

# Power relationships in the lower track science classrooms : how students "own" teachers

Muhammad Danial Ahmad Sufyan

2018

Muhammad Danial Ahmad Sufyan. (2018). Power relationships in the lower track science classrooms : how students "own" teachers. Student research paper, Nanyang Technological University.

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/138053>

---

© 2018 The Author(s).

*Downloaded on 13 Oct 2024 21:11:57 SGT*

## Power relationships in the Lower Track Science Classrooms: How students "own" teachers

Muhammad Danial bin Ahmad Sufyan  
School of Social Sciences

Asst. Prof Teo Tang Wee  
Mr. Yeo Leck Wee  
Nanyang Institute of Education

### **Abstract –**

This paper presents an analysis of the power relationships in a particular lower track science classroom of a secondary school in Singapore. We aim to understand the power relationships that arise out of student-teacher interactions in the classroom. In the everyday classroom, students constantly attempt at undermining the authority of their teachers. These attempts are what we will term as ‘owning’.

The sociological framework we use to frame our analysis is through symbolic interactionism. This framework will allow us to understand how two teachers of varying experiences engage ‘face-work’ to manage owning. Through (in)correct lines of action, the owning will consequently succeed or fail. Analysis of interviews with the two teachers, their students and video recordings of their lessons will shed light on how owning is more than just unidimensional and indeed, contains nuances that can only be studied through the symbolic interactionist perspective.

By correctly managing different facets of owning, these attempts could enhance rapport and mutual respect between student and teacher. The findings show the many complexities that lie in educational pedagogy of today and by studying owning, we hope to provide teachers, old and new, with alternative ways to look at and manage classroom authority.

**Keywords –** Symbolic interactionism, Face-work, Managing authority, Student-teacher relations

### **INTRODUCTION**

As Erickson (1987) argues, the problem with traditional views of classroom authority is that for effective classroom teaching and learning to take place, authoritarian settings of classroom environments must exist: students must cooperate with classroom learning and students must willingly agree with what is taught to them. The traditional expectations of society are for teachers to command total ownership of the classroom and the students are to solely absorb and reproduce what is taught to them. This creates an imbalance of authority in the classroom and creates two distinct and discrete bodies within the classroom: the teacher (superordinate) and the students (subordinate) with complete disregard of the differences in educational proficiencies, personalities and attitudes of each and every student. This in turn, affects the effectiveness of existing teaching methods carried out in the classroom

and also “has great bearing on the quality of students’ educational experience and teachers’ work” (Pace and Hemmings, 2007:4). A better understanding of classroom power relations deserves priority. Classroom authority traditionally involved direct discipline of student by the teacher however, as qualitative studies have shown, power relations between the teacher and their students take vastly different forms depending on factors that vary from classroom to classroom (Hemmings, 2003; Hemmings & Metz, 1990).

Modern day power relations in the classroom have taken on a different form. Differences amongst students such as socioeconomic status, gender, race and other key identifiers have garnered greater attention in recent years (Pace & Hemmings, 2007). These differences have also been brought to the classroom, effectively changing the classroom dynamic of superordinate over subordinate, teacher over student. Furthermore, as Metz (1978) posits, modern day classroom management involves ongoing negotiations between teachers and students and are influenced by numerous societal factors.

Thus, this paper attempts to look at classroom authority through the lens of interactions and interpretations of student teacher relationships through the everyday classroom setting. Using the symbolic interactionist perspective, a sociological concept popularised by Erving Goffman, we use these aforementioned interactions and interpretations in hopes of providing a holistic outlook in modern day educational pedagogy and how contemporary educators manage authority in the classroom.

In this paper we posit that teachers are constantly exposed to challenges of authority posed by their students. This is through either overt or covert efforts, done collectively by the class or done through a single individual student. Nonetheless, all this serves to undermine the authority of the teacher. These efforts or attempts are what this paper will now on term as ‘owning’. With the data collected through interviews and classroom observations, we found that teachers deal with these ownings with various proficiencies and in various ways. These various ways at which teachers deal with these ownings are what we call lines of action. These lines of action can be viewed as “organically derived and generative from social interactions ascribed with symbolic meanings” (Teo & Osborne, 2012: 543). These lines of action are used to manage their ‘face-work’ and through successful or

unsuccessful face-work, the teacher can either gain 'face' or lose 'face' in the process (Goffman, 1955).

