

Literature Review: Artifacts of Power in the Classroom

Louis "Bud" Kanyo

Michigan State University

13 December 2010

Abstract

There are connections interwoven in literature considering artifacts that may influence the power structure in classrooms that casual readers may overlook. It is these connections that bind the literature beyond measures of topicality. This literature review focuses on the rhetoric of the articles and the connective threads that are crafting within their topicality.

The review introduces various articles and consider them through the following frameworks: purpose, method, state of the research (strengths, weaknesses, analysis), and thematic tendencies (hegemony). These layers of consideration will interplay with specific foundations for each article, showing a connection between the literature in the field, and the hidden curriculum of hegemony.

Keywords: hegemony, power, classroom control, silence, concerns in education

Introduction

I still hate my fifth grade teacher. She was the first teacher I had in my educational experience who was a bully in the classroom. She was horrible on some days and merely belittling on others. It was in her class that I started to hate learning. I cringed when she would return papers to the class. Every specific detail had to be done *her* way or the work would be returned filled with red ink and comments about doing things the right way, not being lazy, and advice to stop feigning stupidity. Her torment took hold of the oral language in the classroom as well. I remember saying “got” when I should have said “have” during class once and she took great pleasure in “educating” me in front of the class. She commented something to the effect that just because my parents spoke that way didn’t mean I had to speak in an uneducated manner as well. She tried to control the classroom through fear.

It was about the same time I entered her classroom that I started seeing a psychologist to talk about my parents’ divorce. My father leaving devastated me as a young child. I had been filled with confusion and resentment for years. What did it mean that Daddy was gay and didn’t want to live with us anymore? Was I bad? The psychologist I began seeing, “Hi! You can call me George,” spent many years helping me deal with my emotional burden. George would often give me homework from our sessions. On the follow-up visit he would ask me what I thought about the activity, how I felt, or what I had struggled with. I found this unbelievable – an adult asking me what I thought about something, or how I felt during the activity. I attribute the fact that I’m not in rotting away in a cell today to his guidance and mentorship.

Learning was different when I did it with George than when I did it for Mrs. Fifth-grade. Learning was natural and comfortable when it happened outside of the classroom and away from the bullying. I felt like what I learned with George mattered. I felt safe and able to take risks. Yet, in the classroom I knew learning was anything but safe that year. My teacher made sure that students knew learning was a job, a mountain to climb, and that she most definitely held power over our learning. She

once told me that not everyone was meant to do well in school and the earlier we realized that the easier it would be to accept it. I suppose that was my earliest experience with a teacher who abused the power of their classroom.

Thus, the focus on power in the classroom and how it may be seen by the cast of education is an important concept to me. Since that fifth grade year, I have seldom thought I had any control over the majority of my education. The bulk of my education was narrative in nature. The teacher taught and I learned (or at least pretended to learn). I cannot readily recollect ever being asked, “What do you think?” or “How do you learn?” for most of my educational experiences. When my teachers made their decisions during the school day, my role was to sit and watch. I remember being given assignments as punishment when the class was too loud, or given a pop-quiz when the teacher thought none of the students had done the reading or homework. The decisions of the classroom seem too often to be aimed at teaching students their place and station. In other words, classrooms are designed to promote a narrow, hegemonic view of education, learning, and student roles.

Purpose Driven Literature

Many studies in the field aren’t directly discussing grades as a hegemonic force, but their findings help illustrate the problem. One of the first articles considered in the search for literature on power in the classroom was a piece by Guskey (2009), which explores the differences in teachers’ interpretations on various influential issues apropos to how grading and reporting influence student learning. Specifically, it sought to determine the nature of K-12 teachers’ perspectives on issues related to grading and reporting. In addition, it considered whether variances in teaching contexts, especially the subject area and grade level, had an impact on those perspectives. Guskey thought that teachers’ individual viewpoints on these issues are likely to impact the grading policies and practices of their classrooms. Thus, the piece concludes that a clearer understanding of those individual teacher perspectives is vital in efforts to reform grading and reporting. Essentially, Guskey warns that if how

teachers think about grading, reporting the grades, and the connection to learning isn't considered, educational reform in those areas will be ineffective and problematic. What he didn't go so far as saying is that teacher's perspectives are at least partially the results of past hegemonic educational experiences which color both their grading and their students' future ideas about grading and learning. Despite their idiosyncratic differences in grading, their resultant inconsistent outcomes create the universal issue where students see grades as unjust labels foisted on them without their input and control.

