Teaching and Teacher Education 55 (2016) 100–109

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Teaching and Teacher Education

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/tate

'The teacher almost made me cry' Narrative analysis of teachers' reactive classroom management strategies as reported by students diagnosed with ADHD

Juho Honkasilta [a, *], Tanja Vehkakoski [a], Simo Vehmas [b]

[a] Department of Education, Special Education, University of Jyväskylä, P.O. Box 35, FI-40014 Jyväskylä, Finland
[b] Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 16, FI-00014 Helsinki, Finland

HIGHLIGHTS

- Classroom management is studied from the viewpoint of ADHD-diagnosed students.
- A narrative approach is applied to analyse student interviews.
- Students produced negative evaluations of teachers' classroom management strategies.
- Student resistance was constructed as a justified reaction to teacher conduct.
- ADHD played surprisingly minimal significance in student narratives.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 22 January 2015
Received in revised form
9 December 2015
Accepted 31 December 2015
Available online xxx

Keywords:
Narrative analysis
Classroom management (CRM)
Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)
Student voice
Youth
Teacher

ABSTRACT

This interview study addresses the gap in earlier research by focussing on the narratives of 13 ADHD-diagnosed Finnish students regarding teacher reactive classroom management strategies. The data are analysed through narrative analysis. Five different narrative types are identified, in which teacher behaviour is evaluated as (1) disproportionate, (2) traumatising, (3) neglectful, (4) unfair and (5) understanding. The dominant storyline – common to the first four types – constructed the narrator's transgression as contingent upon and a justified reaction to teacher conduct. The vicious cycle of coercive classroom management strategies and the culture of blame between students and teachers are discussed.

1. Introduction

A large body of research addresses classroom management (CRM) issues from the teacher's viewpoint. The viewpoints of students – those being monitored, managed and governed by teachers – provide insights for CRM that are both complementary to and contradictory of those of teachers. This paper elaborates the importance of taking the student voice into account and addresses the issue of CRM by studying narratives of students diagnosed with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), one of the most common and contested neuropsychiatric disorders among youth.[1] ADHD is generally strongly associated with behavioural, social and academic difficulties (e.g., Crundwell, 2005; Scholtens, Rydell, & Yang-Wallentin, 2013) and consequently, with disciplinary

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: juho.honkasilta@jyu.fi (J. Honkasilta), tanja.vehkakoski@jyu.fi (T. Vehkakoski), simo.vehmas@helsinki.fi (S. Vehmas).

[1] Based on the estimated world-wide prevalence of ADHD – put at 5.29% (Polanczyk, de Lima, Horta, Biederman, & Rohde, 2007) and 3.4% (Polanczyk, Salum, Sugaya, Caye, & Rohde, 2015) – it is probably safe to state that every ordinary classroom is likely to feature at least one pupil manifesting behavioural traits characteristic of an ADHD diagnosis, that is, levels of inattentiveness, hyperactivity and impulsiveness that are perceived disadvantageous in (mainly) home and school social contexts.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.12.009
0742-051X/

problems (Loe & Feldman, 2007) and struggles with CRM at school (Kos, Richdale, & Hay, 2006). Despite this, as regards studies focussing on CRM, the experience and voice of young people diagnosed with ADHD are somewhat absent. This lack is striking considering the volume of literature addressing the issue from a behavioural management point of view, with a tendency to subdue fundamentally the student voice and experience on the issue. This narrative research thus addresses this gap in the literature by voicing the experiences of 13 Finnish students (aged 11–16) diagnosed with ADHD regarding teacher reactive CRM strategies, that is, remedial practices resulting from student behaviour that is considered inappropriate (Clunies-Ross, Little, & Kienhuis, 2008; Safran & Oswald, 2003).

1.1. Student viewpoint on CRM

Student reports indicate that a disruptive classroom environment negatively affects learning prerequisites and outcomes throughout the educational stages (Bru, 2009; Cothran, Kulinna, & Garrahy, 2009; Seidman, 2005). Addressing the issue, however, is a rather complex matter owing to the varying views among students regarding the prerequisites of the learning climate (Infantino & Little, 2005; see also Paaso, Uusiautti, & Määttä, 2013) and the appropriateness of certain CRM policies and procedures adopted by teachers. Student perceptions appear to vary according to backgrounds and educational status (Moen, Davies, & Dykstra, 2010). For instance, Hoffman and Lee (2014) reported that undergraduate students in the U.S. expected authoritative instructor control over classroom misbehaviour, and suggested, for example, that policy enforcement through coercive means (e.g., embarrassing disruptive students) could be an effective way to garner more teacher respect and thus encourage students to be less disruptive. As regards educational stages after secondary school, these student views stand in contrast to other studies emphasizing that offensive teacher behaviour (sarcasm, verbal abuse, condescension, etc.) is not acceptable, and does not promote student affect for teacher or teacher trustworthiness (Baloglu, 2009; Banfield, Richmond, & McCroskey, 2006; Thweatt & McCroskey, 1998). Further, Gregory and Ripski (2008) conclude that discipline-referred high school students associated their perception of their teacher as a trustworthy authority figure with behaviour that was less defiant and more cooperative.

Primary and secondary school student viewpoints on preferred CRM strategies – the age group of this study – seem far more consistent in interrelated yet independent sets of international research. It strongly promotes teacher use of relationship-based (discussion, hinting, meaningful praise, etc.) rather than coercive (punishments, reprimands, aggressive behaviour) strategies in order to support both academic and non-academic student behaviour (Lewis, 2001; Lewis, Romi, Katz, & Qui, 2008; Lewis, Romi, Qui, & Katz, 2005; Romi, Lewis, & Katz, 2009; Romi, Lewis, Roache, & Riley, 2011). This set of research indicates that teachers' use of coercive reactive CRM strategies increases student disruption, misbehaviour and negativity towards teachers and schoolwork and reduces students' sense of responsibility for individual and communal rights for safety and learning as well as their sense of connectedness to the school and peers (see also Roache & Lewis, 2011a; Wentzel, 2002). According to Lewis (2001), secondary school students reported experiencing more coercive teacher strategies and less sense of individual and collective responsible behaviour than did primary school students, whereas primary school students along with those more interested in schoolwork were more likely to experience relationship-based discipline. Lewis (2001) concludes, therefore, that either coercive teacher strategies promote misbehaviour or student misbehaviour promotes aggressive teacher responses, or both (see also Lewis et al., 2008; Roache & Lewis, 2011a).

This vicious cycle of coercive CRM strategies is also perceived by teachers (Clunies-Ross et al., 2008; Roache & Lewis, 2011a, 2011b; Romi et al., 2009). Coercive reactive strategies are widely recognised as being detrimental to the student–teacher relationship and a peaceful learning environment (Gable, Hester, Rock, & Hughes, 2009; Little & Akin-Little, 2008; Roache & Lewis, 2011b). Instead, an affective, caring teacher–student relationship is an important factor for students' wellbeing, engagement and academic success (Roorda, Koomen, Spilt, & Oort, 2011; see also Roache, 2009) and for teachers' comprehensive wellbeing (Spilt, Koomen, & Thijs, 2011).

1.2. Varying views between students and teachers

Student reports are not, however, fully in accord with those of teachers. First, both primary and secondary school students have been found to report more frequent teacher use of aggressive strategies than would appear from teachers' reports (Roache & Lewis, 2011b; Romi et al., 2011). Second, Infantino and Little (2005) found that secondary school students and teachers diverge on the kind of behaviour regarded as troublesome, since 'talking out of turn' was the only behaviour perceived as troublesome and frequent by both parties (see also Miller, Ferguson, & Byrne, 2000). Similarly, Paaso et al. (2013) studied sixth graders' perception of what the authors coined 'peace to learn' in reference to "a peaceful state that makes meaningful and productive learning possible" (p. 16). Students' interpretations and their own position regarding the issue took several forms, varying from an aspiration to promote peaceful learning environment as it was valued by teachers to regarding it as something secondary or even coercively imposed by the teacher.

