



# An Examination of Oppositional Student Behavior Against School Norms in the Context of Erving Goffman's Theory of Stigma

Research Article

Taner ATMACA<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Duzce University, Faculty of Education, Department of Basic Education, Duzce, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0001-9157-3100

**To cite this article:** Atmaca, T. (2020). An Examination of Oppositional Student Behavior Against School Norms in the Context of Erving Goffman's Theory of Stigma, *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 12(1), 112-129.

## ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 16.10.2019

Available online:  
04.03.2020

## ABSTRACT

The primary objective of this study is to examine student behavior characterized as either "abnormal" or "deviant" according to school norms in the context of Erving Goffman's theory of stigma. The main focus of the study is to determine whether or not individuals who, as a result of exhibiting deviant behavior in school outside of certain behavior patterns regarded as acceptable and not measuring up to a desired behavioral standard, have been labeled and stigmatized by both their teachers and their peers as possessing a 'spoiled identity' are inclined to continue these behaviors as a result of having been stigmatized in this manner. This study was designed in accordance with the principles of qualitative research design, structured as a case study, and completed using the deviant case sampling method. The participant in the study was one (1) 11th grade student who was enrolled in a vocational high school for underachieving students in Sultangazi, a high-poverty district located in the periphery of the Istanbul metropolitan area. The participant had been branded as a troublemaker and stigmatized by his teachers and peers as a result of both his physical appearance and his behavior. The data found in the study was gathered during the 2018-2019 academic year in three stages. The research findings revealed that the student had internalized the label 'mafya' [literally meaning 'mafia' in Turkish but more accurately translated as 'thug'] that had been affixed to him and sought to engage in behavioral patterns that would warrant this label more and more frequently. In other words, the label applied to this student turned into a self-fulfilling prophecy.

© 2020 IOJES. All rights reserved

### Keywords:

Goffman, Stigmatization, School Norms, Stigma, Deviance/Deviant

## Introduction

Erving Goffman's works left an indelible mark on sociology, and he is widely regarded as one of the most important sociologists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Goffman worked studiously on categorizing individuals in society and also on *how* the individuals in these societies create virtual social identities. He was also an

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author's address: Düzce Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi A Blok 205 Nolu Oda (Duzce University Faculty of Education A Block Room Number: 205, Düzce-Turkey)  
Telephone: +903805421100-2457  
e-mail: taneratmaca@duzce.edu.tr  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2020.01.007>

important exponent of what is termed symbolic interactionism theory; this theory rests on ideas and concepts created by what is generally now known as the Chicago sociological tradition or Chicago school and is built on the field of microsociology, a field concerned with the nature of life experiences and everyday social interaction between and among individuals and how to study these interactions and experiences. Goffman asserted that the ways in which these so-called actors in social spaces represent themselves in daily life are far from trivial or ordinary; rather, they are actions which arise from deep within and are influenced by interactions (Orhan, 2018).

Goffman, who played a significant role in the symbolic interactionism school of thought, conceived of society as a place where 'actors' or 'performers' assume roles. He defined the various places in which our daily life takes place as stages and noted that actions performed and roles assumed by the same person differ greatly depending on both the time and place. Goffman was the first to adapt the term 'dramaturgy' from theater into sociology to describe these actions; put another way, it is the idea that daily life experiences are essentially comprised of roles forced upon actors by social rules and norms. This dramaturgic approach further posits that daily life is constructed upon an artifice or a fiction and every action taken is simply a role being performed (Coser, 2012). As De Certeau (2009) stated, many habits, attitudes, and behaviors are thus developed in a tactical manner in everyday life.

Goffman concentrated most of his time and effort on both the presentation of the self in everyday life and on stigmatization. He characterized the ways in which actors present themselves and their actions in everyday life, the ways in which they attempt to manage and control other people's impressions of them, and the behaviors they exhibit in front of different people in different times and places (the 'masks' they assume) as 'the presentation of the self' (Goffman, 2016). In his role theory, developed to explain actors' day-to-day interactions and interaction rituals, Goffman also put forth the idea that every individual is preoccupied with presenting his or her own (idealized) image to an audience (Hülür, 2017). Stigmatization is therefore a way to describe the process in which people attempt to discredit, label, and 'spoil' the appearance and/or behavior of individuals who, according to the norms of a society, possess an unusual or unconventional appearance or who exhibit peculiar behavior (Goffman, 2014).

In his works, Goffman described three different types of stigma. The first type is physical stigma; this includes physical deformities and abnormalities in appearance. The second type is stigma of character traits: a weak will, domineering or unnatural tendencies, rigid beliefs, and behavioral issues are often included in this type. The third type is stigma of group traits, with race, religion/religious beliefs, and ethnicity being the most common. Stigmas involve epithets and labels being applied to a difference which is not welcomed and indeed often actively discredited by a society; while they can sometimes lead us to understand why certain behaviors are accepted or rejected by society, they can also cause us to simply generate an array of flaws and defects stemming from one single flaw (Goffman, 2014). In addition, there are actors who do *not* exhibit behavioral patterns expected from individuals in a society and who conceive of their own situation and behavior as normal; they often assert that everyone (the audience/spectators) except for themselves is actually abnormal. In other words, the person is stigmatized but does not feel any regret or remorse (Goffman, 2014).

An individual becomes discredited by other people and society through various stigmas as a result of the differences they possess or unwanted behavior that they exhibit in their everyday life. In particular, when organizations who expect their members to follow specific, codified, and acceptable institutional norms and behavioral patterns see any differences, they identify these differences as a type of deviance and even stigmatize these people with various names. Foucault characterized this situation as a projection or reflection of power tasked with discipline, control, and surveillance, all of which pervade modern power structures. One of these institutions, school, strives to create 'disciplinized' and normalized individuals. In this way, schools

take on roles and duties which represent power including surveillance, control, and dominance. (Demir, 2009; Şentürk and Turan, 2012).

It is always possible for places which have crowds of people like schools, prisons, and military camps to contain people who are not there of their own free will and who exhibit behavior designed to disrupt the existing system. When certain negative behaviors exhibited by students are categorized as deviant, the system attempts to normalize students within the bounds of disciplinary norms. If and when the students resist these attempts, this resistance creates a stalemate where both parties are fighting against the other. This sort of situation is more often seen with individuals who are academically low-achieving and who have low expectations regarding school. In schools where academically low-achieving students attend or have been otherwise forced to continue their education, students are not afraid of authority or school authority figures. Students who fit this profile react strongly and reflexively against authority figures (a hallmark of all schools) who control their behavior in school in such a way that it conflicts with their freedom outside the school. This situation is, for the most part, valid for students who do not believe that school provides them with useful information (Hurn, 2018).

