our attention, some more than others, they bring a powerful dimension to the way we take up our identity. These cultural discourses tell us what kind of things we should do, think, and hope for as a gendered, classed, raced, individual within society.

(Walshaw, 2007, p. 79)
These practices then can also be applied to a particular institution. In addition to race, class, and gender, the individual’s position within the institution could also be added. That is, teachers’ identities can be constructed from a particular set of beliefs; they have been indoctrinated by those who also operate within the context of the school—other teachers, students, parents, administrators, for example. The term “discursive practices” has been becoming more prevalent in research on schools (Lewin, 1997) and according to Margaret Walshaw, “it functions like a set of rules, providing us with what is possible to speak and do at a given moment.” (p. 40). Discursive power is roving, shifting and always changing. Foucault said that it makes no sense to talk about knowledge or the objects of knowledge outside discursive practices, since what can appear as "knowledge" to us is only knowable or made visible through the practices we construct the world with (Dreyfuss, 2008). Discourses not only position what people say and do, but also organize the actual people and their systems (Walshaw, 2008). These discursive practices also construct our identities as "knowing subjects" and the subjectivities of being positioned as insiders (or outsiders) in a particular institution. Foucault (1980) said:

What type of power is susceptible of producing discourses of truth that in a society such as ours are endowed with such potent effects? What I mean is this: in a society such as ours, but basically in any society, there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterize and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation, and functioning of a discourse. There can be no possible exercise of power with a certain economy of discourses of truth
which operates through and on the basis of this association. We are subjected to the production of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association. We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth. (p. 93)

Most teachers, therefore, learn what is considered important within a particular site, and then actively negotiate with the subjectivities made available at the site. To reiterate, this study operated from the assumption that the discourses that affected teacher decisions serve to discipline the teacher psychologically. Discourses are those by which we are “judged, condemned, classified, determined in our undertakings, destined to a certain mode of living and dying, as a function of the true discourses which are the bearers of the specific effects of power” (Foucault, 1980, p. 94).

If discourse is the set of rules, the institution, not the individual, is the regulator—the rule maker--possessing the control, the body that authorizes discourse. In some instances, these rule sets/regulations determine how schools and their communities have their space, time and movement articulated. To Foucault, institutional power is exercised through disciplining the body (1980). For example, the teacher, the principal, the community act here as the agent of discipline and exercise institutional power. Foucault wrote about the experiences of children (1977), and made several comparisons between schools and the military in terms of taking away individual freedoms. Children’s movements, what they learn, and how long they learn it for, are all dictated by institutional power (1977). Likewise, teachers and those personnel who work with and for children all observe,
normalize, rank, classify, and document students’ movements, thoughts (to an extent), and abilities.

Foucault stated that those who do not comply with the boundaries established at the institution are isolated, labeled “delinquent,” and are sometimes used to demonstrate to others what happens when one doesn’t follow the way of that particular school (1977). If power alone is not considered to have the potential to be oppressive, why then is institutional power perceived as oppressive? To use Foucault’s words (1977), the power “traverses all points and supervises every instant in the disciplinary institution…it compares, differentiates, hierarchizes, homogenizes, excludes” (p. 183). It must be stated that there are instances where institutional power may be considered positive and productive. For instance, administrators may be pleased with the apparent order in the halls when students are walking down the halls with their arms crossed. Additionally, work on bulletin boards may be protected. Furthermore, it is conceivable that teachers are even comforted by the structures imposed upon them. Teachers may believe they know what is expected in the workplace. Yet, my experiences as a teacher inform me to know that there are many instances where institutional power is perceived as a series of unfair practices imposed upon a particular group, whether it be students, teachers, or bus drivers. And while Foucault makes these claims using children as examples, it is evident in research gathered for this study (Crocco & Costigan, 2007; Gore; 1998; King, 1995) that this institutional power has an effect on children’s behavior.
Discipline

In *Discipline and Punish* (1977), Foucault offers a definition of discipline that is at the crux of this dissertation. In short, Foucault defines “discipline” as a series of methods “which made possible the meticulous control of the operations of the body, which assured the constant subjection of its forces” (Foucault, 1977, p. 137). Discipline, according to Foucault, “may be identified neither with an institution nor with an apparatus; it is a type of power, a modality for its exercise, comprising a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, level of application, targets; it is a physics or an anatomy of power, a technology” (p. 215). To demonstrate discipline, Foucault begins this text by stating the case of a prisoner, Robert-François Damiens, who was being punished for the attempted assignation of Louis XV of France. Damiens’ is the last account in France of someone being tortured for public spectacle. His punishment included being drawn and quartered publically, so that the message that crime is wrong would be seen by all in the community, as a warning for those individuals to be honest members of society. This demonstration also gave a harsh reminder to society that the state had power, thus re-establishing power relations. Damiens was punished in 1757, a time when feudal forms of punishment were utilized to punish anyone who opposed hierarchically organized social powers (Pongratz, 2006). Foucault juxtaposes this public spectacle with the state of prison discipline decades later. He provides Faucher’s “Timetable for Prisoners” published in approximately 1837 where the goal became reformation of prisoners. No longer were there public displays of punishment. Rather, prisoners were disciplined to self-regulate and reform themselves so they might become part of society again (1977). The more subtle methods to discipline prisoners, called *technologies*, at play here forced
the prisoners to self-regulate and conform to norms within the prison. These technologies will be discussed later in this chapter, but it is enough to say here that the prison is not so different from the school.

When one examines the role of discipline and punishment in schools, striking parallels are seen to the birth of the prison. In fact, the term classroom management came centuries after the use of corporal punishment was brandished in the classroom. Ludwig Pongratz stated, “To speak of punishment produces unease: to all appearances, punishments demonstrate the failure of well-meaning pedagogic intentions” (Pongratz, 2006, p. 29). This failure, he stated is why today educationalists would rather speak of: classroom management, self-steering or prevention, instead of discipline and constraint. Not without reason are they proud of the fact that tough physical punishments, which in the premodern world were considered ‘normal’ educational tools, were rejected and abolished by enlightened bourgeois society. But it remains debatable whether contemporary pedagogy, instead of excessive, painful punishments, has not replaced them with quite different modes of punishment, which may be more silent and unconscious than their predecessors, but certainly no less effective.

(p. 29)

So, rather than talk about controlling bodies and punishing students, teachers are expected to practice classroom management, controlling through technologies rather than by public spectacle. As William Doll (2000) stated, teachers are often told not to lose control of the classroom. This issue of control is often viewed as oppressive, where the teacher holds the control and students are subjected to it. Dewey (in Doll, 2000) is
regarded as one of the first educational philosophers to view control as “residing in the interactions (teacher-students, student-students, people-texts, history-present, etc.) existent in the situations they are in” (p. 73). This view of control is more in line with Foucault’s techniques of power and is used as part of the theoretical framework of this study.

Docile Bodies

Foucault explained that discipline is used to make a body docile (1977). A docile body is one “that may be subjected, used, transformed, and improved…they were also political puppets, small scale models of power” (Foucault, 1977, p.136). To explain docile bodies Foucault described the mechanization of the soldier who is transformed from a peasant (1977). Both teachers’ and students’ bodies are made docile by engaging in discursive practices, and by reacting to institutional power. The teacher is made docile when he or she perceives particular practices as being the norm. The teacher says and acts in a way considered consistent with others in the institution. The student is made docile when he or she comes to follow a particular set of behaviors in order to self regulate in accordance with discourses provided. Phillip Corrigan refers to the “tightening of bodies” that accompanies schooling to manifest in “generations of former and current students who raise their hands to speak, who ask permission to leave rooms, who tense up in examination situations, who beam with the tiniest expressions of approval” (Gore, 1998, p. 231). There are several methods one can employ to “tighten” these bodies, or to shame the soul, as Foucault may have analogized. According to Goodson and Dowbiggen, docile bodies of knowledge “discipline not only the subjectivities of the clientele whose interests and needs are presumed to be served; they also discipline the professions with
which they are associated by encouraging their members to pursue agendas concerned chiefly with career structures” (1991, p. 107).

Foucault, himself, developed four categories, or techniques, to make a body docile (Foucault, 1977). They are: (a) “The distribution of bodies;” (b) “The control of activities;” (c) “the total *programme*” and; (d) “the composition of forces.” They were categorized by Foucault as the techniques of power (p.141), and are described in the next section of this chapter.

*Techniques of Power*

As Foucault described how punishment was initially carried out by public spectacle, schools too commenced their role in American society with the practice of punishment being broadly visible to encourage obedience through fear. The basic framework of medieval-feudal forms of punishment was modeled on the principle of repressive exclusion, and anything that was opposed to the expressions of the social powers was exorcized (Pongratz, 2006). This is why individuals like Damiens were publically drawn and quartered in 1757 (Foucault, 1977) and students at that time, and for decades more, were beaten with switches (Pongratz, 2006). From a historical perspective, Herman Francke (1663-1727), an educator, was renowned for his maxim of breaking the will of the child (Pongratz, 2006). The 1700s were predominantly a period of repressive education. By the late 1880s, however, corporal punishment still existed, but without the public spectacle (1884; cited in Pongratz 2006). And just as Foucault discussed how prisons no longer punish by public spectacle, Pongratz (2006) parallels Foucault’s work by stating that the obvious point of attack in educational punishment was no longer the student’s body, but rather, “the soul, which is shamed, exposed, or disappointed” (p. 32).
These techniques were considered more subtle forms of punishment (Pongratz, 2006), but were effective nonetheless. Jennifer Gore broke Foucault’s four techniques into eight techniques of power in an attempt to develop a methodology (1993). These eight techniques: monitoring (or surveillance), normalization, exclusion, classification, distribution, partitioning, totalization, and regulation were used to explain how novice teachers were both disciplined and disciplining. Although these categories appear distinct for the purpose of this paper, there exists tremendous overlapping between categories. For example, examinations do more than just measure knowledge; they serve as a form of surveillance, and they normalize and classify as well. The following are descriptions of each of Foucault’s techniques of power.

Figure 1: Display of the Techniques of Power
Teachers realize that the paperwork they submit will seldom be reviewed or evaluated. But the infrequent or superficial nature of these forms of surveillance make them no less powerful. (King, 1995, p.16)

As stated earlier, punishment prior to the late 1700s was done publically, in an attempt to make an example of criminals and deviants. For centuries, it seemed that there was no way to control a population without force and violence (Walshaw, 2007). This all changed in the late 1790s, when the Panopticon, a prison designed by English philosopher Jeremy Bentham, made it possible to control prisoners without force (O’Farrell, 2005). This institution was designed in a pentagonal shape with a central monitoring room that permitted those in charge to observe whomever they desired, whenever they desired. Foucault (1977) described the prison’s importance:

There is no need for weapons, physical violence, material constraints.

Just a gaze. An inspecting gaze, a gaze where each person feeling its weight will end up by interiorizing to the point of observing himself. (p. 180)

From Foucault’s explanation of the Panopticon came one of his written about concepts—that of surveillance and the constant gaze. Although this prison was cost-effective and was built for a specific number of inmates, Bentham envisioned this structure to solve other “control problems” (Walshaw, 2007, p.112). Bentham may be content to see 200 years later, surveillance is practiced globally, through satellites, phone taps, video surveillance, Global Positioning units, and countless other technologies designed for watching and eavesdropping on people. Dreyfuss and Rabinow (1983)
reported that Bentham had little faith in school teachers, and that his design for prisons was in Bentham’s mind adaptable for schools. In modern schools, teachers monitor students; administrators monitor teachers; students monitor each other; and teachers monitor each other. Through Panopticon, the constant monitoring singled out individuals who were non-conforming, enabling constant comparisons and scrutiny.

For Foucault, monitoring was a necessity for institutions. Monitoring, or surveillance, is the watching, or observing, of the subjected. It is the fact of constantly being seen, of being able to always be seen, that maintains the disciplined individual in his subjection. Teachers are very involved in directly monitoring students through overtly observation and indirect monitoring through assessing test results and checklists. Students are subjected by having to sit straight - with all four chair legs on the floor and eyes forward - by having to fold their arms when walking down the hall, by answering a clap back as a way to signal silence, and by sitting “criss-cross applesauce,” (formally known as “Indian style”). In addition to external arrangements such as desk placement, students’ motivational structures, and psychic dispositions, school life and social forms were considered to establish attention (Pongratz, 2006). King (1995) noted that teachers are subjected to discipline in this way. For many teachers, dress is restricted. Others may not be allowed to share their political views; some must prepare their boards in a prescribed way; and they must only use an adopted textbook. These gestures, as Foucault would call them, are aimed at increasing efficiency in the school (King, 1995), but may not be consistent for all.

Foucault (1977) wrote, “A relation of surveillance, defined or regulated, is inscribed at the heart of the practice of teaching, not as an additional or adjacent part, but as a
mechanism that is inherent to it and which increases in its efficiency” (p. 176). This monitoring can come in the form of supervising others, observing others, or the implied threat of others observing you. Foucault calls this a “gaze” (1977).

This “gaze” occurs in several ways. In 2009, school officials rely heavily on on-site police officers and video tape surveillance. But monitoring also occurs when the teacher writes on the whiteboard and asks a student behind her to stop talking. When a teacher learns the names of his students as a strategy to keep students on task, he has established a positive form of monitoring leading to more efficient pedagogical practice (Gore, 1998). From the research, surveillance/monitoring is the most documented and studied technique of power.

Normalization

A certain significant generality moved between the least irregularity and the greatest crime: it was no longer the offence, the attack on the common interest, it was the departure from the norm, the anomaly; it was this that haunted the school, the court, the asylum, the prison (Foucault, 1977, p. 299).

As stated earlier, there is tremendous overlap between categories, and normalization is no exception. Many of the concepts addressed in the section, could also be argued as being vital to the argument regarding surveillance. Gore (1998) defined normalization as “invoking, requiring, setting, or conforming to a standard—defining the normal… Educating is about the teaching of norms—norms of behavior, of attitudes, of knowledge” (Gore, 1998, p. 237). In addition, time and space can be normalized. Normalization can occur through a requirement to read books like the What to Expect When You’re Expecting series (Murkoff et. al, 2003) and Yardsticks (2007) by Chip
Wood. These texts normalize children by telling what they should be able to do, say, or behave like when they are certain age. This will be addressed in subsequent paragraphs.

Foucault (1977) highlighted the importance of comparison in “normalizing judgment,” or normalization, when he stated, “… individual actions are referred to a whole that is at once a field of comparison, a space of differentiation and the principle of a rule that must be followed” (page 182).

Normalizing is also achieved through a series of high stakes tests. In several states, norm-referenced tests such as the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) and the CAT (California Achievement Test) are administered in addition to criterion-referenced tests such as the Criterion Referenced Test (CRTs) (Bohlin, Durwin, & Reese-Weber, 2009). All permit data to be collected and measured to set norms, though only norm-referenced tests claim this responsibility. These tests provide scores that dictate who is considered “average” or “normal.” These test scores then become evaluative of teachers, communicating who has successfully imparted the knowledge students at a particular grade need to know. This can lead to ranking of students and teachers. These tests tell students who is normal, and reveal which teachers are doing their jobs.

In addition, when teachers are told to implement certain behavioral strategies, like only having five rules, as Harry and Rosemary Wong (1998) maintain (p. 145), or making students place a finger over their mouths when they walk down the hall, teachers are normalizing behavior management pedagogy. Harry Wong calls normalized teachers “effective teachers” and teachers work to achieve this normalization. Jones’ work also prescribes methods for arranging desks and how to talk to students, and identifies four kinds of behavior problem students—including the “helpless hand raiser.” This guide
gives teachers strategies to normalize these students. The text *Yardsticks* (2007) by Chip Wood provides lists of what “normal” students at certain ages should do and what teachers can anticipate. And if one has ever read, *What to Expect When You’re Expecting*, when having a child, one will know the frustration when a child doesn’t do what the “normal” child is doing at a particular age or stage. Books such as the Wongs’ *First Days of School* can produce the same results.

Normalization also transpires when teachers treat students’ bodies as the vehicle that brings a brain to school. Their bodies are under the control of teachers who issue quiet signals like “1,2,3, eyes on me,” sit up straight, two feet on the floor, stay put, don’t use the restroom except on bathroom breaks, no talking, touching, and so on. In addition, teachers punish misbehaviors of the body. Individuals may choose to use reward, punishment, and ranking to achieve control while normalizing (though rewards and punishments are equated with the technique of regulation).

One may traditionally think of norms as prohibiting actions, but they also dictate what our thoughts or actions should be. They often tell us what one must be to “fit in.” Ball (1990) states that teachers are, “trapped into taking responsibility for their own disciplining through schemes of self-appraisal, school improvement, and institutional development” (Ball, 1990, p. 162). Here teachers are strongly encouraged to believe that adhering to the norms is what makes them professionals (1990). As with monitoring, the normalization of teachers is happening more frequently, perhaps as a result of *No Child Left Behind*. Math texts like *Saxon Math*³ are completely scripted in primary education. These scripted programs take all autonomy away from the teacher, as they communicate

---

³ *Saxon Math* is a publication of Saxon Publishers, a division of Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Supplemental Publishers.
that there is truly only one way to administer a particular lesson. This, then, suggests that there is only one acceptable, normal way to teach a particular lesson, and therefore mandates normalizing practices in particular content areas.

**Disciplining the Use of Time**

As previously mentioned, use of time has been normalized through documents that tell exactly how each minute is to be spent. To facilitate the efficient coordination of people’s actions, the time each person takes to complete an activity also has to be specified, normalized, and controlled. The aim is to turn everyone’s lifetime into a totally useful time.

The more time is broken down, the more its subdivisions multiply, the better one disarticulates it by deploying its internal elements under a gaze that supervises them, and the more one can accelerate an operation, or at least regulate it according to optimum speed. (Foucault, 1977, p.150) Therefore this disciplinary time divides linear time into marked and measured units. It differentiates the division of space to control the flow of school days. Periods of blocks are devised and a sequence of instruction is developed (Kirk, 2004). King (1995) states the “The daily schedule, the daily time-table, not only regulates students’ lives, but clearly controls the teachers’ activities as well” (King, 1995, p. 18).

A pitfall of making every minute useful is that sometimes, it is virtually impossible to complete all the tasks or goals required in the specified amount of time. This can often lead to fear or panic that there may be retaliation because certain skills may not have been taught before a standardized test or by a prescribed benchmark. Foucault suggested that the panic teachers display and suffer is exactly what regimes of efficiency, monitoring
and control set out to do (Jardine, 2005). Such a regime forces teachers to cover material, rather than teach for mastery. Therefore, as part of teachers’ management, strict adherence to a schedule devised, in part, by the school district is mandatory.

In addition to a time table, King (1995) describes the “temporal elaboration of the act” (p. 19). King describes these as the “instructions, restraints, and controls” (p.19) that adjust the body to temporal imperatives. This translates roughly to state benchmarks and curriculum guidelines that are set forth by a school district. It is common, in my experience, to be told how long to spend on a particular skill. That is, “they” are telling students that they should have a particular skill mastered in a certain amount of time. Teachers are often forced to “move on,” even if students have not retained or learned proper material, based on the regulation of time set forth by benchmarks.

Students also experience the potentially harmful result of delineating time, in that they are expected to have mastered particular skills. Often this schedule does not reflect Piaget’s or Eriksen’s developmental timetables, which are also two more examples aimed at normalization. However, these standards and objectives sometimes seem like random divisions, established by the school districts, that call students to have particular skills at designated times. In addition, time even impacts the carrying out of punishments (King, 1995). Wong and Wong (1998/2009) stated that rules must be taught and practiced during the first week of school. If they are not, the class is lost. They state for teachers that the following things that will occur if rules and procedures are taught in the first week of school:

You will have fewer problems in the classroom.

You will present yourself positively to your students.
You will feel less stress.

You will feel better about your capabilities in the classroom.

You will be much sought after and admired.

You will be respected as a professional.

You will have greater student success.

You will be a super successful teacher.(Wong & Wong, 1998, p. xii)

This list immediately gets at the techniques of power regarding regulation. It seems to state that if an instructor does not start teaching rules and procedures, according to Harry Wong, he or she can expect the opposite of this list to occur. The proverb, “Time is of the essence,” is drilled into novice teachers from the instant they are hired.

Another way a teacher’s time is regulated is that there is often little time for giving students consequences for bad behavior. Teachers frequently have to give up their lunch time or after school time to hold detention because there is no time in the day to do so. Teachers have to deal with student misbehavior because the principal doesn’t have time to address poor behavior. Often for a teacher to monitor a misbehaving child, they are subjected to their very own discipline.

*Exclusion*

Exclusion defines difference and sets zones by limiting what some students or teachers are permitted to do within the institution (Gore, 1998). Sometimes exclusion is the bodily removal of a student from the activity, thus excluding those who are not normal. In addition, particular identities and practices can be excluded, as can be ways of constructing knowledge (1998). Foucault’s teacher, Canguilhem, stated “a pedagogy that
does not set boundaries, that does not normalize and pathologize, is almost inconceivable” (Gore, 1998, p. 238).

Institutions exclude students from activities based on not completing tasks (like class work or homework), for acting in a particular way (talking back), and sometimes for not having materials or money. It is common for students who do not turn in a number of homework assignments, or who get in trouble during the year to be restricted from field trips. Additionally, some students are excluded from activities for reasons that are beyond their control. For example, band instruments, uniforms, club fees are all collected for institutional practices. Even in free public schools, socio-economic status can still affect the individual’s ability to take part in school activities. Students may not get skills or experiences that could increase learning based on the fact that they have been excluded by the school for not having funds. This is a form of exclusionary discipline that may have enduring effects on the students.

Classification

When Foucault wrote about disciplinary power, he investigated the differentiating of groups of individuals from one another, classifying them, classifying oneself (Gore, 1998, p. 239). Author Ron Clark (2004) stated he once had a principal in Harlem who made it clear she could not match a student’s face and name, but she could certainly tell you what a student received on the standardized test if you said the child’s name. In the wake of high-stakes testing determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), students are continually classified. These classifications include the rankings of individuals and groups. Students may be classified in schools these days as members of “gifted and talented” groups or of “free and reduced” students, or by ethnicity. Standardized tests
provide numerous scales that organize data by classifying students by gender, race and socio-economic status (Bohlin, Durwin, & Reese-Weber, 2009).

**Examination**

Many researchers have included the examination as part of a discussion on surveillance. While it is true that exams are a documentation that can be monitored, I believe that it constitutes a much larger discussion within the realm of classification. Hoskin (1990) wrote that examinations have been used since the 1800s, and have been the key that turns discipline into knowledge. Students and teachers are both continually ranked based on examinations both overtly and concealed.

For Foucault (1977), examinations limit students because the exam determines the official knowledge students should possess. Often students know the concepts being taught, but are unable to perform on the examination for numerous reasons. These include not being able to perform because of testing pressures. The stress surrounding some of the high-stakes tests is certainly a factor in test performance. Foucault (1977) states that the examination produces what will count and will not count as knowledge. This very specific exam-knowledge is then manipulated to classify individuals, to reward and punish them, and to integrate them and their predictable knowledge and effort into the whole of society in a controlled way. This knowledge has very powerful effect. Who determines what will count on these examinations? Who determines what information is more valuable, or has more worth on examinations? For example, the fifth grade math **Criterion Referenced Test** in Nevada contains many questions measuring understanding of data analysis. These data analysis questions constitute one third of the test (Hawk and McGlothen, personal communication, November 17, 2003). Who determined that fifth
graders need to know mean, median, mode, and range, and graphing concepts, to the point that these concepts constitute 33% of what students will tested on across the state? And does knowing this fact alter the curriculum that will be taught, excluding some concepts to teach more graphs?

Within the concept of examination, lies another concept—the appraisal. For Foucault, appraisal is another kind of examination. Many teachers are appraised annually. While the examination and appraisal may not seem relevant to a topic on discipline and behavior managements, it is a paramount consideration. It is crucial from the standpoint that teachers have modified their instructional practices to attain satisfactory scores. The subjectivity of these appraisals can make a teacher exemplary at one site and average at another. This can affect transferring from one site to another. Additionally, merit pay exists in some states and countries to “reward” teachers who produce the desired results from their children. Schools that do not achieve the desired results end up on a “Watch List,” which of course implies that they are being monitored. Schools that fail to perform can end up being taken over by the state. Administrators may lose their positions, usually by being transferred to other schools or to other administrative roles. The appraisal’s power comes from a hierarchical observation as well as a normalizing gaze (O’Farrell, 2005). Examinations qualify, classify, and reward and punish; and their high-stakes use definitely affects the institution’s morale and management, especially with respect to the delineation of time and space and the uses (or misuses) of examination and appraisal.

**Ranking**

Foucault defined ranking as a system that distributed “individuals in educational order” (Foucault, 1977, p.146). Of all the professions, teaching is one where there exists
little differentiation in any kind of status. A first year teacher and a veteran teacher are still called teachers (King, 1995). All positions are relatively equal, as a teacher, a librarian, and a physical education teacher are often paid on the same salary scale. An exemplary teacher, whose students achieve proficiency on standardized tests, usually has the same rank and pay of a poor teacher who comes in late and leaves at the bell. Rank can be determined after any examination, or can be determined by a cumulative average. Rank is based on comparisons, whether one is talking about students’ ranks or teachers’ ranks. Simmons (2005) suggests that rank is its own reward because those who execute the desired results are placed in higher positions.

These ranks sometimes determine eligibility for particular programs or higher education institutions. Therefore, their importance may drive the student or faculty member to achieve. Teachers may lose their certification if they have not attained a certain rank at the school. Although rank seems to be individualized for Foucault, Ball (1990) and others think that rank is also used to determine a school’s worth, and that this ranking has serious effects on the administration and community of particular schools. Ball states, “Normalizing judgments are turned upon whole schools; each school is in a field of comparison. An artificial ‘order’ is laid down” (Ball, 1990, p. 163). For instance, the No Child Left Behind Act has helped to designate “High-Achieving Schools,” “Watch Listed Schools,” “Schools of Choice,” and “Empowerment Schools.” All of these are based on rankings developed by test scores and proficiency rates on a school’s criterion-referenced tests.

Ranking is also a disciplinary technique that allows students to see their progress in a linear way. It allows for systems of punishment and reward. It can isolate and it can
validate behaviors when students are attempting to reach particular goals (Simmons, 2005).

*Distribution*

Distribution, also conceptualized by Foucault, argues that position of bodies, how they are arranged, separated, and isolated, is also a technique of power (Gore, 1998). I have decided to include discussion of physical space in this category, although it could easily fit in many other categories, especially normalization.

