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ABSTRACT

The quality of student learning in the history classroom is an ongoing concern manifested most recently in discussions of what students should be learning—facts, skills, or some combination. Constructivist notions of instruction emphasize learning as meaning-making rather than as memorization of facts and suggest that learning history includes social construction of knowledge. Situated cognition theorists suggest "conversations" as a metaphor for learning in which students, teachers, and professional historians engage figuratively and literally in discourse (both spoken and written) about culturally significant ideas, events, and beliefs.

This study, set in a suburban high school, examined learning from a constructivist perspective, one that is often left out of the ongoing debate about fostering historical understanding. Eleventh grade students' engagements with scholarly conversations in the field of history and with their peers as they read and discuss secondary and primary sources as part of a cognitive apprenticeship were the central concerns of this research. The study established the context of student learning within an Advanced Placement American Studies classroom and then examined four episodes of small group discussions for uses of heuristics that students employed in their exploration of "the Declaration of Independence," "the presidency of Abraham Lincoln," "the US entry into World War One," and "the decade of the 1960s."

Research questions focused on how curricular structures for both an Advanced Placement American Studies course and the American History portion of that course
fostered entry into conversation about American history, how the classroom curriculum shaped teacher-led discussions, what pedagogical moves enabled students to adopt particular ways of speaking about history, and how discourse in small group discussions developed and were influenced by instructional contexts.

To describe the classroom context, teacher-led discussions and key discussions of “What is history?” and small-group discussions were described in detailed field notes or audiotaped by the researcher was the participant-observer and teacher in the class. The content of teacher-led discussions was examined for the teacher’s and students’ use of the ideas of historiography. To explore the extent to which teacher-led discussions shaped students’ thinking, the language of the small group discussions was examined for students’ use of heuristics used for considering historical evidence.

Research findings include strong circumstantial evidence that the classroom context established historiographically-based conversations and provided students the opportunity to use historians’ tools. In the small group discussions, students adopted two heuristics, sourcing and contextualization, and used them in ways analogous to historians. Sourcing, in particular, was used by students in substantive ways in three of the four small-group discussions during episodes. In general, the findings suggest that the classroom context may have supported student learning, and that, unlike the claims of previous studies, with instruction students can work productively with primary and secondary sources to not only examine historical evidence systematically but also to learn how to use historical heuristics that are suggestive of expert ways of knowing history.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

One's history, personal or national, is important. Dr. Oliver Sacks, a neurologist, describes the case of a man who has lost his personal history in *The Man Who Mistook His Wife for a Hat and Other Clinical Tales* (1970). Jimmy G. was a man in his fifties who had a memory of only his earliest life, from birth until age nineteen at the end of World War II. He had no memory of the last 30 years, had no ability to add to his long term memory, and had only the briefest short term memory. Sacks documented the devastating effect of Jimmy's inability to recall and organize his memories; Jimmy described himself as not feeling anything, good or bad, or not feeling alive. He had, according to Sacks, only his superficial present: "He had not complained of loneliness, but he looked so alone; he never expressed sadness, but he looked so sad (p.35)."

National history is equally important for the collective consciousness of a people. Athanases, (1988) argues that history can be used to explain current events, to provide a basis for the future, to provide people with a cultural heritage, to hold people together in the culture to support and destroy cultural myths, and to understand causality in the past. Jimmy's inability to process events and remember beyond the present moment suggests a terrifying potential for a country that forgets its past:
"... none of us had ever encountered, even imagined, such a power of amnesia, the possibility of a pit into which everything, every experience, every event, would fathomlessly drop, a bottomless memory-hole that would engulf the whole world" (Sacks, 1970, p. 33-34).

Concerns about Students Learning History

Given the importance of history then, many people are justifiably concerned about what goes on in America's history classrooms, especially in secondary schools whose students are expected to engage in the formal study of history as a discipline (Bradley Commission, 1988; Ravitch and Finn, 1987). Educators and lay people alike believe that America's history classrooms are failures--that the students who emerge have not "learned" history. The question then becomes what is meant by learning history. If one group feels that the real problem is that students are not learning content or the right content, then another group feels the real problem is that students have not learned the proper thinking skills. Let us examine those positions before exploring an alternative views.