Although this paper aims to provide a qualitative analysis on effective classroom and authority management; analysis and discussion on the matter are nowhere generalisable. Due to time and data gathering constraints, what we gathered were interviews and recordings that concern only one particular secondary school classroom in the lower track science stream for one conventional academic year. Nonetheless, this paper aims to serve as a primer for further discussion on owning and its management of these attempts. Further research would ideally include classrooms from different tracks as that will garner methods of owning that might differ from the lower track and also span across a timeframe greater than a year to see the evolution of how students attempt to own the teachers and how teachers themselves manage these ownings and attempt to promote healthy class relations.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Education pedagogy and power relations in classrooms have long been a point of discourse for numerous scholars specialising in the field of education (Erickson, 1987; Hemmings, 2003; Metz, 1978; Pace & Hemmings, 2007).

Pace and Hemmings (2007) posit that educational pedagogy has historically faced numerous criticisms from the different approaches schools choose in managing authority. Traditional authority has garnered significant support in the history of educational pedagogy while contemporary teachings focus on relatively lax approach to managing classroom authority. Enforcement of authority and discipline on their students were not implemented in some schools. The authors choose to use social theory to understand authority within the classroom setting. According to the authors, truly understanding classroom authority is pertinent and has to involve an integration of knowledge from writings on—in the case for these authors— social theory, educational ideology, and empirical qualitative studies of schooling.

Erickson (1987) wanted to study the lack of efficacy that teaching in the classroom had amongst the minority. He learnt that there was a link between the lack of achievement amongst minority students and the cultural differences during student-teacher interactions together with the cynicism of these minority students due to the lack of chances to experience upward social mobility through the labour market.

For Metz (1978), he posits that classroom management is changing and evolving. Bureaucracy, red tapes, and external bodies of regulation as he argues, are what corrodes the ability of educators and schools to maintain authority and instil discipline in their students. He also recognises that even though these new bodies

of regulation for educators exist that make it that much harder for classroom authority to be maintained, schools still bear the full responsibility for nurturing students and to maintain orderly conduct.

While these literatures of education seem to be arguing for different causes; it comes together for this paper. We recognise that the foci of current literature is towards the wellbeing of students, the evolution of the educational climate and so on but there is a lack of literature regarding *what* should be done. Existing literature deals with *what* is happening and there is a distinct lack of *why*.

This paper aims to cover that research gap by using a modern classroom environment to study how educators of today try to manage their authority while still maintaining healthy student-teacher relationships. We aim to use Goffman's work on performance and roles to study how two teachers with significant years between them deal with the same problem: managing their authority in the classroom.

## METHODOLOGY

We studied a Secondary Two Normal Academic (NA) streamed class of an undisclosed secondary school for the duration of this research project. The class was taught by two form teachers, Jasmine Lee and Timmy Tan. Jasmine Lee was the more senior of the two, with ten years of teaching experience as compared to Timmy Tan who has only had three years of teaching experience under his belt. They were both science teachers assigned to Class 204, a NA class with twenty-eight students in total; comprising of sixteen male students and twelve female students.

Two major types of qualitative data gathering were used: participant observation through ethnographic fieldwork and in-depth interviewing of both teachers and the students. Ethnography was done in the classroom setting where video recordings of a typical science lesson in a lower-tracked classroom was recorded over the span of an academic year with each lesson usually lasting around forty-five minutes. The individual assigned to carry out these recordings was employed to only start the recordings and to stop the recordings; during the process, the individual stood at the back of the class, this was to reduce the Heisenberg effect on both the teachers and the students in order to derive more accurate results and analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992).

Personal interviews were done face-to-face with the interviewer accompanied by a co-interviewer. These interviews were recorded and then transcribed ad verbum. HyperResearch, a software program used for qualitative research and analysis was employed to code for instances of owning. This included each individual's definition and interpretation of what owning entails. In addition to that, it included the individual's experience

of either dealing with the owning attempt (the teacher’s experience) or their attempt at owning (the student’s experience).

