R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 020 565 EA 001 359

SCHOOLS AS ORGANIZATIONS--SOME ILLUSTRATED STRATEGIES FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND PRACTICE.

BY- WILLOWER, DONALD J.

PUB DATE DEC 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.12 26P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SOCIAL SYSTEMS, SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT, DISCIPLINE, TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, SOCIALIZATION, TEACHER BEHAVIOR, TEACHER ROLE, STATUS NEED, TEACHER EDUCATION, STUDENT ROLE, *CLASS MANAGEMENT, *SUBCULTURE, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, *SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, COUNSELORS, PRINCIPALS,

WHEN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL IS VIEWED AS A SOCIAL SYSTEM, PUPIL CONTROL IS THE THREAD RUNNING THROUGHOUT SCHOOL CULTURE. THE PART OF THIS SOCIAL SYSTEM MOST CONCERNED WITH CONTROL AND EMPHASIZED IN THIS STUDY IS THE TEACHER SUBCULTURE. SINCE STATUS IN THE TEACHER SUBCULTURE IS DIRECTLY RELATED TO CLASS CONTROL, PERSONNEL WHO FIND THEIR STATUS MOST THREATENED WILL PROBABLY BE MOST CONTROL-ORIENTED. A STUDY OF 1,306 EDUCATORS (468 ELEMENTARY AND 477 SECONDARY TEACHERS, 84 ELEMENTARY AND 97 SECONDARY PRINCIPALS, AND 180 COUNSELORS) SUBSTANTIATES THIS HYPOTHESIS. ELEMENTARY TEACHERS ARE LESS CONCERNED WITH CONTROL THAN SECONDARY TEACHERS (SMALLER CHILDREN PRESENT LESS THREAT TO STATUS), PRINCIPALS ARE LESS CONTROL-ORIENTED THAN TEACHERS (THEIR STATUS IS LESS THREATENED), AND COUNSELORS ARE LESS RIGID CONCERNING CONTROL THAN TEACHERS (THEIR STATUS IS NOT THREATENED). RELATED FINDINGS SHOW THAT EDUCATORS WITH MORE DOGMATIC ATTITUDES EMPHASIZE CONTROL WHILE LONG TIME TEACHERS ARE MORE CONTROL-ORIENTED THAN TEACHERS RECENTLY FINISHING PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION. THE CONTROL ORIENTATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS ARISES BECAUSE THEY SERVE UNSELECTED CLIENTS WHO ARE OFTEN UNWILLING AND UNRESPONSIVE. IF SCHOOLS ARE TO BE LESS CONTROL ORIENTED, THEY WILL HAVE TO BECOME INCREASINGLY ATTRACTIVE TO STUDENTS. THIS PAPER WAS PRESENTED IN THE WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY SOCIAL SCIENCE COLLOQUIUM SERIES (MORGANTOWN, WEST VIRGINIA, DECEMBER 1967). (TT)

SCHOOLS AS ORGANIZATIONS: SOME ILLUSTRATED STRATEGIES FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND PRACTICE*

Donald J. Willower

Professor of Education
The Pennsylvania State University

In this paper, I will sketch out some work on the public school which we have been engaged in during the past several years. The primary theoretical orientation employed views schools as social organizations, and I will present some of the ideas and substantive findings which this orientation has generated. In doing so, I welcome this opportunity for critical analysis; put another way, I will indicate some of our dissatisfactions, some of the things we wish we could have done better or differently, some of the limitations and weaknesses of the work as well as what I see as its stronger points.

At the same time, I want to make explicit certain broad strategies that reflect our underlying values and, in a sense, distinctively mark our studies as scholarship in educational administration. Although our approach is primarily sociological, our work goes beyond social science. We have direct and abiding interests in the relationship of theory and practice, in the uses of knowledge, and in the improvement of schools. These interests had consequences for what we did and how we went about it. And such shopworn notions as those implicit in the basic and applied research distinction are not very helpful. The distinction is not so clear-cut nor so easy. It is, I think, more advantageous to look to the research strategies adopted and their uses in development and practice.

---

* A paper presented in the West Virginia University Social Science Colloquium Series, Morgantown, West Virginia, December 1967.

We do not claim that our studies represent some kind of ideal in these respects; we know their limitations too well. Nonetheless, they do furnish some ideas and procedures that seem appropriate for discussion in a colloquium such as this one.[1]

The empirical phase of this line of inquiry began with the study of a single educational organization, a 1,600-pupil junior high school located in a middle-sized city in Pennsylvania. The techniques used were essentially observation and interview. Over a 14-month period beginning in 1962, we made numerous observations of behavior in the faculty lounge, faculty and administrative meetings, classes, the corridors, the cafeteria and the assembly, and conducted a great many interviews. We kept extensive field notes, and attempted to follow up in later observations and interviews those things that earlier data revealed to be interesting or important.