*Space*

In addition to having time normalized, space is also segmented and regulated. There is both physical and psychological space within societal institutions. Foucault (1977) wrote that in a disciplinary society everyone has predictable place at a predictable time, and is doing predictable things. Individuals need to accept centralized monitoring and control, and must learn to act with little or no independent initiative. In his chapter, “Docile Bodies,” in *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, Foucault explains how discipline acts in space. He coins the phrase “Art of Distributions,” and classifies it into four distinct categories. These categories are: (a) “enclosure,” a practice that limits movement of groups; (b) “partitioning,” which isolates groups of people; (c) “developing functional sites”, by the development of “functional sites,” that permit each locality to serve a particular purpose; and (d) “ranking” where individuals are ordered (Simmons, 2005). In this section, I will address the first three parts of discipline because I believe that ranking is primarily an issue of normalization as opposed to being a function of space.
Enclosure

One technique that builds disciplined space is enclosure, where individuals are controlled by being contained (Foucault, 1977). Enclosure can have advantages like keeping theft down and minimizing disturbances (p. 142). Although Foucault’s explanation generally focuses on factories, its application in education is clear. In education, enclosure can only be as wide and as long as the perimeter of the school; however, it is usually smaller. Enclosure focuses on the boundaries of schools. It may be the fence that keeps students from leaving school property during recess. Here, enclosure serves to separate the real world from the “school world.” Courtyards in the middle of the institution may be built to serve as paradises within the school. Enclosure may also take place through the dots found on the concrete that mark where each class is to stand or through physical borders that define where they may line up.

Most schools have some sort of physical enclosure. The forms of enclosure can vary from chain-link fences to security guards and metal detectors. As Simmons (2005) points out in her dissertation, since the 16th century, schools have made attempts to keep the masses out. Enclosure can also take place in the form of remote isolation. Putting students in study carrels, putting them in in-school suspension, and removing them from programming are also forms of enclosure that are used to discipline students. In short, enclosure serves to organize the community in a certain way. The institutions’ configurations may serve to include or exclude students.

Partitioning

A second way that space is divided is by Foucault’s notion of partitioning (1977). Typically this involves the separation of groups of students. Foucault saw partitioning as
a way to further isolate or include individuals by working at the level of the body.

“…space needs to be divided into as many sections as there are bodies or elements to be distributed” (Foucault, 1977, p. 143). Sometimes instruction requires the need to eliminate communication between groups. Partitioning serves to separate individuals from each other so that no power can be gained as a collective (Simmons, 2005). It is not unusual to see elementary teachers have students make false walls with their folders to prevent them from seeing each other’s papers. Some teachers use “study carrels,” (Foucault calls them cubicles), which are desks that have a “wall” that surrounds all sides so a student can’t be distracted or seen. These are examples of physical partitions.

Psychological partitions can function through the arrangement of students in different classrooms. In schools today, students are often grouped by age, even if their ability levels are not equal. Within those age partitions, often some sort of separation is made according to ability groups. Ability groups are determined by results on some common assessment. For example, remedial courses for those who don’t do well on a standardized test serve to partition people who are considered to be of one type. Less obvious partitions are also produced in year-round schools when students are placed on particular tracks. All these partitions can make disparity amongst classes, with some obvious benefits and drawbacks for each.

Parents’ desire to have students in private schools or in accelerated classes can partition by socio-economic status or by the perceived “seriousness” of the student. If all the “high-achieving” students are enclosed in one space and are partitioned from the “not high-achieving” rank, each place can be dedicated to its function. Some would argue that this is not best practice (Bohlin, 2009).
For students, differentiation is exhibited when teachers assign classrooms for the next school year, develop groups of students for projects or instruction, or when there are physically moving bodies -- whether students are moving themselves or imploring others to do so (Gore, 1998). Kirk (2004) adds that differentiation includes the spatial seating of pupils to allow close supervision by the teacher. The seating of pupils in rows also makes a visible hierarchy of competence and worth, depending on where pupils are positioned in relation to the teacher and to each other (2004). To combat this, *Tools for Teachers* by Fred Jones (2000) develops paths for teachers to walk to always change the power exchanged between the student and the teacher.

*Functional Sites*

Reorganizing and dedicating space is also a technique of power. Foucault describes these spaces as “functional sites.” One may think of the proverb, “A place for everything, and everything in its place,” when Foucault (1977) describes labeling every tool compartment in a tool drawer. But in the educational institution, there are countless ways individuals are organized, as are activities and places where curriculum is carried out. The complex scheduling of students, putting their bodies in the correct functional site, is one way power is exercised. In addition, schools are sometimes divided by grade levels. In other places, schools have a mixture of grade levels in each “pod” of the school. The location of the office manager, the principal, the assistant principals, and great rooms all put value on where power is exercised. Some schools have “roving” teachers who borrow space from colleagues or who are on break, whether on track break or a preparatory period. Not having a space of one’s own can affect the morale of the teacher and the
students, not to mention also cause the misuse of time when students have to pack up the room to move to another every few weeks.

*Totalization*

Totalization has been defined as “The specification of collectivities, giving collective character, forms readily recognizable element of pedagogical activity, sometimes achieved through simple linguistic structures, such as using the word ‘we’” (Gore, 1998, p. 242). The use of the collective, fostering a team mentality, is especially effective. I believe it is why some teachers establish community by giving their classroom a name. The “we” can change to accommodate whatever relationship the hierarchy wishes to achieve. It can be established as the girls in one class, the class, the grade level, the school, the state, the nation, as children or as adults.

As these examples show, while totalizing is “clearly a technique used in pedagogy for governing or regulating groups, students and teachers also ‘totalize’ themselves by naming themselves as part of various collectives” (Gore, 1998, p. 242). I believe that the infusion of popular culture in the classroom also leads to a sense of totalization. It is where the teacher makes a connection by using materials the students’ appreciate. A study of discipline and power could certainly include this line of research.

*Regulation*

Although regulation is a component of all the techniques of power explored thus far, the category of “regulation” is necessary for specifically addressing the creation and breaking of rules. Jennifer Gore (1998) defined regulation as “controlling by rule, subject to restrictions, invoking a rule, including sanction, reward, punishment.” (p. 243). I
believe the strongest component of regulation comes in the discussion of how school rules and classroom rules are generated and executed.

Regulation implies constant monitoring. It is my contention that Foucault’s power relations and disciplinary techniques can explain why schools and educational institutions have maintained similar pedagogical expectations and mandates. Despite its obviousness, Gore (1998) found that few researchers (Bernstein, 1975, 1990; and Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977) have paid attention to the micro level functioning of power in pedagogy (in Gore, 1998, p. 232), and Simmons (2005) says that few acknowledge Foucault’s necessity in the field.

An educational institution’s use of space, its regulations and procedures which govern its internal life, its varied activities, and the diverse persons who work there and attend there all have their own functions. Foucault explains each component as having a well-defined character and that all these things constitute a block of capacity—communication—power (1988b). Each individual is subject to the disciplines of power, being monitored, measured, and ranked in terms of norms, and is subject to exclusion, regulated, enclosed, and partitioned. These are the concepts generated and promoted by Foucault that would prove useful in a study of elementary school power relations. The individual’s willingness to play his or her role in this disciplinary power environment may have substantial impact on the individual’s ability to obtain knowledge and become a valued member of society. This is why there is need to explore these concepts and see how they function in the school district.
Resistance and Domination

Foucault stated that there are no relations of power without resistances (1980). According to Foucault (1980) resistance lives outside of power. Resistance occurs when individuals take advantage of loopholes, or points of resistance, in the system when there are shifts in a system. In general terms, resistance is a strategy of opposition, a form that counters some of the effects of power (Schaafsma, 1997). Thomas Popkewitz and Marie Brennan explained that resistance is “an approach to continually making problematic the stories we are given and those we tell” (1998, p. 27). Although resistance occurs in all power relations, this study also examines resistance in cases when power is abused. In 1980, Foucault worked to describe domination. He wrote that domination is not the kind of sovereign domination of a king over his ruling class, but more of the domination between those who are both subjects. He states that domination occurs “in the multiple forms of subjugation that have a place and a function within the social organism” (p. 96). Foucault was not interested in asking specific people why they use domination, but rather:

Let us ask, instead, how things work at the level of on-going subjugation, at the level of those continuous and uninterrupted processes which subject our bodies, govern our gestures, dictate our behavior, etc….We should try to discover how it is that subjects are gradually, progressively, really and materially constituted through a multiplicity of organisms, forces, energies, materials, desires, thoughts, etc. (page 97)

The purpose of this study was to ask these questions of ongoing subjugation when teachers are disciplined by peers, by administrators, and most importantly self-regulated.
Olssen wrote, “Resistance should oppose domination wherever it finds it. Such an inference suggests that domination is an imbalance of power. It is one of many structures of power, and what resistance aims at is an equalization” (Olssen, 2007, p. 208). Olssen (2007) also stated that “Foucault seemed to acknowledge a more fundamental right to resistance when power becomes damned up, resulting in domination. Thus in his interview “Truth and Power,” Foucault spoke of strategies of resistance taking effect when surveillance and oppression become “unbearable” (1980, p. 122). Resistance was posed as outside of power (Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998) though some (Young, 1990) believe it is scaffolded within power (Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998). Foucault (1977) sometimes seems to call for spontaneous acts of resistance that presuppose an inner subject, or at least a body with some still remaining untamed “pleasures.” Foucault's main contribution is in an account of the way subjects are incited to respond. The subject is not only an ensemble of social relations, and not only does politics penetrate to the core of the subject's most personal habits, but this subject believes, as a condition of being human now, that it must confess its hidden secrets to improve itself (Foucault, 1979).

Foucault’s concepts are uniquely applicable to each and every project a scholar attempts. The pliable philosophy can assist researchers in defending their argument. Simmons (2005) feels that Foucault has been disregarded by many scholars whose arguments clearly resonate with Foucault’s epistemological beliefs, yet pay no homage to him in terms of citations. Marshall (1990) offers that academics are “exasperated” that Foucault does not fit neatly into one sort of framework (p. 11). And in 1996, Marshall wrote that there is still no paradigm for methodology and says: “Perhaps that is healthy” (p. 195). While this may be true, my own research has yielded literally thousands of
citations from the man who conceptualized disciplinary power. The library shelves are filled with texts on, by, or about Foucault.

Concluding Thoughts on Foucault

The theoretical work on power by Michel Foucault informed this study. Foucault’s conceptualization of power as a non-hierarchical, circulating force helps to explain that all people in a school have the ability to bring about change. Power is exercised in three ways: as dividing practices, as scientific classification, and within subjectivities. Within subjectivities, discursive and institutional powers are exercised using the techniques of power. Foucault’s concept of discipline, though, is a more hierarchical, relatively negative mechanization of docile bodies. When power is abused, one person or group in the relation of power may have achieved domination. Oppressed groups need to resist such domination or comply with various degrees of obedience.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

Phenomenology helps us to see the ordinary as strange and in need of some explanation. Maurice Roche (1973, pg. 27)

Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology implemented in this study to investigate novice teachers’ perceptions of classroom management, teacher autonomy, and disciplining, while they complete their first year of teaching. This chapter also describes the analysis used to isolate the techniques of power that are at play when disciplining teachers’ bodies. The procedures for site and participant selection, tools and techniques for data collection, and the role of the researcher in the study are included in this section. The protocol for this study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Research Board (IRB) at Franklin Pierce University (see Appendix II).

Problem Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to explore the experience of novice teachers’ relationships with institutional and discursive power during their first year of teaching. Again, the central question is: “How does the novice teacher understand and experience institutional and discursive power, as he or she becomes both the agent and the subject of school discipline?”
Figure 2: How research questions were formulated

Because this question asks about two kinds of power, as well as two positions of the teacher, the research question was broken down into a micro level and a macro level (See Figure 2). This was necessary in order to answer the question more precisely. Power is distributed at the micro level through day-to-day interactions, work and outcomes,
whether positive or negative Clegg (1989, p. 187). Therefore, to explore how novice teachers are the agent of discipline, the goals of the micro level analysis were to report what novice teachers stated they believe when developing their own classroom management protocols. This includes what they do daily in establishing classroom management. At the micro level, interview questions asked what resources/directives first-year teachers used in establishing these systems, how they organized and prepared their systems and procedures, what they did when a strategy failed, and what resources they sought when they needed assistance. A research sub-question for this section of my study was: “Once a former college student leaves my classroom, how does he or she come to establish and maintain classroom management protocols? What factors impact these decisions and how do they feel about their efforts?”

At the macro level, socially constructed definitions are created (Clegg, 1978). Here, I explored the teacher as the subject of discipline. The research here is more philosophical in nature and incorporates how teachers explain how it is they become part of the fabric of their school. The research question that I ask here is: “How does the novice teacher experience institutional and discursive power as he or she becomes assimilated into the culture of his or her school?”

To better answer this two-part research question, additional questions were generated to make the research more practical and to inform the body of work on disciplining. The implications of these sub-questions arose from the analysis of data and are answered in chapters 5 and 6 of this study. These sub-questions were:

a) How can this knowledge impact the field of education, especially higher education, teacher attrition, and new-teacher induction programming?
How can this knowledge better inform my own college instruction?

Research Design

**Qualitative Research**

To meet the purposes of this study, a qualitative research tradition was employed. Merriam (1998) stated that qualitative research “is an umbrella concept covering several forms of inquiry that help us understand and explain the meaning of social phenomena with as little disruption of the natural setting as possible” (p. 5). Denzin and Lincoln (1998) explain qualitative research as a “socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry” (p. 8). It does not place “an emphasis on processes and meanings that are not rigorously examined, or measured (if measured at all) in terms of quantity, amount, intensity, or frequency” (1998, p. 8) as quantitative research often does. Qualitative research was crucial to the design of this study because its purpose was to know more intimately what it means to experience discipline. This experience had to be described via a series of interviews and discussions, and could not adequately be measured using Likert scales. Nor would the lengthy interviews be practical when using a large sample size, as is required of quantitative research. This research stemmed from beliefs and experiences that name discipline as a cause for teacher attrition. It also imparts a socially constructed definition of power and what it looks and feels like for a novice teacher. Again, qualitative research tradition is the best fit for research of this kind.

Strauss and Corbin (1990) stated that the qualitative research method could be used to gain an understanding of phenomena because it assists in furthering areas about which
much is already known. When developing this study, the concept of teacher attrition was already well-researched; likewise, many researchers have used the theoretical frameworks of Foucault to prove or disprove a theory based on institutional and/or discursive power. However, this research combined the theory of Foucault with this qualitative tradition by using phenomenology and looking at discipline in a unique way. This qualitative research described perceptions of phenomena from the participants' perspective, and was, once again, the appropriate structure with which to find meaning in the shared experiences of these participants.

The following criteria provided by Lincoln and Guba (1985) were used to develop the qualitative design of the study:

1) The research had a specific focus/research problem.
2) There was a degree of fit between the focus as stated and the inquiry paradigms that was brought to bear on it;
3) There was a fit between the selected inquiry paradigm and the theory that was employed;
4) It was determined where and from whom the data was collected;
5) Data analysis procedures were established;
6) There were planned logistics for the project as a whole, prior to, during, and as a follow-up to the field excursion, and for closure and termination;
7) There was planning for trustworthiness. (p. 248)

These tenets were adopted in the following ways. The research focus was the examination of discursive and institutional power as it is experienced by novice teachers with the suspicion that it influences teacher attrition. As stated previously, the objectives
of the focus could also be pursued using a qualitative methodology. The theory for this study comes primarily from the work of Michel Foucault, whose own research has been largely qualitative in nature. The techniques of power are, again, most appropriately explored using a qualitative tradition. Data collection was determined with much thought placed on the selection of candidates. (This will be further explored in the chapter.) Data analysis procedures were established by using the methodology prescribed by phenomenology, and will also be detailed in this chapter. The logistics of the project were considered, defended by my committee, and approved by the IRB at Franklin Pierce University, where I am employed. To plan for trustworthiness, participants were selected from a pool of candidates with whom the researcher had rapport, and anonymity was granted to get more thorough feedback.

Within qualitative methodology, there exist a number of traditions of inquiry. For example, case studies, ethnography, grounded theory, biographical methodology and phenomenology are types of qualitative research that vary significantly in their own traditions. When researching what structure would best fulfill the aims of this research, phenomenology was clearly the structure needed to achieve this goal. The next section will move toward a definition of phenomenology and explains why this methodology was appropriate for the study.

Phenomenology as a Tradition of Inquiry

In addition to applying the structure of a qualitative study, it became clear to me through my doctoral work, that a phenomenological study would be best suited for my line of research. In phenomenological research, “perception is regarded as the primary source of knowledge” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 52) and the relationship between perception
and its objects is not passive (Holstein & Gubrium, 1994). Rather, human consciousness brings meaning to the experience and gives its own definitions. That is, the world is produced and experienced by its members (1998). Therefore, to “know phenomenologically is to allow to unfold what is already present but not yet seen” (Pinar & Reynolds, 1992, p. 7).

Phenomenology is usually attributed to Edmund Husserl (1931) and the early work of Martin Heidegger who “communicates a nostalgia for an earlier time in which (it was alleged) the sky was visible in its entirety, as were we” (Pinar & Reynolds, 1992, p.2). It was furthered by Schutz in the 1960s, who argued that individual images, theories, ideas, etc. could be applied to experiences to make them meaningful (Holstein & Gubrium, 1994). Their philosophies have been applied to various fields including nursing, psychology, and sociology. In the field of curriculum studies, using phenomenology as an accepted methodology in North America has been attributed to Dwayne Huebner (1975) who, according to Pinar and Reynolds, (1992) borrowed it from American Maxine Green (1975), a renowned educational philosopher. The work of phenomenology is used widely in education today, and is considered an important research method.

Every attempt was made to implement phenomenological methodology accurately in this study. A phenomenological study focuses less on individuals, and more on a concept or phenomenon (Creswell, 1998). Grumet (1992) noted:

An individual encounter in the world is consulted not to reveal the particular truth of its facticity, but its general truth as it emerges in a community of multiple subjectivities and is confirmed by subsequent
encounters. In this respect there is no end to phenomenological research.

(p. 38)

In this study, the phenomenon examined was the experience of being a first-year teacher who experienced discursive and institutional power. By recording the “lived,” or every day, experiences (Moustakas, 1994) of these teachers, this study aims to examine the meaning of power and discipline in schools. To do this work, two key concepts were utilized. Husserl (1931) coined the words, “neosis” and “neoma” (Moustakas, 1994). In neosis, the participant/or researcher perceives, thinks, remembers or judges (p. 69). In this study, perceptions of experiencing discipline were recorded. First, the researcher gave an account of her experiences (which can be found in chapters 1 and 5). Following this process, all attempts were made to suspend researcher beliefs though a process called bracketing or epoche. Novice teachers’ thoughts and perceptions were sought, to construct meaning and to name institutional and discursive power as causes teacher attrition. Neoma is the process by which one becomes conscious of his or her thoughts and perceptions. This research activated neoma, as questions about discipline were investigated (see Appendix III). In addition, neoma took place when the researcher analyzed her own thoughts, as well as when participants read the research themselves.

Phenomenological method was also selected because it is best suited for describing the “meaning of the lived experiences several individuals” (Creswell, 1998, p. 53) who are experiencing institutional and discursive power in their first year of teaching. To a much lesser extent, these individuals also share the experience of having been students in my class on classroom management. Researchers who employ this line of phenomenological research search for the “essential invariant structure” or the central
underlying meaning of the experience and “emphasize the intentionality of consciousness where experiences contain both the outward appearance and inward consciousness based on memory, image, and meaning” (Creswell, 1998, p. 52). Therefore, this study was aimed at describing the experiences of institutional and discursive power with the intent of finding an underlying meaning of the experience.

As stated earlier, a challenging facet of this line of research is to set aside all prejudgments by a process called *bracketing* (Creswell, 1998). *Bracketing or epoche* means that the researcher sets aside all previous beliefs about what is real until it can be founded on a more certain basis (Creswell, 1998; Husserl, 1931). According to Madeleine Grumet (1992), the *epoche* is designed to “cleanse the field of consciousness so that we may see, feel, imagine the essential form of a thing.” Bracketing is an autobiographical process of inquiry, whereby the writer reads his or her own text. Grumet (1992) stated:

> Thus for the phenomenologist, knowledge of the world requires that we distance ourselves from our experience in order to come closer to it… We cannot talk about education without talking about dialectic between person and world, a dialectic that holds all of the mysteries and ironies of paradox. The apparent polarities of subjectivity and objectivity, immanence and transcendence, particularization and generalization, essence and existence dissolve into reciprocity, each constituting the other. (p. 30-31)

Therefore, the first three chapters of this dissertation provided me the opportunity to cleanse the research of personal pre-conceived notions. Once these notions were eliminated, the remaining processes provided as unbiased a study as is possible. Chapter
7 combines the two interests. I turn now exclusively to the data. This task was not a simple one, as I was entrenched in this work for a decade, and have strong feelings about what happens to novice teachers. I was not alone in this tendency toward bias, as this is a common difficulty for phenomenologists. “The challenge facing the human science researcher is to describe things in themselves, to permit what is before one can enter consciousness and be understood in its meanings and essences in the light of intuition and self reflection,” (Grumet, 1992, p. 30). Personal experiences are often what cause a researcher to commence exploration of any particular topic.

Identification of Participants

Both qualitative and phenomenological research traditions require that a sound method be employed when collecting data. This research used interviewing for its data collection, almost exclusively, which is typical of phenomenological studies. To establish rapport with my participants, I selected people with whom I had already maintained a professional relationship. Having once been a professor for these individuals, feeling that we had shared a positive experience in the classroom, I felt confident that these novice teachers would be candid with issues that may be deemed sensitive, especially if he or she was considering quitting teaching. In addition, these individuals were reminded at the beginning of each interview that they could refuse to answer any question or leave the interview altogether. Not one participant refused a single question. A researcher who wishes to employ phenomenological tenets usually has three to 10 participants who take part in in-depth interviews (Creswell, 1998). According to Merriam, the main purpose of an interview is to obtain a special kind of information (1998). In fact, the researcher wants to find out what is “in and on someone’s mind” and interviews subjects to find out
information that one cannot observe directly (Patton, 1990, p. 278; cited in Miriam, 1998).

This qualitative research involved the interviewing of novice elementary school teachers from different schools, and included two different school districts, one urban and one suburban. The purpose of this study was to investigate the meaning of the beginning teacher’s experiences with discipline, as they are both the subject and agent of discipline. This involved finding teachers who were in their first year of teaching. Because teachers would be asked questions about their own classroom management successes and failures, as well as their relationships with colleagues and administrators, it was imperative that participants be comfortable with the researcher. For this to occur, participants were selected because they were students in a class I taught that discussed classroom management pedagogy. (The syllabus for this course can be found in Appendix V.) This decision, while very helpful in collecting what I consider really personal data, was also difficult because it severely limited the people who I could approach to participate.

For confidentiality purposes, participants answered questions outside of the school day. Therefore, Institutional Review Board (IRB) permission was submitted to the university where I am employed, but such permission was not required for the subjects’ individual schools or school districts. For additional confidentiality, all school systems and participants were given pseudonyms. Once approval for the study was obtained, a search of my prior students was completed from a database supplied by my university. The criteria participants had to meet were that they were in their first year of teaching, and that they were teaching in a public elementary school (grades K-5). I decided to focus only on elementary schools because their structure varied significantly from middle and
junior high schools. I decided to focus on public schools as they have the same mandates and similar aims through the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, and I wanted to avoid religious agendas or other philosophies. Using the database and selection criteria, I called 18 possible participants to explain the process. Those who were not available by phone were contacted via their university e-mail address. Many potential participants contacted were not able to participate because they had not completed college, or they had decided not to go into teaching and had changed their major. Therefore, there were only 11 possible participants who could take part in this study. Of those 11, only five had the time and desire to participate. Five was an acceptable number for a phenomenological study (Creswell, 1998), and I believed I could sufficiently answer my research question with this number of candidates.

All phone calls took place at the participants’ homes. My initial e-mails were sent to students’ university addresses. Some participants responded from their work e-mails. In my e-mail response back, I asked participants to respond from a personal e-mail because I was aware that confidentiality could not be assured through electronic communication.

*The Common Course*

All participants took part in a required course entitled “Strategies for Effective Elementary Teaching,” a course where I was the instructor. I taught this course from 2001 until 2007 every spring and fall semester. The course was a three-credit course whose duration was the average 16-week semester. Again, an attempt to ensure confidentiality will limit details about the course that all participants took, but the majority of the syllabus has been provided in Appendix V. All participants were in this course during the same academic year, but none of them work together at present. The
participants in the study were not informed of who else was participating, as another attempt to ensure confidentiality.

The content of this course is described in the catalog as “Current research-based practices in classroom communication skills, delivery of instruction, questioning techniques, lesson design, and behavior management.” To this end, students are taught many instructional strategies like cooperative learning, structured discovery, concept attainment, and others. However the part of the course that focuses on behavior management and delivery of instruction was critical to this research, as these individuals were taught some basic classroom management strategies and structures, including the development of token economies, teaching for motivation, and others.

The Participants

Participants for this study worked in one of two school districts. Both school districts are in the southwestern United States, but they are in two different states. The first district will be called Jones School District (JSD) to provide anonymity. JSD is among the largest districts in the nation. It has well over 300 schools. The second school district, called here Smith School District (SSD) is significantly smaller (less than 10 total schools in the district) than the first, and it is located on the border of a Native American reservation.

JSD is located in a large, urban center, and is stabilizing after a long period of tremendous population growth. JSD has had to build more than 10 new schools a year from 1998 to 2007 to keep up with population growth. During this time, JSD has hired well over 1,000 teachers a year to keep up with the population growth. As a result, JSD has hired many novice teachers in the past decade, and has had difficulty retaining many
of them. At the time of writing this dissertation, JSD has declared its first hiring freeze, and the number of teachers hired will be substantially less than the number JSD hired in previous years. This is most often attributed to a failing economy in this area. House prices increased so dramatically from 2003 to 2006 that homes are no longer affordable to many families who once moved to this large, urban center.

Because of the size of this school district, the JSD has several support structures in place for novice teachers. The district has an administrative unit whose purpose is to train novice teachers. This unit has a cadre of teachers who work with novice teachers several times throughout the year. Novice teachers who take part in this training receive financial incentives. According to participants in the study, the majority of these professional development opportunities tend to deal with classroom management. Most schools in this district also have mentoring programs in place. As an incentive to teach in the JSD, each of the participants in this study was placed higher on the pay scale, so that they would receive a higher salary than the normal base pay for a novice teacher.

