DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 113 EA 008 441

AUTHOR Tjosvold, Dean
TITLE The Issue of Student Control: A Critical Review of the Literature.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Humanistic Education; *Individual Development; Interpersonal Relationship; *Literature Reviews; Open Education; Organization; *Power Structure; Social Psychology; Status; Student Alienation; *Student Behavior; *Student Teacher Relationship

ABSTRACT

A critical review of educational and social psychological literature was undertaken in order to clarify the impact of schools' control orientation on student learning and on the teacher-student relationship. The propositions argued are (a) a strong control orientation is incompatible with helping students become responsible young adults, (b) the methods of increasing teacher power and status, and decidedly unequal teacher-student relationships adversely affect student learning and the teacher-student relationship, and (c) teacher and student collaborative use of their resources, increased student participation in decision making, and enhanced student status and power may facilitate student learning and development. (Author)

The Issue of Student Control:

A Critical Review of the Literature*

by Dean Tjosvold

Freedom and control are opposing credos among educators. "Romantic" educational reformers argue that "free schools" ought to be established so that students have the "freedom to learn:" students are able to decide, and should be allowed to decide, their own learning goals and activities. Many educational "realists," however, insist that teachers need to control student behavior in order to minimize student misbehavior and to insure that students reach learning goals prescribed by the school.[1] Most educators are caught between their desire (often fostered in teacher education programs) to "free" the student and their desire (often encouraged by organizational pressures) to "control" students (Hoy, 1968, 1969). Educators are vexed by and divided on the student freedom and control issue.

In his classic study, Waller (1932) argued that schools were excessively concerned with the control of students; Willower and Jones (1967), too, concluded that schools were primarily concerned with order and discipline. Indeed, popular symbols of schools (e.g., the paddle, the ruler, the teacher's furrowed brow) suggest this preoccupation with student control. In recent years, however, the tradition of control and its supporting ideology have been widely challenged. Many students, by a variety of methods, have sought to enlarge their control over their own school lives (Chester & Lohman, 1971); many educators have attempted to ease the regimentation of student behavior.

For educators whose students are alienated, the problem of freedom and control is especially urgent. Considerable evidence indicates that the

*Paper presented at the 1976 American Educational Research Association Annual Convention

American family has greatly deteriorated as a socialization agent; millions of children are deprived of meaningful interaction with parents, extended family, and other adults that is the basis for socialization into the adult world (Bronfenbrenner, 1974). Many children are neglected by and isolated from adults due in part to the pressures of poverty, divorce, and the rat race. These children are minimally aware and accepting of adult values and lifestyles: they are disaffected, indifferent, unwilling to take responsibility, unable to persevere on problems, and, in severe cases, willing to engage in antisocial, counterproductive behavior.

The alienation of many young persons impose more of the burden on schools to socialize these children into skillful, competent young adults, while making this objective more difficult for schools to achieve. Unsocialized students are uncommitted to learning the values and skills of the adult world. Moreover, these children often reject the legitimacy of schools to command them to pursue educational goals and do not value the incentives, like grades, that schools have traditionally used to induce reluctant students to pursue these goals. Controlling alienated students, then, by the educators' status and power may be ineffective. However, "freeing" these students by allowing them to decide their own activities is also unsatisfactory in that, as alienated children are not internally committed to educational goals, they will fail to acquire the values and skills necessary to function well for themselves and society. Administrators and teachers who confront alienated students are in a quandary: unilateral control of students is impaired; "freeing" the students appears only to lead to chaos and the abdication of the school's responsibility.

Educators involved in the open education movement (and related movements like inquiry learning and experiential learning) suggest an alternative to either reliance on power and status to control students unilaterally or the

"freeing" of students from adult control and direction. Central to open education is the belief that educators' attempts to control students should be deemphasized. In an open classroom, students and the teacher jointly decide learning goals and activities, and students are free to move around the room and choose their partners with whom they will work (Walberg & Thomas, 1972). Instead of unilateral control or freedom, open education advocates collaboration between teachers and students.

Educational researchers have advocated reforms consistent with this central idea of open education. De Charms (1971) found that student experience in deciding their own actions, which he calls origin training, can facilitate the reaching of educational goals, including achievement motivation and academic performance. Kohlberg and Turiel (1971) suggested that student participation in decision-making processes can stimulate student moral development. Educational sociologists have warned us that the bureaucratic structure of schools may increase student alienation and, thereby, lower academic performance (Anderson, 1973). Recent research on attribution processes calls into question the schools' reliance on extrinsic incentives, like grades, to promote learning because they may undermine student internal motivation to learn (Lepper & Greene, 1975).

A common theme in the open education movement and related reform proposals suggests that teacher power and status used to exercise unilateral control should be tempered in the classroom. The teacher's use of status to prescribe student behavior and her power to force compliance with her directives should give way somewhat to the students' right to make their own decisions and their power to implement those decisions. The consequences and methods of changing the power and status differences between teacher and student should be examined (Walberg & Thomas, 1972). Moreover, as

unilateral control of a growing number of alienated children appears to be infeasible, new methods of control and coordination need to be devised.

The purpose of this essay is to review educational and social psychological literature on control and on unequal power and status relationships and to suggest educational research issues and implications for school practice. Although the focus of this review is on the teacher-student relationship, similar social processes are likely to characterize other unequal relationships in schools, such as the administrator-teacher, school board member-teacher, and administrator-student relationships. This review does not include literature on the methods of influence. Tedeschi (1972) has compiled essays on the social psychology of social influence processes; Johnson and Matross (1975) have analyzed influence processes in counseling settings.

This review attempts to demonstrate that social psychological concepts of power and status and related literature can be useful in analyzing educational problems. Johnson and Johnson (1974) have demonstrated that the social psychological concepts of cooperation and competition suggest instructional goal structures that can facilitate educational objectives. The theory and research on power and status, while perhaps not as adequate as the research on cooperation and competition, can be helpful for educators. I trust this review will stimulate research and theory on power, status, and control that will be more useful to educators.

Several propositions concerning unequal relationships and the issue of control in schools are argued in this review. Although an authority hierarchy that grants administrators and teachers superior power and status over students may often control and coordinate staff and student behavior so that the objectives of school are accomplished, this hierarchy poses important problems for the school. Proposition 1: School personnel often use their

superior power and status to control unilaterally student behavior in many areas. By doing so, schools do not fully accomplish their objective of creating skillful, self-directing, responsible young adult. Proposition 2: Confronted with students they believe are uncommitted to educational goals and classroom procedures, educators often seek to strengthen their ability to control students by enhancing their superior power and status over students. The methods of emphasizing their superior power and status adversely affect the relationships between educators and students and student learning. Proposition 3: Decidedly unequal relationships among school persons are characterized by inaccurate communication, deception, competition, and ineffective conflict resolution and problem-solving capabilities. These relationships may also lower student self-esteem and increase their sense of powerlessness. Proposition 4: Students and teachers should move towards the cooperative use of each other's resources to reach mutually determined goals. Increasing student participation in decision-making, enhancing student status and power, and reducing student uncertainty may facilitate important educational goals. A limited democratically structured school and classroom can help implement these changes.

