Disciplinary Power in The School: Panoptic Surveillance

Gözde ÇEVEN[1]

Yıldız Technical University

Mithat KORUMAZ[2]

Yıldız Technical University

Yunus Emre ÖMÜR[3]

Yıldız Technical University

Abstract

The curiosity on how disciplinary power operates in a secondary school in the context of Panoptic surveillance became our motive. We designed the study as a single case study in qualitative approach to grasp the holistic understanding of disciplinary power, surveillance, and resistance to it in a secondary school. The data were obtained by a set of data collection techniques including a focus group interview, semi-structured interviews, observation and document analysis. The content analysis method was employed to analyze the collected data. In the analysis, we identified the themes of forced docility, norm provider, and reflection on discipline. To the findings, the main disciplinary power practice in this school is surveillance on appearances, behaviors, and exams, and the students prefer reacting to surveillance practices in two ways: either normalizing their behaviors or displaying resistance and insisting on the undesired behaviors. For further research, the relation between power, surveillance, and resistance can be analyzed as multiple case study to compare the findings at different types of school.

Keywords: Disciplinary Power, Foucault, Surveillance, Resistance, Secondary School

[1]PhD Student, Faculty of Education, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0003-0191-5061 **Correspondence**: cevengozde@gmail.com

[2] Assist. Prof., Faculty of Education, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0003-1800-7633 Email: mithatkorumaz@gmail.com

[3] PhD, Faculty of Education, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0002-1535-3461 Email: yunus.emre.omur@gmail.com

Introduction

Power relations in daily life have a tendency for using some sorts of strategies not based on the concept of ownership but rooted in schemes, maneuvers, and techniques. As articulated by Foucault's in his outstanding work *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of Prison*, there has been no longer physical punishment for disobedience against power since the beginning of the 19th century in Europe. Instead of it, there is a toolbox, which is insidious control on the bodies and souls of individuals. It is defined as the art of surveillance, a disciplinary technique to rank, order, and normalize individuals (Foucault,1995). A school is deemed to be one of the most favorable contexts for applying traditional and modern technologies of the art of surveillance except for a prison, a military, and a hospital, (Gallagher, 2010; Hope, 2016; Lyon, 2007; Taylor, 2012) since it is a crucial part of the norm-providing power which aims at raising individuals serving to the power itself (Bakioğlu & Korumaz, 2019). In this paper, surveillance in schools is considered with Foucault's metaphor of panopticon, a kind of prison originally designed by Jeremy Bentham.

The panopticon is depicted as a round building or circle of cells with an observation tower at the core. 'All that is needed, then, is to place a supervisor in a central tower and to shut up in each cell… a worker or a schoolboy… One can observe from the tower, standing out precisely against the light, small captive shadows in the cells of the periphery' (Foucault, 1995, p. 200). The panopticon, which is a reflection of the enlightenment mind, obtains the information of the individual through examination and surveillance in institutions in which the individual's life is enclosed, they are classified, observed, recorded and their behaviors are analyzed comparatively (Gücüyener, 2011). Imagining this prison design, it is not hard to say that there is a similarity between the panopticon and schools. As Deacon (2006) it is necessary to evaluate modern schools in the context of the disciplinary power that began to multiply and spread in seventeenth century Europe. The realities of physical surveillance, attendance records, exams, performance progress reports, body-belongings researches, seclusion units in schools interrogate us the idea that a school could be a prison in disguise (Barker et al., 2010; Hall, 2003). In short, schools are designed as an institution where there is no rule-gap, strict discipline prevails and no one can escape surveillance (Dolgun, 2008). Students, in alert against the possibility of being under surveillance, are urged to feel they have to improve their abilities of self-control (Hope, 2018). They normalize being monitored and monitoring since they are socialized in the surveillance culture (Taylor, 2012). In other words, the panopticon takes advantage of the uncertainty experienced by those who have been shut down for being disciplined (Lyon, 1994). Ultimately, the birth of pedagogy emerged purely from the needs of disciplinary power (Akar, 2007). Although there is a possibility for resistance to this surveillance culture (Foucault, 1995), this resistance, devoid of being mass effective, mostly consists of individual awareness against manipulation and control by the power (Birnhack, et. al, 2018). Insisting on the resistance, students

are at risk facing with various modern techniques of punishment (Taylor, 2012) such as threat, reprimand, offending, isolation, suspension, and expulsion (Margolis & Fram, 2007; Noguera, 2003). This case results in increasing the number of individuals obedient, non-questioning, irresponsible or authoritarian in society. In this paper, disciplinary power with its influential tool, panoptic surveillance on students, is examined in a secondary school in İstanbul to reveal how it is exercised by school staff and reacted by students.

Power, Surveillance, Resistance

In Foucault's (1995) analysis of power, discipline is defined as the power exercised through surveillance, control, discrimination, spatial regulation, and classification. Disciplinary power is not homogenous domination of one individual over other individuals and one group over other groups or not something shared between those holding sovereignty and those not having it. This sort of power is 'the interaction of warring parties, as the decentered network of bodily, face-to-face confrontations, and ultimately as the productive penetration and subjectivizing subjugation of a bodily opponent' (Habermas, 2007, p.255). Foucault demarcated it as something continuously exercised and rotating (Lilja & Hanthagen, 2014). 'Power is located at the levels of struggle and manifest in its effects' (Haugaard 1997, p.67). The human body tends to be vulnerable to this circulating power everywhere, which leads it to be explored, broken, and rearranged (Foucault, 1995).

