August 2013

"Sit-still and Shut-up": The Construction of Childhood and Classroom Management Pedagogies in a Preservice Education Textbook

Marlene P. Frederick
The University of Western Ontario

Supervisor
Dr. Wayne Martino
The University of Western Ontario

Graduate Program in Education

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in Master of Education

© Marlene P. Frederick 2013

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd

Ⓖ Part of the Educational Methods Commons, Educational Psychology Commons, Elementary Education and Teaching Commons, Other Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons, Pre-Elementary, Early Childhood, Kindergarten Teacher Education Commons, and the Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Frederick, Marlene P., ""Sit-still and Shut-up": The Construction of Childhood and Classroom Management Pedagogies in a Preservice Education Textbook" (2013). *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 1381.
https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/1381

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact tadam@uwo.ca.

"SIT-STILL AND SHUT-UP":

THE CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDHOOD AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
PEDAGOGIES IN A PRESERVICE EDUCATION TEXTBOOK

(Thesis format: Monograph)

by

Marlene Patricia <u>Frederick</u>

Graduate Program in Education

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education

The School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

Abstract

This study addresses the limitations and restrictions of approaches to classroom management that are promoted in one particular textbook that is used in Teacher Education faculties in Canada. It contributes to building an understanding of the role of textbooks in endorsing certain truth and knowledge claims about childhood and classroom management. The thesis is informed theoretically by Foucault (1977-1982), Gee (2001) and poststructuralists such as Weedon (1999). Through undertaking a discourse analysis informed by the work of Gee and Foucault, I conduct a single case study of one particular textbook to highlight the particular role of educational psychology as 'a regime of truth' in defining and legitimating what is to count as an effective approach to classroom management. My own autoethnographic accounts as a classroom teacher are also used and weaved throughout the analysis and serve to challenge the normative claims about classroom management made in the textbook. The implications of introducing preservice education students to only one 'regime of truth' concerning classroom management in terms of elaborating more socially just pedagogies are outlined. I argue a need to introduce preservice education students to a variety of approaches to classroom management, including approaches from a social actor theory or poststructuralist discourse. This thesis is a part of a larger attempt to achieve equity and social justice education in which the dignities of children are respected and their voices are heard.

Keywords

Acknowledgments

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

As a new teacher, I continuously reflect on and challenge my own classroom management practices as I try to figure out who I am as an educator and which pedagogical practices fit with my beliefs about childhood. While I was supply teaching, I received a note from a grade six teacher whose class I had been assigned. She mentioned that I should not have any problems with classroom management, but that there was a new student, and if she had difficulty focusing she could sit in the three-wall carousel desk at the back of the class. The teacher also noted that the new girl would arrive late, most likely, as she was often in the principal's office. I started the lesson and the students were working quietly until the new student burst into the classroom, sat backwards in her chair, moved her desk roughly while searching for her textbook, and taunted other kids instead of starting her worksheet. I approached the student calmly and asked if she might focus better in the carousel desk, to which she responded, "Yeah, maybe I'll work better IN MY CAGE!" Then another student prompted a barbaric-chant: "Yeah! Send her to her cage! Send her to her cage!"

It was in this moment that I recognized the striking resemblance between schools and prisons: the way children are organized into straight lines, some wearing uniforms, and the way children are trained to respond to bells and whistles, the control of when children are permitted to eat, drink, sit, stand, speak and even go to the bathroom. It does not seem 'natural' or 'right' to enforce such rigid bodily control on children, and such practices raise issues, not only about what is taken for granted as normal in institutions such as schools, but of human rights and social justice. This particular experience prompted me to consider the discourses governing such approaches to classroom management, their historical construction and the perspective of childhood embedded within these regimes in order to understand the norms governing classroom management and how these define the limits of who we are or how we come to understand ourselves as educators today.

In this thesis I conduct a critical discourse analysis of a specific classroom management textbook that is used in preservice teacher education courses throughout

Canada, while using my own autoethnographic narratives as a first year kindergarten teacher to counter-argue universalizing statements about normative teaching practices. I examine the discourses or systems of thought governing how pedagogical relations are being constituted and legitimated in the textbook in order to explicate and reflect on what I consider more equitable and socially just approaches to classroom management.

Purpose and Aims

By investigating the discourses of childhood and pedagogical practices endorsed in the official textbook, my aim in conducting this research is to understand how the textbook constitutes the child as an object of specific pedagogies within the context of teacher education, particularly as it pertains to framing and legitimating an educational psychology approach to classroom management. I investigate the implications of using the popular textbook and which by its selection testifies to the endorsement of officially sanctioned approaches to teaching classroom management. Drawing on the work of Michel Foucault (1977-1982) and James Paul Gee (2011), I aim to understand how the image of the child and schooling is constituted within the official classroom management textbook used in a mandatory course at one particular Faculty of Education. To achieve these goals, I seek to…

1. interrogate how childhood is constituted in a specific textbook which deals with classroom management;
2. develop an understanding of the sorts of discourses that inform pedagogical approaches to *modern* classroom management in the textbook;
3. and identify some of the ways in which the bodies of children are regulated and voices of children are silenced as a basis for building knowledge and understanding about the limits and possibilities for elaborating more socially justice pedagogical practices in classrooms.

Significance

Teaching is considered "a highly stressful occupation," and classroom management is repeatedly cited as the main cause of "burnout for teacher" (Kokkinos, 2004, p. 229; Sutton et al., 2009, p. 130; Covell et al., 2009, p. 282). Classroom

management is also considered one of the most significant factors that contributes to student achievement (Marzano, 2011, p. 85), and of course, a topic of ongoing concern and anxiety for preservice and in-service teachers, administration and the public (Simonsen et al., 2008, p. 351; Milner & Tenore, 2010, p. 560; Freiberg & Lamb, 2009, p. 99). For new teachers, "managing student misbehaviour" is their most serious challenge (Kokkinos, 2007, p. 229; Covell et al., 2009, p. 282). In the blunt words of Charles (2002):

> Our schools are in the grip of a serious problem that is wreaking havoc on teaching and learning. That problem is student misbehaviour. If you are now teaching, you have had ample experience with it. If you are preparing to teach, be forewarned: It is the major obstacle to your success and has the potential to destroy your career. (p. 1)

Despite the enduring concerns of educational practitioners, there is a lack of interest and research in the field of classroom management, as well as a negligence of explicitly teaching classroom management in teacher education programs (Evertson & Weinstein, 2006, p. 3). Simonsen et al. (2008) identify classroom management as a "critical skill area" which requires training and support that aligns with "practices that are backed with evidence" in order to enable teachers to be successful (p. 351).

In Farkas and Johnson`s (2005) survey of attitudes among professors of preservice education, there is an identified gap between the attitudes of teachers and those of their professors (p. 3). Virtually all classroom teachers (97%) say that good discipline "is 'one of the most important prerequisites' for a successful school"; fewer than 4 in 10 education professors (37%) consider it "absolutely essential to train 'teachers who maintain discipline and order in the classroom" (p. 3). Simonsen et al. (2008) raise concerns that even teachers who receive training in classroom management may be presented with outdated information stemming from preliminary findings of early research which may not have a sufficient evidence base (p. 351).

Milner and Tenore (2010) stress that there is not a "one-size-fits-all" approach that will allow a teacher to perfect his or her classroom management (p. 577). Rather, literature varies drastically in interpretations of effective teachers and definitions of classroom management. For instance, corporal punishment, a controversial method of

discipline, is both legalized (with limitations) in Canada through Section 43 of the Criminal Code, and it is reported as an 'option' of maintaining order in the classroom, although such methods are rarely used (Little & Akin-Little, 2008, p. 227). With this disturbing fact in mind, it is essential to interrogate current approaches to classroom management, particularly those validated within educational policy, as well as pedagogies explicitly taught to preservice and in-service teachers, because there is not a 'best' form of classroom management; however there are certainly approaches that are legitimated and sanctioned within teacher education faculties and schooling systems and presented as the 'truth' about classroom management. In this thesis, I use a Foucauldian and poststructuralist lens to understand how the relationship between knowledge and power plays a role in the officially sanctioned approaches to classroom management, and investigate the extent to which such pedagogies respect the dignity and human rights of children. Conducting research into pedagogical approaches to classroom management, specifically as they relate to discourses of childhood, are essential in understanding and implementing educational practices that are in the best interests of the child.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Frameworks

Introduction

In this chapter I outline the conceptual framework that informs my understanding of childhood and classroom management. While I predominantly engage with the philosophical work of Foucault (1977-1982) and Gee's (2011) perspective on discourse analysis, I also draw on theorists who work from a social constructionist world view, specifically James and Prout's (1990,1997) interpretation of social actor theory and Weedon (1999) and Sondergaard's (2002) reading of poststructuralist theory. The theoretical and analytic perspectives selected inform my understanding, both of schooling and of the child as normative, and the taken for granted social constructions which also enable my own creative exploration of truth claims about schooling and childhood presented in the preservice education textbook.

Foucault and Power/Knowledge

I utilize a Foucauldian (1977) understanding of power/knowledge to analyse the privileging and *disprivileging* of certain forms of knowledge and truth claims made in the textbook about childhood and classroom management pedagogy. According to Foucault (1977), "power is not a privilege that one possesses; rather power is embedded in a network of relations in constant tension and activity" (p. 27). For Foucault, power is not something the state exercises unilaterally over citizens or teachers over students. Power is not a 'possession' of states and their agents, such as teachers, who are 'free' to exercise power. Rather power is always already part of how we constitute the positions of 'teacher' and 'student' or 'adult' and 'child.' (Foucault, 1977, p. 27). Foucault claims that "power is not exercised as an obligation or prohibition on those who 'do not have it'; it invests them, is transmitted by them and through them; it exerts pressure upon them, just as they themselves, in their struggles against is, resists the grip it has on them" (p. 27). Coining the term "power-knowledge," Foucault states that it must be understood that "power produces knowledge" (27):

…there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations. These power-knowledge relations are to be analysed, therefore, not on the basis of a subject of knowledge who is or is not free in relation to the power system, but, on the contrary, the subject who knows, the objects to be known and the modalities of knowledge must be regarded as so many effects of these fundamental implications of power-knowledge and their historical transformations. (p. 27-28)

According to Foucault, knowledge is inseparable from power (p. 27). Stevenson and Cutcliffe (2006) explain that Foucault (1977) rejects "simple forms of describing the knowledge/power nexus, for example, 'Knowledge is power' or 'Holding power,' are dismissed by Foucault" (p. 6). Foucault (1982) argues that power does not act on others in a direct and immediate way, rather "it acts upon their actions: an action upon an action, on existing actions or on those which may arise in the present or the future" (p. 220). Stevenson and Cutcliffe (2006) interpret Foucault's (1977) idea that power produces knowledge with an understanding that "knowledge is used to select techniques of power, and to implement the chosen techniques in practice" (p. 6).

In this thesis, I use power/knowledge to address my concerns about the limitations and generation of knowledge from an Educational Psychology discourse that is often presented as 'truth' within classroom management textbooks. By understanding knowledge and power as interconnected ideas, I am able to explore Educational and specifically Developmental Psychology as a discipline with its own 'regime of truth', and to analyse how it functions to establish what is to count as legitimate and true when it comes to thinking about classroom management and the child as a particular sort of subject. I also utilize a Foucauldian (1977) understanding of disciplinary power to analyse the pedagogy endorsed in the textbook, specifically by relating examples of classroom management practices to Foucault's claims about hierarchal observation, normalizing judgement and evaluation.

Foucault and Disciplinary Power

Within Michel Foucault's historical and philosophical investigations, his grounding question is one of who we are and how we understand ourselves. To understand who we are, we must recognize that "we do not act as isolated individuals; rather we are a product of a contingent history" (May, 2006, p. 16). May (2006) explains Foucault's philosophical understanding that the way we act is "not simply a result of individual choice, but an effect of the operation of certain historically contingent norms" (p. 16). In short, our actions and thoughts are "historically contingent" and cannot be understood necessarily as a product of rational choices or of an "enlightened consciousness" (p. 16). We do not choose to be who we are today, and we cannot simply reject who we are and become someone 'new'. There are certain historical contingencies and norms governing how we come to understand who we are today, and reflecting on these contingencies opens up possibilities for thinking otherwise as, "we do not have to be who we are" (May, p. 16). In following Foucault, May argues that to be otherwise is not an individual choice, rather "within our contingent present we can make collective decisions, redirect cultural epistemologies and practices, and essentially be something else" (p. 16).

I employ the philosophical work of Foucault (1977-1982) because his theories allow me to understand both the way in which current disciplinary practices and adult relations with students are deeply embedded in the history of schooling and historical constructions of childhood – in short they are contingent upon certain norms and discourses about the child and the role of teacher. Furthermore, Foucault's idea that we might be someone else allows for an optimistic outlook towards a potential change in how teachers think about children and classroom management practices, which might afford the latter greater access to human rights and dignities. Such analytic perspectives highlight the extent to which specific norms govern the construction of children and the role of the teachers' pedagogical practices, as they are embedded discursively in officially sanctioned approaches to classroom management that are endorsed through employing specific textbooks within the context of teacher education. In my interpretation of the discursive constitution of classroom management practices in one

teacher education textbook, I draw on certain analytic categories and frameworks that are informed by my reading of Foucault (1977) in his study of discipline and punishment.

Foucault's study of discipline and punishment situates punitive mechanisms and means of punishment within a complex social apparatus or system (Foucault, 1977, p. 23). Moreover, he understands punishment as both a way of exercising power and as a political tactic (p. 23). Foucault treats the history of penal law and the history of human sciences as separate epistemologies that overlap with disturbing or useful effects, depending on one's point of view (p. 23). By understanding the change and development of punitive methods as a "political technology of the human body," Foucault is able to read a common history of power and object relations to better understand "how man, the soul, the normal or abnormal individual have come to duplicate crime as objects of penal intervention; and in what way a specific mode of subjection was able to give birth to a man as an object of knowledge for a discourse with a 'scientific' status'" (p. 24).

Whereas psychology-based classroom management texts discuss discipline as an action of being disciplined or punished or as a state of being (see Millei, 2005), I utilize a Foucauldian understanding of discipline as a mechanism of power through which the behaviour of individuals is regulated, as well as understanding means by which power is exercised in terms of the organization of architectural or physical spaces, time, and individual behaviours in institutions (O'Farrell, 2007). Discipline for Foucault is the creation of the subject who takes itself as an object through the organization of time, space, and bodies. I subscribe to a "Foucauldian (1980) sense" by understanding discipline as "a practice that is produced historically in a specific socio-cultural context" which is "structured by assumptions and produces power" (Millei, 2005, p. 128). Discipline, according to Foucault, is not an institution or an apparatus, rather it is "a type of power, a modality for its exercise, comprising a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of application, targets; it is a 'physics' or an 'anatomy' of power, a technology" (Foucault, 1977, p. 215). Schools are just one example of the disciplinary institution that Foucault examines.

Mirroring the penal evolution in society, educational disciplinary practices have become less cruel, less painful, and administered with more kindness and respect and considered more humane (p. 16). Foucault captures this transformation in a quote by

Mably (p. 326): "punishment… should strike the soul rather than the body" (in Foucault, p. 16). As epistemologies about human behaviour change, disciplinary practices move away from practices of harming and inflicting pain on the body and instead *will the body* to behave in particular ways (p. 11). Disciplinary practices have a higher aim than physically punishing the body of perpetrators. Instead, discipline in modern society is the practice of submission of bodies through the control of ideas as expressed by Servan in Foucault (1977): "A stupid despot may constrain his slaves with iron chains; but a true politician binds them even more strongly by the chain of ideas" (p. 102). This "new art of punishing" reveals techniques of a "new politics of the body", which is the canvas for painting modern classroom management practices (p. 103).

Discourses about the human body and understandings of how to *discipline* the body, invest in it, make marks, and *will the body* to carry out certain tasks are bound up in an understanding of the body's economic use and a view of the body as a "useful force only if it is a productive body and a subjected body" (p. 26). Knowledge about the body is not just about its functioning; rather knowledge about the body is about "the ability to conquer the forces of the body" which Foucault calls the "political technology of the body" (p. 26). In this sense, the body is not viewed as "property to be manipulated"; rather as a "strategy to be exercised" (p. 26). Besley (2005) explores the changes in endorsed pedagogies surrounding the act of 'discipline' within educational institutions, as she identifies that "'discipline' [has] long been almost synonymous with 'corporal punishment' – a physical assault on the body of a person – the abolition of which [has] engendered a hugely emotive and long-running debate" (p. 310). My thinking about equity and social justice classroom management pedagogy is influenced by Foucault's (1977) concerns regarding discipline and punish. While the brutalities of public executions and ritual displays of excessive pain have been abandoned in *modern* educational institution, including within Ontario, Foucault asks if "we really entered the age of non-corporal punishment?" (p. 101). While practices of inflicting pain on students as a means to discipline the body is a way of the past in Ontario elementary schools, Foucault argues that the power within the apparatuses of educational institutions only "seem less 'corporal' in that it is more subtly 'physical,'" however, strict controls over

the physical body of children continue to be heavily regulated through less physically and more psychological exercises of power (p. 177).

Foucault (1977) describes 'discipline' as a "way of enforcing respect for the regulations and authorities, of preventing thefts or losses", as well as a means to exert a moral influence over behaviour and which treats actions in terms of their results (p. 203). May (2006) explains that discipline is "the project for the body's optimization, for turning the body into a well regulated machine by means of "breaking down its movements into their smallest elements and then building them back into a maximally efficient whole" (p. 73). The organization and spatial dimensions of the mechanism of power and its regulatory effects or uses, as Foucault explains that for this "project" of discipline to be effective, discipline must take place in an enclosed area in which the movements of individuals and can be monitored and intervened upon" (p. 73). Foucault identifies that "that is what a prison is like, and disturbingly, so are schools" (p. 74). There are three central aspects of disciplinary training according to Foucault: "hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and examination" (May, 2006, p. 74), each of which can be identified in current classroom management strategies that are propagated in the textbook which is the subject of this thesis.

Foucault (1977) references nineteenth century monasteries and military training sites as instrumental in creating objective epistemologies of the human body. The "invention" of the technology of the human body ignites an understanding that "one may have control of another's body" to operate it as they please (p. 138). Disciplinary practices become about turning the body into an "aptitude" which can be "increased for economic utility while also increasing political obedience" (p. 138). Social institutions define a detailed "political investment in the body" (p. 138). The first of the disciplinary processes, hierarchal observation, is coercion of the body "by means of observation" (p. 170). Hierarchal observation is a technique in which the eyes of an observer "must see without being seen" within an observatory setting, such as a military camp, hospital, or school, which are all institutions that aim to alter the behaviours of those being observed (p. 171). Foucault describes the design of a school in Paris in which "the very building… was to be an apparatus for observation" (p. 172). For example, educators stand on elevated platforms in order to see the heads, hands and legs of each pupil at their desks

(p. 173). This design makes it easier to "encourage obedience and work", as well as to record all activities so that offences could be perceived and judged immediately (p. 174). Hierarchical observation requires the gaze of the observer to always be "'on, must never let up, and must be as efficient as possible" (May, 2006, p. 74), which is a grounding theory in the modern day desk arrangement recommendations of classroom specialists Jones (2000) and Gibbs (2001) (p.21 & p. 57). Students feel the constant eye of the observer, which serves to have students internalize their behaviours and observe their thoughts and actions against the norm.

Normalizing judgment, the second aspect of disciplinary training according to Foucault (1977), is a binary operation that works by means of conformity, the norms and standards each child must strive to meet, and individualization, which are the interventions and training on particular individuals in order for them to achieve the norm (May, 2006, p. 74). Foucault claims that "at the heart of all disciplinary systems functions a small penal mechanism" (p. 177). In schools, Foucault explains that disciplinary punishments enforce the artificial order outlined in a curriculum in a way that is defined as natural and executed in a manner that allows for observable processes, such as dividing children by age and setting standardized expectations for children in that age group (p. 179). Distribution of children according to ranks or grades has a double role: to mark the gaps, rank qualities, skills and aptitudes, and punish and reward children (p. 181). In a standardized system, non-conformity is punishable and corrective disciplinary punishment is perceived as necessary for the natural development of the child (p. 177).

However, punishment is only one method in a disciplinary system. Foucault references earlier pedagogical documents that discuss the importance of altering behaviour through training and frequent rewards to increase desirable behaviour to achieve norms. He discusses that by clearly distinguishing good and evil behaviour with rewards and punishments, the penal system is understood to assess acts with precisions and judge individuals in truth (p. 181). In disciplinary institutions, normalizing judgment "compares, differentiates, hierarchies, homogenizes, excludes. In short, it *normalizes*" (p. 183). "The power of the norm appears through the disciplines" in education systems as "the Normal is established as a principle of coercion in teachings with the introduction

of a standardized education and the establishment of… teacher's training colleges" (p. 184). The power of the normalizing process serves to homogenize the social body. Normalizing judgment also makes it possible to measure gaps, determine levels and fix differences (p. 184). Foucault explains that the techniques of normalizing judgment and hierarchal observation are combined to form the final ritual of discipline: the examination (p. 184).

Finally, Foucault (1977) discusses examination as a technology of power and an element of the disciplinary training process. Examination, according to Foucault, is an "marks out where [a child] stands relative to the standard, the Norm, to which [he or she is] being compared" (May, 2006, p. 76). Through a normalizing gaze, a constant surveillance makes it possible to qualify humans, as well as to classify and punish. Examination establishes a visible judgment of individuals, which justifies the reason that of all of the mechanisms of discipline the examination is the most highly ritualized (Foucault, 1977, p. 184). Foucault explains that examination is a "ceremonial display of power" and a form of experimentation, deployment of force and establishment of that which is considered to be true (p. 184). This aspect of the disciplinary training "manifests the subjection of those who are perceived as objects and the objectification of those who are subjected" (p. 185). Schooling, Foucault interprets, "became a sort of apparatus of uninterrupted examination… it became less and less a question of jousts in which pupils pitched their forces against one another and increasingly a perpetual comparison of each and all that made it possible to both measure and judge" (p. 186). Foucault claims that examination introduces a mechanism that links a certain type of the formation of knowledge to a certain form of the exercise of power (p. 197). In other words, power is exercised through the formation of power, such as through institutions that are designed for maximum visibility which ensures a hold of power exercised over subjects (p. 188). Foucault describes an epistemological transformation in which through the process of examination, the individual lives of people become strategically documented as means to identify differences from what is perceived a 'normal' (p. 189).

Historically, the lives of people of high status were documented, but in modern factories, hospitals, and education systems, a broader class of individuals is meticulously documented as a means of surveillance in attempts to capture and alter human behaviours

(Foucault, 1977, p. 189). Foucault claims that "a 'power of writing' was constituted as an essential part in the mechanism of discipline" (p. 189). Through documentation, schools are able to "define the aptitude of each individual, situate his level and his abilities," and "indicate the possible use that might be made of [children]" (p. 189). Moreover, in a system of discipline that compares and measures humans against the norm, "the child is more individualized than the adult, the patient more than the healthy man, the madman and the delinquent more than the normal and the non-delinquent" (p. 193). These individualizing mechanisms "are turned into our civilization; and when one wishes to individualize the healthy, normal and law-abiding adult, it is always by asking him how much of the child he has in him, what secret madness lies within him, what fundamental crime he has dreamt of committing" (p. 193). Foucault references Jeremy Bentham's design of a Panopticon to make prisoners "perfectly individualized and constantly visible," or in other words, a utopia of disciplinary institution that "assures the automatic functioning of power" (p. 200-201).

In schools, the project of monitoring and intervention, as it relates to regulating the bodily movements of the child, is exemplified in such controls as the use of timers, bells, and whistles, insisting that students line up in single file lines, planned seating arrangements, enforcement of 'proper' posture or pencil grip, and uniforms. In fact, seating arrangements share a striking resemblance to Bentham's Panopticon, which is an architectural design envisioned for an ideal prison. The Panopticon is constructed with a ring around a central core so that guards can see inside all prison cells (Foucault, 1977, p. 200). Visibility becomes "a trap" when individuals can be monitored at all times from their individual prison cells (Foucault, 1977, p. 200). While guards cannot look into all of the prison cells simultaneously, the prisoner cannot be sure when he or she is being monitored or under surveillance. Moreover, since the guards cannot be seen by the prisoners, they must assume that they are being watched at all times, even if guards are not actually present in the central core tower. The result of this surveillance strategy is that prisoners guard themselves and they learn to self-regulate their behaviours under the gaze of prison authorities (p. 200).

