

Students' Role Expectations as Perceived by Teachers and Students in American Studies and American History Programs¹

ELIZABETH P. WATSON *
JON C. MARSHALL
ALVIN P. SOKOL

TEACHING based on a "process oriented" position would emphasize the *development of critical skills* in student-centered learning situations. The purpose of such techniques is to use reliable knowledge as a means of formulating valid generalizations. It is assumed that such generalizations will influence the student's actual behavior. This position differs from the conventional "content oriented" position, which tends to emphasize the *acquisition of knowledge* which at that time is assumed to be reliable. In general, the difference is in *learning how to use knowledge* as opposed to *storing knowledge*.

The direction of current social studies curricular innovations is toward a process oriented position (Berman, 1968; Fair and Shaftel, 1967). The nature of these changes is a deviation from the conventional emphasis on the acquisition of knowledge through changes in curricular and administrative organization, which is based on an acceptance of nonconventional instructional goals and assumptions (Hunt and Metcalf, 1968; Fenton, 1966; Massialas and Cox, 1966; Oliver and Shaver, 1966; NEA, 1963; Simpson, 1953; Engle, 1960).

Goals set for social studies programs are generally related to the relative impor-

tance of the processes of learning and the acquisition of specific content (Engle, 1960). Acceptance of an extreme position on a process-content continuum implies certain assumptions about the needs of the learner, the nature of learning and transfer, and the role of the teacher and student. These assumptions furnish the basis for decision making about the improvement of the teaching-learning process in the classroom (Simpson, 1953).

Keller (1961) reflects one of the extreme positions when he states that, "subjects as such have disciplines that will help to develop students' minds . . . [and] what students should do in school is [to] study subjects and become acquainted with facts and ideas" (p. 42). The converse is expressed by Engle (1960) when he states that decision making requires ". . . synthesizing of all available information and values. . . in teaching social studies, we should emphasize decision making as against mere remembering" (p. 301).

Studies (Massialas, 1963; Oliver and Shaver, 1966) designed to compare these two orientations have attempted to demonstrate that the process oriented teaching method

¹The research reported in this article was conducted as part of a Title III of ESEA, I/D/E/A National Demonstration Schools Project, awarded to the University City Public Schools, University City, Missouri, Grant No. OEG-0-8-052000-2908, Ronald M. Compton, Director.

* Elizabeth P. Watson, Assistant Professor, Department of Elementary Education, University of Missouri—St. Louis; Jon C. Marshall, Associate Professor, Department of Behavioral Studies and Research, University of Missouri—St. Louis; and Alvin P. Sokol, Research Coordinator, Title III Special Projects, University City School District, University City, Missouri

(a) does not result in decreased acquisition of knowledge, and (b) develops thinking skills which enhance transfer and the utilization of knowledge. Evidence has been gathered in these studies which supports part one of this position. However, the studies have failed to demonstrate significant differences in types of goal achievement between the two orientations.

Past research has focused on the relation between the means for achievement and goal attainment. Seemingly, these studies have assumed that teacher identification and implementation of the means for achieving particular goals are the only necessary and sufficient facets of goal attainment, and that this attainment should be measurable after relatively short instructional periods. However, the success of achieving such goals is logically and psychologically dependent on adequate communication of the goals to the student and his acceptance of them (Getzels and Thelen, 1960; Broom and Selznick, 1955; Snygg, 1966). It seems that more fundamental questions concerning the nature of learning and the role of the teacher and student might first be asked about the teaching-learning process.

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the extent to which an "innovative" social studies program was associated with different role identifications of students and teachers as compared to conventional programs.

