29 ● Power in the Classroom IV: Alternatives to Discipline

PATRICIA KEARNEY ● TIMOTHY G. PLAX ● VIRGINIA P. RICHMOND ● JAMES C. McCROSKEY

West Virginia University

As Wlodkowski (1982, p. 2) has noted, "If anything could ever had been made real by wishing for it or wanting it, we would have made disciplined students the norm long ago." Demands for disciplined and obedient students are a clearly defined part of our cultural orientation. The public continues to clamor for more classroom discipline, claiming that uncontrolled students are the number one problem facing our schools (Gallup, 1981). In this way, discipline is construed as the panacea for all learning-related problems. Educators are retained and tenured on their ability to *make* students learn. Surveys of elementary and secondary teachers indicate that good teaching in their schools is equated with student control (see Hoy, 1968). Experienced teachers and administrators most frequently advocate a rigidly disciplined classroom and are quick to reprimand beginning instructors for their permissiveness (Hoy, 1968). The pervasiveness of the disciplinarian mentality is staggering (see Willever & Jones, 1963; Check, 1979).

Ironically, discipline alone may actually work against learning (see Hoy, 1968; Glasser, 1978). Highly disciplined schools fail to stimulate greater learning and are generally associated with increased incidence of student misbehaviors (Wlodkowski, 1982; Lufler, 1978). No research evidence suggests that more or better discipline, in and of itself, leads to greater teacher effectiveness (see Wlodkowski, 1982). On the contrary, teachers who employ frequent discipline interventions tend to find their classrooms even

Correspondence and requests for reprints: Patricia Kearney, Department of Speech Communication, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506.

more disruptive and hard to manage (Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, & Smith, 1979). More rules, harsher penalties, and "get tough" policies fail to gain student compliance and conformity (Clegg & Megson, 1968; Heal, 1978; Lufler, 1978).

Historically, corporal punishment has been the most notable means of imposing discipline. Advocates claim that the educational system is handicapped without the implicit or explicit threat of punitive sanctions (Coy, 1980). Educators often assert that corporal controls are an expedient way of managing student misbehaviors. Parents also demand teacher authority through physical punishment, indicating that such measures are *good* for some students. Others, who argue against corporal actions, indicate that punishment leads to student rebellion and revenge. Moreover, it is argued that such controls set up inappropriate, punitive models that interfere with affective learning and discourage educators from employing other forms of control in managing their classrooms (Coy, 1980). In schools where corporal punishment has been restricted, however, teachers have been left wanting. What alternative control techniques are available to public school professionals? The present investigation attempts to expand upon and clarify what is known about teachers' use of management strategies in the classroom. Of primary concern in this study were the available alternative teacher communication techniques that can be employed to control student behaviors necessary for learning.

"Power in the classroom" refers to the teacher's capacity to influence students to do something they would not have done had they not been influenced (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983). Thus the ability of teachers to employ power influences the effectiveness of their classroom management. Power strategies are actually behavior alteration techniques that teachers communicate to control or modify student actions (Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1983). Since learning requires that teachers assume control in order to optimize classroom environments conducive to learning, teachers must "strategically communicate messages that compel students to engage in learning" (Kearney et al., 1983, p. 1). Consequently, power strategies are critical for managing the classroom.

This study was designed to explore the use of power in the classroom by expanding and refining the classification of behavior alteration techniques and messages that teachers report are representative of the classroom environment. The result of this investigation is a comprehensive, classroom-relevant taxonomy of alternative behavior alteration techniques that teachers can and do employ to modify or elicit student behaviors. As with earlier investigations, the research and thinking in the areas of power and classroom management provided directions for the present study.

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Discipline traditionally has been linked to control—"student acceptance of or submission to teacher authority" (Wlodkowski, 1982, p. 2). There is little doubt that this perspective was especially pertinent to historical interpretations, in which schools were conceived as despotic structures (Waller, 1932). In early discussions, teachers were defined as dominating rulers and students as "subjects" to be "civilized" (see Waller, 1932; Durkheim, 1961; Boocock, 1983). In this way, students were expected to submit to teacher authority (Waller, 1932; Wlodkowski, 1982; Hoy, 1968). This long-standing teacher-student characterization is still reflected in the contemporary custodial orientation toward education.

Administrators and teachers who communicate impersonality, mistrust, and pessimism to students reflect a custodial environment. Schools with such an environment emphasize autocracy, teacher dominance, rigidly defined teacher-student role hierarchies, and strict, unilateral teacher control (Hoy, 1968). Novice teachers quickly shed permissive pupil control ideologies advocated in their training programs and adopt an increasingly custodial orientation after their student teaching experience and again after their first year of teaching (Hoy, 1968). These noticeable teacher changes are alarming when evidence indicates that custodial-type schools are no longer effective in controlling student behavior (Glasser, 1978; Lufler, 1978; Wlodkowski, 1982).

While traditional schools may have defined discipline as the optimal goal, contemporary educators can ill afford to demand student submission as a function of teacher authority (Glasser, 1978; Rutter et al., 1979). In this decade, "education for education's sake" holds little meaning for our youth. While formal education may have been equated with political, social and economic opportunities in the past, students question the relative efficacy of education's meeting those obligations today. According to Boocock (1983), the current crisis in education is a function of credential inflation and surplus absorption. That is, students no longer believe that academic credentials ensure them either professional opportunities or the training necessary for on-the-job performance. Additionally, students may view schools as "holding places" where young people are kept so as to exclude them from a work force already glutted. Consequently, formal education has lost much of its value for our youth. This declining value of education has inevitably led to a loss of teacher authority (Boocock, 1983). Discipline techniques designed to *make* students learn, then, may have little or no effect.

In response to these concerns, instructional researchers have recently focused on student control as it relates directly to learning (Hoy, 1968). Given this contemporary perspective, effective teachers are competent in

both instructional (that is, instructional technologies, learning objectives, content, and evaluation) and classroom management skills. Within the context of classroom management, discipline loses its name, its meaning, and its pervasive emphasis (Rutter et al., 1979; Wlodkowski, 1982). Instead, "classroom management" refers to those teacher behaviors that "produce high levels of student involvement in classroom activities, minimal amounts of student behaviors that interfere with the teacher's or student's work, and efficient use of instructional time" (Emmer & Evertson, 1980, p. 342).