Along the same lines of Guskey's (2009) piece, is a piece by Gopinath (2004), which focuses on the use of various teacher criteria for grading assignments and how the criteria are interpreted and used to grade. Gopinath sees the belief that grading that shares criteria is automatically standardized as problematic, but commonly utilized to battle large volumes of work. Thus, when multiple educators grade an assignment, whether due to team teaching or departmental norming practices, variation still often occurs. However, Gopinath explains this variation as a method to confront the problems with the power and control of grading by showing the team teaching or norming sessions can help instructors find an agreement, a norming line per se, that reconciles control and appropriate evaluation. Thus, while the Gopinath piece is showing a correlation between a fairer grading practice and teamwork or norming, the Guskey (2009) piece presents the idea the each teacher's individual perspective on these concepts will influence whether or not the reform will work to restructure the implied power of grades in the classroom from a tool of hegemony to a tool of equality.

While they may not say so directly, some of the literature in the field (Gopinath 2004; Guskey 2009) looks at grading (and other indicants as well) as a tool of hegemonic reproduction in the classroom, other literature focuses more specifically on how tools like grades are a self-serving influences of power associated with the classroom. Thus, certain choices made by teachers can reinforce their status in the educational or societal power structure. In one such piece Tata (1999) illustrates how grades can be used to gain popularity with students. The purpose of Tata's study was to

see if fairness in grade distributions and procedures influenced instructor evaluations. Tata believes that grades are the currency of the educational system and the players involved, both students and teachers, see grades on such a common basis that they are taken without pause as a beneficial tool in the classroom. Tata's research considers that high grades have various immediate benefits, such as motivation and approval, as well as long term benefits with admission procedure and employment. Thus, since the importance of grades is both immediate and long-ranging, Tata considers how students who perceive their grades as too low or unfair are more likely to take action with negative ratings of teacher effectiveness. Thus, teachers can avoid this risk by awarding higher grades to avoid negative ratings and commentary on their fairness and effectiveness. Much like Gopinath (2009) previously considered, Tata explores the fairness of this aspect of grading in the classroom. Again, Tata didn't use his/her data to make the claim that grades serve as hegemonic force, but the data certainly supports such a claim. If grades are rewarded to manipulate student behavior, and student evaluations in turn manipulate teacher behavior, and knowing that both parties generally desire the highest rating available, clearly the system promotes a teacher-centered environment.

Having thus far argued that literature in the education field isn't directly debating the idea of grades (and soon to mention other indicants) being a hegemonic force in the classroom, but indirectly demonstrating them as an influence, it may seem strange to consider the Montmarquette and Mahseredjian (1989) article that asks if education itself even matters anymore. Montmarquette and Mahseredjian explain that estimates of traditional educational input variables, such as the class size, the teacher's education and the teacher's experience, are statistically significant. Yet, in context, these variables are not any more statistically significant than any other input variables. Montmarquette and Mahseredjian present a host of literature themselves (McKenzie and Staaf, 1974; Becker, 1982; Correa and Gruver, 1987) that helps to frame their own research considerations that any input variable has a unique strength or power in the classroom. Their research shows how the units of substitutability in

student utility and achievement functions govern whether a student responds positively or negatively to the teacher's greater/lesser effort or harder/easier grading. Thus, Montmarquette and Mahseredjian seem to inadvertently echo Tata's position that inputs can have differing benefits, such as motivation and approval in Tata's research, or socioeconomic demographics, utilization, and achievement in their own research. Having considered that Montmarquette and Mahseredjian research on how input variables influence student benefits (status/stratification) in the classroom, and Tata's (1999) similar consideration in the world beyond the classroom, it may be helpful to consider that a layer of complexity is forged when considering the hegemonic influence these concepts craft as an undertone in the field and in society. Because Montmarquette and Mahseredjian note numerous variables complicating grading and grading's affect (among other issues) homogeneity may seem a less likely outcome or strategy. Certainly, like the previous researchers, they don't mention it. However, they do show – despite these large and numerous variables – that the outcomes are largely consistent (expected numbers of students fail and expected numbers of students succeed?), which is why they question education's role in the first place. They don't pinpoint the variable(s) creating the outcome, but without intending, they do illustrate the hegemonic role of education.