Procedure

Three suburban high schools were selected for this study. One of these was considered to be the innovative, experimental school (Ep). It was chosen on the bases of (a) having been designated a National Demonstration School; (b) having published a set of process oriented objectives; and (c) having reorganized the grade eleven social studies program to facilitate the objectives, which included variable scheduling and team staff utilization. The general orientation of this program was defined as "teaching students to think for themselves and to understand the inseparability of American history and litera-

Part	Group	n	Σ Ranks	U	Significance
I	Ep	12	253	29	P < .002
	C	17	182		
II	Ep	12	228	54	P < .05
	C	17	207		
III	Ep	12	240	42	P < .02
	C	17	195		

Table 1. Mann-Whitney U Test of Significance of the Difference Between the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers)

ture" (Balcom, 1968, p. 2). The program was developed within the stated school philosophy of "helping each child develop his unique character to become a citizen capable of making responsible decisions" (Balcom, 1968, p. 1). The program was facilitated through teacher-developed materials, a resource center, common planning time for the 12 teachers, two-man teaching teams, modular-flexible scheduling, two-hour time blocks, etc. Within certain limitations, group size and composition, teacher-student ratio, room size, and scheduling varied according to the specific learning objectives at a given time. Strategies for implementing the course materials in each class were determined by the teaching team involved.

The other two schools were selected on the basis of having comparatively conventional social studies programs with course content generally based on the organization of an adopted text, and students divided into groups of approximately 25, each assigned to one teacher. They ranked nearest to the experimental school (out of 22 other schools in the area) on the basis of 16 educationally related variables. These schools were denoted the control programs (C1 and C2). In these programs, American history and literature were separate courses organized in the conventional manner.

In order to measure the perceptions of expectations for student behavior in these types of programs, a 213-item inventory was developed. The inventory was entitled the *Watson Analysis Schedule (WAS)* (Sokol and Marshall, 1968; Watson, 1969). The items were based on a thorough review of social studies and related literature and were, thus,

presumed to represent behaviors associated with process and or content orientations to learning.

The inventory consisted of 71 items repeated in three separate parts, under the following headings: *Explicit Expectations*, "In this class students are told that they are expected to . . ."; *Actual Expectations*, "It is my opinion that in this class students are actually expected to . . ."; and *Realized Expectations*, "It is my opinion that in this class students actually do (are) . . ." These three parts reflect three major aspects of goal communication and attainment.

Each respondent to the WAS marked, on a five-point scale, the degree of certainty with which he perceived each item to be an expectation or not to be an expectation in his particular social studies class.

Estimates of the reliability of the inventory were obtained using a test-retest procedure to determine the expected consistency

of responding for an individual over a week's interval. Data were gathered from 39 high school students not involved in this study. The mean reliability coefficient for an individual was .563, with a standard error of .02. The effects of fatigue did not seem to have an adverse effect on responses to the WAS, in that the reliabilities for the three parts were not significantly different (Sokol and Marshall, 1968).

The WAS was constructed to measure the perceptions of learning behaviors of persons in "process oriented" and "conventionally oriented" classroom situations. Construct validity, as defined by Cronbach and Meehl (1967), was established through the process of construction of the inventory. After a thorough search of the literature, many items were identified which could or should be expected to reflect many of the variables associated with the learning constructs of "process oriented" and "conventionally ori-

Factor	Direction of Loadings	Part I Number of Loadings		Part II Number of Loadings		Part III Number of Loadings	
		Ep	C	Ep	C	Ep	C
2	+	4	13	9	5	1	14
	-	8	4	3	12	11	3
3	+	5	7	3	10	7	4
	-	7	10	9	7	5	13
4	+	6	8	7	9	4	8
	-	6	9	5	8	8	9
5	+	6	8	6	10	6	6
	-	6	9	6	7	6	11
6	+	9	9	5	9	5	6
	-	3	8	7	8	7	11
7	+	10	7	6	12	6	9
	-	2	10	6	5	6	8
8						6	7
						6	10
9						8	6
						4	11

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Table 2. Fisher Exact Probability Test of Independence of Bipolar Dichotomies (+ or -) and Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers)

Part	Group	n	Σ Ranks	H	df	Significance
I	Ep	30	1275.5	10.54	2	P<.01
	C1	30	1089.0			
	C2	30	1730.5			
II	Ep	30	1220.5	7.22	2	P<.01
	C1	30	1248.0			
	C2	30	1640.5			
III	Ep	30	846.0	19.40	2	P<.01
	C1	30	1392.0			
	C2	30	1826.0			

Table 3. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance of the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep, C1, and C2 (Students)

ented." A sample of 71 of these items was included in the WAS.