Similarly, classrooms are designed so that the teacher can observe children at all times while self-regulating their own behaviours. Children are expected to "act as though

they are under surveillance, even if there is nobody there to observe them" (May, 2006, p. 76-77). Foucault sees modern school discipline as an extension of Benthemite assumptions about the reform of criminals. Foucault explains that "The Panopticon is a marvellous machine which, whatever use one may wish to put it to, produces homogeneous effects of power" (p. 202). As inmates observe their own behaviours in relation to norms and examine themselves, the non-corporal disciplinary practices are meant to constrain humans and both alter, train and correct the prisoners, whether they are criminals, workers, patients, or students (p. 203).

Similar to the Panopticon, proclaimed classroom management specialists, such as Fred Jones (2000), provide educators guidance in preventing disruptive behaviour through manipulation of classroom space (p. 32). Jones recognizes that by arranging students' desks so that students can be seen and heard at all times, children are more likely to self-monitor and, hence, to regulate their own behaviour. He claims that by organizing desks so that a teacher is the shortest distance away from every child then a teacher "will soon come to enjoy the intimacy and control that proximity gives [him or her]" (Jones, 2000, p. 32). Furthermore, he indicates that children will feel that the teacher is too close to "goof off" which will deter children from engaging in off-task or disruptive behaviour (p. 21). Children, therefore, are trained to self-monitor their behaviour and the behaviour of their peers under the normalizing gaze of the teacher.

According to Foucault, Bentham believes that a greater aspect of the Panopticon is that the architectural design may even provide "an apparatus for supervising its own mechanisms" (Foucault, 1977, p. 204). In the disciplinary institution, the teacher is also under the constant gaze of the unseen observer, which alters the teacher's behaviour and ensures that teaching practices correspond with the supervisor's imposed methods (p. 204). In other words, there are certain normalizing judgments about how to conduct and manage children's behaviour in classrooms, which are often enforced by administrators and other teachers in their surveillance of one another, as I illuminate in this thesis with reference to my own experiences as a classroom teacher. After reflecting on my personal experience discussed earlier in this thesis involving the student in my class who referred to her secluded carousel desk as a 'cage,' a particular quote from Foucault (1977)

resonates with me: "is it surprising that prisons resemble factories, schools, barracks, hospitals, which all resemble prison?" (p. 228).

I use Foucault's analytic framework on disciplinary power to investigate the unintended consequences and effects of embracing certain pedagogies and classroom management practices. As Foucault (1982) states: "people know what they do; they frequently know why they do what they do; but what they don't know is what what they do does" (p. 187). An unintended consequence of the rise of the disciplined child promoted throughout the history of education also serves to deny children access to their human rights and, hence, to their voices being heard (UNCRC, Art.12 (1)). This becomes for visible when when children resist being controlled like prisoners, they expose the weakness of "the centuries-old assumption that adults [can] orchestrate childhood without children perceiving it as such" (Ryan, 2008, p. 574). Children, as a vulnerable minority group, are often silenced within the education system due to adult perceptions of children as incapable or not worthy of an opinion. The structure of schooling has a long history of enforcing bodily controls on children, restricting their movement and voice.

In studying the practices of prisons, Foucault (1977) raises the disturbing resemblance between the treatment of prisoners and students in his connection that the Panopticon, as an architectural design for prisons, "provided the outlines for the general forms of educational discipline" (p. 202). This phenomenon is concerning because "the historical grip of [pedagogical] practices is a tight one," but a closer examination of the regime of practices allows the historical grip to be identified and interrogated so that it does not hold so tightly that educators are eternally bound to a particular path; instead by understanding history "[educators] can intervene upon it" (May, 2006, p. 21). In this sense, the work of Foucault provides analytic insights into disciplinary power that is exercised through the use of textbooks in preservice teacher education programs, specifically in terms of the particular truth claims and expert knowledge that are endorsed.

Social Constructionist Perspectives on Schooling and the Child

In order to understand the sorts of discourses that inform pedagogical approaches to *modern* classroom management in specific textbooks, I embrace a social constructionist world view, specifically by drawing on the work of theorists who examine the social construction of childhood, schooling and processes of normalization that are embedded in such discourses. Social constructionism refers to the idea that all meaning-making is a value laden practice that is mediated by language systems. Social constructionists view knowledge, objects and reality as something that is constructed as opposed to essential or discovered (Andrews, 2012, p. 1).

Social constructionism emerges through attempts to interpret and understand the nature of reality and it opposes scientific approaches that assume "observations are an accurate reflection of the world that is being observed" (Andrews, 2012, p. 2). Unlike a scientific pursuit of unmediated truth, social constructionism recognizes the role that social values and relationships play in the context of knowledge justification and creation of epistemologies (Boghossian, 2001, p. 5). A gap exists between what is said to be true using scientific evidence and what humans actually believe (p. 7). Knowledge is not a reflection of the world; rather communities "redefine knowledge as pertaining to invariances… in experience rather than to entities, structures and events in an independently existing world" (Gergen, 2001, p. 7). When people believe something to be true, they believe it because they think there are reasons or evidence to think it is true even if everyone does not share in the same belief. However, by examining the social element of knowledge and belief it can be understood that science is not purely a rational matter, rather it is influenced by "the thinker's background values and interests" (Boghossian, 2001, p. 7-8).

According to Boughossian (2001), in order to claim that something is a social construction, one must question the social values of the society in determining "why they believe that they believe" (p. 1). He explains that there is a difference between metaphysical claims that a thing or fact is real, but of our own creation in contrast to an epistemic claim that does not simply induce belief due to evidence, rather a particular belief has to do with the role that belief plays in social lives (p. 2). If people have a belief not because of evidence, but because of the social purpose the belief entails, then the

belief is a social construction that could be abandoned without fear of irrationality (p. 2). Boghossian (2001) suggests that "a good reason for believing something… only has that status relative to variable social factors – a sharp separation between the rational and the social is illusory" and such beliefs become embedded in everyday practices. (p. 8).

Processes of interactions of people in the social world influence people and result in "routinization and habitualization" (Andrews, 2012, p. 3). Frequently repeated actions become a pattern that can be reproduced without much effort, which frees people to engage in innovation, building off of embedded ideas, rather than engaging in new ideas (p. 3). According to Andrews, the meaning of "habitualization" is weaved into routines and "forms a general store of knowledge that is institutionalized within society and extends to future generalizations as seemingly objective knowledge" (p. 3). Belief of objective knowledge or perceptions of fact is continuously reaffirmed in social interactions, as Andrews (2012) explains that "the world can only be known in relation to other peoples' experience of it and not independently of that experience" (p. 7). Gergen (2001) reinforces that knowledge is the by-product of communal relationships not of individual minds (p. 4). He states that ideas of what is natural or true have their origin in relationships and these ideas are carried out through cultural practices (p. 4). Language is pivotal throughout the process of knowledge creation through social practices and relationships (Andrews, 2012, p. 3).

Language maintains and reconstructs epistemologies and provides a means of structuring the way the world is experienced (Andrews, 2012, p. 3). Concepts do not need to be redefined in everyday conversations, rather there is a shared meaning and understanding of language used to express subjective reality of everyday life and how the world is understood to the extent to which the thoughts, feelings, and implications of everyday language are largely taken for granted and perceived as the objective reality of the natural world (p. 2-3). It is this sense that the role of language within classroom management texts is important for understanding taken for granted educational practices embedded within everyday interactions between educators and students (p. 7).

In *Education and Constructions of Childhood*, Blundell (2012) examines the intellectual history of ideas around which the objectified idea of the child is constructed and he examines the way in which these ideas translate into educational institutions that

create and validate the image of a *normal* childhood (p. 4). Furthermore, Blundell stresses that the socially constructed ideas of "the Child" and of childhood that inform thinking and shape institutions and direct practice may not be conductive to children's well-being (p. 2). Although Blundell's work focuses on educational movements in the United Kingdom, the history of ideas he presents mirror the construction of childhood and education in North America as well. Emerging dualisms in the Renaissance period of childhood in opposition to adulthood distinguished children as in a state of "becoming," otherwise described as a state of "futurity" and Blundell argues a need for change in the Western world view of childhood as he advocates for a movement towards understanding children as competent "beings" (p. 15). Blundell proposes that "childhood should be seen as a socially constructed phenomenon rooted in historical and cultural circumstance," as the interest in children during the Renaissance produced certain ideas about the child and childhood that continue shape educational provisions and the meaning of childhood today (p. 12).

　　With an increasing interest in childhood during the Renaissance, concerns were raised about good and proper childhoods compatible with Christian values, and as a consequence Blundell demonstrates how Protestant parents, for example, saw it as a central responsibility to educate their children about religious knowledge and beliefs (p. 17). With the invention of the protestant childhood, childhood was affirmed with the image of preparation for the future (p. 17). A shift in the social construction of childhood emerged during the Age of Enlightenment as philosophers, including Rene Descartes, came to understand children from a scientific perspective (p. 18).

　　Blundell (2012) describes the way in which the construction of childhood and education evolves during Enlightenment convictions concerning the power of reason. Emphasis on the capacity to exercise reason and the development of children as individuals became the primary concern of Western education and formed the basis upon which curricula, pedagogy and core education values were constructed (p. 19). However, Renaissance epistemologies of childhood as a stage of becoming were intertwined with scientific reasoning and developmental perspectives of childhood. As Blundell (2012) notes, philosopher John Locke (1693) suggested that childhood was an apprenticeship to adulthood (p. 22). Locke also prompted debate with his belief that adults should appeal

to reason and not force with children because of the state of the child's nature as a rational being (p. 23). With the increase in interest in the development and education of children, formal schooling became normalized, particularly in a form that organized people into distinct groups based on age which defined a condition for childhood as a time of immaturity (p. 24). Blundell describes a movement towards a romantic perspective of childhood, a discourse which understands childhood as a state of "innocence, purity and natural goodness" that is only "contaminated on contact with the corrupt outside world" (p. 25). He expresses that romantic images of the child dominated schooling in early modern England, particularly with the impact of Jean Jacques Rousseau (1762), whose ideas continue to shape educational institutions and practices today (p. 25).

Rousseau drew attention to the role of society in avoiding the corruption of children and in supporting each child in developing 'self-love' (p. 29). His epistemologies about the freedom and nature of the child as a human being were paired with propositions for highly-structured, orderly and disciplinary educational regimes where childhood is conditioned by constant adult surveillance (p. 31). Rousseau's image of the idealized, natural and 'pure' child became dominant in opposition to demands of factory-like mass schooling in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries" (p. 33).

Such romantic images of the nature of the child as an innocent being were at the heart of Johann Friedrich Froebel's invention of kindergarten (p. 45). The program Froebel aimed to create intertwined the physical growth states of intellectual, moral and social development through a medium of play, which he considered to be natural and instinctual to children (p. 45). The identified need to play also emerged in Maria Montessori's educational methods in which she combined developmental theories and a romantic image of the child as evident in her permissive disciplinary practices which she called "active-discipline" (1972 in Blundell, 2012, p. 54). Blundell (2012) quotes Montessori (1912) in proclaiming that "a room in which all the children move about usefully, intelligently, and voluntarily, without committing any rough or rude act, would seem to me a classroom well disciplined indeed" (p. 55). As the Enlightenment came to an end and the Industrial Revolution introduced alternative perspectives of the child,

Western society experienced a movement towards a perceived need for mass education (p. 67).

Blundell (2012) describes that with the emergence of the industrial society, the construction of schooling served two major purposes: the first was to keep children out of dangerous factories, and the second was to develop children in a manner that ensured the nation's future prosperity and well-being (p. 69). Schooling of all children, not just the elites, was perceived as crucial for the betterment of society, thus moving away from natural and romantic perspectives of the child towards perceiving childhood as impacted by society and the environment (p. 72). Blundell argues that Joseph Lancaster, a British educator who developed a system of mass education in the early nineteenth century, was pivotal in addressing the supposed need to monitor children in education systems and recalls Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon as Lancaster designed schools with elevated desks for optimal monitoring by the instructor (p. 75). Christian influences imposed ideas that all children "must be mild, obedient and good as He" in attempts to ensure the maintenance of Christian values in future generations (p. 81). Schools for the poor were also designed to meet the needs of working class families in order to ensure the "proper development" of future factory workers (p. 86).

Blundell (2012) suggests that attempts during the Industrial Revolution that burden children with the weight of the future "can be no less prevalent in current discourses on how social degeneration might be reversed and remedied" (p. 87). The growth and provision for the "newly invented 'public child'" prevailed through the Industrial Revolution with the idea that education could transform society (p. 90). The construction of schooling became a general condition for childhood in Western industrial societies and with the British Elementary Education Act of 1870, a core change in the experience of childhood came into effect with the introduction of both free and compulsory education (p. 99). Compulsory education was created due to the influence from employers of industries who believed that workers needed basic academic knowledge. In addition the general public believed that education could help improve the social and moral order (p. 99).

An unexpected reality was revealed when education became free and available to all, as students with special needs became visible to the public at schools (p. 105). New

vocabulary to describe the capabilities of children included, "dull, backwards" and "ineducable". Such children became a liability and shocked the education system as educators struggled to 'cope' with such students (p. 105). Blundell quotes Hendrick (1997) in stating that new compulsory education introduced "the right of strangers to assault children" (in Blundell, 2012, p. 101), and testimonies of those educated in the industrial system reveal that "teachers were incompetent and miserably paid and [they] could only maintain discipline 'by sheer brute strength'" (p. 104-5). Nevertheless, Blundell describes that the societal "commitment to the principle of universal access to elementary school education and the signature institutions that would shape children's experiences of education… were in place" (p. 105).

Blundell (2012) makes reference to Ellen Key (1909) who pronounced the 1900s to be "The Century of the Child" as health and welfare services became a priority with masses of children accessing the education system (p. 108). Medical inspections became normalized in schools, as children were weighed, measured and assessed by medical professionals (p.110). After the First World War, movement to new ways of theorizing the child and associated curricula and pedagogy emerged from discourses of the mind (p. 124). Blundell (2012) shows that as the idea of early child rearing and its importance to the developing child's psyche gained popularity, the child became the object of increasing psychological and behavioural observation (p. 126). He quotes Susan Isaac, a psychologist and follower of Freud, who commented that "the aim of education is to create people who are… self-disciplined" (p. 127).

Blundell also draws attention to Jean Piaget's studies of the "natural" development of the child, which tended to enforce a clear distinction of childhood as a separate condition from the rest of human kind (p. 128). He expresses that Piaget's convincing scientific evidence was "so engrained and naturalized that it passes as the indisputable truth about childhood and children" (p. 128). Even today, Piaget's work maintains highly-regarded in the construction of developmentalism as the dominant discourse shaping the language and practice of education (p. 129).

Blundell (2012) cites John Dewey as a major contributor to the development of social constructionist perspectives of educational theories that emerged during the 1920s and 1930s (p. 131). Social constructionists argue that the world is a constantly changing

social reality (p. 131). Blundell states that for Dewey, "knowledge always references the meanings shared in a social context rather than to absolute, unchanging or essential truths" (p. 131). Dewey did not believe that the child is a passive recipient of knowledge, rather he maintained that "the child has agency and an active disposition towards learning" (p. 134). Dewey's influence was evident in the British Education Act of 1944 which challenges Piaget's developmental theories of childhood such as "assumptions that 'younger equates to lesser' as justification for the continued subordination of childhood to adulthood" (p. 136). In opposition to Piagetian discourse, the 1967 Plowden Report prioritized creativity and choice, with the belief that this freedom would make learning more meaningful to children and extend naturally to skill acquisition, an idea which was criticized at the time by those with concerns about employability in the labour market and the importance of being able to read, write and perform calculations effectively (p. 149).

Debates continue today between knowledge-centered traditionalists and child-centered progressive perspectives on education, and so Plowden's child-centered method was short-lived due to scientific research that claimed his methods had few tangible benefits for children and society (p. 149). Blundell notes another significant difference in State education policy documents as the term "child," which was essential to Plowden's view, was supplemented with the low-status and assimilating term "pupil" used in The Education Reform Act or 1988 (p. 150). He states that policy documents outlined that "to be a good pupil is to be punctual, obedient, willful and industrious while climbing the ladder of knowledge skills and understanding set out by the curriculum" (p. 150). Once again, Piagetian ideologies prevailed and dominated discourses of childhood, as seen in the 1988 Education Reform Act and the accompanied establishment of the Office for Standards in Education in which a national system was locally administered (p. 147). The Act concerned school layout and furnishings that allowed for optimal teacher supervision, as well as regulation of time. In 1989, educational standards surpassed the national level with the introduction of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) (p. 158).

The UNCRC legitimated developmental, social and romantic perspectives of childhood, with its commitment to healthy development and growth, focused on cultural context and on the future of children and their place in society. Furthermore it broke

ground as it confirmed the participatory rights of children to freedom of expression, especially over matters concerning them (p. 158). The focus on the participatory rights and understanding of children as competent, social agents is paramount in Alan Prout and Allison James' (1990) argument of a new paradigm for the sociology of childhood and the introduction of Social Actor Theory.

Discourses of Childhood and Social Actor Theory

James and Prout (1990) claim that children have perhaps at no other time been as highly profiled as during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, and at the heart of current debate is the question: "What is a child?" (p. 1). Consistent with social constructionist perspectives, James and Prout argue that "The Century of the Child" is characterized by "the massive corpus of knowledge build up by psychologists and other social scientists through the systematic study of children" (p. 8). Psychological explanations of childhood development, announced early in the twentieth century have, until recently, dominated the study of childhood, and are supported by child-rearing and educational practices (p. 10). James and Prout explain that social actor theory stems from a framework of the 'new' social study of childhood which moves beyond assumptions of the naturalness of childhood thus making it possible to explore alternative perspectives of childhood, as they explore in *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood* (p. 10).

James and Prout (1990) explore "the ways in which the immaturity of children is conceived and articulated in particular societies into culturally specific sets of ideas and philosophies, attitudes and practices which combine to define 'the nature of childhood'" (p. 1). They identify various perspectives of childhood and decipher a list of three guiding principles; the first is that childhood is to be understood as a political and cultural construction rather than as natural phenomena (p. 3). "Biological immaturity" is a universal experience of childhood, but ways of understanding childhood are neither universal nor natural (p. 3). Corsaro and Qvortrup explain that like other socially constructed categories including class, gender, and race, childhood is a "permanent structural form or category that never disappears even though its members change continuously and its nature and conception vary historically" (as cited in Ryan, 2008, p. 555). For many, childhood' remains a category of personhood similar to 'womanhood'

prior to feminist thought, in the sense that both groups are undifferentiated in their purity, incompetency, irrationality and dependency" (James & Prout, 1990, p. 15). In fact, James and Prout (1990) argue that childhood is a social institution as it forms "a specific structural and cultural component of all known societies," although interpretations vary historically and cross-culturally (p. 3).

The second principle of social actor theory, according to James and Prout (1990) is that the study of the institution of childhood "can never be entirely separated from other variables such as class, gender or ethnicity" (p. 4). In Ryan's (2008) examination of James and Prout's *New Paradigm of Childhood*, he adds that "children are active subjects operating within a social field rather than mere products of heredity and environment" (p. 555). James and Prout (1990) stress that despite comparative historical and cross-cultural analysis studies that reveal a variety of childhoods − a single, simplistic, more traditional "world" view of "the Child" dominates literature and professional practice (p. 4).

The third principle raised by James and Prout (1990) is an idea of a paradigm shift in the way in which children are understood in comparison to adults. Ryan (2008) suggests that this 'new' approach to understanding childhood has evolved because "'plain observations' about the experiences of children do not align with modern ideals of childhood" (p. 556).

Social actor theory challenges the adult versus child modern dualism, allowing children to be viewed as competent agents (Ryan, 2008, p. 556). James and Prout (1990) argue that "children must be seen as actively involved in the construction of their own social lives, the lives of those around them and of the societies in which they live" (p. 4). Understanding the socially constructed distinctions between child and adult versions of personhood, particularly perspectives of the individual as a "product of society vs. rights-bearing subject" or as a "natural phenomena vs. political construction" are considered by Ryan (2008) as "integral to modern analytical thought" and valuable in interpreting how contemporary works about childhood relate to past ones (p. 555). Research from emergent paradigmatic perspectives attempt to give voice to children by regarding childhood and the social relationships of children as worthy to be studied in their own right and not "just as receptacles of adult teaching" (James & Prout, 1990, p. 8).

The elements within social actor theory, particularly the idea of individual agency and the construction of childhood as a socially constructed category contradict the standpoints of socialization and developmental theories of childhood (Ryan, 2008, p. 554). Social actor theory conflicts with understandings of childhood "as a natural, universal and biologically inherent period of human development," such as within in a Piagetian developmental theory, in which the ultimate goal is adulthood (p. 115). From a developmental perspective, the meaning of childhood is defined by adults "who thus determine how a child should behave" (p. 115). On the other hand, when childhood is conceptualized as a social, political and cultural construction rather than as a *natural* phenomenon, it is possible to recognize children as right-bearing subjects as opposed to products of society and environment.

A perspective of childhood, which acknowledges children as persons who are able to participate in their own construction as subjects, enables researchers to recognize the latter as political agents who are imbedded within and constrained by social institutions, including education, in which certain groups are privileged and others are oppressed (p. 555). Furthermore, treating childhood as a social construction involves understanding that there is no such object as "the real child" or one authentic and universal experience of childhood (James & Prout, 1990, p. 27). Instead, from a social actor perspective, childhood can be understood in terms of "how different discursive practices produce difference childhoods, each and all of which are 'real'" and within what Foucault refers to as their own "regime of truth" (p. 27).

Poststructuralist Theory

The work of Sondergaard (2002) and Weedon (1999) indicate that poststructuralist approaches to empirical analysis draw on social constructionist epistemologies. According to Weedon (1999), Foucault is one of the major theorists that poststructuralist theories draw from, with a focus on "issues of language, subjectivity, the unconscious, the body, discourse of power… the transparency of language, the nature of power and the possibility of accessing truth" (p. 3-4). Sondergaard (2002) suggests that investigation of proposed "truth claims" are interesting to study because they produce social and cultural effects as well as induce "regular effects of power" (p.188).

Sondergaard proposes that perhaps the "most radical claim of poststructuralism is to reject the possibility of arriving at a 'truth' about the essence of a phenomenon" (p. 188). It is in this sense that a poststructuralist approach "opens up space for alternative voices" in interpreting social constructions and practices that are typically perceived as normal or natural (Weedon, 1999, p. 4).

While biological theories dominate the definition of the nature of childhood, Weedon claims that poststructuralists deconstruct meanings presented in biological difference as they "argue that difference is cultural rather than natural" (p. 23). She argues that the effect of poststructuralist theory is the ability to investigate biological differences "as material, as produced, but as ungrounded in any fixed nature" (p. 24). Poststructuralist perspectives examine the processes of subjectification in which "identities and social categories are constructed through processes of exclusion"; this process extends to one group "becoming subordinated by power" and "becoming a subject" (Sondergaard, 2002, p. 188). Furthermore, Weedon explains that poststructuralist theories stress the importance of language in challenging theories of "fixed meanings or bodies" (p. 102). She states that "meaning is an effect of language" and is, therefore, "historically and culturally specific" (p. 102). Meanings are formed within institutions and they create specific discourses (p. 102). The idea that discourses produce meaning and subjectivity is one of the fundamental poststructuralist ideas (p. 102-103). Weedon explains that just as gender discourses define what it means to be and behave as a woman or man, children and educators learn how to think and behave in accordance with social norms (p. 104). Poststructuralist theory prompts educators to reject ideas of the "natural order of things" and question current practices (Sondergaard, 2002, p. 187).