This is the point where Goffman's theory of stigma comes into play; student behaviors which do not conform to the accepted behavioral patterns that square with school roles and duties are categorized and often stigmatized by the school administrators and teachers who represent authority. It is highly likely that students who cannot distinguish themselves academically and who cannot exhibit behavioral patterns that line up with school expectations will behave in a way that suppresses and minimizes their inability to meet these expectations and, in turn, become exposed to stigmatization. According to Goffman (2014), this is one of the common tactics employed by individuals to legitimize their stigma and justify their inability to accomplish something due to various reasons; that is to say, they become more likely to attempt to pursue secondary gains.

### **School Norms and Stigmatization**

Schools are hierarchical institutions which are managed according to specified rules and norms. Every school is affected by the culture of the social environment it contains; the students who come from this environment, their social lives, and their tendencies to follow social norms and rules outside of school can determine their tendencies to follow in-school norms and rules as well. Not conforming to these norms is regarded as abnormal behavior. Goffman even notes that the refusal to conform is stigmatized as deviance or immorality (2014).

In schools with academically low-achieving students, there is a high likelihood that students who do not have high expectations regarding their academic prospects and who continuously exhibit behavior that is not regarded as normal by teachers and school administrators will be stigmatized precisely *because* of these behavioral patterns. These stigmas, while generally intended to embarrass and denigrate the students, can sometimes have the opposite effect. However much the teachers who represent authority intend for the stigma to disgrace and have negative social implications for the student, the stigma may actually turn into a badge of pride or honor for the student depending on the social environment in which he or she is stigmatized. For example, in a social environment where acts of violence are commonplace and considered normal, stigmatizing a student who engages in such behavior will not be overly disgraceful or defamatory for them; however, the same stigma might be seen as quite shameful for a student in a different social environment. As such, the culture of the social environment the student finds him or herself in has a major effect on the meanings attributed to certain stigmas.

Stigmatizing a student in school can be interpreted as a way of creating a barrier against him or her; it also lays the groundwork for directing other people to behave toward the stigmatized student in a specific manner. After the student has been placed into a specific category and the student has been judged based on stereotypes related to that category, the stigma starts to determine the image of that student in the minds of others. According to Goffman (2014), if a student possesses a trait or personal quality that is visible and ripe for stigmatization, he or she will be exposed to many types of stigmatization in his or her social environment including ridicule, taunting, exclusion, and fighting from the very first day of school onwards. However, stigmas related to behavior are often applied to individuals who, over the course of time and often in the midst of puberty, rebel against specified school norms and become a part of what are known as counter-school or anti-school cultures. Stigmatization can, then, trigger criminality, latent criminal tendencies, and a feeling of satisfaction or gratification regarding these behaviors (Mahoney, 1974); this is because stigmatization speeds up an individual's process of creating abnormal identities (Byrne, 2001).

As behaviors thought to be undesirable and contrary to an institution's norms start to be seen more frequently and exhibited by a specific person, stigmatization evolves into the process of scapegoating (Shoham, 1970). Even if the stigmatized person doesn't exhibit undesirable behaviors, offenses and transgressions that have become associated with that person's name implicate them in a sort of criminal complicity. In Tannenbaum's (1938) words, the malice of these sorts of actions paves the way for the person themselves to be stigmatized as being malicious. There is also a high probability that an individual who has been stigmatized once due to negative or undesirable actions will continually be associated with those actions (Dursun, 1997). According to Becker, constantly reiterating a stigma can turn into a sort of self-fulfilling prophecy (2017). Tannenbaum (1938) notes that continually emphasizing an individual's fault(s) and reminding an individual of their stigmatization is an attempt to ostracize and shame that individual.

### **Stigmatization and Deviant Behavior**

Over the course of time, many different sociological theories have proposed a link between various factors and deviant or criminal behavior. One of these theories is the idea that social deviants are individuals who, depending on how they have been stigmatized, exhibit behavior that defies and violates social norms and rules accepted by their social environment. There are some unique aspects of this theory which have been listed below (Bakacak; 2002; Goode, 1994).

*Relativity:* The meanings attributed to people's behavior(s) differ from culture to culture and from society to society. An action that is defined as deviant in one culture or society might be seen as normal in another. As an example, Goffman (2014) notes that for some groups, going to the library is seen as something to be ashamed of while for others, it is a source of pride.

*Audience:* There needs to be an audience in order for stigmatization to exist; it cannot exist otherwise. Even if the audience does not see a deviant action, people can still find out about it through word-of-mouth.

*Stigmatization:* Also known as labelling, stigmatization consists of two distinct stages: the action stage and the actual stigmatization stage. If an action is characterized as deviating from certain norms, then the person who performed that action is vulnerable to stigmatization. The stigma is now a mark (or stain) on the person and they now possess a spoiled identity; as a result of the stigma, they start the process of rebuilding their identity *around* that stigma.

*Probability:* The lower the social status of the person exhibiting deviant behavior, the higher the probability that they will be stigmatized. In addition, secondary characteristics such as sex, age, race, physical traits etc. can also increase the probability of stigmatization.

Braithwaite (1989) explained the effects of stigmatization on the cessation or continuation of deviant behavior by using shame as a foundational concept. He posited that there were two types of shame: disintegrative shame and reintegrative shame. The first type carries the possibility of reinforcing or even increasing deviant and criminal behavior while the second plays a role in reintegrating the individual with society. Bauman, another writer on this topic, concluded that the idea of an “excess of order” imposed by modernity stigmatizes everyone who rebels against this order as the ‘other’ or as a threat (Bakacak, 2002; Bauman, 2019). Becker, on the other hand, sees deviance as a sort of attack on norms and argues that societal groups give rise to deviance by stigmatizing individuals who behave contrary to established rules and norms. Put another way, Becker notes the tendency of those who have power and dominion in a certain area to label and stigmatize those who step outside the lines (that the group in power has defined) as “others”, as deviant behavior is behavior which has been discredited by society (Becker, 1963).