The *Watson Analysis Schedule* was administered to all students and teachers participating in these programs. At the time of administration 1,732 students (525, 550, and 657 in Ep, C1, and C2, respectively) were enrolled in the three programs, which were being taught by 29 teachers (12, 8, and 9 in Ep, C1, and C2, respectively). The 12 Ep teachers consisted of 6 history and 6 literature specialists.

Student and teacher responses on each of the three parts of the WAS were separately analyzed by means of Principal Axis Factor Analysis, Q-technique. These analyses were performed on the 29 teachers in the three programs as well as on a random sample of 90 students, 30 from each program with each teacher represented. Follow-up tests (Mann-Whitney U, Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance, Fisher Exact Probability Test, and Chi-Square) were used as appropriate to test the significances of the differences in factor loadings among the programs. The first two tests were used to analyze the differences among the programs in magnitude of loadings on the Principal Factors of the solutions, and the latter two procedures were used to test the significance of the differences among programs in the direction (+ or -) of bipolar factors loadings. Due to the sample size (29 teachers and 90 students) the control teachers were combined for comparing Ep and C, while the students were analyzed separately comparing Ep, C1, and C2.

Results

The factor analyses for teachers yielded 7 to 9 factors on the three parts, and those for students yielded 22 factors on each part. However, for follow-up analyses, these solutions for the students were reduced to 7 factors for each part, since the remaining factors contributed too little to the final solution to yield useful information.

The massiveness of the data generated for the factor solutions precludes their inclusion here. These results can be found in reports by Sokol and Marshall (1968) and Watson (1969). Tests of significance were applied to determine whether or not the directions of factor loadings for teachers were independent of membership in the experimental and control groups. The two control groups were combined (denoted C) for analysis of teacher responses because of the small sample sizes. Since the Principal Factor contains only positive loadings, the Mann-Whitney U Test of Significance of Differences of Ranks (rank order of factor loadings with the first rank assigned to the lowest factor loading) was applied to this factor. The results of this test for the three parts are presented in Table 1. Inasmuch as the subsequent factors consisted of both positive and negative loadings, the Fisher Exact Probability Test was used to analyze the independence of bipolar dichotomies and group membership. These results are presented in Table 2.

Similar analyses were run for the stu-

dent factor solutions. Due to the larger sample sizes, the student results were analyzed according to the original categorizations: Ep, C1, and C2. The Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance was applied to the loadings for the Principal Factor (see Table 3). Since the remaining factors consisted of both positive and negative loadings and three group classifications, the Chi-Square Test was used to analyze the independence of bipolar dichotomies and group membership. These results are presented in Table 4.

The final step in these analyses was the identification of the resultant factors. This was done by comparing individual profiles for similarities and differences with respect to their factor loadings.

Discussion

The general results of this investigation indicate that there were systematic differences in student expectations between the

Experimental teachers and the Control teachers, and that there were differences in perceived expectations among students enrolled in these programs. As might be expected, these differences were found on all three parts of the WAS: Explicit Expectations, Actual Expectations, and Realized Expectations. Furthermore, they were apparent in the factor solutions obtained for the teachers and students on the three parts of the WAS.

Of high import were the general orientations reflected in these factors and the consistency with which these orientations followed throughout. The Experimental program as indicated by the teachers reflected student-centered problem solving with emphasis on current issues. The converse was indicated as program characteristics by the Control teachers (see Table 5).

