

## Teachers Held Responsible for Students' Performance are More Controlling

Being in a meritocratic society, students' examination results are of utmost importance as it determines their entry to better institutions which raises the possibility to get a better job in the future. Sadly, teachers are held responsible for their students' performance by the school as well as the parents. Under such enormous pressure, it is no wonder that many teachers choose to be [controlling](#).



Research has shown that teachers who are held responsible for their students' performances are more controlling than those who are told that there were no performance standards for their students' learning (Deci, Spiegel, Ryan, Koestner, & Kauffman, 1982). Teachers, who are more controlling, talked more, were more critical of their students, gave more commands, and allowed less choice and [autonomy](#). Such teaching behaviours would cause students to have lower intrinsic motivation and self-esteem.

### Implications:

- There should be other yard sticks for measuring teachers' performance rather than using their students' performance. Besides, teachers who are given academically better classes would logically perform better if gauged on their students' results.
- Performance standards may not have a negative effect on intrinsic motivation if it was communicated in an [informational](#) way with concern instead of pressure. This applies to administrators communicating to teachers as well as teachers to students.
- We may not be able to change the yardsticks measured by the system or the way society thinks but we can change the way we think. The controlling way may lead us to the results we want for some students but it might "kill" many others, in terms of loss of interest in studies or simply giving up on their studies altogether. The autonomous way does not guarantee results but could enhance students' intrinsic motivation and conceptualisation which facilitates better performance. So why not try the autonomous way?

### Keywords:

Autonomy	Refers to volition—the organismic desire to self-organize experience and behavior and to have activity be concordant with one's integrated sense of self (Angyal, 1965; deCharms, 1968; Deci, 1980; Ryan & Connell, 1989; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999).
Controlling	Events that pressure people toward specified outcomes, thereby denying them the experience of choice (Deci & Ryan, 1980).
Informational	Events that provide people with meaningful feedback in the context of choice (Deci & Ryan, 1980).

### References:

- Angyal, A. (1965). *Neurosis and treatment: A holistic theory*. New York: Wiley.
- deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation*. New York: Academic.
- Deci, E. L. (1980). *The psychology of self-determination*. Lexington, M.A.: Health.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1980). The empirical exploration of intrinsic motivational processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 13). New York: Academic Press.
- Deci, E. L., Spiegel, N. H., Ryan, R. M., Koestner, R., & Kauffman, M. (1982). Effects of performance standards on teaching styles: Behavior of controlling teachers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 74*(6), 852-859.
- Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 749-761.
- Sheldon, K. M., & Elliot, A. J. (1999). Goal striving, need satisfaction, and longitudinal well-being: The Self-Concordance Model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 546-557.