The School as an Organization

The basic objective of schools is to transform children into socialized, skillful, and competent young adults. To accomplish this important objective, administrators, teachers, counselors, other school personnel, and students are organized according to certain roles, norms, and values. The roles (e.g., teacher, student) specify the division of labor in the school and the behavior expected of persons who have these roles. Conformity to these roles is necessary to coordinate behavior among the organization members so that the school can accomplish its purposes. The teacher's role, for example,

includes preparing lessons to learn; the student's role includes using these lessons to learn. Norms and values serve to integrate the activities of persons carrying out different roles in the organizations. Norms define appropriate behavior within the organization; values give ideological support to the organization's purpose and aspirations (Johnson, 1970).

Problems of control inevitably arise in schools. Problems occur in role performance and conformity to norms. Teachers may lack the skills to perform their role competently; students may misperceive, or even reject, role expectations and school values and norms. Students may have needs that they believe cannot be legitimately met within the school: they may feel their needs for power are frustrated and attempt to meet these needs by ordering the teacher or fighting with other students. Problems may occur in the use of power: teachers may use their power illicitly to gain favors from their students; students may use their power to disrupt the class. If these individual needs and behaviors dominate, the school cannot accomplish its objectives.

An authority hierarchy has been delegated the responsibility of solving these problems of coordination and control. This hierarchy consists of positions with each position subordinate to the position above it. Students, who have low-status in that they belong to a subordinate position in this hierarchy, are expected to believe that they ought to obey the high-status administrators and teachers within certain defined limits (Katz & Kahn, 1966; Tedeschi, Bonoma, & Schlenker, 1972). Indeed, following the high-status persons' orders within these limits is a major student role expectation. Teachers and administrators are thus given the right to make certain decisions for the students concerning how the students should behave.

In most schools, the teacher has the right to order a student to read an assignment and the student is obligated to read it. The teacher's right

to order and the student's obligation to obey is an important basis for the teacher's capacity to control student behavior so that organizational goals are attained. As students may not always willingly comply with the teacher's orders, teacher capacity to control students unilaterally is strengthened by their power of distributing valued resources to the students (Katz & Kahn, 1966).

Definitions

Social power is an enticing, yet elusive concept for social psychological and educational researchers. Though commonly used, attempts to define social power satisfactorily for a broad range of researchers have not been successful. Social power is generally considered to be a characteristic of a relationship, rather than of an individual or group (Emerson, 1962), but within this consensus, there is much disagreement. Some theorists have defined social power as the capacity or potential to control another person's behavior (Dahl, 1957). Other theorists have considered social power as the actual control over another's behavior (Russell, 1938; Mayhew, Gray, & Richardson, 1969). Still other researchers suggest that social power should be defined as the potential to influence a person in a desired direction (Cartwright, 1959). Although these definitions are consistent with the common sense notion that power is related to the ability to cause behavior and change, they present several serious problems to the researcher. These problems include distinguishing among power, status, control, and influence and operationalizing and measuring power. Defining power as the capacity to affect another person's outcomes (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) appears to avoid these problems. Outcomes refer to a person's rewards and costs or, alternatively, his goal facilitation and frustration. Using field theory rather than behavioristic terms, power can also be defined as the control over valued resources.

More specifically, individual A has power with respect to individual B when B perceives that A controls the dispensing of resources that B values. Social power then depends on a need-resource correspondence (Strong & Matross, 1973). The power of A is determined by the extent to which B values the resources that A controls. B's valuing these resources in turn depends upon the availability of alternative sources of these or similar resources (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) and the value B has for the goals that can be affected by A's resources. A's resources can be B's goals or they can be part of the path to B's goals; A's control over valued resources implies that A can facilitate and frustrate B's goal, that is, can affect B's outcomes.

Persons have unequal power to the extent that A controls more resources valued by B than B controls resources valued by A. Teachers have more power over students than students have over teachers for teachers control more resources valued by students, e.g., grades, than the students control resources valued by teachers. A teacher's superior power derives directly from his position in the organization rather than from his personal characteristics, though these too can be sources of power. While a student has a low-power relative to the teacher, the student is seldom powerless for she has resources, e.g., acceptance, that can facilitate and frustrate teacher goals. Valued resources are often exchanged between teachers and the students as they carry out their roles and seek to accomplish school objectives. For example, a teacher makes his resource of knowledge available to the student as she seeks to learn. The student, in turn, makes her resources of energy and attention available to the teacher as the teacher attempts to attain his goal of being a competent teacher who helps students learn.

Status has been variously, and loosely, defined as prestige, attractiveness, social class, and so on. Status when defined as position in an authority

hierarchy can be distinguished from power and can be adequately operationalized and measured (Johnson & Allen, 1972). Unequal status persons belong to different positions that make up the hierarchy. Teachers have more status than students for their position is superordinate to the student position.

Status and power are related to, but distinguishable from, influence and control. Influence refers to attempts to induce another person to perform a desired behavior; (unilateral) control occurs when the influence attempt is successful in that the person behaves as desired (Cartwright & Zander, 1968). Unilateral control is distinguished from mutual control or collaboration in that collaboration occurs when both persons consent to act in mutually advantageous ways (Argyris & Schön, 1974). Power is a basis for successful influence and unilateral control: positively valued resources can be promised, presented, or withdrawn; negatively valued ones can be threatened, applied, or withdrawn (Lipe & Jung, 1971). The person who is the target of an influence attempt based on power may comply because he believes his outcomes will be superior than if he defies the influence attempt. Status is also a basis for unilateral control; low-status persons usually believe they ought to comply with legitimate influence attempts of the high-status person and, therefore, comply. Power and status are not the only bases for control and collaboration in organizations; much organizational behavior is coordinated by norm conformity. However, educators who seek considerable unilateral control over students are apt to try to increase their superior power and to enhance their superior status over students.

This analysis of power and status suggests that the teacher's ability to control students unilaterally depends upon student values and beliefs. Teachers have been portrayed as having despotic control (Getzels & Thelan, 1960), but have also been seen as vulnerable to students (Waller, 1932).

A teacher whose students unquestionably accept her legitimacy to make decisions for them and who value her resources highly can exert unilateral, perhaps even despotic, control However, whereas in most organizations, acceptance of the high-status person's right to command obedience is a prerequisite for membership in the organization (Katz & Kahn, 1966), membership in schools does not require this acceptance. In addition, students may consider the teacher's resources of knowledge and grades as not immediately satisfying. The teacher's ability to control students unilaterally by her superior power and status is greatly impaired when students reject her right to make decisions and do not value her resources.

Freedom and Control Ideology

Willower and his associates (Willower, in press) have carried out an interesting program of research focused on educators' orientations toward student control. They have found that educators do have distinguishable sets of beliefs about student relationship to school authority. A "custodial" teacher perceives students as irresponsible and lacking self-discipline; to compensate for these deficiencies, schools must emphasize their authority by making decisions for the students and by compelling them to act appropriately. On the other hand, a "humanistic" teacher perceives students as capable of self-direction and as internally committed to learning; schools then should be communally arranged with power and the capacity to make decisions widely shared among administrators, teachers, and students. Compared to "custodial" teachers, "humanistic" teachers were found to have a number of positive characteristics, such as openness, a sense of power, creativity, and self-actualization. "Humanistic" teachers were also found to be more student-centered and to have students who like school.