Interview Data	DurationDuration (HH:MM:SS)
Classroom Video Recordings	05:09:00
Mrs Lee (Form Teacher)	00:51:23
Mr Timmy (Co-Form Teacher)	00:56:49
Anwar	1:08:49
Shafiq	00:32:04
Azfar	00:43:14
Nat	00:39:11
Aishah	1:01:38
Jan	00:49:40
Ridhwan	00:23:12
Eunice and Xin Wei	00:49:56
Total Duration	13:04:00

Table 1: Total duration of recorded videos and transcribed audio recordings

We managed to gather close to eight hours of interview data that was then coded into HyperResearch. Meanwhile, video recordings of the science lessons lasted a little over five hours. In total, including classroom observations and the personal interviews, we managed to collect and analyse thirteen hours and four minutes of data.

Subsequently, primary analysis of the data collected was carried out. Our analysis used the symbolic interactionist perspective and Goffman’s theory of facework. Using the data in this manner allowed us to understand how owning is interpreted and experienced with each individual and allow us to further refine attempts by students that are considered to be acts of owning as well as the different tenets of owning.

## FINDINGS

We found that the dynamics of the term ‘owning’ was not new. Where the current form is called ‘owning’, the students that were interviewed also were familiar with other similar nomenclatures such as ‘burning’ and ‘savage’. Discussions with the form teachers also brought about other terms such as ‘stepping over [the teacher’s] head’. We can conclude in this case, that owning is not a new phenomenon.

We also found that students had their own preferences of teachers as witnessed in their audio interviews. The general consensus was the preference of Mr Timmy’s

style of classroom management which we will discuss in the section of face-work vis-a-vis owning.

We have also evolved our definitions of owning through the data collected. Where we once saw owning as generally a negative endeavour, students now use owning as a way to establish rapport and to give vibrancy to an otherwise dull day at the classroom. Thus, we were required to identify ownings of different degrees and intentions; not every owning was to undermine authority. Indeed, some ownings were the students’ way of getting closer to the teacher.

Due to this, we had to redefine our outlook of owning based on the interviews we had with the teachers and students in our study. Traditional views of owning had to be forgotten and we had to make way for modern perspectives of educational pedagogy to take the centre stage.

## CODED DATA OF OWNING

Using HyperResearch software, we coded for data that aligned with our interests towards owning. This was an exploratory process. As we coded for just instances of owning, we discovered that owning was not only defined by teachers and students to be negative but also could serve as a positive reinforcement of the student-teacher relationship as well. Furthermore, as we went through more of our transcribed data, we discovered further nuances in owning that was unaccounted for at the start of this research endeavour.

Code Name	Frequency
Definition of Owning	8
Extent of Owning	4
Owning as a Challenge	4
Positive Intents of Owning	6
Negative Intents of Owning	6
Reaction to Owning	9
Owning as a Two-Way Process	7
Owning as a Form of Rapport Building	6

Table 2: Frequency table of codes relevant to the nuances of owning

As evident in the table above, the definitions of owning are riddled by its nuances. Owning can either be viewed as a challenge; either with a negative or a positive intent. It can also be viewed as a two-way conversational process between student and teacher. It can also be viewed as a way to establish rapport between student and teacher as well. All this culminates into the intricate term of owning as discussed in this paper today. However, the importance of dissecting these ownings has to be emphasised.

## CONDITIONS OF OWNING

In order to accurately identify instances of owning, we required strict guidelines on what entailed said phenomenon. It was inadequate to simply state any classroom outburst or student-teacher interaction as a form of owning. This was for the fact that if it was as done as such, there were simply too many instances and too many insignificant episodes of outbursts and interactions that could affect classroom chemistry but do not adversely undermine the teacher's authority.

Thus, we have agreed upon certain conditions that would constitute owning in the classroom.

- 1) The student starts the owning attempt.
- 2) Acknowledgement of owning attempt by students in the vicinity.
- 3) Acknowledgement by the teacher of the owning attempt.
- 4) The counter to the owning attempt.

Of course, not every attempt of owning we have looked at covers all four requirements. However, we have used this guideline to filter out the many varied interactions students and teachers have with each other in order to study only the ones that constitute the true meaning of owning. This is to ensure consistency with regards to the quality of the ownings studied.

## TENETS OF OWNING

Prior to starting preliminary data analysis on this research topic, we originally believed owning to be of malicious intent. This meant that all forms of owning were to serve a singular purpose of undermining the teacher's authority. However, upon analysing the transcribed audio interviews with the students and the teachers, we found that to not be the case. Following this, both students and teachers provided different interpretations of what owning meant to them.