Concerns about Content.

Reformers such as E. D. Hirsch, Lynne Cheney, and Diane Ravitch argue that students are not learning the proper historical facts. And it follows that, since students are not learning the "facts" of history, they will not be able to make sense of significant historical texts (Hirsch, 1983). Hirsch argues for the importance of "the words [his emphasis] that high school graduates ought to know--a lexicon of cultural literacy... [It] would include not just ordinary dictionary words, but would also include proper names, important phrases and conventions" (p. 168). He argues that students lack this cultural lexicon and that schools in particular ignore it. Cheney asserts that its
"the content more than the theory of schooling that's at issue" (in Applebome, 1997, p. 5). With the increasing concern about content has begun the debate over state and national educational tests (Applebome, 1997).

In his review of methods of history instruction, Athaneses (1988) suggests that society expects students of history to learn a narrative of the past, gain a sense of cultural identity, and develop an uplifting moral perspective. Ravitch and Finn's (1987) report on the 1986 National Assessment of Educational Progress's (NAEP) examination of student knowledge of history and literature in What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know? argues that students are not learning a factual narrative. According to their analysis, the average student answered correctly only 54.5 percent of the 141 item history examination that was a part of the 1986 NAEP. Their specific concerns are that only 24 percent of American students are able to place Abraham Lincoln's administration in the correct twenty-six year historical period and that only 37 percent of these students can correctly identify the group of immigrants most affected by the National Immigration Quota Acts of 1921 and 1924. According to Ravitch and Finn, students are failing to learn the important facts of history. They ask how students can understand our history if they do not know facts, dates, and events that constitute our past. John Leo in "The Hijacking of American History" (1994) argued that students are gaining neither a cultural identity nor an uplifting moral perspective.

Concerns about Thinking Skills.

Other researchers and educators (Brandhorst, 1989; Kownslar, 1979; Newmann, 1991; Onosko, 1991; Sears & Parsons, 1991) are concerned that students are leaving high school without the "higher order" or critical thinking skills necessary to examine issues that they will need to confront as adults. The ability to examine bias, identify irrelevant information, and to interpret, analyze, and manipulate information is important for adults in the modern world, and, the argument goes, students either lack
these social studies skills or have learned them as isolated skills, thus short-circuiting their application to current issues (Brandhorst, 1989; Kownslar, 1979; Onosko, 1991).

Skills-oriented researchers argue that students should be taught thinking skills in the classroom (Sears & Parsons, 1991) rather than a mass of information (Onosko, 1991). These skills include the ability to detect biases or fallacies, distinguish between relevant and irrelevant information, and interpret, analyze, and manipulate information (Newmann, 1991). Higher order thinking skills are often presented as a hierarchy of skills and sub-skills to be learned (Brandhorst, 1989) in isolation and then transferred to all social studies or even all disciplines (Kownslar, 1979). For example, Ohio’s proposed model curriculum for the social studies (1993) emphasizes the skills that students should learn, for these skills enable students to make sense of content area information. Accordingly, students are seen as technicians learning discrete skills and then applying them as necessary. At the same time, the focus on discrete thinking skills has been panned as lacking a context for using the skills and for ignoring the apparent domain specificity of such skills (Brandhorst, 1989; Camperell & Knight, 1991; Sears & Parsons, 1991).

Another approach to curricular change is critical pedagogy. Critical theorists, such as Giroux, press for “critical literacy” in which students develop a skeptical attitude toward all resources and authorities and examine the role of power in the classroom, community, and society at large (Giroux, 1990). Giroux (1988) has also considered the contributions of history; specifically, that history is the national memory and that it needs to be liberated from the role that it currently plays supporting the status quo. History, according to Giroux,

... is a sober witness to the oppression and pain endured needlessly by history’s victims and a text/terrain for the exercise of critical suspicion, highlighting not only sources of suffering that need to be remembered so as not to be repeated, but also the subjective side of human struggle and hope (p. 69).
Students who have truly learned history, from Giroux's perspective, will become critical thinkers with a taste for social change. Taken as a whole, these various perspectives criticize the modern American classroom for failing to turn out students adept in the content or the skills or the politics of history. Given the range and intensity of this debate, two commissions were established in the late 1980s to make recommendations for the reform of history education.