Consistent with this orientation, Richmond and Andriate (1982) define "classroom misbehavior" as any student behavior that interferes with learning. Effective managers, then, are able both to encourage behaviors appropriate for learning and to reduce student misbehavior. In this way, students assume a more positive stance relative to the overall learning environment. Rather than forcing students to learn in the antiquated discipline sense, the teacher creates and manages a classroom where techniques are employed to influence students to *want* to learn. Two separate research areas have converged on this problem. One area emphasizes the encouragement of on-task behaviors and the other the reduction of student misbehaviors. While these emphases address classroom management from different points of departure, both ultimately prescribe conditions that lead to management effectiveness.

From the first perspective, student involvement in initiating and maintaining on-task behavior is a necessary condition for effective classroom management. The use of prompts (Krantz & Scarth, 1979), positive questioning techniques (Borg & Ascione, 1979), motivational messages, structured transitions, teacher-led group activities (Good & Beckerman, 1978), and other teacher strategies all promote greater task persistence.

The second perspective is represented in the body of research on control techniques designed to minimize student disruptions or misbehaviors. Unlike discipline, these control strategies are inextricably tied to learning or on-task behavioral requirements. As such, while student misbehaviors are discouraged, these approaches provide concurrent rewards for appropriate behaviors conducive to learning. Such positive control techniques include token economy (Jenson, 1978), behavioral contracts (Harris, 1972), incentive systems (Emmer & Evertson, 1980), extinction, reinforcement, time-outs (Shrigley, 1979), and others.

Recently, a third perspective on classroom management has emerged from the instructional communication literature (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Richmond & McCroskey, in press; Kearny et al., 1983). The most recent research in this area (Kearney et al., 1983) examines the application of behavior alteration techniques. This approach examines classroom management from both relational and message-based orientations. In contrast

to other perspectives on classroom management, this approach is based on the teacher's use of power in the classroom.

POWER IN THE CLASSROOM

For the purpose of classroom management, the term "power-based strategies" refers to the teacher's potential to affect student on-task behaviors and student disruptions to learning. The most suitable framework for defining power-based strategies within the classroom is provided by French and Raven (1968). McCroskey and Richmond (1983) interpreted this conceptualization for their research on power in the classroom. Within the classroom, *coercive* power emanates from student's perceptions that they will be punished by the teacher if they fail to comply with the teacher's influence attempts. *Reward* power is based on students' perceptions that they will be rewarded if they comply with teacher demands. *Legitimate,* or assigned, power stems from students' perceptions that the teacher has the right to prescribe behavior. *Referent* power is based on students' desire to comply in order to please or identify with the teacher. Finally, *expert* power arises from students' desire to comply because they perceive that the teacher is competent in specific areas.

McCroskey and Richmond (1983) examined teachers' and students' perceptions of teacher use of each of these five types of power in the classroom. Junior high, high school, and college teachers and their students were found to share somewhat similar perceptions. Both teachers and students perceived that reward, referent, and expert power were employed more frequently than either legitimate or coercive power. However, teachers perceived that they used expert power more than their students believed they did, while students perceived their teachers as using more coercive power than their teachers perceived themselves as using.

Richmond and McCroskey (in press) examined the effects of power type/usage on students' affective and cognitive learning. Their results indicated that teacher use of coercive and, to a lesser degree, legitimate power was negatively related to both affective and cognitive learning. However, both referent and, to a lesser degree, expert power were positively related to both learning outcomes. Reward power was not found to be meaningfully associated with learning.

Teacher authority and discipline in the traditional sense have little or no meaning in today's classroom. McCroskey and Richmond (1983) demonstrate that influence in the classroom is relational. Teachers do not automatically possess power; students must perceive its existence. According to teacher and student perceptions, then, power and subsequent influence

evolve relationally within the classroom. Further, Richmond and McCroskey (in press) found that legitimate (or assigned) power and coercive (or punishment) power were both negatively associated with learning. These types of emergent power most closely resemble authority and discipline. These power types, then, may be detrimental to classroom management. Such influence attempts may fail to either encourage on-task behaviors or discourage misbehaviors to create an atmosphere necessary to optimal learning.

Based upon these findings, Kearney et al. (1983) studied the bases of power available to teachers in order to broaden the range of alternatives available to teachers in their efforts at classroom management. This third investigation focused on the generation of an initial list of potential power strategies for classroom use. A college student sample was employed to generate an open-ended list of potential influence statements. This list was coded into a typology of eighteen behavior alteration techniques (BATs) that were best represented by a combination of statements or behavioral alteration messages (BAMs). Each unique set of BAMs provided an inductive basis for labeling each of the eighteen separate BATs. The grouping of BAMs were then given to elementary and secondary teachers for an assessment of their usage and effectiveness in changing behavior in the classroom. Teachers reported that seven of the BATs were used frequently and were perceived as effective. Results also indicated that teacher use of BATs was not meaningfully associated with instructor gender, grade level, or years taught.

Overall, the results demonstrated power need not be restricted to direct teacher appeals. That is, teacher power need not rely on externally based sanctions. Unlike the bases of power explicated in McCroskey and Richmond (1983) and Richmond and McCroskey (in press), BATs employed in the classroom can be indirect. In other words, additional BATs that teachers reported they used frequently were "student centered," referencing inherent student benefits through compliance. Most pertinent to the classroom environment specifically, teachers reported that they also relied on "student audience effect" techniques or those strategies that appeal to students' peers and reference groups for compliance.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Defining effective teaching from a classroom management perspective constructively diverges from traditional views of instruction. While numerous teachers are still forced to operate within a custodial orientation, the research evidence indicates that discipline *cannot be* the goal of instruction. In fact, the classroom management literature suggests that discipline "may

actually be a force against learning" (Wlodkowski, 1982, p. 8). Effective managers are those who view student control only as it relates to the overriding goal of learning. Instead of emphasizing discipline, then, classroom managers seek to gain student compliance by shaping an optimal learning environment that encourages learning. Behavior alteration techniques offer teachers a useful approach to achieving this objective through communicating student-centered messages that offer reasons for compliance.