Third, the divergence of causes identified for classroom misbehaviour is noteworthy. Teachers tend to attribute student misbehaviour to child and family factors (e.g., Kulinna, 2007–2008; Mavropoulou & Padeliadu, 2002; Poulou & Norwich, 2000), implying thus that they are not to be held accountable for student misconduct. Students, on the other hand, are more likely to attribute it to their need for attention and/or a lack of meaningful class content (Cothran et al., 2009) or to student vulnerability to pressure from other pupils, their own emotional turmoil or struggles with school work (Miller et al., 2000). Also for students, classroom misbehaviour might be opposition to teachers' stances towards them, characterised as unfair, insensitive and negligent (Miller et al., 2000; Tirri & Puolimatka, 2000; Wentzel, 2002). With respect to teachers' attributions of misbehaviour to domestic factors, Miller et al. (2000) study of students' causal attributions for classroom misconduct shows that students attributed significantly greater responsibility for their disturbance to teachers than to their parents.

This divergence between teacher and student views points to a fundamental issue in classroom practices and culture. Lewis and Burman (2008) point out that, although teachers are willing to promote the student voice in CRM, their use of rewards instead of more inclusive techniques, such as discussion and negotiation, fundamentally subdue that voice. Similarly, Thornberg (2009) remarks on teacher practices that sub-due student voice. He concludes his fieldwork in two Swedish primary schools by stating that students are seldom given a voice in creating, modifying or abolishing formal rules by teachers and their inclusion alongside teachers in school democracy is rather illusory, tending to have them merely confirm teacher proposals than actually influence in creating school/classroom culture.

1.3. CRM experiences of ADHD-diagnosed students

Despite the ineffectiveness of coercive CRM strategies related to ADHD (DuPaul & Weyandt, 2006), students diagnosed with ADHD or manifesting behaviours associated with it are more likely to be subjects of coercive disciplinary actions (detention, expulsion, etc.) than their peers (Loe & Feldman, 2007). Assertion is that student behaviour mediates coercive CRM strategies. There is however more to this than meets the eye. In addition to promoting positive attitude and sense of competence (e.g., Anderson, Watt, Noble, & Shanley, 2012; Kos et al., 2006), a teacher's informed knowledge and experience of ADHD may also promote *less* favourable emotions towards and expectations of diagnosed children as well as *less* confidence in his/her own competence to manage the behaviour (Anderson et al., 2012; Kos et al., 2006; Ohan, Cormier, Hepp, Visser, & Strain, 2008). Furthermore, knowledge of ADHD may increase teachers' perception of ADHD symptoms as being disruptive in the classroom (Greene, Beszterczey, Katzenstein, Park, & Goring, 2002; Ohan et al., 2008) guiding thus their perception of behaviour in terms of dysfunction that may otherwise have assumed a framing of "normality" (as individual differences). The label itself may carry negative connotations, stereotypes and stigma for in- and pre-service teachers (Kos et al., 2006; Ohan, Visser, Strain, & Allen, 2011) and thus become self-fulfilling in terms of mediating teachers' (coercive reactive) CRM strategies. Disturbingly, the dominantly negative associations of behavioural, social and academic problems with ADHD are also shared by students so diagnosed (Advokat, Lane, & Luo, 2011; Eisenberg & Schneider, 2007; Kent et al., 2011; Kos et al., 2006; Travell & Visser, 2007; Singh, 2011, 2013). These negative expectations associated with ADHD bear potentially damaging effects on diagnosed students' self-esteem, motivation and performance (Eisenberg & Schneider, 2007).

However, previous findings regarding student experience relevant to the topic of CRM bear resemblance to the student viewpoint in general (see above, 1.1 and 1.2), thus presenting two main themes in the CRM literature on ADHD that need to be taken into account. The first theme has to do with social interaction. Resonating with the findings of Miller et al. (2000), students diagnosed with ADHD are reported to relate the severity of manifestation of ADHD-related problems at school to teacher and peer conduct (Cooper & Shea, 1998; Gallichan & Curle, 2008; Prosser, 2008). Further, Singh et al. (2010) report young people having experienced as burdensome the lack of empathy and understanding towards them, along with stigma (e.g., being labelled as 'stupid') and differential treatment related to their diagnosis and symptomatic behaviour. Prosser (2008) highlights that, as the label bearers, students themselves emphasise the importance of their relationships with teachers and peers, and how they experienced that label ceased to be a problem once teachers knew the students as individuals (see also Gallichan & Curle, 2008). Additionally, Singh (2011) notes that shouted arguments with teachers seem to be everyday experiences for ADHD-diagnosed children. She emphasises that, if classroom interaction is an ongoing struggle between students and teachers in which teacher actions are perceived by the students as disrespectful, aggressive and out of control, little incentive is left for students to manage their own behaviour in compliance with norms and expectations. Indeed, as Gallichan and Curle (2008) point out in their study of perspectives by young people of their disorder, a student failing to fit in illustrates not only student traits but also the characteristics of the school and, particularly, the values and norms expressed in teacher practice.

The second important theme that emerges from the CRM literature on ADHD is the different ways that diagnosed students and teachers interpret and account for their behaviour. Hughes' (2007) study of the views of children of the effects of the social environment on their behaviour highlights the different reality constructions of children (students) and adults (parents, teachers), which may vary tremendously in terms of emotions, needs and accountability. For instance, adults may understand an unwanted event through a set of psychological and medical assumptions that point to dysfunctional child characteristics, whereas child experience reveals a contextual set of interaction in which unfairness and subsequent emotional turmoil account for their unwanted behaviour (Hughes, 2007). In line with this, young people diagnosed with ADHD are reported to account for transgression (e.g., fighting as a badge of honour) as a valid, justifiable, and unavoidable act within the youth microculture (Kendall, Hatton, Beckett, & Leo, 2003; Singh, 2011; Singh et al., 2010), emphasising the importance of teachers' understandings of the experienced reality of students. The student viewpoint accentuates the social and interactional nature of misbehaviour and questions what are, from an adult perspective, predetermined and straightforward moral assumptions on the issue.

2. Methodological framework

This study focuses on how 13 Finnish students diagnosed with ADHD narrate teachers' reactive CRM attempts. This focus on the narratives of the *students behind the label* is premised on the issues raised here concerning: (1) how the literature dominantly views ADHD as the object of CRM, thus subduing student voice and experience; (2) the similarity of classroom misbehaviour attributions made by students (with or without the label), begging the question of what role if any the concept of ADHD plays in this; and (3) the dearth of research literature on ADHD and CRM that voices student experience. The experience of students who potentially become labelled as disordered owing to the mismatch between their actions/reactions and classroom environment, its normative expectations and teacher CRM strategies are central in understanding the pivotal nature of the relationship between teachers and those deemed troubled and troubling.

Methodologically, this study employs a narrative framework. The worlds in which students live can be understood and interpreted through their narratives, which simultaneously elicit individual experiences as well as illuminate social realities in terms of rights, duties and expectations. As Drew (1998, p. 295) notes, when one's own conduct or that of others is reported in an unavoidably incomplete and selective manner, the reported description, or story, becomes itself an accountable phenomenon through which 'an action's (im)propriety, (in)correctness, (un)suitability, (in) appropriateness, (in)justices, (dis)honesty, and so forth' are displayed. Thus, the narrative serves an interactional function among interlocutors or an audience, because the narrator deliberately positions not only his or her self but also the other actors of the story in relation to a socially accepted, right-and-wrong moral framework. Taking a narrative approach here should contribute to a fuller understanding of the CRM phenomena as regards ADHD.