Willower's research using the Public Control Ideology (PCI) form, which was derived from observation of schools and a system theory perspective,

gains more credibility because it is consistent with MacGregor's (1960) research on Theory X and Theory Y, which was derived from observation of business organizations and a participatory management perspective. Similar to Willower's "custodial" teaching style, Theory X management style is based on the assumptions that (a) organization members dislike work and will avoid it if possible, (b) they must then be controlled and threatened so that they will work for organizational goals, and (c) they prefer to be controlled so they can avoid responsibility. Given at best their passive resistance to the organization's goals, the effective manager must control and direct members so they accomplish the organization's goals (Johnson, 1973).

Similar to Willower's "humanistic" teacher, a Theory Y manager assumes that (a) persons seek work and can be self-directed, (b) the rewards of self-actualization can motivate persons to accomplish the organization's goals, (c) under the proper conditions, persons seek responsibility, (d) the capacity for responsibility as well as intelligence and creativity are widely distributed among persons, and (e) these capabilities are now very much underutilized. Consequently, an effective manager needs to concentrate on helping persons recognize and develop their self-control and other capabilities and to concentrate on creating the conditions under which persons can seek their own goals while advancing the organization's goals. While Theory X management style may still dominate business organizations as the related assumptions about motivation have, until recently, dominated psychology, there is a growing recognition of the validity of Theory Y assumptions about human motivation within psychology (Maslow, 1954) and of the need to adopt Theory Y management style in business (Johnson, 1973).

Research on the Pupil Control Ideology and Theory X and Theory Y suggests that the teacher beliefs about student motivation and capabilities

are closely and probably casually linked with teacher efforts to control students. A teacher who believes students are irresponsible and unwilling to learn is likely to try to control them. A teacher's efforts to control students may reinforce his beliefs that students are untrustworthy and unmotivated as a way of making his efforts to control appear reasonable (Strickland, 1958). A teacher intent on controlling students probably does not encourage his students to develop the confidence and skills necessary to act responsibly and may often elicit nonconforming student behavior (Willower, 1965). A "custodial" teacher is likely then to bias the information he receives about his students so as to reinforce his beliefs that he must exert strong control over them. Distrust of students and concerted efforts to control them are mutually reinforcing.

Strengthening Teacher Control

Educators appear to be under strong organizational pressures to exert unilateral control over students (Waller, 1932; Willower & Jones, 1967). Even "humanistic" teachers may feel obligated to strengthen their capabilities to control students (Hoy, 1968, 1969). Literature relevant to methods of increasing the teacher's power and status in order to control students is reviewed in this section. These methods of increasing the teacher's power and status, however, appear to derogate and downgrade the student while enhancing the teacher and to have severe adverse consequences on the student and on the student-teacher relationship.

Increasing Power

While few empirical studies have considered methods of increasing power, several theorists have suggested methods of doing so (Strong & Matross, 1973; Michener & Suchner, 1972). In order to be a basis of power, the teacher's resource must be perceived and considered valuable by the students. To increase her power, the teacher should make her present resources known,

gain more resources, or, possibly, to induce the students to believe that she has resources that she actually does not control. To persuade the students of their need for her resources, the teacher may emphasize the importance for the students of their goals that can be affected by the teacher's resources. Methods such as withdrawing resources so as to convince the students of their need for these resources and persuading the students that they have few or no alternatives for these resources can increase the teacher's power over students.

A teacher intent on control may try to lower her dependence on the students and thereby increase her superior power--that is, the difference between her power over the students and the students' power over her. The teacher would then (a) belittle the students' resources, (b) maintain that she does not need these resources, (c) demonstrate alternative sources for the resources the students do control, and (d) convince the students that she can forego their resources if they become at all costly.

Status Enhancement

Although little research is available that is directly relevant to increasing the ability to control based on high status, role theory (Sarbin & Allen, 1968) does suggest some approaches to this problem. A teacher intent on using her high status to exert control may clarify to the students that an essential role expectation for all of them is obeying the teacher's orders over the range of behavior that she wishes to control: the role of the teacher includes directing and controlling; persons in the student role are expected to obey. The teacher could clarify any vagueness students may have about this role expectation so that students do not act consistently with a different role expectation. The teacher can strengthen this role expectation by enlisting other students, teachers, administrators, and perhaps parents to inform students that they too expect the students

to comply with the teacher's decisions. As these role expectations are statements concerning how students should behave, clear role expectations indicate specifically to the student how he can obtain social approval and avoid social disapproval from the persons who hold this role expectation for him. Strengthening the teacher's status and increasing her superior power both imply the enhancement of the teacher (she makes the important decisions and has the valuable resources) and the belittling of the students (they are too inexperienced and narrow-minded to make decisions and they possess few valuable resources).

Student Responses to Control Attempts

Students appear to respond in several ways to educators' attempts to strengthen their power and status so they can control students unilaterally. Several theories suggest that being controlled is itself frustrating and provokes assertions of the self. Brehm (1966) reactance theory suggests that students may respond to constrictions upon their freedoms by overvaluing these freedoms (this theory may explain, in part, the value students place on long hair). De Charms (1971) has argued that school attempts to control students frustrate their desire to be the cause of their own behavior and undermine their academic performance. Argyris and Schön (1974) suggested that being controlled by another person is often experienced as losing and provokes efforts to avoid being controlled and, if possible, to control the other person. Students have demanded more control over their own school lives (Chesler & Lohman, 1971). Sit-ins, demands for a student bill of rights, and protests are methods some students have chosen to try to increase their area of self-control.

While direct confrontation with educators is an important and publicized student response, indirect methods of counteracting educators' attempts to control may be used more frequently. In response to control attempts,

students may develop their own sub-cultures (Willower, 1965). These sub-cultures can help students deny that the teacher's resources, such as praise, grades, and knowledge, are important to them and help them to overvalue student resources, such as success in athletics, clothes, popularity among peers, and so forth (Coleman, 1961). These student sub-cultures appear to obstruct significantly the goals of the school (Coleman, 1961; Bidwell, 1965; Boocock, 1973).

Students may resign themselves to their low-power and status and their lack of control over their school lives. Rhea (1968) suggested that students often accept their dependency by attributing to educators the competence to make wise decisions. Students also know that accepting their dependent position spares them the difficult task of making decisions about their future and, indeed, of developing decision-making capabilities. Though students accept their dependency, they may still attempt to increase the outcomes they receive from educators, usually by trying to compile a record of good grades that they believe will be useful in the future (Rhea, 1968). Bidwell (1965) has argued that students often seek to manipulate their teachers' liking for them into special favors, especially high grades. Students have been found to believe that bluff and personality are more useful in getting good grades than is knowledge (Rhea, 1968).

Research has not clarified the conditions under which low-power and -status students may respond to control attempts with active confrontation, the development of their own sub-cultures, acceptance, or apathy and withdrawal. Students may often respond to attempts to control them by alternating among several of these possibilities. Some students may even be preoccupied with resolving their internal conflict over how they personally should respond to control attempts. The emphasis on the teacher's superior

power and status to control students also affects the relationships between teachers and students; these unequal relationships, it is argued in the next section, adversely effect classroom interaction.

Unequal Power and Status Relationships

Unequal power and status are often believed to corrupt the superordinate and subordinate persons and their relationship as well. For example, feminists argue the liberation of women can also liberate men and strengthen female-male relationships. That inequality corrupts relationships is also a recurrent theme in applied fields of psychology. Many psychotherapists, for example, believe that they can be more successful if they can establish a relationship relatively immune from the client and therapist roles; these unequal power and status roles may undermine mutually open and growth-producing liaisons (Rogers, 1951; Laing, 1967). Based on theories of organizational change (e.g., Bennis, 1969), Schmuck and Schmuck (1974) argued that the sharing of power and decision-making capabilities may help humanize schools so that they promote the competence of students and teachers.