Thus far, the generation of an initial pool of BATs has relied on college student reports (Kearney et al., 1983). Unlike previous research on compliance-gaining strategies (see, for example, Marwell & Schmitt, 1967; Miller, Boster, Roloff, & Seibold, 1977; Cody, McLaughlin, & Jordan, 1980; Schenck-Hamlin, Wiseman, & Georgacarakos, 1982), the format employed in generating BATs purposefully omitted hypothetical scenarios or reference to specific relationships in order to elicit a wide range of potential responses. While this approach was essential for an initial, comprehensive list of BATs, the results of the Kearney et al. (1983) study suggest that additional BATs may exist for the classroom. That is, the uniqueness of "student-centered" and "audience effect" techniques indicate that classroom strategies are qualitatively different from other compliance-gaining typologies. Thus the present study was designed to extend, validate, and refine the BAT typology through teacher input. Additionally, classroom-relevant BAMs that represent each technique are more appropriately derived from sources of those messages themselves—teachers. Therefore, the following research questions have been formulated:

RQ1: What types of behavior alteration techniques are available for teacher use in the classroom?

RQ2: What representative messages do teachers generate when they employ each BAT?

Based on the revisions of both BATs and BAMs specifically applicable to the classroom, the third question was asked in order to isolate those techniques teachers use most and least frequently with their students.

RQ3: What BATs do teachers perceive that they employ most frequently; which do they use least frequently?

Kearney et al. (1983) suggest that teachers employ primarily positive BATs in the classroom. However, earlier research indicates that teachers are more likely to use a more discipline-oriented model of student control (Hoy, 1968). Either teachers are unwilling to report or they are unaware that they frequently use such custodial forms of control. According to student perceptions, coercive power is frequently used more than teachers report (Mc-

Croskey & Richmond, 1983). By assessing what strategies teachers perceive that *other* teachers employ, teachers may be more willing to identify additional BATs being used in the classroom. Therefore, we asked the following question:

RQ4: What BATs do teachers perceive that *other* teachers employ for the same grade level taught?

Since teachers may report that they use one set of BATs and that other teachers employ a different set, the fifth research question was asked to determine teachers' perceptions of the relative effectiveness of each BAT.

RQ5: What BATs do teachers perceive to be effective in the classroom?

Finally, Kearney et al. (1983) failed to demonstrate any meaningful association between specific teacher variables and the selection and perceived effectiveness of BATs employed in the classroom. However, the revised BATs and BAMs, as well as the inclusion of *other* teachers' use of BATs, may produce quite different results. Therefore, we asked:

RQ6: Are the BATs teachers perceive they use those they perceive that other teachers use and those BATs they find effective a function of: (a) instructor gender, (b) number of years teaching, or (c) grade level taught?

PROCEDURES

Data Collection

Data for this study were collected in three phases. The first two phases involved the same group of subjects. The third phase employed subjects not involved in the previous phases.

Phase 1. A total of 343 teachers in grades K-12 were provided a form with the following instructions:

> As a teacher you often try to get your students to do things that they may not want to do. The student usually thinks, and often asks, "Why should I do this?" Please give us the most common answers you would give to this question.

The form provided 25 numbered spaces for responses. Subjects were informed that if they had more responses they should provide those on the back of the form.

Subjects in this phase were enrolled in a basic graduate course in communication in instruction. The form was administered the first day of class,

before any instruction in the content of the course. The teaching experience of the subjects ranged from 1 to 37 years.

Phase 2. The subjects from Phase 1 were divided into 55 groups of 5-7 members each, representing level of grade taught (K-3, N = 10; 4-6, N = 10; 7-9, N = 9; 10-12, N = 9; other, N = 17). While most of the subjects taught in clearly distinct categories within elementary or secondary schools, an "other" category was necessary to accommodate subjects who taught at multiple levels (speech pathologists, music teachers, special education teachers, and so on).

Each group was provided a copy of the behavior alteration technique categories and representative messages generated in the Kearney et al. (1983) study. They were also provided a form with each category label. Substantial space was provided between labels on the forms. Each group was asked to go over the messages they had generated in Phase 1 and place the ones they could in the categories provided. After they had completed this task, they were asked to review the messages they had been unable to classify and attempt to group them in new categories and to label the new categories.

Phase 3. On the basis of the results of the first two phases (discussed below), 22 categories of behavior alteration techniques with representative behavior alteration messages were generated (see Table 29.2). Subjects (N = 402) were provided a form that included the 22 BATs and corresponding message examples. The subjects were asked to indicate (on a 1-5 scale, 5 = high) how frequently they used each of the techniques, how frequently they believed other teachers at their same grade level used the technique, and how effective they perceived the technique to be in modifying student behaviors at that grade level. The subjects were also asked to indicate how many years they had taught, the level at which they taught, and their gender. The range of experience was 1-24 years, with a mean of 4.8 years. There were 66 males and 336 females in the sample. The sample size for each level taught was as follows: K-3, 115; 4-6, 81; 7-9, 56; 10-12, 66; other, 84.

Data Analyses

The data from Phase 1 and Phase 2 were analyzed to obtain answers to our first two research questions. The data obtained in Phase 2 (group responses) were examined to determine the number of groups at each teaching level that generated behavior alteration messages that the group could classify for each of the Kearney et al. (1983) BAT categories. In addition, these data were examined to determine whether the groups had generated categories beyond those provided them. Potential new categories were rejected only if all of the behavior alteration messages provided as examples could clearly be classified in one or a combination of the Kearney et al. (1983) categories by two of the investigators. All other new categories were accepted. Finally, all of the responses from Phase 1 were classified by the

investigators into Kearney et al. (1983) categories plus the new categories generated by the analysis of the Phase 2 data. The unclassifiable messages (approximately 2 percent) were examined to determine whether additional categories could be formed.