From the standpoint of research, our purposes were to apply and develop concepts and generate hypotheses which might be theoretically useful and function to guide further inquiry. In casting our nets for ideas, we looked to the particular and the situational in all their richness and complexity, and we suffered an embarrassment of riches. And so, while we made substantial efforts to keep our minds open to odd data and unusual interpretations, and occasionally even sought to create some rather bizarre frameworks, in the end we returned to social system concepts to give order and meaning to our data. We saw the school as a small society and attempted to portray it in much the same way that a cultural anthropologist might describe and analyze a primitive society. Such a perspective called attention to structural elements in the school, formal and informal organization, titles, systems of superordination and subordination, and so on; as

well as to the values, norms, rules, traditions, ceremonials, and so forth that constitute the school culture.

From the standpoint of our broader strategy, we knew that field studies of schools, and especially of what might be called the teacher subculture, were few in number and we felt that such studies would be particularly valuable. Students and learning had been studied extensively; concern with the psychology of learning appeared to dominate in a great portion of serious educational research efforts. A better balance seemed, and still seems, desirable.

Studies of the school culture appeared also to have marked potential for blending the theoretically abstract and the particular, a potential that held special promise both for understanding better the nature of schools and for communicating this understanding in professional preparation programs. In this connection, I had long been impressed by the manner in which such studies as Gouldner's research on bureaucratization in a gypsum plant combined theoretical analysis with a wealth of illustration and example,[2] and in spite of the differences between schools and gypsum plants, I had made use of such studies with what I felt was relative success, in graduate seminars in educational administration.

Moreover, studies that employed a social system framework were likely to furnish dispassionate and critical perspectives on the way of life of schools and their personnel; perspectives that seemed more common among researchers than practitioners, yet were crucial for the development of the reflective or scientific temper so necessary for thoughtful judgment and reasoned action.

Now let us return to the field study, and consider some of the clues about schools that were gleaned there. One feature of our data that

was particularly striking was the extent to which concern about pupil control influenced the life of the school. Pupil control problems were found to play a major part in teacher-teacher, teacher-counselor, and teacher-administrator relations. To furnish a few illustrations, teachers who were viewed as weak on control had marginal status among their colleagues. Newer teachers especially, reported that a major problem was to convince the older, more experienced teachers that their younger colleagues were not soft on discipline. The older teachers, dominate in the faculty informal structure, seldom hesitated to criticize other teachers, especially newer ones, whom they thought of as being lax about maintaining sufficient social distance with regard to pupils. Situations of high visibility provided special testing grounds where teachers made valiant efforts to have their classes "look good" or be well behaved and orderly. Thus, in school assemblies, some of the more striking performances were played out in the audience. Newer teachers sometimes tried to win approval from their colleagues by talking or acting tough with regard to students, but these attempts met with mixed success, one teacher reporting that "no matter how strict you are, they still think you're soft... ."

The faculty lounges furnished locales where privileged discussions of students could take place. In this connection the following kinds of discussion predominated: boasting about the uncompromising manner in which a difficult discipline problem had been handled; "gossiping" about students, about their families and especially the brothers and sisters who had preceded them at the school; joking about students, and particularly, ridiculing certain student answers to teacher questions and tests. While such behavior undoubtedly had important safety valve functions, its significance for teacher socialization should not be missed.

With regard to teacher-administrator and teacher-counselor relationships, let two examples suffice. The principal was new to the school and the faculty was concerned that he might turn out to be "weak on discipline." This point was mentioned many times by teachers during interviews. The guidance counselors also were viewed by teachers from the perspective of pupil control. Thus, many of the teachers felt that the counselors "undermined" them in matters of discipline. This was recognized by the counselors, one of whom stated that "if these walls could talk, the teachers would be unhappy; they would feel that the guidance office doesn't support them."