Using the poststructuralist idea that our access to all 'truths' or 'norms' about children are contingent upon and are historically embedded within institutional arrangements and discourses, in connection with readings of Foucault's power/knowledge, I am able to analyse the textbook with an understanding that authors work from different discourses of childhood and various 'regimes of truth' to make claims about classroom management pedagogy. An understanding of poststructuralist and Foucauldian notions of truth enable me to explore the textbook in a way that sheds

light on the limitations of an approach to classroom management that relies entirely on Educational and Developmental Psychology and which ignores the significance of other theoretically informed perspectives such as those grounded in social actor and poststructuralist theories.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have outlined the theoretical frameworks that inform my understanding of the topic and focus on classroom management, particularly as they relate to the construction of childhood as a political category. I examined Foucault's (1977-1982) understanding of discipline as a 'technology' or form of power, as well as his understanding of disciplinary training in relation to the role of the Panopticon in institutions such as prisons, as basis for grounding my understanding of the role of knowledge-power relations in endorsing certain approaches to classroom management. For instance, developmental psychology rather than social actor theories are accorded more currency and legitimacy in the textbook that is the subject of this thesis and this has implications for how classroom management and the child are thought about and understood. The fact that the discourse on learning or pedagogy is dominated by the concept (goes under the title of) 'classroom management,' helps situate the practices of schooling under a larger disciplinary regime of truth. Developmental psychology and orthodox theories of human socialization are the most obvious and direct formal intellectual arms of this regime. It is no surprise that the instrumental assumptions, concepts, and images of childhood learning from these perspectives frame the textbooks on something called 'classroom management'. Such bodies of knowledge play a key role in justifying certain normalizing judgments, and support hierarchical observation, and examination as a means by which to exercise power and to control or subjugate students. I also drew on theorists who worked from a social constructionist world view, specifically Blundell (2012), James and Prout (1990 & 1997), to draw attention to the historical construction of schooling and perspectives on childhood. Finally, I examined Weedon (1999) and Sondergaard's (2002) reading of poststructuralist theory, which draws attention to the politics of truth embedded in discourses about schooling, childhood, and *discipline*. These various theoretical and philosophical frameworks have

enabled me to explore the perspectives of childhood and schooling from a political standpoint and to draw attention to the values and norms that govern thinking about classroom management.

Chapter 3

Literature Review

Introduction

In this chapter I explore definitions of discipline and classroom management in literature written from a variety of perspectives on classroom management. Using Ryan's (2008) "Landscape of Modern Childhood," as a framework for categorizing researchers' understandings of childhood and classroom management, I locate various works within discourses of 'the developing child', 'the conditioned child', 'the authentic child', and 'the political child' (p. 558). Through the process of reviewing literature from various disciplines, I identify that a researcher's definition of classroom management reflects a particular construction of the child and childhood, which corresponds to an individual scholar's approach, methodology and claims made within the study about classroom management.

It is important to point out that many scholars do not strictly subscribe to one discourse of childhood; rather there are overlapping understandings and claims made about childhood and pedagogical practices pertaining to children in schools and classrooms. However, this is not to deny that there are generative tensions between scholars from opposing fields, thus creating inconsistent or competing definitions of and approaches to addressing classroom management. I begin the literature review by examining definitions of classroom management from within the field of education psychology, as this discipline dominates the literature on classroom management.

The Developing Child

The definition of classroom management that dominates classroom management research relies on a 'scientific' understanding of classroom management and childhood which draws significantly on educational psychology; one that is calculated, measurable, and testable. A developmental understanding of classroom management has its roots in psychological and behavioural discourses of childhood; major contributions to this field include Freud's model of psychosexual development, Piaget's model of cognitive development, and Kohlberg's model of moral development (Ryan, 2008, p. 559). Ryan

explains that researchers "pursue objective knowledge of childhood as a natural phenomenon", which may maintain an "outright rejection of human subjectivity in behaviorism" (p. 562). Furthermore, Ryan indicates that such perspectives are pronounced in classroom management literature that describes normative behaviour, age and maturity guidelines, emphasis on testing and standardization, behaviour modification strategies, and recommendations for "often simplistic deployment of stage theories" (p. 561). Simonsen et al. (2008), for example, claim that studies involving classroom management from this domain are supported by "evidence-based" research, often involving experimental design, and with a long history in the field of education, and indicate that developmental perspectives may be the most persuasive in informing practitioners' approaches in schools to addressing and thinking about classroom management (p. 351).

Simonsen et al. (2008), promote the view that teachers need to be trained and supported in implementing practices which are supported by evidence; however, they argue for scientific approaches to research in a manner that de-validates other methodologies (p. 351). They state, for example, that "most organizations agree" that evidence-based practices meet the following five criteria: "(a) the use of a sound experimental or evaluation design and appropriate analytical procedures, (b) empirical validation of effects, (c) clear implementation procedures, (d) replication of outcomes across implementation sites, and (e) evidence of sustainability" (Kerr & Nelson, 1996, p. 89 as cited in Simonsen et al., 2008, p. 352). Furthermore, Simonsen et al (2008) attest that educators who follow "current trends" in classroom management need to be guided by "scientifically-validated" practice, which they identify as a "standard that has gained popularity in the past decade" (p. 352). The four critical features of effective classroom management, according to Simonsen et al., are consistent with much of the literature drawn from this field of developmental psychology.

The first feature of sound classroom management, according to Simonsen et al. (2008), coincides with research that finds that "classrooms with more structure have been shown to promote more appropriate academic and social behaviors" (p. 357). Little and Akin-Little (2008), for instance, claim that classrooms should "maximize structure and predictability," such as strategic designs of the classrooms that allow for close physical

proximity between the teacher and students in order to help "curtail disruptive behaviours and refocus a student to instructional tasks" (p. 228). This position is supported by Simonsen et al. who state that physical arrangements such as desks, educational tools, and posters should be arranged in a way that minimizes distractions (p. 352). Simonsen et al also stress that classroom structure and routines should be predictable and consistent for students and rules and expectations must be explicitly defined through a high amount of teacher-directed activity (p. 354).

According to Simonsen et al. (2008), the second feature of classroom management is a structured process of teaching, reviewing, monitoring and reinforcing classroom rules and expectations (p. 358). For instance, Little and Akin-Little (2008) claim that rules are "the first place to start in effective classroom management" (p. 228). They argue that rules should be very specific, describe an observable behaviour, focus on behaviours that are measurable, positively stated (for instance, Little and Akin-Little cite a school 'pact' to "Be Safe, Be Responsible, Be Respectful"), rules should be posted in a prominent place in the classroom, and directly connect to consequences (p. 230).

Thirdly, Simonsen et al. (2008) argue that rules should be "explicitly and systematically taught to students" with "frequent review" and constant monitoring and supervision by the teacher in order for the teacher to appropriately apply reinforcement strategies (p. 358). This teacher-regulated method is said to lead to great gains in decreasing disruptive behaviour, specifically "talking out," and increase academic achievement, particularly when paired with feedback and reinforcers (Simonsen et al, p. 358).

The fourth element of classroom management, according to Simonsen et al. (2008), is the use of strategies to acknowledge appropriate behaviour – this strategy is considered essential for teaching students to understand expectations and to associate their behaviours with specific consequences (p. 364). Behavioural research provides numerous examples of reinforcement strategies, some of the most popular being verbal teacher praise or "explicit reprimands", such as stating the observed behaviour and telling the student "exactly what they should do in the future in a brief and concise manner" (p. 364). Written feedback is also recommended, such as sticker charts used to track a student's time on-task which may result in a reward if the criterion is met (p. 364). Little

and Akin-Little claim that group reinforcement and token economies "have the potential to be fun" (p. 232), and furthermore, Simonsen et al. claim that there is "broad evidential support" that these systems encourage students to self-monitor and peer-monitor behaviours as the group works collectively to achieve a tangible reward or desirable activity (Simonsen et al, 2008, p. 363). Planned ignoring of improper behaviour while praising the positive behaviour of other students is repeatedly cited as an effective "error correction" technique (Little & Akin-Little, 2008, p. 230; Simonsen et al., 2008, p. 368). Removing a student from a "reinforcing environment (e.g., play structure with peers) to a less reinforcing environment (e.g., empty classroom)" is another evidence-based method of reducing undesired behaviour (Simonsen et al., 2008, p. 365).

The fifth feature, according to Simonsen et al, is "evidence-based practice" which supports the use of direct instruction from the teacher, as well as computer assisted instruction, class-wide peer tutoring, and guided notes, as these practices involve highly structured engagement and active student participation, such as writing and answering questions as opposed to passively listening to the teacher (p. 359). They state that classroom management approaches are used to create ample opportunities for students to respond, which is considered a key element in maintaining student engagement (p. 359). In addition, they indicate that some engagement strategies include whole-group responds and response cards "i.e., erasable boards on which all students write their answers to a question and then hold the boards up for the teacher to see" (p. 359). They argue that "if students are actively engaged in instruction, then it is difficult to engage in incompatible behaviours (e.g., talking out, out of seat)" (p. 359). The notion of preventing undesirable behaviours is also pivotal in socialization theories of classroom management.

The Conditioned Child

Like developmental perspectives of childhood, theorists from a socialization or 'conditioned child' perspective also explore childhood as an objective phenomenon; the difference, however, is that childhood is not understood as a natural phenomenon, rather children are considered to be a "product of environmental conditioning" (Ryan, 2008, p. 559). Ryan, for example, claims that the perspective of the conditioned child plays on

ideologies of children's subjectivity and emphasizes classroom management that encourages children to develop into certain kinds of adults (p. 563).

Ryan (2008) states that "modern socialization theory can be traced back at least to Locke's rejection of 'innate 'ideas;'" a theory that the child is "a blank slate for adults to write upon so long as they do it with adequate finesse" (p. 569). From this perspective, nothing is "natural" about the child; rather adults attempt to prompt desirable habits "without the child perceiving it as such" (p. 560). For example, Ryan explains the experiment of "Skinner's Box," in which an enclosed devise is used to control the physical environmental conditions of his daughter's crib, "because it allowed the Skinners to change their baby's behavior 'to suit [their] convenience,'" by reducing feeding times and elongating their baby's naps until the parents were ready for breakfast (p. 563). This form of classical conditioning appears in less drastic forms within literature dealing with classroom management in which childhood is perceived as a stage of conditioning children to behave in accordance with certain norms, values, and behaviours that are consistent with a particular view of their role in society as future adults.

Researchers who subscribe to a socialization perspective, as described by Marshall (2008), manipulate fear tactics by raising concerns about 'the undisciplined child' and potential criminal behaviour children may exhibit as youth or as adults (p. 268). Little and Akin-Little (2008) emphasize the importance of studying classroom management by relating children's misbehaviour to "tragic events in locations such as Red Lake, Minnesota, and Litteton, Colorado" (p. 227). From this fear-induced perspective, researches such as Milner and Tenore (2010) are able to argue that poor classroom management may contribute to undesirable behaviours from students, perpetuating a cycle of criminality (p. 563). Noguera (2003) raises a concern that "disciplinary practices in school often bear a striking similarity to the strategies used to punish adults in society," particularly exclusionary practices with "the assumption that safety and order can be achieved by removing 'bad' individuals and keeping them away from others who are presumed to be 'good' and law abiding'" (p. 342). The result, however, according to Noguera, is that "those most frequently targeted for punishment in school often look – in terms of race, gender, and socioeconomic status – a lot like smaller

versions of the adults who are most likely to be targeted for incarceration in society" (p. 343).

Midthassel (2006) claims that students are thought to view teachers as role-models and mimic their behaviours and, therefore, "the teacher has to behave in a way that creates a positive adult model for their pupils" (p. 372). For example, teachers are expected to consciously regulate their emotions as to avoid "losing it" with students during challenging confrontations, and so teachers model and even use self-talk strategies for emotional regulation, such as deep breathing and diverting their attention from the problem (Sutton et al., 2009, p. 132). In Midthassel's (2006) study of a teacher-created school-wide classroom management initiative, the element identified as most important is that for "clear classroom management… the teacher is a model for the pupils' behaviour" (p. 380). One teacher interviewed stated, "'for some kids you are going to be mama, daddy, brother, auntie, uncle, grandmother, and granddaddy… For some of them it's going to be almost like a big brother. They're going to do what you do. Now if you're modeling good behavior, they're going to act like you, almost like a younger sibling would'" (Milner & Tenore, 2010, p. 584). In Milner and Tenore's example, the teacher's understanding of their relationship with students emphasizes the conditioned child perspective in that children are expected to passively adopt the behaviours being modeled by the teacher and to internalize specific societal norms. Views from a 'conditioned child' standpoint generate tension with classroom management researchers who position themselves with romantic theories of classroom management which appeal to the intrinsic wants and needs of the 'natural' or 'authentic child'.

The Authentic Child

A significant portion of classroom management literature exemplifies an understanding of childhood as a "natural phenomenon" that "romanticizes the subjectivity of children" (Ryan, 2008, p. 559). Freiberg and Lamb (2009), for instance, hold a romantic perspective of childhood which leads to claims that classroom management is about authenticity and developing relationships with children (p. 102). Milner and Tenore (2010) interpret student misbehavior as a product of disconnected teachers, suggesting that "students often question: 'Why should I adhere to this teacher's

management desires when she or he does not really care about me?'" (p. 567). Authentic relationships between students and teachers are said to be "essential for [teachers'] effectiveness" (Sutton et al., 2009, p. 131). From this sentimental view, images of innocent children needing to be loved and cared for are consistent with discourses in the literature that promote meeting the emotional needs of children (Marshall, 2008, p. 358).

Ryan (2008)'s "Landscape of Modern Childhood" illustrates how romantic theories of childhood bear similarities to developmental perspectives of childhood in their connection to biology and natural stages of early development; the difference is an understanding that children are not mere "products of biology"; rather they are subjects who "actively participate in their own representation" (p. 564). Milner and Tenore (2010) claim that individualism is important in this domain as emphasized by the rejection of universal pedagogical practices in favour of building "solid and sustainable relationships with… each student as an individual" (p. 577). In opposition to socialization approaches to classroom management, dealing with student misbehaviour does not require teachers to conceal their emotions; rather teachers are advised to show their true emotions. For example, in Milner and Tenore (2010) one teacher shares a narrative of a heated argument which he compares to that of "two brothers fighting," in which he and the student yell and wave their arms in frustration as a means of communicating their feelings (p. 579). Milner and Tenore explain that the consequence of such outbursts contributes to the powerful relationship the teacher develops with their students. They conclude in claiming that classroom management is about teachers' trying to understand each student by respecting their right to express themselves (p. 599). The premise of their idea is that "where there is respect, there is less defiance and more cooperation" and that students are motivated to "please teachers who they like", particularly those who show genuine care (Englehart, 2012, p. 71-72; Covell et al., 2009, p. 285).

Englehart (2012) claims that quality relationships "feed students' developmental needs", and "provide a sense of emotional security that would otherwise be missing for some kids" (p. 72). Marshall (2008) describes how literature portrays children as "pure and uncorrupt" beings, using quotes consistent with a theme of dependency which attracts "sympathies… [and tends] to show children as passive victims" (p. 360-361). To

emphasize that "teaching is about building relationships," Freiberg and Lamb (2009) include an emotional story from an elementary school teacher:

> I needed to build a relationship with Andrew, though he frightened me. We began to talk at recess, about cartoon art and cars—his passions. Slowly, we started to connect. I was no longer his disciplinarian; I was his mentor, friend, and teacher. He learned to make changes in his actions and his reactions to peers. Andrew began to trust me and sought me out to talk. He tried harder in academics and we celebrated his successes. By the end of the year, the child feared by many hugged me and said, 'I don't know how I'm going to make it without you next year.' I nearly cried. And I thought, me too, Andrew (p. 102).

This individualized and student-centred approach to classroom management expressed by Freiberg and Lamb may have its roots in the work of major romantic theorist, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who opposed socialization theories of conditioning obedience in children with his idea that "individual virtue [can] emerge only when love of self…[is] developed through engagement with 'natural consequences'" (Ryan, 2008, p. 570). A romantic belief in "naturalness" of children," (Marshall, 2008, p. 359) is reflected in the "natural reinforcers" documented in classroom management literature (Little & Akin-Little, 2008, p. 229).

While natural reinforcers such as specific verbal praise or a positive note home from the teacher is encouraged, numerous researchers argue that the power of physical touch is a stronger reinforce for children (Simonsen et al., 2008, p. 362; Little & Akin-Little, 2008, p. 229). The use of touch "(e.g., pat on the back or shoulder)" is considered one of the most powerful reinforcement techniques because of its "ability to comfort and quiet" students (Little & Akin-Little, 2008, p. 229). Likewise, the use of an educator's touch in corporal punishment is also considered "an effective and necessary disciplinary practice," by some *modern* classroom management researchers as identified in Paolucci and Violato (2004) (p. 197).

Ironically, views of the authentic child are used by both researchers who advocate for and against the use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary practice. This "spare the rod and spoil the child" attitude towards a perceived necessity of the using corporal punishment on children to 'train' them can be traced back to romantic perspectives,

specifically from the Victorian Age, of "beating the devil" out of inherently evil children (Bartman, 2002, p. 287). Within Paolucci and Violato's (2004) meta-analysis of published research on the affects of corporal punishment in the United States and Canada, they note that spanking, which is defined as "physically noninjurious and as administered with an opened hand to the extremities or buttocks, with the intention of modifying behavior," has potential to benefit children long-term (p. 198). Finding that disciplinary spanking "does not appear to pose a serious emotional, cognitive, or behavioral health problem" for most children exposed to it, Paolucci and Violato (2004) claim that when corporal punishment is administered by an adult with whom the child has a "warm, nurturing relationship," then this form of touch can "facilitate a child's happy accommodation to the world" (p. 216).

On the other hand, romantic images of pure and innocent children in need of protection are prominent in more recent works advocating against the use of corporal punishment on children. In Kilimci's (2009) study of teachers' perception of corporal punishment as a method of discipline in elementary schools, the dominant moral and ethical arguments against use of force is that spanking denies children the right to be protected from abuse (p. 242). Using the same argument, Bartmen (2002), claims that it is the responsibility of school officials to "protect children from violence in schools;" therefore, allowing the use of corporal punishment is an infringement on the basic human right to be free from violence (p. 283). Romantic images of the child are often the foundation of initiatives that promote children's rights, such the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) (Kilimci, 2009, p. 242), specifically, the child's right to be protected. From an alternative perspective in which children are seen as political agents as opposed to passive victims in need of protection, researchers working within a social actor theory framework advocate for classroom management practices that protect children from harm and enable children to participate in major educational and legal decisions that concern them.

The Political Child

Ryan (2008) identifies the political child as "construed as a subject participating in the social construction of childhood," with a part to play in the politics of education (p.

574). For researchers working within a social actor theory discourse, classroom management is about child participation. Ryan states that literature from the political child perspective includes research which explores childhood as a "political and cultural construction rather than a natural phenomena" (p. 555).   Researchers view children as social actors, meaning they are "active subjects operating within a social field rather than mere products of heredity and environment" (Ryan, 2008, p. 555). Researchers such as Freiberg and Lamb (2009) reject the limitations of cognitive developmental charts and stimulus-behaviour consequences and they recommend educators challenge current classroom management pedagogy:

> Look inside today's American classrooms and you will find many students still living in a behaviorist world: struggling to earn that next gold star that equals extra privileges or living in perpetual fear of that dreaded check next to their name, meaning a loss of privileges. In this traditional model of classroom management, based on behaviorism, discipline is teacher-directed. There are fixed rewards and consequences for student behavior. Fear of predetermined consequences and desire to earn rewards are used to motivate students and keep them compliant and obedient. Is this the most effective way to focus student attention on learning and reduce discipline problems? (p. 99)

The alternative involves embracing practices which value children's voices, acts on their claims, and shifts control and responsibility from teachers to students for meaningful participation in their education.

With a view of children as competent social actors, researchers recommend facilitating an environment in which children participate in active, not passive roles in their education by providing children with opportunities to be heard by adults willing to make change (Lundy, 2007, p. 931). In accordance with Article 12 of the UNCRC, children are entitled "to have their view given due weight in all matters affecting them," particularly within education (Lundy, 2007, p. 929). In many classrooms "students have little (if any) voice and perspective in the learning environment" (Milner & Tenore, 2010, p. 569). Milner and Tenore (2010) claim that in classrooms where teachers admit that they do not have "everything figured out," listen to their students' perspectives on educational issues, and take action on their student's voiced concerns, then relationships

between teachers and students strengthen and student misbehaviour decreases (p. 568). Educators are coming to realize different ways in which students voice their opinions, not only though verbal and written exchanges, but also through body language and behaviours (Lundy, 2007, p. 937), as exemplified in Hall and Rudkin's (2011) *Seen and Heard: Children's Rights in Early Childhood Education*.

In Hall and Rudkin (2011), children's rights are investigated from children's perspectives and different forms of expressions are considered worthy of being listened to. In a case study, four-year-old students worked collaboratively to create a world for their classroom pet hamsters in which human rights are respected, reflecting both their broader interest in rights, their desire to advocate, and their deep-thinking voiced by non-traditional means (Hall & Rudkin, p. 68). With emphasis on freedom and mobility, the students create a world which protects the rights they afford animals, specifically they honour the hamsters' rights to security while granting them freedom to move, explore and make mistakes. Most profoundly, students value the hamsters' voices. Students interpret the hamsters' body language and translate it, for example, Jack announces that when the pets nibble on their cage, the hamsters are saying: "'Please let me out of my cage!'" (Hall & Rudkin, p. 69). Social actor theory perspectives of classroom management require the same attention to children's behaviours in order for adults to amplify children's voices in the same way children listen to the voices of their pets.

Heydon (2008) argues that to listen to children requires humility that allows educators to enter into a relationship with the belief that children have something to teach adults (p. 30). When adults listen and amplify the voices of children, whether it is through speech, jumping, twirling, biting or drawing, then children's deep thinking and competency becomes apparent (Hall & Rudkin, 2011, p. 90). Students who "talk back" or "mouth off" to teachers may be heard differently by educators who believe that students voices are worthy of being listened (Milner & Tenore, 2010, p. 563). Lundy (2007) argues that simply listening to children is not sufficient (p. 931), rather action and a shift in control and responsibility are necessary in social actor theory discourses of classroom management strategies "that reify systems of oppression and voicelessness among students" (Milner & Tenore, 2010, p. 570).

When children are seen as "active in the construction and determination of their own social lives, the lives of those around them and of the societies in which they live," then educators recognize the value of granting children responsibility and control in their education (James & Prout, 1997, p. 8). Lundy (2007) uses a rights-based argument towards classroom management pedagogy by referencing Article 12 of the UNCRC, which entitles children to be "involved at each of the stages at which decisions are made which will ultimately impact on the child in the classroom"; specifically, Lundy argues that children should be included in decisions which impact the individual pupil, school and classroom policies, as well as government policy and legislation (Lundy, 2007, p. 931). Marzano (2011) describes a "powerful" school-wide classroom management initiative which involves students in designing rules and procedures, signing a student-made contract and having students enforce their rules (p. 86). Freiberg and Lamb (2009) argue that when classroom management becomes the responsibility of the student, then students have "opportunities to be responsible, with freedom and choice, but not [a] license to do whatever they [wish]" (p. 101). Releasing responsibility to pupils requires a change in a "teacher's perspective from 'I am in control' to 'we are in control'" (p. 104-105). In a rights-respecting environment, children have "the freedom to participate actively in the curriculum" (Tzuo, 2007, p. 38), thus increasing student engagement, which is often cited as the root of student misbehaviour (Covell, 2010, p. 39).

In a comparative study, Covell (2010) relates the consequences of classroom management practices in traditional schools in contrast to schools that explicitly teach and attend to children's rights to be heard and participate in educational decisions in accordance with Section 12 of the UNCRC (p. 39). Students in rights-respecting schools are involved in developing behaviour codes of conduct, they participate in classroom teaching that is democratic, and they have numerous opportunities to participate in school functions, such as budgeting and hiring (p. 40). Covell concludes that pupils' in rights-respecting schools identify higher levels of school engagement, referring to their "positive perceptions and feelings about their school, teachers and peers," as well as their "active participation in school-related activities and learning" (p. 39). Rights-based schooling is found to increase children's enjoyment, and strengthen their self-esteem and academic motivation. Furthermore, Covell claims that this method of management

encourages greater respect for the rights of others which fosters "prosocial behaviors" and strengthened relationships between teachers and pupils (p. 41).

Conclusion

In this section I categorized classroom management literature into four perspectives of the child based on Ryan's (2008) "Landscape of Modern Childhood" (p. 558). Classroom management practices from a political child perspective connected with the authentic child view of the importance of developing teacher-student relationships. The political child and the conditioned child shared perspectives of using institutionalized education as a means by which to raise democratic citizens. Conversely, the political child has generative tensions with age and maturity limitations regulated through classroom management practices rooted in a view of the developing child. As Milner and Tenore (2010) affirmed: "Indeed, what has become increasingly clear in this line of scholarship is that researchers do not necessarily agree on the constructs used to conceptualize classroom management" (p. 572). While the perspectives of childhood were reflected in diverse and sometimes conflicting claims and recommendations for the future of classroom management, research from all four perspectives agreed that classroom management requires much more research, and educators require additional support in implementing classroom management practices, both at the in-service and preservice level (Midthassel, 2006, p. 369). I identified a gap in literature that explores how Faculties of Education might incorporate a wider variety of discourses of childhood and classroom management pedagogy into their programs, or how they might explore more equity and social justice approaches to classroom management. In this thesis, I am concerned to investigate the discourses of childhood and pedagogical practices endorsed in one officially sanctioned classroom management textbook that is used in a preservice education program. This literature review enables me to contextualize and also serves as important backdrop to important discussions regarding the politics of classroom management and the various constructions of childhood that are embedded in different theoretical perspectives and approaches..