In a supplementary analysis (for which no research question was posed in advance) a sample of 1217 behavior alteration messages was drawn from the total responses provided in Phase 1 (total was slightly in excess of 3650 responses). These messages were classified into three categories: prosocial (for example, reward-type), antisocial (for example, punishment and legitimate types), and other. This analysis was performed to determine whether there was either a pro- or antisocial bias in the data obtained. The analysis indicated that there were 542 prosocial messages, 535 antisocial messages, and 140 that were classified as other. Since there was no apparent pro- or antisocial bias, this issue was not considered subsequently.

The data from Phase 3 were analyzed to obtain answers to research questions 3-6. To determine frequency of self-use, other use, and perceived effectiveness of each of the techniques, means for each response across the entire sample were computed. In addition, frequency analysis was performed to determine the percentage of respondents reporting high (4 or 5) use or effectiveness and those reporting low (1 or 2) use or effectiveness.

To determine whether teacher gender, length of teaching experience, or level taught affects perceived use or effectiveness of the techniques, multivariate analyses of variance were computed for each of these predictors, with the use and effectiveness responses as criterion variables. Where significant multivariate results were obtained, univariate analyses of variance were computed to probe the results.

Finally, since the data on use and effectiveness were collected during the same sitting, correlations among responses were examined to determine the existence of any meaningful patterns. Separate factor analyses were computed for self-use, other use, and effectiveness. A liberal criterion of an eigen-value of 1.0 was set for termination of factor extraction. Both orthogonal and oblique rotational analyses were examined. In addition, the unrotated analyses were examined. A minimum loading of .60 was set for considering an item loaded on a factor. In addition to the factor analyses, the correlations were computed between responses for self-use and other use, self-use and effectiveness, and other use and effectiveness for each BAT.

RESULTS

Phases 1 and 2

Analysis of the data provided by the various teacher groupings indicated that instructors at each teaching level generated behavioral alteration

Table 29.1
Number of Groups Generating Behavior Alteration Messages for Each Behavior Alteration Technique

BAT	Teaching Level K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Other	Total
Reward from Behavior	10	10	9	9	16	54
Reward from Others	8	7	5	6	7	33
Punishment from Source	8	9	9	7	11	44
Referent-Model	3	3	5	4	7	22
Legitimate-Higher Authority	10	8	6	7	14	45
Guilt	7	4	7	6	12	36
Reward from Source	7	10	5	7	13	42
Normative Rules	8	8	8	6	14	44
Personal Responsibility	6	6	7	6	13	38
Expert	5	5	3	5	7	25
Punishment from Behavior	7	7	8	8	9	39
Self-Esteem	8	6	7	8	12	41
Debt	2	5	4	3	6	20
Personal Relationship-Negative	4	2	1	2	5	14
Altruism	3	5	7	2	7	24
Personal Relationship-Positive	7	6	5	5	6	29
Duty	5	4	6	3	7	25
Legitimate-Personal Authority	10	10	9	8	15	52
Number of Groups	10	10	9	9	17	55

messages for each of the original eighteen BAT categories (Kearney et al., 1983). However, no particular BAT was represented by a spontaneously generated message from any single member in any of the groups sampled (see Table 29.1). The BATs for which the most groups reported messages were Reward from Behavior and Legitimate-Personal Authority. The fewest groups reported messages for Personal Relationship-Negative, Debt, and Referent-Model. Clearly, all of the BATs generated by the student sample employed in the Kearney et al. (1983) research are appropriate for teachers. However, some BATs seem to be more a part of what teachers indicate they use than others.

Four new BATs were generated in the data provided by the teacher groups: Deferred Reward from Behavior, Punishment from Others, Peer Modeling, and Teacher Feedback. The first of these represents a splitting of the original BAT of Reward from Behavior into two categories—Immediate

Table 29.2
Revised Behavior Alteration Techniques and Messages

Technique	*Sample Messages*
(1) Immediate Reward from Behavior	You will enjoy it. It will make you happy. Because it's fun. You'll find it rewarding/interesting. It's a good experience.
(2) Deferred Reward from Behavior	It will help you later on in life. It will prepare you for college (or high school, job, etc.). It will prepare you for your achievement tests. It will help you with upcoming assignments.
(3) Reward from Teacher	I will give you a reward if you do. I will make it beneficial to you. I will give you a good grade (or recess, extra credit) if you do. I will make you my special assistant.
(4) Reward from Others	Others will respect you if you do. Others will be proud of you. Your friends will like you if you do. Your parents will be pleased.
(5) Self-Esteem	You will feel good about yourself if you do. You are the best person to do it. You are good at it. You always do such a good job. Because you're capable!
(6) Punishment from Behavior	You will lose if you don't. You will be unhappy if you don't. You will be hurt if you don't. It's your loss. You'll feel bad if you don't.
(7) Punishment from Teacher	I will punish you if you don't. I will make it miserable for you. I'll give you an "F" if you don't. If you don't do it now, it will be homework tonight.
(8) Punishment from Others	No one will like you. Your friends will make fun of you. Your parents will punish you if you don't. Your classmates will reject you.
(9) Guilt	If you don't, others will be hurt. You'll make others unhappy if you don't. Your parents will feel bad if you don't. Others will be punished if you don't.
(10) Teacher-Student Relationship: Positive	I will like you better if you do. I will respect you. I will think more highly of you. I will appreciate you more if you do. I will be proud of you.
(11) Teacher-Student Relationship: Negative	I will dislike you if you don't. I will lose respect for you. I will think less of you if you don't. I won't be proud of you. I'll be disappointed in you.