According to another argument put forth by Becker, an individual who strays from norms will be regarded as having a deviant identity, and this will necessarily change the image of their social identity as well. In time, a stigma applied to an individual will take the place of their real identity, and the individual starts to accept the attributes of the stigma attached to him or herself; this situation leads to further deviant behaviors or even criminal behavior. The stigmatized individual is branded as a deviant, and the people around him or her act and react accordingly (Becker, 1963). In this study, it is aimed to examine the student behaviors which are regarded as deviant and done by student who is stigmatized by their teachers and friends.

## Methods

### Research Model

This study was designed as a holistic single-case study, a type of qualitative research design. In this type of design, various factors related to a single case (environments, individuals, events, processes etc.) are researched thoroughly with a holistic approach, and research is centered upon how these factors affect a specific case and/or situation. Holistic single-case study design is one type of design used in order to test, verify, or refute various existing theories. As a rule, holistic single-case study design is preferred for *sui generis*, extreme, and/or deviant cases that stray far from normal standards (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013).

### Study Group

In this study, extreme/deviant case sampling (a purposive sampling method) was used. This method of sampling is especially useful for thorough examination of unique phenomena or for bringing different aspects of novel or unconventional situations to light. This study was carried out with a single student; the student in question was an 11<sup>th</sup> grade student who was enrolled in a vocational high school for underachieving students in the Sultangazi district of Istanbul. The student has five siblings, and his mother and father are both elementary school graduates. The family has been living in Sultangazi for approximately 20 years. His mother is a homemaker, and his father is a textile worker; their monthly income is approximately equal to the Turkish minimum wage. Before the student in question was chosen, preliminary information from teachers and the school administration regarding students who appeared most frequently in disciplinary infractions, investigations, and write-ups was obtained. In order to verify the information, students from different classes were asked questions about who was most likely to be behind any trouble or misconduct in the school or be linked to these types of events; the results all pointed to the same person.

After the veracity of the information was confirmed, the student’s teachers and peers were asked questions about whether there were any existing labels or stigmas attached to or associated with this student. The answers obtained indicated that due to the student’s physical appearance, he was called “Cemal the Arab” or “thug”; “thug” was especially common among his peers. As a result of both his exhibition of behavior

contrary to school norms and rules and his involvement in a large number of disciplinary infractions, the student had been stigmatized by both his teachers and his schoolmates and was thus an appropriate candidate to participate in this study.

### **Data Collection Tool**

A semi-structured interview form was utilized in this study. The existing body of literature was scrutinized and a form was created in accordance with the first-hand information obtained from studies which examined the relationship between stigmatization and crime or which were thought to be directly related to the act of stigmatization. Subsequently, the question form was sent to two academics who had worked in this specific area of research, and, after performing the necessary corrections and deletions, the form was ready for use.

### **Data Collection**

The data in this study was collected in three distinct stages. The first stage started after identifying the student who was to take part in the study. A 40-minute pre-interview was held in March 2019 with the student in question; both direct and oblique questioning was used in order to determine whether or not this was a case of true stigmatization. After learning that this was indeed the case from the student himself, the aim of the study was explained. Following this, the second stage began immediately after learning his response to whether or not he was going to volunteer for the study. In the second stage, data collection commenced the following day with a focus group discussion. Although the study sample consisted of only one person, two other friends of the student who exhibited similar behavior patterns were included in this discussion. This second interview lasted approximately 45 minutes. In the third stage, the results obtained from the first stage were examined and compared with the existing body of literature. An additional interview with supplementary questions that would help to fully delineate the situation was held in April 2019, again keeping the existing body of literature in mind. The final interview was one-on-one and lasted approximately an hour.

### **Data Analysis**

Descriptive analysis was used in the analysis of the data. In Patton's (2014) words, vivid description carries the reader into the event that is being described and depicted. Descriptive analysis is an analytic technique used in this study in which a great deal of space is devoted to direct quotations and results are approached through the lens of cause-and-effect relationships in order to make the thoughts and experiences of the participants whose views are discussed as engaging as possible.

## **Findings**

In this section, findings regarding the changes in behavior that arose as a result of stigmatization and the stigmatization process of the student (the subject of the study) are discussed.

### **The Process of Stigmatization**

In order to understand the story of how the student who participated in this study came to be stigmatized by his friends and teachers, a number of questions were asked of him such as "What type of stigmas and labels have been used to define you at this school? Why do you have a bad reputation at this school, and did you have similar problems at your previous school(s)? What have you experienced and what were the events that resulted in you being stuck with this label/stigma?" At first, the student replied in this manner: *"They call me a thug. That happened in high school, in middle school I hung around with a (bad) crowd but didn't have any problems with the teachers. When I size myself up, think about what I do, I think that I talk a lot, that*

*I'm always butting in, I can't really help it. I can't accept people for who they are, can't accept anyone's weird stuff except my own. That's why I always act so stubborn."*

After examining the student's reply, it can be easily seen that the behavioral patterns the student continues to exhibit in his current school that are characterized as deviant behavior which is contrary to school norms and school rules were present in previous educational stages as well. In his self-evaluation, the student himself alludes to this fact. However, the ecosystem and culture of the student's current school create an environment where the negative behavioral patterns formed in previous educational stages are magnified and made more conspicuous instead of an environment where the student would be able to smooth out the rough edges while endeavoring to conform to school norms. In such an environment, it is evident from multiple statements that the deviant behavior(s) which allow the student to create a new living space in said environment are reinforced by a variety of approbative behaviors from both teachers and fellow students.

*I stick up for myself if someone treats me unfairly, I don't just sit there and take it. That's a problem with some of the teachers, like one time a couple days ago I got a three-day suspension after arguing with a teacher. My stomach hurt, I asked for permission to go to the bathroom. I said why don't you just let me go, and he said you think you get to decide? We went at it, he filed a formal complaint against me and they handed me a three-day suspension. He wrote everything down, said I was insulting him etc. I got a hold of it and showed him the paper, said did I say anything like that to you. He said I didn't write anything of the sort. I'm the good guy in this situation but because I'm me, I get a bad rap.*

It is believed that one of the major factors that contributed to the student becoming stigmatized was the fact that the student had made a name for himself as someone who would not hesitate to verbally or physically argue or clash with teachers and school administrators (authority figures) at the slightest provocation when faced with different types of problems and situations. By refusing to shy away from resisting authority, the student's behavior and speech was branded as contrary and deviant as he had created an image of himself in the minds of the school administration and his peers as a student who fell well short of the school's preferred 'acceptable and respectable' model student

