DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 933 EA 009 745

AUTHOR McPartland, James M.
TITLE School Authority Systems and Participation Theories.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, N.Y., April 4-8, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Decision Making; Organization; Organizations (Groups); *Participant Involvement; *Power Structure; Public Schools; *School Organization; Secondary Education; *Student Motivation; *Student Participation; Students; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

In this speech, the author considers how the authority dimension of school organization may be related to students' lack of attention to long-range goals and to some of their motivational problems in the classroom. First, the author reviews how the distinction between short-run and long-run returns is similar to familiar distinctions made by organizational theorists concerned with control mechanisms and by educational psychologists interested in types of student motivation. Second, he describes two organizational routes to activate long-range goals as a source of control or motivation: recruitment or selection and socialization. He reviews the arguments that most schools are at a great disadvantage compared to other types of organizations in appealing to long-range goals. Third, he offers some ideas on how variations in the schools' authority structure may be related to the strengthening of long-range goals as a source of student motivation for learning activities. He uses some recent evidence from school surveys to argue that the types of academic choices provided to students may be an important organizational feature to make students less influenced by immediate responses from peers and more attentive to information about the long-range outcomes of their school work. (Author/IRT)

School Authority Systems and Participation Theories

James M. McPartland

The classroom incentive theorists assume that student motivation depends mainly on the immediate returns that the students receive for their behavior. These theorists seek to increase student motivation to work hard at learning tasks by arranging a responsive environment that will regularly recognize and reward student effort in mastering the learning assignments. Some of the most interesting work in this area seeks to deal with the powerful informal peer incentives that exist in the classroom, and to come to terms with the difficulty of defining evaluation criteria to make frequent rewards accessible to students at different ability levels. This work considers variations in the task and reward structures of the school to produce a more successful organizational use of the immediate returns of student behavior. My assignment for this symposium is to consider alternative organizational reforms of schools that may appeal to different motivational sources other than immediate rewards, and to comment on their applicability to typical public school populations.

A quite different set of organizational factors may come into play when you consider long-run returns rather than immediate rewards as a source of student motivation to work hard in school. Several researchers have emphasized the importance of long range returns as a source of student motivation, and how schools may be at a great disadvantage compared to other types of organizations in appealing to this source.

Some researchers have seen the lack of connection between learning assignments and later life goals as the cause of poor student adjustment to schools. Stinchcombe (1964) cites the poor "articulation" between some students' career goals and their perception of the schools' curriculum as a fundamental source of student rebellion in high schools. Others have noted the poor appreciation

by many students of the long-run consequences of their actions in school, causing students to see little need to concentrate on school assignments (Boocock and Coleman, 1966). To partially address these problems, some have called for the organization of instruction around clusters of occupationally relevant competencies (e.g. Levitan, Mangum and Marshell, 1972), or the requirement of experiences in real career situations as part of schooling (PSAC, 1973), or the use of social simulation techniques in schools (Boocock, 1972).

Most junior or senior high school students give little serious thought to their long range plans, or to how what they learn in school may be of use to them in the future. All recent evidence points to lack of realistic knowledge and activity on the part of many students concerning the outcomes which immediately follow high school: continuation of schooling in college or getting a full-time job. We repeatedly find that the proportion of students who report that they will continue their education beyond high school exceeds the number who will actually go on (e.g. Coleman, et al, 1966). Moreover, very few students report activities to gain information about particular colleges and their entrance requirements much before the senior year when college applications are due.[1] Indeed, some have argued that students come to follow a "policy of noncommitment" to long range goals that deprives them of any "criteria to assess the meaning of their current experiences" (Rhea, 1970).

In this presentation, I will consider how the authority dimension of school organization may be related to students' lack of attention to long-range goals and to some of their motivational problems in the classroom.

---

[1] In one study, while 61 percent of twelfth graders had "written or talked to a college official about going to his college", only 31 percent of eleventh graders had done so. The comparable twelfth-eleventh grade percentages for "talked in detail to a school counselor about specific colleges" were 58 percent and 32 percent; and for "talked in detail to teachers about specific colleges" were 45 percent and 28 percent. (McPartland, McDill et al., 1971). In another study (Epstein and McPartland, 1975), one third or less of eighth graders had decided on what courses they would take the next year in high school, and half had not decided what curriculum or program to follow in high school.