Thus, in the study of one school, pupil control appeared as a thread running through the fabric of the school's culture. The general proposition that pupil control plays a central part in the organizational life of public schools was clearly consistent with, and in fact, grew out of, our observations of a single school; but it also "fitted" in a number of other ways. It fitted the traditional picture of schools as places that pupils seek devoutly to avoid, a view expressed in such novels as The Adventures of Tom Sawyer and in what might be called the lore surrounding schools, not to mention the even more direct expressions voiced by some students. Although there have not been many researches that take the school as a social system as a starting point, it fitted in a general way the portrayal of teachers and schools found in such studies as Waller's early classic and the work of Becker.[3] It also fitted Carlson's analysis of the school as an organizational type.[4] He noted that some service-type organizations control the selection of their clients, while others do not; in some cases, clients can refuse to participate in the organization, while in others, they cannot. Public schools, along with prisons and public

mental hospitals, fall into that category where the organization has no control over client selection and clients have no choice concerning their participation. That control should be identified as central in such organizations seems reasonable.

Certainly, it is necessary to be cautious when comparing schools with prisons and public mental hospitals since, to use Goffman's term, the latter organizations are total institutions and schools are not.[5] In addition, in prisons and public mental hospitals greater emphasis is given to coercive controls than in schools.[6]

Yet, the nature of an organization's relationship with its clients ought to have numerous consequences for organizational life. In addition, the literature on prisons and mental hospitals employing the perspectives of organizational theory is fairly well developed, and could furnish valuable clues concerning schools.[7] We drew upon this literature as well as from our field study to help in the development of hypotheses for further inquiry.

We were interested in a number of areas: types or styles of pupil control in terms of both teacher behavior and teacher ideology; the relationship of organizational position to control styles and ideologies; the relationship of personality to these variables; teacher socialization, and the impact of socialization on the idealistic teacher; the relationship of control problems to organizational innovation and change; the problems associated with goal displacement in schools; the problems of adaptation to norms in the teacher subculture; and problems associated with variations in the attractiveness of schools for pupils as related both to the nature of the community from which the school draws clientele and to internal adaptations in the school organization. And this is only

a partial listing. While a number of hypotheses on these questions were developed, I will confine my discussion to those that we actually tested.

In order to deal with control styles, it was necessary to specify a pupil control typology. Control, an essential ingredient of group life, implies requirements for and restraints upon behavior. Concepts such as norms, role expectations, and rules, while differing in their specific meanings, have in common an emphasis on the specification of "proper" behavior in given circumstances. Compliance is insured through a system of rewards and penalities or sanctions. Sanctions may be primarily punitive, utilizing devices such as coercion, ridicule, and the withholding of rewards; or they may be non-punitive, based upon understanding, emphasizing appeal to the individual's sense of right and wrong, and self-discipline rather than imposed discipline.

We adapted to our purposes a typology employed by Gilbert and Levinson in the study of the control ideology of mental hospital staff members concerning patients.[8] They conceptualized a continium of control ideology ranging from "custodialism" at one extreme to "humanism" at the other. These extremes are "ideal types" in the Weberian sense; that is, they are pure types not necessarily found in such form in experience.

In adapting this typology, prototypes of custodial and humanistic orientations toward pupil control were developed. A custodial pupil control ideology stresses the maintenance of order, distrust of students, and a punitive, moralistic approach to pupil control. A humanistic ideology emphasizes an accepting, trustful view of pupils, and optimism concerning their ability to be self-disciplining and responsible.

Subsequently, we devised as an operational measure of pupil control ideology, a 20-item paper and pencil type instrument which we called

the PCI Form. Responses were made on a five point scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree," and a single overall score for each respondent was assigned by summing item scores. Examples of items are, "It is often necessary to remind pupils that their status in school differs from that of teachers," and "Pupils can be trusted to work together without supervision," (reverse item). We were reasonably satisfied with the results of our reliability and validity tests,[9] and the instrument has since discriminated rather well in several studies in which it has been used.

Here, I would like to share several of our methodological decisions and some reservations. First, after beginning with observational as well as attitudinal data, we decided to study ideology rather than performance or actual behavior. This decision set limits on our work that should be continually kept in mind.

We did this for two reasons. One was practical. Put candidly, it was easier to devise a measure of pupil control ideology than of controlling behavior. This was not a minor consideration in view of the limitations of financial resources, personnel, and time that we had to contend with. The other reason was that in the earlier study we had been impressed by what appeared to be a considerable front of tough talk and behavior maintained by some teachers before their peers. We felt that there would be discrepancies between ideology and behavior (a point we will return to later) and we preferred to start with the more enduring of the two--ideology.

For better or worse, after some thought we bypassed a prose definition of ideology. We did, of course, contrast ideology with behavior; ideology was clearly internal and attitudinal and, in the case of the pupil control ideology of educators, it was work related and client re-

lated. But in the end, we took a positivistic line and merely provided the prototypes of the custodial and humanistic orientations toward pupil control (although somewhat more elaborately than I did above), and the operational definition of pupil control ideology afforded by the PCI Form.