Issues of the History Curriculum

To deal with a perceived failure of students to learn the content of history, the Bradley Commission (1988) and the National Commission (1989) (sponsored by the National Council for the Social Studies) have suggested reforms that focus on extensive curricular change. Although their reports differ on specifics, both commissions suggest new national curricula with an emphasis on the content to be taught in history class. Taking a familiar and now traditional view, these reports seem to argue that recall of content is historical learning, and that increased content knowledge will ensure student understanding. But perhaps most interesting is that these reports understand history as a finished product which students learn and as a means to a unified society and to a shared view of history.

Due to financial considerations the National Commission project went no further than the publication and distribution of the proposed curriculum. In *Historical Literacy* (1989) however, the Bradley Commission extended its argument beyond the original report. In several articles, for example, historians argued for the importance of the historical method and the significance of history in American education. In the same book, however, McNeil, Kammen, & Craig (1989) comment that the products of this ongoing historical process should merely “feed (my emphasis) into high school and college classrooms and provide teachers with an ever-evolving understanding of the past *to set before the young* (my emphasis)” (p. 110). McNeil et al. state flatly that
experiencing history as a process is the "special province of graduate school and of the historical profession at large" (p. 110). Apparently the job of younger students is to learn the content so that at some time in the future, if they have a special interest in history, they will be allowed to experience history as a process rather than a product.

Neither commission made specific recommendations about the methods that might be used to re-emphasize history in the public schools, however. More recent efforts, such as the National Standards for History (1993) and Ohio’s Model Curriculum for Social Studies Social studies: Ohio’s model competency-based program, (1994), have continued to emphasize skills rather than acknowledge history as a constructed body of knowledge. This same concern over the content that students should learn erupted as a part of the arguments over the National Standards for U.S. History (Crabtree, Nash, & Symcox, 1993). National figures ranging from Lynne Cheney to Albert Shanker argued point-counterpoint over the appropriateness of the Standards and the specific content that they recommend. Condemned as the result of the "forces of political correctness" (an anonymous member of the commission cited in Cheney, 1994) and praised as "substantive and demanding" (Shanker, p. A-14, 1994), the National Standards debate continues to focus on the issue of which historical facts students should absorb. The United States Senate passed a resolution condemning the standards and demanding that standards respect Western Civilization. Nash and Crabtree (cited in Applebee, 1996), co-directors of the American History Standards Project, argued that the standards are appropriate since students would be introduced to the story of the issues and debates that occurred in history. In a sense this debate over history standards seems to be based on two views of learning: one view sees students as passive learners to be filled with the appropriate information, and the other views history as shaped by issues and debate. That there is currently a variety of concerns about history instruction and students’ learning of history should not be surprising; notions of what history is, of
what the historian’s role is, and of what the learner’s role is have changed over the last one hundred years. Recent debates are only additions to an ongoing debate.

**Changing Notions of History and the Historian’s Role**

Before the twentieth century, historians and authors of primary source materials frequently thought of history as a story for the purpose of presenting a moral or a set of moral behaviors. The people and events of the past were presented in a series of powerful narratives that recalled the exploits and failures of the past. Some stories were created from whole cloth; Parson Weems invented stories about Washington chopping down a cherry tree and throwing a silver dollar across the Potomac (Kownslar, 1979). Weems felt no remorse over his inventions since these stories fulfilled his larger goal of illuminating Washington’s special qualities of honesty and strength (Athanases, 1988).