In terms of the families serviced by teachers in the JSD, in 2004, statistics from the Census Bureau reported approximately 200,000 individuals in the district who were at or below the poverty line. Of these individuals, almost 50,000 were school aged (ages 5-17). The majority of students in this school district were Hispanic, and the district was very diverse. Some schools in the district had populations who were almost exclusively Hispanic, a few had predominantly Asian populations, while others are had almost total Caucasian populations or African-American populations. As a whole, the school district is very ethnically and racially diverse.
Unlike JSD, in 2007, Smith School District (SSD) experienced unprecedented growth. The population of the county had more than tripled since 2000, and the total population of the state had almost doubled since 1990. SSD serviced a wide range of students, whose families were involved in agriculture. Recently, though, major corporations including car manufacturers, retail, and manufacturing had also become prevalent in the area. The area had an unemployment rate of approximately 5%, and despite its population growth, this statistic had not significantly changed at the time of my study. Approximately 15% of its population was below the poverty level in 2000. SSD has public schools at every level (elementary, middle, and high), and new schools continue to be built to accommodate the rapid population growth. It could be assumed that SSD will need to hire more teachers to keep up with the population growth.

In terms of the participants themselves, the only commonalities were that they were students in a course they took as education majors at the same university where I was their professor, and that they were all hired for their first teaching position at a public elementary school in the fall of 2007. Of the five participants, only one is male. All five participants are white, middle class. Three of the five were classified as traditional age college students (18-22), while two chose teaching as a second career (one worked in business and one was a school aide) and were over 30 years old. All participants completed an education degree program and were certified by the state in which they were employed. Because they were novice teachers, none of the five participants were considered “Highly Qualified” according to No Child Left Behind classifications.

It is also important to note that teachers in the JSD were not permitted to migrate within their school district for 2 years. That is, teachers who may have been dissatisfied
at their school and wanted to go where they might have a different experience, were regulated against such a practice.

The following are individual descriptions of the five participants:

Jane is a fourth grade teacher at a suburban school in the JSD. She is Caucasian, and is between 30 and 40 years of age. Jane does not have children of her own. Her student teaching school and her current school are similar in socioeconomic status; both possess a majority of students who come from middle to upper-middle class families. Less than 10% of students are on free and reduced-price lunch. Both schools have made adequate yearly progress over the past couple of years. Her class size has never been less than 30 all year. Jane has largely reported a positive experience as a new teacher, and remained enthusiastic in conversations throughout the year. After her first year in the district, Jane reported that she would be coming back, and that she would be teaching fourth grade again.

Gwen is a fourth grade teacher at a suburban school in the SSD. While student teaching, Gwen worked at a school in the Jones School District that was more affluent than where she currently teaches. In addition, Gwen’s student teaching school had opened just prior to the year in which she did her student teaching. Gwen did a fair amount of substituting in the JSD before she graduated college. The needs of her students are slightly different in the SSD than they were in the JSD. She reports difficulty working with Native American spokespeople who as representatives for families. Gwen graduated from college as a traditional student (between 20 and 25) in terms of age. Her class size in the SSD has consistently been between 20 and 25 students. Gwen is also returning for the 2008-9 school year, but her grade level has changed and her principal has migrated.
Ken is a third grade teacher at an urban low-income school who graduated from college as a traditionally-aged college student. He completed his student teaching in a middle class, more affluent area school in the JSD, and reported having difficulty making the transition to a school where Spanish is spoken by students more often than English. Ken has a class size between 20 and 25. Ken is married, and did not (at the time of this study) have children of his own. While Ken’s student teaching school made adequate yearly progress, his first position is in a school that is considered “In Need of Improvement” and every child there received free and reduced-price lunch. Ken reports that teaching at the school has been difficult because faculty members are required to use a number of specific literature programs with different ability levels. A significant amount of Ken’s time is spent assessing students, and ensuring that they receive instruction from literacy programs designated appropriate for students who score at a particular competency level. By the end of the school year, Ken deemed the year a success and was very enthusiastic about returning.

Carol is a first year teacher who spent many years as an aide for several schools in the JSD. She was the only participant who had children at the time of the study. She teaches third grade, and is between the ages of 30 and 40. Carol moved schools during her first month of teaching because student numbers were not high enough for her to stay at her first placement. After switching schools, in a procedure known as “surplussing,” she was sent to a new school where the other third grade teachers were told to give her five students each with no other caveats. In her opinion, she ended up getting most of the students with behavior problems and students who needed to be identified as “special needs.” She has 20-25 students at a low-income, high Spanish-speaking school. Carol has
worked as an aide exclusively at low-income urban schools and was not surprised or disappointed by the abilities and challenges of teaching students who come from lower socio-economic families. Carol had experience working in a school, but was not a teacher until this year. Carol does feel that the administration could have handled the new position better, by establishing a better system for placing students in her class. Carol also has a very small classroom, which has made seating an extra challenge. At the end of the school year, Carol was excited to report that she would be given a slightly larger classroom in the 2008-9 school year. She was excited about its “location and position.” She also stated that the students with behavior issues she had throughout the year had performed well with the behavior plans she had devised. In Carol’s final e-mail she wrote, “I actually feel that I had a pretty good first year compared to what I have heard from other teachers and their first year.”

Beverly is a kindergarten teacher for the Jones School District. She is of traditional age for a college graduate. She was unmarried, and lived at home with her parents at the time of this study. She has between 20 and 25 students in an urban elementary school. The school has a high Hispanic population, and approximately 55% of students received free and reduced-price lunches. Her student teaching placement was similar socio-economically to her present placement. Beverly had no kindergarten experience in student teaching, or any other field experience for this grade when she was hired. Beverly was the only participant who took an incomplete for personal reasons when she was a student in my course. Beverly reported that she would be returning to the school, and that she would teach kindergarten again, although she wrote, “I really liked it, although it is so hard! I am just glad I was able to get through my first year!”
Role of the Researcher

The role of the researcher is somewhat unique in this study because I had established rapport with the participants, and was at one time in an authoritative position to them. This unique position afforded me the ability to talk as an experienced teacher who went through many similar trials and tribulations when she was a novice teacher. It also helped solicit honest responses, whereas trust had been already been established. In this investigation, I selected a purposeful sample, interviewed participants, and then engaged in phenomenological methodology to describe how novice teachers experience and understand discipline. I also had the responsibility of developing interview questions, search for commonality in the phenomenon of being a first-year teacher, and to member check not only for accuracy, but to provide a learning experience for participants as well.

In chapter 1, I gave a description of my experiences as a teacher and professor, in an attempt to bracket my preconceived notions about power and discipline in the school. I did not, however, address what I suspected I would find in this study. As researcher, I expected to find that participants would be disgusted with all the rules and procedures they had to follow and that they had to use in their own classrooms. I also expected that participants would find the rules oppressive and may even be bitter towards authority. I expected that some participants may even be thinking about quitting teaching, even by their second interview in January, given the staggering statistics about novice teachers. I anticipated problems using a canned curriculum. I was unsure to what level they would be compliant or even obedient, and was unsure about what they would perceive as being the most frustrating parts of teaching, as well as who they would seek advice from.
Though attempts to bracket my experiences were genuine, I believe that one can never truly bracket all their ideas. The generation of the questions, the interpretation of the results are both informed by my personal experiences.

Data Collection Techniques

A phenomenological study relies on interviewing as a data collection technique. It typically involves the interviewing of no more than 10 individuals using long interview protocols (Creswell, 1998). Thomas and Brubaker (2000) state that interviews and questionnaires enable people to report information about themselves, about their life condition, beliefs, or attitudes. For this study interviews were used as the method to understand the phenomenon of experiencing what first year teachers perceive as discursive and institutional power.

Once it was determined that elements of phenomenological study would be utilized, and participants were identified, the interview method was investigated. Creswell (1998) offers the following procedures to completing interviews:

1. Identify interviewees based on purposeful sampling procedures.
2. Determine what kind of interview is practical and will meet net the most valuable information to answer research questions.
3. Whether conducting one-on-one or focus group interviews, I recommend the use of adequate recording procedure, such as a lapel mic for both the interviewer and interviewee or an adequate mike sensitive to the acoustics of the room.
4. Design the interview protocol, a form about four to five pages in length, with approximately five open-ended questions [Note: this may be longer for phenomenological studies].
5. Determine the place for conducting the interview.

6. After arriving at the interview site, obtain consent from the interviewee to participate in the study.

7. During the interview, stick to the questions, complete within the time specified (if possible), be respectful and courteous, and offer few questions and advice. (pp. 123-124)

Using Creswell’s format to establish interview procedures, the following steps were taken:

1. **Identify interviewees on purposeful sampling procedures.** Creswell states that some successful phenomenological studies have involved only one participant (Duke, 1984; cited in Creswell, 1998), but due to the length of the interviews, no more than 10 participants are recommended. To this end, purposeful sampling must be carried out. To gather a group of students for whom a purposeful sample could be extracted, participants were selected from a course that I taught because they had similar instruction in the area of classroom management. In addition, all participants were first-year elementary school teachers who had experienced institutional and discursive power in this first year as a teacher in a public school. According to the “Profile of Teachers in the U.S. 2005” study compiled by the National Center for Education Information, my study is consistent with the profiles of teachers, who are predominantly white females. Statistically, 82% of public school teachers are female (2005, ¶8). With this in mind, this study sampled a population where 80% (4 of 5) were female. Ethnically, the same study reports that 85% were white (2005, ¶9). Given the small sample size, all five participants are Caucasian, which is statistically similar to the demographic. Given the need for a small sample
whose identity would be fairly representative of the profiles of today’s teachers, I was pleased with the participants I was able to solicit and sample.

_Determine what kind of interview is practical and will meet net the most valuable information to answer research questions._ As investigator, it was essential that each participant be interviewed throughout the semester to record the events and discourses that would demonstrate other techniques of power present themselves. From the researcher’s perspective, a phone call a day would have been wonderful. However, as with any research, it is imperative that one be cognizant of the time and needs of the participants. These participants, perhaps more than others, had a new job to worry about, and taking hours of their time was in my opinion, a disservice to them. Therefore, as researcher, I determined that each participant would participate in three interviews, one to occur in the first quarter of the year, one to occur in the third quarter of the year, and a brief one in June to see who would return in the fall. I also made contact with participants at the end of the school year to verify that they completed the school year, and were, in fact, returning the next year.

_Design the interview protocol, a form about four to five pages in length, with approximately five open-ended questions [Note: this may be longer for phenomenological studies]._ Although much research in education has used the work of Michel Foucault, there have been few instances of individuals (Gore, 1993, 1998) who use his work in the same way that my research does. Therefore, there exists no database of questions that would be used for research of this kind. To develop my own questions, I used the concepts of the techniques of power described in Michel Foucault’s _Discipline and Punish_, as well as the work of Jennifer Gore (1993, 1998) to develop my own interview
questions. Most questions were designed to elicit descriptions of these techniques. However, because these interviews focused on perceptions, a “semi-structured interview-question strategy” was utilized (Merriam, 1998, p. 73). This approach is considered a “mix of more and less structured questions” (p.73). This approach was implemented because it is considered the best in permitting variable ways for respondents to interpret a general question, (Thomas and Brubaker, 2000, p. 151). This less formal strategy aided in revealing the variable ways respondents interpreted the general questions and exposed the extent of variability among the individual's interpretations.

_Determine the place for conducting the interview._

To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, it was necessary for respondents to answer these questions away from their school site. Initially, the researcher was going to visit the participant at the university where participants took a class with the investigator. Unfortunately, the investigator moved cross country and was unable to meet as originally planned. However, phone interviews were able to elicit the kinds of answers to the questions needed to complete this research. The participants were contacted via e-mail, and phone and audio records were maintained.

_After arriving at the interview site, obtain consent from the interviewee to participate in the study._

Even though participants were asked to complete consent forms, the researcher reminded respondents that the conversation was taped and that they could choose not to answer questions or not to participate at any time during the phone interview.

_During the interview, stick to the questions, complete within the time specified (if possible), be respectful and courteous, and offer few questions and advice_
Of all the interview procedures, this was the most difficult to adhere to, because of the sheer nature of having discussions that were about what participants were going through. In addition, the investigator offered suggestions or gave small examples of instances she had in similar situations, as these interviews had the additional aim of providing feedback to respondents. I was cognizant of the time, and as is evident in the audiotapes, every attempt was made to ensure that the investigator was not inconveniencing the participant. All interviews were done one-on-one, and were done over the phone. All five phone conversations were between 30 and 60 minutes long in duration, with 45 minutes being the approximate median amount of time on the phone.

In addition to interviews, many researchers use qualitative practices such as observing, interviewing, designing and administering surveys, and analyzing artifacts (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998) to examine change and perceptions. This study gathered novice teacher beliefs and practices by interviewing and re-interviewing them. In addition, school accountability reports were collected. All participants were asked for school-wide discipline plans. Only two schools had created a printed document. They are not included, as this could constitute a breach in anonymity. Audio transcripts were maintained to be used for analysis. All formal interviews were audio taped, and then relevant comments were transcribed. The transcriptions were made into tables that are published in the appendices of this study. Member checks were maintained to ensure credibility and to provide feedback to participants. Participants were given chapters 4-6 including significant statements, formulated meanings, clusters of meaning for their review. The participants were given one week to e-mail any changes or additions. The e-mail was sent to all participants requesting that if any changes or additions were needed,
that they were to be made by 4:00 p.m. the next day. No changes or additions were requested.

Participants had the ability to respond to each question in the way he or she saw fit. In addition, participants were told they could refuse to answer any question or refrain from participating altogether, though none did so. Data were collected in audio files. I listened to the complete audio tapes one time. I then listened again and began constructing a matrix. I drafted my initial data tables (found in Appendix IV). I then transcribed comments that I wanted to use in my research. They are comments that I believe demonstrated experience with institutional and discursive power. From this, additional matrices were developed to decipher meaning from when the participant was subject or agent of discipline.

Anonymity

All participants were granted anonymity. Most first-year teachers are already anxious about their performance; novice teachers were likely to be less-candid if they knew their name could be traced to the research. All novice teachers were asked to complete a consent form (see Appendix I) for use of the data analysis in report findings.

Data Analysis

To analyze this data, phenomenological methodology was first applied. The steps of this analysis can be summarized as: (a) bracketing; (b) horizontalization of the data; (c) finding meaning in the data; (d) finding themes in the data, and (e) providing exhaustive description (Creswell, 1998). Each of these steps will be defined and described in the following paragraphs.
Bracketing or epoche

According to Creswell (1998), the first step of phenomenological data analysis begins with a full description of the researcher’s own experience of the phenomenon. My experiences have been fully described in the forward and in chapter 1. This first section provides an account of my first year of teaching, including my experiences with institutional and discursive power. Once this was done, all prejudgments were bracketed, or temporarily put aside. In this study, this step in the research was actually completed prior to my making any contact with participants.

Horizontalization

Once all personal experience is put aside, the researcher then finds statements in the interviews about how he or she is experiencing the topic being explored (Creswell, 1998). In this case it is understanding discipline in their first year of teaching. Horizontalization is defined as extracting important statements from the transcripts (Polkinghome, 1989). In this study, horizontalization of the data was accomplished by making lists of significant statements from the transcripts. (These tables can be found in the appendices.) Each statement is treated as being equal to all the others (Creswell, 1998). When done correctly, Creswell states that all the lists are completed without repetition. Using elements of phenomenology (Creswell, 1998; Husserl, 1931; Moustakas, 1994), the investigator should develop matrices or tables by pulling out comments that get at the essential essence of the experience being examined. Following Reiman’s example (from Colaizzi 1978, in Creswell, 1998) data were initially treated as such:

1. All the subjects’ descriptions were read and reviewed in order to “acquire a feeling for them” (p. 280).
2. Significant statements were highlighted on the transcriptions and were cut and pasted into a matrix. These statements pertained to Foucault’s notion of discipline. Repetitive statements were cut from the matrix (Creswell, p. 280).

For this initial process, a table was generated that consisted of statements made by participants that focused on discipline. It did not separate out discursive from institutional, nor was it necessary at this juncture to break apart comments made when the participants discussed their socialization and autonomy in the school versus how classroom management was established. Nor did I even focus on change over time. These statements are in no particular order. They include comments from all five participants, yet it is important to reiterate that if a common strand showed up in all five interviews, it would not be evident at this point because all repetitive statements are not indicated on the chart. As is common with phenomenological studies, this decision was made to first focus exclusively on the meaning of discipline. It is important to remember that this study uses the definition of Foucault (1977) to describe discipline, rather than the traditional notion of discipline being synonymous with punishment. Foucault defined discipline as “methods which make possible the meticulous control of the operations of the body, which assured the constant subjugation of its forces and imposed upon them a relation of docility-utility…” (p. 137).

3. Finding Meaning in the Data. Once this phase is accomplished, statements are then grouped into meaning units. For Creswell (1998), this is accomplished by spelling out the meaning of each significant statement. In this difficult step, the meanings arrived at must not sever the connection with the original description. The formulations discover and bring out those meanings hidden in the various contexts of the phenomenon that are
present in the original descriptions. In this study, these “meaning units” examined Foucault’s techniques of power as well as institutional and discursive power. Two matrices were developed to find meaning in the statements. These tables divided comments into those that were made when the teacher was the subject of discipline and those made when the teacher was the agent of discipline. This step was necessary in that it provided context to the comments made by participants.

Following this step, the researcher reflects on her own description and uses “structural description, seeking all possible meanings and divergent perspectives, varying the frames of reference about the phenomenon, and constructing a description of how the phenomenon was experienced.” (Creswell, p. 150). In this study, the investigator then developed an overall description of the meaning and the essence of the experience of being a first year teacher experiencing institutional and discursive power. This process was followed first for the researcher’s account of the experience and then for that of each participant. Following Creswell’s recommendations after this step, a composite description was generated (Creswell, p. 150).

4. Clusters of the themes were organized from the aggregate formulated meanings. This allowed for the emergence of themes common to all of the subjects’ descriptions (p. 280).

Clusters were developed and themes emerged. The clusters seemed naturally to gravitate toward Foucault’s techniques of power. Responses were categorized using Foucault’s concepts, and Jennifer Gore’s methodology for instances of monitoring, normalizing (how time and space are disciplined), exclusion, classification, ranking of
teachers, distribution, enclosure, partitioning, functional sites, totalization, and regulation.

This process will be explained in detail in chapter 5.

Because interview questions specifically address these techniques to see how these are administered by the administration, and how they were perceived by novice teachers, I analyzed which techniques were present and which were not, including where they presented themselves (in institutional power/ discursive power, etc).

To revert back to Colaizzi’s (1978) procedures for the treatment of data (in Creswell, 1998), the following are the next steps in the procedure for analyzing data in phenomenological fashion:

4a. These clusters of themes were referred back to the original descriptions in order to validate them. This was done to see if there was anything in the original that was not accounted for in the cluster of themes, and whether the cluster proposed anything that was not in the original. If either of the above were true, a re-examination was necessary.

4b. At this point, discrepancies may be noted among and/or between the various clusters. Some themes may flatly contradict other ones or may appear to be totally unrelated to other ones. The researcher then proceeded with the solid conviction that what was logically inexplicable might be existentially real and valid.

5. An exhaustive description of the phenomenon resulted for the integration of the above results.

6. The exhaustive description of the phenomenon was as unequivocal a statement of the essential structure of the phenomenon as possible.
7. A final validating step was achieved by returning to the subjects and asking if the description formulated validated the original experience (p. 280).

In answering criterion 7 at this stage of phenomenology, Moustakas (1994) offers five questions I had to ask myself:

1. Did the interviewer influence the contents of the subjects’ descriptions in such a way that descriptions did not truly reflect the subjects’ actual experience?

2. Is the transcription accurate, and does it convey the meaning of the oral presentation in the interview?

3. In the analysis of the transcriptions, were there conclusions other than those offered by the researcher that could have been derived? Has the researcher identified the alternatives?

4. Is it possible to go from the general structural description to the transcriptions to account for the specific contents and connections in the original examples of the experience?

5. Is the structural description situation specific, or does it hold in general for the experience in other situations? (Moustakas, 1994, p. 57)

The researcher followed these steps providing: (a) a statement of the essential structure of how the novice teacher experiences institutional and discursive power; (b) rich description of the meaning of discipline, and (c) validity by sending the work to participants. These items can be found in chapter 5.

Summary

This study implemented qualitative research design (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998; Lincoln and Guba, 1985) to inform my understanding on how first-year teachers
experience discipline, both as its agent and its subject. Because of the small sample size,
the necessity for in-depth interviews, and a desire to understand participant perceptions of
discipline, phenomenological methodology (Husserl, 1931; Colaizzi, 1978; Creswell,
1998) was utilized. Michel Foucault’s conceptualizations of power and resistance
theoretically framed the study.
Figure 3: Teachers experience discipline in two positions.

Introduction to the Findings

This chapter presents an analysis of the findings of a phenomenological study that examined how first-year teachers experienced institutional and discursive power. The research question for this study was “How does the novice teacher understand and experience institutional and discursive power, as he or she becomes both the agent and the subject of school discipline?” The investigation focused on how teachers view themselves as gaining or losing autonomy in the school, as well as how they develop their own classroom management systems. Chapters 5 and 6 will present: (a) perceptions of first-year teachers as they are socialized into a new school in the first few weeks of
school; (b) perceptions of first-year teachers who are in their third quarter of school, thereby investigating their experiences over a year; (c) feedback in June, the end of the school year, to determine who would be returning for a second year; (d) perceptions experienced by novice teachers of varying age. Some were entering teaching after spending decades in other fields while others were traditionally-aged first-year teachers; (e) novice elementary school teachers’ perceptions of how to establish classroom management systems in their own schools and; (f) novice elementary school teachers’ perceptions of administrative support and mentoring at their own schools.

Chapter 5 discusses and analyzes data related to instances when the teacher was the agent of discipline. Several themes emerged. They are: (a) the regular use of token economies; (b) teachers’ desire to mechanize the body; (c) use of surveillance techniques; (d) the constant desire for rules and procedures; (e) and perceived differences of teacher ability, based on the teacher’s education. (These themes are addressed in the following paragraphs.)

Whereas Chapter 5 focuses on the teacher as agent of discipline, Chapter 6 provides the data of novice teachers as the subjects of discipline. It concludes with an analysis of the data where, in specific practices, teachers were acting simultaneously as the agent and subject of discipline. Again, the data are subdivided in this way only to make distinctions more clear between the teacher as agent and the teacher as subject of discipline.

The figure below summarizes the phenomenological process undertaken in this study. The first column represents the findings shared in chapter 5 of this dissertation. During the horizontalization phase a list of statements made about discipline were generated. This list was then analyzed to find significant statements that just pertained to instances where
the teacher was agent of discipline. These statements were then analyzed for meanings. For instance, it became clear through the analysis of significant statements that teachers perceived the need to alter curriculum to allow their students to perform well on an exam. Once this process was completed, Foucault’s techniques of power then contemplated to see how these concerns about discipline were actually instances where different techniques were applied. The same process was completed for instances the teacher was subject of discipline. Found in column two of the chart below, it is evident that the identical process was completed. Finally, in column three, specific instances where the teacher was acting simultaneously as agent and subject were parsed out from the data. The findings from the processes highlighted in columns 2 and 3 can be found in chapter 6.
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Figure 4: Phenomenological analysis used in the study
Discipline, in General

From the audiotapes and transcriptions, 112 different statements were captured that reflected experience with discipline (See Appendix III). Again, these statements were not, at this point, broken into categories of subject or agent, nor were they broken into discursive or institutional power. Two examples are: “Evaluation Process? I don’t like it;” and “When I give them [tokens] out, they respond better.” For the most part, the comments were so varied that it was immediately obvious that analyzing discipline from the perspective of agent and subject would be essential to glean relevant findings from the research. The next section of the chapter looks exclusively at statements generated by the novice teacher that refer to instances where he or she was the agent of discipline.

Novice Teachers as Agents of Discipline

Novice teachers, in this study, were teachers who were in their first year of teaching elementary school. Once the concept of "discipline" was explored using perceptions in participant work, the next step in the analysis was to subdivide the matrix into terms that reflected when the teacher perceived herself or himself as being the agent of discipline and the subject of discipline. This process was necessary for example, when looking at Beverly’s data (Beverly is the kindergarten teacher). She hated the idea of being watched by administrators for evaluation purposes (a “surveillance technique,” to use Foucault’s terminology). At the same time, however, she told her kindergartners that the cameras are always watching them, thereby utilizing this same technique of power. The data underwent horizontalization again using these same data with these new parameters. This section of the study analyzes primarily instances of institutional power, that is, how the teacher exercises the rules of the school as he or she acts upon students. The following
figure on page 121 provides a matrix of this second horizontalization when only statements about being the agent of discipline were made.