Despite the necessity of seeking power relations outside the institutions, these relations become concrete and crystallized in institutions (Foucault, 2014). The disciplinary power is mostly exercised through surveillance, which comes to be routine, instilled, and boosted by social organizations such as prisons, hospitals, asylums, and schools (Foucault 1995). For most of its history, modernity has done its work under the prophecy of panoptic power by imposing discipline through constant surveillance (Bauman, 2017). Power relations, based on discipline and subjectification, regulate and reshape bodies, actions, attitudes, and daily behavior patterns of individuals (Foucault, 1995). Haggerty and Ericson (2000) allege that panopticon surveillance as a disciplinary power includes soul training, enabling prisoners to think about the subtleties of their behaviors in order to transform themselves. In other words, the possibility of being observed at all times pushes the subject to control its behavior as if being supervised even when not being observed.

As for our focal point in this paper, it could be remarked that schools have a correlation with prisons in terms of the discourse of panopticon. 'Not only are prisoners treated like children, but children are treated like prisoners... Here, the schools are also a bit prison-oriented' (Deleuze, 1977, p. 210). Doing everything on time, being obedient and memorizing what is shown exactly as desired without making individual decisions are the most important skills that students try to acquire in modern schools (Dolgun, 2008). In the disciplinary society, schools constitute a concentrated

miniature of the society and it is the duty of teachers and school administrators to constantly monitor whether the rules are followed; the school is a space of relationships that is defined by visual transparency of individual behavior (Bauman, 2003). Just to clarify, a school, a microorganism of the education system, has a unique feature from other political settings in that it is directly affected by the social change (Bakioğlu & Korumaz, 2019) and the first official step for individuals to normalize obedience to disciplinary power. Ultimately, the birth of pedagogy originated from the needs of disciplinary power, one of whose functions is to control whether each person is doing what they are told (Foucault, 2014). This process is especially important for schools; schools are the main centers where information on production is transferred (Foucault, 2014). There are lots of panoptic surveillance practices in school settings such as attendance records, filling in reports, wearing uniforms, observing rules, abiding by time schedules, and taking exams under strict rules (Hope, 2018; Foucault, 2014). For example, literacy allows to understand and apply instructions; art lessons help to make sense of pictures, figures and schemes; mathematics develops minimally rational calculations; thanks to physical education, physical strength develops, and social studies lesson is necessary to be a good citizen (Dolgun, 2008).They are pervasive in schools since the success of this power stems from the use of hierarchical gaze, normalization, and examination.

Disciplinary power functions as training, monitoring, and examining individuals about how to do things by virtue of institutions in the truth regimes, based on scientific discourses. However, 'where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power' (Foucault, 2014, p.238). Resistance can be defined as reversed power, necessarily employing the same techniques as the power in favor of individuals who would like to create spaces for their own decisions (Hartmann, 2003; Nealon, 2008; Pickett, 1996). In this sense, resistance to discipline can appear in different forms as in avoiding, restating discourses, and undermining the control of subjects' behavior by institutionalized norms (Lilja & Vinthagen 2014). The disciplinary power could be also suspended through resistance practices such as foot-dragging, slander, sarcasm, passivity, disloyalty, ignorance, avoidance, and escape (Scott, 1989). Although there is no general consensus among researchers about whether conformity might be a way of resistance (Bash, et al., 1985; Marx, 2003; Simon, 2005), Bash et al. (1985) state that conformity could be regarded as a passive resistance technique. In terms of schooling, Gallagher (2011) in his research points that intentional noise made by students during class exemplifies resistance to the teacher, representing the figure of power. For the other resistance example in a school context, the relation of punishment and reward could be taken into consideration. Bargaining an individual's relationship to assigned punishments and rewards could destabilize the effect of disciplinary power (Lilja, 2008). A student who facing disciplinary punishment due to his/her acting out norm in school can be seen as a hero by those admiring him/her but avoiding performing behaviors against school norms for any reason. Therefore, being punished by the disciplinary board yields a reward.

Panoptic surveillance and resistance in schools in the Foucauldian context have attracted attention from a lot of researchers (Opfer, 2001; Bushnell, 2003; Perryman, 2006; Devine-Eller, 2004, Lewis, 2006, Kupchik, 2010; Taylor, 2013). Referring to the cynical effect of neoliberal policies on education, Webb et al. (2009) also assert that standardized tests as the machine of surveillance installed on the act of 'No Child Behind Left' is proper for matching students provided with inadequate education service with easily manageable low-paying positions oriented by an increasingly overcentralized and layered national and global economy. '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' (Foucault, 2017, p.65). In light of these studies, we could say that knowledge is one of the things that power needs to manage docile bodies. In fact, tools like IQ tests and standardized exams provide this knowledge for the institutions. They suggest that a minority of students displayed resistance to surveillance by administration and teachers in schools.