Chapter 4

Methodology

Introduction

In this chapter I outline my methodological approach to undertaking a case study involving a critical discourse analysis of a specific textbook written by Edmunds and Edmunds (2010) that is used to introduce teacher education students to effective classroom management strategies. The single, instrumental case study is bound by an analysis of one preservice education classroom management course textbook along with reference to a corresponding course syllabus. The main issues that I examine include the way in which the child is constituted in the language used in the textbook, the sorts of discourses that inform the pedagogical approach to current classroom management legitimated by the authors and the phenomena of specific ways in which the bodies of children are regulated and the voices of children are silenced in the classroom management practices endorsed in the textbook. I seek to identify patterns and emergent themes through a poststructuralist approach to critical discourse analysis informed by the work of Gee (2011) and Foucault (1977-1982).

I use a Foucauldian (1975-1977) understanding of disciplinary power and power/knowledge to investigate the coercion of the body and silencing of students' voices endorsed in the classroom management textbook. By examining examples from the textbook in connection with Foucault's understanding of disciplinary training, I examine more specifically the notions of power that inform and are embedded in the Edmunds and Edmunds text. I examine the authors' examples of classroom management in practice using the elements of the disciplinary process, as identified by Foucault (1975), specifically hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment and examination. By drawing on Foucault, I analyze the systematic power Edmunds and Edmunds endorse in the textbook, which appears to provide students with active participatory rights. However, upon closer examination, I examine how the power-knowledge underpinning Edmunds and Edmunds' approach to classroom management involves more systematic ways of coercing the body to behave in a particular way by 'training' students to both self-regulate their behaviours and pressure their peers to conform to particular

behavioural norms. I address Foucault's (1975) claims about using normalizing judgment strategically to "homogenize the social body" as a means by which to analyze techniques endorsed in the textbook (p. 184). I also explore "regimes of truth" surrounding Edmunds and Edmunds' claims about effective teaching practices and discuss the consequences and effects of embracing pedagogies and classroom management practices that reinforce adult superiority over children.

In order to interpret the richness and complexity of social and political issues involved in the knowledge construction throughout the textbook, I engage in "triangulating" key observations from multiple theoretical conceptualizations, including elements from Foucault's epistemological framework, social actor theory and poststructuralism (Stake, 2005, p. 443). Weaving in ethnographic observations enable me to strategically employ personal counter narratives in response to the dominant approach to classroom management that is presented in the textbook. Such alternative interpretations challenge official and dominant constructions of childhood and schooling that are advocated in the textbook. The bounded and focused case study of this particular textbook and syllabus allows for a deeper understanding of the political significance of the various discourses at play in how classroom management is constituted and the idea of the child-student that is implicated in such discourses. The purpose is to reflect on the implications of official textbooks for authorizing certain pedagogical strategies in terms of how to best manage children in the current education system, with the specific aim of entertaining possibilities for elaborating more socially just practices in classrooms.

An Instrumental Case Study

This case study involves an examination of a textbook used in a preservice education program in the only course at a particular Faculty of Education that claims to explicitly teach theories of classroom management. Case study method allows for a concentrated focus on the single textbook in a manner that is specific and bounded (Stake, 2005, p. 444). While the textbook is the main focus of the study, the syllabus is included in order to examine which chapters of the text are identified as important enough for required reading, as well as to frame the manner in which the textbook is used for assessment purposes. Stake proposes that "the more the object of the study is a

specific, unique, bounded system, the greater the usefulness of the epistemological rationales," which is why this study is limited to an analysis of the course textbook and course syllabus (p.445). In examining the textbook and syllabus, I also raise important issues about knowledge construction and reproduction (Stake, p. 144). I concentrate on the influence of the textbook's social and political context, both in its use at the particular Faculty of Education, as well as more generally within the Ontario education system as a whole.

In this qualitative analytic investigation into the way in which the image of the child and schooling is constituted within the official classroom management course textbook and syllabus, I adhere to the definition of research offered by Denzin and Lincoln (2005): "Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world" by utilizing "a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible" (p. 3). According to Denzin and Lincoln, qualitative research differs from quantitative research in that the former seeks to answer questions about "how social experience is created and given meaning," whereas the latter emphasizes "measurement and analysis of casual relationships between variables, not processes" (p. 8). They compare qualitative researchers to quilt makers because of their ability to assemble images and pieces of a story using various hooks to create a new creation of a single quilt which makes something visible to the world in a meaningful way (p. 4-5). In my own artistic endeavor, I weave my own personal experiences as a new teacher throughout my analysis of the textbook alongside an engagement with theoretical frameworks elaborated by Gee and Foucault. These narratives function not only to illuminate injustice in practices of knowledge reproduction involving official approaches to classroom management as they are articulated in the textbook, but they also serve to explicate my own misalignment with the official stance on classroom management as it is endorsed by the writers of the textbook. Like a quilter, I stitch, edit, and "puts slices of reality together" to interrogate how childhood is constituted in the textbook in order to generate an understanding of the sorts of discourses that inform pedagogical approaches to classroom management and use strategies to metaphorically stitch a quilt that might 'make visible' possibilities for elaborating more social justice pedagogical practices in classrooms (p. 5).

In order to "provide insight to an issue," I engage in an "instrumental case study" (Stake, 2005, p. 445). An instrumental case study enables my work to "advance understanding" of social justice classroom management pedagogies and constructions of childhood that perceive children as competent social agents (p. 455). Instrumental case studies differ from intrinsic case studies, which seek to better understand a particular case; rather I build on theoretical conceptions of education and childhood to as basis for reflecting on the politics and truth claims governing educational practices that deal with classroom management (p. 446). Unlike intrinsic case studies, an instrumental case study may examine a case that is either typical of other cases or it may be a unique phenomenon in its own right (p. 445).

In arguing for adopting case studies as a research strategy, Karl Popper, a philosopher of science, coined the argument that no matter how many white swans one encounters, the universal statement "all swans are white" can never be confirmed as true: "for the future could yield a black swan" and indeed, black swans do exist (Redman, 1994, p. 68). Popper proposes that just one observation of a single black swan falsifies the generalizing statement about all swans. Case studies allow researchers to focus in-depth on phenomena that occur in a real-life context and researchers may find that "what appears to be 'white' often turns out on closer examination to be 'black'" (Redman, 1994, p. 68). The "loose plan" characteristic of an instrumental case study allows for the opportunity to "recognize and develop late-emerging issues" that arise throughout my investigation which may bring forth an insightful and powerful understanding of the social and political issues involved in knowledge dissemination through the textbook. By following Gee's (2011) guideline and approach to discourse analysis, I am seeking to see "what is ordinary" in the language of the text though a social constructionist lens (Stake, 2005, p. 445). In addition, I use my authoethnographic narratives to challenge the universalizing and normalizing effects of the regimes of truth that govern officially sanctioned approaches to classroom management that are endorsed in the textbook .

The Study of Textbooks

Distinctive to instrumental case studies, I purposely and carefully selected a case that provides a learning opportunity to reflect on and challenge my own pedagogy of

classroom management in connection with the preservice education textbook in order to achieve my ultimate purpose of working towards equity and social justice education (Stake, 2005, 445). According to the research of John Issitt (2004), editor of a journal of textbook study, textbooks "offer an empirical ground on which to base investigation" because they represent "a form of certified 'official' knowledge" (p. 684). Issitt loosely defines textbooks as objects which "cast as surveys of ideas, mere compendiums of existing knowledge arranged and served up for the learner's consumption" (p. 687). Textbooks achieve a "temporary status as a legitimate form of knowledge" and they are presented in educational institutions as both certain knowledge and necessary knowledge (p. 685). Embedded in textbooks is a "foundational epistemological assumptions – that they have a status… with potential for universal application" (p. 685). Issitt insists that the process of exploring the different elements expressed in textbooks is deeply revealing (p. 685). He claims that despite the assumption that textbooks maintain political neutrality, upon close examination, textbooks rarely sustain an ideologically neutral position (p. 688). Analyzing the "hands and forces" that create certain textbooks is revealing, as Issit points out that only select elite authors, writers and researchers have cultural status and "license to produce the 'new'" (p. 685).

As I discuss the relevant political and ethical issues surrounding the use of the textbook as a set text within teacher education faculties, I maintain that my work is not meant to 'expose' the authors, but to understand the major role that textbooks play in authorizing, privileging and endorsing certain constructions of knowledge and truth claims.

Issitt argues that textbooks have a practical purpose and it is not reasonable to expect that one textbook can embody infinite perspectives on classroom management or present views free of political implications (p. 690). Nevertheless, analysis of the textbook used in this preservice education program is crucial, particularly from a social constructionist perspective, as "textbooks present a fine target for the researcher setting about revealing the patterns of the construction of knowledge" (p. 688) The course textbook examined in this study, therefore, in its role as an essential site of learning in the preservice educational program, "is a key mechanism for the production and reproduction of ideas" about the child and classroom management pedagogies (p. 688).

In the study of the textbook, Issitt insists that it is relevant to acknowledge the way in which textbooks and the learners are positioned in a manner that presents the learner as having a "subordinate epistemological status," for instance, the learner is expected to consume knowledge in preparation for regurgitation in an examination or assignment (p. 689). The learner is not expected to think critically about the information or knowledge presented in the text; rather the learner is presented with knowledge that "counts" as the truth and, thus, "alternative claims on the same knowledge area or alternative lines of exploration are cast as irrelevant" (Issitt, p. 689). In order to understand the relationship between the textbook and the learner, it is essential that I examine the textbook in the context of the classroom management course, by framing the textbook in connection with the course syllabus.

Issitt argues that it is important to study the textbook currently in Canadian Faculties of Education because, while it is relatively easy to identify equity issues and political bias in hindsight, such as in examining late nineteenth-century colonial history textbooks in which nations, classes, racial types or genders are referred to in value-laden terms, "it is less easy to see the constructions of our own contemporary ideologies and witness the epistemological assumptions circumscribing the mindset of late modernity" (p. 690). In other words, it is more challenging to identify the injustices in current theories and practices presented to teacher candidates through modern course texts. Swayed by my own interest in achieving classroom management practices that are socially just and which afford children their human rights, I examine the current Edmunds and Edmunds (2010) textbook using critical discourse analysis, which enables me to interrogate and unravel how the textbook functions socially and politically to legitimate certain approaches to addressing classroom management in *modern* educational institutions (Gee, 2011, p. 69).

Discourse Analysis

My understanding of critical discourse analysis is informed by the work of Gee (2011) and Foucault (1966). Gee (2011) defines discourse as "ways of combining and integrating language, actions, interactions, ways of thinking, believing, valuing, and using various symbols, tools, and objects to enact a particular sort of socially recognizable

identity;" in other words, a discourse "is a characteristic way of saying, doing, and being" (p. 29-30). These elements of a discourse are combined through one's identity and practices in a way that others recognize one as being engaged in a particular discourse (p. 35). For instance, in the same way a dancer combines movements of twists, jumps, and twirls in a manner that makes the movements recognizable as particular forms of dance, I aim to recognize the performance of the authors of the classroom management text who combine the "patterns of words…values, beliefs, symbols, tools, objects, times and places" in a particular manner that makes the text recognizable as legitimate and essential for 'normal' or 'acceptable' pedagogical practice in education.

Discourse analysis, Gee (2011) explains, is "the study of language-in-use," such as conversations, stories, or in this case, language used in a preservice textbook (p. 8). With an understanding from Gee that some forms of discourse analysis examine the linguistic and grammatical elements of language, I conduct a different form of discourse analysis in which I seek to understand the situated meaning, social practices and implications of knowledge construction about officially sanctioned pedagogical approaches to classroom management, as well as the construction of childhood and schooling that are endorsed in one particular textbook (p. 8). Through critical discourse analysis, I examine how the text functions socially and politically to certify particular truths about what is to count as effective classroom management practices (p. 69).

Gee's (2011) approach to critical discourse analysis is influenced by the Foucauldian interpretation of discourse as "a practice that is produced historically in a specific socio-cultural context" that is "structured by assumptions and produces power" (p. 69). I analyse implications and issues of power involved in the process of legitimating certain pedagogical beliefs in an officially sanctioned classroom management textbook (Millei, 2005, p. 129). Specifically, I examine the relationship and presentation of the discourses legitimated in the textbook and other discourses that are excluded or even de-legitimated in the text (Gee, 2011, p. 38). I also identify some of the ways in which the language in the textbook influences thinking about classroom management practices in terms of systematically working to regulate the bodies and voices of children. In doing so, I am able to interpret the phenomenon as a basis for building knowledge and understanding about the limits and possibilities for elaborating

more socially justice pedagogical practices in classrooms. Thus, I am able to "engage in politics" and analyze "whose 'interests' are represented, helped, or harmed" by the way in which the authors write about childhood and classroom management (Gee, p. 204).

Through discourse analysis I make problems and controversies visible to the world in a new way (Gee, 2011, p. 8-9). Gee (2011) claims that "language is always political because language is pivotal in how humans interpret and negotiate the world, institutions, and relationships" (p. 8-9). In dealing with issues of equity and human rights, it does not suffice to identify how texts function in social interactions; rather it is necessary to analyze how texts function politically in social interactions (p. 68). Similarly, Burr (2004) states that when people speak and write to each other, the world gets constructed and the use of language can therefore be thought of as a form of action (p. 8). I examine the way in which writing and presenting certain perspectives on classroom management reinforces and constructs norms, because, as Gee (2011) claims, the specific use of language implies to the reader "what is 'appropriate,' 'normal,' 'natural,' 'good,' or 'acceptable'" with regards to the relationships between children and adults and the treatment of children in education (p. 210). To guide my analysis, I adhere to many of the seven questions that Gee states a discourse analyst should ask of any piece of language-in-use, as well as the corresponding tools and building tasks he proposes (p. 17).

Gee (2011) lists "seven building tasks of language" or areas of questioning that are examined in this study (p. 17). The seven building tasks are areas that construct "reality" by building the world and accomplishing actions and identities whenever one speaks or writes (p. 16-17). In this study, I approach the textbook by questioning the following areas that are outlined by Gee: the way in which language is used to identify certain discourses of childhood and pedagogical practices as more or less significant than other discourses, the way language is used to engage in certain practices or activities, the sorts of identities the language attributes to children and educators or the way in which language is used to create a particular identity of the writer, the relationship the language seeks to enact with others, the way language is used in a taken-for-granted manner which serves to identify discourses or practices as "normal," "good," or "the way things ought to be", the way language is used to draw connections, and finally, how the use of

language "privileges or disprivileges" certain epistemologies about childhood and classroom management (p. 17-20). I use the "six tools of inquiry" that Gee discusses in order to understand how the seven building tasks are used in language to "enact or build in the world" (p. 28).

Situated meanings, figured worlds, social languages, discourses, conversations and intertextuality are the six tools of inquiry or "thinking devices" that help me to interpret "how people build identities and practices and recognize identities and practices that others are building around them" (Gee, 2011, p. 28). While engaging in questioning most of the seven building task areas, I use situated meaning as a guide to consider the context in which language is used to "create or construe" information about classroom management in certain ways (p. 73). Gee's explanation of "figured worlds," meaning the image of a typical story or "simplified world" that "captures what is taken to be typical or normal," enables me to examine the textbook in terms of "words and phrases of communication" that make assumptions about childhood or classroom management practices (p.72). Furthermore, I examine the use of "social languages" which Gee uses to refer to the way in which people "use different styles or varieties of language for different purposes" (p. 28). The expressions and "voice" used by the authors is telling of the values and beliefs legitimated in the text (p. 46). The choice in language expresses the discourses endorsed in the textbook as the authors use certain language to "build identities and activities" and engage in "ways of thinking, acting, interacting, valuing, feeling, and believing" (p. 28). I also analyze the manner in which the authors address large scale societal "Conversations" or debates about childhood and schooling (p. 29).

To explore the social and political implications of the language used in the textbook, I use Gee's "big questions" as a guide to the six thinking devices (situated meanings, figured worlds, social languages, discourses, conversations and intertextuality) to ask questions about the seven building tasks (significance, practices/activities, identities, relationships, politics, connections and sign systems/knowledge) (p. 121) (Appendix A). I focus heavily on the thinking devices and rely mostly on the tools of inquiry that enable me to examine the text in terms of understanding the discourses of childhood endorsed by the authors, the way that the discourses inform pedagogical

approaches to classroom management, and the consequences of the authors' perspective that limit and exclude more socially just pedagogical practices.

Gee states that framing the problem is both a tool and a hindrance as "discourse analytic interpretations (just like people's everyday interpretations of language) are always vulnerable to changing as we widen the context within which we interpret a piece of language" (p. 67). To maintain validity in my analysis, I "keep widening the context in which [I] interpret" to include both the course textbook as well as the syllabus, "until [I] see what information and values are being left unsaid or effaced in a piece of language;" Gee states that it is at this point I can stop and make claims (p. 68). While critical discourse analysis is criticized because the analyst "is swayed by his or her own interest or passion for intervening in some problem in the world", I believe that by combining my own personal experiences as a new teacher through autoethnography in combination with critical discourse analysis, it is possible for my work to "speak to" and "intervene in" social and political issues surrounding the presentation of certain pedagogical practices in a preservice textbook (p. 9).

Autoethnography

According to Denzin (1997), autoethnography is "a performance text… turning inward waiting to be staged" (p. 199). While engaging heavily in classroom management literature, both for the purpose of this study, as well as for my own personal growth as a first year teacher, I continuously reflect on my own trials and tribulations, internal conflicts, and questions about who I am and who I want to be as an educator. Through autoethnography, I am able to reflect on my experiences to share them in a way that will provoke the reader to think critically about their own practice. I weave in my own narrative with critical discourse analysis of the textbook to create "charged moments of clarity, connection, and change" (Jones, 2005, p. 765). The emotional element that I bring to the analysis is important for "understanding and theorizing the relationship of self, power, and culture" (Jones, p. 767). Jones claims that personal stories engage the reader in scenes of conflicting moments as I tell a story and connect experience and theory in hopes that readers "will bring the same careful attention to [my] words in the context of their own lives" (p. 765).

Through autoethnography, I demand "attention and participation" on the part of the reader; I encourage the reader witness my experience and create an opportunity for change (Jones, p. 765). In telling my story, I reveal my own part, particularly my own "frightened or cowardly or self-deceived part" in the bodily control and silencing of children's voices through classroom management practices and attempts to fit in or reject certain teaching norms (Jones, p. 767). The "power of narrative" helps to "create, interpret, and change" the social, cultural, politically and personal reality of those involved in the institution of education (p. 767). I challenge myself to critically reflect on my own experiences through "self-investigation" of my own role in the social world as my narrative becomes a "means for interpreting the past, translating and transforming contexts, and envisioning a future" (p. 768).

Jones (2005) argues that autoethnography is grounded in the ideas that "our identities and daily practices are a series of performance choices (conscious and unconscious) that we improvise within cultural and social guidelines" and "that we learn through participation or through performance" (p. 771). I challenge particular "identities or ways of life" that are prescribed for educators in the classroom management text by presenting my individual lived experience "as a means for pointing up the subjective and situated nature of identity" (p. 771). As Jones proposes, my personal narrative performance blends "art" and "life", as I present my experience as one that invites critique, rather than presenting my experience as "authentic (true) and untouchable" (p. 781). Most importantly, my story reflects a "'disturbance' in social, cultural, and political networks of power'" (p. 781). My story is different and unique from the universalizing story that the classroom management textbook attempts to construct for new educators – or in the words of Karl Popper, my experience as a new teacher is a "black swan" (Redman, 1994, p. 68).

Conclusion

In this chapter I outlined my methodological approach in undertaking a singular case study analysis of a particular textbook used at multiple Faculties of Education across Canada. I justified my use of autoethnographic narratives as a basis for counter-arguing normative claims made in the textbook. My understanding of critical discourse analysis

has been informed by the work of Gee (2011) and Foucault (1977-1982). The chapter also outlined how I use discourse analysis to identify how the child is constituted discursively in the textbook, the sorts of discourses that inform the pedagogical approach to modern classroom management legitimated by the author and specific ways in which the bodies of children are regulated and the voices of children are silenced in the classroom management practices endorsed in the textbook.

Chapter 5

Discourse Analysis

Introduction

In this chapter, I present a singular case study through undertaking a discourse analysis of a specific textbook that is used to introduce effective classroom management strategies to preservice education students. The textbook I examine, "Educational Psychology: Applications in Canadian Classrooms" by Alan Edmunds and Gail Edmunds (2010), is currently in use at more than five preservice education faculties across Canada. I focus on how the textbook is deployed at a particular faculty of education to explicitly address classroom management. For instance, the course at this particular faculty for which this textbook is required reading is the only course in the preservice education program which claims to explicitly teach theories and applications of classroom management. The analysis focuses substantially on chapters one and three as these chapters are identified in the course syllabus at this particular university as mandatory readings specifically concerning classroom management.

As a recent graduate from a preservice education program, I engage in my analysis of the textbook by critiquing and reflecting on my own practice as a first year Kindergarten teacher. Throughout my analysis, I weave in ethnographic narratives about my experience navigating applications of classroom management pedagogy. These accounts serve as counter-narratives in the sense that they challenge the universalized positions that are endorsed in the textbook about what constitutes effective classroom management strategies and approaches in the classroom. I use a poststructuralist perspective on the politics of knowledge to guide my explicit political stance and critically reflect on how on the "regimes of truth" about what constitutes effective classroom management as they are authorized in the textbook. A poststructuralist lens enables me to analyse and critique certain perspectives that conflict with my own understandings and teaching practices about how best to manage classroom behaviour in the early childhood classroom (Mac Naughton, 2005, p. 3).

Poststructuralist thinkers, according to Mac Naughton (2005), are influenced by the work of Foucault as they challenge "the assumption that knowledge is free of – and distinct from – politics" (p. 4). They argue that language is intimately connected with "the politics of knowledge and that those politics are evident in the language [educators] use to think of [themselves], [their] subjectivities and to describe our actions and institutions" (p. 4). Furthermore, poststructuralists challenge the idea that "individuals can think and act freely outside of politics of knowledge" (p. 4). Like Mac Naughton, Sondergaard (2002), argues for research that investigates "truth claims," such as those made in the textbook from an Educational Psychology discourse of knowledge, as such "truth claims" produce social and cultural effects as well as induce "regular effects of power" (p.188). Mac Naughton discusses the importance of being a critically reflective educator, so in my practice I consider the "effects of power relationships between people" and I "seek to analyse [the] implication in oppressive and inequitable power relationships with students and then use [my] analysis to work against that oppression and inequity" (p. 7). Critical reflection, Mac Naughton explains, "is the process of questioning how power operates in the process of teaching and learning and then using that knowledge to transform oppressive or inequitable teaching and learning processes" (p. 7).

The assumption in Mac Naughton's claim is that there is no single, universal, or correct way to be an educator and that "all teaching and learning can either contribute to or contest oppression and equity" (p. 7). I believe that there are many different ways of 'doing' classroom management. However, in my analysis of a preservice education textbook, I identify a particular regime of truth and knowledge/power that informs the particular approach to classroom management that is being advocated, and seek to challenge it in support for an approach that, as I understand it, is more democratic, rights-based, and which values children as competent, political actors and decision-makers.

I rely heavily on Gee's (2011) seven building tasks (relationships, identities, sign systems and knowledge, politics, connections, practices and significance) and six thinking devices (figured worlds, social languages, situated meanings, discourses, intertextuality and conversation) to examine how this particular textbook functions socially and politically in educational practice (p. 69). By first positioning the discourse of childhood that Edmunds and Edmunds rely on to explore classroom management, I

analyse how language is used politically to construct a hierarchical power relationship between the authors as experts of knowledge and the readers as passive consumers of knowledge and I examine how the knowledge-power relations enable the textbook to function as a 'regime of truth.' This focus on the construction of knowledge is examined by focusing on the way in which Edmunds and Edmunds favour and certain discourses of childhood and pedagogical practices. I examine the politics of language embedded within the text, and the connections drawn to other texts that serve to reinforce an authoritative relationship between teachers and students by utilizing a developmental educational psychology discourse of childhood as an authoritative framework, specifically by exploring the understanding of self-regulation endorsed in the text. I question the idea of power that appears to be exercised in the constitution of the child as a particular object of the teacher's pedagogical gaze, such as by examining their approach to a democratic rule-making process endorsed in the text.