The fact that the student had extremely low expectations of his school, essentially refused to adapt to academic life, and for the most part did not take school into account when thinking about his future affected the way he perceived and conceived of both the school and actors who represented authority. Instead of trying to understand the root cause of and get rid of the undesired behaviors created as a result of this cognitive schema, some teachers' attempts to humiliate the student by stigmatizing him created a feedback loop which, knowingly or not, contributed to the continuation of the undesired behaviors. The student's statements below can be evaluated with these facts in mind:

*It's not like I'm an angel or anything, but the teachers are the ones who make everything worse. They don't treat almost anyone else like they treat me, just a few other people who act like me. Here we are, almost ready to graduate, feeling worthless because we get humiliated so much. But you know, for example, we had another teacher, a new teacher who came this semester, never seen him before. He'd heard some bad stuff about us, but still liked us after he came to our class a few times. He said straight to my face, you aren't anything like what they told me about you.*

The statements above can be interpreted as a sign that as the student's bad reputation spread through word-of-mouth, the student was transmogrified into a malicious figure, which in turn led to all sort of prejudices being held against him. In addition, it was observed that friends and acquaintances in the same social circle as the stigmatized individual were also affected by this situation. In Goffman's words (2014:36), the spoiled aspects of a stigmatized individual's social identity lead to the other people in contact with said individual being lumped in with him or her. It follows that the student's hostile attitude in the face of offensive behavioral patterns that some teachers insisted on using when communicating with the student led to an impasse or deadlock between teacher and student.

In addition, it was observed that the teachers who behaved warmly toward the student, took him under their wing, and approached him from a perspective that had not been tainted by the mental images associated with the stigma he carried provoked very different feelings in and responses from the student. On the other hand, as a result of the degrading stigma attached to the student, there were also teachers who, despite the fact that they didn't know him, displayed adversarial approaches that reinforced the stereotypes attributed to him and caused him to continue certain negative behaviors. The student's following statement confirms the veracity of this observation:

*When something happens, none of the teachers come and talk to me, they just go and bad mouth me to the other teachers. It's gotten so bad that teachers who don't even have any classes with me think bad things about me. A teacher who I've never had a class with in my life saw me and said "oh so you're that thug". I've got a reputation alright, a bad one.*

### **Findings Regarding the Continuation of Behavior Contrary to School Norms**

The student's replies to the questions "What things changed in your life after being stigmatized?" and "How did your approach to the school and to your teachers change over time?" are discussed here in detail. It can be determined from various statements that degrading and debasing stigmas, far from convincing the student to follow school norms and rules, actually seem to have played a role in reinforcing negative behaviors and ensuring that the student continues to display these behaviors. Furthermore, some teachers' habit of making snide comments regarding the physical appearance of their students made the students more likely to foster strong negative attitudes against them. The statement below can be interpreted within this context:

*Even though we try to respect our teachers, sometimes you can't just help it, you say something. You keep quiet, you don't say anything, but everyone has a limit and so do we. But no one ever calls me over and says hey, what's going on with you man, let's talk. No one asks how I'm doing. Like for example, we've got a literature teacher, see him 8 hours a week. Every class, without fail, I get smacked. Sometimes he does it jokingly, but it hurts. He shouts and screams at us, like he's mocking us. Cusses too, venting, taking everything out on me. He makes fun of my friend's nose, says he doesn't like it. Calls another one of my friends "the head SOB". I ask my teacher why he says stuff like that, he says it amuses me. Well, it might amuse you but it doesn't amuse me. Just a few days ago he cussed at a kid right there in class, the kid opened his mouth but couldn't say anything.*

When one takes into account that students are in the middle of puberty and disadvantaged both in terms of their academic experiences and also in terms of their family's level of prosperity, it can be discerned that these types of behaviors and expressions directed at the students encourage them to reject the 'acceptable and respectable' model of student and instead work actively *against* this model. It is also apparent from the student's statements that guidance counseling services that are not student-centered, teacher approaches which lack empathy, and the absence of any sort of examination of the academic or individual/familial reasons which underlie the situations that force them to exhibit behaviors which ignore the culture of the school and school rules are major challenges. Moreover, other statements show that many teachers are inclined to develop negative cognitive schemata regarding students and approach them based on a single flaw or deficiency that they then generalize and apply to the student's character as a whole.

*We've got two teachers in the department, Ramiz and Erdem, they're solid guys. They listen to us, they care about us. Whenever something happens they're there with us, listen to our side. The other teachers just say you're lying, you're definitely lying. The way they approach us comes from the labels the other teachers gave us. They don't even say good morning, none of them ask how we are. If they reached out I'd meet them halfway. They talk about me in the other classes too. Just the other day they took the other class out on a field trip but skipped our class. My friend went and asked the vice-principal why they didn't take us on a trip too. The VP went ballistic, cussed him out, saying why should I take you on a field trip. Guess they've singled out the class too, kinda infamous now just because of me and a few of my friends. They're punishing us in a roundabout way.*



The terms and language that the student uses in relation to the teachers who approach him warmly and empathetically can be considered a reflection of the culture he is a part of. It is obvious from the respect afforded to these types of teachers that the student clearly separates them from the others; this situation can be directly correlated to the approach(es) teachers take with students. It follows that entrenched stereotypes about the student present in the other teachers' minds trigger discriminatory sentiments and are constructed not to bridge the gap between teacher and student, but to widen it. Another assertion that could be made about this approach is that it changes student patterns of behavior with respect to the school. Moreover, there is a high probability that various direct and indirect punishments and judgments heaped insultingly upon the student will also cause the other students to begin thinking more negatively about the school *and* the authority figures in the school.

The feeling of alienation that the stigmatized student experiences in relation to the school and some teachers also paves the way for the feeling to occur that, in actuality, *their* language and behavior is wrong, and his own language and behavior is actually "normal". The fact that the student has a different personality and identity both in and out of school and that he continues to engage in behavior at odds with the school culture in accordance with his stigma shows that the school ecosystem itself enables this type of behavior. The statement below clarifies this idea:

*Outside of school I'm actually a really nice guy, I just can't shake my bad rep here. The way the teachers look at me, the way they act, everything, it's all meant to punish us, to exclude us. We ask something, they don't answer, I don't even say hi anymore. I see some of them outside of school, I just want them to stay the hell away from me. But some of them I like, I saw one the other day, ran up to him and kissed his hand [a sign of respect in Turkish culture], why'd I do that, 'cause I like him.*

These statements reveal that the student's relationship with teachers also creates, in parallel, their approaches to dealing with him. Isolating and ostracizing the student because of the stigma attached to him instead of nurturing and helping him speeds up the process of the student becoming a part of counter-school culture. It was also observed that, over time, the student started to embrace statements made about him as a result of his stigmatization, see them as an indispensable part of his identity, and act in a way that would "do justice" to this conception of him. Once again, we see the situation turning into an example of a self-fulfilling prophecy. Additionally, similar to the stage analogy found in Goffman's idea of dramaturgy, two separate identities are presented and performed in two separate locations (in and out of school), and these identities are constantly created anew.