First, I will review how the distinction between short run and long run returns is similar to familiar distinctions made by organizational theorists concerned with control mechanisms and by educational psychologists interested in types of student motivation.

Second, I will describe two organizational routes to activate long range goals as a source of control or motivation: recruitment or selection, and socialization. I will review the arguments that most schools are at a great disadvantage compared to other types of organizations in appealing to long range goals.

Third, I will offer some ideas on how variations in the schools' authority structure may be related to the strengthening of long range goals as a source of student motivation for learning activities. Some recent evidence from school surveys will be presented to argue that the types of academic choices provided to students may be an important organizational feature to make students less influenced by immediate responses from peers, and more attentive to information about the long range outcomes of their school work. I will make the connection between these survey findings and the results of Melvin Seeman's studies on locus of control and social learning.

The distinction between short- and long-run returns in organizational and motivational theories

Educational and organizational theorists have made distinctions about types of motivation and mechanisms of control that use different terms but have important similarities to the distinction between short- and long-run returns. Three alternative sources of student motivation have been outlined by these theorists, which can be linked to three classes of organizational control mechanisms, and to short- or long-run returns. Educational theorists have discussed extrinsic, intrinsic and internal motivation (e.g. Bruner, 1968; Scott, 1971)

and organizational theorists have classified control mechanisms as remunerative, coercive or normative (e.g. Etzioni, 1964; see also Likert's [1961: 222-236] distinctions between authoritative and participative organization).

Extrinsic motivation finds its source in the immediate rewards or punishments that can be expected from authorities or peers for particular behaviors. These are the formal and informal reinforcers that follow soon after a student's actions. Organizations appeal to these motivational sources when they use remunerative control based on the manipulation of material resources or rewards and when they use coercive control based on the application or threat of sanctions and restrictions.

Intrinsic motivation derives from inherent features of the immediate task. Some psychologists believe that certain tasks can be rewarding in themselves even though there may be no rewards from others that follow the particular behavior (Bruner, 1968; Day et al., 1971; Hunt, 1971). Some believe that this is merely a habit of conditioned response that carries over from an earlier history of being rewarded for similar behavior, while others hold that human beings find particular task features appealing, such as novelty, social contacts, spontaneity, uncertainly and change, or simply the successful completion of a job that requires some competence (e.g. Inbar and Stoll, 1970; Bruner, 1968: 113-128; also see Avila and Purkey, 1966). The motivational source is seen to be inherent in the type of task, so that intrinsically satisfying tasks could theoretically exist under various authority or control structures in an organization.[2] But the rewards are immediate: they derive from the task activity itself.

---

[2] Blauner (1964) and Likert (1961) would probably maintain that intrinsically satisfying tasks are more likely to develop where authoritative control or supervision is not severe and subordinate latitude or participation is permitted.

Internal motivation is distinguished from the other types in that it depends neither upon immediate returns from authorities or peers nor upon immediate satisfactions from the task itself. A person who is capable of ignoring immediate rewards must have some compensating rewards or overriding standards to motivate his or her actions. In simplest terms, these compensating inducements can be described as future or long-range returns for which immediate behavior has some instrumental meaning.[3] When an organization's major goals are also important long-term goals of its individual members, organizational theorists speak of "normative control." In this ideal situation, an organization does not have to establish elaborate supervisory and immediate incentive systems to control or motivate its members, because it can depend on the shared goals to ordinarily produce the desired behaviors.

Let's consider how the structure of public schools may be related to possibilities for normative control and motivation from long-term rewards.

Two organizational methods for using long-run incentives

Organizations can appeal to the long-run interests of its members that coincide with the organization's main goals through (1) recruitment or selection, and (2) socialization processes. They either enroll members who have previously developed appropriate long-term interests and who see the connection between these interests and the desired behaviors in the organization, or they try to develop the appropriate norms and their behavioral connections. Public schools appear to be at a great disadvantage compared to many other organizations with regard to selection of its members, but may have some unusual inherent opportunities with regard to socialization processes.