With the increasing importance of a scientific perspective in academic scholarship, during the first half of the twentieth century historians took a more positivistic view of their enterprise. They came to believe that through careful application of historical method a single true story could be written about the people and events of the past (Athanases, 1988). After World War II historians began to question the goals of scientific historicism and to argue that rather than being discovered and then revealed to the world, history is constructed through an ongoing process of examination and re-examination of current understandings of the past. Not only was history to be examined but the historian’s background, experience, and viewpoint were to be part of the critical examination as well. Part of a historian’s role was the selection of materials associated with historical events, the construction of an interpretation of those materials and thus of those events, and criticism of that construction (Collingwood, 1956). Edward Carr asserts that “[History is the] continuous process of interaction between the historian and his facts, an unending dialogue between the present and the past” (p. 35). He argues further that there is an
The changing perspectives of professional historians can be seen in the range of suggestions regarding content, skills, and politics made for history instruction in the high school classroom. In 1899, the American Historical Association's Committee of Seven proposed what was to become a very popular organization of the teaching of history: the so-called "four block" organization of history, thus fixing the content and structure of history instruction. History was to be taught in four segments: ancient, medieval, modern English, and US history. The context and pedagogy for history instruction and curriculum were adjusted as well by The Committee on Social Studies of 1916. Based in the beliefs that school should lead to the improvement of humanity and that science could provide the solutions to the ills of humanity, this committee's reports urged that schools include social studies in their curricula. Civics, political economics, sociology, geography, contemporary issues and history would be taught to students throughout their secondary education, rather than history alone (Saxe, 1992). In this way, ground work for instruction in history was laid.

James Harvey Robinson, an expert on history instruction on the 1899 Committee (Saxe, 1992), saw history instruction as the "opportunity [for students] to become acquainted with historical methods [research and criticism]" and the provision of "the most accurate, objective, and comprehensive account of all fields of human endeavor" (Robinson, 1912, pp. 33-34, quoted in Saxe, 1992). For Robinson and
The Committee on Social Studies the goal of history instruction was aiding us “to understand ourselves and our fellows and the problems and prospects of mankind” (Robinson, 1912, p. 12 quoted in Saxe, 1992).

The Inquiry Method

After World War II, in a period of school reform dominated by a return to the structures of the academic disciplines, there was a new interest in social studies instruction and indirectly in history instruction and curricula. The two leading lights of the New Socials Studies (NSS) movement were Lawrence Sensesh, a Purdue economist, and Edwin Fenton, a Carnegie Mellon historian. The focus of NSS was on student learning of an academic discipline rather than on more student- and society-centered curricula. The structure of the discipline and the inquiry method, which reflected the ideas of scientific historicism, were part and parcel of the NSS. The inquiry method emphasized the use of primary source documents within a student-centered examination of historical as well as of contemporary issues (Nelson & Drake, 1994).

The inquiry method, first suggested in 1967 by Fenton in The New Social Studies (Athanases, 1988) saw students as necessarily engaged in their own learning. Teaching history as an inquiry process was attractive to both researchers (Sears & Parsons, 1991) and history teachers (Holt, 1990) who argued that it would allow students to use the skills of the historian while learning the content of history with an emphasis on primary sources. Rather than lecture, drill, and memorization, Fenton would have history instruction organized as inquiry reflecting the kinds of research that professional historians did. He argued for a problem-centered approach to history in which students would discuss, for example, the question of whether the New Deal was a success or not. This process included examination of documents, exploration of the biases of the writers of the documents as well as their own biases, discussion of their
understandings of the documents and then a synthesis to formulate an answer to the question. The end product would be a specific answer to the significance of the New Deal, an answer which the teacher had determined prior to class and which was arrived at through extensive teacher-led classroom discussions (Fenton, 1967).

Although in its genesis the inquiry method was seen as innovative, it failed to become the method of choice in public school classrooms. This failure has been traced to several problems. Teachers at the time of implementation of the inquiry method reported little or no preparation in the technique as well as a lack of materials. The issues of the day—the Cold War, the civil rights movement, and the Vietnam War, that were to be the center of instruction were so controversial that they were difficult for teachers and students to grapple with. Students who had spent their educational lives in teacher-centered classrooms were uncomfortable in inquiry-based classes and pressured teachers to return to traditional content oriented teaching methods. Teachers who attempted to adopt the inquiry method were equally apt to be labeled “lazy” as “innovative.” Accordingly, inquiry teachers were viewed as not knowing their subject and condemned for not covering the content required in the course (Nelson & Drake, 1994). While it had a promising beginning, the inquiry method has not developed into a widely accepted way of thinking about the classroom and the students' role in that classroom.