The fact that the school is populated mainly by academically weak students and that the school is not equipped to deal with or support the academic needs and experiences found in its own culture and in the culture of the neighborhood at large negatively affects its students cognitively, affectively, and behaviorally. It is evident from the student's statements that labels and stigmas intended to be denigrating and humiliating and which are expected to make the student feel ashamed of what he or she has done actually, in time, turn into a source of pride and a mark of distinction due to the effect of the culture: *But I really like the fact that I get called thug, I really like the idea that my friends and teachers know me that way, I can't lie.*

The label/stigma "thug" being applied to the student and actions intended to prove that he was worthy of the secondary identity that came out as a result of this label were both directly and indirectly instrumental in the student becoming mixed up in more and more incidents involving physical violence. The statements quoted below also indicate that the student was unable to control himself when faced with these types of incidents:

*I don't pick fights with anyone but my permanent record is a mile long. There's fighting, threats, insults, you name it, it's on my record. One of the fights happened last week, they had five six people ganging up on two. Kid is all bloodied up. I couldn't help myself, they know me. I went over, pulled the kid out. My friends thought that they*

*had been hitting me so they came over and beat the other guys up. Even though I didn't throw a punch, I got the blame. They overstepped their bounds. Last week there was another problem, outside of school. Two guys followed two girls from our school, bothered them, made them uncomfortable. We grabbed the guys and took care of the problem. We take a sort of pride in our school, its good name. These girls are like our sisters. People who don't know us don't like us, think bad things about us. But people who know us like us.*

The student's tendency to take it upon himself to fulfill certain roles and act in accordance with the stigma attached to him reinforced the legitimacy of the stigma itself. The fact that his name was linked to fights and physically violent altercations either directly or indirectly *and* the fact that this helped him make a name for himself in the school played a role in this stigma becoming a badge of honor. The school administration and teachers focused almost all of their communication and interaction efforts on this aspect of the student and his behavior, and as such, made his efforts to build an identity based on the stigmatized aspects of his personality inevitable. These statements from the student back this idea up:

*The administration doesn't do jack, they call us the three horsemen of the apocalypse. A couple days ago something went down, I went to the VP. He says to me "look at that mug, just begging for a punch". He punches me every time he sees me anyway. But he better be careful, he might catch me on a bad day and we'll see what happens then.*

Not only does this statement contain barely-concealed threats, it also presents us with important clues as to how communication occurs between stigmatized students and the school administration. The remarkably scornful and contemptuous tone and choice of words and complete lack of interest in winning the student over trigger the student's reflexive retaliatory behaviors. This situation is not limited to the school administration; some teachers also evince the same type of approach to these stigmatized students as evidenced by the statement below:

*In another class (English), sometimes there are times when I don't understand, and I say I don't understand, can you explain. He says sit down, those four will pass anyway you'll flunk out. I ask the teacher what the topic is and he says "a topic". He hasn't made any effort to win us over just 'cause I got a bad reputation. Now I just sleep through class so we don't fight. You know the classic 'slackers in the back of the class', that's us in this class. Kinda like passive resistance. Like when this teacher came in, I was looking out the window and he said I wish you had thrown yourself out there before I came in. He actually said that openly. I started to skip his class with my friends. We skip classes until our department course starts [the classes that have to do with the student's chosen vocational track]. We specifically skip his class. We go play a couple rounds of okey [a tile-based game similar to Rummikub]. When we skip the teacher is happy too, apparently he says good riddance.*

The fact that stigmatized students retaliate and strike back is thought to be a major factor that underpins teachers' negative approaches toward those students. Labeling students who strike back as the "lead instigators and source(s) of trouble" in classes and the school as a whole and both verbally and through one's actions identifying them as evil and hateful leads these students to directly and indirectly exhibit behavior contrary to school norms. Their insistence on exhibiting behavior they believe to be representative of individuals in the category they have been placed into and, due to the effects of the stigma attached to them, their assimilation into the anti-school culture becomes inescapable. The style of discourse and approaches used by the school administration and teachers in school ensure that the stigma is ever-present and constantly discussed, and this ensures that the bearer of the stigma creates an identity to fit the stigma. It can be inferred from many of the statements above that this new identity is forged under the influence of the school culture and that once the stigmatized individual starts to wear his or her stigma as a badge of honor, they tend to exhibit patterns of behavior that bring their stigma to the forefront of their life rather than hide it away.

## Results, Discussion and Suggestions

In Goffman's words, a school is a public space which contains rituals of behavior carried out on various stages including what he defined as front stage and back stage behavior. The fact that the student in question had poor academic performance and also that there were many students in the school who fit the same profile played a major role in the student becoming more inclined to become a part of the counter-school culture. As a school is a public space, it requires all stakeholders to adhere to certain norms and rules. These norms and rules, which are established based on cultural and environmental factors, are approved and accepted by some but seen as wrong and stifling by others. A person or group of people who violate a set of enforced rules or norms are classified as "reprobate" or as someone who can't be trusted to live within the scope of the rules that the others obey; this situation often leads to them being stigmatized as deviant or aberrant (Becker, 2017). However, when looked at from the opposite side, it is very likely that the person who has been stigmatized with a variety of pernicious labels harbors similar thoughts about those who judged and labeled him or her and will question the legitimacy of the authorities who stigmatized him or her in the first place (Becker, 2017).

School is, from Foucault's perspective, also a domain of power and as such incorporates surveillance as part of its very nature (Foucault, 2000). The tasks of surveillance, control, and supervision in school include using various methods to ensure those who don't follow specified norms and rules fall in line, and an assortment of sanctions and methods to help achieve this goal are found within the institution. Actors who represent power, dominion, and authority in the school not only determine school norms and rules with a variety of regulations and codes of conduct, they are also able to bend and/or interpret the rules as they see fit. The school administration and teachers naturally expect students to conform to all pre-determined rules and norms, be compliant and obedient, and generally be agreeable and amenable to following various sets of rules. This expectation is seen as reasonable as it allows the school to be run more efficiently and reach specified pedagogic objectives.