Despite all studies on surveillance as disciplinary power, considering the relevant literature, there is a gap needed to research on this issue in a secondary school in Turkey. The aforementioned studies demonstrate that surveillance as a disciplinary power might serve to control the conformity of students at some schools in Europe and the USA; however, while reviewing the relevant literature, we notice that there are few theoretical or empirical studies conducted in Turkey (see e.g., Ağın, 2019; Alğan, 2014; Asan, 2013; Meşeci, 2007; Şentürk and Turan, 2012; Taşkın, 2014; Temir, 2013). Therefore, we think examining surveillance practices in such a context could provide data unexplored earlier. Our main research question and sub-research questions are respectively as in the following:

- How do school staff (i.e., school principal, vice principals, teachers and psychological counselors) exercise disciplinary power with its influential tool, panoptic surveillance on students in a secondary school?

- How does disciplinary power with its influential tool, panoptic surveillance normalize students' behaviors in this school?'

- In which ways do students resist to disciplinary power with its influential tool, panoptic surveillance?

To understand the role of surveillance in this context, we aim to identify its themes on students in the context of Foucault's panopticon and describe the ways of resistance by students to the surveillance as disciplinary power.

Method

Research Approach and Design

In this research, we examined the practices of surveillance as disciplinary power and the resistance shown to them in a secondary school in a district in İstanbul. The residents in this district are at high socio-economical and high education level. However, none of its students live in the district where the school is located. They largely reside in peripheral districts near the location of the school. While most of the parents are at low socio-economical and low education level (i.e., primary school graduation), some of them are at middle level. The classroom size in the school is between 20 and 25 students, which means it is quite small comparing to the other public secondary schools in İstanbul. Due to the uniqueness of this school context, we took care to avoid generalizing in a quantitative approach, unlike, adopted exploratory philosophy in a qualitative approach. We utilized case study design in this research since case study design allows focusing on the complexity of a case (Creswell, 2007), its uniqueness, and the connections with the social context of which it is a part (Glesne, 2016). Owing to investigating the case in such a school, we employed a single case study design in the research. Therefore, in this research, case study design provided us for in-depth grasping the surveillance practices as disciplinary power exercised to the students, how students normalized them and their behaviors, and how they resisted to these practices. Another reason for this design was that the case study gives space to use a variety of data collection tools to get a detailed understanding in a limited area.

Participants

We adopted maximum variation in the purposeful sampling method while deciding on whom we interviewed. It enables us to maximize the differences in the findings reflecting the different perspectives on a case, which is optimal in qualitative research (Creswell, 2007). We reached a great variety of data through maximum variation. Our participants are from different disciplines and have different experience period as a professional in the education field. This variation in sampling provided a holistic understanding of how the surveillance as a disciplinary power on the students worked in this school. The table of the participants in this study is as follows:

Table 1. Participants of the study

Pseudonym	Profession	Branch	Year of service in teaching
Gray	School Principal	Religious Education	33
Black	Vice-Principal	Religious Education	5
Green	Vice-Principal	Turkish	9
Pink	Psychological Counselor	PCG	9
Brown	Psychological Counselor	PCG	6
White	Teacher	Religious Education	27
Yellow	Teacher	Religious Education	7
Orange	Teacher	Science	10
Red	Teacher	Turkish	7

Purple	Teacher	Arabic	3
Maroon	Teacher	Science	8
Turquoise	Teacher	Social Science	20
Navy Blue	Teacher	Turkish	22

As shown above, the criteria of the study for selecting participants were profession, branch, year of service in teaching. We interviewed 13 participants to collect data for the study. The participants were the school principal, two vice-principals as school administration, two psychological counselors, and eight teachers from different branches. The service year in the teaching of participants differs from three years to thirty-three years. Furthermore, we gave code names to participants according to the color whose clothes they wore on the day we had the interview.

Data Collection

Before the interviews, we had observed life in the school for three months attending classes, ceremonies on special days. Instead of using any structured or semi-structured observation form, we kept research diary. Writing diary entries provide data accounts for a qualitative research to enlighten the unnoticed details in daily life (Creswell, 2012). As a research team, we regularly revised our diaries and made discussions on the common and different points we caught. Therefore, the observations recorded on diary entries enable us to grasp the holistic understanding of the research context. Scanning the relevant literature and considering the aims of the study and observation notes, we also designed six main questions to use in the focus group discussion and interviews and presented the questions in the form to two experts in the relevant field and a linguist. Accordingly, some questions were reviewed and readjusted. Afterward, we asked the questions to two teachers in the school as a pilot study and confirmed their clarity. All interviews were conducted in the school, with teachers in the teachers' room, with counselors and the administrators in their own rooms after making appointments from the participants. The semi-structured face-to-face interviews were made in 2020, January. Each interview took roughly 40-50 minutes. The focus group discussion occurred with two teachers and a psychological counselor in the school. It took 46 minutes. We informed the participants about the aims of the study and asked them to read and sign the protocol reminding they were free to leave the interview whenever they wanted. The participants' views were recorded on a tape recorder with their permission. After transcribing the interviews, we received participant confirmation for each transcript and deleted the records. The participants confirmed their transcripts. Therefore, we did not need to omit any statements in the views. To check whether the collected data during interviews and discussion was credible, we analyzed some documents such as the school's website, the papers on the information boards.