There are two main research questions: 1) How do Finnish adolescents diagnosed with ADHD narrate the reactive CRM strategies of their teachers? 2) How do they position themselves and their teachers in these narratives?

2.1. Methods

2.1.1. Context

In Finland, unlike in other countries (e.g., the USA, Canada,

Australia), the assessment of remedial/special education provision is made based on observed individual educational need(s) and behavioural characteristics rather than diagnosed disabilities, that is, formal diagnoses are not needed for receiving special education services (e.g., Graham & Jahnukainen, 2011; Itkonen & Jahnukainen, 2010; for an overview, see Honkasilta, Sandberg, Närhi & Jahnukainen, 2014). For instance, Björn, Aro, Koponen, Fuchs, and Fuchs (2015) compared the policies of response to intervention (RTI) framework of the United States with those of Finland in the context of implementing special education services. They conclude that with similarities between the policies as regards three-tier framework of providing early support for all students, one of the main differences is that in the U.S. RTI is primarily related to the renewal of diagnostic procedures (e.g., identifying specific learning disabilities, emotional or behavioural disabilities etc.) whereas in Finland this is not the case (Björn et al., 2015). Thus, Finland provides an interesting study context, since it means that in respect of school policy, at least, ADHD diagnosis is not predetermined as a defining characteristic of a student's school path, emphasising thus the role of social practice. Regardless of deriving solely from the context of one country, the transferability of the results can be partly justified by the premise that these narratives represent norms, values and expectations generally shared and upheld in Western culture in relation to which the meaning-making of individual experiences are constructed.

2.1.2. Data and data collection

The study participants were recruited in 2012 with the help of the ADHD Association in Finland. The Association informed its member families of the opportunity to participate in interview research focussing on the experiences of parents and their children diagnosed with ADHD regarding the child's compulsory schooling by sending information letters to their homes – one dedicated to parents, another for their children. The precondition of the family participation was that the child in question was (1) formally diagnosed, (2) aged 11–16 and (3) willing to participate. These criteria were to ensure that participant families had experiences of the diagnosing process and life prior and after it, as well as substantial experience of compulsory schooling. Thirteen families participated. The data of this study consist of the interviews of two girls and eleven boys.

The interviews were mainly conducted in the adolescents' homes in a setting that they chose (room, sitting position, etc.), with the exception of three interviews, which, on the wishes of the parents, were conducted on university premises. Two of the interviews were conducted with parents also in attendance, one because a girl participated on her own initiative during the parent–interviewer discussion and the other because a boy eventually declined to participate alone. The interviews were all audio-recorded and lasted, on average, around 90 min. The interviewer ensured that sufficient breaks were provided during the interviews.

The interview topics included adolescents' representations of school, their own school attendance, teachers and ADHD. The interview questions did not focus on teachers' CRM strategies themselves; rather, stories about the strategies were spontaneously narrated by the young participants. This spontaneity indicates that the stories were particularly important for them and their experiences as students, and, thus, a legitimate focus for the research. The intention of the interviews was to enable participants to make free, intuitive associations, to construct meanings actively and to talk about experiences that they considered relevant and were willing to share. Thus, the interviews were carried out using narrative interview methods (summarised in Hollway & Jefferson, 2008), such as open narrative questions to elicit perceptions and experiences. Functional methods were also used. This entailed using feeling cards with a wide range of positive, neutral and negative feelings (e.g., happy, bewildered, frustrated), with an assignment regarding their own perceptions of teachers. Each selected card was followed up by an open narrative question (e.g., 'You chose [feeling card x]; could you tell me more about what it brings to your mind?'). The cards themselves were not considered in the analysis; the sole purpose of their use was to facilitate intuitive responses. The use of interview methods was negotiated with the participants, which led the functional methods to be omitted in two cases because the participants expressed their comfort and confidence in talking without any auxiliary means.

2.1.3. Analysis

Narrative approach was applied to analyse the data. By this approach, we assume that the essence of adolescent experience can be captured and constructed in the form of a story (e.g., Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2011). To clarify, we conceptualised a story as a sequence of events shared through narrative, and narrative as a discursive practice of telling a story in interaction with the interviewer (e.g., Brockmeier, 2004). Stories provide a means to elicit and relive experience (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2011), and the way stories are narrated provides a sociocultural means to make sense of and/or account for the experience (Bakhtin, 1986; Wetherell, 2001).

The first two phases of the analysis dealt with coding the transcribed text into actual analysable data. The first step was to code the bits in the text that dealt with teachers' reactive CRM measures. Then the second step was to distinguish between real narratives and merely reported opinions involving teacher behaviour without further elicitation of a narrative. We defined narrative as events and happenings configured into a temporal unity by means of a plot (Polkinghorne, 1995). Thus, each narrative was required to entail personal experiences of past events, temporal ordering, a transition from one state of affairs to another, complicating action and evaluation of the events/action (see Polanyi, 1989, chap. 1; Ricoeur, 1988, chap. 3).

With the narratives identified, the next analysis phase consisted of identifying differences and similarities between them. The narratives were mainly identified according to the constructed emotional (e.g., grief) and social (e.g., stigma) consequences of reactive CRM strategies, and eventually named, following the narrator evaluations, as teachers' (1) disproportionate, (2) traumatising, (3) negligent, (4) unfair and (5) understanding behaviour. Then the subsequent analysis phase was adapted from the linguistic tradition, with an emphasis on the intentionality and functionality of language (e.g., Wetherell, 2001). We analysed how the narrators talked when they engaged in narrating stories from their past about teachers' reactive CRM methods and interpreted what kinds of realities were accessed and constructed in these narratives. This was done systematically, by comparing how the participants positioned themselves in the story in relation to their teachers and other actors in the story (peers, parents, etc.).

Finally, in order to emphasise the collective nature of these experiences, we formed each of the five narratives into a narrative type. Each narrative type embodies the range of experience of the narrators sharing that narrative type. These consisted of the following four elements: accounts of one's own behaviour; interrelated positioning of the self and other actors; descriptions of teacher responses; and evaluations of the narrated situation. The model of presenting these narrative types in the Results section was adapted from the 'word images' introduced by Clandinin et al.

(2006, chap. 6). Thus, instead of narrating these stories in our own words, we mediate the collective narratives in adolescents' words, by combining authentic data utterances on a cross-case basis. Each narrative type is compiled so as to read almost as an unbroken narration of a specific story.

2.2. Trustworthiness and ethical considerations

The controllability and non-judgemental nature of the analysis was strengthened by analysing not only the contents of the narratives but also their grammatical and contextual features (Wetherell, 2001). Collaboration between the authors during the analysis process enabled cross-reading and comparison of the data analysis within the chosen methodological frame, an approach that improved the conformability and credibility of the analysis. In addition, readers can assess the credibility of the study for themselves, through the authentic data examples (word images) that are presented prior to the interpretations presented in the Results section.

The credibility of the study is also strengthened by focussing on the spontaneously provided stories of particular interest. However, we are mindful of the inability of the researchers to be completely objective, and that, although the narrative types presented in the Results section illustrate authentic collective narratives, as researchers, we eventually rewrote the stories and retold the narratives to our audience guided by our research agenda. Expressing the authentic voices of the young could have been strengthened even by doing the research with the participants and/or by sharing the text with them in order to confirm our analysis and interpretations. These methodological improvements were, however, omitted owing to lack of resources (timewise, difficulties to contact, etc.).