The student who took part in the study displayed a number of behaviors which were seen as not conforming to the school's formal and informal structure, and he was stigmatized as a result. This stigmatization, far from deterring the student from displaying these undesirable behaviors, actually seems to have played a role in reinforcing negative behaviors. The fact that the student was implicated in events that he did not even take part in (in addition to the fact that he was involved in many events and often behaved contrary to school norms and rules) indicates that the stigma had gained wide currency in the school. It can be inferred from the findings that the stigma attached to the student (under the influence of the culture he was a part of) transformed from a simple stigma to the acquisition of one identity at the cost of another *and* caused him to adopt new behaviors to go along with the roles necessitated by this identity. The school administration and teachers' constant verbal and behavioral feedback connected to this aspect of the student's identity also played a large part in the formation of a new identity. Goffman (2016) characterized this situation as a continuation of the showcase and stage. Taking into account the cultural codes prioritized by the environment the student lives in and the overall state of the school, it is easy to understand why the stigma that was supposed to humiliate and denigrate the student had the exact opposite effect. According to Goffman's (2014:36-37) theory, in this situation the stigmatized person often begins to think that the behavior and attitudes that he or she has been exposed to are the result of intrinsic attributes that he or she possesses.

As a result of his or her stigma, the stigmatized individual may conclude that the treatment they receive from the school administration and teachers is a type of emblematic or symbolic violence. Symbolic violence is, in Bourdieu's words, a form of violence that is both "polite and difficult to see" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2016; Özsöz, 2014; Türk, 2016). The type of language used and behaviors displayed by the teachers and school administration against the stigmatized student harbor a symbolic violence connected to the student and are

an act of dominion. These acts of dominion or domination are found, in Bourdieu's estimation, hidden behind symbolic violence. Much of the time, symbolic violence is deployed directly on bodies without using any physical force and is a crafty and insidious tool (Bourdieu, 2014:54; Çeğin and Özpolat, 2017).

Similar arguments can be found in Chul Han (2018) as well. According to Han, this new type of violence has a different topology, and as is it gradually internalized, it becomes invisible. Moreover, perpetrating violence increases the feeling of power and, as such, more violence comes to mean more power (Chul Han, 2018). Those who have been exposed to symbolic violence, however, cannot grasp the power relations as these structures are invisible, and at the same time this violence constitutes the actual source of power and authority. Symbolic violence compels the one experiencing it to be understanding and acquiesce to the one in power, and power relations take on an almost natural form that no one can question (Chul Han, 2018). The symbolic violence perpetrated on the student who was the subject of the study was mainly verbal, which in and of itself is verbal violence. According to Chul Han (2018), language, because of its diabolical (divisive, disjunctive) qualities, is both a unifier and a divider/defacer. The denigrating, humiliating, and *reifying* aspects of verbal violence contained in the language used can themselves also be classified as symbolic violence.

The student's continued production of roles to fit his stigma, teachers' continual emphasis of that particular part of the student, and their inability to bring another positive quality of his to light are all connected. Along with the reinforced, accentuated, and constructed new identity, the expectation itself that the student will create new roles that fit his new position also causes him to believe in those roles. According to Goffman, (2016) it is expected that the audience watching the role performed by an actor on the stage will believe that the character on the stage really does possess those qualities and characteristics. At the same time, it is also believed that the person's performance and stage act is put on for the sake of others. The actor has completely lost him or herself in the play and started to believe in the reality of the role they are performing. Goffman's comparison matches up with the situation of the student who participated in the study as it was observed that the student was inclined to identify the role he had undertaken himself as a real role. He thought that he needed to make the role realistic in order to have an effect on the audience, and this thought can itself affirm the idea that the stigma attached to the student had a substantial effect on his decision to engage in negative behavior contrary to school norms.

Behaviors that do not conform to the legal regulations, customs, manners, traditions, and conventions created by a societal culture are characterized as deviance (Demir, 2010), while people who transgress the normal boundaries as defined by society are characterized as abnormal. People who either intentionally or unintentionally make it a habit of overstepping these bounds are stigmatized as deviant. The cases or situations where deviant behavior is detected are, therefore, termed deviance. Crime and criminality are classified as deviant behaviors; deviance means violating the established rules and norms of a society. Every crime is judged to be a deviant behavior because the person who commits a crime has deviated and strayed from societal norms (Arıkan, 1986; Özaslan-Çalışkan and Akca, 2017).

A student's repeated violation of school norms and rules signals (in the eyes of the teachers and the school administration) that a student's position/status in the school needs to be re-evaluated. Becker (2017:55) characterizes this situation as changing from a default position to a revealed or exposed status. This new status obtained by the student becomes the most dominant aspect of his or her personality; everything is defined by that status/position. Because of the stigma that was attached to the student due to their "deviant" behavior, the way in which the school administration and teachers decided to address him and behave toward him actually caused his "deviance" to continue. According to Becker, (2017) after being branded just once as a deviant, exclusion and ostracization is almost inevitable.

Many factors comprise stigmatization including social exclusion, accusations, disidentification, and behaving disrespectfully and rudely toward the stigmatized person (Brondani, Alan & Donnelly, 2017). It was

observed that the stigma attached to the student not only caused the student to be on the receiving end of exclusionary, calumnious, and accusatory conduct, it also lowered teachers' standards of speech and behavior to a baser level. Teacher and administrator actions such as disregarding, dismissing, or discrediting the student due to his stigma also contributed to the student rebelling against school norms and the authorities who represent them. Additionally, the student's internalization of the stigma over time eventually resulted in him creating, forming, and presenting a new identity. This corresponds to multiple findings in the available literature that indicate that labeling and stigmatization lay the groundwork for students to engage in behaviors deemed as criminal (Braithwaite, 1989; Creaney, 2012; Mahoney, 1974; Moore, Stuewig and Tangney, 2014).

Bearing Goffman's ideas of microsociology and the framing of daily life in mind, it is clear that the ways in which actors in social spaces represent themselves and their identities in daily life are far from trivial or ordinary; rather, they are actions which arise from and are linked to deep-seated causes (Orhan, 2018:197). In this context, it is appropriate to mention the many factors that lie behind the student's abrasive and dismissive behaviors which are intended to undermine school norms. Further research is necessary to determine how many of these factors are related to the student's present school and how many of them are more closely related to previous experiences in the student's academic life. However, some of the reasons underlying the student's continuation of reflexive retaliatory and counter-school behaviors can be easily identified: the teachers and school administration at the student's current school consistently belittle, discredit, disregard, and disidentify him. When we once again take a broader look at the situation making use of Goffman's conception of sociology, it is clear that the student's experiences outside of school, his family life, his social environment, and the culture he was a part in all played a role in his continuation of these behaviors.