Thus, while considering influence and the crafting of a tenor of influence in the classroom, Anania (1983) joins the dialogue. Anania's article, *The Influence of Instructional Conditions on Student Learning and Achievement*, studies the amount to which the learning outcomes students accomplish are an indicant of the value of the teaching they obtain. The cognitive and affective learning of students was examined under three different styles of teaching environments: conventional group instruction, mastery learning, and tutoring (Anania, 1983). The research also examines whether qualities of instruction which are adaptive to the needs of the specific student has an influence when considering prior student characteristics (i.e., aptitude and prior achievement) and the successive achievement students accomplish. While Anania isn't specifically considering the worth of education itself in the

piece, there is an underlying connection with the Montmarquette and Mahseredjian (1989) article's asking if education matters anymore. Anania reframes this consideration, however, by exploring if students are learning due to their current instructional influences (i.e. current education matters) or past academic achievement/learning (i.e. current education doesn't matter). Whether the current influence of instruction has an impact on student outcomes or not, Anania does offer stark connections to hegemonic structures within the research when presenting that, "Students learning under different qualities of instructional conditions develop correspondingly different affects toward learning. Students receiving a more favorable quality of instruction (i.e., mastery learning strategies) develop more positive interest and attitude toward learning than occurs when students receive conventional instruction," (p. 19) and considering issues like class size, tracking, and, as other literature has previously considered (Gopinath, 2004; Guskey 2009), perceptions of fairness.

It may be worthwhile to note at this point, that notions of fairness seem to repeatedly creep into the structures of literature in education (Gopinath, 2004; Guskey 2009; Anania 1983). The question of who defines fair and unfair in education is addressed by Vaughn, Schumm, Niarhos, & Daugherty (1993). The focus of their research was aimed at detailing what students thought about the fairness, or lack thereof, of teacher adaptations in the classroom. They sought to find what a diverse student sample would think of adaptations. In theory, an adaptation made for one student may seem unfair to another student. Thus, teachers ability to decide who to make adaptations for, who not to make adaptations for, and what adaptations would/would not be made, seemed to reinforce the hegemonic structure of society. Vaughn (et. al) found that higher achieving students usually found the adaptations to be unfair since they seldom needed the adaptation. Thus, the students needing the adaptation were those from the lower tier of the social ladder. The better achieving students were found to believe that certain adaptations to the struggling student(s) allowed higher grades scores to be achieved than had no adaptation been made. In other words, adaptations were fine; as long as they didn't make the

classroom or sense of accomplishment unfair and didn't cause the stratifying structure of grades to lose what validity the students thought they carried (Tata, 1999; Gopinath, 2004; Vaughn, Schumm, Niarhos, & Daugherty, 1993). What Vaughn, Schumm, Niarhos, and Daugherty didn't factor in was how "high performing students" were likely part of the culture favored already in education. Their natural, unadapted-for successes were the result of the hegemonic system, and adaptations could be seen as a break from the hegemonic norm. Thus those favored by hegemony quite understandably were less likely to admire or desire a change in the system. What Vaughn, Schumm, Niarhos, and Daugherty show then is both the possibility of adaptation being used to continue hegemonic practice, and more interestingly the resistance from those who see it as leading to possible non-hegemonic practice.

Building from the Vaughn, Schumm, Niarhos, & Daugherty (1993) notion of validity and adaptations, Cook & Germann (2010) move these concepts from the traditional classroom into the online realm. The authors set out to determine what impact potential backchanneling, or virtual "whispering in the back of the digital classroom" make for the student, the student's grade, or for the instructor? The study explored the value of WEBCT data, which records activity and page hits students engage in with online courses, as a gauge of the influence that the virtual whispering may have on learning outcomes. Cook & Germann (2010) consider a piece of literature from Cogdill et al (2001) that provided a definitional and principled conversation about the digital backchanneling phenomenon and its presence in the digital classroom. The value of the backchannel and its categories, Cogdill presented, seemed helpful for online instructors as a tool to help students interact socially and build a learning community. Yet, the enigmatic content of backchannel communication increases the specter of anxieties since the backchanneled communication could be the sharing of answers and ideas that may invalidate test scores and assignment evaluations.