Since vulnerable participants were included in the study, a brief discussion of ethics is in order. The University of Jyväskylä Ethical Committee, which is committed to comply with the ethical principles of research drafted by the National Advisory Board on Research Ethics in Finland (TENK), was consulted prior to conducting research interviews. Further, adequate informing of the research was provided and participant assent was confirmed by the interviewer when becoming acquainted with the participants. In order to protect the participants' anonymity and integrity, pseudonyms are used and minor descriptive details about participants' lives have been either changed or omitted from the narrative types.

Another ethical issue that should be addressed here concerns teachers' 'right to reply' to the largely negative character of the narratives. The narratives presented here are not neutral or unbiased; on the contrary, we have striven to present the narrator's (student's) voice to the best of our ability. Therefore, owing to the lack of teacher's (or any other) perspective, we emphasise that this paper does not take a stand on teachers' actual behaviour outside the narratives or seek to establish or invalidate the 'truth' of any particular perspective in relation to another.

3. Findings

The findings are presented through the five different narrative types representing students' different ways of describing and evaluating teachers' reactive CRM strategies. In addition to evaluating teacher use of CRM means, the adolescents also produced accounts of their own behaviour and positioned themselves in relation to teachers and other actors in different ways.

3.1. Narratives of disproportionate sanctions

This narrative type has been constructed based on the stories of eleven students: Thomas, Susan, Laura, Dave, Michael, Jacob, Wilhelm, Marcus, Jack, Matt and John. In this narrative, the focus of attention is shifted from the undesirable classroom behaviour of the narrators to teacher responses to it: the narrators' behaviour is portrayed as a minor detail, in a vague way or hardly disruptive ('a pen falls'; 'I kind of hit the guitar real soft', lines 2; 4), whereas the teachers' reactions are constructed as authoritarian (lines 26–28;31–32), as well as disproportionate in relation to the students' original behaviour ('The teacher just started to shout at me and call me names', line 5). Even if the self is positioned as a more active agent in behaviour that opposes the usual norms of student conduct, such as overt rebellion against the teacher in order to fight for one's need for justice and conformity (lines 23–25), it is constructed as contingent upon the disproportionateness of teacher conduct: 'If she would just back off, then maybe we would too' (line 36).

The intensity and continual occurrence of teacher reactions is also emphasised by the use of strong adjectives and adverbs in formulating extreme cases: 'It just means more of that horrible lecturing' (line 3), and 'The teacher yelled at us almost all the time (…) and then like got really angry' (line 7). In addition to extremity, the teachers' CRM actions are judged as unprofessional and inappropriate and indisputably against the cultural norms of exemplary interactive behaviour. For example, teachers offensive verbal behaviour is emphasised by reporting about their calling the students names (e.g., ' … that I'm some kind of nightmare brat and like

1	The teacher's so mean
2	that when like a pen falls
3	it just means more of that horrible lecturing.
4	I stopped playing and I kind of hit the guitar real soft
5	then the teacher just started to shout at me and call me names (…)
6	saying I had somehow hit the guitar.
7	The teacher yelled at us almost all the time (…) and then like got really angry
8	and if we didn't do right then like it just meant detention right away.
9	And said stuff like in my family I've not been raised proper.
10	Then the teachers might call me some kind of rubbish student
11	that just gets hyper all the time
12	and some kind of nasty kid that just causes everyone grief and all that.
13	You know it was totally not the first time,
14	I've had some really nasty stuff from a teacher.
15	That I'm some kind of nightmare brat and like the shitest kid ever
16	you know the teacher almost like made me cry once
17	after [he/she] started shouting all kinds of stuff at me, like
18	"Are you really so fucking sick in your head, what's wrong with you, you should fucking get some help".
19	The vice-principal even said straight to me that "You look like that possessed kid from *The Exorcist*".
20	Then I like told my mum
21	and we had that talk and I remember how the teacher was all like,
22	"You've definitely got it all twisted around in your head".
23	I was like
24	"You teach us to let people finish talking but you don't yourselves (…) act like that,
25	which is pretty ridiculous, isn't it".
26	Then the teacher was like
27	I've got all the rights to interrupt you, so don't you dare try to pull one over on me (…)
28	so you best start watching how you behave.
29	Then there really comes this totally awful feeling, just a totally sad feeling, when you start thinking how
30	people can be so mean (…) especially when it's a teacher.
31	They don't want to hear from young people that they are doing something wrong
32	they just get irritated
33	I've had to suffer because I've dared to speak up
34	I've also totally got legit opinions.
35	Teachers shouldn't take things personally.
36	If she would just back off, then maybe we would too.

the shittiest kid ever', line 15) and insulting students ('[He/she] started shouting all kinds of stuff at me, like "Are you really so fucking sick in your head, what's wrong with you, you should fucking get some help"', line 18). In addition, teachers are reported to become personal in conflict situations: ' … and said stuff like in my family I've not been raised proper', (line 9). This judgmental evaluation of teacher behaviour by narrators is overtly presented in line 14 by the use of the adjective 'nasty' ('I've had some really nasty stuff from a teacher') as well as in lines 13, 16, 23–30 and 33, in which the interviewer/reader is invited to share the moral and emotional space and premise of the narration (e.g., 'You know the teacher almost like made me cry once after [he/she] started shouting all kinds of stuff at me').

The whole meaning-making of these unfortunate experiences is based on their wrecked expectations of the teacher's institutional responsibility to react constructively: 'Teachers shouldn't take things personally' (line 35; also lines 29–30). In the context of opposing the teacher's actions, claiming the position of a young human being (line 31) highlights even more strongly the students' subordination to the teacher position, not only owing to their different institutional roles but also owing to their different age status. By expressing a deontic modality regarding the morals and ethics of teacher conduct – that is, how teachers 'should' behave and react – narrators adhere to these normative expectations and thus posit themselves as advocating their rights and needs as students and minors.

3.2. Narratives of traumatising sanctions

1	They were like "Stop, stop!"
2	I was like "I'm not stopping".
3	I just got fed up with all them teachers and I made up my mind to take off.
4	So then they just grabbed me and said,
5	"I'm the teacher and you listen to what I say and I make the rules
6	and you follow them and you stick to them".
7	Then that teacher started to hold me so that I was like trapped
8	and I started to go mental, like I have to get away 'cause again is coming that tense [mood].
9	They took you down there
10	two teachers sat on me on the floor – "You go nowhere until you calm down"
11	that got me really angry so I started hitting and kicking on the ground so long that
12	I just got so tired
13	I was in third or fourth grade
14	I was this ten-year-old girl
15	and for real two adults sat on me
16	that really says a lot in my opinion.
17	Then I stopped fighting and I managed to get away
18	I ran to the other end of the hall where there was a door (…) the B stairwell (…)
19	the fire escape where I got out
20	Then I ran through the snow and slush in my wool socks to the train (…) over half a kilometre.
21	All my mates were asking like what happened out there in the hall.
22	I didn't make it even like halfway through sixth grade (…),
23	I was afraid there would be a ton of questions about this stuff
24	and then I had also had this real fun hobby
25	but I quit that too
26	'cause there were some guys [from my school] that asked about that (…) stuff
27	when I couldn't get out of school.
28	So I was just left really traumatized then.
29	I called that day mainly "The Thursday"
30	because it happened on a Thursday.