Also, we've never felt completely comfortable with the terms custodial and humanistic. In fact, in an earlier paper the terms external and internal control were used. The terms custodial and humanistic are clearly value laden, the former negatively and the latter positively. However, because our prototypes were adaptations from Gilbert and Levinson, we stuck with their terminology.[10] Moreover, the prototypes themselves are imperfect. For example, we have had misgivings concerning the lack of a place in our scheme for the very strict but scrupulously fair and nonpunitive teacher.

But in spite of these reservations, the control typology developed did serve to facilitate hypothesis construction. We will now consider some of these hypotheses along with accompanying rationales.

Many of the attitudes and much of the behavior of school personnel and of people in general, it appears to us, can be explained in terms of efforts to maintain and enhance status relative to others. In schools, such efforts extend across a wide range. We are all familiar with the example of the uncooperative school custodian, and Griffiths and his colleagues, in their study of New York City schools, have made lucid note of GASing (getting the attention of superiors) behavior on the part of teachers.[11] However, more common examples can be found in the mechanisms employed by teachers to maintain their status relative to pupils. These include modes of address and dress and the use of various devices such as detention, or staying after school, verbal reprimands, permission

slips of different kinds that may govern legitimacy of student movement in the building, and even grades.

The intra-organizational status problems of teachers are grounded in the nature of the school as an organization and in requirements for the teacher role. They arise, in part at any rate, because the school is an organization that serves unselected clients; and unselected, perhaps unwilling or even antagonistic clients require extensive controlling, at least from the standpoint of the organization. Furthermore, the collective or group aspect of the student response to organizational control should be kept in mind. Student values are apt to be in conflict with those of teachers and other school personnel, and the student subculture exerts an important influence on its membership.[12]

Those in a direct relationship with numbers of such unselected clients and those whose status is most threatened by clients are likely to be comparatively rigid in their client control ideology. Teachers are required directly to control relatively large numbers of pupil clients, and pupils are apt to represent a serious potential threat to teacher status. Principals and specialists such as guidance counselors are not directly responsible for pupil control, and pupils are apt to represent a less serious threat to the status of incumbents of these positions. These considerations led us to predict that teachers would be more custodial in their pupil control ideology than principals or counselors.

We also believed that elementary and secondary school personnel would differ with regard to pupil control ideology. Elementary school pupils, when compared with secondary pupils, pose a lesser threat to teacher status because of their tender years, smaller size, and relative immaturity. Again, an essential part of our conceptualization was the

proposition that, in organizations with unselected clients, there is a positive relationship between the perceived threat posed by clients to controller status and the tendency of controllers to adopt a custodial ideology. Given this proposition and the differences between elementary and secondary school pupils just remarked, we predicted that secondary teachers would be more custodial in pupil control ideology than elementary teachers, and that secondary principals would be more custodial in pupil control ideology than elementary principals.

We were also interested in the socialization of teachers with regard to pupil control ideology. We felt that as teachers were absorbed into the teacher subculture, their pupil control ideology would become more custodial. While teacher preparation programs appeared to us to lay stress on permissiveness, we believed that the most significant socialization takes place on the job, not in the teacher education program. Data from the field study had suggested that older, more experienced teachers distrusted and opposed permissiveness and advocated much more rigid control of pupils. While we recognized that only longitudinal data[13] could provide an adequate test of the proposition that a more custodial pupil control ideology is an outcome of teacher socialization, we decided to make a less adequate cross-sectional test by comparing the pupil control ideology of teachers with five years or less experience with that of teachers having more than five years' experience. Our prediction was that the more experienced teachers would be more custodial in their ideology than the less experienced teachers.

In addition to studying the relationships of organizational position and socialization to control ideology, we proposed to gather some data on personality factors and pupil control ideology. For this purpose

we employed Rokeach's concepts of open and closed-mindedness, and their operational measure, the Dogmatism Scale.[14] Rokeach described the open-minded individual as one who receives stimulus information without distortion, evaluates and analyzes it objectively, and then responds to the information on the basis of its own intrinsic merit, unimpeded by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from external forces. Conversely, the closed-minded individual is one who distorts stimulus information and acts upon it on the basis of many irrelevant factors in the situation that arise from within the person or from external forces. He has difficulty differentiating information and its source, and is prone to evaluate and act on the basis of irrational inner forces.