The focus of my analysis is on the disciplinary practices endorsed in the text by using Foucault's theories of discipline and power/knowledge to investigate the coercion of the body and silencing of student's voices. I also investigate the unintended consequences and effects of embracing pedagogies and disciplinary practices that reinforce adult superiority over children, particularly in order to recognize the ways in which the bodies of children are controlled and their voices are silenced, and to understand the exercising of power as a political tactic within the educational institution. Finally, I argue for a need for change, to present multiple discourses of knowledge in preservice education programs to enable new teachers to make informed and critical decisions about elaborating on more socially just pedagogical approaches to classroom management.

Classroom Management from an Educational Psychology Discourse

Edmunds and Edmunds claim that the goal of using this particular textbook to teach preservice education students is not only to introduce students to "evidence-based" research from the field of educational psychology, but to also demonstrate the importance or necessity of using the principles of education psychology to endorse and justify a particular pedagogical approach. They define classroom management as:

…the actions teachers undertake to create environments that support and enhance academic learning and appropriate social-skill development. This does not mean that classroom management is a 'bag-of-tricks' that is suddenly whipped out by teachers whenever students act improperly, nor is it a method of 'controlling' students so that they obediently respond to teacher demands. Rather, classroom management is a coherent set of principles and skills that are applied and integrated into everyday activities of teachers and students who are interacting and working together. (p. 75)

Furthermore, Edmunds and Edmunds state that their intention in writing a book "grounded in the activities of an actual classroom" is to "portray how and when the principles of educational psychology can be applied by teachers" (p. x). They frame their perspective of childhood and classroom management within a discourse of educational psychology with a strong statement that "teaching practices without valid support from educational psychology research are simply a waste of valuable instructional time" (p. 8). Drawing heavily on stage theorists including Piaget, Erikson, Kohlberg, Anderson, Carroll, Sternberg, and Bloom, Edmunds and Edmunds position their text within the discourse of educational psychology, more specifically, developmental educational psychology, which grounds their perspective of childhood and informs the justification and rationale for the classroom management strategies legitimated and endorsed throughout their textbook. James and Prout (1990) claim that psychological explanations of childhood development have, until recently, dominated the study of childhood, and guide many child-rearing and educational practices (p. 10). James and Prout's exploration of social actor theory, along with scholars such as Siegler (1996) and Confrey (1990) argue for the social study of childhood which moves beyond assumptions of the 'naturalness' and 'biological immaturity' of childhood thus making it possible to explore alternative perspectives of childhood and classroom management pedagogy.

Informed by Siegler (1996) and Confrey's (1990) critiques of developmental and cognitive theories that dominate educational institutions, I propose that the developmental educational psychology approach that Edmunds and Edmunds use to understanding childhood, as well as the corresponding classroom management pedagogy informed by this particular discourse, underestimates the competency of the child, and

leads to practices that limit student participation, agency and voice in the politics of the classroom. Siegler (1996) argues that developmental models have a number of virtues, namely that they outline the order in which developmental change occurs in a "simple, straightforward, and memorable" way (p. 11). Confrey (1990) expresses that the "powerful psychological theories offered by Piaget and Vygotsky… alter educators to the fact that children may see the world and experience objects qualitatively different from adults" (p. 28). However, Siegler and Confrey argue that developmental stage theories are problematic in practice, as such theories "have proven to be inconsistent with a great deal of data. Furthermore, the way in which they are inconsistent with the data has created a serious dilemma" (Siegler, 1996, p. 11). Findings of early competencies in the child are often framed in terms of competencies that the child is thought to lack (p. 12). Siegler argues that it is necessary to "move beyond attempts to characterize *the* way that children of a given age think, and recognize the variability of their thinking" (p. 12). In doing so, the results of children's competency, particularly young children, are surprising and more advanced and complex than developmental models suggest (p. 12). For instance, the "deep-rooted beliefs about essences that support the assumption of a 1:1 correspondence between age and mode of thought" extends to "deep-rooted beliefs regarding agency" (p. 15). Such beliefs disregard the diversity of children in their construction of a universal child and universal developmental measures (Confrey, 1990, p. 32).

Thus developmental theorists may ignore the variability in children's thinking, and ignore their ability to make choices. Unfortunately, this leads to "narrower, less accurate" interpretations about the cognitive capacities of children (p. 16). While adult educators play a major role in teaching students and providing opportunities to learn, I argue that certain developmental models are used to reinforce adult authority over children in a dominating way, specifically in order to deny children meaningful participation in the democratic classroom management approach seemingly endorsed in Edmunds and Edmunds' text. For instance, in using social actor theory, James and Prout (1990) argue that "children must be seen as actively involved in the construction of their own social lives, the lives of those around them and of the societies in which they live" (p. 4).

I argue for approaches to classroom management in which educators understand the child as a "rights-bearing subject" as opposed to a biological understanding of the child as a "natural phenomena" or a "product of society" (Ryan, 2008, p. 555). This distinction of understanding the child as a political agent is reflected in literature from a social actor theory perspective; especially texts that argue for democratic approaches to classroom management (see Anderson, 2004). While Edmunds and Edmunds state that they use a 'democratic' approach to classroom management, the extent to which children are granted democratic rights is limited and restricted by biological and psychological discourses about the cognitive abilities of children.

Upon closer examination of the textbook, the authors' approach to childhood and classroom management is inconsistent with the "democratic" approach they endorse and, moreover, is more closely affiliated with pedagogical practices that are grounded in a developmental educational psychology discourse in which teachers are positioned and constituted as authoritative figures who are required to establish and maintain hierarchical power relationships in their classrooms (p. 84). As I attempt to illustrate in this chapter, Edmunds and Edmunds present an approach to classroom management, which does not easily align with my own understanding and practices as a classroom teacher. Teachers are constructed in the textbook as particular sorts of subjects and are invested with a particular authority and moral superiority, which are understood in terms of the need to endorse certain hierarchical power relationships in the classroom.

Expert Knowledge and Politics of 'Truth'

Language is used politically in the textbook to construct a hierarchical power relationship between the authors as experts of knowledge and the readers as passive consumers of knowledge, which enforces knowledge-power relations. In other words, the textbook can be understood as endorsing a 'regime of truth' about childhood and effective classroom management pedagogies. Gee (2011) explains that authors use language in a particular way to "create or sustain social relationships or to end or harm them" (p. 210). In this case, Edmunds and Edmunds use language to establish a hierarchical power relationship with the reader – they represent themselves as the

authoritative subjects on classroom management requiring the reader to defer to their knowledge and expertise.

Identity, according to Gee (2011), refers to "different ways of being in the world at different times and places for different purposes," specifically how people "recognize and act out different social roles or different social positions in society" (p. 207). Edmunds and Edmunds use fictional characters, Annette Elkins, a new teacher and her professor from a graduate level educational psychology course, Dr. Andrew Cameron, to portray a knower versus seeker relationship; they purposefully construct an expert-novice relationship between themselves and the intended readers. Throughout the textbook, Annette, a relatively new teacher, communicates through e-mails with Dr. Andrew Cameron, her educational psychology professor and "mentor" (p. xvi). By positioning the reader, or preservice education student, as lacking knowledge, Edmunds and Edmunds reinforce their socially constructed identity as having status as knowledge-producers.

Edmunds and Edmunds state that the purpose of creating the teacher and professor relationship is to "provide readers with detailed explanations of educational psychology concepts, particularly in regard to the questions teachers may have about the relevance of these concepts to classroom activities" (xiii). However, Edmunds and Edmunds tend to reiterate certain dualistic positions involving knower versus seeker, and confident scholar versus confused teacher candidate to depict the relationship between Dr. Cameron and Annette, which is symbolic of the constructed identities that Edmunds and Edmunds create for themselves as knowledgeable producers of the "truth" about classroom management versus the position of the novice teacher as inexperienced, passive consumer of knowledge. To further legitimate the authors' hierarchical positioning within the expert professor versus novice student-teacher relationship, Edmunds and Edmunds deny the possibility that Dr. Cameron may learn anything of value from Annette, as they state that "Dr. Cameron's exchanges with Annette allow him to update and hone his abilities to explain concepts and applications and to direct teachers towards readings pertinent to their classrooms" (p. xiii).

Annette takes on a passive subjugated role, expressing a lack of knowledge as she uses knowledge-lacking phrases such as "I don't know," emphasizing that she has "lots to

learn" and revealing an enlightened experience as she is able to connect educational psychology to her practice as a teacher (p. 5). Preservice education students are positioned with Annette who identifies as being "so lucky to have a mentor like Dr. Cameron," specifically because the textbook is supposedly written in a way that students do not need to take an active role in interpreting or understanding the text (p. 78). In short, the student or reader is required to defer to the authority of the expert. For instance, Edmunds and Edmunds boast that their text is unlike "most educational psychology textbooks", which tends to alleviate teachers of the task of "interpreting the various and often multi-faceted components of the chosen models and incorporating them into a usable plan," as these sort of textbooks 'do the thinking' for the readers. As a recent graduate from a faculty of education, and as a new teacher, I am not passive in my engagement with the textbook, but given my access to critical frameworks and my own experience in the classroom, my own narratives serve to challenge the 'regime of truth' that is being presented in the textbook.

Additionally, the authors use "Think Boxes" that claim to "encourage readers to consider their opinions and reactions to material presented in the text," supposedly prompting preservice education students to "use scholarly knowledge, and understand it in such a way that he or she can test the conclusions of the research, and may falsify it, since knowledge will be seen as testable hypotheses, not conclusions to be followed" (p. 7). However, the 'Think Boxes', for the most part, merely prompt readers to be reflective, in a non-critical manner, on personal experiences or help readers to strengthen their understanding of concepts presented. For example, upon explaining Annette's classroom management strategy, Edmunds and Edmunds include a 'Think Box' that reads: "Imagine that you are a student in Annette's class. How do you think you would react to her approaches to classroom management and instruction?" (p. 132). Prompts do not challenge the reader to think critically about their own beliefs about classroom management or compare ideas presented to those informed by other theoretical positions or epistemologies. Rather the constructed social identity of preservice students as passive recipients of knowledge is reinforced through the 'Think Boxes' which serve to prepare students to respond to test questions and course assignments.

The authors "build identities for others" as the textbook frames preservice students as passive subjects in order to build them back up by empowering them with the provision of a specific form of knowledge (Gee, 2011, p. 19). It is in this sense that the textbook functions as a 'regime of truth' and is embedded in certain knowledge-power relations. For Foucault (1978), power relations cannot be understood in binary terms as an "all encompassing opposition between rulers and ruled, nor is power an oppressive force that works top-down in a way that affects the individual unconsciously (p. 94). "Power is not an evil; rather power is a strategic game. I do not see where evil is in the practice of someone who, in a given game of truth, knowing more than another, tells one what to do or transmits knowledge to another". In fact, I believe it is important that preservice students have access to experienced professors and literature about classroom management to inform their practice. However, I see ethical problems with the effects of domination in the arbitrary and useless authority of a teacher, particularly if power is exercised abusively by an authoritarian teacher (Foucault, 1987, p. 130). It is important to "distinguish the relationships of power as strategic games between liberties – strategic games that result in the fact that some people try to determine the conduct of others". It is in this sense that Edmunds and Edmunds support a particular discourse of classroom management, and are concerned with directing preservice education students to embrace particular strategies for regulating student behaviour in the classroom.

A relationship of domination is exemplified when Edmunds and Edmunds manipulate a strategic relationship between themselves and the reader, in order to direct the readers' ways of thinking and behaviours with regards to classroom management. Edmunds and Edmunds first present the supervising teacher as inexperienced in stating "[preservice education students'] practicum experiences are usually filled with moment-by-moment, real-life teaching challenges that require mindful and on-the-spot decisions. They rightfully wonder how there could possibly be time to consider the relevant concepts, how conceivable is it that they would properly apply them under such pressing conditions?" (p. ix). Edmunds and Edmunds support a need for preservice students to learn about methods of classroom management in order for them "to develop *teacher self-efficacy*: a teacher's belief in their own abilities to be effective despite the numerous challenges they will encounter" (p. xii).

As the textbook authors build a particular identity for preservice students as lacking and in need of knowledge, they propose that teachers can feel confident by learning from approaches that are informed by developmental educational psychology, as exemplified when Annette thinks to herself: "'It's important for me to feel confident, not only in my teaching knowledge, but also in my choice of teaching approaches. By taking the time to plan and think things through, I'm providing myself with the best opportunity to be an effective teacher'" (p. 25). Such use of language serves to validate the text book authors' truth claims about effective teaching, and allows the authors to position themselves as experts and all-knowing, without exploring or introducing students to other discourses of classroom management. In short, Edmunds and Edmunds draw on particular discourses of classroom management, which endorse certain pedagogical norms about teacher authority. Such norms require the teacher to direct the behaviour of the child and severely limit student's active negotiation and participation in more socially just pedagogical practices, as I will illustrate later in this chapter.

I am drawn to Foucault and poststructuralist thinkers because they draw attention to different 'regimes of truth'; rather there are multiple truths depending on one's position, values, and beliefs (Mac Naughton, 2005, p. 5). Foucault theorizes subjectivity in terms of the subject's entry into "a certain game of truth" and he acknowledges that one's observations can never be free from pre-conceived notions (Foucault, 1987, p. 120). It is the use of such a conceptual framework that enables me to think about the various ways in which the child is inserted into a game of truth and pedagogical relationship through undertaking a particular sort of discourse analysis which highlights the power relations embedded in specific disciplines such as educational psychology. Within a complex field of social practices, teachers, like myself, are made to adopt certain pedagogical practices and interventions and, hence, to work on themselves as particular sorts of subjects, to cultivate specific capacities, and to regulate themselves. The more I engage in poststructuralist and Foucaultian thinking, I reject certain developmental truths governing childhood and the institution of education, and, as a consequence, I experience the ostracising feelings that coincide with thinking about education in a critically reflective manner. I first experienced these ostracising feelings as a preservice education student.

While I was encouraged to consider multiple truths and multiple discourses of childhood during my undergraduate education, I often felt that my political understanding of education was dismissed or rejected in certain preservice education courses. For instance, during a pre-service practicum placement, a discussion was prompted amongst teaching staff about whether or not texts dealing with gender diversity and same-sex relationships should be made accessible in the classroom library to young students, or should these texts be held in a separate space for teachers to present when they believe it is necessary to address the topic. I found that my argument to make such texts accessible to young students was dismissed as educators applied developmental discourses presented as the 'truth' about the innocence of childhood, to argue that children are not capable of understanding gender non-conformity and same-sex relationships; it was held that children are not developmentally 'ready' (psychologically speaking) to engage with, and make sense of, such texts.

From a developmental perspective, Edmunds and Edmunds express an inherent connection between age and cognitive ability in proposing that "[teachers] use more direct instruction when teaching students in elementary grades because they have to learn specific skills, and [teachers] use it less in the higher grades because students' problem-solving and critical-thinking skills are more mature" (p. 24). For example, using Kohlberg's Stages of Moral Reasoning, Annette, the fictitious teacher in Edmunds and Edmunds's text, determines that she needs to address rules and routines differently with students based on their age and "level of language and comprehension skills" (p. 81). By extension, Edmunds and Edmunds are able to argue that based on theories of moral development, "the issues of the fairness and appropriateness of rules would be completely lost on the younger students" (p. 81-82).

While Siegler (1996) claims that theories developed by Kohlberg and Piaget have some virtue or merit in their "simple, straightforward, and memorable" descriptions of developmental sequences, which are important as they identify the order in which changes occur, he argues that such theories assume that all children follow the "1:1 relation between developmental status and reasoning", which in practice "proved to be inconsistent with a great deal of data" (p. 11). For instance, he describes a dinner-time conversation in which a child may reveal a variety of ideas "ranging from insightful to

incoherent", which may suggest that "children's thinking is far more variable than suggested by traditional theories of cognitive development" (p. 4). Siegler reasons that children have competencies that developmental theories suggest children lack, as children display "impressive reasoning, conceptual understanding, and problem-solving strategies" in a variety of meaningful ways that cannot be easily measured or listed in 1:1 correspondence between age and mode of thought in developmental models (p.11).

In my own practice, while my Kindergarten students may not have the vocabulary to articulate their understanding of higher order concepts in the same manner as adults or older students, they prove to have an understanding of the concept of fairness, though they explain their reasoning in ways that may be interpreted as simplistic. For example, after a fire alarm was pulled by a student with autism I responded to my students' concerns about whether or not there was a real fire. Two students, Carissa and Alex, were not concerned about our safety; they were visibly stressed about what would happen to the student who caused the evacuation. "Is he in big trouble?" Carissa asked. "No" I responded, "The student who pulled the fire alarm has special needs; do you know what that means?" Carissa shook her head, so Alex enthusiastically added "You know, like Stevie," referring to a student in our class who we had not identified as having special needs. Alex elaborated, "Stevie has special needs so he doesn't get in trouble when he runs on desks and stuff." Carissa gave a nod of understanding and expressed that the decision to treat people differently can be fair.

Siegler (1996) expresses that in educational institutions dominated by developmental stage theories presented as 'truth,' such as those elaborated by Kohlberg in Edmunds and Edmunds' text book, children are presented as "slaves of their cognitive structures" (p.11). However, Siegler argues that children possess "multiple ways of performing these cognitive activities", but that they may require adult scaffolding to express themselves in ways that do not correspond to traditional cognitive models (p. 4). Similarly, Confrey (1990) argues that these powerful psychological theories fail to recognize "multiple types of knowledge", as they continue to argue for a universal view of knowledge (p. 32).

My lived experience directly conflicts with Edmunds and Edmunds' reasoning to exclude students in grades one to six from conversations about fairness based on

Kohlberg's Stages of Moral Reasoning. The connection between age or grade and perceived incompetency or competency of the child is emphasized by Edmunds and Edmunds who continually make reference to the need to understand "at what ages/grades can students be taught/not taught particular curricular concepts (p. 11). In utilizing a developmental educational psychology approach to classroom management, Edmunds and Edmunds legitimate the denial of children's right to be heard on educational matters that affect them by arguing their incompetency to participate in higher-order thinking necessary to determine classroom rules. During the "democratic" rule making process, which will be discussed at length later, Edmunds and Edmunds grant students a token participatory role that is highly-regulated by the teacher and which relies on a position that children "see the world and experience objects qualitatively different from adults" as they develop from cognitive incompetence to competence (Confrey, 1990, p. 28). Edmunds and Edmunds, therefore, ignore the possibility of children's variability in cognitive ability to understand higher-order concepts, and deny all students the opportunity to actively participate in the democratic rule-making process (Confrey, 1990, p. 28). Thus, a developmental educational psychology perspective on the incompetent, developing child is privileged and taught as 'truth' in the textbook, with other more socially just discourses about childhood and classroom pedagogy being excluded or 'disprivileged' (Gee, 2011, p. 102).

Privileged and 'Disprivileged' Discourses of Childhood and Pedagogy

Gee (2011) claims that in a critical discourse analysis of a text, it is important to examine what is written and how a text is written in order to recognize the "forms of knowledge (ways of knowing) that are relevant in this context and how they are used and privileged or disprivileged" (p. 102). As Issitt (2004) expresses, the study of textbooks is ideal for examining "the patterns of the construction of knowledge" (p. 688). Drawing on Foucault (1975), it must be understood that educators do not "act as isolated individuals; rather they are the product of a contingent history" (May, 2006, p. 16). While Edmunds and Edmunds make numerous claims about their "new" approach to classroom management in a manner that suggests that their scientific and research-informed textbook holds higher status, or is privileged, in comparison to 'older' or different texts, it

shares epistemological claims with the texts that they refer to, particularly in their common developmental educational psychology approach to childhood and classroom management (p. ix). For example, the first sentence in the text states: "This book is different" suggesting that their "new" and "unique" approach to classroom management is one of enlightenment (p. ix).

Gee (2011) recommends examining the purpose when authors make reference to other texts. Edmunds and Edmunds attempt to legitimate their text as unique by comparing their textbook to previous educational psychology textbooks, which they describe as "nothing more than watered-down introductory psychology books" (p. x), or "exhaustive portrayal of educational psychology principles" (p. xii), whereas their textbook supposedly brings "conceptual clarity" to complex phenomena (p. x). However, Foucault's (1975) work can be used to reflect on how educators operate, given certain norms and histories (May, 2006, p. 16). Therefore, Edmunds and Edmunds' actions and thoughts are historically contingent and cannot be understood necessarily as a product of rational choices or of an enlightened consciousness; rather they stem from a history of educational practices embedded within society and which are accepted by many as truth, or simply taken-for-granted, particularly from within the discipline of educational psychology as a regime for endorsing certain truths about managing and directing children's behaviours in classrooms. Issitt (2004) stresses the importance of analyzing the "hands and forces" that create certain textbooks, as much is revealed by exploring the privileged authors, writers and researchers who have the cultural status and "license to produce the 'new'," especially the manner in which their educational and professional experience and perspective of the child and schooling direct the truth claims made in their texts (p. 685).

Gee (2011) explains that language is used to "render certain things connected or relevant (or not) to other things" in order to "build connections or relevance" or even to "break or mitigate" connections that seem inherently connected to each other (p. 19). Edmunds and Edmunds present the handbook that informs their textbook as "the gold standard for issues related to classroom management," using only "the most current research principles" (p. 73-74). Gee (2011) claims that through social language and discourses, the connections that authors make to other texts – the intertextuality at the

basis of legitimating certain claims of truth - serve to reinforce their own discourses and epistemologies (p. 121). As Edmunds and Edmunds state: "'*research*' implies legitimacy and credibility," and is used to further validate the theoretical and research base applied in their textbook (p. 14). In the preface, the authors state that "readers are exposed to current educational psychology research, and they learn how the findings are directly related to classroom learning" (p. xiv). Edmunds and Edmunds validate educational psychology in its own right by identifying that this discourse is founded by a "history of strong empirical support" (p. 77). They connect their work to major stage theorists, including Piaget, Erikson, Kohlberg, Anderson, and Carroll, highlighting specific charts and findings, which serve to validate the textbook, as the work from these particular theorists continues to be central in the construction and maintenance of developmentalism as the dominant discourse shaping the language and practice of education (Blundell, 2012, p. 129). The manner in which the work of Piaget and other developmental psychology theorists is "engrained and naturalized" in a way that it is accepted as the "indisputable truth about childhood and children" is evident in the claims made about educational psychology as informing the ultimate approach to classroom management (Blundell, p. 128). The power of applying language from long-standing theories and empirical work grounded in the discipline of developmental educational psychology amplifies the perceived credibility of the claims and practices endorsed in Edmunds and Edmunds' text, despite the manner in which their biased approach closes off the opportunity to explore other more socially just approaches to classroom management.

Mac Naughton (2005) discusses that poststructuralists believe "the politics of our time and place influence which stories [of childhood and classroom management] are told, when and by whom, which is why some stories are heard more often and given greater status than others" (p. 4). As Edmunds and Edmunds share stories of an approach to classroom management strictly from the discourse of developmental educational psychology, stories of more rights-based, more child-centred approaches to classroom management are silenced or marginalised (p. 4). For instance, Mac Naughton argues that texts grounded in developmental educational psychology dominate the field of early childhood education, whereas "Foucault's ideas of 'disciplinary power', 'docile bodies'

and 'power/knowledge'" are rarely found in mainstream early childhood texts. The absence of such understandings is possibly due to his claim that "truth does not exist" (p. 4). Rather he believed that what educators "hold to be true about, for instance, child development or early childhood curriculum, is a fiction created through 'truth games' that express the politics of knowledge of the time and place" (Mac Naughton, p. 5).

Politics of Language and Power of Discourse

Edmunds and Edmunds utilize the language associated with developmental educational psychology in a political way in order to reinforce an authoritative relationship between teachers and students, particularly notable in the way that they approach self-regulation as a highly individualized and teacher-regulated component of classroom management that serves to exclude or label 'deviant' students. What is being authorized and legitimated for preservice students is a particular approach to classroom management which rejects, or at the very least, closes down a consideration of its limits and other pedagogical possibilities for relating and regulating student behaviour that do not reproduce hierarchical power relationships. Gee (2011) explains that social goods and their distribution, such as being a "good student" or "good teacher" or being accepted as an "acceptable," "normal," "good," or "adequate" student or teacher, are "always at stake" as "language is always 'political' in a deep sense" (p. 7). Textbooks are not neutral; they present a particular 'regime of truth'. Like any textbook, Edmunds and Edmunds use language that is informed by a particular discourse of childhood and knowledge underpinning the approach to classroom management being advocated, and which is embedded in value-laden systems and presented as a privileged "truth" (Stake, 2005, p. 690). As Stake (2005) argues, textbooks are "a key mechanism for the production and reproduction of ideas," so by denying preservice students' access to multiple epistemologies surrounding the discourse of childhood and classroom management, possibilities for new teachers to elaborate more social just pedagogies are closed down (p. 688).