The traumatising narratives, provided by Susan and Arthur, are focused on the disciplinary reactions of teachers that violate students' rights and needs for physical integrity (lines 4, 7–9, 15). The teacher is given the role of an autocrat who, instead of attempting to understand the individual's reasoning behind unwanted actions, strives to prevent the actions in order to maintain obedience to its autocratic legislator: 'so then they just grabbed me and said, "I'm the teacher and you listen to what I say and I make the rules and you follow them and you stick to them"' (lines 4–6). There are two ways in which the narrator is positioned in the narrative. First, the teacher's judgmental stance and authoritarian exercise of power are constructed as provoking the student's reactive reactions and strong resistant agency: 'I was like "I'm not stopping"'; 'Then I started to go mental' (lines 2, 8). Second, attention is drawn to the narrators' victim position – the position of the self as a powerless 'ten-year-old girl' (line 14) who is 'like trapped' (line 7) and struggling, in this case against two adults. The students' own actions are thus accounted for by those of teachers; it is the latter who are (ultimately) responsible.

What is noteworthy in this narrative type as compared with the previous one is the narrating of paralysing and far-reaching negative consequences that a teacher's strict reactions have carried for the narrator's socioemotional well-being. This is illustrated by overtly emphasising the emotional impacts and the emotionally traumatising nature of the experience relived in the narrative ('So I was just left really traumatised then', line 28). The detailed descriptions of events throughout this narrative type, such as naming the incident by the day on which it took place ('I called that day mainly "The Thursday"', line 29), also demonstrate how the effects of teachers' insensitive decisions are narrated to be deeply etched in the students' narrative self, meaning that they remain in how narrators construct who they are in relation to their past and their present. In addition, the depth of the narrator's misery is rendered apparent by narrating social consequences, such as how the narrator drops out of school and opts out of a hobby (lines 22–27), owing to feelings of shame after suffering punishments and running dramatically away in front of peers. At the same time, narrating how 'I started to go mental, like I have to get away ' (line 8) and, consequently, how in that state of mind 'I ran through the snow and slush in my wool socks to the train' (line 20) enables the interviewer/reader to empathise with the narrator and his/her emotional experience of panic.

Note also that the narrator alone is positioned as being subjected to the teacher's actions, whereas peers are the ones on whom the narrator reflects the negative social and emotional outcomes of the narrated story. Thus, the narrators positioned as being victimised in relation not only to teachers but also to peers, suggesting that, in addition to physical integrity, the narrations of the violation of student needs cover also those of having to do with social integrity.

3.3. Narratives of teacher neglect

What is striking in this narrative is the substantial use of negations when students describe teacher actions (e.g., 'I couldn't get help from nowhere'; 'The teachers didn't do nothing'; 'They didn't listen'; 'They didn't care', lines 2, 6, 10–11). This implies that the common expectations of teachers have remained unfulfilled, that, as institutional agents and as adults, teachers should 'care', 'get involved', 'listen', 'be interested' and have faith in their students in all circumstances ('They gave up, and a teacher should never ever give up'). Thus, the essential difference in this narrative type as compared to the previous ones is that teachers are not accused of keeping the children on a too tight rein but of being indifferent to them. The most

1	Then my life really started to be hell
2	when I couldn't get help from nowhere (…)
3	it definitely wouldn't have been so hard for me if I, well, could have seen
4	that teachers cared, that they would get involved (…)
5	and they are still adults.
6	But it didn't go like that – the teachers didn't do nothing (…)
7	if you went for a smoke (…)
8	and they knew it for sure.
9	You couldn't [talk] with him/her
10	they didn't listen
11	they didn't care.
12	You could just tell that they aren't interested or don't believe you.
13	We had these parent–teacher notebooks at some point (…) there was a fight with this and that,
14	"Not like that, you can't do that, don't do that" and that's it.
15	They didn't care about what had gone on
16	or where the whole thing had come from in the first place.
17	They gave up
18	and a teacher should never ever give up.
19	More than anything I would've needed someone to set limits.
20	I easily lost it when no help came [with the assignment]
21	or no one could come show how it's done.
22	Then I just got thrown out (…)
23	pretty often at the end of sixth grade, I just sat there in the hallway
24	right in the middle of class.

extreme example of this is given here with the reference to smoking at school in which teachers did not interfere, even though 'they knew it for sure' (line 8). The narrators do not, thus, deny their own non-compliance with rules, such as smoking (line 7) or fighting with peers (line 13), but instead long for a deeper relationship with teachers ('It definitely wouldn't have been so hard for me if I, well, could have seen that teachers cared, that they would get involved', lines 3–4), or look for more thorough interventions than mere symbolic punitive methods and prohibitions (line 13–16).

In accordance with this, the narrators Matt, Susan, Marcus and Pete position themselves as persons in need of help, guidance, and care. This help was expected to be realized in the forms of pedagogical guidance ('I easily lost it when no help came [with the assignment]', line 20) and behavioural management ('More than anything I would've needed someone to set limits', line 19). Similarly to previous narrative types, the students construct strong causality between teachers' and their own behaviour – in this case, between teacher neglect and their own socio-emotional suffering. The teachers' lack of regard for student needs is constructed as resulting in serious consequences such as school malaise ('then my life really started to be hell', line 1), and exclusion from learning ('I easily lost it when no help came) and participation in the classroom activities ('then I just got thrown out', lines 20–24).

3.4. Narratives of unfair sanctions

This narrative type compiles those of eight students: Susan, Laura, Dave, Pete, Jacob, Wilhelm, Marcus and John. Its critical evaluation focuses on the unfair nature of teacher actions in terms of how the narrator is treated and disciplined differently from peers (lines 5–6, 13–14, 20–25). The unequal and unjust stance of teachers (lines 16–17) is emphasised by positioning them as an inconsistent judge passing sentence on innocent students under false pretences: '[The principal] jotted down on paper some swear words and other nasty stuff that I hadn't even said ' (lines 7–8); 'If like James hit Daniel (…) the teachers said that it was my fault and I got blamed for it' and 'I always got the blame first' (lines 15–17).

Although the self is also positioned as morally responsible for actions that can be considered as being against normative classroom behaviour through bona fide concessions (e.g., 'At the start it

1	I've had so many of those teachers that always say
2	"Every day we start with a clean slate"
3	but it totally never goes that way.
4	They were really unfair.
5	I started to scream (…) just like
6	"Why can't y'all sometimes look what they do, that it's totally not always me that's guilty in all this".
7	[The principal] jotted down on paper some swear words and other nasty stuff
8	that I hadn't even said (…), which wasn't true at all.
9	At the start it definitely came from me
10	but then in the end
11	it must have been pretty clear for a lot of people
12	that the teacher like straight up wanted me out of class.
13	Those sometimes treated like I was different [because of ADHD].
14	Then sometime in primary school it felt like there were different rules for everyone else.
15	If like James hit Daniel (…)
16	the teachers said that it was my fault and I got blamed for it.
17	I always got the blame first.
18	I hadn't done nothing.
19	The teacher had like three or four favourites.
20	It was always me that got thrown out 'cause I was the one yelling
21	I was the noisiest one
22	only later was it like, oh okay, those others were also part of it
23	those who had been bothering me
24	I still remember how they laughed at me.
25	Then I was the one who had to stay after school.

definitely came from me'; 'I was the one yelling – I was the noisiest one'), the narrators emphasises that this was not a real cause for sanctions by positioning the self as a scapegoat. Instead, the real reasons for unfair treatment are narrated to be stigmatisation (being 'treated like I was different [because of ADHD]', line 13), teachers' negative attitude towards him/her ('The teacher like straight up wanted me out of class', line 12) and teachers' forming of charmed circles ('The teacher had like three or four favourites', line 19). Thus, the student who is not in favour is marginalised as a scapegoat as if the teacher had personal issues with him or her. Consequently, this unfairness is narrated as the premise for student resistance: 'I started to scream (…) just like "Why can't y'all sometimes look what they do, that it's totally not always me that's guilty in all this"' (line 6). Here the peers are positioned as both offenders (making the narrator a scapegoat, line 23) and witnesses of the strife (who 'laughed' at the narrator agitated by the experienced teacher injustice, line 24). Their positioning emphasises the narrator's longing for equity and justice.