The distrustful, pessimistic orientation toward pupils exemplified in a custodial control ideology appeared to us to fit rather well the prototype of the closed-minded individual just described; and the more trusting, optimistic orientation of the humanistic ideology seemed consistent with open-mindedness. Thus, our general hypothesis was that closed-minded educators would be more custodial in their pupil control ideology than open-minded educators. We predicted that closed-minded principals would be more custodial in ideology than open-minded principals and that closed-minded teachers would be more custodial than open-minded teachers. We proposed to test these predictions using our overall samples of principals and teachers and also separately for elementary and secondary school principals and teachers.

These, then, were our main hypotheses and predictions. In terms of our broader strategy, it should be clear that the propositions we chose to work with were on a middle level of abstraction, or to use a more com-

mon term, they were in the middle range. They dealt with status relations but they were also directed to problems associated with inter-positional relations in a particular kind of organization, the public school. We were concerned with a general theory of status relations in groups in order to furnish insights into schools as organizations; we wanted our predictions to be based upon theory to provide a framework for explanation and understanding. In other words, we attempted to fulfill our commitment to practice by employing theory; theory that could be connected to the specific environment of practice.

We were interested in adding a modest increment to knowledge about role relations in schools, but we knew that our contribution to a theory of status relations in groups was minimal. The one-sidedness of this relationship is not a necessary one and students of particular institutions could well make important contributions to more general theory. But the point is that an extensive research task remains undone in the field of educational organization, and in the division of academic labor, this is the appropriate realm of the student of educational administration, whether adding to general theory, or as seems likely to be more common, drawing from general theory for work on a somewhat lower level of abstraction.

Now we return to our predictions and to the empirical tests that were carried out. I will omit much of the detail here since it is reported elsewhere.[15] Our operational measure of pupil control ideology, the PCI Form, was completed by 1,306 educators: 945 teachers, 468 at the elementary level and 477 at the secondary level; 181 principals, 84 at the elementary level and 97 at the secondary level; and 180 counselors. The Dogmatism Scale, Rokeach's measure of open and closed-mindedness, was com-

pleted by 973 of these educators, including 805 teachers, 376 at the elementary level and 429 at the secondary; and 168 principals, 79 at the elementary level and 89 at the secondary level.

The statistical method used to test our predictions was the t-test for the difference between the means of two independent samples. In the case of the predictions on open and closed-mindedness, we considered those scoring in the upper quarter on the Dogmatism Scale within each of the relevant categories to be closed-minded and those in the lower quarter to be open-minded. We also gathered data on the relationships of pupil control ideology, dogmatism, and certain characteristics of the sample such as age, sex, experience, and amount and type of education.

The empirical tests supported our predictions in every case: teachers were more custodial in pupil control ideology than principals or counselors; elementary teachers and principals were less custodial in pupil control ideology than their counterparts at the secondary school level; teachers with more than five years' experience were more custodial in ideology than were teachers with five years' or less experience; and closed-minded teachers and principals, whatever the level, were more custodial in pupil control ideology than open-minded teachers and principals. In each of the eleven tests made of our major predictions, the difference was in the predicted direction and it was significant at the .001 level.

These constitute our major results. There were other data that we found interesting, and we felt obligated to report as much information as we had on sample characteristics as they related to our main variables. But since a theoretical basis was lacking and no prior predictions were made, no calculations of significance were carried out.

Among findings of this kind that are worth noting here, those concerning dogmatism and organizational position are rather interesting. Principals as a group were considerably more open-minded than teachers as a group and this held quite consistently at both the elementary and the secondary school levels. This indicated that both role and personality factors probably influenced the pupil control ideology differences of principals and teachers.

While position and dogmatism both were related to control ideology in the instance just described, the same kind of reinforcement did not occur in connection with grade level differences. Elementary and secondary teachers had quite similar mean dogmatism scores, and those of elementary and secondary principals were virtually identical, but in both cases, their pupil control ideology differed significantly. When data on open and closed-minded principals and teachers and grade level were examined, only slight differences in dogmatism were found, but when examined in conjunction with pupil control ideology, the data supported the propositions that open-minded secondary teachers are more custodial in pupil control ideology than open-minded elementary teachers and closed-minded secondary teachers are more custodial in ideology than closed-minded elementary teachers, and similar propositions could be stated concerning open and closed-minded elementary and secondary principals.

These considerations furnish relevant information on the possibility that the Dogmatism Scale and the PCI Form measured the same attitudes; at least some independence appears to be indicated. The trick, from the methodological standpoint, is to have relationship but not overlap. In other words,there should be a logical connection of some sort between variables that are hypothesized to be related to one another in

some predictable manner, but the relationship should not be merely tautological. Conjunction is sought but not tautology, although very small doses of the latter do not appear to be fatal in the social sciences.