(*continued*)

Table 29.2 (Continued)

(12) Legitimate-Higher Authority	Do it, I'm just telling you what I was told. It is a rule, I have to do it and so do you. It's a school rule. It's school policy. The principal said so.
(13) Legitimate-Teacher Authority	Because I told you to. You don't have a choice. You're here to work! I'm the teacher, you're the student. I'm in charge, not you. Don't ask, just do it.
(14) Personal (Student) Responsibility	It is your obligation. It is your turn. Everyone has to do his/her share. It's your job. Everyone has to pull his/her own weight.
(15) Responsibility to Class	Your group needs it done. The class depends on you. All your friends are counting on you. Don't let your group down. You'll ruin it for the rest of the class (team).
(16) Normative Rules	We voted, and the majority rules. All of your friends are doing it. Everyone else has to do it. The rest of the class is doing it. It's part of growing up.
(17) Debt	You owe me one. Pay your debt. You promised to do it. I did it the last time. You said you'd try this time.
(18) Altruism	If you do this, it will help others. Others will benefit if you do. It will make others happy if you do. I'm not asking you to do it for yourself; do it for the good of the class.
(19) Peer Modeling	Your friends do it. Classmates you respect do it. The friends you admire do it. Other students you like do it. All your friends are doing it.
(20) Teacher Modeling	This is the way I always do it. When I was your age, I did it. People who are like me do it. I had to do this when I was in school. Teachers you respect do it.
(21) Expert Teacher	From my experience, it is a good idea. From what I have learned, it is what you should do. This has always worked for me. Trust me—I know what I'm doing. I had to do this before I became a teacher.
(22) Teacher Feedback	Because I need to know how well you understand this. To see how well I've taught you. To see how well you can do it. It will help me know your problem areas.

and Deferred. Punishment from Others, similarly, represents an additional BAT stemming from the Punishment from Source and Punishment from Behavior categories in the original study. The Peer Modeling BAT represents the splitting of the Referent-Model category into Teacher Modeling and Peer Modeling. The final BAT, Teacher Feedback, represents a completely new category. Each of these new BATs was generated across several of the teacher groups, although the labels that were attached by the teachers were not all identical.

Less than 2 percent of the spontaneously generated messages from Phase 1 could not be classified into the original BAT categories or the four new categories. Almost all of these came from teachers who clearly did not understand the assignment or provided responses that the investigators could not interpret (for example, "It is 2:30"; "Tell a joke"; "Are you passing all your other classes?"). No new BAT could be generated from these responses.

On the basis of these results the 22 Bats appearing in Table 29.2 were included in Phase 3 of the present study. Additionally, the sample statements used by Kearney et al. (1983) were modified by including specific statements generated by the teachers in Phases 1 and 2. Also, some of the labels for the BAT categories were modified to relate specifically to the teacher-student relationship.

Phase 3

Table 29.3 reports the mean self-use, other use, and effectiveness scores for each of the BATs. The percentages of respondents indicating high or low use of effectiveness are also reported. Employing a majority percentage criterion, four of the BATs were found to be used frequently by the teachers sampled: Immediate Reward from Behavior, Deferred Reward from Behavior, Self-Esteem, and Teacher Feedback. Employing the same criterion, ten of the BATs were found to be used infrequently: Punishment from Behavior, Punishment from Teacher, Punishment from Others, Guilt, Teacher/Student Relationship-Negative, Legitimate-Teacher Authority, Debt, Altruism, Peer Modeling, and Teacher Modeling.

Results with regard to the teachers' perceptions of the use of the BATs by other teachers at their same grade level were substantially different. A majority reported that six techniques are frequently used by other teachers: Immediate Reward from Behavior, Deferred Reward from Behavior, Punishment from Teacher, Legitimate-Higher Authority, Legitimate-Teacher Authority, and Teacher Feedback. In contrast, a majority of the teachers reported only four techniques that are infrequently used by other teachers: Punishment from Others, Guilt, Teacher/Student Relationship-Negative, and Debt.

In terms of effectiveness, the majority of the teachers reported only

Table 29.3
Mean Self-Use, Other Use, and Effectiveness Ratings and Frequency Percentages of High and Low Self-Use, Other Use, and Effectiveness

	Self-Use %			Other Use %			Effectiveness %		
BAT[a]	$\bar{X}$	High Use	Low Use	$\bar{X}$	High Use	Low Use	$\bar{X}$	High Effect	Low Effect
1	3.9	69	8	3.6	53	11	3.9	66	10
2	3.5	54	20	3.6	60	14	3.0	34	33
3	3.0	39	37	3.4	48	20	3.5	55	20
4	2.8	27	39	3.1	34	25	3.1	33	35
5	3.9	72	9	3.4	46	14	4.0	73	6
6	2.2	16	63	3.0	33	32	2.3	14	59
7	2.3	22	61	3.4	56	23	2.4	21	56
8	1.4	3	89	2.3	13	60	2.0	12	69
9	1.8	6	77	2.4	16	52	2.0	10	68
10	3.1	44	30	3.1	40	25	3.3	44	24
11	1.7	4	80	2.4	17	56	2.0	9	67
12	3.0	31	32	3.6	59	14	2.7	24	44
13	2.4	24	54	3.5	56	18	2.4	14	55
14	3.2	39	25	3.4	43	15	2.9	25	32
15	2.7	28	43	3.1	34	27	2.9	30	37
16	2.7	26	43	3.0	31	30	2.7	24	37
17	1.6	5	84	2.2	12	62	1.9	5	76
18	2.3	15	61	2.4	15	49	2.5	18	48
19	2.4	17	55	2.9	29	36	3.1	39	31
20	2.4	19	57	2.9	33	35	2.4	19	51
21	2.9	33	37	3.2	41	24	2.8	26	41
22	4.0	73	7	3.6	55	13	3.7	60	12
Overall	2.7	30.3	46.0	3.1	37.5	29.8	2.8	29.8	41.4

a. See Table 29.2 for category labels.

four techniques that are highly effective: Immediate Reward from Behavior, Reward from Teacher, Self-Esteem, and Teacher Feedback. In contrast, a majority reported that eight techniques are ineffective: Punishment from Behavior, Punishment from Teacher, Punishment from Others, Guilt, Teacher/Student Relationship-Negative, Legitimate-Teacher Authority, Debt, and Teacher Modeling.