No separate factors emerged separating the six English specialists from the six history specialists. In fact, there was greater homogeneity between these two groups within the Experimental program than was evidenced

Factor	Direction of Loadings	Part I Number of Loadings			Part II Number of Loadings			Part III Number of Loadings		
		Ep	C1	C2	Ep	C1	C2	Ep	C1	C2
2	+	5	17	26	20	14	10	20	15	8
	-	25	13	4	10	16	20	10	15	22
		$\chi^2 = 29.73^*$			$\chi^2 = 6.76^*$			$\chi^2 = 9.71^*$		
3	+	10	22	13	15	14	12	17	9	21
	-	20	8	17	15	16	18	13	21	9
		$\chi^2 = 10.40$			$\chi^2 = 0.63$			$\chi^2 = 9.98$		
4	+	18	8	18	20	6	23	18	14	12
	-	12	22	12	10	24	7	12	16	18
		$\chi^2 = 8.90$			$\chi^2 = 22.13^*$			$\chi^2 = 2.49$		
5	+	13	15	14	15	8	19	10	21	10
	-	17	15	16	15	22	11	20	9	20
		$\chi^2 = 0.27$			$\chi^2 = 8.30^*$			$\chi^2 = 10.84$		
6	+	22	16	10	15	12	17	14	17	19
	-	8	14	20	15	18	13	16	13	11
		$\chi^2 = 9.64^*$			$\chi^2 = 1.69$			$\chi^2 = 1.71$		
7	+	24	11	12	14	17	13	21	12	8
	-	6	19	18	16	13	17	9	18	22
		$\chi^2 = 13.98^*$			$\chi^2 = 1.16$			$\chi^2 = 11.92^*$		

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Table 4. Chi-Square Test of Independence of Bipolar Dichotomies (+ or -) and Ep, C1, and C2 Groups (Students)

among the history teachers in the Control programs. Furthermore, examination of the rotated factor solutions seems to indicate greater agreement among the 12 Experimental teachers than among the 19 Control teachers. These results would seem to indicate that the Experimental teachers were interacting and thus operating as a team.

The general orientations for students were consistent with those noted for teachers. The students tended to stress teacher-centered recall as one orientation versus student-centered critical participation in problem solving and decision making. However, not all explicit and actual expectations were realized and, conversely, not all realized expectations were formulated as explicit or actual ones (see Table 6).

It is interesting that the general expectation of "teacher directed problem solving, allowing for student participation and decision making" was agreed upon by both the teachers and the students. The students indicated that the teachers explicitly expected this not to be limited to school application.

Consistently, the experimental students perceived their role as that of critical participation in problem solving and decision making, while the control students tended to perceive their role as that of noncritical acceptance.

However, the difference between the two conventional programs as perceived by

students, combined with the partial similarities to the experimental orientation, reflects a lack of consistency in expectations for these two programs. This lack of consistency yields conflicting expectations wherein students in both groups see themselves as being in a program featuring teacher-centered decision making with noncritical acceptance by students. In some instances they departed from this mode and reflected some characteristics of the student problem-solving and decision-making model. It should be noted that this conflict did not appear for the teachers.

The dimension of the accumulation and utilization of facts was present in both the content-"historical" and process-"social study" orientations. This would suggest that the accumulation of facts was important to both orientations, but that there was a distinction between them in the manner of the utilization of these facts; in the latter orientation, the emphasis seemed to be upon the utilization of facts for problem solving and decision making.

In view of the analysis for the teachers, these results for the students take on even greater importance. The consistency in the teachers' perceptions of their own role lends credence to the ability of a school faculty to implement a social studies curriculum which includes active, critical student participation in problem solving and decision making.