Other findings that are worth noting are the following: male secondary teachers were more closed-minded than both female secondary teachers and elementary teachers of either sex; teachers in the older age categories were more closed-minded than younger teachers; less experienced teachers and elementary principals were more open-minded than their more experienced counterparts, but less experienced secondary principals were more closed-minded than more experienced secondary principals. Male teachers tended to be more custodial in pupil control ideology than female teachers, but grade level appeared to be the main contributor to this difference. More experienced secondary school principals were less custodial in ideology than less experienced secondary principals; and elementary teachers with more formal education tended to be less custodial than those with less formal education.

Again, keep in mind that since these variables lacked a prior theoretical basis, they were treated as peripheral. As a result, we have not unraveled the interrelationships of position, personality, and some of these other variables nearly well enough. Our preference was for prior explanation and prediction that allowed little leeway for post factum interpretations. In so far as our explanations were simple ones, and in the main, they were just that, little attention was given to intervening variables. A minor irritation was provided by the fact that circumstances were such that Dogmatism Scale responses were not secured from all subjects who completed the PCI Form; this required a more lengthy presentation of data on sample characteristics than we preferred, seeming to give

these variables relatively more prominence than they had received from the conceptual standpoint.

In general, however, it seems fair to say that the conceptual framework employed was, in pragmatic terms, a relatively powerful one. It led to predictions which were confirmed.

Before turning to some speculations that I would like to share with you, I want to note that some additional work on pupil control ideology has recently reconfirmed our predictions concerning the pupil control ideology of elementary and secondary teachers in a new sample;[16] and in other work, Wayne K. Hoy has been gathering longitudinal data on a sample of teachers beginning with their student days, and his findings, although somewhat limited in the time span covered to date, clearly support the proposition that teacher socialization breeds increased custodialism in pupil control ideology.[17]

In the final section of this paper, I will present some ideas, largely speculative, which might be helpful in projecting this line of inquiry in new directions.

First, some limitations. While organizational position was found to be related to pupil control ideology, our work did not deal directly with the influence of selection and attrition factors on the organizational position variable, nor do we get a very clear picture of the extent to which the demands of a given role may function to change ideology.

It is possible to interpret differences in the dogmatism scores of principals and teachers as suggesting that teachers who are very closed-minded seldom become principals. In addition, if teacher socialization results in increased custodialism, one can speculate about what happens

to teachers who refuse to be socialized. Such teachers, probably rather idealistic in outlook, have only a few alternatives. They can adapt as best as they can in circumstances that they must find uncongenial, leave teaching for pursuits outside of education, seek out schools with more humanistic norms, or prepare for other positions within the field of education. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the majority of the counselors in our sample, a group with a comparatively humanistic pupil control ideology, came to counseling from secondary school teaching, a position associated with a relatively custodial ideology.

Whether the influence of positional and personality factors on pupil control ideology tend to reinforce one another, as they do in some cases, or operate more independently, as they do in others, it is interesting to consider the likely consequences of these differences in control ideology. One might expect to find considerable conflict over matters of pupil control, with principals, counselors, open-minded educators, and newer teachers opposing their more custodial colleagues. Undoubtedly, such conflict does occur. However, we suspect that the structure and task of the public school function to reduce <u>overt</u> conflict but increase inner tensions for certain individuals.

Conflicts of attitudes and ideas are not necessarily open conflicts. Ideology may or may not be reflected in behavior. While a correspondence between ideology and behavior can reasonably be expected in a free situation, it cannot be assumed in a formal organizational setting. Hierarchical relationships, rules, sanctions, and pressures from groups both within and outside of the organization intervene. Foremost among these for public school personnel are the pressures created by the necessity to "educate" large numbers of unselected clients, the demands of the

faculty peer group that these pressures generate, and the vulnerability of the school in political terms. These, conjoined with the difficulty of assessing the effectiveness of schools in a compelling way, are apt to lead to systematic discrepancies between ideology and behavior in the public school.

Such discrepancies can be interpreted as adaptations to custodial norms by those holding more a humanistic ideology, who, we suspect, will behave in ways that suggest to their colleagues that a more custodial control ideology is held than actually is. This kind of "on-stage behavior"[18] tends to reduce interpersonal conflict for the actor and facilitate his integration in the colleague group. The faculty lounge observed in our field study afforded numerous examples of on-stage behavior, occuring interestingly enough, in an off-stage location. But these designations are, of course, relative to the group perspective being employed, whether of peers or the public.