The multivariate analyses for the impact of teacher gender on perceived use and effectiveness were all significant ($< .0001$). Table 29.4 reports the results of the univariate analyses. Only four analyses yielded significant results for self-use. Females were found to use Immediate Reward from Behavior, Self-Esteem, and Teacher Feedback more than males.

Table 29.4
Mean Self-Use, Other Use, and Effectiveness Ratings for Significant Sex Differences

BAT	*Male*	*Female*	*F*	R^2
Self-use				
Immediate Reward from Behavior	3.4	4.0	19.03	.05
Self-Esteem	3.6	4.0	8.99	.02
Expert Teacher	3.3	2.9	6.67	.02
Teacher Feedback	3.7	4.0	7.10	.02
Other use				
Immediate Reward from Behavior	3.3	3.6	4.69	.01
Self-Esteem	3.2	3.5	4.94	.01
Teacher Feedback	3.3	3.6	5.39	.01
Effectiveness				
Self-Esteem	3.7	4.1	12.48	.03
Teacher Feedback	3.4	3.7	6.50	.02

Males were found to use Expert Teacher more than females. Results were significant on three BATS for other use. Females reported that other teachers use Immediate Reward from Behavior, Self-Esteem, and Teacher Feedback more often than males reported they did. With regard to effectiveness, significance was obtained only for Self-Esteem and Teacher Feedback. Females reported that both BATs were more effective than did the males.

The multivariate analyses for the impact of teaching level on perceived use and effectiveness also were all significant ($< .0001$). In these analyses, the subjects in the "other" category were omitted due to the very diverse nature of the members of the group. Table 29.5 reports the results of the univariate analyses.

Results relating to self-use were significant for six BATs. Teachers in the upper grades reported more use of Deferred Reward from Behavior, Punishment from Teacher, Debt, and Expert Teacher. Teachers in lower grades reported more use of Reward from Teacher and Reward from Others.

Significant results were obtained for eight BATs pertaining to other use. Teachers in upper grades reported that their colleagues use more Deferred Reward from Behavior, Punishment from Teacher, Legitimate-Higher Authority, Debt, and Teacher Modeling. Teachers in lower grades saw their colleagues using more Immediate Reward from Behavior, Reward from Others, and Self-Esteem.

In terms of effectiveness, only two results were significant. Teachers in

Table 29.5
Mean Self-Use, Other Use, and Effectiveness Ratings for Significant Teaching Level Differences

BAT	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	F	R^2
Self-use						
Deferred Reward from Behavior	2.9[b]	3.7[a]	4.0[a]	4.0[a]	15.31	.13
Reward from Teacher	3.3[a]	3.1[a,b]	3.0[a,b]	2.7[b]	3.42	.03
Reward from Others	3.0[a]	2.9[a]	2.6[b]	2.5[b]	2.86	.03
Punishment from Teacher	2.1[b]	2.6[a]	2.6[a]	2.4[a]	3.03	.03
Debt	1.4[b]	1.6[a,b]	1.8[a]	1.7[a]	2.83	.03
Expert Teacher	2.7[b]	3.0[a]	3.2[a]	3.1[a]	2.50	.02
Other use						
Immediate Reward from Behavior	3.8[a]	3.6[a,b]	3.3[b,c]	3.2[c]	5.03	.05
Deferred Reward from Behavior	3.1[b]	3.7[a]	3.9[a]	4.0[a]	14.32	.13
Reward from Others	3.2[a]	3.2[a,b]	2.9[b,c]	2.7[c]	4.99	.05
Self-Esteem	3.6[a]	3.5[a]	3.4[a,b]	3.2[b]	2.80	.03
Punishment from Teacher	3.2[a]	3.5[a,b]	3.5[a,b]	3.8[b]	3.15	.03
Legitimate-Higher Authority	3.5[a]	3.6[a]	3.7[a,b]	4.0[b]	2.52	.02
Debt	1.9[a]	2.1[a,b]	2.4[b,c]	2.6[c]	5.72	.05
Teacher Modeling	2.7[a]	3.0[a,b]	3.1[a,b]	3.3[b]	2.78	.03
Effectiveness						
Deferred Reward from Behavior	2.6[b]	3.1[a]	3.2[a]	3.4[a]	5.89	.06
Reward from Teacher	3.7[a]	3.7[a]	3.5[a,b]	3.2[b]	2.46	.02

Note: Means with same superscript are not significantly different.

upper grades saw Deferred Reward from Behavior as more effective, while teachers in lower grades saw Reward from Teacher as more effective.

The multivariate analyses for the impact of years of teaching experience were all nonsignificant. Thus, on the basis of the data obtained, teaching experience does not appear to alter teachers' use of BATs, their perceptions of their colleagues' use, or the effectiveness of the techniques.

An examination of the factor-analytic results indicated no meaningful factor structure for the BAT items for self-use, other use, or effectiveness. On the unrotated factor solutions, no item met the .60 eigenvalue criterion, strongly suggesting the presence of multiple factors. However, rotated solutions that produced five factors indicated that no factor included more than two items with high loadings. Thus, even though there were some meaningful correlations between BAT category scores, there did not appear to be an

Table 29.6
Correlations Among Ratings of Self-Use, Other Use, and Effectiveness

BAT	*Self-Use/ Other Use*	*Self-Use/ Effectiveness*	*Other Use/ Effectiveness*
Immediate Reward from Behavior	.51	.60	.28
Deferred Reward from Behavior	.56	.57	.42
Reward from Teacher	.54	.67	.44
Reward from Others	.51	.51	.46
Self-Esteem	.42	.47	.29
Punishment from Behavior	.49	.56	.34
Punishment from Teacher	.50	.51	.37
Punishment from Others	.38	.32	.28
Guilt	.43	.48	.34
Teacher-Student Relationship: Positive	.61	.64	.47
Teacher-Student Relationship: Negative	.46	.50	.32
Legitimate-Higher Authority	.50	.55	.33
Legitmate-Teacher Authority	.49	.58	.41
Personal (Student) Responsibility	.64	.58	.47
Responsibility to Class	.63	.61	.58
Normative Rules	.50	.61	.44
Debt	.49	.59	.46
Altruism	.57	.62	.55
Peer Modeling	.55	.48	.42
Teacher Modeling	.53	.66	.45
Expert Teacher	.55	.72	.48
Teacher Feedback	.48	.63	.35

underlying structure that would permit reduction in the number of categories employed.