---

[3] A more elaborate discussion of internal motivation would also consider personal standards of behavior that are strong enough to offset most changes in immediate rewards in motivating action. (See Bidwell [1972] and Scott [1971].) Normative control in an organization exists in this sense when the members' personal standards serve to naturally guide behavior in directions that are appropriate for the organization's purposes.

A usual method that organizations use to establish a membership which shares the main organizational goals is the recruitment of appropriate members and weeding out of misfits. If schools were able to enroll only those students who desired to work hard on school work, they would not have to establish elaborate immediate incentive systems to control or motivate their students. In this ideal situation, school authorities would need only to make available appropriate instructional opportunities, and then simply get out of the way so students could follow their own drive to learn. While some selective schools and colleges may be able to enroll such self-motivated student bodies, obviously public schools are not so fortunate. The recognition that compulsory school attendance laws present serious motivation and control problems for schools lies behind many suggestions to change promotion or graduation requirements or to provide new alternatives for students to receive their schooling (See Spady, 1977, on Compentency Based Education, and PSAC, 1973 on schooling alternatives). We need research to learn whether student motivation is affected by schools that use different recuritment practices (such as allowing students to choose among a number of alternative schools in the system)[4] or by schools that use different graduation requirements (such as releasing the bright but bored students who can meet minimum standards of academic competence). We may learn of ways that schools can change their recruitment and placement practices to better respond to those students who have developed clear ideas on the kind of school experiences they desire.

---

[4] Karweit (1973: 44-46) in a study of an inner city high school found that attendance problems were significantly less for the students who had chosen the school for the special (business) courses offered in the school, compared to those who cited other reasons for their choice, even after controlling on curriculum placement of the students. Also, there are indications that attendance is better in the vocational high schools in some cities, although this may be explained by the possibility that more dissatisfied students drop out early from these schools to get a job.

Given that public schools must continue to accept all students whether or not they have an initial commitment to the school's goals, are there ways of organizing public schools to increase the probability that such commitments will develop over time? Again, schools appear to have particular disadvantages for socializing long-term goals and their connections to learning behaviors, but they also have some unusual advantages.

Secondary schools are at a disadvantage because the students they seek to influence are at a stage-in-life where any agreement with adult authorities may be resisted. For adolescents, establishing their autonomy and independence from adult control is of great importance to them (Elder, 1968). The teachers and school authorities who may try to persuade them of the importance of the schools' norms can be viewed as adult agents trying to continue their dominance. For this reason, many students will resist persuasion from school authorities to adopt school norms or to comply with school expectations. In addition, the positive relationships that may be necessary for teachers to convince students of the importance of the schools' goals are unlikely as long as teachers must also fill the role of evaluators and enforcers of academic standards (Waller, 1965; Bidwell, 1965; Spady, 1975).

On the other hand, there should be a natural alliance between schools' and students' long range goals. A primary function of schools is to teach students the skills and competencies they will need as adults, and all surveys show that students want schools to help them get ahead in life. The problems in establishing this alliance seem to be (a) that school demands and regulations are also meant to achieve other goals (e.g. sorting, custody and administrative efficiency) which students do not always share, and (b) students

have not developed strong long-term goals and cannot see the connection between the daily demands of classroom instruction and their own potential long-term interests.

There is some evidence that each of these problems can be addressed by modifications in the school authority system to permit student participation in school decisions.

Student Participation in Governing Decisions and Consumer Decisions

Schools can involve students at two points in the decision-making processes. First, students may participate in the "governing decisions" that establish the school rules and regulations and that define the specific academic or non-academic alternatives that are available for student selection. I will present some indirect evidence that student involvement in governing decisions can make otherwise unattractive rules and regulations more acceptable to a student population. In other words, student participation in decision-making may serve to neutralize the importance of some school goals that students do not naturally share.

Second, students may participate in "consumer decisions" by exercising greater choice among alternative academic offerings that may be provided in the school. I will present some other indirect evidence to suggest that certain academic choices can get students thinking about their long-range goals and make them receptive to information about the connection between classroom activities and their own career or adult goals. In other words, participation in consumer decisions may help to activate the shared long-run goals between students and schools. In addition, we have evidence that giving students

regular practice in making independent decisions builds their confidence in relying on their own personal standards and enduring interests.