3.5. Narratives of teachers' understanding behaviour

1	In primary school when they [the teachers] didn't even know what ADHD is
2	and I was always playing with some pen or rubber on my desk and they complained about it
3	'cause there came some noise
4	but then later [in secondary school] in special ed[ucation]
5	the teacher knew that it like made things easier
6	he/she didn't say nothing.
7	It sometimes got a bit too crazy
8	when everybody started getting all hyper in class
9	but then the teacher was real good at getting us to like stop
10	saying let's go maybe play some basketball for like 15 min
11	that calmed us down and then we went back inside.
12	They were like the best ones I'd had
13	those secondary school teachers
14	they could relate to us in a totally different way
15	like in the totally right way
16	who knows, it's like they would have had ADHD too.
17	They knew how to really relate.

Pete provided the only positive narrative of teacher reactive CRM strategies. His narrative emphasises the importance of the teacher's knowledge of ADHD and her/his stance towards the student being diagnosed, with teachers' general unawareness of ADHD-related behaviour claimed to lead teachers to regard the narrator as a nuisance (lines 1–3). The turning-point in this narrative is the special education placement: the special education teachers are positioned as the heroes of the story who are described as possessing completely different values and practices from those of mainstream class teachers. This is shown by the extreme expressions contrasting the two: 'They could relate to us in a totally different way like in the totally right way' (lines 14–15). As regards ADHD, the comparative nature of the assessments of the teachers emphasises the interrelatedness of teachers' knowledge of disability and their understanding practices.

Thus, in this narrative, the student positions himself as being able to behave accordingly when the teachers as experts flexibly adjust the requirements of classroom practices to coincide with students' readiness to achieve what is expected (lines 5–13). Similarly, teachers are eventually respected for the empathic and understanding stance that they show towards students (note the positioning of part of the class through the use of the pronoun 'us'). The depth of teachers' narrated understanding and so called street credibility becomes evident by positioning teachers in a similar experiential reality to that of the narrator and by constructing the diagnostic term of ADHD as an imaginary common denominator between the teachers and the narrator ('Who knows, it's like they would have had ADHD too'; 'They knew how to really relate', lines 16–17).

4. Discussion

This study has examined narratives about teachers' reactive CRM strategies as provided by 13 Finnish adolescents diagnosed with ADHD. Five narrative types with different emphases have been identified and, except for one, all of them involve a negative evaluation of teacher conduct. The findings are summarised below in Table 1.

The dominant storyline involved the construction of the narrator's classroom misbehaviour as minor or contingent upon the disproportion of teacher action or reaction (verbal abuse, punishments, exclusion, etc.), identified as coercive in previous literature (e.g., Lewis, 2001; Roache & Lewis, 2011b). By shifting the focus from their own behaviour to that of their teachers, the narrators evaluated teachers' actions in relation to the role expectations of what it should mean to be an adult/teacher educating a child/student. The perceived failure of teachers to live up to these expectations was constructed to provoke, legitimise and account for the narrators' so-called misbehaviour. Thus, even if the narrators sometimes admitted the socially questionable nature of their behaviour, it could not be held against them because, in theory at least, it was within their normative rights, both as children (to be raised and empathically guided by adults acting as adults) and as students (to be involved in more open and respectful reciprocal interactions with teachers). These findings lean towards the interpretation that coercive teacher strategies promote misbehaviour (Lewis, 2001; Lewis et al., 2008; Roache & Lewis, 2011a). Additionally, narrating teachers' wrongful reactive classroom management strategies were considered to be 'moral work' (see Drew, 1998, p. 259) and to preserve adolescents' face concerning unwanted behaviour in the interview situation. On the assumption that both the diagnostic label of ADHD and just being a student embody a plethora of sociocultural fallacies, these *cover stories* (Clandinin & Connelly, 1996) enabled narrators to re-construct their narrative identities and to free them from enemy images of malicious youth rebelling against adults (see also Archakis, 2012).

The way that students positioned themselves in their narratives can be divided into two main types of student reaction: *resistance* or *submission*. Rather than the student–teacher relationship, these promoted its associated power struggle. Resistance appeared clearly in the narrative types of the disproportionate and traumatising sanctions of the teacher. In the former narrative, narrators constructed resistance as the only remaining source of self-actualisation for students owing to the teachers' unconstructive stance and practices. In the latter, submission was played out of necessity in order to break free and thus to resist. These findings resonate with those of Evaldsson (2014) regarding resisting teacher authority as a means to display agency in classroom practices (see Priyadharshini, 2011). There is also a point of resemblance to Glasser's (1996, 1997) theory of choice, which emphasises that individuals control their own behaviour and are willing to comply only if their needs are met. Instead, in the narratives of neglect and unfair sanctions, submission became evident in the ways in which young people positioned themselves as being victimised, abandoned or intimidated in relation to teacher action. In these narratives, including that of traumatising, the fragility experienced was relived through the narration of the long-lasting emotional (grief, shame, etc.) and social (exclusion, stigma, etc.) consequences teacher that conduct had for them. Third, a *receptive* form of reaction occurred in the narrative of teachers' understanding behaviour. This was the most passive characterisation of the narrator's own behaviour, in which the narrator's role was expressed as content conformation to teacher reactive strategies rather than as active collaboration, which was longed for in the negative narrative types.

In addition to teacher–student relationships', constructive peer relationships and the teacher's expected role as enabling and protecting such relationships became accentuated by focussing on the student's voice. The ways that peers became positioned as affecting incidents and the ways that the narrators reflected the negative social and emotional outcomes of the narrated stories on peers, call for affinity and solidarity in the classroom. Thus, as important as it is to pay attention to how individual disruptive behaviour affects the classroom community (see, e.g., Cothran et al., 2009), it is also important with regard to how the community affects the individual. This is one premise of promising class-wide positive-behaviour support interventions (see, e.g., Närhi, Kiiski, Peitso, & Savolainen, 2014) and of creating democratic school culture (see Lewis & Burman, 2008; Thornberg, 2009). Thus, instead of facilitating peers to discipline or otherwise to fortify the exclusionary ideal-

Table 1
The summary of results.

Narrative of teacher conduct	Teacher in relation to expectations	Position of self	Social consequences	Main needs expressed
Disproportionate	Fails to promote respect	Resistant	Disbelief in educational authorities	Respect, Equity, Conformity
Unfair	Fails to promote justice	Stigmatized	Stigma	Justice, Affinity
Neglectful	Fails to promote educational care and nurturing	Abandoned	Exclusion	Help, Guidance, Caring
Traumatizing	Fails to promote emotional and social safety	Intimidated	Opt-out from peer activities	Physical and social integrity
Understanding	Promotes individuality	Grateful	Self-fulfilment	Acceptance, Understanding

deviant dichotomy in the classroom (Hempel-Jorgensen, 2009), it becomes essential to facilitate the sensation of affinity, of belonging and of wanting to be a part of the whole.