These results further support the state-

WAS, Part	Experimental Program	Control Programs
I	<i>Away from</i> past-oriented recall delimited by academic requirements as conventionally evaluated <i>Away from</i> teacher as exclusive decision maker, with noncritical acceptance by students <i>Toward</i> student-directed problem solving, with significant decision making	<i>Toward</i> past-oriented recall delimited by academic requirements as conventionally evaluated <i>Toward</i> teacher as exclusive decision maker, with noncritical acceptance by students <i>Away from</i> student-directed problem solving, with significant decision making
II	<i>Toward</i> teacher-identified problems, with student-centered problem solving and decision making <i>Away from</i> recall of teacher-determined content, <i>toward</i> student-centered problems	<i>Away from</i> teacher-identified problems, with student-centered problem solving and decision making <i>Toward</i> recall of teacher-determined content, <i>away from</i> student-centered problems
III	<i>Away from</i> past-oriented uniform behavior, <i>toward</i> changed behavior in society <i>Away from</i> teacher as exclusive decision maker with noncritical acceptance by students	<i>Toward</i> past-oriented uniform behavior, <i>away from</i> changed behavior in society <i>Toward</i> teacher as exclusive decision maker with noncritical acceptance by students

Table 5. Teacher Factors Associated with Programs

WAS, Part	American Studies	American History, C1	American History, C2
I	<p><i>Toward</i> decision making and significant outcomes</p> <p><i>Toward</i> student critical participation in problem solving, <i>away</i> from past-oriented recall and uniformity</p> <p><i>Toward</i> student participation in problem solving and relevant learnings, <i>away</i> from noncritical acceptance</p> <p><i>Toward</i> student as decision maker, within an open and accepting climate</p> <p><i>Toward</i> student critical participation in problem-solving decisions</p>	<p><i>Toward</i> decision making and significant outcomes</p> <p><i>Away</i> from student participation in problem solving and relevant learnings, <i>toward</i> noncritical acceptance</p> <p><i>Away</i> from student as decision maker, within an open and accepting climate</p>	<p><i>Away</i> from decision making and significant outcomes</p> <p><i>Away</i> from student critical participation in problem solving, <i>toward</i> past-oriented recall and uniformity</p> <p><i>Toward</i> student as decision maker, within an open and accepting climate</p> <p><i>Away</i> from student critical participation in problem-solving decisions</p>
II	<p><i>Away</i> from teacher as exclusive decision maker, with noncritical acceptance by students; <i>toward</i> relevant mode of continued learning</p> <p><i>Toward</i> student critical participation in problem solving and decision making with "self"-social learning</p>	<p><i>Away</i> from teacher as exclusive decision maker, with noncritical acceptance by students; <i>toward</i> relevant mode of continued learning</p> <p><i>Away</i> from acquisition of factual content, limited to the past, for future utility</p> <p><i>Toward</i> problems based on students' interests and experiences</p>	<p><i>Toward</i> teacher as exclusive decision maker, with noncritical acceptance by students; <i>toward</i> relevant mode of continued learning</p> <p><i>Away</i> from student critical participation in problem solving and decision making with "self"-social learning</p> <p><i>Toward</i> acquisition of factual content, limited to the past, for future utility</p> <p><i>Away</i> from problems based on students' interests and experiences</p>
III	<p><i>Toward</i> critical participation in problem solving and enjoyment of activities</p> <p><i>Toward</i> critical participation in problem solving, with an open climate; skill not limited to school application</p> <p><i>Toward</i> problem solving and meaning, <i>away</i> from better citizenship</p> <p><i>Toward</i> student participation in problem development, with self-evaluation</p>	<p><i>Away</i> from student-teacher interaction in limited problem solving with making reports</p> <p><i>Away</i> from problem solving and meaning, <i>toward</i> better citizenship</p>	<p><i>Away</i> from critical participation in problem solving and enjoyment of activities</p> <p><i>Away</i> from critical participation in problem solving, with an open climate; skill not limited to school application</p> <p><i>Toward</i> student-teacher interaction in limited problem solving without making reports</p> <p><i>Toward</i> problem solving and meaning, <i>away</i> from better citizenship</p> <p><i>Away</i> from student participation in problem development, with self-evaluation</p>

Table 6. Student Factors Associated with Programs

ment that the general goal orientation of the innovative program has been successfully communicated to the students and seems to fit their need disposition as reflected in the Realized Expectations. This is further supported by the factor descriptions wherein the innovative students evidenced an enjoyment of activities, while the conventional students in the most teacher-centered program indicated the converse.