Consequently, the student's lack of academic expectations with regard to his school or the loss of any expectations he *did* have resulted in a sort of avalanche effect where, over time, his continual involvement in problematic events in school caused him to become labeled and stigmatized, at which point he then transformed into a student who defies and violates school norms. This situation continued to evolve until it reached a point where it resulted in permanent stigmatization; the student then started to perform the role given to him "on stage". It was observed that the stigma had no deterrent effect on the student's behavior and, to the contrary, contributed to the student's misbehavior. Based on this fact, it follows that the student, who was well on his way to becoming a part of counter-school culture, created new norms, values, and competencies for himself as an alternative to the norms, values, and competencies imposed upon him by the school and provide justifications for and explanations of the meanings behind his actions as well.

Similar takeaways are also found in Willis' work (2016); it is also noted in this work that becoming a part of an active counter-school culture is much more common in educational institutions populated mainly by the children of working-class families. The student who participated in this study intentionally rebelled against the school order, sabotaged classes, and (along with some of his friends) adopted attitudes and language patterns in their daily school life to show just how little they cared about the school culture, which could be interpreted as an attempt to thwart the school's goals and objectives. A final conclusion is that being known as an actor who rebelled against the system both in and out of school and being seen as the lead instigator in delinquent situations that required intervention played an important role in the reinforcement and establishment of the student's stigma.

The current study has its own set of limitations, the most obvious one being the fact that it has a sample size of one. As there was one single participant who exhibited extreme behavior, this study being generalized to apply to students in similar situations is out of the question. However, it can be asserted that, when taking into account various factors stemming from the student participant's school and environment as well as personal factors, the research findings and results were formed in accordance with these factors taken as a whole. As such, a comprehensive, personalized mediatory effort from school guidance departments could be

effective in bringing the underlying reasons for students' undesirable behaviors to light, especially students who exhibit behavior similar to that of the subject of this study and who have similar school experiences.

## GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

### Okul Normlarına Aykırı Öğrenci Davranışlarının Erving Goffman'ın Damgalanma Teorisi Çerçevesinde İncelenmesi

Okullar belirli kurallar hiyerarşisi ve normlar içerisinde idare edilen kurumlardır. Her okul bulunduğu sosyal çevrenin kültüründen etkilenmektedir ve o çevreden gelen öğrencilerin okul dışındaki sosyal hayatları ile toplumsal norm ve kurallara uyma durumları okuldaki norm ve kurallara uymalarını da belirleyebilmektedir. Bu normlara uymamak ise normal dışı kabul edilmektedir. Hatta Goffman'a göre bu durum "sapkınlık ve ahlaksızlık" olarak damgalanır (2014:31)

#### Problem Durumu ve Araştırmanın Amacı

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı okul normlarına göre "normal" kabul edilmeyen ve "sapma" olarak nitelenen öğrenci davranışlarını Erving Goffman'ın damgalanma teorisi çerçevesinde incelemektir. Çalışmanın odağını, okulda istenen nitelikte ve makul kabul edilen davranış örüntülerinin dışında sapsmış davranış sergileyen ve hem öğretmenler hem de akranlarınca itibarsızlaştırılmış benlik ve kimlik damgasına sahip bireyin bu davranışları vurulan damga ile devam ettirip ettirmeme eğilimini ortaya koymak oluşturmaktadır

#### Yöntem

Bu çalışma nitel araştırma desenlerinden bütüncül tekli durum desenine göre tasarlanmıştır. Bu desende bir duruma ilişkin etkenler (ortamlar, bireyler, olaylar, süreçler vb.) bütüncül bir yaklaşımla derinlemesine araştırılmakta ve bu etkenlerin belirlenen durumu nasıl etkilediğinin üzerine odaklanılmaktadır. Bütüncül tekli durum deseni daha önceden ortaya konan çeşitli teorilerin test edilmesi, doğrulanması ya da çürütülmesinde kullanılan desen türleri arasında yer almaktadır. Bunun yanında genel standartlara uymayan, aşırı, aykırı ya da kendine özgü durumların çalışılmasında da bütüncül tekli durum deseni tercih edilmektedir (Yıldırım ve Şimşek, 2013:326). Araştırmada amaçlı örnekleme metodlarından aykırı durum örnekleme (extreme/deviant case sample) tercih edilmiştir. Bu örnekleme metodu alışkın olunmayan durumların ortaya çıkarılmasında ya da özel bir fenomenin derinlemesine incelenmesinde kullanılmaktadır. Bu çalışma tek bir öğrenci ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. İlgili öğrenci İstanbul'un Sultangazi ilçesinde akademik başarısı en düşük kişilerin devam ettiği bir meslek lisesinde on birinci sınıf öğrencisidir.

#### Bulgular

Araştırma bulgularına göre öğrencinin, kendisine davranışlarından dolayı vurulan mafya damgasını içselleştirerek bu etiketin içeriğini dolduracak davranış örüntülerini daha sıklıkla gerçekleştirdiği anlaşılmaktadır. Farklı bir anlatımla, öğrenciye vurulan damga bir tür kendini gerçekleştiren kehanete dönüşmüş durumdadır.