Classroom Management

Though these will be subdivided in the next section of the analysis, the data illustrated that the teacher was most often an agent of discipline when he or she was establishing rules and procedures with students. This is obvious, but the nature of the agency was more specific. Jane was quick to say that her management system was “Harry Wong.” Carol stated that she set up her class “like Fred Jones.” This may indicate that the quick-fix strategies provided to novice teachers by the school district are perceived as the “right answer” to give when asked about classroom management. Classroom management protocols described by subjects were able to highlight how teachers are the agents of discipline. For example, Beverly and Jane established protocols for children to walk down the hall in a very specific way, and Jane and Gwen implemented a sign-out system for students to use the restrooms. Most comments by teachers revealed they believe they have control over students, and they make the decisions that deal with classroom management. When talking about rules, Beverly stated:

Yes, I definitely enforce them [the rules] -- maybe more than other teachers just because I am [a kindergarten teacher] and it is my students’ first experience in school and it may be harder for some of them to follow rules so I am really strict about following them because they need to get used to it.
Table 1: Statements reflecting when teacher was perceived agent of discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Statements About Teacher as Agent of Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I don’t want to be stopping every five minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maybe it’s my fault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I’m following the guidelines. They are mapped to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards and the benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We are testing so much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We have no time to teach anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kids even asked me, “When are we having [standardized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tests]?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. That’s what the [standardized tests] are based on any way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If I covered fractions, I’d have the upper hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student desks need to be moved apart and separated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I know the big thing right now is making AYP [Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Progress].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Today was a good day, yesterday I felt like everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was falling apart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It just feels like it’s chaos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. They know my expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. When I give them out [tokens], they respond better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. You get a “paw” if everyone did really well at lunch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If you do this you get an extra 15 minute recess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. As far as gang colors, we don’t really worry about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them. We are pretty affluent and it’s elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school, you know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. You have to tell the students how to walk down the hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Kindergarteners and first graders have to walk with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their fingers to their lips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My students are supposed to walk with their hands by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their sides and they aren’t allowed to touch the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bulletin boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Eyes forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I like to keep an eye on who’s going [to the bathroom]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Wong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Students who don’t behave miss Fun Friday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I know which students have roving eyes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Rules are sent home at the beginning of the year for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. They are posted throughout the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am really strict about following them (the rules)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they need to get used to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Yes, there are guidelines for success that are posted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the bathrooms and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

For novice teachers, the philosophies and techniques of educator Harry Wong are quite popular. Wong’s text the *First Days of School: How to Be an Effective Teacher* (1998/2009) is a bestseller in education. It is used by new teacher induction programs and in some college instructional classes. It is a handbook of sorts that helps students establish classroom management practices. Wong himself has attended the new teacher orientations that the participants have taken. To say they’re “doing Harry Wong” means they are implementing strategies from his text.
hallways that everyone must follow.
29. Noise level of zero in the hallways and bathrooms, etc.
30. I just keep going over them with the kids at the beginning of the year until they understand what they mean.
31. Stoplight system with clothespins for students that do not follow them (Green, yellow, red- if they get on red after the warning of yellow, then they get a note sent home).
32. Our administration wants the students to know that we as the teacher lay down the law…
33. We have pods with mixed grades to get a variety of students.
34. I tell them the cameras are watching them.
35. (I am) getting more comfortable with what I have to teach and the curriculum.
36. Most of them are ARL [Alternative Route to Licensure]s.
37. I have more experience than them [ARLs].
38. Not that I’m trying to belittle them.
39. Less desirable to hire
40. Viewed as this group will not be successful
41. Well, they are ARLs.

However, participants also provided instances showing that they replicated the norms of the institution. For example, Beverly’s students walk down the hall with their fingers to their lips. Again, Beverly supports these rules emphatically, saying that it is a kindergartener’s first experience in school, and they need to know rules. But these same kinds of rules were applied in Ken, Carol, and Gwen’s classes who all teach third or fourth grade. In each case, students walk down the halls with their hands folded with the thought that this prevents a student from touching the bulletin boards or other students. The data here provide examples of when the teacher is disciplining students’ bodies.

Another frequent example of classroom management, and a key component of disciplining student bodies, was the use of rewards to elicit student behavior. In Carol’s classroom, students receive an “extra 15 minutes of recess.” Other comments provided demonstrated that students follow the rules they can receive tokens for following rules and procedures. (The use of tokens is described in more detail on page 128.) There were
no instances in the data where the participants resisted or questioned these institutional norms related to student behavior in the school.

After these significant statements are considered, phenomenological method requires that meanings be derived from the data. Similar to the process described in the last paragraph, the significant statements were further categorized to gain a better understanding of how teachers experience discipline when they are its agent. The table below consists of a brief statement about each of the meanings that were generated. They are then expanded upon in the following paragraphs.

The formulated meanings described below reflect the theme of the teacher as agent indicated previously. I acknowledge there are categories that overlap. Every attempt was made to be specific about the classroom management strategies applied in the participants’ classrooms. These practices are further described in the following section of this chapter.

Token Systems

The most significant finding in this part of the research was that all participants had developed some sort of token economy in their classroom, and most said they first learned about it in my course. A token economy is a system of individual reinforcement of target behaviors in which some kinds of token is administered and exchanged later for backup reinforcers (Boisjoli, 2008). Token economies can look very different, but the philosophy is the same. Token systems are designed as behavior modification programs

---

55 I would be remiss if I did not state that this was one kind of system I demonstrated in my college classroom. I must reveal, though, that I did hand students examples of token economies, including the one I used in my classroom when I was an elementary teacher. This is a perfect example of something I did unaware of the disciplining and conditioning I was doing as a teacher.
that come from operant conditioning psychology. They can be traced back to 1859, when Avendano y Carderera used them with his male students.

Table 2: Formulated meanings/agent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formulated Meanings of Teacher as Agent of Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All participants implemented some sort of token system in their classroom, and several use another one that is implemented school-wide. While some performance systems are more elaborate than others, it is clear that the students are rewarded (and sometimes fined) for their behavior and their performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is a stress over how little time teachers have, whether it involves improving the time it takes students to quiet down, or how much testing impedes teaching time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is a perceived need to have children’s bodies very mechanized, whether it is how they fold their arms when they walk down the hall or where their desk faces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Because participants believe that making AYP is important, they sometimes deviate from the benchmarks or curriculum mapping to teach a skill they have been told will be on the test. They believe they are ‘helping’ their students in this way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Novice teachers tend to have ups-and-downs in their establishment of classroom management systems. All participants related times when student behavior made them consider their career choice, but none planned on quitting at this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Participants perceive the monitoring of children as being important. They want to know when students are going to the restroom, where students’ eyes are on a test. Some will even remind students that they are being videotaped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Participants perceived the need to enforce rules for their classroom. There were differences in how they were developed and disseminated, but all participants could articulate both their school and classroom rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Participants perceived a difference in rank among novice teachers. Those gaining certification through alternative routes were viewed by others as less qualified and sometimes positioned themselves as being less qualified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The token is not a reinforcer; it is a way to earn the reinforcer (Boisjoli, 2008). Token systems are structures related to the techniques of power because these systems reinforce the norms and serve as a promised reward to make the transition to docility (or “compliance”, according to Kohn (1995) more palatable to students. In terms of Foucault,
though he did not address token economies in his work, it would be fair to say that the tokens are used to reinforce the norms of the classroom, and are thus used as a normalizing technique.

In this study, Beverly gives tokens when her kindergarteners give compliments to one another. Jane, Gwen, Carol, and Ken all give out something like money to the students, though the names of their tokens are left out to preserve anonymity. Participants revealed that they were the only, or one of the few, teachers in their school using a token system. Gwen stated in her interview that she told her principal she wanted to implement such a system, and her principal wanted to develop it school-wide. Jane stated, “They respond better if I give them something.” Ironically, both of these participants were the ones who stated that they needed to increase their fines when students exhibited poor behavior. The intent was to make negative consequences more meaningful because some students were so rich that fining them didn’t faze them. Jane used an illustration from a story about a grain of rice that doubled every day in order to describe and implement a class-wide system of fines that doubles with each infraction. She reported that the system seemed to work well. Note here, that the whole class is punished. This is a totalization technique where the collective group of students is punished if one individual misbehaves. In addition, the language here is reflective of policing and the legal system. This kind of peer pressure is generally frowned upon, but is relatively common in my experiences. Tokens here tend to police or judge individuals. Participants Jane, Gwen and Carol all revealed that theft of the tokens is an issue. Participants Ken and Beverly did not report such similar findings. Knowing that these tokens are valued by students such that they

7 Please note that for the teacher as agent of discipline, I did not find the following techniques of power as clusters emerging from the data: distribution, functional sites and partitioning.
will commit a crime to possess them may be another indicator that they are more trouble than they are worth.

*A Need for Children’s Bodies to be Mechanized*

For a body to be made *docile*, it has to be controlled by someone or something else (Foucault, 1977). Instances where novice teachers enforced school rules without resistance provide examples of the teacher making docile bodies of students. The examples participants gave here parallel Foucault’s example of the soldier who was mechanized through strict drills and routines (1977). For example, Jane and Beverly spent a significant amount of time discussing how students were to walk down the hall. Carol’s school even gave out “report cards for following rules and procedures.”

For Jane, just saying a phrase like “hallway manners” elicited a set of behaviors where students folded their arms and refrained from talking. Jane stated:

You have to tell the students, basically. The kindergarteners and first graders have to walk with their fingers to their lips, and teachers have to remind them that they aren’t supposed to talk in the hallway. My students are supposed to walk with their hands by their sides and they aren’t allowed to touch the bulletin boards. They have to keep their eyes forward. That’s pretty much the same for everybody. I think the third and fourth graders are pretty responsive. They are so used to it that all you have to do is tell them “hallway manners” and they know what to do.

Beverly made similar comments, although the rules were different for primary students at her school. Here, these young students were expected to place a finger over their mouths to remind them not to talk. Older students also had terms like, “noise level
zero” to define how much talking was permitted in the hall. Ken reflected on the use of dotted markings outside the school where students were to line up with their teacher at the end of the day to wait for parents. Other examples, such as folding arms when walking down the hall, sitting on your bottom in your seat, sitting “criss-cross apple sauce” are instances of mechanizing the students’ bodies. In each of these instances, the novice teacher would pay students with classroom tokens for doing these behaviors correctly; however, depending on the subject, there were varying frequencies with which they would be “paid” for this.

Monitoring is Important

Student safety is a paramount concern to the teacher. To accomplish this, students need to be monitored. This sort of monitoring is not what Foucault refers to when he speaks about surveillance. Foucault’s (1977) monitoring, or surveillance, is intended to make people act a particular way because they are always being watched. The paranoia of knowing this forces them to self-regulate in an attempt to do what everyone else is doing, or what an expert (teacher, principal) expects them to do, to be normalized. For this reason, many comments made about watching children were not included here, as I did not think that surveillance attempts, conscious or otherwise, were meant to make a body docile, but rather, were meant to ensure students were safe. Nonetheless, it is safety brought about by docility that may prevent these techniques from being questioned. One way to curb the strict adherence to rules is to have the teacher make safety an issue, asking children what behaviors would help achieve safety. Instances where teacher surveillance came into play included the practice of students having to sign out that they were using the restroom, monitoring students at lunch and then rewarding students for
their performance, and observing procedures as students move down the hall. In addition, students are monitored in Beverly’s school in the teachers’ lounge, as teachers, educators, and passers-by can see how students performed on standardized tests posted there. Though students may not have been aware of this, it is conceivable that others who should not have access to student progress (such as other people’s parents, teachers of specials) were able to make judgments and decisions about the student based on this data, such as grouping them or rewarding them in some particular way. The publication of this data for all to see is a form of surveillance because, at any time, a person in a position of power can see the test scores and make decisions based on them.

The most overt example of surveillance, as I have stated earlier, was that of Beverly, the kindergarten teacher who tells her students that the video cameras are watching them. This was the practice most similar to the regulations in Bentham’s Panopticon, where the students knew there was another person (probably the principal) who was watching what they were doing. The implied message was that “you need to act how other children your age act here and we’ll know if you choose otherwise.”

*Rules, Rules, Rules*

In terms of classroom management, participants were asked how they developed their rules. I believed that knowing the rules of the classroom would give me some insight into how students were disciplined. My initial thought was that I would see if novice teachers required students to sit, walk, or act in a particular way. What was uncovered was that teachers’ rules have been normalized. I was not surprised when Jane answered, “Harry Wong. No more than five rules, no less than three.” As I have stated earlier, Harry and Rosemary Wong’s text *The First Days of School* was given to most beginning teachers in
this district, and he has spoken at induction meetings and orientation. Wong offers a set
of predictions/promises that will come to pass if teachers set clear rules and procedures at
the beginning of the year, namely that:

You will have fewer problems in the classroom.
You will present yourself positively to your students.
You will feel less stress.
You will feel better about your capabilities in the classroom.
You will be much sought after and admired.
You will be respected as a professional.
You will have greater student success.
You will be a super successful teacher.


The trouble with a statement like this though, in my opinion, is that it may make
teachers believe there is a recipe for establishing a problem-free classroom, and that his
way is “the way” in which classroom management should be carried out. When Jane said
that her style was five rules like that of Wong’s, her comment did not specify what ought
to be the content of the rules, but rather the quantity. All other participants were required
to have rules. Beverly stated that her rules are generated by the school’s rules. She stated,
“Yes, there are guidelines for success that are posted in the bathrooms and hallways that
everyone must follow. Some of them are “walk in the hallway without touching the walls,
keep your arms folded- noise level of 0 in the hallways and bathrooms etc.” She stated
that they were “really good procedures that the kids need to follow.” Though some
teachers were required to have them posted, three were not. When asked how teachers
imparted the rules to students, in each instance, the exact phrase “We kept going over them” was uttered. I argue here that though teachers act as agents of discipline when developing a set of class rules, it appears in the current study that teachers have a normalized belief about what rules ought to look like and they apply the “formula” of Harry Wong rather than developing rules that they believe they need, or they choose to not utilize them at all. The teachers do not question rules; they believe that they make sense and they impart them, believing that rules of this kind are “good” for kids. Beverly stated, “I think they are good rules because they are pretty basic and common sense and they are not hard to follow,” meaning that most people would not resist them. I believe this reinforces the cycle of teachers believing that strict rules are a part of schooling, and that it is the teacher’s job to ensure that rules are carried out.

Good and Bad Days

This particular theme may not relate specifically to the technologies that the other themes have addressed. However, this theme has been included because it did appear in each interview, and it has the potential to affect the teacher attrition issue. It also speaks to a perceived failure of the teacher to be an effective agent of discipline. When asked if participants planned on coming back next year and if they could see themselves still teaching in 5 years, all participants answered affirmatively, although some appeared more confident than others. I interpreted this to mean that I had caught them on a good day. Perhaps if I had asked a day earlier or a month earlier, I might have received a different response. In all cases where teachers perceived themselves as having a bad day, an anecdote or comment was made about student behavior. For Gwen, a fight had broken out in her fourth grade class. For Jane, it was that students were too chatty. For Carol, it
was the sheer number of behavior problems. Beverly didn’t specify a particular behavior, but she said she found the work “exhausting.”

Perceived Differences in Education

This last section is completely different from the rest of the research addressing the teacher as agent of discipline. That is because in all the other instances, the teacher was viewed as being the one to discipline, or make docile, a student’s body. In this last formulated meaning, it became apparent that there was one other perception that involved the novice teacher classifying another novice teacher. In truth, of all the data I collected, it was also the one area that I had not anticipated. It became obvious that there was a perceived comparison of faculty that ranked novice teachers against each other based on their education. In three interviews, a stigma associated with teachers who received their degrees through alternative routes for licensure was apparent. Jane was the most vocal about this issue. When I asked her if there were other first-year teachers who were perceived as having been part of an inferior preparation program, the following was her response:

Yes, actually other first-year teachers, most of them are [program specified] most of them have only ever been in the classroom for about 25 hours and I have more experience. Not that I’m try to belittle them. I give them credit for even attempting this given the amount of experience that they have… They were less desirable to hire…Not that I make that many mistakes but I occasionally make minor ones compared to what they are doing. Their classroom management skills are nowhere near as good as mine after [my university]. (Jane).
Jane’s comment is not the only one that names and criticizes particular programs. Gwen could identify which teachers in her school were members of this same program, demonstrating that there is some classifying and ranking of teachers. However, the aim of this research is not to demonstrate that successful novice teachers only come from 4-year university programs, nor do I want to criticize any alternative route to licensure program. It is, however, the intention of this study to expose the perceptions of discipline at work in schools. Foucault’s techniques of power, especially ranking, are appropriate frameworks to analyze comments like the one just cited.

As I suspected, in terms of the analysis of the teacher as agent, I found my data to be less telling than when teachers were the subject of discipline. As I stated in previous chapters, in some ways, I expected the agent of discipline data to exist only as a way to use the language of teachers as opposed to Foucauldian terminology. It also provided me the opportunity to be a sounding board for these participants whom I had instructed on different classroom management protocols. Most of my findings reside at this daily micro level of discursive power; that is, “What is the normal way a student should act? What is the normal flow of curriculum to impart to students?” However, these formulated meanings did provide some insight into the macro level of establishing what is perceived as normal for the disciplining of students by first-year teachers. The most telling statements at this level of teacher as agent of discipline included descriptions of the way that teachers disciplined their students by making them complete tasks in the same robotic way, and then rewarded or punished them depending on their movements. The teacher possesses institutional power that is not negotiated with students. Rather, the teacher is in charge simply because he or she is the teacher. Another way that this
institutional power presented itself was in teachers’ statements that teaching to the test was beneficial for their students.

*Foucault’s Techniques of Power*

After searching for meaning in the statements provided, my next step in the study was to arrange *clusters of meaning*. In this section, the techniques of power were listed. I took examples from each of the techniques (wherever they were applicable) and used them to determine what techniques of power were at play, as well as how they manifested themselves when the teacher was the agent of discipline. The following table on page 140 shows the results from this process.

Consistent with the methods used in phenomenology, once the themes were generated and analyzed in the *Formulated Meanings* section of this chapter, the next step required developing “clusters of meaning” (Creswell, 1998). To do this, I applied the techniques of power to the categories that had emerged. Table 3 reflects this analysis. The following passages provide additional insight into the development of these clusters.

*Surveillance*

Three key examples of classroom surveillance were extracted from the Formulated Meanings, though some other examples that illustrate both surveillance and other techniques are prevalent. In terms of general surveillance, the “monitoring” formulated meaning theme explains how surveillance is disciplined in schools. The first example is one where some teachers show students that there are video cameras in the classroom, and they use it as a way to let students know that their behaviors are constantly monitored and are subject to review at any time.
**Clusters of meaning: Experiences of Novice Teachers with Discipline using Foucault’s ‘Techniques of power’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agent of Discipline</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Surveillance/Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Novice teachers make sure students know other school officials are involved in their disciplining. (E.g. Students are made aware of video cameras).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Novice teachers want to know what students are doing at all times. (E.g. Students sign out when they use the restroom).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Novice teachers try setting up their classes in a way that they can easily get to every desk so they can check student progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Student progress can be monitored by the posting of test scores or other work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Students have procedures for most everything they do, including where their hands should be while walking in halls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Time is normalized. There is a perceived amount of time students should have to transition, a perceived amount of time it should take to do a task or take a test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Students are marked as proficient or non-proficient on state tests based on a cut score determined by the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A token economy is used to reward the procedures that are deemed normal in the classroom—lining up properly, doing homework, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Totalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Participants did not make their classroom the collective. That is, the collective was “the kids,” “my students,” etc. versus statements like, “In our classroom we…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. All novice teachers studied perceived value in token economy systems and had some way to reward students and fine students based on their behavioral (and sometimes academic) performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Novice teachers perceive the way to fix behavior problems in these token economies is to increase the fines or “up the ante”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Classification/Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Test scores are used to determine reading groups, math groups, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Students who do act normally, are not allowed to participate in “fun activities” like Fun Friday, field trips etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A second example relates to giving students rewards when they receive good reports from other educators (such as those who monitor lunch). Students must act in a particular way and comply with stated rules if they are going to receive an award. Jane gives “paw” tokens, while Carol gives free time if students act in a normalized way and are “caught being good.” A third example of surveillance is the posting of student work and test scores. Beverly gave the only example in this study where student names and ranking were posted publicly, though other teachers had seen the practice in other schools. Educators, peers, and pretty much any one physically present in the school can monitor student progress simply by looking on the walls. A fourth and final example occurs in the way novice teachers set up their classrooms. In certain cases, desks were arranged in a way that teachers could quickly get to a student to monitor behavior. Carol, Gwen, Ken, and Jane all cited specifically the work of Fred Jones (2000) as informing the strategy they used to set up their rooms to establish these surveillance methods. Restated, the teachers use the techniques of others to discipline their students and believe that discipline naturally depends on their constant monitoring. This disciplinary regiment is one of the most overt findings in this study.

Normalization

Teachers spend the first several weeks of class establishing rules and procedures. In this process, they establish the norms of the classroom, and often the school. Participants in this study reinforce this normalization by providing tokens. These tokens serve as short-term ways to bribe students to conform. However, both Jane and Gwen reported examples of modifying their systems when students resisted the tokens. During February,
both of these teachers chose to increase the rewards for students continuing to replicate
the normalized procedures.

Normalization of the mind takes place when students are taught a specified
curriculum. The state department of education or other accrediting body determines what
knowledge a student should have access to, based on the child’s grade level, thus
assuming that the grade level is the norm. This is certainly a form of normalization in
itself, and it does not allow for learner differences. Normalization here is predominantly
established through the use of benchmarks and portfolios. Within this realm of
normalization, what counts as knowledge varied from school to school, even when
teachers worked in the same district. Ken’s school required him to teach three different
reading programs based on student performance on an entry test, while Jane’s school
required a battery of tests to be administered for ability grouping. In one instance, Gwen
reported that instructors at her grade level were asked to teach something at the whim of
the office administrators. “Fourth grade got told we had to do state reports on all 50
states, and it isn’t even part of our curriculum,” Gwen stated. Though the same standards
were to be addressed at the district level, the normalization of curricula actually appeared
to be limited to more local control, that of the school site. These normalizing practices
may be viewed as taking the freedom out of teaching, prohibiting teachers to construct
new ideas or to teach material in unique ways. It undermines the professionalism of
teachers because they are not viewed as being trustworthy enough to prescribe instruction
the way that they deem necessary.

Classification
As I just mentioned in normalization, the use of tests or portfolios classifies and ranks students. Though each student is responsible for taking the same state-wide criterion-referenced test, the way an individual school ranks students may affect what knowledge they are given access to, or are excluded from. Teachers did not consciously report how learning may have been influenced by rankings, but the grouping of students based on their performance on tests that occurred in teachers Jane, Gwen, and Carol’s classrooms suggests that students are excluded from specific kinds of instruction based on their performance on a test. That is, curriculum is regulated (another normalizing factor) based on performance on tests. For example, Gwen reported that the state criterion-referenced test was used to determine who had access to the accelerated math class. She reported that an 80% passing rate on this assessment gained students entry to this class. It excluded all others who didn’t meet the test score, even if they had performed well in math instruction and just performed poorly on the one exam. Likewise, performance on a pencil and Scantron test does not take into account different learning styles. Therefore, only the students who can do well on the kind of standardized test administered gain entry to a particular set of knowledge. Knowing that this is the way accountability is measured has changed the way material is taught and even how students are rewarded. It alters what counts as knowledge and what learning looks like.

Statement of the Essential Structure of Experiencing Discipline as Agent

Utilizing the data collected, and analyzing it through a Foucauldian lens, I noted that the initial essence was that novice teachers perceive that institutional and discursive power exists in their respective institutions, even if these exact terms were not utilized in interviews. The data support the claim that teachers believe they are in charge of the
classroom management in their own class, and they do not appear to realize that their management has been normalized through institutional power. Novice teachers do not necessarily see that they have been disciplined into the actions they take as classroom managers. They believe they have autonomy, though in actuality many of their actions support institutional power. They seem comfortable with the level of power that they have been given. These teachers have been socialized to the point where no alternative can be imagined or thought. I support this claim by observing that respondents have not expressed disdain over the way they act as agents of discipline. In each case, participants thought rules and procedures were fair. Additionally, they implemented token systems with the perception that they would get better responses from students if they did this. They created the rules and the economies, even though not everybody used them. When acting as agent of discipline, novice teachers tended to describe an “us (teachers) and them (admin)” relationship, rather than a collective. Generally, subjects perceived that the needs of the group were met. But they were able to cite examples of behavior/problem students who were not fitting in their classroom environments and were excluded from their class. Teachers did not report being uncomfortable with these unsuccessful experiences.

The next chapter of this study goes on to explore how the novice teacher perceives that he or she is the subject of discipline. It also addresses instances when the teacher is simultaneously the agent and subject of discipline. This section also describes the way teachers are socialized into a new community, as this also reveals insight about teacher perceptions of institutional power and discursive power.
CHAPTER 6

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS: NOVICE TEACHERS AS SUBJECT OF DISCIPLINE

While the last chapter informed the reader about the experiences teachers shared while serving as the agent of this discipline, the purpose of this chapter is to examine what occurs when the teacher is the subject of discipline. In both roles, as subject and agent, teachers can experience discursive and institutional power through the administration, veteran teachers, experienced staff, parents, and even students. Additionally, the fears associated with student testing and making “AYP” or Adequate Yearly Progress are disciplinary practices that act on the novice teacher.

As with chapter 5, a particular form of phenomenological analysis was conducted. The original 112 statements about discipline generated from transcripts can be found in Appendix IV. The following matrix was developed by pulling statements from the original 112 statements that pertained to instances where the teacher was subjected to discipline. Of the 112 statements, 80 statements revealed such subjection. These comments appear in Table 4.
Table 4: Teacher Perceived Self as Subject of Discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Statements About Teacher as Subject of Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Evaluation process? I don’t like it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The administration was there to back me up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is what they call a support cadre but I really haven’t used them too much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think they don’t want students to think that we can’t handle it ourselves so we have to send them to administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. She’s really busy or hectic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel a little standoffish about approaching her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel like we are getting slammed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nobody really told me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I’m following the guidelines. They are mapped to the standards and the benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. We are testing so much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Kids even asked me, &quot;When are we having [standardized tests] them?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. That’s what the [standardized tests] are based on anyway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If I covered fractions I’d have the upper hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. They [administration] got permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. We got the results as a grade level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Well your kids did better than mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Student desks need to be moved apart and separated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My grade-level chair mentioned to me that my kids did well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I didn’t know what was acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. They said it reflected on me how I was teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I know the big thing right now is making AYP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I didn’t run it by administration or anything so I don’t know if it’s okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I felt like the newbie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. All of the new people were sitting at the same table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. We were like what, do we have leprosy or something?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Everyone was into their own cliques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. One clique has the administrator’s ear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Grade levels sit together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I got all “threes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. They tell me that I’m exactly where I need to be right now; if they’re fine, then I’m okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The [district] is making us go through an induction program to support a raise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. When I’m in all of this induction stuff, I’m like “I did this all at [University].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Why do I have to do this again?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A lot of the stuff we are just going over again and again.
I was so stressed out and overwhelmed with all of the work.
I kind of know what is expected now because I didn’t know what was expected before. So I think having experienced it once, I think I know what I’m getting into and I’ll be better next year.
They did everything for you to instruct you, everything but write it up.
Don’t write it like “this;” write it like “this.
We spent 2 or 3 hours going over the staff handbook.
If you do this you get an extra 15 minute recess.
They encourage you to wear school shirts.
Men don’t have to wear ties but they do have to wear button up shirts.
I think a lot of the teachers abuse the dress code a little bit.
Like oohhh she wore that?
It’s just like gossip.
[Parents] didn’t want a new teacher for their kids.
The veteran teachers took the textbooks and did something called curriculum mapping.
It’s all laid out for us.
[Plans are] checked every Friday.
I didn’t get any negative comments, so I assume I’m doing okay.
Other teachers got comments that they had to do things over.
I hope they [administration] come in at a time when I’m actually teaching.
Nervous.
If your whole class bombs then you aren’t doing what you’re supposed to.
There are groups that we can join to do things together-- exercising, etc.
We have collaboration meeting for our grade levels.
[Rules] are in the handbook for the staff.
Yes, there are guidelines for success that are posted in the bathrooms and hallways that everyone must follow.
Our administration wants the students to know that we as the teacher lay down the law...
We have pods with mixed grades to get a variety of students.
Administration not visible
[In college] there should have been more hands on experience for making lesson plans and ideas that were actually aligned with the curriculum.
They just expect too much.
That I need to do more small group instruction and direct my lesson plans more to fit the needs of my students.
They are expecting us to do small group instruction like all day for every subject and I just don’t feel that it is possible especially in kindergarten.
Test scores-we have to post them right in the hallways next to the administration offices.
Everyone can see how your class did, but the actual number scores are not posted.
They say it is for us to look at, not to compete, but to see how our own classes are progressing).
70. Grade-level chair told me what will be on the test and what to do to prepare for it
71. We are required to write objectives on the board, and go back to them for closure.
72. Division will show up on the test even though it won’t be in the benchmarks
73. They [administration] tried to make us stay to 3:30 when our contract says 3.
74. She wanted us to sign out if left before 3:30.
75. I didn’t think I [had freedom] at the beginning of the year.
76. No one is around.
77. Not checking
78. Checklist for evaluating
79. This evaluation was meant to be a conversation piece.