However, as aforementioned, the knowledge provided is implicated in a particular regime of truth that relies solely on developmental educational psychology to justify its legitimacy. For instance, Edmunds and Edmunds claim that the core of educational

psychology "is the understanding of teaching and learning. It is a broad domain because everything that happens between teachers, students, and curricula within classroom finds its essence here" (p. 10). They cite the development of children as an essential understanding of educational psychology as the discipline answers "at what ages/grades can students be taught/not taught particular curricular concepts?" and "how do changes in students' cognitive, social, emotional, moral, and physical development influence the teaching and learning process?" (p. 11). Edmunds and Edmunds further privilege the field of developmental psychology by reinforcing that "while many of the other disciplines within the social sciences influence education, such as philosophy, sociology, and psychology, it is educational psychology that explains it" (p. 10). They suggest that educational psychology reveals "the fundamental reasons 'why' certain things happen in everyday classrooms" and so teachers have an obligation to use related theories in their classroom management practices: "it is equally obligatory, therefore, to diligently implement the research principles of educational psychology" (p. 10). While Edmunds and Edmunds refer to Annette's exploration of educational psychology, they purport to guide preservice education students in stating that "there is a wealth of information at her disposal as a result of research conducted within the discipline of educational psychology… she has a better understanding of how [practices were] carefully determined to be both valid and applicable to classrooms" (p. 17).

Edmunds and Edmunds use language politically to reinforce the legitimacy of their approach to classroom management by using taken-for-granted claims about the importance or necessity of implementing practices that are grounded in educational psychology. In the same manner, they depict the use of research grounded in educational psychology as a necessary basis for good teaching and learning, using a reference by Sternberg (2008) to express "why psychological theories about learning and instruction need to be applied to education" (Edmunds & Edmunds, 2010, p. 10). The quote utilizes value-laden terms, such as identifying educational psychology as having a "scientific basis" to suggest that educational psychology research is valid in comparison to other research that is supposedly only able to "guess what intuitively might make sense" (p. 10). The discipline of educational psychology is presented as providing "vital understandings" for educators and as an uncontested truth because of its historical use

and scientific legitimacy in education (p. 12). For example, Edmunds and Edmunds comment repeatedly on the long-standing tradition of using research based in educational psychology which "come[s] from a long line of efforts… more than a century ago" (p. 12).

While a developmental discourse of childhood and schooling is a part of certain historical contingencies and norms governing how educators come to understand the profession and approaches to learning and cognitive development today, May (2006) reasons that it is by reflecting on these contingencies that opens up possibilities for thinking otherwise as, "we do not have to be who we are" (p. 16). Edmunds and Edmunds argue that it is essential for preservice education students to learn about the history of educational psychology "so that current research methods can be properly situated, appreciated, and understood" (p. 16). However, it is problematic that a developmental educational psychological approach to classroom management is the only perspective that preservice education students are introduced to in this course, particularly because the developmental 'regime of truth' is taught as the only 'truth' and explored as an exclusively authoritative framework for addressing classroom management (p. 12).

Developmental Psychology as 'a Regime of Truth' and Authoritative Framework

Edmunds and Edmunds present their material in a manner that appears to be unbiased and apolitical, as the language that is used to present their research both supports their identity as knowledgeable subjects and enables the authors to cast other forms of knowledge as irrelevant or at least to ignore their political significance (Gee, 2011, p. 121). As discussed in the literature review, the authors' interpretation of classroom management is grounded in a particular discourse about the child, which is reflected in the pedagogy endorsed in the approach to classroom management that is being authorized or advocated in the textbook. In interpreting Edmunds and Edmunds' explicit claims made about classroom management, specifically the perspective presented about "effective classroom management" and their approach to self-regulation, there are a number of elements essential to analysing their definition of classroom management which correspond to their perspective of childhood and schooling.

To Edmunds and Edmunds, the purpose of classroom management is to enhance academic learning, which they argue can only take place when students learn to develop self-regulation in order to monitor and change their behaviours (p. 75). Classroom management, according to Edmunds and Edmunds, is interwoven into all aspects of schooling through "a coherent set of principles and skills that are applied and integrated into the everyday activities of teachers and students who are interacting and working together" (p. 75). Furthermore, they claim that classroom management is not a method of 'controlling' students "so that they obediently respond to teacher demands," but rather that it is about engaging students in the process of classroom management and teaching students to think about their behaviours and to behave in a particular manner, which requires teachers to create a "orderly and psychologically secure space that compels students to think about how they behave in their environment, rather than simply reacting to their environment without thinking" (p. 71).

In the same way that Servan in Foucault (1977) states: "a stupid despot may constrain his slaves with iron chains; but a true politician binds them even more strongly by the chain of ideas," Edmunds and Edmunds use regulatory power and surveillance to 'train' children to think in a certain manner about their behaviours so that they can act to change behaviours on their own (p. 102). For instance, Edmunds and Edmunds' declare: "We never actually change children's behaviours, we change their thinking and they change their behaviour" (p. 98). While what Edmunds and Edmunds are proposing looks like a Foucauldian approach in terms of using hierarchical gaze, surveillance, examination and self-regulatory strategies to 'direct' and 'monitor' children's behaviour, their approach to self-regulation limits opportunity for child agency in determining behavioural goals, as well as the processes for achieving goals. Moreover, it "ignores the role of others and of social context in shaping self-regulatory capacitates" (Yowell & Smylie, 1999, p. 470).

Edmunds and Edmunds propose that self-regulation is a key component of their classroom management approach; self-regulation is not inherently 'bad' or 'evil'. However as Yowell and Smylie (1999) explain, the thinking behind self-regulatory strategies as a pedagogical approach to classroom management can serve to limit and restrict student agency and autonomy or, on the other hand, it may "promote individual

growth and social change" (p. 471). They explain that there are two dominant discourses surrounding the theory and practice of self-regulation (p. 470). According to Yowell and Smylie, "Cognitive and social psychologists generally define self-regulation in terms of an individual's selection and tenacious pursuit of goals" (p. 470). Specifically, self-regulation is the capacity to set goals, define and pursue the strategies required to achieve these goals, and effectively manage the challenges and frustrations that occur along the pursuit to achieve these goals (p. 470). For instance, Edmunds and Edmunds present an example of a child named Zack who is diagnosed with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) (p. 102). In order to help him achieve a teacher-directed goal to focus, complete assignments and avoid distracting his peers, Edmunds and Edmunds recommend teaching the child a strategy to use a personalized check list to identify whether or not he is "on task" in order for Zack to self-regulate this own behaviours (p. 102). When Zack encounters difficulties in his pursuit to master his self-regulatory goal, he is taught to ask for the teacher to help him re-focus and get back "on-task" (p. 102).

While it is important for a teacher to teach students to self-regulate their behaviours so that everyone can work cooperatively in a respectful, learning environment, Yowell and Smylie (1999) argue that a particular discourse of self-regulation, specifically a "cognitive and social psychology definition" connected only to the selection and pursuit of goals "is overly narrow", due to the exclusive focus on the individual, which "implies that the regulation of [behaviour], and the emergence of the self, more generally, is strictly an individual process" (p. 470). Furthermore, the cognitive and social psychology definition "emphasizes only processes inherent in goal pursuits while saying little about the normative content of those goals" (p. 470).

For instance, I have a student in my class, Stevie, who exhibits many of the "annoying" characteristics that Edmunds and Edmunds use to describe Zack (p. 102). Stevie is diagnosed with a behavioural disorder and developmental disability; he chases and hits students in a playful manner when he becomes over-excited. Rather than approach self-regulation purely as an individual process, I teach Stevie individual self-regulation strategies, such as how to recognize when he is becoming overly-excited and strategies he can use to calm himself down (such as to play in the 'centre for one,' an area with a comfortable chair, play-doh, stress balls and books). Furthermore, I also teach

strategies to the rest of my students, specifically ways that they can self-regulate their own behaviours in a way that will help Stevie calm down (such as by sitting down immediately if Stevie starts chasing them, to freeze and say 'stop,' or to move closer to a teacher as opposed to laughing, screaming, or running faster). In this way, students recognize how their behaviours work to excite or calm Stevie which hinders or helps Stevie to self-regulate his own behaviours. Yowell and Smylie (1999) refer to the individual or "intrapsychological" aspect as well as the social and interpersonal interactions in their approach that counters the cognitive and social psychology discourse to self-regulatory practices (p. 470).

Yowell and Smylie (1999) extend the cognitive and social psychological definition of self-regulation to include the "intentional and planful pursuit of goals in a manner that is flexible and that promotes individual growth and social change" (p. 471). Furthermore, Yowell and Smylie argue that "the development and support of self-regulation can be characterized by reciprocal interactions within, and between, the following sets of individual and social context elements: (a) internalizations and close personal relationships, (b) empowerment and environment contingency, and (c) future orientation and social capital" (p. 471). Using Yowell and Smylie's understanding of self-regulation, it is possible to elaborate on more social justice pedagogical approaches within the student and teacher relationship, specifically by understanding the teacher's role not as an authoritative figure, but as crucial in the "development of self-regulation in democratic communities" (p. 473). The teacher is able to guide the class towards "growth of mutual respect and belonging that may result from close interpersonal relationships, empowered pursuit of culturally appropriate goals that is contingent on organizational relations and participation in democratic process that is shaped through sociocultural relations" (p. 473).

Edmunds and Edmunds hierarchical, authoritarian structure of classroom management lends itself to highly teacher-directed and teacher-regulated approaches which provide "little support for student autonomy or trust, and in some cases suppress the emergence of students' self-regulatory capacities" as well as limit the potential for establishing caring relationships (p. 475). On the contrary, Yowell and Smylie endorse self-regulatory practice that perceives the child as having autonomy by involving the

child's "expression of interest, thoughts, and values as well as the freedom to make choices" (p. 474). Arguing that "self-regulation is a socially constructed and embedded concept," Yowell and Smylie recommend practices that foster close personal relationships between teachers and students and amongst students (p. 487). They also advocate for ensuring active student participation in the selection of goals, tasks and plans and processes of self-regulation that involve students in "cultural enrichment," whereas Edmunds and Edmunds endorse an approach of "rote memorization and understanding of cultural knowledge" about adherence to cultural and behavioural norms and 'appropriate' social interactions (p. 481). Finally, Yowell and Smylie (1999) argue that "without developing the self-regulatory capacities of youth, the individual and social relations that are so important to them, schools fail to fully support democratic communities. Indeed, they may jeopardize them" (p. 488). By analyzing the discourse of childhood endorsed in the textbook, I raise concerns about the pedagogical approach that regulates student voice and limits student agency in embracing a more 'democratic' pedagogical approach to classroom management.

Discourses of Childhood and Implications for Pedagogical Approaches

Drawing on the work of Michel Foucault and James Paul Gee, I analyse the implications of the developmental educational psychology discourse of the child that Edmunds and Edmunds endorse in their textbook. I interrogate the idea of power that appears to be exercised in the constitution of the child as a particular object of the teacher's pedagogical gaze. I am concerned to foreground the power relations and norms governing the specific pedagogical approach to classroom management that is being advocated, specifically by identifying the ways in which the bodies of children are regulated and voices of children are silenced. I am particularly concerned with the way in which Edmunds and Edmunds' approach to classroom management uses research drawn from the discipline of developmental educational psychology to seemingly endorse more socially just pedagogical practices. However, these frameworks and modes of thinking actually limit the possibility to perceive children as competent, political actors and, in this sense, deny them the opportunity to engage in classroom management in an

authentic and meaningful manner – they ignore pedagogical approaches from alternate epistemological standpoints that encourage children's voice and active participation (Hooks, 1994; Foucault, 1972, p. 131).

Educators are encouraged to relate to themselves as authoritative subjects and to regulate student behaviour within specific regimes of knowledge-power relations derived from developmental psychological approaches to theorizing. Foucault (1987) emphasizes that individuals are not free to invent a form of subjectivity on their own, rather "the way in which the subject constitutes himself in an active fashion, by the practice of the self… They are patterns that he finds in his culture and which are proposed, suggested and imposed on him by his culture, his society and his social group" (p. 122). Foucault (1972) defines "truth" as a creation of this world, "produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint…induces regular effects of power" (p. 131). Each society, including the discipline of educational psychology, "has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true" (p. 131). Within these regimes of truth, the subject, or rather the teacher and the student are constituted in a certain way, and are required to construct themselves or to become certain subjects, given the particular regime of knowledge/power relations that inform the conceptualization of the child and the approach to classroom management that is being endorsed.

While distinctively positioning their work and framing their approach to classroom management within the discipline of developmental psychology, Edmunds and Edmunds, on the surface, endorse pedagogical practices that value student voice and participation in classroom management. The first rule that Edmunds and Edmunds include in "The Invitation" is that all rules will be "democratically decided upon" (p. 84). Democracy in education, according to Anderson (2004), involves seeking public interest to develop a "morality based upon concerns for others," an understanding that "governing others is never simple because of the plurality of differences among people," opportunity for people to govern themselves in "reliable, trustworthy ways" and, most importantly,

students need an education to "learn how to govern themselves and others in ways that are democratic" (p. 3). While Edmunds and Edmunds claim that their approach to classroom management is democratic in nature, the application of their classroom management approach does not provide students with participatory rights or enable students to govern themselves and others in a democratic manner. For example, the concept of democracy is introduced by Annette, with little explanation of what it means, or how it looks in the classroom. Rather, democracy is presented in stark comparison to the overtly authoritarian approach to classroom management applied by the teacher Annette replaces, named Mr. Dawe (p. 82).

The conversation in the textbook is prompted by Tara, an older student, who expresses her concerns about the former teacher in asking "'Miss, before..., uh, Mr. Dawe just told us all the rules and we had to obey them… when we did something wrong, he would yell at us or make us write lines… and some of his rules weren't even fair.' Her voice softens, 'Are you going to do that, too?'". Annette challenges her students to identify what was unfair about Mr. Dawe's approach, to which a student responds "'Mr. Dawe didn't trust us… He just never gave us a chance… it was so not fair'" (p. 82). From here, Annette lays the foundation for suggesting a democratic approach to determining rules and consequences for adhering to or breaking the classroom rules. She listens to her students' complaints about Mr. Dawe and responds: "'I think we can make the rules fair for everyone and only use punishments that are suitable and ones that you agree to'" (p. 82). Once her students cling to the idea that they will "agree to" the rules and consequences Annette announces: "'You see, rules can be fair… but, what really makes rules, rewards, and punishments fair is when everyone in the class has a chance to understand them, talk about them, and then agree to them by a majority vote'" (p. 83).

Contrary to Annette's statement that all rules will be democratically decided upon, she adds a qualifying comment as follows which reinforces her hierarchical status in the rule-making process: "'Except for a few mandatory rules that Mrs. Nugent and I have decided are best for everyone in our school and our classroom… we will also decide what happens when the rules are either followed or broken'" (p. 83). The first non-negotiable, teacher-determined rule that Annette posts is "Rule #1: All our rules will be fair and reasonable, and they will democratically decide upon. They will be posted on

the wall for everyone to see and they will be enforced" (p. 84). Anderson (2004) argues that education is "necessary because citizens do not easily learn how to govern themselves and others in ways that are democratic" (p. 1). However, while Annette waits for students to ask questions about the meaning behind this rule, she does not attempt to engage students in a conversation about democracy (Edmunds, 2010, p. 85).

Anderson (2004) illuminates the challenges of undertaking democratic classroom management pedagogy in stating that "classroom rules may look fine on paper, but applying the rules with students who differ in their experience, minds and bodies is seldom easy" (Anderson, 2004, p. 2). While Anderson iterates, "even one of the foremost democratic theorists, Robert Dahl (1998), bemoaned that a "tidy set of ideas" about democracy is not available," Anderson argues that there are fundamental aspects that must be included for a classroom management approach to be labeled 'democratic,' such as the education of students about democracy and their role in a democratic society (p. 4). While Annette's approach to classroom rules involves student participation more than Mr. Dawe's authoritarian approach, the example of Annette's approach to setting class rules demonstrates that there are definite limits to the democratic participation of students in setting the rules. However, Anderson (2004) suggests that students can participate in a meaningful and more active manner when the idea of democracy is explicitly taught and discussed continuously with students (p. 2).

Edmunds and Edmunds use developmental stage theories in a way to establish that children are not cognitively able or ready to engage in higher-order-thinking, and in making this argument, they enforce a highly-regulatory version of democracy in which students are denied the opportunity to participate actively in negotiating the classroom rules and consequences (p. 83). While students are invited to provide input in creating additional rules, beyond the mandatory rules determined by the teacher, the additional rules are not entirely student-created or student-driven; rather the process is highly-regulated by the teacher. While I believe that ultimately teachers are primarily responsible for classroom management, the teacher still has a major role to play in enabling students to participate in a democratic classroom environment. Edmunds and Edmunds restrict the opportunities for students to develop their own 'additional rules' as they enforce that "before the rule-making process started, Annette had formulated a series

of other rules that she thought would be helpful based on her past teaching experiences"
(p. 96). They suggest that teachers should persuade or ask leading questions to direct
their students to recommend rules that are teacher-driven (p. 96).
Furthermore, Edmunds and Edmunds suggest that the teacher has the authority to "veto a
rule" even if it is approved by students through a majority vote (p. 95). A hierarchal
understanding of adults as superior moral and authoritarian subjects in relation to children
as subjugated subjects is expressed by Edmunds and Edmunds who assert that "teachers
are primarily responsible for the overall direction that instruction takes, for the way the
classroom is managed and governed, and for the establishment of the academic and social
tone that students operate in" (p. 24). While many would not dispute that the full
responsibility lies with the teacher for ensuring a safe and productive learning
environment in the classroom, there are clearly some questions that need to be raised
about the extent to which and nature of student involvement in the instructional decision-
making process.

While Annette acknowledges that students have a role in constructing their own
knowledge and skills, she reasons that knowledge construction is a part of children's
normal development: "Rather than simply absorbing information, students develop their
own cognitive structures, and they actively construct their knowledge and skills" (p. 24).
However, the authors use theories of cognitive development to express concern about
young children's ability to construct their own knowledge and caution educators to direct
and supervise children throughout this process, as Annette states that while "students get
to construct their own meaning and knowledge under my watchful guidance… [she] can
keep [students] from constructing knowledge only on their own and/or constructing
knowledge that is obviously incorrect" (p. 24). In this manner, Edmunds and Edmunds
appear, on the one hand to construct the child as competent in having the ability to
construct knowledge, while, on the other, endorsing a pedagogical approach that serves to
limit, constrain and guide students' knowledge construction under the normalizing gaze
of the authoritarian teacher. Edmunds and Edmunds utilize a 'technology' to "produce,
transform or manipulate" the classroom environment and presentation of knowledge, as a
means to "determine the conduct of individuals and submit them to certain ends or
domination" (Foucault, 1988, p. 18). Foucault interprets this "governing of the soul" as a

social education process in which students are understood as 'subjects' who are to be regulated, supervised and morally directed under the constant gaze of the teacher (p. 18).

Edmunds and Edmunds propose classroom management practices that engage students in rule-creation through regulation and go as far as to identify their method as "democratic" (p. 84). Their proposed efforts to hear children's voices through collaborative methods suggest that the teacher-versus-student hierarchy is disrupted in their "unique approach" (p. xi). However, closer analysis of their textbook reveals that while appearing to present students from a political child perspective that acknowledges student voice and participation in the rule-making process, Edmunds and Edmunds reposition teachers in a highly regulatory manner which serves to assert the teacher's superiority over students and to reinforce, rather than ameliorate, the normative hierarchical process.

Despite propositions that suggest Edmunds and Edmunds believe students should be active in the classroom management process, they are autonomous only in a very limited sense as defined by the terms of the theoretical framework that is imposed to legitimate and justify a particular approach to addressing classroom management. Furthermore, by endorsing particular classroom management strategies within this regime of power/knowledge relations, preservice students are not really encouraged to consider alternative and more democratic approaches that are committed to engaging students more authentically in negotiating classroom management processes. For example, Hooks (1994) argues for teaching in a manner that "respects and cares for the souls of our students" proposing that "to educate as the practice of freedom is a way of teaching that anyone can learn" (p. 13). Drawing heavily on the work of Paulo Freire and social activists, Hooks argues that education can be transformed around the self-actualization of teachers and empowerment of students (p. 15). She describes education as a place of intellectual "promise and possibility," in which the child has the "right to be an independent thinker" (p. 4). Otherwise, the classroom feels "more like a prison, a place of punishment and confinement" (p. 4). For students to reveal themselves, take risks, challenge norms and think critically, teachers must allow themselves to be vulnerable before their students (p. 21).

Hooks shares a narrative of the kind of passionate teacher and student relationships that came to life in her classroom: "He was taller than six feet; I remember the day he came to class late and came right up to the front, picked me up and whirled me around. The class laughed, I called him "fool" and laughed. It was by way of apologizing for being late, for missing any moment of classroom passion" (p. 198). The exercise of power expressed in Hook's narrative contrasts significantly to a narrative in Edmunds and Edmunds textbook in which the teacher guides students to determine the appropriate rules and consequences for late arrival: "Rule #7: Students must be on time for class. Each month, if there are less than eight instances of students being late, the class earns the privilege of watching a movie during class time. A student who is late must apologize to the class and stay in the classroom during morning recess" (p. 96). Edmunds and Edmunds' approach to classroom management is not consistent with the "practice of freedom" advocated by Hooks (1994); rather their approach "strives to reinforce domination" (p. 4). In this sense, preservice students are only introduced to one 'truth' which limits their ability to explore multiple truths about childhood and classroom management and select approaches that best align with their beliefs or enable them to explore more equitable and social justice pedagogies.

My approach to classroom management challenges developmental 'truths' about the child in favour of practices that engage the children actively in the politics of classroom management as competent, social actors. I understand the child as having a right to participate in democratic decision-making that is authentic. I understand power through a Foucaultian lens as something that is exercised and "deployed and given concrete expression" as opposed to "an all encompassing opposition between rulers and ruled" (Foucault, 1987, p. 90). While I understand that power can work as an oppressive force that emanates from top down, in a monarchial fashion, I understand this is only one form of power, a form that I attempt to minimize or eliminate in my practice (p. 90). As Foucault states, the exercise of power "must not be sought in the primary existence of a central point, in a unique source of sovereignty… power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength that we [educators] are endowed with it is in the name that one attributes to a complex strategically situation in a particular society" (p. 92-93).

As a teacher, I recognize that there must be some form of order in a classroom for learning to take place, and so, like any relationship, whether it be one of love, institutional, or economic, "power is always present" when one means to direct the behaviour of another (Foucault, 1987, p. 122). Furthermore, in any given game of truth, I know more about some things than my students and I am able to teach, guide, communicate skills and transmit knowledge – the power at play between me and my students in the transfer of knowledge is not necessarily evil or bad. However, I critically reflect on the way in which I transmit knowledge to avoid exercising power in the form of domination. For example, a normal practice in Kindergarten classes involves having all students sit on the carpet or in a circle to engage in a group activity. It is also normal practice for the teacher to strategically label or place students in assigned spots based on how they interact with certain students in order help students listen attentively. Rejecting an authoritarian approach to simply tell students where they need to sit, I strive for an approach in which students have the opportunity to make decisions about where they sit and voice their concerns. When my students gather on the carpet, we discuss how to make good decisions about where to sit. I use their language and comments to re-visit our discussion on a daily basis. For example, once students are settled I ask students to think about whether or not the person they are sitting beside "makes them giggle" or "bothers them" and if so, "Where is a better place for you to sit?" Students move away from their close friends or point out others who "always giggle when they're together" and they recommend "better places to sit."

Rather than announce that only one person can talk at a time, I prompt regular discussions about "how it feels when everyone is listening or not listening to you" and I prompt discussions about strategies we can use to both show peers that they are listening, such as making eye contact with the speaker, or to attain everyone's attention, for example, I have taught students to say "I'm waiting for everyone to look at me". While I still aim to regulate students' behaviours in accordance with certain behavioural norms to sit still and listen, I try to do so in a manner that diminishes domination and engages students in the self-regulatory power and politics during 'carpet time'. This is just one example of how I aim to establish a Kindergarten classroom in which I "sustain ethical, democratic lives with children every day" and "recognize the political processes and

effects of privileging one form of knowledge" of the child, early childhood education, and classroom management over another (Mac Naughton, 2005, p. 2).