It is noteworthy that ADHD played a minimal significance in these spontaneous narratives and, moreover, that it played no role in narrating the narrators' own behaviour. In fact, ADHD was referred to only twice, once in the context of being unjustly treated (i.e., stigma) in the narratives of unfair sanctions (see also Singh et al., 2010) and another time as teachers' interpretation frame for student actions in the narratives of teachers' understanding behaviour. From the narrative viewpoint, ADHD thus stood out in student experiences only with regard to their evaluation of teacher behaviour. These narratives accentuate the social and interactional nature of classroom misbehaviour and question potentially predetermined and straightforward moral assumptions about ADHD symptoms (c.f., Hughes, 2007). For instance, narrated emotional outbursts typically associated with manifesting the impulsivity condition of ADHD were constructed as relationship- and interaction-related, not as psychopathology-related.

To conclude, adding to the literature that has identified preferable teacher CRM strategies, this study sheds light upon *the nature of interaction*, beyond (or at the core of) the execution of various strategies. The way that teacher misconduct was evaluated as a legitimate premise for protesting for students' rights, needs and identity reconstructs the *culture of blame* in which the narrators were socialised. Students and teachers positing each other as the antagonists of stories of classroom management by invoking sociocultural role and norm expectations do not, however, bring about solutions for CRM; on the contrary, this only strengthens the culture of blame. To escape from this, it is necessary to recognise and to become conscious of both students' and teachers' basic human needs, needs that cry out to be acknowledged and fulfilled in everyday interactions without reciprocal normative condemnation in the practices of the other party (Rosenberg, 2003, chap. 2). Following Rosenberg (2003, chap. 2), needs are not discordant with one another but instead imply strategies to meet them by means of varying CRM approaches (see also Roache, 2009). In order to become conscious of each party's individual needs, future research on CRM issues and ADHD would benefit tremendously from studying video observations of natural everyday classroom interaction, so that both student and teacher viewpoints and experiences could be voiced. This could deepen the dialogue between teachers and students, as both parties could have access to each other's experiences and interpretations as afforded by the same (objective) observation.

Acknowledgements

We express our gratitude to Professor Mark Stoner and Research coordinator Anna Rytivaara, PhD, for their valuable feedback on this paper.

References

Advokat, C., Lane, S. M., & Luo, C. (2011). College students with and without ADHD: comparison of self-report of medication usage, study habits, and academic achievement. *Journal of Attention Disorders, 15*(8), 656–666. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1087054710371168.

Anderson, D., Watt, S., Noble, W., & Shanley, D. (2012). Knowledge of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and attitudes toward teaching children with ADHD: the role of teaching experience. *Psychology in the Schools, 49*, 511–525. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.v49.6.

Archakis, A. (2012). Doing indiscipline in narrative performances. How Greek students present themselves disobeying their teachers. *Narrative Inquiry, 22*(2), 287–306. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/ni.22.2.05arg.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (pp. 60–103). Austin: Texas University Press.

Baloglu, N. (2009). Negative behaviour of teachers with regard to high school students in classroom settings. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 36*(1), 69–78.

Banfield, S. R., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (2006). The effect of teacher misbehaviors on teacher credibility and affect for the teacher. *Communication Education, 55*(1), 63–72.

Björn, P. M., Aro, M., Koponen, T., Fuchs, L., & Fuchs, D. (2015). The many faces of special education within RTI frameworks in the United States and Finland. *Learning Disability Quarterly*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0731948715594787. Advance publication.

Brockmeier, J. (2004). What makes a story coherent? In A. U. Branco, & J. Valsiner (Eds.), *Communication and metacommunication in human development* (pp. 285–306). Greenwich: Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Bru, E. (2009). Academic outcomes in school classes with markedly disruptive pupils. *Social Psychology of Education, 12*(4), 461–479. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11218-009-9095-1.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1996). Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes: teacher stories—stories of teachers—school stories—stories of schools. *Educational Researcher, 25*(3), 24–30.

Clandinin, D. J., Huber, J., Huber, M., Murphy, M. S., Murray Orr, A., Pearce, M., et al. (2006). *Composing diverse identities: Narrative inquiries into the interwoven lives of children and teachers*. London/NewYork: Routledge (Chapter 6).

Clunies-Ross, P., Little, E., & Kienhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and their relationship with teacher stress and student behaviour. *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology, 28*(6), 693–710.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative. *Educational Researcher, 19*(5), 2–14.

Cooper, P., & Shea, T. (1998). Pupil's perceptions of AD/HD. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 3*(3), 36–48.

Cothran, D. J., Kulinna, P. H., & Garrahy, D. A. (2009). Attributions for and consequences of student misbehavior. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 14*(2), 155–167.

Crundwell, R. M. A. (2005). An initial investigation of the impact of self-regulation and emotionality on behavior problems in children with ADHD. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 20*(1/2), 62–74.

Drew, P. (1998). Complaints about transgressions and misconduct. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 31*(3–4), 295–325.

DuPaul, G. J., & Weyandt, L. L. (2006). School-based intervention for children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: effects on academic, social and behavioral functioning. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 53*(2), 161–176.

Eisenberg, D., & Schneider, H. (2007). Perceptions of academic skills of children diagnosed with ADHD. *Journal of Attention Disorders, 10*(4), 390–397. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1087054706292105.

Evaldsson, A.-C. (2014). Doing being boys with ADHD. Category memberships and differences in SEN classroom practices. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 19*(3), 266–283.

Gable, R., Hester, P., Rock, M., & Hughes, K. (2009). Back to basics: rules, praise, ignoring, and reprimands revisited. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 44*(4), 195–205.

Gallichan, D. J., & Curle, C. (2008). Fitting square pegs into round holes: the challenge of coping with Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 13*(3), 343–363.

Glasser, W. (1996). Then and now: the theory of choice. *Learning, 25*(3), 20–22.

Glasser, W. (1997). A new look at school failure and school success. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 78*(8), 596–602.

Graham, L. J., & Jahnukainen, M. (2011). Wherefore art thou, inclusion? Analysing the development of inclusive education in New South Wales, Finland and Alberta. *Journal of Education Policy, 26*(2), 263–288.

Greene, R. W., Beszterczey, S. K., Katzenstein, T., Park, K., & Goring, J. (2002). Are students with ADHD more stressful to teach?: patterns of teacher stress in an elementary school sample. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 10*, 79–89.

Gregory, A., & Ripski, M. (2008). Adolescent trust in teachers: implications for behaviour in the high school classroom. *Social Psychology Review, 37*(3), 337–353.

Hempel-Jorgensen, A. (2009). The construction of the 'ideal pupil' and pupils' perceptions of 'misbehaviour' and discipline: contrasting experiences from a low-socio-economic and a high-socio-economic primary school. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 30*(4), 435–448.

Hoffman, K. D., & Lee, S. H. (2014). A CIT investigation of disruptive student behaviors: the students' perspective. *Marketing Education Review, 24*(2), 115–126.

Hollway, W., & Jefferson, T. (2008). The free association narrative interview method. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 296–315). Sevenoaks, California: Sage.

Honkasilta, J., Sandberg, E., Närhi, V., & Jahnukainen, M. (2014). ADHD in the context of Finnish basic education. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 19*(3), 311–323.

Hughes, L. (2007). The reality of living with AD/HD: children's concern about educational and medical support. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 12*(1), 69–80. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13632750601135915.

Infantino, J., & Little, E. (2005). Students' perceptions of classroom behaviour problems and the effectiveness of different disciplinary methods. *Educational Psychology, 25*(5), 491–508.

Itkonen, T., & Jahnukainen, M. (2010). Disability or learning difficulty? Politicians or educators? Constructing special education in Finland and the United States.