Data Analysis

The field notes taken on observation and the audio-records were transcribed just after the interviews. We, as a research team, analyzed all data together by using content analysis method to provide credibility in the findings. Content analysis method is 'the systematic examination of texts and visuals, media and/or material culture to analyze their prominent manifest and latent meanings' (Salda a , 2011, p. 10). This method enabled us to uncover latent meanings and patterns in data we collected. We also reread the transcriptions several times and then identified respectively codes, categories and themes. To code the items in data, we utilized conceptual coding, which is valuable for cultural studies, sociopolitical inquiries and critical theory as it encourages reflection on broader social structures (Salda a, 2015). Through it, we could think critically, reveal the relationships between patterns and reach the big picture of our findings.

Credibility and Transferability

There are lots of ways to increase the credibility of a qualitative study. One of the most common methods is triangulation. 'It may be defined as the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspect of human behavior' (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 133). There are different types of triangulation such as method triangulation, participant triangulation, and researcher participant. 'This ensures that the study will be accurate because the information draws on multiple sources of information, individuals, or processes' (Creswell, 2012, p. 259).

We made data triangulation which means that we collected the data via observation, focus group discussion, semi-structured face-to-face interviews, and document analysis to make sure whether we properly understand and describe the participants' views relevant to surveillance as disciplinary power by teachers and resistance to it by students. To gain a deep understanding, we interviewed teachers, psychological counselors, and administrators in the school- utterly 13 participants, thereby building up a better and coherent picture of the case through the participant triangulation. Finally, we, as a research team, collected the data together during some interviews and analyzed together to provide credibility in the data. Hence, multiple triangulation was adopted during research in order to have high credibility on the results of the study.

Transferability means getting the results in a study applicable to those in potential studies in a similar setting or context (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To provide transferability in a study, researchers should use purposeful sampling method and provide a thick description (Creswell, 2014; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). We also chose purposeful sampling method and presented the collected data in detail and direct quotations of the participants' views to obtain transferability in this study.

Results

The analysis of the transcripts of the focus group interview, individual interviews, observations, and documents indicated that *forced docility* is the most emphasized concept all participants agree on concerning the definition of the discipline in the school. The views of participants also support that *norm-provider* is the main function of disciplinary power in the school. Moreover, the participants have a consensus on students' behaviors in a self-controlled way under surveillance via both digital cameras and monitor teachers as in the Panoptic tower. Finally, the participants state that *reflections of discipline* exercised in the school are either normalization in students' behaviors or resistance to discipline by students. In short, the themes are identified as follows: forced docility, norm-provider, reflections of discipline.

Theme One: Forced Docility

The analysis of the data collected reveals that *forced docility* is the theme stressed by all participants to define the discipline. The categories of provocative deprivation, responsibility, and obedience are mostly emphasized by the participants describing disciplinary power. For instance, a teacher participant in the focus group interview defines it as provocative deprivation:

> *Well, I see discipline as being deprived of something. Discipline prevents students from behaving as they wish. They never go beyond the obstacles in front of them, depriving them of that thing. They want to act the forbidden behavior more because they are deprived. It's forbidden, or that rule, they would like to violate it anyway, it is provocative for students* (Purple, Arabic Language Teacher, 3).

A vice-principal emphasizes the definition of the discipline in the school as a responsibility. She addresses the obligation of wearing the uniform, being punctual, and behaving properly in the school while describing discipline. Again, she employs the concept of forced docility:

> *They (students) have to be responsible for their behaviors. There is discipline everywhere. God says that humankind should be responsible and should be disciplined to be happy on the earth and after death. Even religion is discipline. Discipline has to exist in the school, as well. Students are obliged to wear the uniform, be on time for class and treat properly (to their teachers and peers) in the school* (Black, Religious Education Teacher, 5).

In this view, some religious references such as *God*, *after death*, etc. are remarkable in describing surveillance as disciplinary power. The participant also emphasizes there is a correlation between school life and religious norms. It gives the impression normalization by surveillance is based on religion in the school. While explaining what discipline means in this school, some

participants refer to the concept of obedience to school rules, official regulations, and teachers' directions. The school principal defines discipline in this way:

> *… to me, discipline is that students comply with the rules and regulations in the school and unite around the truths supported by the teachers …* (Gray, Religious Education Teacher, 33).

In brief, the general analysis of the collected data reveals that the theme *forced docility* consists of the categories of provocative deprivation, a responsibility based on religious norms, and obedience, and this theme defines discipline in this school.

Theme Two: Surveillance as Norm-provider

The analysis of the data collected during the research shows that *norm-provider* was the most frequently stressed notion to explain the function of surveillance as disciplinary power in this school. Based on the findings, three categories were identified for the theme *norm-provider*: destructive norm, manipulative norm, and classifying norm. Destructive norms include violence-creating, threatening, and regulating. A teacher in this school explains how discipline which is based on violence affects students:

> *When school staff and parents employ discipline based on violence, students take them as a role model and use violence to their peers. In this way, some students in the school try to provide discipline by using violence among their peers. Of course, it is destructive, but they see their role models' way to build discipline and imitate their patterns* (Red, Turkish Language Teacher, 7).