Participation in governing decisions

Political scientists have long believed that the legitimacy of any governing authority or set of rules is affected by the degree to which the governed feel they have some voice in deciding the rules and leadership. If two governing systems that are equally effective in meeting the basic needs of its members, the one that has been able to establish belief in its legitimacy will be more stable, with fewer revolts and withdrawals, according to this view (e.g. Lipset, 1963). There is also a group of organizational theorists who maintain that membership consultation or participation in setting organizational rules and procedures will command greater acceptance and compliance with the decisions (e.g. Likert, 1961).

In a study we conducted a few years ago, we analyzed responses from 3450 students in fourteen high schools to determine the relationship of truancy, vandalism, and protests with simultaneous measures of "student satisfaction with participation in rulemaking" and "student satisfaction with the existing rules themselves." These analyses, shown in Table 1, involved statistical controls on age, sex, race, family socioeconomic status, and perceived quality of school instruction. We found small but highly significant relationships for rates of truancy, attitudes toward vandalism, and protests with both main variables. On the average, students who were most satisfied with participation in rule making and with existing rules reported less truancy and less propensity toward vandalism or protests. The relationships were stronger for satisfaction with participation than for satisfaction with the rules themselves. Indeed, we found a school with some of the

strictest rules but most student participation to be one of the best schools in the sample in terms of few student discipline problems. (See McPartland and McDill, 1974).

Table 1

In spite of these small positive effects, it is hard to see procedures for governing decisions in schools changing very much in the future or being a major factor for strengthening most students' commitment to school goals.

Increased student participation in school governing decisions was an idea that got most attention a few years ago, during the student demonstrations in high schools and colleges, and remains of interest today mostly among those concerned with the legal issues of student rights. Traditional student councils and student governments have gotten a bad name, as frivolous extra-curricular activities that rarely deal with issues more important than pep rallies or school social events, and as outlets only for student representatives who have been carefully screened and restricted by school authorities. Moreover, there are real limits on how far a school can go in sharing authority with students on important school decisions or regulations: principals still bear final responsibility for school problems, teachers have defined their own traditional prerogatives in legal work contracts, and students are only temporary members or clients of a school community, most of whom appear to have little desire to spend time on school committees or planning groups. (At the time of our study (1970), the issue of cafeteria food led the list of student issues, and questions of curriculum, discipline or grading systems evoked only minor responses.)

There may be important special cases, such as desegregated schools that wish to demonstrate racial equity, where new procedures for student and community participation in school governing decisions can have real meaning. And it is clearly worthwhile for schools to seek more student commitment to school rules and programs by involving them in the planning processes. Better governmental procedures can also symbolize that a school expects its students to have autonomous opinions and exercise personal judgments. But, I believe a more promising area for experimentation and research lies in the opportunities for decision-making that individual students may make about their own program of activities as students.

Participation in consumer decisions

If schools are to more effectively appeal to the long-range goals of students, they may need to direct more student attention to career and adult goals and to persuade them that behavior in school has important consequences for these goals. I will present some indirect evidence to argue that a part of the problem is that students are rarely confronted with individual decisions for which information about long-term returns is relevant, nor are they given practice in schools at developing self-reliance and responsibility for their own actions. Instead, important decisions about academic choices are made infrequently or are made for students by the program and course assignments from school authorities. The student is a passive client who receives the treatments that a professional has decided are appropriate. Without the need to make consumer choices about the school courses and experiences to be taken, there is no reason to seek information about the potential consequences of school work and there is no practice at assuming independent responsibility for one's own actions.