Feminists (Maher, 1987) and critical theorists (Giroux, 1979) have been critical of the inquiry method as conceptualized by Fenton (1967). The emphasis on a single accepted solution to an historical issue (a result of scientific historicism) has received most of their attention. A single solution required the examination of a single facet of a problem while ignoring the others. For example, when examining the topic of the Great Depression, is the success of the New Deal the only issue that students could address, as is assumed in the example above? Or might students examine the differing impact of
the Depression on the wealthy and the working classes, women and men, the middle class and minorities? The single solution element of the inquiry approach ignored the reality that problems have multiple facets which require a variety of solutions. The inquiry method approached topics from a single viewpoint established by the teacher prior to the class, an over simplification of the complexity of human experience thereby emphasizing a Western male interpretation (Maher, 1987). The single solution also put aside the possibility of the examination and deconstruction of a diverse set of materials (Giroux, 1979, 1990).

Constructivist Theories of Teaching and Learning

The inquiry method was developed prior to and without the possibilities of recent discussions of constructivist understandings of history (Wineburg, 1991a, 1991b; Seixas, 1993). Currently, constructivist frameworks argue that with authentic forms of learning students develop understanding gradually over time rather than in a sprint. Rather than an isolated act of memorization or the repetition of teacher-sponsored information, learning is a social construction of knowledge that develops through the use of symbolic systems such as language during interaction with others (Applebee, 1993). Accordingly, students’ constructions of their understanding of history are strongly influenced by their life experiences and prior knowledge (Seixas, 1993) as well as through social interaction (Vygotsky, 1962; Britton, 1970, Barnes, 1976). This view of the student as an active participant in constructing his or her own meanings through participation in the classroom discussion and activities frames my reexamination of the inquiry method for the study of history.

Brown, Collins, and Duguid (1989) discuss a way of thinking about the classroom and student engagement in constructivist disciplinary ways of knowing using the concepts of “situated cognition” and “cognitive apprenticeship.” Brown, et al., assume that “All knowledge is, we believe, like language. Its constituent parts index
the world and so are inextricably a product of the activity and situations in which they are produced" (p. 33). Given this assumption of the constructed nature of knowledge, active learning of a set of information is the result of the continual interaction of students working within disciplinary situations. By acting within the discipline being studied, students learn the tasks and the socially constructed ways of thinking associated with the discipline as well as the content.

Theorists of situated cognition press for what they call "cognitive apprenticeships" in which students are enculturated in the discipline under study. Teachers support the apprentice's learning by explicitly discussing their tacit knowledge of the field, modeling the strategies used by the field to construct knowledge and providing supportive environments. Students try out these strategies, construct their own understanding of the significance of events in the past, and complete the same tasks using the same tools as historians. The goal of the classroom is for the students to continue their examination of school subjects such as history independently. (Brown, et al., 1989).

Small groups are especially important to cognitive apprenticeships. By working with their peers, students become a part of social interaction and conversation about the discipline under study and may achieve understandings and arrive at solutions they could not in isolation. The small group may also be effective in confronting ineffective strategies and addressing misunderstandings while providing important collaborative work skills (Brown, et al., 1989).

The Study of History as Constructivist Inquiry

Unfortunately, the argument over content or skills, critical thinking or inquiry approach has ignored the role that students play in their own learning. It is important to recognize that as students read, discuss, and write about texts they bring their own background knowledge to bear and construct their own understandings about events or
people (Anderson, 1984; Langer, 1986; Singer, 1983). Seixas (1993) finds that the background knowledge and life experiences that students bring to their constructions of history strongly influence their thinking and shape both the events and issues that they see as significant and how they remember those events and issues.

Applebee (1993) points out that constructivist notions have shifted the way that educators think about learning. "...[W]hat counts as knowing and doing, are shaped by what other individuals have said and done, by the conversations that have gone before" (Applebee, 1993, p. 2). Rather than memorize facts, rather than apply specific skills in content-free lessons, students construct meaning as they read, discuss, and write about history. In this sense, constructivist notions share some similarities with the critical historiography which developed after World War II.