Comparative Sociology, 9(2), 182–201.
Kendall, R. N., Hatton, D., Beckett, A., & Leo, M. (2003). Children's accounts of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Advances in Nursing Science, 26*(2), 114–130.
Kent, K. M., Pelham, W. E., Jr., Molina, B. S., Sibley, M. H., Waschbusch, D. A., Yu, J., et al. (2011). The academic experience of male high school students with ADHD. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 39*(3), 451–462. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10802-010-9472-4.
Kos, J. M., Richdale, A. L., & Hay, D. A. (2006). Children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and their teachers: a review of the literature. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 53*(2), 147–160. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10349120600716125.
Kulinna, P. H. (2007-2008). Teachers' attributions and strategies for student misbehavior. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 42*(2), 21–30.
Lewis, R. (2001). Classroom discipline and student responsibility: the students' view. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(3), 307–319.
Lewis, R., & Burman, E. (2008). Providing for student voice in classroom management: teachers' views. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 12*(2), 151–167.
Lewis, R., Romi, S., Katz, Y., & Qui, X. (2008). Students' reaction to classroom discipline in Australia, Israel, and China. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(3), 715–724.
Lewis, R., Romi, S., Qui, X., & Katz, Y. J. (2005). Teachers' classroom discipline in Australia, China and Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(6), 729–741.
Little, S. G., & Akin-Little, A. (2008). Psychology's contributions to classroom management. *Psychology in the Schools, 45*(3), 227–234. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.20293.
Loe, I. M., & Feldman, H. M. (2007). Academic and educational outcomes of children with ADHD. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 32*(6), 643–654. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jpepsy/jsl054.
Mavropoulou, S., & Padeliadu, S. (2002). Teachers' causal attributions for behaviour problems in relation to perceptions of control. *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology, 22*(2), 191–202. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01443410120115256.
Miller, A., Ferguson, E., & Byrne, I. (2000). Pupils' causal attributions for difficult classroom behaviour. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 70*(1), 85–96.
Moen, D., Davies, T., & Dykstra, D. V. (2010). Student perceptions of instructor classroom management practices. *College Teaching Methods & Styles Journal, 6*(1), 21–32.
Närhi, V., Kiiski, T., Peitso, S., & Savolainen, H. (2014). Reducing disruptive behaviours and improving learning climates with class-wide positive behaviour support in middle schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.986913. Advance publication.
Ohan, J. L., Cormier, N., Hepp, S. L., Visser, T. A. W., & Strain, M. C. (2008). Does knowledge about attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder impact teachers' reported behaviors and perceptions? *School Psychology Quarterly, 23*(3), 436–449.
Ohan, J. L., Visser, T. A. W., Strain, M. C., & Allen, L. (2011). Teachers' and education students' perceptions of and reactions to children with and without the diagnostic label "ADHD". *Journal of School Psychology, 49*(1), 81–105.
Paaso, E., Uusiautti, S., & Määttä, K. (2013). "Peace to learn"— A discourse analysis of pupils' perceptions. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 48*(1), 16–27.
Pinnegar, S., & Hamilton, M. L. (2011). How is story research in teacher education? In J. Kitchen, D. C. Parker, & D. Pushor (Eds.), *Narrative inquiries into curriculum making in teacher education* (pp. 43–70). Bingley, UK: Emerald Books.
Polanczyk, G., de Lima, M. S., Horta, B. L., Biederman, J., & Rohde, L. A. (2007). The worldwide prevalence of ADHD: a systematic review and metaregression analysis. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 164*(6), 942–948. http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/ajp.2007.164.6.942.
Polanczyk, G., Salum, G., Sugaya, L., Caye, A., & Rohde, L. (2015). Annual research review: a meta-analysis of the worldwide prevalence of mental disorders in children and adolescents. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 56*(3), 345–365. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12381.
Polanyi, L. (1989). *Telling the American story: A structural and cultural analysis of conversational storytelling*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex (Chapter 1).
Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 8*(1), 5–23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0951839950080103.
Poulou, M., & Norwich, B. (2000). Teachers' causal attributions, cognitive, emotional and behavioural responses to students with emotional and behavioural difficulties. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 70*(4), 559–582.
Priyadharshini, E. (2011). Counter narratives in 'naughty' students' accounts: challenges for the discourse of behaviour management. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 32*(1), 113–129. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2011.537078.
Prosser, B. J. (2008). Beyond ADHD: a consideration of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and pedagogy in Australian schools. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 12*(1), 81–97. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603110701683147.
Ricoeur, P. (1988). *Time and narrative*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press (Chapter 3).
Roache, J. (2009). The vicious circle of middle years classroom management. *Professional Voice, 6*(3), 39–44.
Roache, J. E., & Lewis, R. (2011a). The carrot, the stick, or the relationship: what are the effective disciplinary strategies? *European Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(2), 233–248. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2010.542586.
Roache, J., & Lewis, R. (2011b). Teachers' views on the impact of classroom management on student responsibility. *Australian Journal of Education November, 55*(2), 132–146. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/000494411105500204.
Romi, S., Lewis, R., & Katz, Y. J. (2009). Student responsibility and classroom discipline in Australia, China, and Israel. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 39*(4), 439–453. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057920802315916.
Romi, S., Lewis, R., Roache, J., & Riley, P. (2011). The impact of teachers' aggressive management techniques on students' attitudes to schoolwork. *The Journal of Educational Research, 104*(4), 231–240. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220671003719004.
Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher-student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: a meta-analytic approach. *Review of Educational Research, 81*(4), 493–529.
Rosenberg, M. B. (2003). *Life-enriching education. Nonviolent communication helps schools improve performance, reduce conflict, and enhance relationships*. Encinitas, CA: Puddle Dancer Press (Chapter 2).
Safran, S., & Oswald, K. (2003). Positive behaviour supports: can schools reshape disciplinary practices? *Council for Exceptional Children, 69*(3), 361–373.
Scholtens, S., Rydell, A. M., & Yang-Wallentin, F. (2013). ADHD symptoms, academic achievement, self-perception of academic competence and future orientation: a longitudinal study. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 54*(3), 205–212.
Seidman, A. (2005). The learning killer: disruptive student behavior in the classroom. *Reading Improvement, 42*(1), 40–46.
Singh, I. (2011). A disorder of anger and aggression: children's perspectives on attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder in the UK. *Social Science & Medicine, 73*(6), 889–896.
Singh, I. (2013). Brain talk: power and negotiation in children's discourse about self, brain and behaviour. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 35*(6), 813–827. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9566.2012.01531.x.
Singh, I., Kendall, T., Taylor, C., Mears, A., Hollis, C., Batty, M., et al. (2010). Young people's experience of ADHD and stimulant medication: a qualitative study for the NICE guideline. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 15*(4), 186–192. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-3588.2010.00565.x.
Spilt, J. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., & Thijs, J. T. (2011). Teacher wellbeing: the importance of teacher–student relationships. *Educational Psychology Review, 23*(4), 457–477.
Thornberg, R. (2009). Rules in everyday school life: teacher strategies undermine pupil participation. *The International Journal of Children's Rights, 17*(3), 393–413.
Thweatt, K. S., & McCroskey, J. C. (1998). The impact of teacher immediacy and misbehaviors on teacher credibility. *Communication Education, 47*, 348–358.
Tirri, K., & Puolimatka, T. (2000). Teacher authority in schools: a case study from Finland. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy, 26*(2), 157–165.
Travell, C., & Visser, J. (2007). 'ADHD does bad stuff to you': young people's and parents' experiences and perceptions of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 11*(3), 205–216.
Wentzel, K. R. (2002). Are effective teachers like good parents? Teaching styles and student adjustment in early adolescence. *Child Development, 73*(1), 287–301.
Wetherell, M. (2001). Debates in discourse research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 380–399). London: Sage.