Manipulative norms operate on students to become docile students in schools obeying the defined rules. Accordingly, during our observation in the school, we noticed students' uniforms were often checked whether it was suitable for the norms of school. Every month, school administration chose and appraised a model student who wore school uniform properly in front of all stufdents. We infer from the finding that obeying norms are not compulsory but welcomed and incentivized in this school.

In the analysis of the interviews, classifying norms are defined as exams in this study. They are neither only destructive nor only manipulative. They divide students into two groups as superior students and inferior ones. The students taking high marks are welcomed by the teachers, principals, parents, and their peers. However, the students having low marks feel themselves worthless. They are rarely or never honored in the school and at home. A teacher participant explains how exams affect students to be disciplined:

It depends on the student, if the student really has a goal, yes, taking exam can be very effective. For example, a student having a goal for the future says 'I will pass this exam so that I will be like this physics professor. Here I have to win this exam first, I must be in a very good high school so that I can achieve this goal. I can get my dream job.' This kind of student is successful and determined. Otherwise, they are aimless and unsuccessful. These exams are very effective in terms of discipline (Orange, Science Teacher, 10).

According to our observation, at the end of semesters, three students having the highest marks in school reports are celebrated and honored with presents by the school management and applauded by teachers and other students at the ceremony. In addition, students join some contests on religious education such as reciting the azan, reciting the Quran. The winners are also celebrated at the ceremonies. This situation gives the impression that success on marks or contests are welcomed and desired in the school. By teachers and school principals, unsuccessful students are expected to take the role model of successful ones.

A psychological counselor participant emphasizes the given message with teacher observation or digital cameras to students:

Knowing that students are being watched stops their behaviors. However, the message we as a teacher give students is that in visible locations where the cameras are, don't misbehave. Don't forget that there are cameras. For example, these bad behaviors are usually around the fire ladder because there are no cameras there. Smoking is common where there is no camera. The school principal will put the camera there, a camera not working but it will be at least to be scary and deterrent for students (Pink, Psychological Counselor, 9).

We can understand from this view that students' behavior changes depending on whether they are observed or not. When students notice they are under gaze via camera or teacher, they give up their misbehaviors. On the other hand, they prefer showing the undesired behaviors on the blind spot as on the fire ladder. Therefore, the school principal thinks installing even a broken camera works for normalizing students.

The findings reveal that disciplinary power as surveillance is a common tool for normalizing students and become docile bodies in this school. The destructive norms clearly urge students to do so; however, the manipulative norms are cynically practiced having students self-controlled in the school.

Theme Three: Reflections of Surveillance as Disciplinary Power

The analysis of the collected data shows the disciplinary power practiced by the teachers has some effects on students in the school. Discipline reflects in two ways: normalization and resistance.

Some students normalize their behaviors, perform the desired ones and control themselves to obey the rules whereas others resist disciplinary power and display their resistance in different ways such as insisting on misbehavior, self-defense, giving responses in an angry manner, neglecting religious requirements, and smoking in the school. A teacher participant thinks students pay attention to wear the uniform properly when they are warned by her:

> *For example, when I warned a student wearing different clothes about the uniform, the other day the student wore it properly, some of them do so only when they have my lesson, let me say it is just because they fear being punished by me... S/he wears jeans in other lessons because s/he does not think it is logical to wear a uniform in the school* (Maroon, Science Teacher, 8).

A monitor teacher in each hall has students behave in a controlled way during breaks. According to the findings, students think they should obey the rules, not argue with their friends or swear. Otherwise, they need to face some problems such as their parents' calling to complain about their misbehaviors, getting disciplinary punishment, or just reprimanding. The school principal employs the metaphor guardian to explain the role of a teacher responsible for observing students:

> *Of course, teachers keep watching students all time like a guardian, for example, even being in that corridor is a disciplinary event for the student. At least, he says, if I make a wrong action, my friends and the teacher are watching me there. Maybe if I insist on misbehavior, they will discipline me, I will get a punishment or the same way we warn them about certain issues at the same time. I think surveillance whether via teacher or camera provides the discipline for students. They control themselves (Gray, Religious Education Teacher, 33).*

The school principal explains how the disciplinary function of surveillance operates on students' normalization by stressing the possible results of their insist on misbehaviors. Scores in the exams are another normalizing tool for the teachers in this school because having a poor score in the report card means low self-esteem and reprimand by parents for most students. In order not to be unsuccessful, students tend to normalize their behaviors which their teachers find threatening for effective classroom management. A teacher participant states her Arabic lesson is challenging for the students not familiar with the Arabic alphabet and they try to make noise or chat with each other when they find exercises difficult in a class. She goes on by mentioning the technique she uses to make her students docile during class:

> *For example, in a class for 8th grade, I gave three students poor performance score because they made noise during class. they are very afraid of having the low grade. I said to them 'But if you keep silent for three weeks, I will delete this weak score'. These mischievous students did not make any noise in my class for three weeks, they sat quietly. I extended these three*

weeks to four when I extended it to five until the last time of the report card, they sat quietly in a disciplined way (Purple, Arabic Language Teacher, 3).