Through classroom instruction, especially discussion, students engage in the ways of thinking that allow the teacher to play a critical mediating role between broader traditions and student knowledge (Seixas, 1993). Even the inquiry method that had hoped to engage students explicitly in historical inquiry limited the scope of students' analysis and restricted the materials that they would use to primary sources. Thus the inquiry method ignored the teacher's role in enabling students to learn from and participate in important conversations as they read secondary and primary sources. Again it must be emphasized that this is not a relativistic position as is sometimes charged (Park, 1995); not every interpretation is acceptable. All student interpretations occur within the community of the classroom and are mediated and evaluated by the teacher who acts as the connection to the larger scholarly community (Seixas, 1993).

Accordingly, constructivist theories of learning define ways of knowing in the history classroom as the students' ability to construct an understanding of history by using historical perspective, historical imagination, and a critical stance through active engagement with the teacher and peers. Much of the scholarship and theory of
historical understanding examined thus far has, to a large extent, ignored the more recent understandings of history as a social construction. By focusing on only factual content or thinking skills or a method of inquiry, each theorist has lost sight of the larger cultural and curricular conversations (Applebee, 1993) that are part of the discipline of history. In these larger conversations, professional historians discuss various historical events and people to explain their significance and to question and critique each other’s interpretation (Collingwood, 1956). Of course, the conversational domains that a secondary history teacher establishes will differ, but only in degree, not in kind.

Recent conceptualizations of intellectual disciplines argue that they are made up of communities of scholars who engage in an ongoing discussion about the field and the various interpretations that currently hold sway (Collingwood, 1956; Carr, 1961). The discipline of history is no exception. Historians examine various historical events and people with an eye to explaining their significance (Collingwood, 1956; Carr, 1961; Wineburg, 1991a). These interpretations vary according to the belief system each historian brings to the topic, the sources upon which he or she is drawing, and the context in which the historian is writing. Historians then examine or question each other’s work and evaluate what the work has to offer about the issue in question (Collingwood, 1956). In effect, historians are engaged in a conversation about the significance of an event or person and the variety of possible interpretations now current. This constructivist understanding of history and historians coincides with the constructivist notions of inquiry that frames this study of the use of teacher-led and small group discussions in an American history classroom.

**Constructivist Ideas and Curricular Conversations**

Within the broad framework of constructivist theories such as Brown, et al.’s ideas of situated cognition, Applebee (1996) argues for a new conceptualization of
curriculum as more than a specified set of facts and skills for teachers to teach and students to learn. He uses the analogy of a conversation to reconceptualize curriculum to be in sync with the shifting understandings of learning as construction of knowledge and meaning-making rather than memorization. He argues that curricular conversations revolve around the grand topics of the traditional disciplines: literature, history, mathematics, science, language, and arts.

What the academic disciplines do represent at any given moment in time is the current state of an ongoing dialogue about significant aspects of human knowledge and experience. The disciplines exist because thoughtful people care about the traditions of knowing and doing that they represent; they are culturally significant in the sense that they are sustained by a culture over time and place, and in the sense that they are continued beyond the life of any particular individual (Applebee, 1996, p. 10).

The notion of teaching and learning as a conversation fits well with the understanding of history as a social construction that develops in teacher-led and small group discussions. To Applebee's (1996) way of thinking, effective curricula have quantity, quality, relatedness, and manner which then support the development of knowledge-in-action. Quantity refers to the amount of material needed for the conversation to proceed; too much material or too little material means a breakdown in the discussion. Quality suggests the importance of making sure that what is being studied is worthy of study, worthy of conversation. Material should have a strong relationship to the ongoing conversation or not be included at all. This new conception of what makes good curricula suggests that the way in which students' learning is supported is crucial to the success of education.

Applebee (1996) offers knowledge-in-action as opposed to knowledge-out-of-context, that is, learning that is deeply contextualized in traditions of knowing rather than in simply exposing students to facts, dates, and events. Knowledge-in-action is attained through curricular conversations where students participate in the significant
conversational domains with their unique content, tasks, and ways of knowing; students learn to do historical analysis, not just hear about it. Applebee points out the paradox of knowledge-in-action: "in order to learn something new, one must do what one doesn’t yet know how to do (p. 108). Given this seeming contradiction, Applebee argues for an understanding of learning as a social process where students learn how to be a chemist or a historian by trying to be a chemist or historian with others, both teachers and other students (Applebee, 1996). The crucial work of the classroom conversation then is to support students’ construction of knowledge using disciplinary tools of research within disciplinary ways of knowing. At this point, curriculum begins to coincide with constructivist views of pedagogy.