In the same study of 14 high schools I described earlier, there was one school which provided an unusual degree of student choice of courses and teachers. This school conducts its academic program according to what it calls the "quarter system." Under this system, there are four terms in each nine-month academic year. The students in this all black inner city school are presented with a catalog of course offerings for each term and are permitted to choose the courses and teachers to which they will be assigned. There remain required "areas" for which students must build up sufficient course completions over time from a large number of offerings, and there are frequently prereguisites that must be completed before the choice of a certain course is permitted. The English and social studies departments had the most offerings with fewest prerequisites. As mundane as this arrangement might sound to an audience of college educators, it was unique among our sample of 14 urban high schools. We had asked students and teachers on separate surveys how much say students actually have in selection of teachers, the way each student is assigned to courses, and the kinds of courses to be taught in the school. In the selected school, 60 percent of the students reported a great deal of say in selection of teachers while the average percent in the other 13 schools was only 7 percent. In the selected school, 48 percent of the teachers gave the same report, while less than 2 percent was the average teacher response in the other schools. The comparative percentages for a great deal of say in the way students are assigned to courses were 46 versus 22 percent (student reports) and 24 versus 6 percent (teacher reports); for a great deal of say in the kinds of courses to be taught 58 versus 19 percent (student reports) and 69 versus 20 percent

(teacher reports). If choice forced on individuals does nothing else, it should create a need for information on which to judge the alternatives, and it should create pressure on the individuals to develop a "strategy" with which to make selections. So, if students are presented with academic options, they need to learn what the important consequences are of each option, and they need to develop some strategy for themselves which gives some implicit ranking to the costs and rewards of alternative courses of action.

Depending on whether the alternatives presented to students are explicit about content, obligations, time, teachers or grades, we would expect students to be more aware of both their own strengths and weaknesses and of the long- and short-run consequences of the alternative choices. The survey data permits us to examine one of these results: the attention and information on the part of students to long-run academic plans.

Table 2 shows that there are no statistically significant differences in expressed college plans between the students in the academic-choice school and those in other schools, after differences in grade, sex, race and SES are taken into account. On the other hand, there is a statistically significant difference in "college-related activities": the students in the academic-choice school are more likely to have read college catalogs, communicated with specific colleges, and talked at length with teachers and with counselors about particular colleges. This significant relationship is not reduced when the students' expressed plans for college is added as a control variable along with grade, sex, race, and SES. In other words,

the students who have been forced to make regular academic choices in high school seem to be more aware of, and have paid more attention to, information about long-run academic consequences of their education. They appear to be more "strategic" in approaching academic plans, to have considered and weighed the costs and rewards of a number of educational alternatives.

Table 2

Melvin Seeman's research on alienation and information seeking or learning is relevant here (1962; 1967; 1969; Beckford and Neal, 1969). His studies show that individuals pay most attention to environmental cues and learn new facts for matters where they feel they have some control or choice. In the same way, if schools wish students to pay attention to information about how their present instruction may be important for future occupational and life goals, then they should consider providing alternatives for student choice that have different relevance for various goals. If academic choices are offered that can have different explicit long-run consequences for students, we would expect students to seek and be receptive to knowledge about long range goals and how schooling can play an instrumental role in achieving these goals.

I do not cite this evidence from a single school to argue only that providing regular academic choices in all high schools will be a major improvement (although I do believe it would be a step in the right direction). I would prefer to urge that we think about various ways of requiring students to make regular choices that have real differences and real consequences in order to capture their attention for long-range goals and to provide regular

reasons for them to seek information on how their behavior as students may be related to long-range goals.[1]

Related evidence on how requiring student participation in academic consumer decisions may help develop internal motivation can be drawn from a recent study of "open" and "traditional" schools. (This study will be discussed in more detail in another paper in this symposium.) Open schools frequently provide students with regular academic choices of classroom assignments, as well as placing less restrictions on student behavior in the classroom. In this study, we also measured the family decision-making style to gauge how much students shared responsibility for decisions made concerning them in the home. One of our interests in this research was to examine the effects on student "self-reliance" from experiences in open schools and involvement in family decisions that gave them regular practice at exercising and testing independent judgments. The self-reliance scale was drawn from student questionnaire responses intended to measure an individual's general willingness to act without depending upon peer approval or close supervision.

Table 3 gives the results of a multiple regression analysis of student self-reliance on school openness, family decision-making style and a number of other family and background variables. These results indicate that both school openness and (especially) family decision-making style are significantly related to student self-reliance, with the other variables taken into account: students from more open schools and with greater involvement in family decisions are found to be more highly self-reliant.