While considering what is and isn't acceptable in the classroom, and the implication that teachers often play the defining role in those decisions, the Cook & Germann (2010) piece allows insight

into how a teacher's choice to keep students apart or to allow them to work together, even if not in the best of circumstances or contexts – as in the example of during an online course's test, can be a distinctive power play for the teacher in reproducing the hegemonic structure they wish to see in their classroom. Moving forward with this notion, Tsay & Brady (2010), explore the connection between cooperative learning and educational performance in higher education. The authors present the notion that, "One of the greatest and inevitable challenges educators face is determining the most effective teaching strategies for their students. Understanding and assessing student involvement in learning can help teachers design the most effective curriculum and determine how students best learn," (Tsay & Brady, 2010, p. 78). Their research suggests that participation in cooperative learning is a solid predictor of a student's academic achievement during a course. A significant connection was also established concerning the degree to which grades were important to a student and their involvement in cooperative learning for group activities. Additionally, the importance of grades to the student returned as a reliable predictor of performance on quizzes and higher final grades in the class. Still, the question remains, if students who actively participate in class are shown to score higher on assessments, is that indicating they are learning, or that they teacher is favoring their participation by giving them higher grades, as is considered in one form or another in other literature in the field (Gopinath, 2004; Vaughn, Schumm, Niarhos, & Daugherty, 1993; Cook & Germann, 2010; Anania, 1983). Further, are those students who are more grade centered, thus more willing to cooperate with classmates in order to attain those grades also more part of the classroom, already closely aligned with the hegemonic power structure? Thus, is this just another example of hegemonic education favoring those who best fall into line with those in control?

Of course, some readers might object the framework of hegemony I use as a thread for this literature because in the most literal sense, they aren't topically considering hegemony as their focus.

Although I admit this is a valid point on the surface, I still feel that readers in this field are able to see the complex foundation interwoven, albeit subtly, through these pieces.

Method Consideration

Methods used to collect research data vary widely in the educational field. Variations in collection methods range from the personal to the abstract, from small sample sizes to supposedly large sample sizes, and from quantitative methods to qualitative methods. In the Guskey (2009) article, the data was gathered through a survey distributed electronically to 807 instructional staff members from a medium-size, Midwest school district. While the number of 807 instructors seems large, it also carries the burden of being impersonal and open for misinterpretation. Thus, readers will decide on the appropriateness of the method explored in the article based on their own stylistic tendencies and taste and the relationship to Guskey's *ethos* developed in the article. Meanwhile, approaching educational research from a substantially different perspective, Gopinath (2004), studied only one class over one semester, looking primarily at two written case analyses on materials considered during the class. Gopinath and a colleague then both used the same criteria to evaluate the assignments: 350 word limit, specify an issue, analyze the issue, and conclude the discussion. Though I concede that Guskey's survey size seems to carry a better academic credibility for many academic readers, I still maintain that Gopinath's methods also offer strengths to certain members of the academy. The taste and stylistic appreciation of the academia is crafted by each individual reader's appreciations. Thus, while one reader may better appreciate Guskey's larger survey size, another may better appreciate Gopinath's depth and detail in the smaller survey size.

Adding a much more quantitative approach in method by transitioning along the research continuum to a more mixed methods research style, Tata (1999) uses a truth table set-up with specific definitions to craft the collection of data. Tata first defined fairness as, "...meeting expectations and being consistent," (1999), and then proceeded to craft a 2-by-2 experimental design addressing grade

distribution (met expectation/didn't meet expectation) and grading procedure (consistent/inconsistent).

By including data from nearly 100 students, and achieving a close split in gender and grade level, Tata seems to have split difference on the method continuum set by Guskey (2009) and Gopinath (2004).

Readers, it would seem, would be able to look at Tata's research and see a seemingly larger pool (even if that is not the case), like Guskey, but also the attention to detail achieved by Gopinath.

Echoing the more mixed methods research style of Tata, Montmarquette and Mahseredjian (1989) try to add a degree of quantitative analysis into their research. Their research uses the model of Correa and Gruver (1987) to, "...enhance the econometric specification of students' academic achievement equations by introducing a latent teacher grading variable," (p. 336). To put it another way, Montmarquette and Mahseredjian consider that students socioeconomic demographics, often known by the teacher, have an impact on grading that teachers may be unknowingly be creating. Thus, they use the Correa and Gruver to analyze the grades, grading practices, and socioeconomic demographic of first and fourth graders in Montreal public schools.