Analysis of the Statements about the Teacher as Subject of Discipline

Using the data provided in this matrix, it was apparent that a number of factors appear to subject the teacher to discipline, and that there are academic, political, and social implications. There are twice as many comments (80 as opposed to 42 about teacher as agent) that were pulled from the discipline matrix for this strand than were extracted for the teacher-agent category of discipline discussed in the preceding chapter. This could connote that teachers feel they are subjected to discipline more than they administer it, or that they are more aware of the rules they are supposed to follow. When the traditional notion of disciplining as punishment is evoked, it may seem like some statements are not relevant. However, this research employs the notion of disciplining as developed by Michel Foucault in the text *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1977) where discipline is an “uninterrupted, constant coercion, supervising the processes of the activity rather than its result” (p. 137). It is a series of methods that “made possible the meticulous control of the operations of the body, which assured the constant subjection of
its forces” (p. 137). The next step of phenomenological process was to group teachers’ statements into “meaning units” (Creswell, 1998) and write a textural description of the experience. A textural description is defined by Creswell as an exercise where “the researcher writes about what was experienced, a description of the meaning individuals have experienced (p. 237). After the data were analyzed, they were categorized by themes that arose from Foucault’s techniques of power. It is here where the connection between discipline and some of these questions that may appear less obvious and will be less transparent. Table 5 is the analysis performed by the investigator using the data in Table 4:

The data in Table 5 were generated using phenomenological method. The statements listed above suggest a wide array of issues impacted these five first-year teachers. In this next section, more detail will be provided about the meanings generated above. Once they are explained in depth, these trends are then related to the techniques of power.

Importance of the Grade-level Chair

One theme that seemed consistent through all interviews was the importance of the grade-level chair in all novice teacher experiences. In most cases, the grade-level chair was not part of any mentoring team, nor was he or she perceived as being an administrator. However, novice teachers reported that it was the grade-level chair who provided them with the curriculum, who provided them information on what would be on the national criterion-referenced test, and in some cases, even made comments about the progress of these novice teachers. This finding is important because it names an external authority figure who seems to inform novice teachers of what the ‘true norms’ are, and sometimes even encourages the novice teacher to resist the norms.
Table 5: Formulated meanings for teacher as the subject of discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formulated Meanings About Teacher as Subject of Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Novice teachers perceived that they were comfortable sending students to another classroom or the principal’s office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Novice teachers overwhelmingly perceived the grade-level chair to be the most helpful and knowledgeable person to seek out when there were curricular and behavioral issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Novice teachers perceived mentoring programs as being ineffective, although there were different reasons for why they found them so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Novice teachers perceived administrators (and sometimes mentors) to be very busy and saw them as visible during lunch periods only. Some participants found administrators to be even less visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Novice teachers generally were nonchalant in their opinions about evaluations; while they generally disliked being evaluated, most did not express concern that they were being monitored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Standardized tests were perceived as being very important, and scores were shared at least with the grade-level; some schools post them. Novice teachers perceived that there was a correlation to whether a teacher was “good” or not based on the outcomes of these tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. New teachers experienced a transitional period where they didn’t feel welcome initially, but had found a support group by February.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Novice teachers perceived the existence of cliques at their school; many found that the clique was determined by what grade you taught; others shared history of being at different schools together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Novice teachers felt generally unprepared for all the paperwork they would be completing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Many aspects of curriculum are spelled out for novice teachers, and are sometimes completely mapped out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Classroom management protocol tends to be up to the teacher, but teacher induction trainings/lectures provide lots of strategies. Most participants shared that they had taken classroom management training online and were dissatisfied with the lack of hands-on experience/training they had.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, this person seems to wield some administrative power, though this position may not be considered as such. This individual adds another dimension to as the
agent of discipline to novice teachers. Jane revealed that only the grade-level chair spoke
with her about her students’ scores on a standardized examination:

No one, administration-wise, talked to me. My grade-level chair
mentioned to me that my kids did well, because I didn’t know what was
acceptable. On average, the whole class did close to 80. I know it was
between 75 and 80. She said that it was really good, and I was
thinking it was bad because, you know, in the 80s is more grade level
and 90s is exceeding grade level. And she said, ‘No, no, no, overall
grade average is good.’ So that’s all she said. But she said it reflected on
me how I was teaching. I think that’s kind of weird. It’s not really,
should be part of my accountability. It’s the student doing the work…not
teachers’ responsibility but their [students’] performance. They’re the ones
that should be getting the pat on the back if they are doing really well”
(Jane).

The data support the finding that the grade-level chair acts as a less direct purveyor of
institutional power, aiding in the normalization of novice teachers. That is, he or she
makes evaluative statements about the novice teacher’s performance. It is this person
who tells the novice teacher if he or she is doing well. It appears that the grade-level chair
monitors novice teacher performance, to some extent, by using the test results to make
these statements. In terms of the technologies of discipline, the novice teacher is *gazed
upon* (using Foucault’s term for surveillance) by peers. For example, the grade-level chair
had the test results before the novice teacher. She came to the novice teacher and
commented on the test scores attained by students in the novice teacher’s class, and she
described the progress of the class as being representative of the novice teacher’s abilities. This subject was not approached by other administrators in her school when the test scores were revealed. Jane was the only subject who perceived the grade-level chair as “busy” and “hectic.” Although other teachers did not report having the exact same experience, they did reveal that they perceived the grade-level chair as expert.

To illustrate this perception, Carol revealed that it was the grade-level chair who told her what to expect on the standardized test. “My grade-level chair had me teach division because it is a big part of the test, but it doesn’t show up in the Benchmarks [a specific document provided to teachers that tells them what content should be taught during what specific weeks] until the fourth quarter.” Carol modified her instruction and deviated from the printed benchmarks because she valued the grade-level chair’s opinions in this matter. Like Carol, Gwen also perceived the grade-level chair as the expert. In her February interview, Carol called the grade-level chair “the boss.” She also related a time where the grade level chair told her what she anticipated the writing topic would be for a state exam. Additionally, Carol related that things were “better” because the grade-level chair had a student teacher, and now was “more visible,” thereby being able to assist her more frequently. In short, the grade-level chair is one who monitors and disciplines novice teachers, whether it be the way that they provide feedback on teacher test scores like Jane and Carol, or the way they tell teachers how to mentor the novice, or to resist pieces of the curriculum, like Gwen and Carol’s grade-level chairs advocated. None of the subjects reported having issues with the grade-level chair assuming this less direct administrative position. The transcripts seem to suggest that this evaluative and mentoring role of the grade-level chair has been normalized.
Perceived Ineffectiveness of Mentoring Programs

In this study, there were two kinds of mentoring programs taking place. One mentoring program affected four of the five participants, and was a district-run, new-teacher induction program. The second kind of mentoring program affected all five teachers and consisted of a particular type of on-site training, including programs/procedures that were unique to their individual school. Both involved a series of practices, discussions or activities that were designed to assist novice teachers, and in many cases were established to increase teacher retention (Hanson & Muir, 2008). There is much research to support the necessity of mentoring programs for novice teachers (Hanson & Muir, 2008; Wang & Odell, 2008), and this study will not make the argument that these programs should be abandoned. However, the data collected from participants about mentoring and teacher induction programs were not positive. In fact, novice teachers in this study did not perceive value in the mentoring experiences that they had in their first year of teaching. The teacher induction program was not necessarily considered mandatory. But if teachers wanted to move up the pay scale and make more money, their attendance was required. This could be considered a token economy for teachers.

Jane shared:

[School district] is making us go through an induction program to support a raise increase. They started us at tier three instead of tier one. In order to get tier three pay and to go to tier four pay next year, you need to go through the induction program and meet all of their requirements. There are six classes in all. There are three seminars and a lot of it includes classroom management.
This teacher induction program serves as a disciplining practice in several ways. First, teachers who attend this training are being asked to follow specific kinds of classroom management strategies. To encourage these individuals to attend, they are promised rewards for their compliance. This is the exact terminology Alfie Kohn uses when he condemns token economies (1995). Secondly, this statement reveals there is a definite “us” versus “them” mentality. The “district” wields some authoritative power that is vague; no one person is “the district.” In terms of the techniques of power, one could argue that the district here is making an attempt to normalize and standardize classroom management practices. That is, novice teachers may have come from different universities that did not teach classroom management the way that the district wanted it to be administered. Therefore, all novices would learn the “correct” strategies, and they would have less earning potential if they did not take part in this training. They were therefore “excluded” (another technology) from earning what those who did attend earn. This is an attempt to control the conduct of employees when they work with students, and is most certainly a technology of discipline.

Ironically, Jane also revealed that strategies she was told to try at these induction meetings didn’t work for her. “The students said, ‘What’s wrong with you?’ when I followed what I was supposed to do. They thought that I was acting weird.” In addition, it was Jane who was most vocal about these trainings being a repeat of a classroom management course at her university. Ken and Beverly both expressed reasons why their mentoring programs were ineffective. These reasons included the perception that such programs were scheduled at inconvenient times or did not appear to be uniquely tailored to their school’s needs. But neither stated that they were critical of their district’s
mentoring program because they had received the same instruction in college. Again, all had attended the same university. Follow-up questions revealed that both Ken and Beverly had taken their classroom management course online. None of the participants questioned district leaders about why they needed to take this course. Knowing that it was the only way for gaining financial incentives seemed to be enough for them to go through the training. My researched showed that there were varied methods for how teachers were mentored. Carol stated that there were regular meetings to discuss induction, but they were before school and were not long enough. Jane and Beverly had mentors, but did not seek them out for assistance. Follow-up questions revealed both teachers went to colleagues they viewed as friends first.

In terms of the use of mentors, it appears from the data that taking a whole-group approach does not seem to work. Based on the data here, novice teachers would prefer more individualized mentoring, and recommend that time be afforded for it. Data suggest that situations where the whole group received the same instruction felt like a normalizing practice where everyone learned the same basic management strategies, and was asked to use them in their classroom. This may be perceived as the teachers looking for more support because they are having a difficult time conforming when the normalized strategies aren’t working for them. By stating that they need more individualized attention, participants are finding that replicating these short-term strategies is ineffective for them. It could be stated that they are having difficulty conforming to the norms, and therefore seek support in conforming.
Evaluations

In terms of discipline, Foucault’s explanation of the examination is present in teacher evaluations. These evaluations are a surveillance test of sorts, because failure to perform on these specific sets of criteria can have punitive results, such as teacher probation, remediation (with a behavior specialist or administrator), or termination. Foucault (1977) stated that examinations tell individuals what counts and does not count as knowledge, just as these evaluations state what makes an effective teacher. The importance of this subject cannot be understated.

In initial interviews, when the issue of evaluations was presented, the words “nervous,” “nerve-wracking,” and “anxious” were mentioned. In this early interview, beginning teachers had not yet been formally evaluated, and only a few had the administrator even come in their rooms. When administrators entered, it tended to be to handle a child with behavior problems, or to casually drop by to see how novice teachers were doing. However, by the end of the February interviews, teachers had been evaluated, in some cases several times. The descriptors of “anxiety” or “nervous” mentioned at the beginning of this section were no longer vocalized. Most appeared to be “okay” with being evaluated, although Beverly stated, “I don’t like it” because it was stressful and she found some of her feedback unrealistic. Gwen reported frustration with her first formal evaluation in February:

I learned a lot from my first evaluation. I argued with the first walk through… [The principal asked] Are the students engaged in a standard assignment that aligns with state standards? We have to teach famous
It was Abraham Lincoln’s birthday and I was teaching Abraham Lincoln. He thought Lincoln wasn’t a famous American.

This statement, in terms of the discipline, was one of the few examples that demonstrate how Gwen made an attempt to resist the rule the evaluator tried to apply. Teachers were generally content with the progress that they had made. Jane relayed her progress to me as, “I got all threes” to demonstrate that she did well. This statement was made because I was considered an insider with knowledge about her district, although I am not employed there. By making this statement, Jane revealed that, through the process of normalization, she was considered proficient in all the ways a teacher is assessed. Her performance followed the norms she had been provided through interpretation of the evaluation rubrics and directives given by her grade-level chair; Jane’s self-worth as a professional was determined and normalized. Jane did not resist her evaluation, and she accepted it as being fair. She had been ranked and classified in a way that defined her as an effective teacher, so she was contented.

Comments like this are similar to those from students who come home from school and say, “I stayed on green.” Novice teachers utilize rubrics, language, and programs implemented in school into their own measures of their individual success. Gwen and Beverly both expressed disdain for a feedback (disagreeing with mandates/ institutional power) made in their evaluations, but neither pursued the issue far enough to have it rescinded. Gwen was told that something she was doing was not part of the curriculum. Beverly was told to use cooperative strategies in all subjects in her kindergarten classroom. Both participants stated that they would resist these directives. It also
appeared from follow-up questions that Beverly was observed the most, of all the participants in the study.

**The Absent Administration**

In each instance, subjects reported when they saw their administrators and how visible they were. With respect to discipline, administrators who do not appear to observe them, suggest that no one is watching. The proverbial “mice can play when the cat’s away” phrase can be applied to the teachers’ statements that they can let their guard down because they will not be monitored as closely. This can mean that curriculum may be altered, or classroom management practices may be changed. The amount of time a teacher saw an administrator seemed to be interpreted differently. For Beverly, seeing her principal at every lunch duty was perceived as a visible administration. However, when asked if the administrators were visible at Jane’s school, she said she perceived them as “not visible,” because she could only find them at lunch duty. In fact, Jane reported making trips past her administrators’ office early in the morning, so they could see that Jane was at work early, not only reinforcing the norms, but exceeding the norms. In all scenarios, the administrators were perceived as being very busy, whether they were attending biweekly district meetings, as in Gwen’s case, or if they were busy dealing with behavior problems in Carol’s school. Participants did not report going to the administrators for advice or assistance. In terms of disciplining the students, participants tended to think the practice was frowned upon. Beverly stated, “Our administration wants the students to know that we as the teacher lay down the law. I think they don’t want students to think that we can’t handle it ourselves so we have to send them to administration.” (Even the phrase “lay down the law” is a return to the policing state of
education.) In all instances, the grade-level chair was considered to be the person to seek out for help. Does the administrator have more power because he or she is not visible? The data seem to suggest that teachers who feel they know they will not be observed because the administrator is physically off campus are the ones who tend to resist the norms of the school, as in Gwen’s circumstances. However, the administrators who have the “gaze,” meaning that they could observe the teacher at any time, seem to have the teachers who follow the norms most closely, as in the case of Ken, Carol, and Beverly. This is a goal of the Bentham’s Panopticon, and the technique of surveillance, to conform because you could be viewed at any given time.

Administrators in most cases were perceived rather positively, in that subjects felt they were “protected from parents” (Jane) and they “had my back” (Ken). There were very few comments toward administrators that could be considered even slightly negative – even in cases where criticism might appear justified. For example, Carol was in a situation where she was “surplussed” from one school because the numbers of students didn’t necessitate the number of teachers they hired. In October, she was transferred to another school. Her administrators told the other teachers to give her a set number of students. No caveats or guidelines were offered to teachers. Carol felt that she was given the students with the most behavior problems and two students who were going to need to be identified for special education placement. When asked if she thought this system for filling her classroom was acceptable to her, Carol responded, “I have seen in other schools where teachers mixed it up a little more, based on test scores or something. It seemed to me that teachers picked their poor-behavior students. It was like, ‘Which one I will get rid of.’” Experiencing the dual role of agent and subject simultaneously, Carol
stated that she had not shared this concern with administration, as she was new and
wanted to retain her position. Carol experienced an abuse of power, an instance where
power was dominated by veteran teachers at her expense. While this does show a cyclical
nature of power in that any group can possess power in a particular institution, it
reaffirms the hierarchical nature of discipline, in that the proverbial “low man” or woman
is the one who is given the perceived worst possible grouping of students.

Gwen was the only subject who expressed that the lack of administrative support
affected school morale. In addition, Gwen was the participant who completely abandoned
the reading program. Perhaps it was because her principals were away the most. To
reiterate, this reaffirms the technique of surveillance, that knowing when Gwen will not
be monitored alters the ways she delivers curriculum. Gwen is also the participant who
stated that the other teachers were also deviating from the prescribed lessons, though the
veteran teachers were slightly more overt about their practices than Gwen. In Gwen’s
estimation, only the Curriculum Coordinator would care, because “She was the one who
bought the textbooks.”

*Standardized Tests, Standard Instruction*

Standardized tests are another form of disciplining, and in fact serve as one of
Foucault’s “dividing practices” to distinguish here “ineffective” teachers from “effective”
teachers. The initial perception of standardized tests is that they measure what a student
knows. However, the subsequent, sometimes overtly stated, perception is that they
measure how well a teacher teaches. So while test scores were mentioned in chapter 5
where the teacher is the agent of discipline, there is another level replete with many
techniques of power at play. For these novice teachers, their performance is monitored
and ranked. The tests regulate what is taught and they normalize teachers by saying that there is only a certain body of knowledge that is significant. For example, Jane is a “good teacher” in the eyes of her grade-level chairperson because she can get her students to master a particular set of knowledge. The individual students’ backgrounds, histories, and even learning abilities and disabilities do not seem to matter. Beverly stated:

Yes, for the interims, we have to print our kids' names and separate them into groups (exceeds standards, meets and approaches). Then we have to post them right in the hallways next to the administration offices. Everyone can see how your class did, but the actual number scores are not posted. They say it is for us to look at, not to compete, but to see how our own classes are progressing. (Beverly)

Beverly’s quotation exemplifies another instance where teachers’ students are ranked and classified in a way that disciplines and ranks the teacher. On the surface, students were the ones being ranked here, but by posting test results, teachers and other passersby could make judgments about teacher performance. This practice is relevant to several techniques of power. That is, Beverly was not only being gazed upon by administrators and her grade-level chair. Her class results were published for all to see, a superintendent who walked down the hall, a parent, a child. Beverly was told that it wasn’t to be used for competition. Why would the principal make this data so visible? For the teacher though, this data presentation can be stifling. Beverly was a kindergarten teacher and therefore saw the data. But her students did not take the tests, and so she was not subject to the same performance pressures that her colleagues faced. In personal experiences, those under testing pressure can perceive those not under direct pressure to be nonchalant, and
they can be viewed as less accountable. This practice of requiring some teachers to be more accountable than others is another example of Foucault’s *dividing practices*.

*The Newbie*

Being new at some point in time is inevitable. In terms of disciplining a body, it is my contention that how a staff welcomes a new staff member is a matter of discipline. A teacher who is welcomed into a school that perceives him or her as “joining a family” has a completely different experience than the teacher who is not even introduced to the other faculty members publically. While there are several techniques at play here, the primary technique of discipline evident here is classification. This is because a new hire can be classified as an integral part of the team or as a warm body who may or may not last the year. This classification alters the experiences for the novice teacher. These seemingly small gestures also speak to the concept of totalization, in that the experiences are different for the teacher who is made to immediately feel like a part of a team, versus an individual who waits to be approved by the collective. Most participants revealed in initial interviews that it took several weeks before they felt comfortable in their schools. In the schools where these new teachers were hired, several other new hires were made. Therefore the first group the novice teachers formed was with other new teachers. Teachers who were classified as being different from everyone else initially sought out others who were classified the same way. Jane stated:

> I felt like the newbie. We went to opening breakfast and all of the new people were sitting at the same table. We didn’t even get invited over and we were like, “What do we have leprosy or something?”

Everyone was into their own cliques and they hadn’t seen everyone all
summer and they were conversing with each other and they had never met us. Nobody really took the initiative to say, “Hi my name is so and who are you?” Everyone stays at their own grade level too. Even still, I stay with my grade level where everybody knows who each other is. They might say hi in the hallway but as far as eating lunch we all eat lunch together [the fourth grade] the fifth grade eats there too; but it’s weird. It’s like, “Where are you going to sit? Where are you going to sit?” And the grade level sits together. It’s very cliquey and the grade levels sit together.

While the establishment of cliques was the intent of Jane’s statement here, another consideration is that of the term “newbie.” Even possessing the title of “newbie” gives an individual some power. Though a classification that may have been Jane may have found isolating, a newbie has the power to ask for help, to make mistakes. Jane may not have felt that she possessed power in this instance, but it gained her membership into the clique of novice teachers at her school. This is another instance of power as circulating, and of being capillary. By the February interviews, teachers had found their niches at the schools. Beverly stated:

Yes, I definitely think that my school makes a huge effort to make sure that we are included. We are always a part of everything at our school.

Also, most of the teachers are so friendly and they try to help us when we need it.

All novice teachers took a little bit of time to not feel like the newbie, and the way an administrator or group of teachers acted as agents of discipline made a difference in
teacher job satisfaction. It should be pointed out that there is power in being a newbie, in that individuals are usually forgiven for not having specific local knowledge, or in not knowing a particular procedure. However, in this study, participants appeared to want to shed the “newbie” status as quickly as possible. Gwen stated that “In the beginning everyone made offers to help, but only now [February] do I feel comfortable enough to take them up on it.” It is as if a teacher must initially prove herself. Once properly disciplined to do good as a teacher, knowing what the rules and procedures of the institution are, can they frame questions that will seem acceptable to ask of veteran teachers. Socialization to the school and professional is a matter of disciplining the body. Teachers may choose not to seek out others until they perceive they are members of the group.

*The Cliques*

In Jane’s last statement (found on page 167, evidence emerges that there are definitely cliques in the school. As stated in the last section of this study, the way groups are perceived in a school does have a disciplinary ramification. Totalization occurs when individuals see themselves as being part of a collective (Foucault, 1977). It was apparent in the data that the collective was a very different group for the participants. It theoretically could be the new teachers, the fifth grade teachers, the entire faculty, the entire school, the entire district. How these individuals positioned themselves demonstrated what effects of totalization were at play. The collective that I saw most often throughout these interviews was that teachers aligned themselves with their grade level. In addition, there were other groupings of teachers, for instance those who were first-year, and those who were not, or those who had worked together at other schools.
versus those who had not. These data also describe the socialization of the novice teacher into their school. In terms of the focus of this study, a significant finding was that novice teachers identified their primary support group as their grade-level peers. It was not just a matter of proximity, as the research also asked subjects where they were situated in the school. Three individuals were in pods that were mixed grade levels. One commonality that the teachers did share is that they tended to eat lunch with their grade level. All teachers were given the same lunch break as their grade-level counterparts, and as Jane illustrated, even when other grade levels had similar break times, the grade levels sat together to eat anyway. Each grade-level clique tended to be all female, with the exception of one where the participant was the only male. Age did not appear to be a factor either, as some of the youngest participants reported having professional relationships with veteran teachers, including those teachers who were retiring that year. Race, religious affiliations, ethnicity and sexual orientation did not seem to be a factor either in the development of these cliques.

Another reason why this finding is important is that these teachers referred to their grade levels as their support system. Gwen and Carol both alluded to the fact that members of their grade-level collective played a significant role in their decisions to stay at a school or in the career. Carol stated, “If I didn’t have a good support system, I would leave.” Her support system, she said, consisted of her family and her grade level. When I called Gwen in February, she was just returning from a dinner with her grade-level mentor to discuss the next school year. Gwen stated that she was concerned because, of the six teachers in the grade level, three were leaving the school through migration or retirement. She also noted that the number of teachers needed for the next year had been
cut. She was apprehensive about how that would impact her support system for the upcoming year. However, she had no plans to leave. “I’ve put my roots down here, and I don’t want to move any closer to my students.” In this statement, Gwen suggests that she doesn’t want to see students in social situations; however, she moved for this position, and she wanted to build a career in her new town. This may suggest that Gwen doesn’t know how to treat students when not inside the institutional walls. The rules and procedures for dealing with these students have changed; additionally there are no rules for telling teachers how to deal with students beyond the law when in social situations. Since teachers may not be prepared for such interactions, they may tend to shy away from such encounters. Another explanation for this is that once outside the school walls, the individual may perceive that he or she without the power she is used to wielding. Being in a social situation could be seen as confusing the rules and procedures established in the school. (A search for teachers’ conceptions of power when they were in public yielded no results, and is a possibility for further research.)

*Paperwork, Who Said Anything about Paperwork?*

As was frequently reported in the review of the literature (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Met-Life, 2004-5; National Alliance, 2005; NGA, 2002) many novice teachers are inundated with the amount of paperwork that needs to be completed. Paperwork can be viewed as a technique of power for several reasons. First, it normalizes the kind of data that counts as knowledge. For instance, building assessment portfolios for students, as Jane was initially asked to do, takes time away from all the other norms she was required to complete. Developing these portfolios, which requires certain data points, normalizes teachers by telling individuals what counts as knowledge and which students possess this
knowledge. When teachers have to demonstrate that they have completed these portfolios, it also suggests which teachers have followed the norms of the school. Punitive measures can take place for those who resist this disciplining.

Secondly, paperwork also serves to discipline time. Paperwork keeps teachers busy rather than working on more challenging projects that could upset the status quo. Teachers who already have full days often need to take on extra responsibilities, usually without compensation or relief from other duties. Paperwork, as described by participants in this study, was required by duties that included creating and furthering assessment portfolios for students, and administering and scoring standardized, criterion-referenced, and interim tests. It also included participating in fundraisers, giving out biweekly progress reports, taking attendance two times a day, and collecting data for special education documentation. Beverly had to complete “a daily behavior note that is filled out by me and the specialists every hour.” Ken also included the fact that at his school he had three completely different reading programs that he needed to implement in his classroom. The paperwork for planning three different programs was stifling and kept him too busy to think or show initiative. Each program was used for a different reading level. Ken expressed concern over managing the lesson plans for each of these reading programs, and I have thus included his comments in the category of “paperwork.