These differing interpretations were important to our eventual link towards the lines of action that teachers would require to take should students try to own them. As Goffman (1955) posits, the correct lines of action would maintain and even possibly improve the teacher's standing amongst his/her students. Consequently, the opposite holds true; taking the wrong lines of action undermines the teacher's authority and even causes certain bouts of contempt and tension between student and teacher thereby affecting the effectiveness of classroom pedagogy. Students themselves have admitted their occasional confusion towards their teachers' reactions to their ownings.

Thus, it is important for teachers to employ the correct lines of action with their students. If owning does contain different nuances, contemporary educators have to correctly identify the line that will provide the most positive effect. In this paper, we will show three tenets of owning that we have identified through data analysis

of transcribed audio interviews and videos of science lessons that have been recorded throughout the year.

## OWNING AS A CHALLENGE

This was the view that we originally started out with when we wanted to study owning. Our research started out as such due to our personal experiences in teaching where we were frequently bombarded with owning attempts by our students.

Indeed, this is the general truth across the board in this class as well. Mr Timmy and Mrs Lee both are science teachers and in a particular recording, Mrs Lee was teaching the class about the human body and its digestive system. Owning attempts by Shafiq and Anwar were frequent, either by making fun of the pronunciation of certain parts or by being rowdy in the classroom. As mentioned earlier to what actually constitutes owning, they attempted to redirect the attention of their other classmates and as well as the attention of Mrs Lee. This was dealt swiftly by Mrs Lee with a harsh remark and the class immediately resumed the teaching and learning process.

In the case for Mr Timmy, his process of dealing with owning attempts and managing classroom authority has led to a greater challenge for him to maintain classroom discipline. Different to Mrs Lee, Mr Timmy does not immediately end the attempt by the student. He tries to counter back with his own witty comments or actions. For example, when one student tried to throw his classmate's item playfully, it garnered a lot of attention by his fellow classmates. Mr Timmy stopped the lesson and instead of a reprimand, tried to return it back to a student but made an error in which student to return it too, making the class even rowdier than usual.

Thus, owning has to be approached tactically. Owning attempts that have the intention of challenging the teacher should be dealt with a reprimand. However, as we will see below, not every owning intention is negative. Indeed, it can be used to establish rapport and promote healthy teacher-student relationships as well.

## OWNING AS A SIGN OF RAPPORT

*"[My class and I] have much more time spent together then [the students] start to get more familiar with me then they realise they could have this kind of wordplay with me..."*

*-Mr Timmy*

During the course of research, what we found surprising was the distinct difference towards the treatment of owning Mr Timmy had as compared to Mrs Lee. He acknowledges the different motivations students might have in attempting to own the teacher.

He takes on a completely new twist towards owning attempts in that he chooses to view it as an establishment of rapport. Indeed, he even relates the health of the student-teacher relationship with the number of times the students attempt to own him throughout the lesson. Interestingly enough, although he is a relatively inexperienced teacher (3 years of teaching experience), he understands the different motivations that students have. For one student, he understands the curiosity that that student shares and without an immediate way of settling said curiosity, chooses instead to interrupt Mr Timmy in class together with a joke or two his way. For another student, through her random outbursts in class, he reasons out that it is due to her alienated status in class that led her to said outbursts.

Consequently, Mr Timmy found owning as a way for students to communicate in their own special way. As students become more aware and comfortable with his teaching methods in the classroom, he in turn, becomes comfortable with the classroom environment as well. He also responds by saying that this comfort in attempting to own him does not entail a lack of respect by the students in any way, although that was what was subtly implied by Mrs Lee during her interview. Instead, he views this as an alternative way to approaching traditional education pedagogy. Instead of maintaining the traditional teacher (superordinate) vs student (subordinate) relationship, he posits that even though the degree of friendliness students might have with him might come off as overly so to his colleagues, he says that "...as a teacher, there is a general respect and that it is mutual and is both ways... [the students] will listen to me and do things that I really need them to do.". This also resonates with not just Mr Timmy but the students that he is teaching as well. Coding the transcriptions, we found that positive and negative ownings had an equal occurrence within our interview data. Thus, for contemporary education, educators have to be wary of the approaches of owning. Indeed, as mentioned by one student in the class; his attempt at trying to just have fun with the teacher during class was met with harsh criticism by Mrs Lee and from then on, was reluctant to speak in class.