Educational Research on Unequal Relationships

Important empirical studies by educational researchers also suggest that a teacher who emphasizes his superior power and status may undermine his relationships with the students and adversely affect educational outcomes. This literature includes the Lewin leadership and related studies that experimentally induced leadership styles. Educational research literature relevant to power and status has often relied on observation of teacher behavior and the presumed effects of this behavior on classroom climate and student achievement.

Lewin and his associates' (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939; White & Lippitt, 1960) leadership studies can be interpreted as providing support for the notion that a leader who uses his superior power and status to control

can have undesirable effects on groups of children. The researchers formed boys' clubs and subjected these clubs to autocratic, democratic, and laissez faire leadership styles. The autocratic leader asserted his superior status by determining the group's activities and frequently used his power resources of praise and criticism as means of control. The democratic leader used his status to help the group members themselves decide their activities. He avoided praise or criticism of the boys. As he was active in the group's activities, members had opportunities to demonstrate to him their valuable resources.

Group members were hostile and aggressive and engaged in scapegoating under autocratic leaders. This aggression and frustration was often indirectly expressed, presumably out of fear of expressing it in the presence of the autocratic leader. Members were more independent, group-minded, friendly, and demonstrated more individuality under the democratic leaders than under autocratic leaders. While they worked longer under autocratic rule, they showed more genuine interest in work and worked longer without supervision under democratic leadership.

The laissez faire leadership style can be characterized as the leader's abdication of status and power with no attempt to build the group's decision-making capabilities nor to develop the leader's and members' power over each other. Members were disorganized and dissatisfied under such a leader. They played rather than worked, and the work they did do was of poor quality.

Results of the leadership studies, interpreted in terms of power and status, suggest that a leader who strongly emphasizes his superior power and status may (a) undermine group cohesion, (b) frustrate group members' goals, (c) induce discontent and hostility both toward other members and toward the leader, (d) create pressures toward conformity, (e) increase

dependency, and (f) lower internal commitment to work. On the other hand, a leader who does not actively use his status and power to help the members build their decision-making capabilities and to develop their power over each other may find the members unwilling to work and feeling disorganized and dissatisfied.

Much of the educational research relevant to unequal power and status between teachers and students has utilized observations of classroom behavior, especially the verbal behavior of teachers. Anderson and his associates (Anderson & H. M. Brewer, 1945; Anderson & J. E. Brewer, 1946; Anderson, Brewer, & Reed, 1946) divided teacher behavior into dominative (controlling) and integrative (proposing collaboration). Students whose teachers scored high on integrative behavior were orderly, self-directed, spontaneous, problem-solving and altruistic. Drawing upon Anderson's distinction between domination and integration, Flanders (1959) classified teacher communication acts into direct and indirect influence attempts. Direct influence attempts (e.g., lecture, commands) tend to restrict student freedom of action whereas indirect influence attempts (e.g., accepting and clarifying feelings) increase the freedom of action of the students. Results indicate that students with teachers who used indirect influence attempts had positive attitudes about their teacher and schoolwork and developed good work habits.

Research using Withall's (1949) Climate Index also suggests that teacher attempts to assert her superior status and power may have adverse effects on the classroom climate (Withall & Lewis, 1963). Withall's observation schedule categorizes teacher verbal behavior into those statements which have the intent to support the learner (learner-centered) or to support the teacher (teacher-centered). Thelan and Withall (1949) found more positive social climates in classrooms where the teacher was learner-centered. Using the Withall Index, Perkins (1949) found that students in adult education classes

with leaders who were learner-centered made better use of evidence to support their ideas and appeared to demonstrate more insight and sound reasoning than students in classes with leaders who were teacher-centered.

Educational researchers have also experimentally induced "autocratic" (teacher-centered) and "democratic" (student-centered) methods in various learning situations. Flanders (1949), for example, used the Withall Climate Index to operationalize teacher-centered and student-centered teaching methods and found that students in the teacher-centered condition were more withdrawn, apathetic, and anxious than were students in the student-centered condition. However, as reviews by Stern (1962), Anderson (1959), and McKeachie (1963) suggest, results of these "autocratic-democratic" studies have not been as consistently in favor of "democratic" methods as is commonly supposed. McKeachie (1963) suggested that "democratic" methods appear to facilitate problem-solving, positive attitudes, group skills, and motivation, whereas "autocratic" methods facilitate acquisition of knowledge. In addition to inconsistent results, methodological problems have hampered this research. "Democratic" methods have been operationalized in such widely different ways as a deemphasis on grades, the use of discussion methods, student self-evaluation, and a personal teacher manner. Moreover, student personalities have usually not been adequately considered as mediating student responses to "autocratic" and "democratic" methods (Wispe, 1951).

This research on leadership styles, teacher observation, and "autocratic-democratic" methods adds support to the notion that the teacher's use of power and status to control student behavior unilaterally can negatively affect teacher-student and student-student relationships and student learning. But this research's usefulness in exploring unequal power and status in schools is limited. The Lewin leadership studies were not

conceptualized in terms of power and status and the operationalizations of the three leadership styles do not strictly represent different emphases of the leader's power and status. There are several problems with research based on observation of teacher behavior (Withall & Lewis, 1963; Bidwell, 1965). The observation schedules assume that the teacher's behavior is the cause (the independent variable) of classroom climate and student outcomes. Because a teacher acts more student-centered given certain student behavior, it cannot be assumed that the teacher's behavior is the cause of classroom climate (Withall & Lewis, 1963). A limitation of observation research especially significant for the issue of power, status, and control is that this research does not specify the conditions under which unilateral control attempts or collaborative attempts are appropriate. For example, Flanders (1959) suggested that sometimes "direct" influence attempts are preferred, but his observation findings do not seem to be much help in specifying when this is so. Similarly, researchers on "autocratic" and "democratic" methods have generally been interested in demonstrating the superiority of one method (usually the "democratic" one) over the other method rather than investigating the consequences of these methods on the social dynamics of the learning situation, or, relatedly, investigating the conditions under which one method is more effective for reaching an objective than is the other method (Anderson, 1959). Understanding the social processes that are likely to occur between teachers and students because of their unequal power and status may indicate how the undesirable consequences of this inequality can be mitigated.

Social Psychological Research on Unequal Relationships

Unequal power and status can induce certain social processes in a relationship and affect the individuals' personalities. Unequal relationships, it is argued in this section, are characterized by distorted and

impoverished communication, which in turn, negatively affects the generation of useful student feedback and the establishment of a personal, "humanizing" teacher-student relationship. Moreover, developing effective conflict resolution and problem-solving capabilities between unequal status and power persons may be difficult. These relationships also may affect student self-esteem and feelings of powerlessness.

Unequal relationships' effects on personality. Self-esteem indicates the extent to which a person believes that he is competent, worthwhile, and successful (Coopersmith, 1967). Self-esteem is related to academic performance as well as psychological well-being (Coopersmith, 1967; Johnson, 1970). Both the symbolic interactionist and psychological success theories suggest that the low-power and -status position of students may lower their self-esteem.