The identification of the items based on the factor analyses leads the investigators to

conclude that the innovative program is indeed quite different from the conventional programs. The nature of this difference appears to be a general and, in the case of the innovative group, a highly consistent, agreement between teachers and students of the type of role the student is to play.

Present programs might well look to their students and faculty to see if the roles now exercised as perceived are those they in fact want to develop. Those involved in programs might spend more time identifying the

role orientation which is consistent with the kind of person the student should become, and plan curriculum which enables the learner to exercise behaviors consistent with this role.

References

Max Balcom. "American Studies." *Impact of New Ideas in Education*, Vol. 5, No. 1. University City, Missouri: School District of University City, Missouri, 1968.

Louise M. Berman. *New Priorities in the Curriculum*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1968. 238 pp.

Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick. *Sociology*. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1955.

L. J. Cronbach and P. E. Meehl. "Construct Validity in Psychological Tests." In: William A. Mehrens and Robert L. Ebel, editors. *Principles of Educational and Psychological Measurement*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1967. pp. 243-70.

Shirley H. Engle. "Decision-Making: The Heart of Social Studies Instruction." *Social Education* 24: 301-304, 306; November 1960.

Jean Fair and Fannie R. Shaftel, editors. *Effective Thinking in the Social Studies*. Thirty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: The Council, 1967. 253 pp.

Edwin Fenton. *Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966. 514 pp.

Jacob W. Getzels and Herbert A. Thelen. "The Classroom Group as a Unique Social System." In: Nelson B. Henry, editor. *The Dynamics of Instructional Groups*. Fifty-Ninth Yearbook of the National

Society for the Study of Education. Part 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960. pp. 53-82.

Charles R. Keller. "Needed: Revolution in the Social Studies." *Saturday Review* 44: 60-62; September 16, 1961.

Maurice P. Hunt and Lawrence E. Metcalf. *Teaching High School Social Studies: Problems in Reflective Thinking and Social Understanding*. Second edition. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1968. 449 pp.

Byron G. Massialas, editor. *The Indiana Experiments in Inquiry: Social Studies*. Bulletin of the School of Education, Vol. 39, No. 3, Bloomington: Indiana University, May 1963. 139 pp.

Byron G. Massialas and Benjamin C. Cox. *Inquiry in Social Studies*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966. 339 pp.

National Education Association. *Planning and Organizing for Teaching*. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1963. 159 pp.

Donald W. Oliver and James P. Shaver. *Teaching Public Issues in the High School*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966. 326 pp.

Ray H. Simpson. *Improving Teaching-Learning Processes*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Inc., 1953. 479 pp.

Donald Snygg. "A Cognitive Field Theory of Learning." In: Walter B. Waetjen and Robert R. Leeper, editors. *Learning and Mental Health in the School*. Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1966. pp. 77-96.

Alvin P. Sokol and Jon C. Marshall. *Inquiry into Innovations*. Research Report I, Demonstration Schools Project, University City Senior High School, Title III of ESEA Public Law 89-10, 1968. 197 pp.

Elizabeth P. Watson. "Inventoried Perceptions of Expectations in Three Different Social Studies Programs." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1969. □

Improving Educational Assessment & An Inventory of Measures of Affective Behavior

Prepared by the ASCD Commission on Assessment of Educational Outcomes
Walcott H. Beatty, Chairman and Editor

Price: \$3.00

NEA Stock Number: 611-17804

172 pp.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Copyright © 1971 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.