### **FACE-WORK VIS-À-VIS OWNING**

As posited by Goffman (1955), everyday social interactions can be treated as a performance of sorts. Actors take their 'lines' and perform 'roles'. Keep in mind a 'role' to Goffman is the same 'role' treated in an acting world. A role an individual chooses is a performance and that performance is seen by the individuals who are intending to view said performance. The most important takeaway in Goffman's series of essays regarding performances and roles is the external perception of self, independent of how one's self truly feels. That is to say, how Mrs Lee and Mr Timmy view themselves is rendered useless. What matters is how

their students and colleagues view them in their roles as teachers. This importance will again be iterated later in this section.

The reason this paper chose to undertake Goffman's face-work as our main framework of study is due to the everyday uniqueness in the performance of student and teacher. Being a teacher is an achieved status, this comes with a certain level of authority (on the student) and demands a certain level of respect; at least in the Singapore context. However, the student is no longer just a subordinate as existing literature on pedagogy states. The constant attempts at undermining the teacher's authority (be it Mrs Lee or Mr Timmy) could have been treated harshly, with both teachers having the choice to either punish the students with detention or with a reprimand. However, the role strain of being a teacher involves being both a superordinate and as a mentor towards the students as well. Character-building, nurturing and instilling motivation in their students (while inherently positive) provide a certain contradiction towards their roles as authority figures as well and as a result, role strain (Lin, Vaughn and Ensel, 1981).

There is a stark difference between how Mrs Lee and Mr Timmy conduct their roles as teachers and the lines of action they take towards owning. However, they both have mentioned about owning being a two-way process. For Mrs Lee, she mentions that she shuts the students down by owning them back. This is the line of action that she took and even mentions that this is successful at drawing their attention back to the classroom. On the other hand, for Mr Timmy mentions that owning is a form of wordplay, an activity more than an act of rebellion. For him, he chooses to have witty comments at the ready to counter any instances of owning. Thus, going back to the discussion on how face-work deals with how students see them, students' perspectives with these two teachers vary widely as well. Using the data coded and the transcription of student interviews as reference, we see that students prefer the teaching methods of Mr Timmy (which could then translate to them preferring Mr Timmy in general) as compared to Mrs Lee. Mr Timmy's lessons were described as 'more fun' to certain students. Indeed, the harshness of Mrs Lee leads to a more traditional form of classroom management. In the video recordings of their classrooms, Mr Timmy has had more questions brought forth by the students as compared to Mrs Lee. Also, the general consensus of the students interviewed was that they enjoyed Mr Timmy's lessons more which could then improve the efficacy of his teaching methods.

On the flipside, classroom management and maintaining authority is also a greater challenge for Mr Timmy. In a standard lesson spanning forty-five minutes, Mr Timmy takes fifteen minutes off, on average, of that time to have the class settle down. This is a stark difference to Mrs Lee who takes five minutes for the class to settle down and begin the lesson. Thus, we can conclude that for effective classroom

management to take place in the classroom, a fine line between taking the line of action of Mrs Lee and the line of action of Mr Timmy must take place. These two extreme approaches to teaching has brought on a wealth of information towards educational pedagogy and thus provided us with great insight into the world of classroom management today.

The lines of actions these two teachers take are but simply two of many other examples that could happen in the everyday classroom environment. We have to acknowledge that the lines of actions educators take today vary drastically, lying between the spectrum of Mrs Lee and Mr Timmy. Making meaning of the coded data only translates towards this particular classroom environment. Hopefully, much more can be studied about the different lines of actions teachers can take into making effective classroom management a reality for all contemporary educators.

Unhealthy classroom relations between student-teacher could spell disaster for modern educators. As Erickson (1987) posits, it is this estranged relationship between student-teacher that contributes to the lack of efficacy of modern teaching methods seen in his study. The wrong lines of action taken by educators today could result in students not performing to their true potential, regardless of how hard these educators try to get their learning points across in their lesson plans.