C-U-R-R-I-C-U-L-U-M

Another concern that Darling-Hammond (2003), Crocco and Costigan (2007) and many others have addressed is the “narrowing of the curriculum” because of No Child Left Behind mandates. Data collected for this study revealed that the novice teachers who participated were all subject to the narrowing of the curriculum. Participants revealed that
they were given guidelines for what to teach. This included benchmarks, “power standards,” portfolio rubrics, scripted curricula, and curricula mapped to particular textbooks. This normalizing practice again tells teachers what counts as knowledge for a student who is in a particular grade in a particular state or county or school. Jane was given a binder that was developed by a veteran teacher/colleague that combined what her district required and the textbooks she had at hand. The norms were established for Jane, and she was expected to implement them. Gwen stated that she thought she had to use these textbooks at the beginning of the year, but was now doing what she wanted because it seemed like everyone else was doing their own thing.

I didn’t think I did [have any freedom] at the beginning of the year. I hate our textbooks so much. I love the supplements, however I don’t agree with the book. They would much rather read novels. We shelved our text books and started doing literature circles. Of course our novels are leveled. I am not sure she [the grade level chair] knows what’s going on. She doesn’t use the reading materials; neither does the second-in-charge. I think the only person who would have a problem is the curriculum coach.

Ken, as I just mentioned, was required to follow the curriculum by using three reading programs to meet the varying levels in the classroom. Beverly appeared to have the most autonomy in her classroom decisions. I suspect it is because her grade level (kindergarten) does not require assessments that impact the school’s designation of making AYP, being “High-Achieving,” or being classified as “At-Risk.” However, even Beverly had benchmarks she was required to use. As I stated earlier, curriculum appeared to be the area that was the most constrained in terms of teacher autonomy, and no one
concealed that fact. Related this time, in February, when asked if college prepared Beverly for teaching, she stated:

The most I can say is that student teaching sort of prepared me but even then not really because I didn’t get hired for the same grade. I don’t feel like my classes prepared me that much because we didn’t really learn how the lessons that align with the curriculum, how to do units that fit into our yearly and monthly lesson plans, what would be the most important thing to teach for certain grade levels and how to teach that effectively. I just think that we could have been prepared a lot more-- it seems like you learn a lot about doing lesson plans that are fully written out over a few pages and you never do that when you are a teacher….there should have been more hands on experience for making lesson plans and ideas that were actually aligned with the curriculum, and they should have gone into each grade level and what it entailed more clearly and how to plan and setup for certain grade levels-- I think that would have helped me a lot more.

This statement was particularly shocking because it advocates the desire of teacher candidates for colleges to teach specifically to the standards that are being adopted in the schools. Beverly feels that she would have benefitted from the strict adherence to norms, and seems to crave the rigidity of the benchmarks. It also speaks to the norms of a grade level, that Beverly feels ill prepared because she completed her student teaching in a different grade level. There is little transference in her mind from grade to grade, and her dependence on alignment demonstrates a desire to operate within the realm of her institutions power.

So, to reiterate a key finding of this study, curriculum is the most constrained area in education, and yet it is one of the few areas where most participants admitted to resisting
directives, though curriculum mandates were the only documented directives they were given. Though I have incorporated some of the techniques at play in the previous paragraphs, these statements were added to make the parallels with discipline more clear to the reader. In fact, Table 8 was constructed first to assist in my understanding of the techniques as they presented themselves. The units of meanings developed in this study were created using Foucault’s techniques of power. In addition, I went back to the original significant statements to provide examples of each of these meaning units. I started by listing each of Foucault’s techniques of power. I then determined which meaning units demonstrated an abuse or a use of a technique of power.

Evidence for some of Foucault’s techniques of power did not appear in my research as a common theme that was found in each of the participants’ experiences with discipline. I will note that not all the techniques were evident, and not all demonstrated were experienced by every participant. However, instances where the majority of the participants endured a similar experience helped identify common traits of being a novice teacher who experiences discipline. Therefore, I deleted some of the themes from the matrix and included them in the footnotes following the matrix.

Instances Where Teachers Were Simultaneously Agent and Subject of Discipline

Some may argue that in all cases, teachers (and in fact members of society) are both agent and subject of discipline. While there may be some credence to this statement, there were several strikingly obvious instances where the teacher was simultaneously the agent and subject of discipline. These instances are very important because they are indicative of a bigger picture; they are sites where institutional power is at play over the entire system.
Table 8: Clusters of Common Themes/ Subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters of meaning: Experiences of Novice Teachers with Discipline using Foucault’s ‘Techniques of power’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject of Discipline</strong>^8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Surveillance/Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Teachers perceive evaluation negatively overall, but by February were more docile about the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Scores on “The Examination” are related to being a ”good” teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mentoring programs are in place, but novice teachers perceive them as problematic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. When the principals were not visible, novice teachers may stray from curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Test scores provide what a ”normal” teacher average should get from her students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mentoring provides the norms for how one should “do” classroom management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Rubrics for evaluation provide an outline of what the normal teacher should be doing in his/her classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Schools had procedures for turning in lesson plans, for posting objectives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Totalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Novice teachers use the pronoun ‘we’ frequently to describe teachers as a whole. (We’re not allowed to wear flip flops).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The collective is often defined as the grade level, and novice teachers perceived their grade level to be their largest professional support system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Cliques had the ability to treat teachers as part of the collective, or to isolate them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Whole school rules that teachers are to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers sometimes asked to break their contract to adhere to principals’ whims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Classification/Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Novice teachers perceive that teachers who are utilizing Alternative Routes to Licensure are classified lower than they are based on abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Grade levels share test scores, and some are posted for all to see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers are classified as HQT. Novice teachers are not able to be highly-qualified by definition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Novice teachers perceive grade level chairs as helpers… enforcers on behalf of busy administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Cliques are often developed from grade-level classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. How principals welcome new staff builds into how one is classified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Mentoring programs often classify those teachers who do the training as the veteran teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Those who did not take mentoring classes were excluded from going up on the pay scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. New teachers are sometimes excluded from cliques at the beginning of the year, until they prove themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^8 Please note that for the teacher as subject of discipline, I did not find the following techniques of power as themes emerging from the data: functional sites and partitioning
Controlling Time and Being Controlled by Time

As stated earlier, Foucault (1977) believed that time can be normalized, and is a technique of power that disciplines bodies. Time was already regulated for participants (i.e. they are subject to the disciplining of time) because they were told how many minutes a day to spend on academic areas. This example demonstrates that these participants were simultaneously the subject and agent of discipline. In addition, time was regulated by academic year, being that specific tests had to be implemented with performance-based consequences. Because of this, teachers reported concerns of not spending enough time on particular contents. That is, they reported stress because they were failing as agents of discipline when they were unable to get a specific area of content mastered by their subjects. This is one way teachers experience discipline when they are its agent. In all interviews, one or more references were made where teachers did not have enough time to teach all the content for mastery. Additionally, participants made comments about students taking too long to transition from one task to another. Jane stated, “I don’t want to stop teaching every 5 minutes,” because “chatty” students were disrupting the flow of instruction. Participants often reported rewarding students for transitioning quickly. Teachers believed there was a way for students to respond physically when they were responding to instruction. Therefore, students who didn’t waste time may have been rewarded. Conversely, those who wasted time by misbehaving were subject to punishment.

Data collected also demonstrated that time was also normalized in school settings where academic learning was not expected to take place. The restroom, the lunchroom, and the playground were all places where time was normalized. For example, two of the
teachers, Jane and Carol, had students fill in a chart when they used the bathroom and students had to write the time they arrived back. Time was being normalized here, once again. Students could see how long other students “take” at the restroom.

Time was also given as a reward to students. Students who behaved well in the lunchroom were given 15 minutes of free time in Carol’s class. (Even the term, “Free Time” for students suggests that the rest of the time has been normalized. Additionally, choices students can make during free time are also normalized.) Those who used their time wisely in Carol’s class received “Fun Friday,” a day where time would be less disciplined. This perceived crunch for time caused anxiety on the parts of teachers and students, as they tried to attain a specified amount of knowledge in their students in a certain amount of time. These stressors included any argument about regulated time, whether the subject was the daily allotment of time, the benchmarks for learning, or the number of weeks before a high-stakes test.

*Entering a School After Day 1*

Another instance where the teacher was both the subject and the agent of discipline affected Carol. Teachers were subjected to the administration’s need to change the composition of their class after the school year had already started. Teachers at her school were given autonomy in selecting students that would be transferred to Carol’s classroom. They were in fact, agents of the composition of Carol’s room. Though Carol was the only participant in this study to have been knowingly affected by this, my own experiences permit me to say this is something that happens with some frequency. Carol was surplusced from a school where she was hired, and was sent to another school. At the second school, teachers were permitted to select the students they wanted to give Carol,
causing her to believe she was given students that the others did not want for the rest of the year. She stated, “The other teachers got to decide who they would send out of the classroom. I have seven behavior children, and several with special needs.” In this instance, the teachers were given power by the administration to select the students that Carol would have to teach for the remainder of the year. In this particular case, Carol perceived this as being an instance where teachers should not have had so much autonomy because she was put in the position of being a novice teacher with a group of students that were homogenous in their grouping as “troubled students.” She reported, “I just wish they mixed it up a little more. In some schools I have seen them use test scores. It just felt like they gave me the kids they wanted to get rid of.” Carol was bothered by this kind of disciplinary practice from her first day at this new school.

Deviating from Curriculum

A third instance where the teachers experienced being subject and agent simultaneously was when they resisted the mandates of the curriculum. They expressed their resistance by deviating from the benchmarks or the curriculum. Benchmarks can serve as long range plans for a teacher. However, in contrast to long range plans that a teacher develops, benchmarks are prescribed by an administrative body, such as a curriculum coordinator or superintendent. The novice teachers in this study were given standards that needed to be taught (this occurred in both school districts). The standards dictated what content needed to be taught at what grade level. For most participants in this study, the benchmarks were broken into six-week periods.

The data suggest that some teachers deviate from benchmarks because of time. However, deviating from benchmarks does warrant its own conversation because time is
the not the only factor that made participants behave in this way. In fact, this was one of the few areas where participants tended to exercise some resistance toward what they were required to do. This resistance is addressed in its own discussion.

Gwen admitted she used all curricula as they were prescribed at the beginning of the year. But by January, she saw that little was being done to enforce how material was to be taught. Gwen’s quote earlier in the chapter describes how she began modifying the prescribed curriculum by the middle of the school year. Gwen was the most ‘rebellious’ of those interviewed, and her reason for abandoning the reading series was because she perceived that the students would enjoy novels more. Other participants were still using the required texts in February, but had supplemented them, especially in math, to better prepare students to take an upcoming proficiency exam. These subjects made comments like, “I feel like it will give my students the upper hand.” Jane said she introduced math concepts earlier than the benchmarks required they be taught because she wanted her students to do well on the test. Only Beverly did not have issues with testing, and that was because she taught kindergarten, where standardized tests were not yet used to determine if schools were making Adequate Yearly Progress.

Beverly, however, did resist instructional strategies that were mandated. When she was told to incorporate more cooperative learning strategies in every content area she stated, “I feel like they are asking too much. I mean I am in full day with 26 students.” Beverly also stated that she felt that in kindergarten, most work was already done cooperatively.

In terms of the teacher serving as agent of discipline, these findings suggest that teachers have several reasons to resist the material they have been subjected to, though it
should be stated that one does not necessarily have to have a “good reason” to resist discipline. Impositions of any kind can be viewed as problematic. Carol and Jane resisted the benchmarks so that their students would perform well on the examination. And while it is argued here that much of the rationale for this comes from the techniques of power at hand when teachers are the subject of this discipline, it is acknowledged here that the students received different instruction that gave them individual advantages on tests. For Gwen’s students, the curriculum was abandoned completely to meet the motivational needs of her students. The data suggested that teachers, who are subjected by curriculum constraints, may resist if, as agent of discipline, they are providing additional advantages (social and/or academic) to the child.

Gwen noted that her students were unmotivated by the basal, and all five participants provided examples where they modified instruction to benefit their students’ performance on the state’s high-stakes test. This point of resistance is interesting in that the teacher who was subjected to a prescribed curriculum, made changes so that students would be privileged to another set of knowledge with the hope that they would outperform other groups of students, or at least that an individual student would appear proficient. This act of resistance has implications on both students and teachers because students end up not coming to the test with the same set of information. Of course, this quest for all students to come to the classroom with only a preprogrammed set of knowledge can never completely happen because other experiences will always inform the students’ prior knowledge. This section of the paper highlighted three instances where the teacher acted simultaneously as agent and subject of discipline.
Description of the Phenomenon using Foucault’s Techniques of Power

Using the data from each of the matrices, it was necessary for me to then describe the phenomenon in terms of Foucault’s techniques of power. To accomplish this task, each of the techniques present was listed and examples of their existence were provided.

**Surveillance/Monitoring**

In terms of being an agent of surveillance, teachers expressed that they were implementing monitoring strategies in their classrooms and in their school. Participants did not provide accounts of buildings being architecturally Panoptical in nature, although each school had video cameras which are considered an element of the “gaze” where students can be monitored at any time. Three teachers named structures that I had introduced in the course I taught. These structures were in the book *Tools for Teachers* by Fred Jones, and were mentioned in previous sections of this study. These structures, whether the subject recalled them or not, were designed to allow the teacher to get to every desk so that students wouldn’t get off task (Jones, 2000). Some participants said they changed the desks in their classroom because their room wasn’t big enough to make the necessary lanes that permitted them easy access to each student. Other ways that participants monitored students was by watching them on video cameras (Beverly), and by monitoring how long students were in the bathrooms (Jane).

In cases where novice teachers were the ones being monitored, evaluation appeared to be the most prominent and consistent way of ensuring that teachers were doing what they were supposed to be doing. In addition, all novice teachers were required to turn in lesson plans to their administrator on a weekly basis. This suggests that teaching content was monitored by the administration, and was a way that teachers were kept in check.
Internally, participants also monitored each other. Statements about the dress code revealed that teachers were critical of those who did not wear something that was considered appropriate in the dress code. Jane stated, “It’s more like gossip. It’s like, ‘Oh, look what’s she’s wearing,’” and Beverly noted, “There’s even a few teachers who wear tennis shoes.” Gwen was the only participant who stated that the administration had attempted to monitor when teachers left school (the principal tried to make everyone stay until 3:30 when contract time specified 3 p.m.), but all acknowledged that they were aware of contact time. Jane acknowledged making herself visible by going through the office on days when she got to work before the administration. In this way Jane, used her own work habits to get the principal to notice that she is a hard worker. Again, if “The Examination” is considered part of surveillance, as Foucault (1977) and King (1995) suggest, then the school where Beverly works also employs surveillance when it posts each teacher’s test scores in the office. Additionally when the grade-level chair came and commented on novice teacher’s class test scores, this was another way to let teachers know that their progress was being monitored. Jane and Gwen were told by the grade-level chairs when their work was good, indirectly, by being told that that their students' test results were good.

Normalization

Schools are certainly institutions of norms (Foucault, 1977; King, 1995; Walshaw, 2007). Norms are established for how one walks, one dresses, one learns, and one teaches. Most norms are unwritten and a novice teacher has to decipher what the norms are. Failure to replicate the norms can result in termination. Results demonstrated that many rules and procedures were implemented in the schools, both for teachers and their
students. In terms of students, participants shared that there were many school rules for students. All participants had a school policy in place for student dress code, and subjects perceived that it was enforced for students. Contrarily, participants made comments about teachers in their respective schools who deviated from the school dress code policy set specifically for teachers. As stated earlier, comments about wearing jeans on a day other than Friday (Ken and Jane) are one way that novice teachers tend to monitor each other. “It’s more like gossip. It’s like, ‘Oh, look what’s she’s wearing,” said Jane. Similarly, Beverly commented, “There’s even a few teachers who wear tennis shoes,” demonstrate that teachers observe and consciously observe these individuals as breaking rules and not following policies. Participants were unaware of administration intervening in situations like this. Other common examples of procedures utilized in participants’ schools were hallway procedures, bathroom procedures, playground procedures, and dismissal procedures.

There was a normalized procedure for students to walk, to talk at certain times, and to talk at a certain volume for every situation. Teachers had common procedures too. One normalized procedure was that lesson plans had to be turned in weekly using established administrator rubrics. Participants were able to allude to such situations. In addition, all participants had established a token economy/reward system. While this is also considered a technique of regulation, it is also a normalizing factor because students were told that they would receive a token if they did what was considered normal for that classroom. This included actions and performance-criteria for behavior and academics. Other features that illustrate how these novice teachers experienced discipline relate strongly to test scores and curriculum. Time to teach material is normalized, and
decisions about what to teach are also normalized through manuals like benchmarks, power standards, and frameworks. These documents tell teachers when they need to teach something and its approximate duration. Jane was even able to add teacher-created documents from her school that aligned adopted textbooks and programs to district guidelines. In addition, it was expected that all students could achieve proficiency in these standards. What this translates into is that there is a standard set of knowledge that students at a particular age are expected to master to obtain proficiency. The tests normalize students themselves. Additionally though, this examination also normalizes the ways teachers teach students. This “narrowing of the curriculum” is documented as a reason teachers leave the profession (Crocco & Costigan, 2007). Another commonality revealed in the data was that the districts had some rubric or checklist to assess teacher performance. The rubric was another way of normalizing staff, to the point where Gwen revealed that the checklist used by her administrator said what should be on walls, and where the grade book should be located. Lastly, only one teacher, Beverly, reported that test scores were posted for all to see. But others certainly reported that their test scores were not kept confidential. They were broadly reported among grade levels, and when one teacher had success in a particular area, the expectation was that everyone would

---

9 Adequate Yearly Progress data suggests a certain amount of growth each year. By 2013-2014, 100% of students in America are expected to be proficient (Nevada Department of Education, 2006, ¶4). At present, the following statistics were available. Dr. Rheault has released the lists of school designations. Out of 613 public schools/programs included in the process, 17 schools have been designated as “Exemplary” and 79 schools have been designated as “High Achieving.” Additionally, 55 Nevada public schools have been designated as being on “Watch,” and 233 Nevada public schools have been designated as “In Need of Improvement” (Nevada Department of Education, 2006, ¶3). Other states have similar deadlines for AYP.
then teach that subject the way that the most successful teacher did. These notions of posting and sharing test results and using them to measure teachers’ success can also be considered a misuse of classification and ranking techniques. Teachers know that their test scores will be made public at their schools. Therefore, it was reported by participants that many sought out grade-level chairs to find out what they could teach that would raise test scores, even if it was not what the normalized curriculum dictated.

In terms of exclusion, teachers used the tactic to remove students from earned benefits, usually participation in some sort of fun activity. Likewise, teachers were excluded from financial incentives when they did not participate in trainings. Lastly, teachers reported instances where they felt excluded and they were definitely conscious of cliques in the school. Gleanings from the data about individuals in specific alternate-route-to-licensure programs, appeared to show that these individuals may be excluded, or at least are classified as inferior because they are perceived as not having the skills the traditional route to licensure people have. These were the main themes that emerged from the data.

**Essential Structure of Experiencing Discipline as Subject**

Most novice teachers are subjected to the same techniques of power in their first year, but each experiences them with their own subjectivities. Participants were starting to test the proverbial water by teaching things they were supposed to teach later, or by using texts that they liked better. In each case, the participants spent their past 7 months figuring out the unwritten rules of the school. For instance each teacher believed that their lessons would be checked weekly (a method of surveillance), so care was taken to do these correctly. Conversely, teachers perceived that administrators were not checking...
up on what they were actually teaching in the classroom, and they were starting to deviate from their scripts.

Summary of the Findings

This chapter summarized the phenomenon of being a novice teacher who experiences institutional and discursive power as the agent and subject of discipline. The central research question was: “How does the novice teacher understand and experience institutional and discursive power, as he or she becomes both the agent and the subject of school discipline?” A succinct answer is that in utilizing the data collected, and analyzing it with a Foucauldian lens, institutional and discursive power exists in their respective institutions, even if this terminology was not utilized in the interview. The novice teacher acts as subject of discipline in several distinct ways. Among them are that (a) They are always feeling controlled by time because of structures imposed upon them; (b) They perceive the grade-level chair as being the most useful person to seek advice from, and they will deviate from institutional norms if the grade level chair recommends it; (c) They perceive standardized tests to be very important and are normalized into altering curriculum to be an “effective teacher” who yields “normal” scores; (d) They seem to go through an initial socialization period, grouping with other new teachers; (e) They are surprised by the amount of paperwork they have to complete, but they don’t seem to question it; and (f) Novice teachers notice when veteran teachers or other novice teachers don’t conform to institutional norms, and they “gossip” about it. In addition, the novice teacher acts as the agent of discipline in many of the ways that he or she is subjected to it. Novice teachers give tokens when students meet the norms, as teachers are given more salary. Participants don’t like being monitored, but tell students cameras
are watching. Some teachers do resist these structures, and in most cases, what they chose to resist varied. The techniques of power were ever present in this study of institutional power.
CHAPTER 7

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*Education is concerned with the bringing forth (educare) of human life. It is thus essentially a “generative discipline, concerned with the emergence of new life in our midst, and what it might hope for in this new life, what it is we might wish to engender* (Jardine, 1992, p. 116).

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to answer the question: “How does the novice teacher understand and experience institutional and discursive power, as he or she becomes both the agent and the subject of school discipline?” Findings from in this phenomenological study revealed that the novice teacher experiences both institutional and discursive power in the workplace. In addition, the teacher experiences discipline, as both its agent and its subject, and often acts as agent in a manner consistent with how he or she is disciplined. Finally, though teachers may share concern over some of these disciplinary structures, all participants reported they would be back for a second year. Data analyses also revealed that novice teachers recognized their dual role, but did not necessarily see how one impacted the other. In general, teachers tended to follow the norms established institutionally for students to adhere to, but resisted in instances such as changing the curriculum when they believed students would find these modifications more motivational or beneficial to high-stakes testing.
As the agent of discipline, participants perceived that they were enforcing school rules and that these rules made sense. They believed that classroom management was an important element of teaching and seemed to agree with the norms established at their respective schools. No participant stated that he or she would change any of the rules/policies in place for students both in their class and in their schools. In general, as the agent of discipline, the novice teacher perceived stress about having enough time and sometimes deviated from instructional directives, believed there were appropriate physical mannerisms that a student needed to present to learn or to be obedient, and established reward systems when students followed norms of the classroom or school.

In contrast, as the subject of discipline, novice teachers followed the advice of the grade-level chair more than any other school authority, found mentoring programs of little value, found administration to be invisible, disliked standardized testing, experienced disciplining in evaluations, and had varied experiences being welcomed into a new school culture. They perceived institutional power as being hierarchical, and that the grade-level chair was the gateway from which power flowed between administration and teachers. This individual was considered expert, more than any other person in the building or in any text that they read. This finding strongly suggests that the role of the grade-level chair ought to be studied more closely.

What is most apparent in this research is that the pressures put upon the teacher’s body to have him or her conform to norms that may be unrealistic (such as 100% proficiency on standardized tests in 2014) is only going to increase the gap between the teachers we have and the teachers we need. Not only does this research suggest that teachers may leave the field of teaching, but this study also found that at the micro level,
teachers are replicating norms that are short-term fixes, and the macro level this kind of instruction is taking away from the broader aims of preparing individuals to work and live in a democratic society. These teachers are being trained only to follow the rules put in place by their governments or institutions and accept them willingly. These short-term fixes do not allow for critical thinking, for thinking deeply about human rights and what kinds of individuals we are creating. In addition, as the literature review suggested (Hehnke, Chan & Geis, 2000), the best and brightest tend to leave the field, with some indication that the reasons they leave relate to how their body has been disciplined.

**Summary of the Study in Relation to the Literature Review**

After analyzing all the available data, the findings of the study were compared with the findings of the review of literature. Teacher-turned-author John Taylor Gatto stated, “Our problem in understanding forced schooling stems from an inconvenient fact: that the wrong it does from a human perspective is right from a systems perspective.” This statement sums up the findings of this study in that what works for institutional power can serve as a detriment to the people it serves. Yes, it is true that power has no connotation, and yes, this is still true of institutional and discursive powers. However, discipline, a small subset of power, seems to show that both teachers and students’ bodies are made docile through the mechanisms used to bring order to schools. The literature review of the history of discipline in schools is fairly consistent with the work Foucault presented in prisons. By this I mean to say that in education and crime alike, a move was made from physical punishment to psychological punishment. The only difference seems to be this move was made substantially earlier than it was for schools. This study found that teachers still engage in these techniques of power when disciplining students. This
study also found that teachers tend to agree with the methods used to control students’ bodies, agreeing with the norms established for the students. However, when subjected to discipline, participants resisted the norms relating to curriculum and questioned many of the procedures put in place for them to follow. The participants interviewed exhibited stress, anxiety, or disdain for many of the issues the teachers who left the field were upset about. For instance, the findings of Crocco and Costigan (2007), Gonzales (2007), and LePage et. al (2005) suggest that classroom management, student behavior, teacher busy work, and lack of administrative support are the main reasons teachers leave the profession. Though no participant anticipated quitting after his or her first year, the fact remains that in this study, these participants were concerned with these same issues. The commonalities and differences of the data are presented below. For instance, concerns about autonomy, paperwork, and classroom behavior are frequently cited by teachers in exit interviews (Darling-Hammond, 2003). These same concerns were present in my research. And although these individuals did not plan to leave the field, four of the five subjects in June admitted they had questioned their decisions to become a teacher at some point in their current school year. What distinguished this study from others is that it sought to find commonality in the reasons why teachers left the field. By looking at the way power flows through and across the teacher’s body, one explanation of the commonality can be explained through the techniques of power. While discipline to Foucault (and power as well) are not necessarily negative or oppressive, they can certainly be applied in this way. This study revealed how the techniques of power were articulated, and that most often they presented themselves in a way such that beginning teachers took issue with them.
Discussion

What this study initially confirmed for me was a suspicion that in the everyday life of teachers, students, and administrators, school and learning is subjugated by disciplinary practices where they are both agents and subjects of discipline. There are simply too many rules, too many norms, discussed and executed, that create both positive and negative outcomes. Gatto wrote, “Ordinary people send their children to school to get smart, but what modern schooling teaches is dumbness” (2006, p. xxix). This “dumbness” is transformed into the minds of students by making them, “indoctrinated, their minds conditioned with substantial does of commercially prepared disinformation dispensed for tranquilizing purposes” (p. xxx). The research presented in this study found that students do have their minds and bodies conditioned, using Foucault’s terminology, made docile by the incessant repetition of following rules and procedures. Participants reward students for holding their bodies a specific way when they move about the classroom. Teachers are rewarded when they sit through these indoctrinating lectures reinforcing the norms of the district. Discussions about curriculum, behavior, innovation, testing, all revolve around what the rules are and, subsequently, decisions made by the teacher to go along with the rules or to resist them. There are several sites in schools where power is concentrated in a small group of people who are hierarchically positioned above the role of school teacher. Yes, Foucault says power circulates, but when a teacher’s career depends on following specific sets of institutional rules, power is manipulated to make teachers feel powerless. This misuse of power, in short, is what I continue to believe leads to teacher attrition. To make connections between the data and practice, the following implications were considered: (a) how these affect the teacher
and; (b) How does this knowledge impact the field of education -- especially higher education where the next generation of teachers is being prepared -- teacher attrition, and new-teacher induction programming? The following section provides discussion of these implications.