Table 3

---

[1] Of course, students may be making academic choices for immediate reasons, such as easy grades or minimum work. We need research on how decision-making strategies develop when adolescents are required to make important choices. We asked a hypothetical question on some of these issues, and the answers indicated that students would select both some demanding and some easy courses each time, if they were given a number of simultaneous course choices to make. The subjects of demanding and easy courses chosen were directly related to the students' relative performance in similar courses previously. See Tables A, B and C in the appendix to this paper.

One interpretation of these findings is that we need to give regular practice in exercising autonomy and independence to produce individuals who are capable of resisting peer pressures with enough confidence in their own standards and decisions. If schools continue to make most of the important decisions for students, they will delay the development of self-reliant individuals having a strong set of internal standards to guide behavior.

Summary

The research presented in these Tables is only a beginning to the studies and practical experiments needed to learn how schools may develop and appeal to the long-range goals of students. These results only indirectly address the issues, and some are based on small or selected samples. They do give reason to expect that the authority systems established in our schooling processes may be an important factor in developing new motivational sources for learning. If we are to appeal to students long-term goals as a reason to work hard in school, methods are needed to encourage them to seek information about long-range outcomes and to persuade them of the relevance of schooling experiences for these goals. An authority system that makes all the important decisions for students, and that limits practice at self-reliance, appears to be the usual school practice and opposite to what is needed to foster development of internal motivation.

TABLE 1

Summary of Multiple Regression Analyses of Student Satisfaction with Rules and with Participation in Rule-Making

(b = standardized regression coefficient; t = test statistic; R = multiple correlation coefficient, n = sample size.)

The measurement scales for each variable are defined on the next page.

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable: Truancy		Vandalism		Student Protests	
	b	t	b	t	b	t
Satisfaction with existing rules	-.044	-2.57	-.078	-4.66	-.115	-6.92
Satisfaction with participation in rule-making	-.125	-7.37	-.146	-8.71	-.185	-11.18
Perceived quality of school instruction	-.147	-8.60	-.106	-6.29	-.100	-6.00
Grade	.042	2.55	-.036	-2.16	.028	1.73
Sex [a]	-.064	-3.78	-.114	-6.65	-.034	-1.98
Race [b]	.092	5.23	-.109	-6.26	-.150	-8.75
Family socio-economic status	-.023	-1.35	.048	2.78	.050	2.93
n	3,450		3,450		3,450	
R	.237		.267		.311	

a. Sex is scored 1 = Female, 0 = Male, for these analyses.

b. Race is scored 1 = Black, 0 = White, for these analyses.

Measurement of Variables
in Table 1

Variable	Questionnaire item(s) and scoring
Truancy	"During the last school year, did you ever stay away from school just because you didn't want to come?" Never = 1; Yes, for 1 or 2 days = 2; Yes, for 3 to 6 days = 3; Yes, for 7 to 15 days = 4; Yes, for 16 or more days = 5.
Vandalism	"Suppose you saw some students who were damaging property of this school, would you feel sorry to see this happen?" Very sorry = 1; Somewhat worry = 2; Wouldn't care = 3; Not sorry at all = 4.
Student protests	"Students can only get really important changes here by having a protest or demonstration to force the change." Strongly Agree = 4; Agree = 3; Disagree = 2; Strongly Disagree = 1.
Student satisfaction with existing school rules	"What do you think of the different rules and ways things are done at this school? Are they very good, very bad, or somewhere in between: The rules this school has about dress codes, hair styles, smoking hall passes, etc." (Scores range from Very good = 5 to Very bad = 1).
Student satisfaction with their participation in rule-making.	The scale score is the difference between answers to two questions: (1) "How often do students actually have an important part now in deciding things here at this school? [regarding] school rules such as dress codes, hair styles, smoking rules, hall passes, etc," and (2) "How often do you think students should have an important part in the future in deciding things here at this school? [regarding] school rules, such as dress codes, hair styles, smoking rules, hall passes, etc." Each separate item is scored from 5 for 'always' to 1 for 'never'; so that the difference between the item scores can range in value from -4 to +4.
Perceived quality of instructional program	The scale score is the combination of responses to three items: (1) "Compared to other schools, this school provides a first-rate education." (Agree = 1, Disagree = 0); (2) "Do you think attending this high school gives a student a better or worse chance of getting into a first-rate college than some other high school in this system?" (3) "Do you think attending this school gives a better or worse chance of getting a good job?" The second and third items are scored as follows: Much better, or A little better = 1, About the same, or A little worse, or Much worse = 0.
Family socio-economic status	The scale score is a weighted combination of six variables: (1) number of siblings, (2) father's education, (3) mother's education, (4) number of material possessions in the home (from a checklist of 10 items), (5) presence of real father in the home, (6) presence of real mother in the home. The weights for the six (standardized) variables in the above order are -.14, .15, .14, -.11, .04, .02. These weights were obtained from a multiple regression of student's college plans on the six measures