The symbolic interactionist approach to self-esteem emphasizes that persons evaluate themselves as they perceive significant other persons evaluate them (Mead, 1934). Several studies suggest that (a) low-power and -status positions are believed to require modest competencies, (b) negative characteristics are attributed to the persons who hold these positions, and (c) negative evaluations are communicated to the low-power and -status persons (Zander & Cohen, 1955; French, 1963; Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1966). The negative feedback and ignoring of the person in the low positions are likely to lower self-esteem. On the other hand, positive feedback and deferential behavior are likely to increase the high-power and status person's self-esteem. Prolonged membership in a high- or low-power and -status position has been found to affect self-esteem (Heiss & Owen, 1972; Maykovich, 1972; Yancy, Rigsby, & McCarthy, 1972).

A student with low-power and -status is also likely to suffer a loss of self-esteem because she has few opportunities for psychological success

and many for psychological failure. According to Argyris (1970), psychological success experiences are the bases for concluding that one is a capable person because one has behaved competently. The opportunities for psychological success increase (and for psychological failure decrease) as (a) the person is able to define her own goals, (b) the goals are relevant to her central needs, (c) the activities involve her important abilities, and (d) the goals represent a challenging level of aspiration. High-status persons in an organization generally have more opportunities for psychological success than do low-status persons (Argyris, 1970). In addition, low-power persons must often determine their activities and goals according to the wishes of the high-power persons and are often assigned unchallenging tasks not wanted by the high-power persons. Low-power and -status persons like students then are apt to experience frequent psychological failure that lowers self-esteem. Low self-esteem is likely to undermine academic performance as well as psychological well-being (Johnson, 1970).

Unequal relationships may induce alienation in the form of powerlessness among low-power and -status persons. Seeman (1959) defined powerlessness as the expectancy that one cannot by one's own actions obtain desired outcomes or achieve one's goals. Since low-power and -status persons' goal attainment or frustration depends in large part on the high-power person and since they are often told how they ought to behave by high-status persons, it is probable that they develop (and realistically so!) general expectancies that they are unable to control their own lives (Rotter, 1966). Some low-power and -status minority groups have been found to have feelings of powerlessness (Clark, 1965; Pettigrew, 1968; Baltzell, 1964).

Feeling powerless is apt to affect low-power and -status students' behavior. Persons who believe that they are powerless have been found to be less resistant to influence attempts, place less value on skill than on

luck, lack commitment to social change movements, fail to seek and to obtain useful information about their situation, and influence other persons ineffectively (Lefcourt, 1966; Rotter, 1966; Seeman & Evans, 1968). Coleman, et al (1966) argued that feeling powerless contributes greatly to student failure to achieve academically. A student whose outcomes are controlled by the teacher and whose decisions are made by the teacher may develop more generalized expectations of helplessness and, thus, fail to develop the skills of being an independent, self-directing person.

Social processes between unequal status and power persons. Persons with low power are apt to feel uncertain about their future goal facilitation and frustration because these depend heavily on the unpredictable behavior of the high-power person (Cohen, 1959). These feelings of uncertainty and anxiety have been though to provoke several reactions, including (a) increased vigilence and attempts to understand and predict the high-power person's behavior (Johnson & Ewans, 1971), (b) distorted perceptions of the high-power person's positive intent towards the low-power person (Pepitone, 1950; Thibaut & Riecken, 1955), (c) attraction mixed with fear toward the high-power person (Hurwitz, Zander, & Hymovitch, 1968), (d) stifling of criticism of the high-power person (Cohen, 1958), (e) unwillingness to clarify one's position to the high-power person (Alkire, Collum, Kaswin, & Love, 1968), and (f) ingratiation, conformity, flattery, and self-effacing self-presentation to induce the high-power person to like and to reward the low-power person (Jones, 1964). In conflict situations, the low-power person may suspiciously expect exploitation because, lacking retaliation capabilities, he believes that he is vulnerable (Solomon, 1960; Tedeschi, Lindskold, Horai, & Gahagan, 1969).

High-power persons may feel less threatened and uncertain, though they appear to be concerned with maintaining their superior power. They may be

defensive and self-protective, especially if they fear that they may be removed from their high-power position (Cohen, 1958). High-power persons may underestimate the low-power person's positive intent towards them because they believe the low-power person helps them because of their superior power (Thibaut & Riecken, 1955). They may devalue the low-power person because they see him as dependent and controlled by external forces, such as high-power persons (Kipnis, 1972). High-power persons have been found to be unattentive to the communications of the low-power person and attempt to protect their superior power by rejecting the low-power person's demands for change (Deutsch, 1973; Tjosvold, 1974; Tedeschi, Lindskold, Horai, & Gahagan, 1973).

Research on unequal status relationships suggests that low-status persons are likely to perceive higher status persons as capable because they are believed to have the competence needed to hold high-status positions in the organization (French, 1963). The perceived competence of the high-status person may engender the low-status person to identify with him (Kohlberg, 1969). This identification can take the form of (a) attraction and perceived similarity (Mulder, 1960), (b) the magical belief that one is the high-status person (Polansky, Lippitt, & Redl, 1950; Lippitt, Polansky, Redl, & Rosen, 1952), (c) frequent and supportive communication with the high-status person (Thibaut, 1950; Kelley, 1951), and (d) imitation of the high-status person's behavior (Bandura, 1969).

High-status persons, on the other hand, may believe that the low-status person is incompetent and, therefore, have little incentive to identify with him. They may be unwilling to convey their own confusions and feelings of incompetence, but be very willing to criticize low-status persons directly for their shortcomings (Kelley, 1951). High-status persons also appear to want low-status persons to agree with their positions on issues relevant to

their high status (Jones, 1964). They may be self-protective when they fear that their maintaining their superior position is threatened and respond by withholding approval from the low-status persons and by perceiving them as incompetent as a way of minimizing their threat (Kelley, 1951; Zander, Cohen, & Stotland, 1957).

Unequal Teacher-Student Relationships

Research on unequal power and status relationships suggests that decidedly unequal teacher-student relationships may be characterized by ineffective communication and conflict resolution. Communication between unequal power and status teachers and students is apt to be impoverished and distorted. Low-power and -status students may be unwilling to express their ideas, feelings, and demands for change directly, but instead attempt to mislead and deceive teachers. Teacher isolation from valid information from students implies that a teacher does not receive useful feedback about his teaching performance. Without valid feedback on how his teaching effects his students, he is unlikely to be able to experiment successfully with new ways of teaching that can have the impact he desires (Argyris & Schön, 1974). In addition, a teacher may feel, in Argyris' (1970) term, unconfirmed because he is uncertain about his own teaching experience and he knows that his own perceptions are liable to bias.

The distorted and impoverished communication between teachers and students may make it difficult for them to establish a "humanizing" relationship (Johnson & Johnson, 1974). A "humanizing" relationship is characterized by mutual openness, concern, empathy, and warmth and is beneficial intrinsically and because it facilitates the development of the skills needed to establish "humanizing" relationships.