The obtained correlations among rating of self-use, other use, and effectiveness for the 22 BAT categories are reported in Table 29.6. All of the obtained correlations were significant and most were moderate to moderately high. Clearly, these perceptions are not independent. Generally, the higher correlations were between self-use and effectiveness. This would appear reasonable, since it should be expected that teachers would choose to use techniques that they believe will be effective. The very substantial correlations between self-use and other use are more difficult to interpret. These relationships may indicate the presence of patterns of BAT use that are relatively consistent across teachers in a given school. However, they may also be a function of teachers not really knowing what their colleagues do and, as

a result, responding to our instrument with their own behavior heavily influencing their perceptions.

DISCUSSION

Consistent with the primary objective of this study, a revised and extended typology of classroom-relevant behavior alteration techniques and messages was generated. Research question 1 was asked in order to isolate classroom strategies available for teacher use. Based on teacher input, the original eighteen BATs (Kearney et al., 1983) were modified to enable more precise discriminations among existing strategies and extended to include new categories. These modifications suggest that strategies teachers employ in the classroom are in some cases similar to existing compliance-gaining typologies, but are qualitatively different in several fundamental ways.

The first difference is that teachers employ BATs that rely on direct as well as mediated appeals. That is, teachers may provide either direct rewards and punishments (among others) to obtain compliance, or mediate those appeals by referencing students' peer groups as sources of power. Second, teachers employ BATs that exemplify the evaluative role of teachers in the classroom environment. Teacher Feedback obtains compliance by calling attention to the teacher's task-oriented objective, to assess student learning and teaching effectiveness. Third, while several of the BATs may seem similar to existing compliance-gaining strategies in the abstract sense, teachers appear to be constrained by the specific types of messages they generate to employ each BAT. Accountability to students, parents, and administrators may require that teachers selectively employ BATs by communicating BAMs that are appropriate to teachers as student role models.

Further modifications of the available BATs for teacher use were addressed in research question 2. Whereas the BAMs derived in Kearney et al. (1983) relied on college students' input, in this study teachers themselves generated classroom-relevant messages. These teacher BAMs were an obvious extension and revision of those previously isolated. Blending the former BAMs with teacher BAMs resulted in empirically refined configurations of classroom-representative BAMs. These configurations, then, can now serve as sets of operational statements for each BAT that teachers use.

Based on the revised BATs, research question 3 was concerned with those BATs teachers use most and least frequently. Similar to the results obtained by Kearney et al. (1983), teachers reported that they used primarily reward-type or prosocial BATs. However, teachers in this sample did not indicate that they most frequently employed "student audience effect-type

BATs or mediated appeals. Instead, teachers rated highly a new BAT, Teacher Feedback. Additionally, teachers claimed to use least frequently those BATs that were primarily punishment oriented or antisocial. These findings would seem to suggest that teachers in this study were better able to discriminate among BATs and BAMs since category labels and messages were refined to be more clearly representative of classroom-specific applications.

Research question 4 was asked to explore those BATs instructors perceived that other teachers used with students at the same grade level. While prosocial and Teacher Feedback BATs made up half of the list of strategies most frequently used by others, teachers also perceived others as frequently using a variety of antisocial BATs. Whereas teachers may be reluctant to report using antisocial BATs themselves, these results indicate that teachers can readily identify their use by other teachers. Perhaps teachers are guilty of projection ("A friend of mine has this problem . . ."). Given this interpretation, teachers may employ both pro- and antisocial BATs. Such use is supported by the initial classification of messages teachers generated in Phase I. Teachers consistently recalled almost equal frequencies of both pro- and antisocial messages. Furthermore, the results of Power 1 (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983) indicated that students perceived their teachers as using more coercive power than did their teachers.

Teachers also appear to be selective in their use of antisocial BATs. That is, teachers reported that other teachers *least* frequently used other types of antisocial BATs. An examination of antisocial BATs most and least frequently employed suggests that teachers perceive others as using antisocial BATs that reflect legitimate power or teacher authority and rarely rely on student or peer sources of punishment. This observation is consistent with the custodial model of classroom discipline. Following this model, new teachers are evaluated on their ability to adopt this authority-based discipline orientation (Hoy, 1968).

Interpreting the results pertinent to research question 5, teachers perceived that the BATs they most frequently used themselves were also most effective in controlling student behavior. Similarly, those they found least effective were also the BATs they employed least. Generally, effective BATs were primarily prosocial, whereas ineffective BATs were primarily antisocial. While reward-type strategies may be effective for optimizing student control, Richmond and McCroskey (in press) found that the use of reward power was not meaningfully associated with student learning. This result calls into question the relative efficacy of prosocial BATs for classroom management.

No single antisocial BAT was perceived as effective. However, teachers perceived that others frequently used antisocial BATs. Perhaps teachers recognize that such BATs are ineffective, but resort to their use regardless. Po-

tentially, the custodial expectation of their school systems may mandate the use of more traditional sources of discipline. Teachers might also employ such strategies simply because they *prefer* the use of punishment to control student misbehaviors (Siggers, 1980), in spite of its ineffectiveness.

Finally, research question 6 asked whether teacher use, others' use, and effectiveness of BATs were a function of teacher gender, years taught, and grade level. Results indicated that primarily prosocial BATs were perceived as used and effective by female teachers significantly more than by males. In contrast, male teachers perceived Expert Teacher as used and effective significantly more than did females. These findings reflect the influence of traditional gender-based roles. That is, females may employ BATs that indicate responsiveness to and support of the student (for example, "You will enjoy it"; "You always do such a good job"; "To see how well you can do it"). Males, however, may rely on self-perceptions of their own credibility and may actively assert this stance ("This has always worked for me"; "Trust me—I know what I'm doing"; and so on).