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF REGRESSIONS OF COLLEGE PLANS AND COLLEGE-RELATED ACTIVITIES ON ACADEMIC CHOICE SCHOOL, GRADE, SEX, RACE, AND SES

(b= standardized regression coefficient; t= associated test statistic)

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables: College Plans b	College Plans t	College Related Activities[a] b	College Related Activities[a] t	College Related Activities[a] b	College Related Activities[a] t
Academic Choice School	.02	1.0	.05	3.0	.05	3.1
Grade (+ = 12th higher)	.01	0.3	.30	18.8	.30	18.9
Sex (+ = Females higher)	-.09	-5.4	.02	0.9	.01	0.4
Race (+ = Whites higher)	-.01	-0.2	-.10	-6.2	-.11	-6.2
SES	.12	6.4	.25	15.3	.26	15.9
College Plans	___	___	___	___	.08	5.2
Sample size (n)	3450		3450		3450	
Multiple correlation (R^2)	.023		.153		.160	

a. College Related Activities is a scale based on four questionnaire items:
"In the past 12 months, have you ever written or talked to a college official about going to his college?"
"Have you ever read a college catalog?"
"Have you talked in detail to a school counselor about specific colleges?"
"Have you talked in detail to teachers about specific colleges?"

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF MULTIPLE REGRESSIONS OF SELF-RELIANCE ON OPENNESS OF SCHOOL PROGRAM AND STUDENT FAMILY AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS, BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

(b = standardized regression coefficient; t = associated test statistic)

Independent Variables:	Self-reliance			
	Secondary		Elementary	
	b	(t)	b	(t)
School Authority:				
Openness of school	.037	2.8	.068	3.0
Family Authority:				
Decision-making style	.246	19.0	.288	12.0
Rules in the home	-.005	-0.4	.069	2.8
Background:				
Age	.225	19.2	---	---
Sex(+= Males higher)	-.006	-0.5	-.096	-4.2
Race(+= Whites higher)	-.009	-0.7	.020	0.9
Parents' education	.126	8.8	.011	0.4
Possessions in the home	.059	4.2	.064	2.5
Family size	.060	5.0	.036	1.6
Sample size (n)	5661		1700	
Multiple correlation (R^2)	.190		.139	

References

Avila, Donald L. and Purkey, William Watson
1966 "Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: A regrettable distinction." Psychology in the Schools 3: 206-208.

Bickford, Hugh L. and Arthur G. Neal
1969 "Alienation and social learning: A study of students in a vocational training center". Sociology of Education :141-153.

Bidwell, Charles E.
1965 "The school as a formal organization". In James G. March (ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally.

1971 "Schooling and socialization for moral commitment." Interchange 3 (No. 2): 1-27.

Blauner, Robert
1964 Alienation and Freedom. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Boocock, S.S. and J.S. Coleman
1966 "Games with simulated environments in learning". Sociology of education 39: 215-236.

Boocock, Sarane S.
1972 "A research and development Chronicle: The Life Career Game." In M. Inbar and C. Stoll (eds.), Simulation and Gaming in the Social Sciences: The Design Process. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Brookover, Wilbur B. and Edsel L. Erickson
1975 Sociology of Education. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.

Bruner, Jerome S.
1968 Toward a Theory of Instruction. New York: Norton.

Coleman, J.S. et al.
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunities. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Day, H.I., Berlyne, D.E. and Hunt, D.E.
1971 Intrinsic Motivation: A New Direction in Education. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada.