#### Sonuçlar ve Öneriler

Araştırmaya katılan öğrencinin okulun formel ve informel yapısına uygun olmadığı düşünülen davranışlarından dolayı damgalanması, onu bu istenmeyen davranışlarından vazgeçirmesi bir yana, olumsuz davranışlarını daha da pekiştirmesine neden olduğu düşünülmektedir. Öğrencinin bizzat içinde olduğu kural dışı ve normları bozucu davranışların yanı sıra içinde olmadığı olaylarda dahi adının geçiyor olması damganın yaygınlık kazandığına da işaret etmektedir. Öğrencinin de kendine vurulan damgayı, taşıdığı kültürün de etkisiyle benliğine mâl ederek bir kimlik edimine dönüştürmüş olduğu ve bu kimliğin rollerine uygun davranışlar ortaya koyduğu bulgulardan anlaşılmaktadır. Okul yönetimi ve öğretmenlerin de öğrencinin bu yönünü sürekli pekiştiren söz ve davranışlarda bulunması kimliğin inşasına destek sunmaktadır. Sonuç olarak, öğrencinin okula ilişkin akademik beklentisinin olmaması veya var olanı

kaybetmesi, okulda istenmeyen olaylara sıklıkla karışması yüzünden zamanla etiketlenmesi ve damgalanması onun okul normlarını tahrif edici bir kişi olması yönünde etkiler dizisi oluşturmuştur. Bu durum zamanla yaygınlık kazanan bir damgalama sürecini ortaya çıkarmış ve öğrenci kendisine verilen rolü “sahnedeyi” canlandırmaya başlamıştır. Bu damganın öğrenci üzerinde olumsuz davranışları yok edici etkisi olmadığı gibi tam tersi yönde bir etki oluşturduğu görülmektedir. Okul karşıtı bir kültürün parçası olma yönünde ötelenen öğrencinin okulun dayattığı normlara, değerlere ve becerilere alternatif olacak başka norm, değer ve beceriler geliştirmeleri; ayrıca bunları da gerekçelendirip anlamlandırmaya çalıştığı da anlaşılmaktadır.



## REFERENCES

- Arıkan, Ç. (1986). Psiko-sosyal yönleriyle sapma. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Hizmetler Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, 4(2-3), 123-140.
- Bakacak, A. (2002). Modern dönemde Becker ve Goffman'ın yaklaşımlarında etiketlenmiş suçlu anlayışı ve günümüzdeki yansımaları. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Bauman, Z. (2019). *Postmodernlik ve hoşnutsuzlukları* (İsmail Türkmen, çev). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Becker, H. (2017). *Hariciler (Outsiders): Bir sapkınlık sosyolojisi çalışması*. Ankara: Heretik Yayınları.
- Bourdieu, P. (2014). *Eril tahakküm* (Bediz Yılmaz, çev). İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (2016). *Düşünümsel bir antropoloji için cevaplar* (Nazlı Ökten, çev.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brondani, M., Alan, R., & Donnelly, L. (2017). Stigma of addiction and mental illness in healthcare: The case of patients' experiences in dental settings. *PLoS ONE*, 12(5), 1-13. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0177388.
- Byrne, P. (2001). Psychiatric stigma. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 178(3), 281-284. doi: 10.1192/bjp.178.3.281.
- Chul-Han, B. (2018). *Şiddetin topolojisi* (Dilek Zaptçioğlu, çev.). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Creaney, S. (2012). Targeting, labelling and stigma: challenging the criminalisation of children and young people. *Criminal Justice Matters*, 89(1), 16-17. doi: 10.1080/09627251.2012.721967.
- Çeğin, G., & Özpolat, G. (2017). Tabiyet ve simgesel şiddet kavramları üzerinden Foucault ve Bourdieu'yü birlikte okumak. *Praksis*, 42, 683-695.
- De Certeau, M. (2009). *Gündelik hayatın keşfi-I* (Lale Arslan Özcan, çev.). Ankara: Dost Yayınevi.
- Demir, S. (2009). Modern toplumdaki kontrol mekanizmaları: Foucault ve disiplin kuşatması. *Kahramanmaraş Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(2), 1-12.
- Demir, M. (2010). Örgütsel sapma davranışının kontrolünde duygusal zekânın rolü: Konaklama işletmelerinde bir araştırma. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 26(1), 196-207.
- Dursun, H. (1997). Damgalama teorisi ve suç. *Türkiye Baralor Birliği Dergisi*, 3-4, 309-322.
- Foucault, M. (2000). *Özne ve iktidar* (I. Ergüden ve O. Akınhay, çev.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Goffman, E. (2014). *Damga: Örselenmiş kimliğin idare edilişi üzerine notlar* (Ş. Geniş, L. Ünsaldı, S. N. Ağırnaslı, çev). Ankara: Heretik Yayınları.
- Goffman, E. (2016). *Günlük yaşamda benliğin sunumu* (Barış Cezar, çev.). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Goode, E. (1994). *Deviant behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Hurn, C. (2018). *Eğitim sosyolojisi: Okulun imkân ve sınırları* (Mustafa Sever, çev. ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Hülür, A. (2017). Erving Goffman: Günlük yaşamda benliğin sunumu. *Abant Kültürel Araştırmalar Dergisi (AKAR)*, 2(4), 158-165.
- Mahoney, M. J. (1974). *Cognition and behavior modification*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Moore, K., Stuewig, J., & Tangney, J. (2014). The effect of stigma on criminal offenders' functioning: A longitudinal mediational model. *Deviant Behavior*, 37(2), 196-218. doi: 10.1080/01639625.2014.1004035.
- Orhan, C. (2018). Avamperestane vehmedilenin kurnazlığı: Erving Goffman. *Gündelik Hayat Sosyolojisi* (Ali Esgin, Güney Çeğin, ed.) içinde, ss. 191-212. Ankara: Phoneix Yayınları.
- Özaslan-Çalışkan, B., & Akca, M. (2017). Damgalanma algısı ve sapma davranışı ilişkisinde kişilik özelliklerinin düzenleyici rolü. *International Journal of Academic Value Studies (Javstudies)*, 3(13), 357-369.

- Özsöz, C. (2014). Pierre Bourdieu: Simgesel şiddet, eğitim, iktidar. *Cogito*, 76, 290-311.
- Patton, M. (2014). *Nitel araştırma ve değerlendirme yöntemleri* (Mesut Bütün-Selçuk Beşir Demir, çev. ed.). Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.
- Shoham, S. (1970). *The mark of the cain: The stigma theory of crime and social deviation*. Jerusalem: Israel University Press.
- Şentük, İ., & Turan, S. (2012). Foucault'un iktidar analizi bağlamında eğitim yönetimine ilişkin bir değerlendirme. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 18(2), 243-272.
- Tannenbaum, F. (1938). *Crime and the community*. Boston: Ginn & Co.
- Türk, H. (2016). Sihirden nefret eden bir illüzyonist: Bourdieu, gelenek ve ideoloji. *Ocak ve Zanaat: Pierre Bourdieu derlemesi* (Güney Çeğin vd., Ed.) içinde (s. 605-626). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Willis, P. (2016). *İşçiliği öğrenmek, sınıf, işçilik ve eğitim: İşçi çocukları nasıl işçi oluyor?* (Dâra Elhüseyni, çev.). Ankara: Heretik Yayınları.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.