"Constructivist inquiry" draws upon the ideas of the New Social Studies and the Inquiry Approach, current ideas about historiography, situated cognition, and constructivist understandings. As such, it emphasizes the perspective of the historian, the role of interpretation, the use of historical imagination, multiple answers to multiple questions of the significance of an historical event, and the role of historians as a community of scholars. It also assumes that students are active learners who construct their understandings of the methods and content of history out of an on-going classroom dialogue about the tradition of history. As cognitive apprentices, students gain knowledge-in-action when they examine both secondary and primary sources with an eye to the writer’s perspective, interpretation, and membership in the community of practicing historians within a supportive classroom context. The most important element of the students’ apprenticeships is the students’ independent work in small groups: using the tools of historians; taking on the role of historian, developing knowledge-in-action as they write essays in which they support their own interpretations and answers to questions which historians still consider.
The Study

With these evolving constructivist understandings of the nature of history and what makes for effective curriculum and instruction, it seems important to re-examine high school students' learning of history. For too long, the issue for educators has been which facts should be taught, what skills should be taught, and "delivery systems" or "teacher-proof" materials for teaching facts and skills. Rather than clarity, this debate brought us articles in the popular press trumpeting conflict and confusion (Hancock & Biddle, 1994; Leo, 1994). However, rather than another study demonstrating what factual knowledge or thinking skill students have not learned, new research is needed that looks at what students are doing in a classroom predicated on constructivist notions in which they are immersed in curricular conversations that revolve around disciplinary habits of mind and tools to complete disciplinary tasks. New research is needed that assumes that history is essentially a conversation that students can take from, and participate in. That is the goal of this study--an examination of the shaping influences of instructional context for curricular conversations on students' discussion about history based on secondary and primary sources.

This study examines an American Studies class where juniors participated in whole class discussions and activities centered around issues of historiography and in small groups which read, discussed, and wrote about secondary and primary sources within an integrated literature-history, team-taught American Studies classroom across a school year. Students read and discussed secondary and primary sources in small groups, and wrote analytic essays as well as participated in and listened to lecture-discussions, debates, video-tapes, simulations, games, and other classroom activities. The small groups' examination of primary and secondary sources was nested within larger units of study within the curriculum of the American History portion of the course and then within the larger curriculum of the Americans Studies integration of
included a range of whole-class and small-group curricular conversations. An examination of students' experiences in these conversations permitted an examination of how students construct meaning and learn history.

Theoretical Assumptions

As I worked with my American Studies partner to create our formal curriculum for American Studies and as I created my own formal curriculum for the disciplinary elements of the history curriculum, I worked from the following theoretical assumptions. Students are active, not passive, learners. They develop their own ideas, understandings, and content; they are not simply empty vessels to fill. This view of students as active learners fits in with my constructivist understanding of the nature of learning.

If students are active learners who construct their own meaning then the classroom must be seen as the site for that construction. Accordingly, the formal curriculum must be open-ended enough to allow for their constructions but supported enough so that there are standards for students to build from. Reading, writing and talking are important parts of a student's construction of knowledge. This belief reflects my background in literacy issues.

I believe that my role as a teacher is to mediate between the larger field of inquiry, history, and my students. As a part of that mediation, I hope to create a zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1962) which provides students with situatedness to scaffold their learning (Applebee, 1993, Applebee 1996). Within the disciplinary framework of history, I intend to encourage students to use talking, reading, and writing to begin to solve problems in history, as historians might.

It is important to navigate between the Scylla of coverage and the Charybdis of depth. A chronological approach must allow students frequent opportunities to examine issues in-depth. The chronological approach allows my students to build upon the
content that they learned in earlier history courses while in-depth examinations allow them to expand their body of knowledge.