Elder, Glen H., Jr.
1963 "Parental power legitimation and its effects on the adolescent." Sociometry 26: 50-65.

1968 Adolescent Socialization and Personality Development. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Epstein, Joyce L. and James M. McPartland
1975 The Effects of Open School Organization on Student Outcomes. Report 194. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University.

Etzioni, Amitai
1961 A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Hunt, J. McV.
1971 "Toward a History of Intrinsic Motivation" in Day, H.I., Berlyne, D.E. and Hunt, D.E. Intrinsic Motivation: A New Direction in Education. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada, pp. 1-32.

Inbar, Michael and Clarice Stoll
1970 "Games and learning". Interchange 1: 53-61.

Karweit, Nancy L.
1973 Rainy Days and Mondays: An Analysis of Factors Related to Absence from School. Report No. 162. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University.

Katz, Daniel
1964 "The Motivational Basis of Organizational Behavior". Behavioral Science, 131-146.

Katz, Fred E.
1960 "The School as a Complex Social Organization: A Consideration of Patterns of Autonomy". Harvard Educational Review 428-455.

Likert, Rensis
1961 New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McPartland, James and Edward L. McDill et al.
1971 Student Participation in High School Decisions: A Study of 14 Urban High Schools. Report 95. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University.

1974 High School Rules and Decision-making Procedures as Sources of School Stability. Report 169. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University.

Presidents Science Advisory Committee, Panel on Youth
1973 Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Rhea, Buford
1970 "Institutional paternalism in high school". Pp. 308-318 in Matthew B. Miles and W. W. Charters, Jr. (eds.), Learning in Social Settings. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Scott, John Finley
1971 Internalization of Norms. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Seeman, Melvin and John W. Evans
1962 "Alienation and social learning in a hospital setting". American Journal of Sociology 27: 772-782.

Seeman, Melvin
1967 "Powerlessness and knowledge: A comparative study of alienation and learning". Sociometry 30: 105-123.

1969 "Alienation and social learning in a reformatory". American Journal of Sociology 69: 270-284.

Spady, William G.
1974 "The authority system of the school and student unrest: A theoretical exploration", Pp. 36-77 in National Society for the Study of Education, 1974 Yearbook on Education.

1975 Authority and Empathy in the Classroom. Mimeographed.

1977 "Competency based education: A bandwagon in search of a definition". Educational Reseacher 6 (January): 9-14.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L.
1964 Rebellion in a High School. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

Waller, Willard
1965 The Sociology of Teaching. New York: Wiley (Science Editions).

Wheeler, S.
"The structure of formally organized socialization settings".

Appendix Tables

TABLE A

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION:

"Suppose you were to take four subjects next term (English, Mathematics, Science, and Foreign Language) and you could choose the highest level or average level or lowest level section in each case, which would you choose? (The highest level covers the subject best, but you may have to work harder to get a good grade.)

	Highest Level	Average Level	Lowest Level
English Course	40.7	55.6	3.5
Mathematics Course	35.4	50.7	13.7
Science Course	31.4	57.2	11.4
Foreign Language Course	22.6	48.3	29.0

TABLE B

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WHO CHOOSE DIFFERENT NUMBERS OF COURSES AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL

0	high choices	--	30%
1	high choice	--	32%
2	high choices	--	22%
3	high choices	--	9%
4	high choices	--	7%

TABLE C

SUMMARY OF MULTIPLE REGRESSIONS OF STUDENT COURSE CHOICES IN ENGLISH AND MATH ON GRADES, GRADE LEVEL, SEX, RACE AND SES

Independent Variables		Dependent Variables: English Choices b	English Choices t	Math Choices b	Math Choices t
Grade Level (+ = 12th higher)		.01	0.3	.01	0.9
Sex (+ = Females higher)		-.04	-2.3	.06	3.8
Race (+ = Whites higher)		.08	5.0	.02	1.0
SES		-.13	-7.4	.01	0.8
Math Grade	Q 262	-.03	-1.7	.38	22.1
English Grade	Q 263	.33	17.3	-.08	-4.5
Grade Point Average	Q 264	.02	1.0	.18	9.1
Multiple Correlations					
	R	.388		.458	
	R^2	.151		.210	