And yet, due to the nature of educational research itself, not all literature aims for the middle and audience approval. Anania (1983) moved fully into the qualitative realm for methods. The learning outcomes and learning processes of students, for example, were examined under the three areas of instruction: "... (a) conventional instruction, a minimal quality of instruction, (b) mastery learning, a more favorable quality of instruction, and (c) tutoring, a maximal quality of instruction," (p. 6) Putting this into action, the Anania research method taught probability to fourth and fifth grade students, and cartography to eighth. Their hypothesis was that the impact of learning in the different levels of instruction may show similarities in the various content areas and grade levels. However, since these were grouped into flexible categories that weren't measureable in a traditional quantitative sense, and the authors would play a role in the grouping and coding of the study, this fits more comfortably in the qualitative realm.

Echoing Anania's (1983) qualitative use, Vaughn, Schumm, Niarhos, & Daugherty (1993) built their research from 876 interviews with high school and middle school students. Two hundred and thirty-one middle school students (142 females, 89 males) and 645 high school students (376 females, 269 males) participated in the study. The ethnic demographic broke down into white non-Hispanic (442 students), white Hispanic (252 students), African American (151 students), and other ethnic groups (31 students). Students were interviewed while in their English class in two middle schools (sixth through eighth grades) and two high schools (ninth through twelfth grades). Since all students were required to take English, the authors felt this would allow them the largest body of students for their research. What made this study qualitative in nature was their focus on student response to the adaptations to better understand the human behavior in the classroom.

While some of the literature in the education field holds the sample size as an indicant of great importance (Guskey, 2009; Montmarquette & Mahseredjian, 1989; Tata, 1999) other pieces of literature in the field (Gopinath, 2004; Anania, 1983; Cook & Germann, 2010) consider sample quality as just as important of an indicant as sample size. For instance, Cook & Germann (2010) only consider two the digital classrooms of two instructors during their research on virtual whispering. In their argument, they consider that the online environment itself, allows a much better collection of virtual activities than researchers are used to in the traditional classroom setting. Thus, their research used the quantified data collected by the online course management system, WEBCT, to analyze the number of hits (pages visited), readings (which articles were read), postings (to the discussion forum), follow-ups (responses to discussion forum postings), mail (number of emails sent within the course shell and when they were sent), and the grade recorded for the student. What Cook & Germann found was that students with higher activities within their collected data generally scored well.

Cook & Germann's (2010) findings were similar to Tsay & Brady's (2010) finding. However, their methods were quite different. Over a span of four months, Tsay & Brady had students complete an

assortment of activities associated with their assignments during and outside of the course. The goal was to have the following tasks completed: propose research questions, design a methodology to answer these questions, collect and analyze data, and discuss findings and conclusions. Grounded on the emphasis of group work in the course, they authors then surveyed the course. The survey contained 13 items measuring a student's active involvement in cooperative learning. Responses were made on a Likert-percentage scale from 0 (never) to 100 (always). Founded on the works and elements that Johnson et al. (1991) advocated to take place in the cooperative learning process, the Tsay & Brady study gauged cooperative learning as it is comprised of seven components: group processing, motivation, competition, dependability, accountability, interactivity, and use of collaborative skills (p. 82) with each component having a clear definition and requirement.

Do you have any conclusion/wrap-up point related? Are their methodologies the best to catch hegemonic practices? Would it take a different/specific type of methodology to actually isolate hegemonic practices? Do the strategies used now work for such a search? I keep thinking to Kuhn and scientific paradigms here. How does their structure/methodologies or even just their choice of questions make them blind to the bigger picture?

State of the Research (Strengths, Weaknesses, Analysis)

It is actually difficult for strengths in the literature to be cohesively characterized due to variation in audience appreciations. Take the first article considered, Guskey's (2009) piece on tradition in grade reporting, for a prime example. While the piece used an electronic survey method to reach over 800 teachers, I hesitate to consider that method having strength in terms of absolute agreement. Due to variations in reader stance and expectation, the impersonal nature that accompanies such a large electronic survey, may outweigh other factors. However, I suspect that many readers would look at the size of Guskey's sample and consider the number an overwhelming strength in the piece. This is a large complexity in the literature of the education field.

Whereas Guskey (2009) provided an ample survey size for many readers, Gopinath's (2004) small survey size could easily be a weakness. The depth to which Gopinath was able to analyze the data collected was admirable; however, having played such a large part of the research as teacher, grader, researcher, coder, and author, Gopinath stumbles into a problematic area of control in his research. Thus, an unlike-minded reader may be concerned with hegemonic influences in Gopinath's research itself. While Gopinath may claim a stance of ethical distance from the responses received, the research cannot, for example, measure up to the same level of credibility as other pieces in the field that are more suited to academic scrutiny.