On-stage custodialism has at least two potential consequences. One is to reinforce custodial norms in the teacher subculture and retard acceptance of change in humanistic directions. Teachers and other school personnel may remain ignorant of humanistic views held by their associates because of on-stage behavior that provides a false portrayal of underlying attitudes.[19] Another possible consequence is that on-stage behavior, at first inconsistent with ideology, will eventually lead to changes in ideology; a custodial ideology may gradually become internalized. And the likelihood that on-stage custodialism will tend to alienate students and thus limit the effectiveness of a humanistic approach may be a further contributory factor.

Another type of adaptation, to which we now turn, is essentially

organizational in focus. It lies in the provision of special roles and circumstances that provide a revised definition of the situation, one that allows school personnel to act in less rigid and more particularistic ways with students, yet suffer a minimal loss of status with colleagues. An example is found in the extra-curriculum and in the faculty adviser roles entailed. Here, teacher-student relationships may be personalized within limits, and obligations as well as new relationships may be formed. But note that student energies are expended in ways which are acceptable to the school, and this, along with the exchange uses of personalization, or the obligations built in personalized relationships, calls attention to the containment, channeling, and control functions of the extra-curriculum[20] as well as to its value as an adaptive mechanism for the more humanistic teacher.

A different version of this adaptation is found in school organizations in certain formal positions that have roles that allow for more personalized interactions with students, a point I have already alluded to in connection with my discussion of the alternatives open to the humanistic teacher. Prime examples are positions in the pupil personnel services area, but most commonly, the guidance counselor position. However, I would suggest that the counselor role, by providing a mechanism for pupil control within a "helping" framework, has the latent function of reducing the likelihood of outside influence and intervention in school affairs.[21] In addition, the clinical orientation of the counselor tends to focus attention on the deficiencies of the student, not those of the system.[22] Thus, the adaptations discussed are doubled edged; in the last analysis, they tend to be protective of the school organization and its offices, and contribute to a state of equilibrium, delicate and uneasy

though it may be.

While we have given some emphasis in our analysis to differences between ideology and behavior, study of the ideology held by the incumbents of various organizational positions concerning an important aspect of the organization's work seems especially relevant to the problem of improving practice. For ideology in a real sense points to potential performance, performance in which player and part are not mismatched.

Yet if changes in humanistic directions in schools are desired, it needs to be recognized clearly that the path to change is likely to be a difficult one, fraught with unintended and perhaps unanticipated consequences. Teachers who are able successfully to employ humanistic approaches are apt to be rare. Even when they can be found, they are likely to face the pressures noted earlier, and they may be burdened by ideological allies who are humane but uncritical and ineffectual. Moreover, the positive results that such teaching may produce are apt to be most apparent in the long run, while short range failures will be more conspicuous. Furthermore, in a humanistic setting, status differences between teachers and pupils are reduced; and such reductions are liable to be resisted by teachers.

If humanistic changes are to be achieved, school increasingly will have to become attractive to students. In this connection, it appears that greater value is being placed on education in the larger society, and in the present era of mass communications, it is possible that the student role will change fairly rapidly in ways that reflect changing social values. If so, the consequences of the forced participation aspect of the student role would be blunted and the conflict of the student culture and the teacher culture diminished. Mitigated conflict would present

enhanced opportunities for the utilization of a variety of teaching methods and technologies. More humane attitudes toward pupils on the part of school personnel could become more common, even dominant. But keep in mind that while such attitudes are important, they are not sufficient. Equally essential are open-minded teachers who possess relevant knowledge, a scientific temper, and the will and ability to apply knowledge appropriately. In such ideal circumstances, professional teacher behavior could become organizationally routine, and organizational role expectations and educational goals could be brought into closer harmony. But the achievement of such ends lies in the future; present circumstances appear to fall far short. I contend that effectively to achieve such changes, we need to know a great deal more about the nature of schools as organizations. As I indicated before, this type of work presents unusual opportunities for blending theory and practice, and I believe that such blending should be a main function of Schools of Education and their faculties.

The work that I have discussed with you is, to be realistic, very limited. It barely scratches the surface and then not always in the most effective way. Within the bounds of the perspective employed, interesting lines for future inquiry include research on the relationship of control ideology and behavior; studies of the unintended consequences of humanistic changes in schools; longitudinal studies of socialization in the various school roles; studies of pupil control ideology in other populations that might shed light on the appropriateness of applying the terms custodial or humanistic to various groups; studies of the relationship of pupil control ideology and goal achievement in schools; and studies that focus on the school unit, the school district, and their

special environments.