On an observation day, at the teachers' room, a Turkish language teacher participant was telling the problem to his colleague in the last class. He was displeased with his quite students who did not any reaction to the chatty students during class. Because of that, he decided on asking hard questions in the exam and announced his decision to all students at the end of class. He added to explain the reason for his decision in this way.

The students who listened to the lesson quietly objected to my decision concerning exam questions. They said that they did not deserve to be asked hard questions in the exam as punishment. I gave the answer saying that you did not react to your friends who disturbed you and hindered a peaceful lesson. In other classes, successful students put pressure on naughty students to be quiet. I will ask hard questions to all of you because of that (Red, Turkish Language Teacher, 7).

We can understand the teacher felt lonely and asked support from the students listening to the class quietly. However, these students did not react to the students chatting during class. Therefore, the teacher preferred threatening by asking difficult questions in the exam to trigger students for providing a quiet classroom atmosphere by putting pressure on students chatting.

Smoking at students' toilets and on the fire ladder is another way to show resistance for some students in the school. A counselor participant explains the reason for this behavior in this way:

Smoking at school is such a thing, 'Look, what am I doing, guy?', the student smoking in the school says to his peers 'You see, don't you? I can smoke in the school'. Otherwise, these children are not addicted. They're not addicted. Indeed, this movement has a challenge. The student is challenging to school administration. He says to his peers 'Look at me, what am I doing, can you do it?'. Not every child can do this because they are afraid, they can't do it. However, this boy implies that 'Look, I'm not scared of anybody else.' by smoking (Pink, Psychological Counsellor, 9).

Even if it is not common, teachers talked about some male students smoke in the school and they were directed to the counseling department and then to the discipline board. According to the psychological counselor, smoking at school is not about being addicted but a way for adolescence to resist the rules and challenge with authority. It shows there is resistance where the disciplinary power exists.

To sum up, we obtained three themes in this study to understand and describe how surveillance as disciplinary power operates in this school, its normalizing effects on students. We also examined the ways of students' resistance to disciplinary practices exercised by the teachers and the school administration. In brief, the findings reveal these themes in this school; discipline means forced docility, surveillance functions as norm-provider, its effects refer to reflections of discipline, either normalization or resistance.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The findings of the study reveal that disciplinary power in this school is defined as *forced docility*. To all participants, students are strictly expected to be obedient to school rules to have a peaceful and suitable educational setting in the school. The most practical technique for it is to gain the notion of students' being responsible for the duties reported by the school administration, teachers, so on. Once students feel it is their responsibility to comply with a rule, they constantly try to obey it improving self-control skills. This finding of the study is in line with Foucault's promise (1995) that discipline is self-punishment. Disciplinary power shifts the focus of punishment from body to mind and it gives the message that the punishment will suffer more than the pleasure they receive while committing a crime, with which it advises them to avoid illegal acts as rational assets so that the body disciplined without being subjected to physical punishment is imprisoned in a system of imperatives and prohibitions (Deleuze, 1977; Foucault, 1995).

As a finding of this study, the participants mostly emphasize that surveillance functions as a *norm provider*. In other words, disciplinary power provides some sorts of the norm such as destructive ones via punishment, manipulative ones via pieces of advice, or classifying ones via exams. Foucault (1995) also defines surveillance as disciplinary power which is a tool for ranking, ordering, and normalizing individuals. As in Foucauldian panopticon, the observer in the tower knows what the prisoners do in their cells; however, the prisoners have no information about whether he is there or not. What makes the observer superior to the prisoners is knowledge. According to Foucault, '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' (2017, 65). Based on the findings of this study, we can easily reach the same scenario in the school through observation on students by monitor teachers or surveillance cameras in the halls during breaks, ceremonies in the school garden, classrooms during the lesson. Furthermore, the findings show that surveillance practices as disciplinary power are influential in the school with the use of three basic instruments, which are 'hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment and their combination in a procedure that is specific to it, the examination' (Foucault 1995, 170). After the discussion on the effect of hierarchical observation on students to become docile bodies by both teacher gaze and surveillance camera, we could emphasize the relationship between normalization and exams referring

to the *reflections of discipline* in the school obtained by the analysis of data. Most of the participants in this study address that students feel anxious when taken to exams and teachers know it very well and use exams as practical apparatuses to control and measure them. Therefore, teachers and school administration practice disciplinary power through exams, performance progress tests, and so on. Eller (2004) asserted that the nature of the standardizing tests could be suitable for making students controllable, predictable, and manageable. The finding of this study supports the normalizing effect of surveillance as disciplinary power on students' behaviors, as well.