Because of their unequal power and status, teachers and students are apt to experience frequent conflict; this inequality also may undermine their

ability to resolve these conflicts constructively. Teachers typically enjoy superior outcomes and are likely to be satisfied with the status quo, while students are more likely to be dissatisfied and seek change (Porter & Lawler, 1965; Deutsch, 1973). However, the impoverished and self-protective communication between teacher and student may seriously hinder their ability to resolve their conflicts productively. Valid information is necessary so that teachers and students can identify problems that underlie their conflicts (Argyris, 1970; Schmuck, 1971). In addition, the exchange of valid information and thoughtful ideas can facilitate the generation of alternative solutions to these problems and the selection and implementation of the solution most acceptable to teachers and students (Johnson, 1973). Moreover, as high-power teachers may be intransigent and students suspicious of teachers, a constructive resolution of their conflicts may be difficult. If teachers and students have nearly equal power, they may have more incentives to take each other's position seriously and to be less suspicious and fearful; they then may find it easier to resolve their conflicts so that both of them benefit (Thibaut & Fraucheux, 1965; Walton, 1969; Gruder, 1970).

Consequences on student learning. Due to the teachers' superior status, students may identify and imitate them. Student imitation and identification may help socialize students into the values and norms of the society (Schmuck & Van Egmond, 1965; Glidewell, Krantor, Smith, & Stringer, 1966). While imitation is a major source of learning (Bourdon, 1970), imitation and identification can be dysfunctional for students. They may imitate teacher behaviors that are ineffective for themselves. More than imitation and identification, students need to develop behaviors and values that can help them reach their own goals and meet the changing requirements of society.

To the extent that the teacher's power and status inhibits open conflict resolution and problem-solving, students do not learn the skills

and values associated with effective problem-solving and conflict resolution; instead, students learn to suppress their dissatisfaction, their demands for change, and their ideas for change. While learning compliance to authority is probably useful in that compliance is sometimes called for in the adult world of work and citizenship, student learning to obey unquestionably as the primary or only legitimate response to authority is unlikely to be a valuable skill even in economic organizations. These organizations are probably more effective if they are based on the principles of collaboration rather than obedience (Bennis, 1969). Strong reliance on authority may also promote the undemocratic intolerance for minority groups and for freedom of expression (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). The emphasis on teachers' power and status to control is unlikely to help students learn the skills and values (e.g., the legitimacy of dissent) necessary for democratic citizenship. In addition, an authoritarian school provides few opportunities for students to articulate their moral ideas, to listen to other students' moral reasoning, or to act consistently with their moral ideas. Schools may then fail to stimulate student moral development and, ultimately, fail to facilitate student commitment to democracy, equality, and freedom (Kohlberg & Turiel, 1971).

Contrary to popular beliefs, the teacher's exercising control over the student is unlikely to teach the student discipline in terms of self-control. As suggested by Rogers (1951) and de Charms (1971), in order for a student to exercise self-control by making choices that enhance himself and his society, he needs to be (a) aware of his own goals, needs, and values, (b) able to determine alternatives available to him, and (c) willing to take the necessary risks to act in ways that can be self-enhancing. The student needs training and opportunities to develop these capabilities, rather than have his decisions made for him. The student's ability to make

his own decisions effectively may be further deteriorated because, as argued earlier, his low-power and -status position may lower his feelings of self-worth and increase his feelings of powerlessness.

Implications for School Practice

This review suggests that the development and use of educators' power and status to control students unilaterally frustrate important educational objectives. It is argued in this section that (a) greater use of educators' power and status to promote teacher-student collaboration, (b) increased student participation in the school's decision-making processes, (c) enhancement of student status and power, and (d) reduction of student uncertainty may partially solve problems posed by unequal relationships and control attempts. A limited democratically structured classroom and school can help implement these changes.

Though educators' power and status are often used to control students, their power and status can be used in collaboration with students to facilitate mutually agreed upon goals. Educators often do use their resources to help students reach their goals; teacher resourcefulness has been found to be related to positive student outcomes (Harvey, Prather, White, & Hoffmeister, 1968). Teachers and students are linked by the common, cooperative goal of transforming students into socialized, skillful, and competent young adults. To accomplish this objective, their power (valued resources) must be exchanged. Awareness of each other's goals and needed resources can facilitate these exchanges of resources and the attainment of the school's objective. Students can identify their personal learning goals that overlap with the learning goals assigned to them by the school and can identify the resources they need to attain these goals. Teachers can identify their resources that will be useful to the students and can indicate a willingness to make these resources available

to the students so that they can reach their educational goals. In turn, the teacher can determine their teaching goals and identify the student resources they can use to accomplish their goals. The teachers and students can then agree to an informal or formal contract outlining how they will use their resources to help each other (Johnson & Johnson, 1975). Teachers and students are likely then to recognize, appreciate, and develop each others' resources, to feel attracted to each other, and to desire to help each other in the future. Under these conditions, the threat, suspicion, and competition that underlie many unequal power and status relationships may be largely mitigated.

As collaboration depends upon student commitment to the school-assigned goals, an important objective for educators is to increase student commitment to these goals. Student participation in deciding learning goals is likely to promote student efforts to implement these decisions successfully (Coch & French, 1948; Chelser & Lohman, 1971). This reasoning also suggests that student participation in deciding classroom norms, rules, and procedures will also increase their commitment to the successful implementation of these decisions.

Granting the students the right to help make important decisions provides opportunities for psychological success and enhances their status (Katz & Kahn, 1965). Student power is also increased when students control more classroom resources, such as time. A teacher can increase an individual student's power by recognizing and developing his resources that are valuable for attaining educational goals. This recognition can increase his social esteem (Flanders & Havumaki, 1960) as well as his self-esteem (Johnson, 1970). If students believe they possess valued resources, they are likely to approach each other for help and, thus, reduce their demands on the teacher.

Teachers can reduce low-power students' uncertainty by credibly communicating to the students when they will use their resources to facilitate or frustrate student goals; the students can then confidently follow options they believe are useful. Teachers who try to be "free" by not specifying how they will use their resources, such as knowledge and grades, will probably deepen student anxieties, reinforce student feelings of powerlessness, and induce ineffective behavior (Wispe, 1951). This kind of teacher freedom does not appear to liberate students.

A limited democratically structured school and classroom is one means of increasing student participation in decision-making and, thereby, increasing teacher-student collaboration, enhancing student status and power, and reducing student uncertainty. In a democratically structured school, teachers and students have significant roles in policy making and in the selection and tenure of adminstrators (Katz & Kahn, 1965; Johnson, 1970). In a classroom, the students and teacher together can decide classroom policies and be responsible for implementing these policies.

This democratic structure can be limited by restricting the areas in which the legislature can make decisions. For example, students in a class may not be allowed to determine the basic learning goals; they, with the teacher, could, however, determine which goals should be emphasized. A limited democratic school and classroom attempts to distribute power and decision-making responsibility among educators and students; it does not imply that only certain teaching styles or methods should be used. In a limited democratically structure school, both "autocratic" methods, e.g., lecture, and "democratic" methods, e.g., discussion, could be used when appropriate.

In a democratic school and classroom, students may learn democratic values and skills, such as legitimacy of dissent from authority, respect

for individual rights and opinions, the open resolution of conflicts, and group decision-making. While these values and skills are learned in democratic situations, they are also prerequisites for the effective running of a democratic structure. Training programs (e.g., Johnson & Johnson, 1975) to help teachers and students develop these skills and values can facilitate the establishment of a limited democratic school and classroom (Argyris, 1974).

Summary and Conclusions

Many educators and students are dissatisfied with the strong pressures upon teachers to enhance their superior power and status in order to control students. This review suggests several sources of this dissatisfaction: (a) derogation of student competence and resources, (b) increased student feelings of powerlessness, (c) deterioration of communication between teacher and student, (d) teacher and student inability to resolve their conflicts openly and constructively, and (e) obstacles to developing a "humanizing" teacher-student relationship. As Waller (1932) has noted, the control orientation of school predisposes teachers and students to believe that a state of war exists between them. This competition over control is likely to induce mutual hostility and to undermine greatly the teacher-student relationship (Johnson & Johnson, 1974).