In closing, I would like to express the hope that I have not dwelt entirely on interests that you do not share. If I have, I can only remark that your colloquium committee made the fatal mistake of asking me to discuss here my own interests and work. Doing so has helped me to clarify some of my own thinking; I hope that the process has had at least some utility from your standpoint.

Notes

1. The most relevant sources are my, "Control in an Educational Organization," with R. G. Jones, in Studying Teaching, ed. J. D. Raths, et al. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967) which reports on the field study; "Barriers to Change in Educational Organizations," Theory into Practice, 2 (December, 1963) which also reports some data from the field study but in a more general context; "Hypotheses on the School as a Social System," Educational Administration Quarterly, 1 (Autumn, 1965) which develops more systematic propositions on pupil control also using data from the field study. The School and Pupil Control Ideology, with T. L. Eidell and W. K. Hoy, (University Park, Pa.: Penn State Studies Monograph No. 24, 1967), is the main document that reports tests of our hypotheses on pupil control ideology including methodological details, and is the source from which I have drawn most heavily for the present paper; "The Counselor and the School as a Social Organization," with W. K. Hoy and T. L. Eidell, Personnel and Guidance Journal, 46 (November, 1967) and "Custodialism and the Secondary School," with T. L. Eidell and W. K. Hoy, The High School Journal, in press, are both based on data from the main study but contain more extensive analyses of their particular topics. "The Form of Knowledge and the Theory-Practice Relationship," Educational Theory, 13 (January, 1963), "The Professorship in Educational Administration: A Rationale," in The Professorship in Educational Administration, ed. D. J. Willower and J. A. Culbertson (Columbus and University Park: University Council for Educational Administration and The Pennsylvania State University, 1964), and one section of "Organization Theories and Educational Administration: The Handbook of Organizations," Educational Administration Quarterly, 3 (January, 1967) deal with the theory-practice relationship.

2. A. W. Gouldner, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954).

3. See Willard Waller, The Sociology of Teaching (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1932) and H. S. Becker, "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," in Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader, ed. A. Etzioni (New York: Holt, Rinehardt, and Winston, Inc., 1961).

4. R. O. Carlson, "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients," in Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, ed. D. E. Griffiths (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

5. E. Goffman, Asylums (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1961), especially pp. 3-124.

6. A. Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations (New York: The Free Press, 1961).

7. Chapters in The Handbook of Organizations, ed. J. G. March (Chicago: Rand-McNally and Co., 1965) on prisons, hospitals, and schools by D. R. Cressey, C. Perrow, and C. E. Bidwell respectively, give some indication of this relative development.

8. D. C. Gilbert and D. J. Levinson, "'Custodialism' and 'Humanism' in Mental Hospital Structure and in Staff Ideology," in The Patient and the Mental Hospital ed. M. Greenblatt, et al. (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957).

9. See The School and Pupil Control Ideology, op.cit., chapter 2.

10. Gilbert and Levinson also were concerned that the terms custodial and humanistic might be contrasted in an unrealistic manner. Op.cit., p. 23.

11. D. E. Griffiths, et al., "Teacher Mobility in New York City," Educational Administration Quarterly, 1 (Winter, 1965).

12. See Waller, op.cit.; C. W. Gordon, The Social System of the High School (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957); and J. S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society (New York: The Free Press, 1961).

13. At least some longitudinal data are now available on this, a point I will return to shortly.

14. Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960).

15. The School and Pupil Control Ideology, op.cit.

16. Our empirical data were gathered in 1965. In a doctoral study carried out at The Pennsylvania State University in 1967 under my supervision, C. A. Landis gathered data from a new sample of 324 elementary and 278 secondary teachers. The secondary teachers were more custodial in pupil control ideology ($p. < .001$).

17. W. K. Hoy, "Organizational Socialization: The Student Teacher and Pupil Control Ideology," Journal of Educational Research, in press; and "Pupil Control Ideology and Organizational Socialization: The Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher," forthcoming. Custodialism in pupil control ideology increased significantly after student teaching, and again after the first year of teaching for both elementary and secondary teachers in Hoy's sample. But the mean PCI Form score for those who did not teach after graduation remained virtually the same a year later.

18. See E. Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1959).

19. See the discussion of "pluralistic ignorance" in schools in B. J. Biddle, "Roles, Goals and Value Structures in Organizations,"

in New Perspectives in Organizational Research, ed. W. W. Cooper, et al. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964).

20. For analyses of the extra-curriculum from a sociological perspective see Waller, op.cit.; Gordon, op.cit., and Bidwell, op.cit.

21. See "The Counselor and the School as a Social Organization," op.cit.

22. A. V. Cicourel and J. I. Kituse, The Educational Decision-Makers (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1963).