Power relations based on discipline regulate and reshape bodies, actions, attitudes and daily behavior patterns of students as in the prisoners and mental patients (Foucault, 1995). The findings demonstrate that students control their behaviors through norms based on school rules. However, according to some participants, the students in this school as disciplined bodies experience provocative deprivation concerning the desire to violate the rules predetermined by those having disciplinary power such as the obligation of wearing the uniform and staying quiet in class. Therefore, we reveal the finding that surveillance practices as disciplinary power pave the way for resistance supporting that 'where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power' (Foucault, 2014, p. 238). The finding that students tend to perform the undesired behaviors such as bullying, making noise or smoking reveals that students always can resist the disciplinary power in this school (Scott, 1989; Lilja, 2008; Gallagher, 2010). More broadly, we can express the findings of our research contribute to the Foucauldian literature concerning surveillance as disciplinary power in two ways. We explored (1) how surveillance practices are exercised in the context of disciplinary power and (2) the ways of students' normalization and resistance to them in a secondary school. Our analysis, to some extent, explores the practices and reflections of surveillance as disciplinary power.

For the field practitioners, the recommendations are presented as the following:

- In any schooling context, staff should avoid exercising surveillance as disciplinary power on students in order to have raise autonomous, responsible and open-minded generations.

- School principals should encourage teachers, counselors and students to share their ideas without any hesitation in order to create democratic education environment rather than surveillance culture based on strictly top-down framed norms.

- Rather than taking a big exam at one time, teachers should employ individualized assessment methods and techniques so that students could be given the feedback based on their own improvement, not standardized evaluation norms.

- For further research, the recommendations are presented as the following:

- The relation between power, surveillance, and resistance can be analyzed as a multiple case study comparing the findings obtained at different secondary schools in İstanbul.

- The same research can be conducted at different school levels (i.e., primary school, high school).

- The surveillance as a disciplinary power on the students and resistance to it by students can be searched in the context of online learning.

- The surveillance as a disciplinary power on teachers and their resistance can also be searched.

To the final remark in this paper, as teachers, education administrators, and policymakers, we should give more space to students to reflect and to transform themselves not by imposing our truths on them or expecting to normalize themselves based on our truths but by letting them find what they already are.

References

Ağın, E. (2019). *Bir ortaöğretim kurumundaki disiplin uygulamalarının eleştirel bir çözümlemesi.* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Akar, M. Y. (2007). *Marksist ve Foucaultcu iktidar anlayışları üzerine sosyolojik bir karşılaştırma.* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Alğan, B. (2014). *Ortaöğretim okullarında uygulanan ritüellere ilişkin öğrenci görüşleri.* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi.

Asan, T. H. (2013). *Türk eğitiminde iktidar-eğitim ilişkileri ve insan yetiştirme politikalarının Michel Foucault'nun panoptikon metaforuna göre incelenmesi* (1975-1946). (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi.

Bakioğlu, A., & Korumaz, M. (2019). *Eğitim politikaları: Kuramlar, yöntemler, göstergeler, etkiler ve uygulamalar.* Nobel.

Barker, J., Alldred, P., Watts, M., & Dodman, H. (2010). Pupils or prisoners? Institutional geographies and internal exclusion in UK secondary schools. *Area, 42*(3), 378-386.

Bash, L., Coulby, D., & Jones, C. (1985). *Urban schooling: Theory and practice.* Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bauman, Z. (2003). *Yasa koyucular ile yorumcular.* (K. Atakay, Çev.). Metis Yayıncılık.

Bauman, Z. (2017). *Akışkan modernite* (2 ed.). (S. O. Çavuş, Trans.). Can Yayınları.

Birnhack, M., Perry-Hazan, L., & Ben-Hayun, S. G. (2018). CCTV surveillance in primary schools: normalisation, resistance, and children's privacy consciousness, *Oxford Review of Education, 44*(2), 204-220. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2017.1386546

Bushnell, M. (2003). Teachers in the schoolhouse complicity and resistance. *Education and Urban Society. 35*(3), 251-272. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124503035003001

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Marrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *The qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative*. Pearson.

Deacon, R. (2006). From confinement to attachment: Michel Foucault on the rise of the school. *The European Legacy: Toward New Paradigms, 11*(2), 121-138.

Deleuze, G. (1977). Intellectuals and Power: A Conversation between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze. In Donald Bouchard (Ed.), *Michel Foucault, language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews*, (pp. 205-217). Cornell University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1992, Winter). Postscript on the societies of control. *October,* no. 59, 3–7. The MIT Press.

Devine-Eller, A. (2004). *Applying Foucault to education*. Presented at the seminar for Foucault and Feminism. Rutgers University.

Dolgun, U. (2008). *Şeffaf hapishane yahut gözetim toplumu.* Ötüken Yayıncılık.

Fendler, L. (2008). Educationalising trends in societies of control: Assessments, problem-based learning and empowerment. In P. Smeyers & M, Depaepe (Eds.) *Educational Research: The educationalization of social problem*, (pp. 47-60). Springer.

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry, 8*(4), 777–795.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish the birth of prison.* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books A Division of Random House, Inc.

Foucault, M. (2003). *Society must be defended.* (D. Macoy. Trans.). Picador.

Foucault, M. (2014). *Özne ve iktidar.* (Işık, E., & Akınbay, O, Trans.). Ayrıntı.