Most concerning about the seemingly democratic classroom management process advocated by Edmunds and Edmunds is that they argue that students do not have the right to argue their punishment in the moment the punishment is being executed (p. 83). The misleading process that appears to provide students with participatory rights in designing the classroom management system functions to silence students' voices in a systematic manner. Edmunds and Edmunds employ a romantic perspective of the child to validate "tough-love" disciplinary action. Romantic perspectives of childhood, according to Milner and Tenore (2010), interpret student misbehaviour as the result of an emotional disconnect between students and teachers (p. 567). From this perspective, the authors appeal to sentimental images of innocent children needing to be loved and cared for to argue that trusting relationships between students and teachers are essential to effective classroom management (Sutton et al., 2009, p. 131; Marshall, 2008, p. 358). In this sense, Edmunds and Edmunds argue that students will trust that their teachers know what is in their best interest, even if it requires a student to receive a particular punishment for misbehaviour, despite whether or not the student agrees with the punishment in the moment. For example, they cite Dreikurs and Cassel (1992) who claim that "the most widely accepted explanation about why individual students behave badly" is that "while humans have an innate and prevailing need to be well received and appreciated, some feel they can obtain this desired acceptance by engaging in negative behaviour" (Edmunds & Edmunds, 2010, p. 74).

Edmunds and Edmunds endorse the practice of constructing school environments which "satisfy the three following fundamental student needs" as a basis for engaging and motivating students in the classroom: (p. 85).

1. To belong and feel connected and to sense that teachers believe in them and will treat them with respect – satisfying this need reduces the likelihood of disruptive, angry student behaviours;

2. To feel autonomous and possess a sense of self-determination, and to feel they are expected and permitted to have ownership, responsibility, and accountability for their actions – satisfying this need increases positive behaviours; and

3. To feel competent, successful, and accomplished – satisfying this need

appeases our basic motivation to enhance our self-esteem, the primary motivating

force for all human activity (p. 85)

The model presented in the textbook combine elements of developmental educational psychology discourse with a romantic image of the child perceived as an object whose psychological needs must be satisfied to achieve preferable behavioural outcomes. Objectifying analogies of the child are used throughout the textbook in a manner that portrays the child as an object with needs that must be fulfilled through education. For example, Edmunds and Edmunds use an analogy of children as cars to highlight the role of teachers in the driving seat, driving their students: a child is like a "car motor that is always running, even when the car is parked; all the child needs is for a teacher or parent to slip their mind into gear by asking them a question or presenting them with something that is interesting or odd," the reason being, as Edmunds and Edmunds identify, is that when the perceived need is filled by an adult, "like the engaged car, the child's learning will then move ahead" (p. 47-48). Furthermore, by constructing the child in such an objectifying manner, the authors are able to identify adults as wiser or more knowledgeable because they understand what the child 'needs,' and therefore can make judgements about the need to treat the child in strict or harsh ways, arguing that it is in the child's best interest in the long run, or rather, that they have the knowledge and experience to 'drive' students.

Edmunds and Edmunds use a story about a grade nine student who appears to have an inherent need to be "liked" (p. 79). Through a tale of tough-love his teacher follows through with strict disciplinary measures because she believes it is in the best interest of the child to be punished for his misbehaviours. Grasping onto the idea that the child needs to be "liked," the teacher explains to the student that she likes him as a person; however, she does not appreciate his behaviours (p. 79). Upon realizing that he is "liked" by his teacher, the student is able to see the ultimate reason that he is being punished and the student decides to behave in an appropriate manner (p. 79). The story serves to legitimate Edmunds and Edmunds' argument that it is in the child's best interest to execute the "agreed-upon" punishment for breaking the "democratically-determined" rules without opportunity for the child to argue or refuse the punishment, assuming that

teacher's intention is to teach the student a lesson or help the student in the long run. This process illuminates the way in which the child's voice is only heard in specific instances when it fulfills a certain need for the child to feel like a participant in the 'democratic' process; otherwise the child's voice is constricted or silenced.

While Edmunds and Edmunds claim to endorse a democratic pedagogy in which teachers collaborate and cooperate with students to engage them fully in the classroom management approach, the extent of hearing students' voices is highly regulatory and serves to assert the teacher's superiority over students. The power exercised reinforces rather than breaks down the hierarchal disciplinary process. By appearing to value students' perspectives, Edmunds and Edmunds reposition teachers as authoritarian subjects or actors using arguments that adults ultimately know "what is best for everyone" (p. 83). The developmental educational psychology discourse that reinforces adults as more knowledgeable, capable, authorities is reinforced in specific examples of the disciplinary practices endorsed in Edmunds and Edmunds' text.

Disciplinary Practices

Gee uses the term "practice" as a "socially recognized and institutionally or culturally supported endeavor that usually involves sequencing or combining actions in certain specified ways" (p. 210). The pedagogy and discourse presented in the textbook have implications for both the preservice students enrolled in the particular Faculties of Education that use the text, as well as practical implications for the sorts of practices validated in elementary schools. The knowledge constructed in the textbook is validated by the requirement for preservice education students at the Faculty of Education to use the textbook chapters that discuss "The Invitation" in order to write a paper about "how they would construct and deliver their own behaviour and classroom management system to solve the problems they observed" (Course Syllabus, 2010). Sondergaard (2002) argues for the use of poststructuralist perspectives to examine the processes of subjectification in which "identities and social categories are constructed through processes of exclusion," which extends to the processes of one group "becoming subordinated by power" and "becoming a subject" (p. 188).

By identifying specific chapters that discuss "The Invitation" as required reading and as necessary for an examination and assignment, Edmunds and Edmunds position the learner as a "subordinate" in a familiar relationship reiterated throughout the textbook in which the teacher and academic are positioned as the superior, knowledgeable expert (Issitt, 2004, p. 689). Beyond the use of the textbook in a specific course, the discourse and pedagogy endorsed in the textbook have real implications for the practices that are validated and applied in elementary classrooms. By examining examples from the textbook in connection with Foucault's understanding of disciplinary training, I question more specifically the notions of power that inform and are embedded in the approach to classroom management in Edmunds and Edmunds text.

I focus in particular on "The Invitation" section of the textbook which is where Edmunds and Edmunds' "unique approach" to classroom management is explained in detail. I use Foucault's theories of discipline and power/knowledge to investigate the coercion of the body and silencing of students' voices endorsed in the classroom management approach, despite the authors' claims that their approach involves collaboration and cooperation between teachers and students. I also investigate the unintended consequences and effects of embracing pedagogies and disciplinary practices that reinforce adult superiority over children, specifically in order to recognize the ways in which the bodies of children are controlled and their voices are silenced, and to understand the exercising of power as a political tactic within the educational institution. Foucault (1975) raises concerns about the disturbing resemblance between schools and prisons, as the institution of education has a long history of enforcing bodily controls on children and restricting their movement and voice (p. 202). He claims that while "the historical grip of [pedagogical] practices is a tight one," its grip is not so tight that educators are eternally bound to a particular path. Rather by understanding the power exercised and endorsed in classroom management texts such as Edmunds and Edmunds "The Invitation," educators may deconstruct and intervene upon the historical or dominant approaches to classroom management in an attempt to realize more social justice and democratized pedagogies (May, 2006, p. 21). My own personal narratives highlight my conflicts with the theory and practice endorsed in the textbook, as I counter

Edmunds and Edmunds' universalizing assumption that their approach "can be easily adapted by all teachers" (p. 75).

Hierarchical Observation

Foucault explains that the disciplinary process involves the "coercion of the body by means of observation" (May, 2006, p. 138). In my Kindergarten class, my teaching partner was annoyed with how our students hide in the classroom puppet theatre to avoid going outside for recess. I watched as my teaching partner roughly disassembled the structure. As I nodded in approval, I recalled Foucault's (1977) statement that "visibility is a trap" (Foucault, 1977, p. 200). Edmunds and Edmunds' approach to classroom management extends beyond attempts to get students to behave when there is a teacher in the classroom observing students; rather they aim to create an environment in which the gaze of the teacher feels constant, whether or not the teacher is even present in the classroom. For example, upon determining classroom rules, Annette engages students in an assignment and then she inconspicuously leaves the classroom for a moment. When she returns she states: "I was gone for about two minutes, but it didn't seem to matter because all of you carried on as if I was still here. I am very impressed and you should be too" (p. 97). Annette praises the students for conducting themselves in accordance with classroom rules during her "first little experiment" (p. 97). Edmunds and Edmunds emphasize the necessity of the constant gaze to control student behaviour, not only through adult supervision, but also through peer-monitoring and self-regulation.

The systematic power Edmunds and Edmunds endorse in the textbook appears to provide students with active participatory rights in determining the classroom rules, collaborating with teachers, monitoring their peers and themselves, and essentially the opportunity to be treated as autonomous beings with control of their future punishments or rewards. However, upon closer examination, the power exercised in Edmunds and Edmunds' approach to classroom management utilizes more systematic ways of coercing the body to behave in a particular way by 'training' students to self-regulate their own behaviours and pressuring their peers to conform to particular behavioural norms. For instance, when "[Annette] is reminded of Dr. Cameron's prophetic words about children's behaviour – 'We never actually change children's behaviour, we change their thinking and they change their behaviour,' " Edmunds and Edmunds are using a scientific

argument to suggest that with an understanding of the body and children's cognitive abilities, educators are able to work on and mould the student body and mind as they wish (p. 98). The process of hierarchal observation is one element of the disciplinary process described by Foucault (1977) (p. 138).

Through the constant gaze and exercise of supervision of the teacher, Edmunds and Edmunds endorse directing the student body, not through corporal punishment or physical force, but by means of observation and normalizing judgement. This normalizing power is not evil; rather it is a 'strategic game' that is applied in schools that are designed in a way to be an "apparatus for observation" (Foucault, 1977, p. 172). For instance, I attended a Kindergarten-teacher workshop in which a presenter explained how teachers can organize their furniture so that centres, shelving, and tables are placed in chunks throughout the classroom with defined paths for walking as open spaces are known to encourage running – the design appears much like a corn maze. They recommended using walls and shelving slightly above students' eye level so that they cannot see their peers, but low enough to enable teachers to gaze upon individuals from anywhere in the room, much like the design of the Panopticon . The Panopticon, as Foucault (1977) describes, is constructed with a ring around a central core so that guards can see inside each prison cell. Guards cannot look into all of the prison cells simultaneously, nor can teachers observe every student simultaneously, therefore one cannot be sure when he or she is being monitored or under surveillance so inmates and students learn to monitor themselves to avoid punishment that would result from contravening institutional norms (p. 200). The practice of hierarchical observation does not need to be oppressive as Foucault's analogy suggests, rather I explore whether or not Edmunds and Edmunds endorsed use of peer and self-monitoring is pursued in a way that reinforces 'a state of domination' or used more productively and according to norms which facilitate democratic participation (Foucault, 1987, p. 130).

Edmunds and Edmunds propose that surveillance and enforcement of rules is a "collaborative and collective" preventative strategy that involves other staff members such as the principal, educational assistances, resource-room teacher and other adults (p. 79). They state that the collective all-seeing eye effectively prevents student misbehaviour because "simply 'knowing that the principal knows' will be an effective

behavioural deterrent for many students because it eliminates their ability to pit the teacher against the principal (or their parents), and it increases their accountability for their conduct beyond the comfortable confines of the classroom" (p. 95). Edmunds and Edmunds exemplify the power of eye-contact, as Annette "slowly looks into each set of eyes" as she explains the rules and states "'you see, rules can be fair,'" followed by a prolonged gaze "directly in the eye" of the problem-student (p. 82-83). Students are not secretly monitored; rather Edmunds and Edmunds promote ensuring that students feel that they are always being observed. They state: "tell the student that you will be monitoring his/her behaviour and in one to two days you will review with him/her how things are going" (p. 80). Like the prisoners of the Panopticon monitor their own behaviours because they do not know when they are being observed, students are made to assume that they are always being watched, even by their own peers, and so they must self-regulate their own behaviours – this disciplinary process is not necessarily 'bad.' However, Strain (1981) argues that students must be taught how to peer-regulate in an equitable and socially just manner so that the teacher and student gaze may be used more productively and less oppressively.

Edmunds and Edmunds essentially use the term "co-regulated environment" in the same manner Foucault uses the analogy of the Panopticon in prisons to express the power of the invisible observer either internal or external to the subject being controlled (p. 77). "The Invitation" claims to use the "powerful motivational dynamic evident in self-regulating management" (p. 76-77). Teachers cannot be the "lone manager," rather "students of all ages have the capacity and ability not only to help manage the classroom, but also to regulate their own behaviour within it" (p. 76). Therefore, it is not through physical force that teachers control student behaviour, rather they explicitly teach "cognitive strategies for (a) making choices, (b) reflecting on the personal meaningfulness of these choices, (c) seeing their choices through to completion, and (d) reflecting on the outcomes of their actions" in order to coerce students to behave as though they are always being watched and conform their actions to an identified norm (p. 77). Strain (1981) argues that peer-monitoring approaches are effective when students received adequate education on how to be socially just and equitable peer-monitors, as well as when they are perceived by educators as "agents of behaviour-change" and

"control agents" (p. 328). In an analysis of peer-monitoring programs, Strain found that peers almost exclusively focused on deviant actions exhibited by children whereas pro-social or 'acceptable' behaviours exhibited by these same children went entirely ignored (p. 337).

While Edmunds and Edmunds address this issue by endorsing reinforcements for appropriate behaviours, modelling this behaviour is not sufficient in educating students on how to peer-regulate student behaviours. Strain (1981) continues to explain that when students are taught to provide reinforcement to appropriate classroom behaviour, the result is improved student performance, suggesting that when students have education on how to be effective, socially just peer-monitors, they are able to achieve many of their desired behavioural goals (p. 337). Edmunds and Edmunds' do not discuss educating students about their role in a peer-monitoring, hierarchical observation approach to classroom management. Strain (1981) cautions educators of the ethics of using peer-monitoring practices, as the approach places significant responsibility on the students to manage their peers' behaviours. Strain argues that teachers must accept the responsibility for choosing to use this form of management and to ensure that students do not manipulate power in an irrelevant or harmful manner, or in a dominating manner (p. 181). Educating students on effective hierarchical observation and peer-monitoring classroom management pedagogy can modify the 'distributions of power' and the 'appropriations of knowledge' in a way that enables students to be 'matrices of transformation' in a movement towards more democratic, equity and socially just classroom management by enforcing norms that correspond to those that govern democratic pedagogy (Foucault, 1987, p. 130).

Normalizing judgment

Foucault (1975) claims that the power of hierarchical observation and normalizing judgement serve to "homogenize the social body" (p. 184), just as Edmunds and Edmunds state that the purpose of textbook is for educators to understand how "assimilation can occur on a daily basis in their classroom" (p. ix). Lorentzen (2006) describes Foucault's tactics of normalizing judgement as a process in which certain norms are brought into being by a "ruling class," and "once the norms are constructed, society as a whole begins to police all of its members to certify that they conform," and,

finally, "the power of punishment" is disguised as a more beneficial or compassionate form of discipline (p. 11). Edmunds and Edmunds address the issue of working with a diverse group of children by expressing a need for students to conform to a certain way of being in the classroom and even encourage fostering an environment of assimilation (p. ix). They endorse assimilation, conformity, and self or peer-regulation, which are not inherently "bad," however, given the sort of normalizing judgement that informs their particular approach to classroom management the consequences of conformity may have "deadening limitation that threaten possibilities for human agency" (Lorentzen, 2006, p. 12). Gee (1999) discusses uncontested, typical stories or "figured worlds" that constitute the teacher as an authoritative subject in a hierarchical disciplinary apparatus that is reinforced in the narratives in Edmunds and Edmunds' textbook (p. 69). While I recognize the more democratic or rights-based approach to classroom management that I subscribe to is also a space with power-relations and normative practices, my concern is that preservice students at this Faculty of Education are only presented with one story of a teacher and student relationship embedded in a particular approach to classroom management in which the teacher is invested with a particular authority that denies more authentic student negotiation and participation.

As discussed in the literature review, approaches to classroom management which borrow from, or rely on, developmental psychology have long dominated education systems, so it is extremely challenging for teachers like me who wish to embrace alternative approaches such as those endorsed by educators such Hooks (1994). Edmunds and Edmunds endorse a common practice, in which the teacher, Annette, determines classroom rules in advance, presents the rules to students, and then the teacher determines rewards and punishments for adhering or breaking said rules (p. 80). Gee (1999) expresses that educators use such "typical stories" so that they can "go on about the business of communicating, acting, and living without having to consciously think about everything – all the possible details and exceptions – all the time" so while certain practice may appear to "work," these typical stories may also serve to "marginalize people and things that are not taken as "normal" or "typical" in the story (p. 70).

I experienced the marginalizing feelings that Gee (1999) describes before my first day teaching while I was setting up my class (p. 70). I intended to 'do' classroom

management in an atypical manner that countered some aspects of the typical process endorsed in texts like Edmunds and Edmunds. Upon arriving to set up my classroom, the other Kindergarten teacher explained the classroom management system she implements called the "Choice Board." Her system consists of a large Bristol board display at the front of the class. Each child's name is printed under a laminate sheet that contains four rectangles of colour paper. Basically, every child starts out with the same colour piece of paper and when a child misbehaves, the child must walk over to the board and switch their card to a different colour that corresponded to the severity or frequency of the student's "poor choice." Students have the opportunity to switch their cards back up the colour scheme if their behaviour improves and at the end of the day students with the card colour that corresponds to the best behaviour are rewarded with a stamp on their hands. Another Kindergarten teacher uses a similar approach only using a set of student-specific bees that move up or down a bee hive to display or classify each student's behaviour. Both teachers utilize elements that are informed by discourses drawn from the field of developmental psychology to inform their classroom management pedagogy, namely an operational-conditioning process to reward students for certain behaviours using stamps as token reinforcement, and like Edmunds and Edmunds the teachers assume power to determine a set of rules without any 'real' or authentic input from students (p. 80).

I observed that most primary teachers at my school use similar approaches to classroom management, whereas my approach does not visually classify, rank, or display student behaviour or include a token reinforcement system. On the first day of school, the music teacher entered my classroom, slowly glared around my classroom and then looked down at me and in his deep, booming voice questioned: "Where is your classroom management system?" Perplexed by the use of the word "where," suggesting that classroom management needed to be a concrete display for all to see, I explained that I intend to use and provide him with some examples of role play, discussion prompts, and community-building activities that I have planned for the first day. A look of pure disgust came over his face and, without a word, he walked away. As a new teacher, I fear being significantly different from the other teachers, and so feeling the normalizing gaze and judgement of my co-worker, I made a conscious decision to include a visible reward

system in my classroom. I changed my approach to classroom management due to a pressure to conform to the institutionalized norm despite my opinion that the particular categorizing and hierarchal display of student behaviour is not in my students' best interest.

Foucault (1975) explains that in a standardized system, such as the institution of education, non-conformity to established classroom rules or social behaviours is punishable and corrective disciplinary punishment is perceived as necessary for a child's natural development (p. 177). Edmunds and Edmunds argue that it is in the best interest of the child to be compared, ranked, and even excluded through a normalizing process in order for students to effectively be "transformed" (p. 71) into "socially competent students" (p. 105). The view that their approach is universally beneficial and applicable denies diversity in teachers and students who reject aspects of a developmental approach to classroom management. Edmunds and Edmunds recommend classroom management practices that put pressure on students to display specific behaviours in order to be accepted by their peers: "If a classroom environment is set up to recognize and foster positive behaviour amongst students, the motivation for engaging in negative behaviour should decrease, especially if the negative behaviour is exhibited as a way to gain acceptance" (p. 75).

Edmunds and Edmunds recognize the impact of peer-monitoring in changing a student's behaviour and promote a manner of exercising this power to encourage students to finish their in-class assignments quickly (p. 92). For instance, in Edmunds and Edmunds' text, Annette explains to students that once they have all finished their in-class work, they may have free-time and chat. One student, Jackson, complains: "Aw, that sounds like everyone will be bugging me to hurry because I'm always last and they will want to talk and I'll never get to talk because I'm so slow" (p. 92). While I do not want children to talk and engage in excessive off-task behaviour, I propose using the normalizing forces of the disciplinary process in order to engage students more productively in learning tasks in the classroom, while avoiding embarrassment or shaming of students. I also believe it is more beneficial to understand why students engage in off-task behaviours as opposed to simply 'training' students to conform and respond obediently to the dominating pressure from peers. For instance, Hooks (1994)

discusses alternative means to engage students and even invite argument to confront the "ever-present boredom" experienced in many classrooms (p. 5). She writes about the classroom as a space of excitement, in which teachers have flexible agendas to "allow for spontaneous shifts in direction," where students are "seen in their particularity as individuals… and interacted with according to their needs" in order to "stimulate serious intellectual and/or academic engagement" (p. 7).

In the same way that Edmunds and Edmunds promote the use of peer-monitoring as a normalizing force of judgement to change student behaviour, I felt the gaze once again of my school music teacher regulating my classroom management practices, both as a way to redirect my practices and to bring them into alignment with his own. The music teacher approached me early in September, frustrated that I have not taught my students to "sit-still and shut-up," as he demanded to know how he can "give students an education if they are squirming around, touching each other and talking." While I believe it is important for students to self-regulate their behaviours and to conform to certain norms, I reject practices of shaming or embarrassing students into conformity and obedience. For instance, when Mya was playing with her t-shirt instead of listening to a peer, I pulled Mya aside to prompt a discussion with these questions: "Why are you sticking your hands in your shirt instead of listening to James? How might James feel when you play with your shirt when he is talking? How can you show James that you care about what he is saying?" Alternatively, the music teacher publically humiliated Mya later that day by pointing out that "everyone else is sitting and listening, except for Mya who is sticking her hands in her shirt. You need to apologize!" The music teacher and I aim to mobilize and exercise power differently in our classroom, the music teacher presenting himself as an unquestionable authority, whereas I attempt a more respectful, non-authoritative approach which involves engaging in a dialogue with students about unacceptable or disrespectful behaviour.

While conformity, to some extent, is necessary for the functioning of the class as a whole, the following story from Edmunds and Edmunds highlights an unquestioned practice to promote self-regulation that may serve to divide students in terms of their capability or inability to 'pay attention,' a highly valued skill in Education. They refer to Zach as an example by which to illustrate how certain behaviours are understood and

thought about by educators. They use this example to bring to light some issues of how labelling and stigma reinforce a power hierarchy and present a more subtle means to prompt a student to self-regulate his behaviours. Zack is diagnosed with ADHD and his "problems" include "blurting out answers, interrupting when others are talking, fidgeting during the singing of *O Canada*, and disruptively going to the window on the other side of the room to check out passing airplane when Annette is teaching" (p. 99). Zach's behaviours are understood from a developmental standpoint, highlighting his insufficiencies in comparison with his more able peers, as his behaviours are expressed as "impulsive," "annoying," "disruptive," "inappropriate," and simply "bad" (p. 101-103).

There is an identified need to teach Zach to self-monitor his own behaviours and conform to socially constructed norms of appropriate student behaviour or rather "change his behaviours for the better" and "improve his status with the other children" (p. 103). The individualized strategy requires Zach to self-monitor his own behaviours in an extremely structured manner, as he is given a timer that beeps in two minute intervals, at which time he looks at a "Self-Monitoring Checklist" and checks-off whether or not he is "on-task" or "not on-task" (p. 102). If he is off-task, he is to report this to the teacher immediately so that he can seek assistance in re-focusing (p. 102). The whole process involves close supervision, close contact with Zach's parents so that the strategy can be implemented at home, and frequent discussions with Zach about his progress (p. 103). Any difference in behaviour exhibited by students is addressed through similar interventions in Edmunds and Edmunds' text, which promote strict controls on the body and voice of students.

Edmunds and Edmunds rely strictly on behaviourist psychology and ignore the impact that Yowell and Smylie (1999) discuss of the collective social aspect of self or peer-monitoring classroom management approaches. While students like Zach in the Edmunds and Edmunds text require excessive monitoring and support to learn in mainstream classrooms as well as for other students to learn in a classroom with minimal disruptions, I reject the rigid monitoring of student behaviour which denies them any sort of agency or voice that is endorsed in Edmunds and Edmunds' text. I do not present an easy solution for supporting students with 'annoying' and disruptive behaviours like those exhibited by Zack, rather I endorse a practice in which educators recognize that

"pedagogical decision-making is political". This practice requires the need for teachers to examine their actions and to question their own practices in terms of the "operation and effects of the power relationships *between* people" in an effort to "transform oppressive or inequitable teaching and learning processes" (Mac Naughton, 2005, p. 7).