For instance, Tata (1999), as a specific example, may gain more credibility with certain readers as the collection method and conclusion used were further removed from the researcher themselves than Gopinath's methods were. Tata's strength was in transparency and distance from the participants' response. Also, unique to Tata's research was the 2 by 2 model in which the data and results were both valid and reliable. However, as previously considered, the reading audience plays an important role in deciding the influence and credibility the study has in general (to the academy) and in the specific (to each individual reader). Thus, there are most likely readers who would propose that Tata's 2 by 2 model still presents design limitations in application due to its inflexible nature or some such aspect.

Moving in a slightly different direction allows us to consider the Montmarquette and Mahseredjian (1989) aspects. In this piece, the authors attempt to craft a scope of substantial size, first and fourth graders in Montreal public schools, and still present an accessible, translatable sample size. This specificity, combined with considerations of sample size, offers the Montmarquette and Mahseredjian piece a new foothold on what readers should expect from the state of research sample sizes; neither inaccessibly large, nor unerringly small; neither focused on the macro, nor the micro. It offers a balance for both like and unlike-minded readers that future research would do well to consider.

It bodes well for research in the education field that authors often consider the balance needed in their research. However, it would be just as beneficial for the literature to consider the implications or ambiguity of the concepts that are acting as the foundation of their research. Take, for example, the Anania (1983) piece. As it concludes, Anania admits that the piece has not provided evidence explaining to the realization of student achievement or the perception of achievement. While this admission by the author is in itself well intended, the omission itself is suspect.

Following this trend of omission, Vaughn, Schumm, Niarhos, & Daugherty (1993) take time to consider that while their correlations may seem modest, their hypotheses about students' perceptions of social alienation and teacher adaptations were confirmed in their research. What the authors seem to omit from their consideration, is that the students they claim often need the adaptations, those who are struggling in the classroom, are already saddled with and stratified by social alienation. Consequently, while the authors claim more research into specific adaptations and responses would be useful, perhaps they miss the opportunity to study pre-and-post adaptation indicants of social alienation.

Meanwhile, breaking the trend of omission, Cook & Germann (2010), transparently explained their data collection method and showed how the number of activities by students within the online course shell was mostly higher for students who did well in the course, than students who did not. The conclusion this led Cook & Germann to was that students who were more active within the course, scored higher within the course. However, this conclusion didn't necessarily prove itself as thoroughly as the authors would have hoped, as they consider the impact that backchanneling, which could be explained in the context as a highly active student instant messaging during a test with a student with very low activities in the digital course, could have on their data.

Interestingly though, Cook & Germann (2010) do find that online instructors are attempting to stamp out this backchanneling concept by labeling it as cheating instead of networking or collaboration.

Thus, the hegemonic tendency that the classroom allows to the student/teacher relationship is hidden with the framework yet again. Students finding answers from another student is deemed unacceptable by certain teachers, while other teachers would see this as an opportunity towards autonomy and advancement en route for student empowerment, instead of a student attempt to subvert the authority and validity of the educational system (Freire, 2007; Bruffee, 2007; Calandra, 2007; Berreby, 2007).

Conclusion

This literature review set out to see if there was a common thread in educational research literature that held underlying tones capable of reproducing cultural hegemony in education. At the close of this review and through analysis of the data collected, I feel there is sufficient evidence to answer in the affirmative. The literature presents the classroom as a place where hegemonic structures, as seen through the subtle use of various artifacts and requirements, is reproduced. However, due to the unique context of this review, I recommend that future research focus on specific indicants or artifacts and explore them to a fuller depth with more demographic consideration and perhaps, from a larger survey pool than I engaged with in this series.

Also, since these hegemonic structures seem to be cultural reproduced for generation-after-generation of students, future research literature may be well served to consider a longitudinal study that follows students from their pre-school or kindergarten year through graduation or college entrance. Through a study of this magnitude, research may begin to uncover when and how subtle shifts in hegemony and the impact that carries into students view of education, occur.

References Reviewed

Anania, J. (1983). The Influence of Instructional Conditions on Student learning and Achievement.

Evaluation in Education, 7, 1-92.