Educators committed to open education and several educational researchers have advocated teacher-student collaboration, rather than teacher or school control. Consistent with this notion, this review has argued for several changes in school organization: (a) increased teacher-student cooperative collaboration, (b) enhancement of student status and power, (c) increased student participation in decision-making to gain student commitment to learning goals and to school procedures, and (d) reduction of student uncertainty. A limited democratically structured school and classroom

can help implement these changes; in order that this structure operate effectively, teachers, adminstrators, and students must develop skills and values in areas such as the open resolution of conflict and group decision-making.

This review is based in part on the assumption that schools have many of the same characteristics as other organizations in society. Indeed, children may be socialized into how they should behave in an organization and how persons should organize themselves by their experience in schools. One important aspect of organizations is that members have unequal power and status and they often use this power and status to control persons with less power and status. Social psychological research on unequal power and status relationships and control does suggest ideas and insights into the organizational life of schools; educational research can determine the extent to which these ideas are valid for educational institutions. These research issues include (a) the methods teachers use to enhance their superior power and status to control students, (b) the communication patterns and conflict resolution capabilities between teachers and students, (c) student responses to control attempts and to their dependent low-power and status position, and (d) sources of resistance to changing teachers' unilateral control orientation to a cooperative collaboration one.

In addition to teachers and students, administrator-teacher and school board-teachers are important unequal power and status relationships in schools. Administrators' and school boards' use of their superior power and status to control teachers may seriously undermine their relationships with teachers and increase teacher uncertainty and feelings of powerlessness. Research could investigate these relationships along the lines suggested by research on unequal power and status relationships. Teachers may respond, for example, to their feelings of vulnerability due to their low-power and

-status position by demanding a greater degree of bureaucratization of schools (Moeller & Charters, 1966). Research could also explore Schmuck and Schmuck's (1974) suggestion that relatively equal administrator-teacher relationships help establish collaborative teacher-student relationships.

References

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1950.

Alkire, A. A., Collum, M. E., Kaswin, J., & Love, L. R. Information exchange and accuracy of verbal communication under social power conditions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, _, 301-308.

Anderson, B. D. School bureaucratization and alienation from high school. Sociology of Education, 1973, 46, 315-334.

Anderson, H. H., & Brewer, H. M. Studies of teachers' classroom personalities, I. Dominative and socially integrative behavior of kindergarten teachers. Applied Psychological Monographs, 1945, No. 6.

Anderson, H. H., & Brewer, J. E. Studies of teachers' personalities, II. Effects of teachers dominative and integrative contacts on children's classroom behavior. Applied Psychological Monographs, 1946, No. 8.

Anderson, H. H., Brewer, J. E., & Reed, M. F. Studies of teachers' classroom personalities, III. Follow-up studies of the effects of dominative and integrative contacts on children's behavior. Applied Psychological Monographs, 1946, No. 11.

Anderson, R. C. Learning in discussions: a resume of the authoritarian-democratic studies. Harvard Educational Review, 1959, 29, 201-215.

Argyris, C. Intervention theory and method: a behavioral science view. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. Theory in practice: increasing professional effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Baltzell, E. D. The protestant establishment: aristocracy and caste in America. New York: Random House, 1964.

Bandura, A. Social-learning theory of identificatory processes. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Bennis, W. G. Organization development: its nature, origins, and prospects. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Berger, J., Cohen, B. P., Connor, T. L., & Zelditch, Jr., M. Status characteristics and expectation states: a process model. Vol. 1. In J. Berger, M. Zelditch, & B. Anderson (Eds.), Sociological theories in progress. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

Bidwell, C. E. The school as a formal organization. In J. G. March (Ed.), Handbook of organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Boocock, S. S. The school as a social environment for learning: social organization and micro-social process in education. Sociology of Education, 1973, 6, 15-50.

Bourdon, R. P. Imitation: implications for counseling and therapy. Review of Educational Research, 1970, 40, 429-457.

Brehm, J. W. A theory of psychological reactance. New York: Academic Press, 1966.

Bronfenbrenner, V. The origins of alienation. Scientific American, 1974, 231, 53-58.

Cartwright, D. A field theoretical conception of power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1959.

Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. (Eds.) Group dynamics: research and theory. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Chesler, M. A., & Lohman, J. E. Changing schools through student advocacy. In R. A. Schmuck & M. B. Miles (Eds.), Organization development in schools. Palo Alto: National Press, 1971.

Clark, K. B. Dark ghetto: dilemmas of social power. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Coch, L., & French, Jr., J. R. P. Overcoming resistance to change. Human Relations, 1948, 1, 512-532.

Cohen, A. R. Upward communication in experimentally created hierarchies. Human Relations, 1958, 11, 41-53.

Cohen, A. R. Situational structure, self-esteem, and threat-oriented reactions to power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1959.

Coleman, J. S. The adolescent society. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Coleman, J. S., et al. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1967.

de Charms, R. Origins, pawns, and educational practice. In G. S. Lessor (Ed.), Psychology and the educational process. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1969.

Deutsch, M. The resolution of conflict. London: New Haven, 1973.

Emerson, R. M. Power-dependence relations. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 31-41.

Flanders, N. A. Personal-social anxiety as a factor in learning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1949.

Flanders, N. A. Teacher-pupil contacts and mental hygiene. Journal of Social Issues, 1959, 15, 30-39.

Flanders, N. A., & Havumaki, S. The effect of teacher-pupil contacts involving praise on the sociometric choices of students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1960, 51, 65-68.

French, Jr., J. R. P. The social environment and mental health. Journal of Social Issues, 1963, 19, 39-56.

Getzels, J. W., & Thelen, H. A. The classroom group as a unique social system. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), The dynamics of instructional groups: sociopsychological aspects of teaching and learning. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Glidewell, J. C., Kantor, M. B., Smith, L. M., & Stringer, L. A. Socialization and social structure in the classroom. Vol. 2. In L. W. Hoffman & M. L. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. New York: Russel Sage, 1966.

Gruder, C. L. Social power in interpersonal negotiation. In P. Swingle (Ed.), The structure of conflict. New York: Academic, 1970.

Harvey, O. J., Prather, M., White, B. J., & Hoffmeister, J. K. Teachers' beliefs, classroom atmosphere and student behavior. American Educational Research Journal, 1968, 5, 151-166.

Heiss, J., & Owens, S. Self-evaluation of blacks and whites. American Journal of Sociology, 1972, 78, 360-370.

Helsel, A. R. Status obeisance and pupil control ideology. Journal of Educational Administration, 1971, 9, 38-47.

Hoy, W. K. The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. The School Review, 1968, 76, 312-323.

Hoy, W. K. Pupil-control ideology and organization socialization: a further examination of the influence of experience on the beginning teachers. The School Review, 1969, 77, 257-265.

Hurwitz, J. I., Zander, A. F., Hymovitch, B. Some effects of power in the relations among group members. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), Group dynamics. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Johnson, D. W. Communication in conflict situations: a critical review of the literature. International Journal of Group Tensions, 1973, 3, 46-67.

Johnson, D. W. (Ed.). Contemporary social psychology. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1973.