Years taught was not shown to be a function of the use (self and other) or effectiveness of particular BATs employed in the classroom. Although disappointing, this result is consistent with the findings obtained by Kearney et al. (1983). Different results might be obtained by eliciting experienced teachers' perceptions of inexperienced teachers' use and effectiveness of BAT employment (see Hoy, 1968). In any case, this issue remains open.

Grade-level data proved to be particularly interesting. While teachers reported self- and other use of prosocial-type BATs for the lower grades, upper-grade-level teachers reported self- and other use of primarily antisocial and Expert Teacher BATs. These results are consistent with traditional elementary and junior/senior high teacher-student orientations. That is, elementary teachers may rely on a variety of reward-type strategies to control student behavior because younger students are more easily influenced by external sources of reward. Older students, however, may no longer perceive that teachers have the ability to provide relevant rewards for compliance (see Boocock, 1983). Instead, teachers in upper grades may resort to punishment or demonstration of teacher competence in the content area taught. Similarly, secondary and college teachers and students have reported the frequent use of teacher expert power (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983). These same students also perceived their teachers as using more coercive power than their teachers perceived themselves using.

One notable exception to upper-grade-level self- and other use of BATs in the present study was the frequent employment of Deferred Reward. In addition, upper-grade-level teachers perceived Deferred Reward to be significantly more effective than lower-grade teachers. While upper-grade-level students may not perceive teachers to have reward influence potential,

these same students may rely on future sources of reward that can benefit them directly (for example, "It will prepare you for a job"; "It will help you later on in life"). In contrast, lower-grade-level teachers found Reward from Teacher to be significantly more effective. Elementary students may attribute to teachers the ability to provide meaningful rewards. Further, such students may require more immediate and tangible rewards, which teachers can readily provide.

The results reported here illustrate the need for a variety of additional investigations. Currently, investigations are under way that examine the types of BATs teachers employ with students of different academic abilities. In addition, the present study assessed only teacher perceptions of BAT usage in the classroom. Research is being conducted that examines student perceptions as well. Moreover, since years of teaching experience failed to predict types of BATs employed, studies should be designed either to tap experienced teachers' perceptions of inexperienced teachers or to observe and code BAT employment in the classroom directly. Finally, this continued research program on teacher power in the classroom will focus on the relative effectiveness of each BAT on both classroom management and student learning outcomes.

REFERENCES

Boocock, S. (1983). Public schools and education. In M. L. DeFleur (Ed.), *Social problems in American society.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Borg, W. R., & Ascione, F. R. (1979). Changing on-task, off-task, and disruptive pupil behavior in elementary mainstreaming classrooms. Journal of Educational Research, 72, 243-252.

Check, J. F. (1979). Classroom discipline—Where are we now? *Education, 100,* 134-137.

Clegg, A., & Megson, B. (1968). *Children in distress.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Cody, M. J., McLaughlin, M. L., & Jordan, W. J. (1980). A multidimensional scaling of three sets of compliance-gaining strategies. *Communication Quarterly, 28,* 34-46.

Coy, S. C. (1980). *Discipline: There are alternatives! A handbook for elementary teachers and principals* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 916).

Durkheim, E. (1961). *Moral education.* New York: Free Press.

Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. (1980). *Effective classroom management at the beginning of the year in junior high school classrooms.* Report No. 6107. Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

French, J.R.P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1968). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gallup, G. F. (1981). The 13th annual Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 62,* 33-47.

Glasser, W. (1978). Disorders in our schools: Causes and remedies. *Phi Delta Kappan, 51,* 331-333.

Good, T. L., & Beckerman, T. M. (1978). Time-on-task: A naturalistic study in sixth-grade classrooms. *Elementary School Journal, 78,* 193-201.

Harris, M. B. (1972). *Classroom uses of behavior modification.* Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Heal, K. H. (1978). Misbehavior among school children: The roles of the school in strategies for prevention. *Policy and Politics, 6,* 321-332.

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

Jenson, W. R. (1978). Behavior modification in secondary schools: A review. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 11*(4), 53-61.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1983). *Power in the classroom III: Teacher communication techniques and messages.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC.

Krantz, M., & Scarth, L. (1979). Task persistence and adult assistance in the preschool. *Child Development, 50,* 578-581.

Lufler, H. S., Jr. (1978). Discipline: A new look at an old problem. *Phi Delta Kappan, 59,* 424.

Marwell, G., & Schmitt, D. R. (1967). Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. *Sociometry, 30,* 350-364.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1983). Power in the classroom I: Teacher and student perceptions. *Communication Education, 32,* 176-184.

Miller, G. R., Boster, F., Roloff, M., & Seibold, D. (1977). Compliance-gaining message strategies: A typology and some findings concerning effects of situational differences. *Communication Monographs, 44,* 37-51.

Richmond, V. P., & Andriate, G. (1982). *Advanced study: Instructional communication.* Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University, Department of Speech Communication.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (in press). Power in the classroom II: Power and learning. *Communication Education.*

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schenck-Hamlin, W. J., Wiseman, R. L., & Georgacarakos, G. N. (1982). A model of properties of compliance-gaining strategies. *Communication Quarterly, 30,* 92-100.

Shrigley, R. L. (1979). Strategies in classroom management. *Educational Digest, 45,* 7-10.

Siggers, W. W. (1980). Changing teacher correcting behavior: Using aversive and positive contingencies. *Educational Research Quarterly, 5,* 25-32.

Waller, W. (1932). *The sociology of teaching.* New York: John Wiley.

Willever, D. J., & Jones, R. G. (1963). When pupil control becomes an institutional theme. *Phi Delta Kappan, 45,* 107-109.

Wlodkowski, R. J. (1982). *Discipline: The great false hope* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 224 782).