Cook, S. and Germann, C. "The Tell-Tale Data: Virtual Whispering and Final Student Grades" Paper

presented at the annual meeting of the NCA 95th Annual Convention, Chicago Hilton & Towers,

Chicago, IL <Not Available>. 2010-11-15 from

http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p396810_index.html

Guskey, T. R. Bound by Tradition: Teachers' Views of Crucial Grading and Reporting Issues. Paper was

presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San

Francisco, CA, April 2009. Retrieved October 03, 2010, from ERIC.

Gopinath, C. (2004). Exploring Effects of Criteria and Multiple Graders on Case Grading. Journal of

Education for Business, 79(6), 314-322. Retrieved October 9, 2010, from JSTOR.

Montmarquette, C., & Mahseredjian, S. (1989). Could Teacher Grading Practices Account for

Unexplained Variation in School Achievements? Economics of Education Review, 8(4), 335-343.

Schmidt, T. A., Houston, M. B., Bettencourt, L. A., & Boughton, P. D. (2003). The Impact of Voice and

Justification on Students' Perceptions of Professors' Fairness [Electronic version]. Journal of

Marketing Education, 25(2), 177-187.

Tata, J. (1999). Grade Distributions, Grading Procedures, and Students' Evaluations of Instructors: A

Justice perspective. The Journal of Psychology, 133(3), 263-271. Retrieved October 09, 2010,

from ERIC.

Tsay, M., & Brady, M. (2010). A case study of cooperative learning and communication pedagogy: Does

working in teams make a difference? Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10(2),

78-89. Retrieved October 03, 2010, from JSTOR.

Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S., Niarhos, F. J., & Daugherty, T. (1993). What do students think when teachers make adaptations? *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 9(1), 107-118.

References Cited & Considered

- Becker, Jr., W.E. (1982). The educational process and student achievement given uncertainty in measurement. *Am. Econ. Rev.* March, 229-236. (Cited)
- Berreby, David. (2007). "It Takes a Tribe." *Composing Knowledge: Readings for College Writers*. Ed. Rolf Norgaard. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2007. 53-58. Print. (Cited).
- Bruffee, Kenneth. (2007). "The Art of Collaborative Learning: Making the Most of Knowledgeable Peers." *Composing Knowledge: Readings for College Writers*. Ed. Rolff Norgaard Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2007. 398-407. Print (Cited).
- Calandra, Alexander. (2007). "Angels on a Pin: The Barometer Story." *Composing Knowledge: Readings for College Writers*. Ed. Rolf Norgaard. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.. 158-160. Print. (Cited).
- Cogdill, S., Fanderclai, T.L., Kilborn, J. & Williams, M.G. (2001). Backchannel: Whispering in Digital Conversation. *Proceedings of the 34th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. (Cited)
- Correa, H. & Gruver, G.W. (1987). Teacher-student interaction: a game theoretic extension of the economic theory of education. *Math. Sot. Sci.* 13, 19-47. (Cited)
- Defazio, J., Jones, J., Tennant, F., & Hook, S. A. Academic literacy: The importance and impact of writing across the curriculum - a case study. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Retrieved October 16, 2010. (Considered)
- Freire, Paulo (2007). The "Banking" Concept of Education. *Composing Knowledge: Readings for College Wrtiers*. Ed. Rolff Norgaard Boston: Bedford/ St. Martin's. 239-253. (Cited)
- Henig, J. R. (2009). Mayors, Governors, and Presidents: The New Education Executives and the End of Educational Exceptionalism. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 84, 283-299. (Considered)

- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., and Smith, K. A. (1991). *Cooperative learning: Increasing college faculty instructional productivity*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4, George Washington University. (Cited)
- Mantzicopoulos, P. (2005). Conflictual relationships between kindergarten children and their teachers: Associations with child and classroom context variables. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 425-442. (Considered)
- McKenzie, R.B., & Staaf, R.I. (1974) *An Economic Theory of Learning*. Blackburg: University Publications. (Cited)
- Page, S., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). Sex and Expectations of Teachers and Sex and Race of Students as Determinants of Teaching Behavior and Student Performance. *Journal of School Psychology*, 28, 119-131. (Considered)
- Schmidt, T. A., Houston, M. B., Bettencourt, L. A., & Boughton, P. D. (2003). The Impact of Voice and Justification on Students' Perceptions of Professors' Fairness [Electronic version]. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 25(2), 177-187. (Considered)
- Tsay, M., & Brady, M. (2010). A case study of cooperative learning and communication pedagogy: Does working in teams make a difference? *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 10(2), 78-89. Retrieved October 03, 2010, from JSTOR. (Considered)