Johnson, D. W., & Allen, S. Deviation from organizational norms concerning the relationship betwen status and power: equity vs self-interest theory. The Sociological Quarterly, 1972, 13, 174-182.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. P. Joining together: group theory and group skills. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1975.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. Instructional goal structure: cooperative, competitive, or individualistic. Review of Educational Research, 1974, 44, 213-240.

Johnson, D. W., & Matross, R. Attitude change methods of helping people change. In F. H. Kanfer & A. P. Goldstein (Eds.), Helping people change: methods and materials. Elmsford, New York: Pergamon Press, 1975.

Johnson, M. P., & Owens, W. Power relations and affective style as determinants of confidence in impression formation in a game situation. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1971, 7, 98-110.

Jones, E. E. Ingratiation. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Kelley, H. H. Communication in experimentally created hierarchies. Human Relations, 1951, 4, 39-56.

Kipnis, D. Does power corrupt? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 24, 33-41.

Kohlberg, L. Stage and sequence: the cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Kohlberg, L., & Turriel, E. Moral development and moral education. In G. S. Lesser (Ed.), Psychology and educational practice. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1971.

Laing, R. D. The politics of experience. New York: Ballatine, 1967.

Lefcourt, H. M. Internal versus external control: a review. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65, 206-220.

Lepper, M. R., & Greene, D. Turning play into work: effects of adult surveillance and extrinsic rewards on children's intrinsic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 479-486.

Lewin, K. Psycho-sociological problems of a minority group. Character and Personality, 1935, 3, 175-187.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. H. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. Journal of Social Psychology, 1939, 10, 271-299.

Lipe, D., & Jung, S. M. Manipulating incentives to enhance school learning. Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41, 249-280.

Lippitt, R., Polansky, N., Redl, F., & Rosen, S. The dynamics of power. Human Relations, 1952, 5, 37-64.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.

Mayhew, Jr., B. H., Gray, L. N., & Richardson, J. T. Behavioral measurement of operating power structures: characterization of asymmetrical interaction. Sociometry, 1969, 32, 474-489.

Maykovich, M. K. Reciprocity in racial stereotypes: white, black, and yellow. American Journal of Sociology, 1972, 77, 876-897.

McGregor, D. The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

McKeachie, W. J. Research on teaching at the college and university level. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research and teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Michener, H. A., & Suchner, R. W. The tactical use of social power. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), The social influence process. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1972.

Miles, M. B., & Schmuck, R. A. Improving schools through organization development: an overview. In R. A. Schmuck & M. B. Miles (Eds.), Organization development in schools. Palo Alto: National Press, 1971.

Moeller, G. H., & Charters, Jr., W. W. Relation of bureaucratization to sense of power among teachers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1966, 10, 444-465.

Mulder, M. The power variable in communication experiments. Human Relations, 1960, 13, 241-256.

Pepitone, A. Motivational effects in social perception. Human Relations, 1950, 3, 57-76.

Perkins, H. V. The effects of socio-emotional climate and curriculum on learning of in-service teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1949.

Pettigrew, T. F. A profile of the Negro American. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1964.

Polansky, N., Lippitt, R., & Redl, F. The use of near-sociometric data on group treatment processes. Sociometry, 1950, 13, 39-62.

Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. Properties of organization structure in relation to job attitudes and job behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 1965, 64, 23-51.

Rhea, B. Institutional paternalism in high school. Urban Review, 1968, 2, 13-15, 34.

Rogers, C. R. Client-centered therapy: its current practice, implications, and theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 86(1, Whole No. 609).

Russell, B. Power: a new social analysis. London: Allen & Unwin, 1938.

Sarbin, T. R., & Allen, V. L. Role theory. Vol. 1. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Schmuck, R. A. Improving classroom group processes. In R. A. Schmuck & M. B. Miles (Eds.), Organization development in schools. Palo Alto: National Press, 29-50.

Schmuck, R. A., & Schmuck, P. A. A humanistic psychology of education. Palo Alto: National Press, 1974.

Schmuck, R. A., & Van Egmond. E. Sex differences in the relationship of interpersonal perceptions to academic performance. Psychology in the Schools, 1965, 2, 32-40.

Seeman, M. On the meaning of alienation. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 783-791.

Seeman, M., & Evans, J. W. Alienation and learning in a hospital setting. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 772-782.

Solomon, L. The influence of some types of power relationships and game strategies upon the development of interpersonal trust. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 223-230.

Stern, G. G. Environments for learning. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American college. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Strickland, L. H. Surveillance and trust. Journal of Personality, 1958, 26, 200-215.

Strong, S., & Matross, R. Change processes in counseling and psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 25-37.

Tedeschi, J. T. (Ed.). The social influence processes. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1972.

Tedeschi, J. T., & Bonoma, T. V. Power and influence: an introduction. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), The social influence processes. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1972.

Tedeschi, J. T., Bonoma, T. V., & Schlenker, B. R. Influence, decision, and compliance. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), The social influence processes. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1972.

Tedeschi, J. T., Lindskold, S., Horai, J., & Gahagan, J. P. Social power and the credibility of promises. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 253-261.

Thelen, H. A., & Withall, J. Three frames of reference: the description of climate. Human Relations, 1949, 2, 159-176.

Thibaut, J. An experimental study of the cohesiveness of underprivileged groups. Human Relations, 1950, 3, 251-278.

Thibaut, J., & Faucheux, C. The development of contractual norms in a bargaining situation under two types of stress. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 89-102.

Thibaut, J., & Kelley, H. H. The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Thibaut, J., & Reicken, H. W. Some determinants and consequences of the perception of causality. Journal of Personality, 1955, 24, 113-133.

Tjosvold, D. Threat as a low-power person's strategy in bargaining: social face and tangible outcomes. International Journal of Group Tensions, 1974, 4, 494-510.

Walberg, H. J., & Thomas, S. C. Open education: an operational definition and validation in Great Britain and United States. American Educational Research Journal, 1972, 9, 197-208.

Waller, W. W. The sociology of teaching. New York: Wiley, 1932.

Walton, R. Interpersonal peacemaking. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

White, R. K., & Lippitt, R. Autocracy and democracy: an experimental inquiry. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

Willower, D. J. Hypotheses on the school as a social system. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1965, 1, 40-51.

Willower, D. J. Some comments on inquiries on schools and pupil control. Teachers College Record, in press.

Willower, D. J., & Jones, R. G. Control in an educational organization. In J. D. Raths, et al. (Eds.), Studying teaching. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Wispe, L. G. Evaluating section teaching methods in the introductory course. Journal of Educational Research, 1951, 45, 161-186.

Withall, J. The development of a technique for the measurement of socio-emotional climate in the classrooms. Journal of Experimental Education, 1949, 17, 347-361.

Withall, J., & Lewis, W. W. Social interaction in the classroom. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Yancey, W. L., Rigsby, & McCarthy, J. D. Social position and self-evaluation: the relative importance of race. American Journal of Sociology, 1972, 78, 338-357.

Zander, A., & Cohen, A. R. Attributed social power and group acceptance: a classroom experimental demonstration. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 490-492.

Zander, A., Cohen, A. R., & Stotland, L. Role relations in the mental health professions. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1957.

Footnote

[1]As de Charms (1971) has noted, the issue is more precisely stated as one between external (school or teacher) and internal (student) control or some mix of these loci of control.