As Agent of Discipline

The primary factor that beginning teachers in this study perceived to be important was classroom management; they all used a system of rewards to get their students to respond in a particular way. H.L. Menken wrote in 1924 that:

The aim of public education is not to spread enlightenment at all; it is simply to reduce as many individuals as possible to the same safe level, to breed and train a standardized citizenry, to put down dissent and originality. (in Gatto, 2006, p. 1)

And although as a teacher I employed this same system, the more I listened to participants talk about their systems, the more I viewed classroom management as Foucault’s description of taking peasants and making docile their bodies so they would be soldiers (1977). These tokens were reinforcers that bred and trained students to behave in a particular way. Alfie Kohn (1995) calls these systems of rewards and punishments “control by seduction” because students are being rewarded or bribed into acting in specific ways. Kohn (1995) acknowledged that they work in the short-term, but states that they have long-lasting negative effects. Teachers said they used these methods to motivate students to achieve, but as Kohn (1995) suggests “it’s remarkable how often educators use the word motivation when what they mean is compliance. Indeed, one of the fundamental myths in this area is that it's possible to motivate somebody else” (p. 2).
Kohn’s criticism of token systems is consistent with the conceptualization of Foucault and the findings of this study. Teachers regulate every action in an attempt to mechanize student behavior. Students hear a bell that signals the end of the day. They then follow a set of procedures such as stacking their chair or lining up in a specified order. Their mind is disciplined into believing that these are the ways students should act in school and possibly that they should be rewarded for only operating within the rules of the authority. As Kohn (1995) suggested, it may be argued that students are bribed. Through a Foucauldian lens, I now argue that these tokens are actually compensation for making docile one’s body, a bribe to lessen one’s resistance against the institutional power that is at play. When Jane and Gwen both acknowledged that their students were no longer responding in the way they wanted, both wanted to increase the fines in each instance when students didn’t behave in a certain way. Again, it was as if students no longer saw their loss of individual freedoms as being worth two tokens. Their attempts to resist caused the teachers to revalue their token systems, but not to reevaluate them. Students all understood the rules and procedures for operating normally in their school. Participants seemed to care about children walking down the hall appropriately, which I would argue is because this is the one time in the teaching day where other teachers and personnel can easily monitor how children move throughout the school. It was interesting to see that when subjected to discipline, teachers in the JSD were asked to attend workshops if they wanted to move ahead on the salary scale. It seems a token system can be applied to teachers as well. Some will argue that merit pay and President Obama’s desire to “pay for performance” will be another token system applied to teachers and administrators. A March 10, 2009 presidential press release states, “The President will [impact] teacher
quality by dramatically expanding successful performance pay models and rewards for effective teachers, scaling up federal support for such programs in up to an additional 150 school districts nationwide (¶14)” It seems the token system will continue, affecting the norms of teaching at a national level.

Teachers employed strategies that were designed to normalize instruction. This was demonstrated when I asked Jane how she set up her classroom and the first two words from her mouth were “Harry Wong.” And although the other teachers didn’t cite him directly, their descriptions of setting up their classroom were spot-on Harry Wong prescribed. Additionally, when I asked Carol how she set up her classroom, she said she used the “Elongated E” recommended by Fred Jones (2000). Others also cited Jones’ work. These novice teachers used the quick fixes set forth by others, and as this study indicates, they did not resist by finding alternative methods that permitted more student autonomy. Foucault (1977) explained “The organization of the serial space was one of the great technical mutations of elementary education…It made the educational space function like a learning machine, but also a machine for supervising, hierarchizing, rewarding (p. 147).” The classroom set-up here is designed to normalize the ways classrooms look and feel. They are designed for specific kinds of learning to take place.

Another factor that affected how participants established their classroom management was controlling and being controlled through time. Time was a factor in that transitions took as little time as possible, that teachers could get from one student’s desk to another quickly and easily, and that time was segmented to cover course materials and test material to help students get high scores on tests. Carol stated that she moved her desks so that with a “quick turn” students could be immediately in groups.
The data implies that this teaching-to-the-test phenomenon occurs beyond classroom management. Teachers are teaching students specific knowledge for success on the standardized examination, as Jane noted, “To give them an upper hand.” What this does is narrow the curriculum for the benefit of the institution, but at what cost? Do students learn more, but lack deeper understanding? Do they learn specific isolated skills because some are statistically more likely to be required on the test than others? How do we measure this, if the goal is to improve the scores on the standardized tests? Is there a way to measure what skills they are not learning? As agent of discipline, teachers are controlling who gains what knowledge. The purpose, according to my research, seems to be largely for the benefit of the test. Alfie Kohn (2001) wrote, “We must make our fight against standardized testing our top priority because, until we have chased this monster from the schools, it will be difficult, perhaps even impossible, to pursue the kinds of reforms that can truly improve teaching and learning” (p. 350).

As Subject of Discipline

The teacher has been subjected to institutional norms in myriad practices. The practices reported in this study are many of the same ones reported by teachers who have left the field. Though the participants all planned on returning to their school, as stated in their interviews during June of their first year, it is conceivable that these institutional practices could eventually cause a teacher to leave the field or the district in which they work. Likewise, over time, they may find ways to exercise resistance and find a balance that they can live with professionally.

Among the issues that affected the teacher when they were subject of discipline were: (a) evaluations as surveillance; (b) the amount of paperwork/busywork necessary to
complete; (c) a norm of resisting the institution, but listening to the grade-level chair; (d)
a shared belief that mentoring programs were ineffective; (e) a belief that teachers have
autonomy when the administrator is physically out of the building; and (f) the pressures
associated with standardized testing, negotiation of cliques in the workplace, and the
dissatisfaction with a prescribed curriculum.

Surveillance

Surveillance in schools took place in a more covert manner than perhaps Jeremy
Bentham’s Panopticon may have prescribed. In terms of physical monitoring,
participants did not seem to worry about video cameras as a means of always being
monitored, but they did report that the physical building administrator was viewed as the
sovereign, and not a docile body, following the rules of a district or other body. Some
participants, like Gwen, responded that she resisted the curriculum when the building
administrator was physically out of the building. No participants provided commentary
that suggested they feared being caught or reported. Participants did report some anxiety
over being evaluated as well, though some questioned the value of feedback, like Gwen,
and others did not, like Beverly.

While it was clear that participants viewed the building administrator and grade-level
chairperson as people who monitored them, they also reported other ways that they were
monitored. For example, the practice of publicly posting standardized test scores was
different in each school, but their ability to be a dividing practice seemed shared. In
Beverly’s school, test scores were posted so teachers could see how others had done. And
although they were explicitly told they were not posted for competition, it was apparent
that teachers did view this practice as a way to rank teacher performance and monitor
each other. Getting feedback from grade-level chair people is another way to evaluate novice teacher performance. Nationally, there have been cases of teachers and administrators cheating to raise test performance on high-stakes tests (Bohlin, Durwin, & Reese-Weber, 2009). As long as these tests are used as evaluations of teachers’ performance, and sometimes the sole measure of teacher performance, cheating and anxiety for teachers will not subside. This is why I argue again that the role of the grade-level chair ought to be closely examined.

Another site of surveillance for respondents was paperwork. King (1995) wrote that teachers complete much paperwork, such as the creation of weekly lesson plans, long range plans and progress reports for the administrator—and they are a form of surveillance no matter how little they are read by others. While participants commented on the amount of paperwork required, the data collected doesn’t suggest that they view these documents as a source of monitoring. Research (Gonzales, 2007) though, has shown that teachers who have had their time and performance disciplined may choose to leave the field.

Mentoring programs are another source for surveillance and normalization. Research provided by Hanson and Muir (2008) and Wang and Odell, (2008) report wide success with mentoring programs being successful in helping retain novice educators. Their importance in this matter should not be overlooked. It is, however, important to also recognize that these mentoring programs do have the ability to act as another site for the dispersing of institutional power. Participants in this study appeared to find mentoring programs ineffective. It was evident that Carol viewed mentoring programs as just “one more thing” to do in a busy schedule. Others, like Jane, reported that it was duplicative of
her college experience, and was therefore a poor use of her time as well. Both of these teachers’ comments could point to resistance toward the program because it is simply reinforcing norms that they believe they have learned elsewhere. It should be reported here, that teachers did regularly attend these mentoring workshops, and that the added financial reward may have been a factor in their attendance. One may consider, with that aspect, if the extrinsic reward here is aimed at teacher compliance. An implication from the data collected here is that perhaps there needs to be differentiated instruction for mentoring programs, because not all novice teachers need the same level of support. I also wonder if once the extrinsic reward is removed, teachers will still continue to carry out the normalizing practices they are being instructed to try, or if they will self monitor so that external rewards or surveillance is not required.

Normalization

As subject of discipline, there were dozens of normalizing practices that took place in the schools where participants worked. Normalizing practices are those practices that seem normal and natural and go unquestioned (Foucault, 1977). As the subject of discipline, novice teachers took part in creating weekly lessons, following benchmarks and curricula (for the most part), creating lessons that lasted a specified duration, and dressing according to school rules--and did not question why they had to comply with these procedures. Teachers tended to resist these normalizing practices if they thought they could affect student achievement on standardized tests, but in most cases, they followed the school rules. As Foucault stated (1988), it is often easier to follow institutional practices than to resist them.
Individuals who align themselves with the conventions of the classroom attain a certain state of happiness, purity, or wisdom (in terms of Foucault’s [1988b] definition of technologies of the self, p. 18). They do not get in trouble; they learn what they are supposed to learn: they’re likely to get nice feedback, and most importantly, they show themselves in positive lights that shine into their futures. But, individuals who resist the conventions of the classroom appear as having further “needs” to be met. (Hammerberg, 2004, p. 373)

For a novice teacher, it is understandable that many would not want to call into question practices when they want to retain a new job. It should be reiterated though, that they did not even call into question these normalizing practices with the investigator. They simply saw these practices are part of a teacher’s job.

Classification

When discussing Carol in Chapter 6, and the situation where she is assigned to a class of students with behavioral issues, perhaps this scenario would be viewed as “trial by fire,” or even “hazing” of new teachers. But this example is important because it demonstrates that teachers do sometimes act apart from a collective. Teachers sometimes classify themselves as experienced and deserving of better students or better classrooms simply because they have been at a site longer. If novice teachers are given the worst possible teaching situations, then it is understandable why the novice teacher attrition rate is higher than the overall average.
Discursive practices

As I stated, I wanted to understand how these experiences are experienced by the novice teacher. These experiences demonstrate that participants perceive power as discipline, and that it is handed down in a hierarchical fashion, consistent with tenets of institutional power. I believe novice teachers spend their first year “testing the waters,” resisting in very small ways, and that these teachers don’t yet observe a cyclical nature of power, by which I mean to say that they haven’t realized their own abilities to resist what has been forced upon them. I believe, given the data collected, that these teachers view the administrators as having the power over the teachers, and that the grade-level chair resides in the middle as the gateway for the dissemination of information. The teacher then, has power over her students and she uses the codes enforced at the school to support her “docilization” of the body. For Foucault, institutional power is exercised through disciplining the body and mind. This includes how schools and those who are part of each school community have their individual space, time, and movement and ideas constrained. There is most certainly a negative connotation to making the body docile in this way.

Although the teachers would perceive the hierarchical structure as top-down and oppressive, I did find some experiences of power where power-knowledge circulated. The most significant cases in the data were when students in these classes stopped behaving appropriately when the reward wasn’t worth it, in their minds. This caused two teachers to restructure the value of their tokens. But I believe that if this study continued through the rest of the year, or if it focused on how the teacher actually did commence her second year, that the effects of the power exercised by students could be described.
What happens when there is no amount of tokens that can satisfy a student? Does the teacher make the students’ bodies more docile, or does she make changes and privilege the students’ voice. More importantly, what happens to these individuals when extrinsic rewards and punishments are removed? How do they behave with their new teacher who doesn’t use them, or when they take on their first job? Addressing these questions and seeing how these scenarios play out would be another interesting research opportunity. I do believe, however, that perception is everything when it comes to teacher attrition and the elements of power that teachers believe are at play. This is because these perceptions will make a teacher decide to stay, migrate, or leave the profession. Erica McWilliam (2004) suggested that:

The desire to teach, or teacher motivation, or the pleasure of teaching, is, as Foucault reminds us, not a spontaneous inner feeling (though it is often held or felt to be so), but a product of training individuals in particular ways of thinking, speaking, and doing as a “proper” teacher. (p. 147)

Novice teachers who have left the field report a number of reasons why they no longer have the desire for teaching. For some novice teachers, the argument that one can resist the techniques of power doesn’t seem plausible if they believe that they will be fired or excluded for not taking part in the normalized operations of the school. For others, it may be that it is simply easier to conform. In this study, institutional power occurred when grade-level chairs told novices how to succeed on the examination, and deviations from a constrained curriculum were employed. It is ironic though, because teachers have little incentive to perform well; that is, they are usually not paid in
proportion to their job performance. However, many are scrutinized for students’ poor results on standardized tests.

In summary, this study serves an important purpose, to describe the perceptions of novice teachers as they experience discipline. The study can be used to inform research on teacher attrition. Like Foucault, I do not believe my research substantiates a “truth” of experiences for first-year teachers. In acknowledging that these disciplinary techniques are still present and may be escalating as new pressures emerge, this research may serve to alert the educational community that the concerns of teachers who left the field are shared by some novice teachers just entering the field.

Outcomes: Toward A Less Docile Body

This study stemmed from personal experience and frustration with the state of education since No Child Left Behind, though this research informed me that these issues were intermittent in educational history. My career as a teacher was filled with stress, anxiety, and disdain when my personal expectations of what a teacher did failed to match my realities in the classroom. My docile body affected every facet of my professional life. As an instructor, I even sought to replicate this normalizing process. I followed the norms set by my university and instructed my class of future teachers as if there would be no new demands on them, despite the recent push toward increased accountability. I was in a relatively unique position of seeing a split-screen. That is, I had the ability to observe and instruct pre-service teachers getting ready to enter the field; while at the same time, I could also see these individuals as they worked through their first year of teaching. Because this study is one of the few that privileges the voices of the beginning teachers (Huntley, 2008), and is also one where the participants were also my students, it was
absolutely essential for me to reconsider the way I teach my college classes. As stated in
chapter 4, two sub-questions were generated that would inform my own instruction. They
were: (a) “Once a former college student leaves my classroom, how does he or she come
to establish and maintain classroom management protocols, and what are the factors that
impact these decisions?” and b) “How can this information inform my own college
teaching?” The outcomes provided by this study, as they relate to these two questions, are
provided below.

Once a former college student leaves my classroom, how does s/he come
to establish and maintain classroom management protocols, and what are
the factors that impact these decisions?

Most teachers instruct a child and never know what happens once that child leaves
their classroom or school. I liken the experience to filling a boat with supplies, and then
waving from a pier, never knowing if the boat made its intended destination. For years, I
taught pre-service students and once they left my classroom, I didn’t know what they
would take with them. To be honest, I figured that my course would have had little
impact on their teaching career, as they took it when they were second-semester
sophomores or first-semester juniors. I knew they still had a classroom management
course to take, as well as student teaching to complete. I did not anticipate, at all, how
much my participants had taken away from my course. One interesting note was that all
the participants stated that they kept the texts from the class, and that they utilized these
books in their own teaching. Participants also stated they implemented a token economy
and that they first learned about this from my course. While most professors would be
contented to hear that their instruction had been internalized by their students, the feeling
for me is bittersweet. If there is a positive, it is that I gave the students the information they needed for membership into a culture that I had been a part of for 10 years. They knew the right researcher names, the buzz words, and the tricks and tools they would need to appear competent (at least in the short-term) and to get them, hired. They may have even received decent evaluations, and this knowledge assisted in keeping them employed with their school districts for their first year. Though, as Alfie Kohn (1995), Ronald Butchart (1998) and others have suggested, this kind of instruction is only beneficial in the short-term. The negative in this, is that I contributed to a practice of normalizing teachers’ bodies so that they all did things a particular way. David Jardine (1992) may have put it best:

One could say that a predatory job market and adverse economic conditions have turned education more and more toward the development of marketable skills and away from a liberal education, which has come to be rather vaguely equated with not knowing how to do anything. (Jardine, 1992, p.116)

As Butchart (1998) stated, we who have attended school in the last 50 years, were in the post-progressive era where short-term means and instant gratification were the norms modeled according to a consumer mindset. Having grown up in this era, and then teaching is this era, I never looked before at the big picture. My expectations of school were normalized from the time I started kindergarten, and they were refined through local control at every school I attended or worked at. So, when I taught a course that highlighted classroom management, I was quick to offer simple strategies to get teachers through the day. There is no one correct way to teach a group of children. Just as there
are varied learning styles, there are varied teaching styles. There is also no benefit in completely ignoring the long-term. When we force a particular way of teaching and call it best practices, we are providing a short-term solution. When the short-term solution doesn’t satisfy beginning teachers, and if they are unable to see the big picture, we are limiting the possibilities for those individuals and we may lose them as teachers.

As their professor, I shared with them anecdotes and artifacts from my own classroom, where I was considered an effective classroom manager by my administrators. I introduced students to a token economy and provided them with a how-to guide for success in administering this. All the while, I promoted the interests of the institutions, and in some ways, I provided them with the “truths” I normalized in my own practice. As someone who taught present teacher candidates while these students were in elementary school, it is all too shocking to see how little initiative and creativity they have in their teaching careers. Rather, they want to know the rules. I honestly believe my college students don’t even expect autonomy anymore. I dare to say that for many current teacher candidates, the normalizing practice they take with them is to subordinate creative approaches and teaching critical thinking and skills that matter in a democracy. Rather, teachers find simple ways to teach to the test and to make students behave in specific ways. I can only wonder what practices this new generation of teachers will replicate in the classroom.

This research awakened in me the need for teaching college students about discipline, as well as helping teachers to develop the goals of democracy in students rather than making students uniform and offering “quick fixes.” Popkewitz (1997) stated that “The purpose of education is “to save the child for (democratic) society and to rescue society
through the child” (p. 91). My experiences and research reiterate the concern that without returning to this purpose, society may not be saved.

The second research question I asked was: “How can this knowledge better inform my own college instruction?” The initial answer to this is that my instruction, while examining classroom management protocols, will always address the ways that each system affects all players involved. My students will examine the techniques of power, and will consider their implications. They will strive for self-management without compromising their own philosophies rather than following normalizing practices of a particular institution. These students need to understand what it means to question what they are being told. They will be taught to compare the outcomes and human costs of using a particular methodology, rather than just being given a quick panacea--a one-size-fits-all approach. I want students to examine the possibilities in education rather than the constraints. They will need to examine their practices and think them through. For instance, when is monitoring needed, how is it to be done, when is it excessive, and how else might it be accomplished, and most importantly, to what end is this monitoring done? Knowing that they themselves feel uncomfortable being monitored, they should never use as a threat to their students. At this point, I struggle with how to have students resist disciplinary practices that cause them pain or injustice because the reality is that the current system imposed on teachers can yield punitive action or termination for teachers who refuse to take part in activities that continue to discipline. Even Angelo Patri had to leave his school to find one more similar in educational philosophy. I am not sure that the system is so constrained that this can happen in this day and age. For instance, the teacher
who refuses to give the standardized test will surely be considered obstinate and will most likely be fired. It is important to note that this is only form of resistance.

The most crucial finding of this study, for me, is that teacher preparation training and teacher induction programs must be mindful of discipline. Teaching students a number of strategies and programs may be well and fine, but if this is the only instruction given, these novice teachers will never teach for democracy and never practice the aims of creating well-prepared young men and women. Rather, they will survive each day, doing a couple of juggling tricks that were suggested in their teacher preparatory classes. These practices will make docile bodies, never producing free-thinking individuals who can determine what knowledge is on their own. Teachers need to be aware that there ought to be choice in making oneself docile, not simply accepting it as part of the job. What seems to be missing in novice teacher education is the need to complete self and social reflection.

While I do believe that it is my duty to continue teaching a variety of strategies, there will be a major paradigm shift in my approach. Perhaps what needs to happen is that thinking deeply about issues should be normalized in the profession, rather than the quick fixes. Teachers, as a professional body, need to be aware of the “truth in education” and be cautious. Norms of schools should be organized to make us more aware of power and its ability to construct reality. The works of New York Schoolmaster Angelo Patri, researcher Ronald Butchart, and philosopher Michel Foucault have brought about change in my own educational philosophy--a change that took a long time to articulate.

Therefore, perhaps this research could best be utilized by policy makers, administrators, and those in teacher preparation programs, who need to value the voices
of novice teachers and realize that an army of docile teachers is not going to produce the kinds of learners and thinkers who are needed to maintain a free-thinking democratic society.

Conclusions

The research study conducted here provides insight into the perceptions of novice teachers as they experience discipline. It is evident that they endure experiences that have caused longer-tenured teachers to quit. The novice teachers in this study tended to comply with the rules they were asked to follow, and did not tend to question them. In some instances, participants even acted to discipline in the way they themselves were subjected to it. After one year, participants seemed contented with their assimilation into their school, and not one participant quit in his or her first year. While this study demonstrates that these participants were subject to a number of the stresses that teachers have stated as reasons for leaving the profession, these participants had signed on for a second year.

Given this period of widespread educational change, especially with respect to political policies like the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the constraining of curriculum and loss of teacher autonomy gives the perception that numerous factors are influencing the attrition rate. Jones (1994) highlighted the concerns shared by novice teachers. Among these concerns were: (a) managing classrooms and disciplining students; (b) conducting parent conferences; (c) working as a member of a teaching team; (d) coping with the frustration of not being successful with every student; (e) motivating students; (f) addressing individual differences; (g) preparing for the school day; and (h) grading student work. Information about testing pressure did not show up in
these concerns, and it is largely because of the time when these pieces of data were collected. 1994 precedes the No Child Left Behind legislation. Crocco and Costigan (2007) found that the new accountability pressures are of concern to novice and veteran teachers alike. In the data collected for this study, it was evident that many of Jones’ 1994 stressors were still present. Of the factors just listed by Jones, the only factor that did not come up consistently with my subjects, was preparing for the school day. Perhaps this is because most knew exactly what they had to teach. (Only Ken, who had to coordinate multiple reading programs, really expressed disdain in this area.) In addition to these pressures, the participants most definitely were concerned with meeting test score requirements (Only Beverly did not directly feel the pressure, as she taught kindergarten. However, it was her school where test scores were posted for all to see “how everyone’s progressing.”)

Lack of administrative support has also been a factor in teacher migration and attrition. Brock and Grady (1997) found that novices expected administrators to orient them to the community of the school, aid teachers in classroom management, and build teacher-mentor programs. My data revealed that while administrators were the ones who hired them and evaluated them, the duties Brock and Grady identified were perceived as being duties performed by teachers, especially the grade-level chair. The importance of the chair in each of these scenarios cannot be underestimated. Again, I believe it is crucial that the role of the grade-level chair, their ideas about mentoring novice teachers, and the decision as to who gets this position need to be reexamined.

To return to Foucault’s conception of power as being able to produce truth and be positive (1979; 1980), what this research concludes is that these novice teachers tend to
be comforted by the rules and procedures. It is important not to overgeneralize, but it appears from this study that those who enter education may be more willing to be compliant. They do not tend to question rules that they are asked to impose upon students. In most cases, participants did not verbalize any kind of resistance that they undertook, but further research could be done to see how these teachers cope with the strict structure they are both disciplining with and disciplined by. Participants believe in their behavior modification systems, and they are not planning to leave the field of education. A possible explanation is that individuals who crave the structure of a system with many rules and procedures choose to become teachers.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study described the experiences shared by first year teachers who are being normalized and disciplined. It highlights their experiences as both the subject and the agent of discipline. The goal of this research was never to fix the ‘teacher attrition problem;’ rather, it was to explain the perceptions of these teachers who are just entering the field and to examine what it means to maintain a dual role of being both agent and subject of discipline. This study observed only individuals with the same position, that of a first-year teacher. This study points to the necessity of involving other groups to see the whole cyclical nature of institutional power in education. I believe there are several key areas where additional research could be carried out. Some of these recommendations are:

1. A similar study could be conducted that examines the perceptions of administrators who are experiencing institutional and discursive power, especially in cities where there is a large district entity. It could be inferred here that the principal is
the sole creator and manipulator of the techniques of power. Of course, this is not true. A study that examines how school principals are both the agent and subject of institutional and discursive power is essential in pulling the lens back further to see an even bigger picture. To better understand the institutional power of administration means examining the discourses they are part of, both within and beyond the physical school.

2. A study could be conducted to explore how students perceive power in this age of accountability. As in the first suggestion, remembering that power is circulating and that everyone involved in a particular institution has power at some times, it would be interesting to also examine the student as agent and subject of discipline. For example, the high school student who colors heart patterns on the Scantron test is resisting. What are the factors and reasons why they resist?

3. A study examining the role of the grade-level chair should be completed, including how schools determine who has this position and what the aims of the position are. A key finding of this study is that the grade-level chair tends to employ the techniques of power over his or her novice teachers. The dual role of the grade-level chair is one that needs to be better examined, especially in determining what kind of individual should hold this position.