Examination

The highly individualized monitoring system identified by Edmunds and Edmunds in their approach to changing Zack's disruptive behaviours is explored in the third element of the disciplinary process, examination, which is when the child is documented and compared relative to the norm in a "highly ritualized" fashion (Foucault, 1975, p. 184). Like hierarchical observation and normalizing judgement, the process of examination and feedback is not inherently 'evil' or 'bad,' rather it can be 'good' and productive in developing a democratic classroom society when utilized in a critically reflective and purposeful manner. My concern is that this process of examination may also be manipulated in power relationships as means to dominate children or serve to deny children agency or voice.

The examination and feedback component of disciplinary training is a technique that "possesses a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish" (Foucault, 1977, p. 184). Explicit self-monitoring systems, like the check-list prescribed for Zack, is the "formalisation of the individual within power relations" and the manner in which an individual is "described, judged, measured, compared with others, in [their] very individuality" (p. 191). My concern is that Edmunds and Edmunds endorse applying strict regulatory approaches that serve to classify, categorize, and control students in a certain way. However, they do not discuss the equity and social justice implications that correspond to this process.

Llamas (2006) discusses that the classification practices devised to differentiate groups or individuals from one another have social implications on the way that students see each other and themselves. For instance, Llamas finds that students who receive poor grades or 'annoy' the teacher develop "bad reputations" and "they are a bit isolated in class" (p. 675). For instance, a student in my class, Nathan, is continually disruptive on the carpet by making 'farting' noises, or giggling excessively and whispering swear words. The approaches I use with this student, such as time-outs or asking other students

to ignore Nathan's inappropriate behaviours have contributed to students isolating Nathan from their social groups or refusing to sit beside him on the carpet. Nathan's inappropriate behaviours, as well as my reactions to his behaviours have led to students identifying him as "bad." Similar to the check list Edmunds and Edmunds recommend for the character, Zack, I address Nathan's inappropriate behaviours using a rigid behaviourist psychology reward system in which he earns stickers throughout the day for using appropriate language, however, his other 'annoying' behaviours continue.

I believe that the problem with using these rigid monitoring systems is that it is completely teacher-directed, and that the whole process denies students like Nathan or Zack opportunity to voice their perspectives, problems or concerns in a way that might enable them to change their behaviours for more meaningful reasons than simply to conform to the standardized behavioural norms enforced in the classroom. For instance, Nathan later revealed to his parents that he does not know how to make friends and so he behaves inappropriately to make his peers laugh and he does not understand why no one will play with him anymore. Nathan's case leads me to wonder if there is a social issue at play in Zack's perceived inability to "stay on-task"; unfortunately this element is not explored in Edmunds and Edmunds text. Instead, rebellious or non-conformist behaviour is perceived in Edmunds and Edmunds as 'annoying' and 'disruptive', which lends to "dividing practice as part of disciplinary power" which works to "produce and regulate difference within, between and among students" (Meadmore, 1993, p. 71). Meadmore warns that practices of individuation should be used with caution and be reflected upon critically and continually in search of more equitable and socially justice practices (p. 71)

Foucault (1995) explains that with power there is resistance: "From the very moment there is a power relation there is a possibility of resistance. We are never trapped by power; it is always possible to modify its dominance in determined circumstances and according to a precise strategy" (p. 162 in Llamas, 2006, p. 680). Llamas (2006) suggests that educators examine resistance and defiance as everyday acts that "can alter organizational context and their social practices" in a way that is mutually beneficial for students and teachers and in equitable and socially just ways (p. 680). He explains that the individualizing and dividing process of examination can serve to isolate and further disadvantage certain students or enable "rebellious behaviour from students to

reveal the social processes by which classroom order is constructed, maintained and altered" and move towards less oppressive and more democratic means of classroom management (p. 681).

Conclusion

Through a singular case study - a discourse analysis of a specific textbook that is used to introduce effective classroom management strategies to teacher education students - I relied heavily on Gee (2011), Foucault (1975, 1977), and Hooks (1994) to explore the equity and social justice implications of the exclusive approach presented by the authors. Edmunds and Edmunds utilized a developmental educational psychology approach to classroom management, and claimed that the goal of using this particular textbook was to introduce students to research from the field of educational psychology, as well as to demonstrate the importance or necessity of using the principles of education psychology to endorse and justify a particular pedagogical approach. The authors claimed to present a "democratic" approach to classroom management, however, the examples of this approach served to reinforce and constitute educators as authoritative figures who are required to establish and maintain hierarchical power relationships in their classrooms. I weaved in my autoethnographic narratives about my own experiences navigating applications of classroom management pedagogy as a first year Kindergarten teacher as a means to counter and challenge the universalized positions that are endorsed in the textbook about what constitutes effective classroom management strategies and approaches in the classroom.

The authors used language politically and strategically as they constructed a relationship between themselves and the readers; specifically a 'knower versus seeker' hierarchical power relationship. This hierarchical power/knowledge relation enabled the textbook to function as a 'regime of truth,' which presented the discourse of developmental educational psychology as the uncontested truth in understanding the child and implementing effective classroom management pedagogy. Moreover, by privileging a developmental discourse of the child, Edmunds and Edmunds *disprivilege* discourses of childhood and pedagogical practices that do not rely on theories and perspectives that are informed by the discipline of educational psychology, thus limiting preservice education

students' access to more equitable and socially just approaches. I examined the limits of an exclusive developmental educational psychology discourse, specifically by exploring children's understandings of 'fairness,' as well as the understanding of self-regulation endorsed in the textbook in which the process is perceived as an individualized problem and the social effects of self-regulation are not addressed.

Furthermore, I interrogated the idea of power that appeared to be exercised in the constitution of the child as a particular object of the teacher's pedagogical gaze, specifically by examining the highly teacher-regulated approach to a democratic rule-making process endorsed in the text. I explored the classroom management practices endorsed in the textbook by using Foucault's theories of discipline and power/knowledge, as I investigated the systematic coercion of the body and silencing of student's voices, as well as the unintended consequences and effects of embracing pedagogical practices that reinforce adult superiority over children. Developmental educational psychology continues to dominate the field of education as an unquestioned practice; however my analysis suggests that change is needed so that multiple discourses of knowledge production in preservice education programs can be made available to enable new teachers to make better informed and critical decisions about promoting more social just pedagogical approaches to classroom management.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

Beyond a Singular Regime of Truth

In this thesis, I investigated the discourses of childhood and classroom management pedagogy endorsed in an official preservice education textbook. I was concerned to understand how the textbook constituted the child as an object of specific pedagogies, particularly how it framed and legitimated certain approaches to classroom management. My reading of the textbook was informed by the work of Gee (2011) and Foucault (1977-1982). As a basis for building knowledge and understanding about the limits and possibilities for elaborating more social justice pedagogical practices in classrooms, I focused on how childhood is constituted in the textbook, the sorts of discourses that informed the pedagogical approaches to modern classroom management, and some of the ways in which the bodies and voices of children were regulated were silenced.

To understand and interpret literature about classroom management, I used Ryan's (2008) "Landscape of Modern Childhood," to divide research into four categories: the developing child, the conditioned child, the authentic child, and the political child (p. 558). The significance of sorting literature into these categories is that it highlighted an inconsistency of definitions of classroom management and a wide variety of pedagogical approaches. The literature examined also highlighted the political aspect of research connected to the discourse of childhood which authors subscribe to, particularly as it extended to the claims about pedagogical practices endorsed in the readings. The process of searching for research about classroom management also revealed a gap in literature that explored the politics of certain discourses of childhood and pedagogical practices endorsed in set textbooks dealing with classroom management for preservice teacher education students.

Within my critical discourse analysis of the textbook and corresponding course syllabus, I examined the way in which the child is constituted in the language used in the textbook, the sorts of discourses that inform the pedagogical approach to modern classroom management legitimated by the author and the phenomena of specific ways in

which the bodies and voices of children were regulated and silenced in the classroom management practices endorsed in the textbook. The bounded and focused case study of this particular textbook and syllabus allowed for a deeper understanding of the political significance of the various discourses at play in how classroom management is constituted and the idea of the child-student that is implicated in such discourses.

While engaging heavily in classroom management texts both for the purpose of this study, as well as for my own professional growth as a first year teacher, I continuously reflected on my own trials and tribulations, internal conflicts, and questions about who I am and who I want to be as an educator. The purpose of weaving my own autoethnographic narratives throughout the analysis was to challenge the particular claims about teachers that were prescribed to educators in the classroom management textbook by presenting my individual lived experience as counter narratives. Counter narratives, according to Bamberg and Andrews (2004), contradict "dominant and hegemonic narratives" (p. 1). Rather than using my personal narratives as means to 'pit strategies' against those of Edmunds and Edmunds, I apply what Bamberg and Andrews (2004) identify as "narratives-in-interaction" in order to "bring off and more intelligibly manage emergent identities" (p. 1). The autoethnographic methodological choice also provided an opportunity for me to critique, challenge and reflect on my own classroom management pedagogy as I began to understand myself as a researcher and an educator. The purpose of the textbook discourse analysis was to entertain possibilities for elaborating more socially just practices in classrooms by addressing the implications of the political presentation of knowledge in the textbook that authorized certain pedagogical strategies in terms of how to best manage children in the current Ontario education context.

In my analysis of the textbook, I explored how the textbook authors, Edmunds and Edmunds (2010), used language to make certain pedagogy and discourses of childhood "significant or important in various ways" as well as "to lower their significance or importance" (Gee, 2011, p 211). The perspectives and pedagogy endorsed or dismissed in this textbook have implications for how preservice students believe they need to 'do' classroom management in order to be effective teachers and, hence, conform to certain normative practices and standards . By rejecting or denying

access to more socially justice pedagogical approaches, Edmunds and Edmunds reinforce the historically contingent forms of knowledge derived from educational psychology as 'truth' and more valid than other forms of disciplinary knowledge. I have showed through the discourse analysis of the textbook that this critical position on the politics of knowledge is consistent with that offered by Gee who expressed that authors use language to render certain ways of thinking as significant or to lessen their significance,(p. 17). In this sense the principles of educational psychology are presented in the textbook as unquestionable and necessary: "given the importance of integrating the concepts of educational psychology into all aspects of all learning environments…" (Edmunds & Edmunds, 2010, p. ix). The phrase "given the importance" depicted educational psychology as an uncontestable discipline and as a basis for justifying the approach to classroom management that was endorsed (p. ix).

While Edmunds and Edmunds do acknowledge that the discipline of educational psychology has evolved over time and that there has been new development, this does not necessarily mean that more progressive or socially just teaching practices are embraced. Gee (2011), for example has argued that new practices are often transformed from old ones, and that t so called 'new' or improved practices may still rely on or borrow elements from older practices to create something only perceived as 'new' (p. 18). I have tried to illustrate in the thesis through my analysis of the textbook that while Edmunds and Edmunds have presented current research and theory about classroom management, their approach sets certain limits to thinking about classroom management given their over-reliance on developmental educational psychology as regime of truth (Foucault, 1977). Exploration of more democratic or socially just pedagogy, and a consideration of what critical theory and sociological perspectives have to offer, may open up opportunities to explore classroom management and relations between teachers and students that do not involve the exercise of hierarchal or dominating power systems (Foucault, 1977).

The significance of denying access to alternative discourses of childhood and classroom management is that there is limited potential for teacher education candidates to explore power as productive in addressing equity and social justice matters in their classrooms. Explaining how power can be productive, Foucault (1980) stated: "What

makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is quite simply the fact that it doesn't weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the entire social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression" (p. 119 in Meadmore, 1993, p. 59-60). For instance, Hooks (1994) expresses that educators who utilized progressive engaged pedagogy worked to transform education "so that it [did] not reflect biases or reinforce systems of domination," however, the individuals Hooks discusses were willing to take risks and resist norms about appropriate and effective classroom management and teacher/student relationships ingrained in education and reinforced in texts like Edmunds and Edmunds' textbook (p. 21).

Implications

Further research is necessary to explore how socially just pedagogical approaches may be incorporated into the curriculum within Faculties of Education to enable preservice teachers to make informed decisions about their classroom management practices. While educational psychology dominate the classroom management literature, I am inspired by May's (2006) interpretations of Foucault's (1977) argument that while "the historical grip of [pedagogical] practices is a tight one… it does not hold so tightly that educators are eternally bound to a particular path; instead by understanding history "[educators] can intervene upon it" (May, 2006, p. 21). Weedon (1999) argues that by exploring language from a poststructuralist lens, one "opens up space for alternative voices" in interpreting social constructions and practices that are typically perceived as normal or natural (p. 4). Social actor theory, according to James and Prout (1990) offers an alternative way of understanding childhood and the child as a political agent by moving beyond assumptions of the naturalness of childhood (p. 10). Scholars who produce research from 'the political child' perspective advocate for classroom management pedagogy and preservice teacher education which values children's voice, acts on their claims, and shifts control and responsibility from teachers to students for meaningful participation in their education (For instance, see Freiberg & Lamb, 2009;

Hall & Rudkin, 2011; Lundy, 2007; Marzano, 2011; Milner & Tenore, 2010; Tzuo, 2007).

Based on my own personal experience as a new teacher as well as the research I have explored about discourses of classroom management, I argue that preservice education students be introduced to multiple discourses of classroom management that are not limited to that those drawn solely from the realm of educational psychology. Perhaps if classroom management education is integrated into other areas of study, as opposed to being exclusively taught in one preservice education course, then the responsibility of teaching classroom management theory and strategy would not fall solely on those professors with a background in educational psychology. For instance, I propose the possibilities of exploring discourses of classroom management in the mandatory social foundations courses which draw on sociological and critical theoretical perspectives in the field of education. In order to ensure that a more equitable and socially justice teacher education is delivered, there is a need for an explicit focus on classroom management from an alternative disciplinary perspective than that which informs the Edmunds and Edmunds textbook. Additionally, students would benefit from preservice education that strategically integrates a focus on classroom management from a critical perspective within curriculum or equity and social justice courses that are offered as part of the teacher education program. This would enable students to engage with various disciplinary approaches and to create a more dialogic and critical space for discussion and reflection on the most effective practices.

In conclusion, I would like to remind the reader of the story that prompted this thesis, the story of my disruptive student who refused to sit in her carousel desk and argued: ""Yeah, maybe I'll work better IN MY CAGE!" Llamas (2006) expresses that by exploring defiance from perspectives other than behaviours that need to be changed, educators may "open up the possibility of different forms of thought, of seeing and acting [through a] struggle together [with teachers and students] for a more equitable and fair schooling" (p. 681). My concern is that by limiting preservice students' access to other truths and perspectives on classroom management,, the well-intended efforts of Faculties of Education serve to restrict the potential for promoting more informed and critical reflections on pedagogical practices. I hope that my research will encourage teacher

educators and policy makers to reflect on the treatment of children and inspire system-wide change towards supporting   socially just pedagogical approaches, because no child should ever feel like she is a prisoner trapped in her cage.

References

Anderson, J. K. (2004). What is democracy? *Kappa delta pi record*.

Andrews, T. (2012). What is social constructionism? *Grounded theory review an international journal.*

Bamberg, M. & Andrews, M. (2004) Considering counter narratives: Narrating, resisting making sense. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bartman, A. (2002), *Spare the rod and spoil the child – corporal punishment in schools around the world*. Indiana International and Comparative Law Review.

Besley, A.C. (2005). Jim Marshall: Foucault and disciplining the self. *Educational philosophy and theory*.

Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism. 2nd ed.* New York: Routledge.

Boghossian, P. (2001) "What is Social Construction?" *Times Literary Supplement.*

Blundell, D. (2012). *Education and constructions of childhood*. New York: Continuum international publishing group.

Charles, C.M. (2002). *Essential elements of effective discipline*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Cohen, et al. (2011). *Research methods in education*. 7th eds. London: Routledge Falmer

Confrey, J. (1990). Steering a course between Vygotsky and Piaget. *Soviet studies in mathematics education.*

Covell, K. (2010). School engagement and rights-respecting schools. *Cambridge journal of education.*

Denzin, N., Lincoln, Y. (2005) *SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. 4th ed. Sage publications Ltd.

Denzin, N.K. (1997). *Interpretive ethnography: ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. California: Sage publications Ltd.

Edmunds, A., & Edmunds, G. (2010). *Educational psychology: application in Canadian classrooms*. Oxford University Press: Toronto.

Englehart, J.M. (2012). Five half-truths about classroom management. *The Clearing House*.

Evertson, C., and Weinstein, C.(2006) *Handbook of classroom management: research, practice, and contemporary issues*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Farkas, S., & Johnson, J. (1997). *Different drummers: How teacher of teachers view public education.* Brophy, J. (1988). Educating teacher about managing classrooms and students. *Teaching and teacher Education.* New York: Public Agenda.

Foucault, M., (1972). *Power/Knowledge: selected interviews & other writings 1972-1977*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M., (1977). *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M., (1987). The ethics of care for the self as a practice of freedom. *Philosophy and Social Criticism.*

Foucault, M., (1984) *The Foucault reader*. New York: Random House Inc: Paul Rabinow.

Foucault, M., (1982) *Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics.* Chicago University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M., (1988) *Technologies of the self*, *in:* in L.H. Martin, H. Gutman & PH Hutton (Eds) *Technologies of the Self*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Freiberg, H.J., & Lamb, S.M. (2009). Dimensions of person-centered classroom management. *Theory into practice*.

Gee, J.P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* 3rd ed. New York: Routledge

Gergen, K.J. (2001). Social construction and pedagogical practice. Social Construction n Context. Swarthmore College: Sage publications Ltd.

Gibbs, J. (2001) *Tribes: a new way of learning and being together.* Windsor, CA: CenterSource Systems.

Hall, E.L. & Rudkin, J.K. (2011). *Seen and heard: Children's right in early childhood education*. London, ON: The Althouse Press.

Heydon, R. (2008). *Early childhood curricula and the de-pathologizing of childhood*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hooks, B. (1994). *Teacher to Transgress*: *education as the practice of freedom*. London: Routledge.

James A., & Prout, A., (1990) *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: Contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood.* London: The Falmer Press.

James A., & Prout, A., (1997) *A new paradigm for the sociology of childhood?* Constructing and reconstructing childhood. Second Edition. London: RoutledgeFalmer Press.

Jones, F. (2007). *Tools for Teaching – discipline, instruction, motivation. 2nd Ed.* California: Fredric H. Jones & Associates, Inc.

Jones, S.H. (2005). *Autoethnography: making the personal political*. The sage handbook of qualitative research 3rd Ed. London: Sage publications.

Issitt, J. (2004). Reflections on the study of textbooks. *History of Education.*

Kilimci, S. (2009). Teachers' perceptions on corporal punishment as a method of discipline in elementary schools. *The journal of international social research.*

Kokkinos, C.M., Panyiotou, G. and Davazogklou, A.M. (2004) 'Perceived Seriousness of Pupils' Undesirable Behaviour: The Student Teacher Perspective' *Educational Psychology.*

Llamas, J.M.C. (2006). Technologies of disciplinary power in action: the norm of the 'good student'. *Higher Education.*

Little, S.G., & Akin-Little, A. (2008). Psychology's contributions to classroom management. *Psychology in the schools.*

Lorentzen, E.G. (2006). Foucault's normalizing judgement, deviancy and Woolf's Mrs. Dalloway. *Humanities international complete.*

Lundy, L. (2007) 'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *British Educational Research Journal.*

Mac Naughton, G. (2005) *Doing Foucault in early childhood studies: applying poststructural ideas*. New York: Routledge.

Marshall, D., (2008) Children's rights and children's action in international relief and domestic welfare: the work of Herbert Hoover between 1914 and 1950. *Journal of the history of childhood and youth.*

Marzano, R.J. (2011). Classroom management: whose job is it? *Association for supervision and curriculum development.*

May, Todd. (2006). A history of the prisons. The Philosophy of Foucault. *McGill-Queen's University Press*.

Meadmore, D. (1993). The production of individuality through examination. *British journal of sociology of education*.

Midthassel, U.V. (2006). Creating a shared understanding of classroom management. *Educational management administration and leadership*.

Millei, Z. J. (2005) The discourse of control: Disruption and Foucault in an early childhood classroom. *Contemporary issues in early childhood.*

Milner, H., & Tenore, F. (2010). Classroom management in diverse classrooms. *Urban Education*.

Morris, M. (2000). "Dante's left foot kicks queer theory into gear" in S. Talburt & S. R. Steinberg (Eds.) *Thinking queer: Sexuality, culture, and education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Nelson, J.R., Johnson, A., & Marchand-Martella, M. (1996). Effects of direct instruction, cooperative learning, and independent learning practices on the classroom behavior of students with behavioral disorders: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders.*

Noguera, P. A. (2003). Schools, prisons, and social implications of punishment: Rethinking disciplinary practices. *Theory Into Practice.*

O'Farrell, Clare. (2007). Key concepts. *Michel-Foucault.com*. Retrieved from http://www.michel-foucault.com/

Paolucci, E. O., & Violato, C. (2004). A meta-analysis of the published research on the affective, cognitive, and behavioral effects of corporal punishment. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*.

Redman, D. (1994) *Karl* Popper's theory of science and econometrics: the rise and decline of social engineering. *Journal of Economics.*

Ryan, P.J. (2008). How new is the 'new' social study of childhood? The myth of a paradigm shift. *Journal of interdisciplinary history.*

Siegler, R.S. (1996). Whose children are we talking about? *Emerging Minds*.

Simonsen, B., S. Fairbanks., A. Briesch., D. Myers., & G. Sugai. (2008). Evidence-based practices in classroom management: considerations for research to practice. *Education and treatment of children.*

Stevenson, C., and Cutcliffe, J. (2006). Problematizing special observation in psychiatry: Foucault, archaeology, genealogy, discourse and power/knowledge. *Journal of psychiatric and mental health nursing*.

Strain, P.S. (1981). The utilization of classroom peers as behavior change agents. New York: Plenum Publishing Corporation.

Sondergaard, D.M. (2002). Poststructuralist approaches to empirical analysis. *Qualitative studies in education*.

Sutton, R.E., Mudrey-Camino, R., & Knight, C.C. (2009). Teachers' emotion regulation and classroom management. *Theory into practice.*

Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies. The sage handbook of qualitative research 3rd Ed. London: Sage publications.

Tzuo, P.W. (2007). The tension between teacher control and children's freedom in a child-centered classroom: resolving the practical dilemma through a closer look at the related theories. *Early Childhood Education Journal*.

United Nations. (1989) Convention on the rights of the child. Retrieved 23 December 2012 <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/crc.htm>

Weedon, C. (1999). *Feminism, theory and the politics of difference.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Yowell, C.M. and Smylie, M.A. (1999). Self-regulation in democratic communities. *The elementary school journal*.

Appendices

Appendix A.

Gee (2011) outlines seven "building tasks" that can lead to a total of forty-two sub-questions which I will use to in my discourse analysis:

1. Building Task 1: Significance: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses, and Conversations being used to build relevance or significance for things and people in context?

2. Building Task 2: Practices (Activites): How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses and Conversations being used to enact a practice (activity) or practices (activities) in context?

3. Building Task 3: Identities: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses and Conversations being to enact and depict identities (socially significant kinds of people)?

4. Building Task 4: Relationships: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses and Conversations being used to build and sustain (or change or destroy) social relationships?

5. Building Task 5: Politics: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses and Conversations being used to create, distribute, or withhold social goods or to construe particular distributions of social goods as "good" or "acceptable" or not?

6. Building Task 6: Connections: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses and Conversations being used to

make things and people connected or relevant to each other or irrelevant to or disconnected from each other?

7. Building Task 7: Sign Systems and Knowedge: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses and Conversations being used to privilege or disprivilege different sign systems (language, social languages, other sorts of symbol systems) and ways of knowing? (p. 121-122).

Curriculum Vitae

Marlene Patricia Frederick

Post-secondary Education and Degrees:	King's University/College at the University of Western Ontario London, Ontario, Canada 2006-2010 B.A.
	The University of Western Ontario London, Ontario, Canada 2010-2011 B.Ed.
	The University of Western Ontario London, Ontario, Canada 2011-2013 M.Ed. (in progress)
Related Work Experience:	Teaching Assistant: Childhood and Social Institutions King's University/College at the University of Western Ontario 2009-2010 and 2011-2012
	Research Assistant: Mathematics and Arts Education The University of Western Ontario 2011-2012
	Kindergarten Teacher Thames Valley District School Board 2012-2013