Gallagher, M. (2010). Are schools panoptic? *Surveillance & Society 7*(3/4), 262-272. http://www.surveillance-and-society.org

Gallagher, M. (2011). Sound, space and power. *Social & Cultural Geography. 12*(1), 47-61. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2011.542481

Glesne, C. (2016). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An Introduction*. Pearson

Gücüyener, M. (2011). *Panoptik gözetimden synoptisizme gözetim toplumu.* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Afyon: Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Blimler Enstitüsü

Habermas, J. (2007). *The philosophical discourse of modernity.* (F. Lawrence, Trans.). The MIT Press.

Hall, N. (2003). The role of the slate in Lancastrian schools as evidenced by their manuals and handbooks. *Paradigm, 2*(7), 46–54.

Haggerty, K. D., & Ericson, R. V. (2000). The surveillant assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology*, *51* (4), 605-622. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071310020015280

Hartmann, J. (2003). Power and resistance in the later Foucault. *In: Annual Meeting of the Foucault Circle, 28 February-2 March*. 1-11. John Carroll University.

Haugaard, M. (1997). *The constitution of power: A theoretical analysis of power, knowledge and structure.* Manchester University Press.

Hope, A. (2016). Biopower and school surveillance technologies 2.0, *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 37*(7), 885-904.   https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2014.1001060

Hope, A. (2018). Foucault, panopticism and school surveillance research. In M. Murphy (Ed.), *Social Theory and Education Research: Understanding Foucault, Habermas, Bourdieu and Derrida.*, (pp. 35-51). Routledge.

Kupchik, A. & Bracy, N. L. (2010). To protect, serve, and mentor? In T. Monahan, & R. D. Torres (Eds.) *Schools Under Surveillance*. Rutgers University Press.

Lewis, T. E. (2006). *Discipline, sovereignty, education: A genealogy of bioschooling*. PhD dissertation, University of California.

Lilja, M. (2008). *Power, resistance and women politicians in Cambodia: Discourses of emancipation*. Nias Press.

Lilja, M., & Vinthagen, S. (2014). Sovereign power, disciplinary power and biopower: Resisting what power with what resistance. *Journal of Political Power, 7*(1), 107-126. https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2014.889403

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Sage.

Lyon, D. (1994). *The electronic eye: The rise of survelliance society*. University of Minnesota Press.

Lyon, D. (2007). *Surveillance studies: An overview*. Polity Press.

Margolis, E., & Fram, S. (2007). Caught napping: Images of surveillance, discipline and punishment on the body of the schoolchild, *History of Education, 36*(2), 191-211. https://doi.org/10.1080/00467600601171401

Marx, G. (2003). A tack in the Shoe: Neutralising and resisting the new surveillance. *Journal of Social Issues,* 5(2), 369-390. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4560.00069

Mathiesen, T. (1997). The viewer society: Michel Foucault's 'Panopticon' revised. *Theoretical Crimonology*, *1*(2), 215-232. Sage. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480697001002003 .

Meşeci, F. (2007). *Cumhuriyet sonrası Türk eğitim sisteminde ritüeller: Kuramsal bir çalışma.* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Nealon, J. T. (2008). *Foucault beyond Foucault: Power and its intensifications since 1984*. Stanford University Press.

Noguera, P. A. (2003). Schools, prisons, and social implications of punishment: Rethinking disciplinary practices, *Theory into Practice, 42*(4), 341-350. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4204_12

Opher, V. D. (2001). Charter schools and the panoptic effect of accountability. *Education and Urban Society, 33*(2), 201-215. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124501332008

Perryman, J. (2006). Panoptic performativity and school inspection regimes: Disciplinary mechanisms and life under special measures. *Journal of Education Policy, 21*(2), 147-161. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930500500138

Pickett, B. L. (1996). Foucault and the politics of resistance. *Polity, 28*(4), 455-466. https://doi.org/10.2307/3235341

Salda a, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative researches*. Oxford University Press.

Salda a, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

Scott, J. C. (1989). Everyday forms of resistance. *Copenhagen Papers*, *4*, 33–62. https://doi.org/10.22439/cjas.v4i1.1765

Simon, B. (2005). The return of panopticism: Supervision, subjection and the new surveillance. *Surveillance & Society, 3*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v3i1.3317

Şentürk, İ., & Turan, S. (2012). Foucault'un iktidar analizi bağlamında eğitim yönetimine ilişkin bir değerlendirme. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 18*(2), 243-272.

Taşkın, P. (2014). *Ortaöğretim okulları öğrencilere yönelik disiplin düzenleme ve uygulamalarının çocukların temel hak ve özgürlükleri bağlamında değerlendirilmesi.* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi.

Temir, R. (2013). *Michel Foucault'nun disipliner iktidar bağlamında gizli müfredat ve disiplin üzerine bir araştırma.* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Uşak Üniversitesi.

Taylor, E. (2012). The rise of the surveillance school. In K. Ball, K. Haggerty & D. Lyon (Eds.), *Handbook of surveillance studies*, (pp. 225–232). Routledge.

Taylor, E. (2013). *Surveillance schools: Security, discipline and control in contemporary education. Crime Prevention and Security Management.* Palgrave Pivot.

Webb, P. T., Briscoe, F. M., & Mussman, M. P. (2009). Preparing teachers for the neoliberal panopticon. *Educational Foundations, 23*(3-4), 3-18. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ871545.pdf