4. A study could be conducted analyzing school systems that have low novice teacher attrition rates compared to those with high attrition rates, and describing experiences of novice teachers in each of these areas. This study examined only five students in the same general vicinity of the United States. A study that made use of a bigger sample size with schools that fit these attrition descriptions would be another way to further this study.
For my own edification, I plan on replicating this study with individuals who are student teaching, and then carrying it through over their first five years of teaching. From the current study, it seems that novices initially resisted the norms they felt constrained to follow, but ended the year satisfied that they had made it through their first year. I want to see if individuals can beat the common statistic of quitting in 5 years. I also plan to further my understanding of disciplinary practices and of how higher education courses are constructed. This study has assisted me in reconsidering the goals of higher education. Other considerations that this work did not consider, and I want to draw from are importance of gender in this work, as well as the context. Would the results of this study be different if I examined a group of middle school teachers or high school teachers? Initial research from Carol Midgely, Eric Anderman, and Lynley Hicks (1995) suggests that there are tremendous differences in philosophies of elementary and middle school teachers, and this would be another key way to explore the questions generated in this study.

My future work may involve use of other forms of phenomenology as Creswell’s structure, while very helpful in structuring my findings, was a bit too regimented in itself. I plan on examining the phenomenological work of Adrian Van Kaam.

In summation, education is in crisis. Individuals are leaving the profession in record numbers, and vacancies continue to increase. Many Band-Aids have been applied to try and put teaching bodies in these classrooms, but the government continues to add regulations that make it more difficult to staff these classrooms. Research states that 18% of new college graduates leave the profession within the first 5 years of teaching (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2001) and that number increases for teachers
hired in urban areas. There are numerous factors that contribute to the high attrition rate. Some are classroom management/student behavior problems, and others deal with how teachers do not have the autonomy they perceived they would have. Five novice teachers were interviewed for this study. Each participant struggled with classroom management, accountability, and figuring out expectations at his or her school. I am alarmed by the fact that they perceived problems that match the main reasons teachers quit, according to my broader research. In February, three stated that if not for their support systems, they would be miserable and/or would leave. By the end of the year, after the testing cycle was complete, participants were relieved they made it through.

Understanding these experiences and perceptions is a first step that is often neglected. Those completing research in this area tend to do quantitative work. However, it is through the rich description of the personal experiences and perceptions that all sides of an issue can be considered, hopefully lessening teacher attrition. Teacher empowerment research will continue to act against constraints of accountability; it is not clear who will win. It is these small corners of the school where power and discipline will be examined, and where meaning will be constructed.
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INFORMED CONSENT FORM

September, 2007

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS
FRANKLIN PIERCE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Title of the Study: Agent and Subject of Discipline: How the Novice Teacher Experiences Institutional and Discursive Power

Background: My name is Lynn Chandler, and I was your professor for a course you took while completing your undergraduate degree. I have been a teacher for nine years, and I am currently researching novice teachers for my dissertation in Curriculum and Instruction.

Purpose: You are being asked to participate in a research study because you are a novice teacher and a former student of mine. I want to know more about your beliefs about classroom management and discipline as you experience your first year teaching. I also want to know what influences your decisions. I have chosen former students because we have established some rapport, and your ability to be candid is essential.

Procedures: As a volunteer, you will be participating in a series of interviews, that will likely take place over the phone. Your involvement should take no more than three hours in total.

Benefits: As a participant, you will be informing the field of curriculum and instruction. This is the kind of grassroots work that has to be done for changes to be made. In addition, you will have the ability to talk to a “veteran” teacher and have the opportunity to vent in an environment where your confidentiality anonymity will be valued.

Confidentiality: Pseudonyms will be used in all writing related to this study. Records will be maintained for a period of three years. Your emails should be sent primarily through personal emails, as opposed to work emails to aid in maintaining confidentiality.

Right to refuse: Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from this study at any time. You will receive the dissertation before it is defended, and have the opportunity to change your quotations if necessary.

Questions: If you have any questions, please contact me, Lynn Chandler, at 603-903-0267. I have read the above information agree to participate in the research study.

_______________________________    _________________________________
Signature of participant                Printed Name
Greetings Ms. Chandler,

Thank you for submitting your research protocol to the Franklin Pierce College Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB has approved your research protocol (The Agent and Subject of Discipline: How the Novice Teacher Experiences Foucault’s Techniques of Power).

Sincerely,

Leslie Inglis, Chair
Franklin Pierce College
Institutional Review Board
APPENDIX III

INTERVIEW 1 QUESTIONS

Hello! I want you to know that right now our phone conversation is not being recorded, so I can take down some personal information. However, I will be taping most of our conversation. I will let you know when I am going to start taping. The material that is taped will be coded to ensure your anonymity. The actual transcripts will only be read by my chair and myself. I will go to great lengths to protect your privacy and that of your schools. Do you have any questions?

Again, I am not taping right now.

Can you tell me your age?

Where are you teaching?

What grade are you teaching?

Did you do your student teaching at this school?

OK, I will be hitting the start button to tape starting now. This is Lynn Chandler and participant _________ on November 11, 2007. Are you aware you are being audio taped for the purposes of gathering data on classroom management and learning environment?

____________________ Great!

TOTALIZATION AND NORMALIZATION

I’d like to start with the community at your school.

In what ways do you observe community being fostered at your school?

Do you do anything with your students in particular to give them their own sense of community?

Does your school do anything to give teachers a sense of community. For instance, are there teacher breakfasts, lunches, or happy hours?

Are there collaboration meetings? Are they mandatory?

Do you attend any of these functions?

Do you feel like your school makes an effort to include first-year teachers in becoming part of the school community? Why or why not?

SCHOOLWIDE RULES AND PROCEDURES

I am going to move onto rules for the entire school. Does your school have school rules that everyone must follow?

How do students and teachers find out about these rules?

Do you think they are good rules? Why or why not?

Do you enforce them? Why or why not?

Are their rewards for students who comply and punishments for students who don’t? If so, what are they?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the dress code like at your school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are teachers held to the same dress code?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree with the teacher dress code? Why or why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are their school procedures that everyone follows? Perhaps all students must walk down the hall a certain way, or line up at recess a certain way. What are some of the procedures all students must follow?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any school procedures you would like to change? Which one, and why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see teachers who don’t enforce the procedures? Are they new or veterans?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you ever see students reprimanded for not following procedures? What kinds of people assist in this reprimanding?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there procedures for teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you name a couple?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What typically happens if a teacher doesn’t follow a procedure?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any teacher procedures you would change? Why</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLASSROOM RULES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have classroom rules?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you develop them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they posted?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you required to post them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there guidelines developed by administrators or teachers for how you develop your rules?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you use them in your class?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you say they are working well?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you make any changes to them next year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you teach them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do parents know your classroom rules?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you inform them of them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BEHAVIOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well are the students behaving?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you say you have any behavior problems?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you deal with behavior problems?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a school-wide policy for dealing with behavior problems?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, is it working?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it acceptable to send a behavior problem to another classroom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you send students to other classrooms?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you decide where to send the problem child?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do teachers send students to the office (or dean’s office)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you say that practice is encouraged or discouraged, why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you sent any students to the office this year? What was the result?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLASSROOM SETUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe how you have set up your physical classroom? How are desks arranged, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you decide to set it up in this way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you use any research or layouts from other teachers to set it up this way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the custodian require the room to be left a certain way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the administration have rules for what has to be on walls, or for how you arrange your room?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you like the way it is set up?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything you want to change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have study carrels?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your students have to do anything to protect their papers when taking a test?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you had any standardized tests yet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you had to alter your room for standardized tests?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHOLE SCHOOL LAYOUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are the classrooms arranged? For instance, are all the fourth graders together? Do you have pods with varied groups, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think it is arranged this way for any particular purpose?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there roving teachers/classes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there are rovers, what kinds of teachers have to rove?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the office manager have her/his own office?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you say the administration is visible? When do you see them most?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have to teach certain subjects at certain times?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you select choose what to teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have to have your lesson plans approved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What criteria are you given for lesson plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel about the lesson plan procedures at your school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel like your college experience prepared you for what you are dealing with now? Why or why not?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MONITORING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you been observed yet? If so, how many times?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel about the evaluation process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What sorts of things does your administrator talk to you about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your school have security systems, like video cameras, metal detectors, etc?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think your students are aware of the cameras?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe any instances of when video cameras were used to solve a crime or “catch” someone in the act?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel about having security cameras in schools?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STANDARDIZED TESTS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What sorts of things do you hear about standardized tests?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they seem important at your school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has anyone talked to you about testing? What do they tell you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who talks about testing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What sorts of activities do teachers and/or students take part in to prepare for standardized tests?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are scores shared with teachers by administration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your administration post test results? How do you feel about testing?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel about teaching in general?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel like you made a good career choice? Why or why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see yourself teaching in five years? Why or why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is your first teaching job different than student teaching?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERVIEW II QUESTIONS

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. How has your year been going so far?
2. Do you feel like you have had any successes you can share with me?

TOTALIZATION AND NORMALIZATION

3. Do you feel like you and any other first-year teachers have had good support from the administration and other teachers at the school so far?
4. Have you had anyone mentoring you this year? If so who was it and what kinds of things did you work on together?
5. How many hours do you think you are putting in? Are you coming early, staying late?
6. Does your administrator seem to pay attention to the times people come and leave?
7. Have you had any standardized tests yet? Interims, Writing Test etc?
8. How were you instructed to prepare for them? Have you had to alter your room for them?
9. How do you feel about testing?
10. Are test scores posted anywhere? Are students or teachers rewarded for attendance during testing, or for getting certain test scores? Are teachers or students ranked or grouped by their performance on these tests?
11. Were there any meetings about the test scores? What kinds of things did you discuss?
12. Did anyone talk to you specifically about your classes test scores? If so, what kinds of things were said?
13. Do you feel like you fit in at the school? Why or why not?
14. Do you have ability groups in your school or class? Reading groups, etc. based on ranking? How did you develop these groups, what criteria, etc?

SCHOOLWIDE RULES AND PROCEDURES

15. Have there been any new school programs or polices that have changed since you started?
16. Do you have a staff handbook? Is there any way I can get a copy of it?
17. Have your students been able to follow the rules for the school?
18. Do you enforce them? Why or why not?
19. Are there any changes in the rewards for students who comply and punishments for students who don’t? If so, what are they?
20. Does it seem like the rules are enforced at this point in the year? Is everything running smoothly, or do the rules seem like they’ve been forgotten?
21. Are there any school procedures you would like to change? Which one, and why?
22. Do you see teachers who don’t enforce the procedures? Are they new or veterans? What happens?
23. Do you ever see students reprimanded for not following procedures? What kinds of people assist in this reprimanding?

BEHAVIOR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. How well are the students behaving?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Do you feel prepared to handle students with behavior problems?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Would you say you have any behavior problems? How do you deal with them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. What resources, materials, and people do you seek out to deal with behavior problems?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Is it acceptable to send a behavior problem to another classroom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Do you send students to other classrooms?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. How do you decide where to send the problem child?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Do teachers send students to the office (or dean’s office)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Would you say that practice is encouraged or discouraged, why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Have you sent any students to the office this year? What was the result?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSROOM SETUP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Have you made any changes to the way you initially set up the classroom? What kinds of changes have you made?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Have you ever been told to change anything about your room? If so, what and how did you feel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Did you use any research or layouts from other teachers to set it up this way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Do you feel comfortable having people walk into your room, parents, specialists, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHOLE SCHOOL LAYOUT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Have there been any changes in the school this year—teachers leaving, new staff, switching classrooms, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITORING/TIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Have you been observed yet? If so, how many times?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. How many times have you been evaluated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. How do you feel about being evaluated? Do you feel the rubric is fair? Do you feel that you were assessed fairly?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. What sorts of things does your administrator suggest?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. How often are your lesson plans checked? Are they checked against benchmarks or power standards too? How do you feel about this?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. How do you do your lesson plans? What do you have to use to do them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Does your principal check to see if you are teaching what you are supposed to be teaching at certain times of day?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. How do you monitor your students’ behavior?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Do you feel well prepared to discipline your students? What do you do with behavior problems? Has this changed over the year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Can you describe any instances of when video cameras were used to solve a crime or “catch” someone in the act?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Have you had a parent teacher conference this year? Are you given any directives in what you need to do for these conferences?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. How do you feel about working with parents?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL/ATTRITION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. What have you changed this year, say after a track break or holiday break?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. What do you wish college better prepared you for?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Do you plan on coming back next year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Do you know if you will be in the same grade? Is that the grade you want?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Are there any things you will change for next year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Do you still see yourself teaching in five years? Why or why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. How do you feel about working for your school district?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT STATEMENTS ABOUT DISCIPLINE

1. Maybe it’s my fault
2. She’s really busy or hectic
3. I feel a little standoffish about approaching her
4. Most of them are ARL’s
5. I have more experience than them [ARL’s]
6. Not that I’m trying to belittle them
7. Less desirable to hire
8. Viewed as this group will not be successful
9. Well, they are ARL’s
10. I feel like we are getting slammed
11. Nobody really told me
12. I’m following the guidelines. They are mapped to the standards and the benchmarks.
13. We are testing so much
14. We have no time to teach anything
15. Kids even asked me, when are we having [standardized tests]
16. That’s what the [standardized tests] are based on any way
17. If I covered fractions I’d have the upper hand
18. They [administration] got permission
19. We got the results as a grade level
20. Well you’re kids did better than mine.
21. Student desks need to be moved apart and separated
22. My grade level chair mentioned to me that my kids did well
23. I didn’t know what was acceptable
24. They said it reflected on me how I was teaching
25. I know the big thing right now is making AYP
26. I didn’t run it by administration or anything so I don’t know if it’s okay
27. I felt like the newbie
28. All of the new people were sitting at the same table
29. We didn’t even get invited over
30. We were like what do we have leprosy or something?
31. Everyone was into their own cliques
32. Nobody really took initiative
33. We [grade level] all eat lunch together
34. Grade level sits together
35. Today was a good day, yesterday I felt like everything was falling apart
36. It just feels like it’s chaos
37. They know my expectations
38. When I give them out [token] they respond better
39. I got all “threes”
40. They tell me that I’m exactly where I need to be right now if they’re fine then I’m okay
41. The [district] is making us go through an induction program to support a raise increase.
42. When I’m in all of this induction stuff, it’s like I did this all at [University].
43. Why do I have to do this again?
A lot of the stuff we are just going over again and again.
I was so stressed out and overwhelmed with all of the work
I kind of know what is expected now because I didn’t know what was expected before. So I think having experienced it once I think I know what I’m getting into and I’ll be better next year.
They did everything for you to instruct you everything but write it up
Don’t write it like “this,” write it like “this”.
We spent two or three hours going over the staff handbook
You get a “paw” if everyone did really well at lunch.
If you do this you get an extra fifteen minute recess.
As far as gang colors, we don’t really worry about them. We are pretty affluent and it’s elementary school, you know?
They encourage you to wear school shirts.
Men don’t have to wear ties but they do have to wear button up shirts.
I think a lot of the teachers abuse the dress code a little bit.
Like oohhh she wore that?
It's just like gossip.
they call hallway manners.
You have to tell the students
gang colors have to walk with their fingers to their lips
My students are supposed to walk with their hands by their sides and they aren’t allowed to touch the bulletin
They have to keep their eyes forward
I like to keep An eye on who’s going when
Harry Wong. No more than five rules. No less than three, If they break one of the rules I take [token]
[Parents] didn’t want a new teacher for their kids
I know which students have roving eyes
The veteran teachers took the textbooks and did something called curriculum mapping.
It’s all laid out for us
Checked every Friday.
I didn’t get any negative comments so I assume I’m doing okay.
I other teachers got comments that they had to do things over
I hope they [administration] come in at a time when I’m actually teaching
Nervous
If your whole class bombs then you aren’t doing what you’re supposed to
There are groups that we can join to do things together- Exercising, etc.
We have collaboration meeting for our grade levels,
We also do banking time to where once a month our school dismisses early and we all meet to collaborate and do workshops etc.
Rules are sent home at the beginning of the year for the students-
they are posted throughout the school
and they are in the handbook for the staff.
I am really strict about following them because they need to get used to it.
Yes, there are guidelines for success that are posted in the bathrooms and hallways that everyone must follow.
Noise level of 0 in the hallways and bathrooms etc.
I just keep going over them with the kids at the beginning of the year until they understand what they mean and then
Stoplight system with clothespins for students that do not follow them. (Green, yellow, Red- if they get on red after the warning of yellow then they get a note sent home)
Because our administration wants the students to know that we as the teacher lay down the law….
I think they don’t want students to think that we can’t handle it ourselves so we have to send them to administration
We have pods with mixed grades to get a variety of students
Administration not visible
[In college] there should have been more hands on experience for making lesson plans and ideas
that were actually aligned with the curriculum
91. They just expect too much
92. Students who don’t behave miss Fun Friday
93. That I need to do more small group instruction and direct my lesson plans more to fit the needs of my students
94. they are expecting us to do small group instruction like all day for every subject and I just don’t feel that it is possible especially in kindergarten
95. I tell them the cameras are watching them
96. Test scores-- we have to post them right in the hallways next to the administration offices.
97. Everyone can see how your class did, but the actual number scores are not posted.
98. They say it is for us to look at, not to compete but to see how our own classes are progressing)
99. Getting more comfortable with what I have to teach and the curriculum
100. Grade level chair told me what will be on the test and what to do to prepare for it
101. We are required to write objectives on the board, and go back to them for closure.
102. Division will show up on the test even though it won’t be in the benchmarks
103. Tried to make us stay to 3:30 when our contract says 3.
104. She wanted us to sign out if left before 3:30
105. I didn’t think I [had freedom] at the beginning of the year
106. No one is around
107. Not checking
108. Checklist for evaluating
109. I don’t want t be stopping every five minutes
110. Evaluation process? I don’t like it
111. The administration was there to back me up
112. There is what they call a support cadre but I really haven’t used them too much.
APPENDIX V

SYLLABUS FROM THE COMMON COURSE
(Please note references to date and other info were omitted)

Course Syllabus: Strategies of Effective Elementary Classroom Teaching

Instructor: Lynn A. Chandler
Office Hours: Made by appointment, usually Wednesdays before class

Course Introduction: Per course catalog, the purpose of the course is to examine current research-based practices in classroom communication skills, delivery of instruction, questioning techniques, lesson design and behavior management in a changing educational context.

General Course Objectives: The general course objectives addresses concepts and research findings those teachers can use to provide effective classroom instruction. The course is based on, but not limited to the writings of Fred Jones, Harry Wong, and Kenneth Moore. The course encompasses research literature on teacher expectations, classroom organization and management, classroom instruction and other topics related to classroom teaching.

Knowledge:
Prospective elementary classroom teachers should be able to understand generic effective teacher behavior and its effects in a classroom, understand the importance of procedures and strategies, and to establish a proactive classroom—rules, procedures, and physical arrangement of the classroom, explain effective grouping and individualized instruction, implement effective teaching techniques to solve classroom problems, describe effective teaching strategies that promote intrinsic responsibility, search websites to explore effective teaching strategies used by experienced teachers and experts, and understand the importance of in-service and self assessment to improve teaching performance. Students will use technology tools and information resources to increase productivity, promote creativity, and facilitate academic learning. Students will also use technology to locate, evaluate, and collect information from a variety of sources, and use technology tools to process data and report results.

Performance (skills):
Prospective elementary teachers should be able to demonstrate proficiency in planning, organizing, writing, and teaching of two microteaching lessons to demonstrate effective teaching strategies using whole and cooperative grouping strategies (NCATE Standard 1) and (INTASC principles 1, 2, 3, and 7). Students will use a variety of technology to locate, evaluate, and collect information from a variety of sources.

Dispositions:
Prospective elementary classroom teachers should be able to search the Internet to discover effective teaching strategies used by experienced teachers, work with colleagues to plan and evaluate microteaching lessons and to work with peers to evaluate their teaching performance. Students must also be able to demonstrate classroom management strategies using verbal and non-verbal responses to handling student misbehaviors (INTASC principle 5)
Results:

Students enrolled in this course will demonstrate effective teaching practices, classroom management strategies, classroom communication skills, and delivery of instruction, questioning techniques lesson plan design, microteaching, Internet searches conduct group presentations on various educational topics, interview a veteran teacher about effective teaching, conduct a critical learning event, and on-going assessment to improve teaching performance. Students will exhibit positive attitudes toward technology uses that support life-long learning collaboration, personal pursuits and productivity.
Course requirements:

1) Attendance Policy: Classroom attendance is crucial for the success of this class and will be used in the calculation of your grade. You are permitted to miss one class without affecting your grade for any reason. After that your final grade will be dropped a 1/3 grade for every absence. For example, if you have an A average on all your assignments and you miss three classes you would then have a B+ class average. (See below)

   Classwork Average (calculated at the end of the semester): A
   One Absence: A
   Second Absence: A-
   Third Absence: B+

   You will be asked to sign-in every week. Students who are 15 minutes-45 minutes late will be marked tardy. Students 45 minutes or later will be marked absent. Two tardies will be equivalent to one absence. I am very firm on this policy. Exceptions will not be made.

2) Reading Assignments/Reading Specialist: You will be asked to read from our texts almost every week. Each week one or more students will be asked to highlight the required chapters for us. This person is called the reading specialist. They are required to create a one-page or more review of the chapter. A copy must be posted on WebCampus on the Sunday before you present (by 11:59 p.m.). At the bottom of the review must be at least one discussion question. The question must be discussed by students on WebCampus. See Discussions below.

3) Journal: Students are to keep a binder that will have the follow sections: Management Strategies, Teambuilding Strategies, Classbuilding Strategies, Mastery Structures, Thinking Skills Structures, Informational Structures, Communications Skills Structures, Social Skills Development, and miscellaneous. Students will be given activities for each of these strategies, and will also be creating their own strategies.

4) Field Experience/Teacher Talk Interview: You are to interview a veteran teacher (someone who has taught more than five years) about the classroom rules and procedures. See attachment.

5) Cyber-Activity: Students are to search www.teach-nology.com/ideas and other internet sources to discover at least four strategies experienced teachers use in each of the below categories. These must be included in your portfolios.
   a. 5 minutes to go
   b. Bullying
   c. Parent communication
   d. Start of the Year
   e. War stories

6) Group Project: Students will be given a strategy to research. Students will develop a one-page explanation of the strategy, a lesson plan using this strategy, and will bring in reference pages of works cited for each student. In addition, the group will present their findings and will execute a lesson using this strategy.

7) Discussions: Using WebCampus: Students will respond to the discussion question posted by the reading specialist. Each response must be at least 2 paragraphs in length.

8) Final Examination: Students will be given a take-home final examination. It is due at the last class.

Methods of Instruction:
   The methods of instruction will be discussions, group discussions, videotapes, Internet access, interviewing, microteaching, and PowerPoint lectures.
## CALENDAR

*I reserve the right to modify this syllabus, especially if enrollment size changes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks/Date</th>
<th>Class Activities</th>
<th>Readings/Assignments Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 1</strong></td>
<td>• Review Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 17</td>
<td>• Introductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sign Up for assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alternate GRE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Classbuilding Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inside-Outside Circles Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 2</strong></td>
<td>• Cooperative Learning Theory</td>
<td>Jones 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24</td>
<td>Interview Strategy</td>
<td>Kagan 1,2, and 8.1-8.4, 9.4-9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Getting Hired through Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 3</strong></td>
<td>• Positive Outcomes/Key Concepts</td>
<td>Jones 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>• Lesson Plans: Madeleine Hunter and Cooperative Preview</td>
<td>Kagan 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Responses due on Webcampus each week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 4</strong></td>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>Jones 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7</td>
<td>Things in Common</td>
<td>Kagan 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 5</strong></td>
<td>Teambuilding</td>
<td>Jones 7 and 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14</td>
<td>Send-A-Problem</td>
<td>Kagan 7 and 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roundtable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 6</strong></td>
<td>Classbuilding</td>
<td>Jones 9 and 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21</td>
<td>Corners</td>
<td>Kagan 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Line-Ups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 7</strong></td>
<td>Thinking Skills</td>
<td>Jones 11 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>Thinking Maps and Kagan</td>
<td>Kagan 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 8</strong></td>
<td>Mastery Skills</td>
<td>Jones 13 and 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>1-2-4 worksheet/Toronto</td>
<td>Kagan 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pyramid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 9</strong></td>
<td>NO CLASS: SPRING BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 10</strong></td>
<td>Information Sharing and Communication Skills</td>
<td>Jones 15 and 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21</td>
<td>Gallery Walk</td>
<td>Kagan 12 and 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carousel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 11</strong></td>
<td>Social Skills Development</td>
<td>Teacher Talk Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones 15 and 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kagan 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 12</strong></td>
<td>Cooperative Project and Scoring</td>
<td>Jones 17 and 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>*Time to Work on Group Projects</td>
<td>Kagan 15 and 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 13</strong></td>
<td>Mastery Designs and Division of Labor</td>
<td>Jones 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11</td>
<td>Jigsaw II</td>
<td>Kagan 17 and 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Time to Work on Group Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 14</strong></td>
<td>Project Designs and Multi-Functional Frameworks</td>
<td>Kagan 19 and 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18</td>
<td>*Time to Work on Group Projects</td>
<td><strong>BRING IN JOURNALS-NOTEBOOKS CYBER-ACTIVITY INCLUDED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GROUP PRESENTATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 15</strong></td>
<td>Student Presentations: Suchman Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25</td>
<td>Concept Attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synectics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concept Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 16</strong></td>
<td>Course Evaluations</td>
<td><strong>TAKE-HOME FINAL DUE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Talk
Interview a Teacher about Rules and Procedures

The purpose of this exercise is to expand your knowledge about classroom rules and procedures. Interview a teacher and ask them for a copy of any printed information that they provide students about their classroom rules and procedures. Attach a copy of their rules and procedures to this assignment. Use the below questions to guide your interview. To successfully complete this assignment, type the question and type the response.

Teacher Interviewed ____________________________
Grade Level ___________________ School __________
Class size _____________________ Phone Number __________

Background information: Give a brief general description of the school’s social, economic, and ethnic makeup.

1. How do you organize your classroom to prevent management problems?
2. What are your rules and procedures? How did you arrive at them?
3. How did you present your rules and procedures to your students? Did you solicit input from them in preparing the rules and procedures?
4. How did you “teach” your rules and procedures? Was teaching them necessary or did you merely present them?
5. What are the consequences for following or not following the rules?
6. How are the following management interventions handled in your class?
   a. Warning
   b. Go to another classroom
   c. In-class time-out
   d. Trip to the principal’s office
   e. Parent conference
   f. Home suspension

7. What is the most difficult or challenging aspect of classroom management?
8. What words of wisdom would you about classroom management would you give a beginning teacher?
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