## CONCLUSION

It must be reiterated that the limitations of this paper deserve attention. There could be a vast wealth of information concerning owning that we have yet to discover because we have simply studied a single stream of a single class in a particular classroom lesson. It would be interesting to witness the differences that the Express stream or the Normal Technical stream might have with regards to owning and their reactions to owning as well. Furthermore, we take a more qualitative approach towards studying the owning phenomenon and its impacts. It would serve this field of research well to also include quantitative approaches as well which statistics of classroom disruption, downtime, questions posed by students could all be translated into a meaningful data set to be studied with regards to educational pedagogy. We have learnt through the research done for this paper that by correctly managing different facets of owning, these attempts could enhance rapport and mutual respect between student and teacher. Conversely, the findings show the many complexities that lie in educational pedagogy of today and by studying owning, we hope to provide teachers, old and new, with alternative ways to look at and manage classroom authority.

However, it could be interesting as well, to not only study the achieved status of being a science teacher of a lower-track classroom but to also to expand the study into the ascribed statuses of the teachers with regards to

owning. For example, Mr Timmy and Mrs Lee, both being of different genders (but of the same race) might provide a different perspective to say a male and female teacher belonging to other racial groups such as Malays or Indians.

The study of modern classroom management will be an issue that will be continuously discussed amongst all educators and scholars. we can only wait and see how other scholars will attempt to study owning; either through a different ideological perspective or a different social framework. Personally, it has been a wonderful experience to be part of such a contemporary realm of study.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Muhammad Danial initiated literature review for the study, transcribed interview data for the project, and drafted the initial manuscript. Asst. Professor Teo Tang Wee provided the data and funding for said project. This included but was not limited to: video recordings of classroom time, face-to-face interviews recorded in an audio format and provided guidance and supervisory feedback whenever necessary. Mr. Yeo Leck Wee provided guidance on the coding software used called HyperResearch and has constantly assisted throughout the project. This included partial transcription of interviews, guidance on the URECA research poster and the provision and transfer of data amongst others.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Professor Teo Tang Wee for all the support and guidance through my project. I have been so fortunate to be taken under you and to be able to learn from such a passionate mentor in the Education department and also a lover of Sociological teachings and frameworks. I thank you for your unwavering patience, care and continual encouragement through this academic adventure of mine.

To Mr Yeo Leck Wee, thank you for your continued support on my poster as well as your comprehensive teaching when it came to HyperResearch, a software I was completely unfamiliar with. I am very sure I was not the greatest person to work with. Regardless, working with you was a joy indeed. Needless to say, both of you have been a huge inspiration to me and the lessons that have been passed on by the both of you will no doubt carry me through my life for the better, academic or otherwise. I wish you both all the best in your future endeavours.

To Mdm Mandy Cheng, thank you for giving me the opportunity to teach and nurture the students that you gave to me when no one else wanted to provide me that chance of being an educator. Never would I have thought that the field of education could be this

rewarding nor this eye-opening. I would not have chosen to pursue this topic if it weren't for you. Your constant guidance, mentorship and care during my term as an educator inspired me to start this adventure in the first place.

Finally, to you, my best friend and confidant. Thank you for insisting that I embark on this project. For that, I have learnt so much more and grew so much more as a person. Thank you for being there; for loving me and inspiring me, as always.

*I also wish to acknowledge the funding support for this project from Nanyang Technological University under the Undergraduate Research Experience on Campus (URECA) programme.*

Teo, T. W., & Osborne, M. (2012). Using symbolic interactionism to analyze a specialized STEM high school teacher's experience in curriculum reform. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 7(3), 541-567.

## REFERENCES

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). Qualitative research for education.

Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 335-356.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry*, 18(3), 213-231.

Hemmings, A. (2003). Fighting for respect in urban high schools. *Teachers College Record*, 105, 416-437.

Hemmings, A., & Metz, M. H. (1990). Real teaching: How high school teachers negotiate national, community, and student pressures. In R. Page & L. Valli (Eds.), *Curriculum differentiation: Interpretive studies in U.S. secondary schools* (pp. 91-111).

Lin, N., Vaughn, J. C., & Ensel, W. M. (1981). Social resources and occupational status attainment. *Social forces*, 59(4), 1163-1181.

Metz, M. H. (1978). *Classrooms and corridors: The crisis of authority in desegregated secondary schools*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pace, J. L., & Hemmings, A. (2007). Understanding authority in classrooms: A review of theory, ideology, and research. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 4-27.