Finally, I believe that the issues, content, and disciplinary practices that I teach better prepare students to be adults who will not be disillusioned the first time they read of injustice newly revealed or a different interpretation of the significance of an event. I hope that they will be able to "disapprove without being astonished, reject yet still understand" (Wineburg and Fournier, 1994, p. ).

Specific research questions to be explored in this project include the following.
1. What are the curricular structures and content of an Advanced Placement American History course designed to foster entry into a conversation about American history?
2. What is the nature of the course content and how does this content shape discussions?
3. What pedagogical moves does the teacher make that support students' adoption of particular ways of thinking and speaking about history?
4. How do students in small groups use various heuristics (Wineburg, 1991a, 1991b) to examine secondary and primary historical sources and how are those usages influenced by the larger instructional contexts for those discussions?
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CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will address five areas of scholarship which I believe are the conceptual underpinnings for my research in the area of history instruction and learning: (a) the general learning theory from which instruction might be drawn, (b) the status of history education in the U.S. and suggestions for reform, (c) the significance of the teacher's role in the classroom, (d) the studies of student's reading, writing, and thinking about history in whole group and small group activities, and (e) studies of how the classroom context supports student learning in history. The purpose of this chapter is to attempt to report what we currently know about teaching and learning history and then suggest what new understandings my research might provide.

A Theory of Language and Learning

My research is embedded within a constructivist framework of language learning and learning through language. Vygotsky (1962) emphasized the importance of the role of language in a child's learning, arguing for the importance of language not just as a communicative act but as a form of social engagement that introduces the child to cultural tools as well. As children engage in language in a social setting they internalize the structures of talking and thinking becoming progressively move independent of their adult caretaker. Vygotsky saw the child as an active learner who
learns within the "zone of proximal development" (ZPD) in which children's earlier understandings are gently disrupted and the child by necessity rethinks his or her understanding of the situation (Langer & Applebee, 1987). The ZPD also describes a child's range of potential of learning that is shaped by the social environment. Working by analogy, just as a child might internalize the knowledge transacted through assisted performance, students in a history class might do so through class discussions. In both cases, learners appropriate knowledge through a direct relationship with more experienced members of their society (Vygotsky, 1978).

Both Vygotsky (1962) and Bruner (1984) argue that the adult-child teaching relationship is crucial for the child's social and cognitive development. Bruner described this relationship using the metaphor of "scaffolding" whereby the adult helped the child understand as well as complete new tasks, thus supporting the child's learning and mastery of the task at hand. Bruner also agreed with Vygotsky that language is a critical tool essential for thinking and that written language in particular offers some key advantages over oral language. Written language supports cognitive growth, the argument goes, because it is abstract and the language of schooling helps develop students literacy skills which enables students in dealing with abstractions (Langer & Applebee, 1987).

Britton (1970), basing his theory on those earlier theories, coined the phrase "talking to learn." As a mode of representation, language enables us to name our experiences, to organize and share them, and to return to them for further reflection. We thus come to know events, ideas, and people through the filter of language. If language is a kind of map a culture provides, we work collaboratively to know and to transform it for our own purposes. Taken as a whole, these theories suggest that students learn best when they are actively engaged in carefully supported activities that include collaboration and meaning making within social contexts. My research will
examine these issues in both an American Studies course and the history portion of that course across an entire year looking first at the larger classroom context and its forms of instructional support and then at the dynamics of exploratory talk in small groups.

A View of the Modern American History Classroom and Suggestions for Reform

Another important element of the background to this research is the current status of history education in the United States. Does history instruction reflect these literacy-based theories of language learning and learning through language? Lecture/recitation methods of teaching history that emphasize the recall of content have been criticized as superficial (Downey & Levstik, 1991). The history classroom has been described as

... the exposition, primarily via textbook and teacher talk of a single watered-down and oversimplified version of truth claims.... Furthermore the assumptions, qualifiers and caveats recognized by scholars in a discipline as basic to the argument are usually omitted.... About the only thing that a student can do with such content is to accept it as truth on the authority of the textbook author and the teacher, and reduce it to memory -- useful primarily in answering, more or less verbatim, the trivia questions posed on oral quizzes and in short answer tests (Engle, 1986, p.20).

Through examination of the National Assessment of Educational Progress surveys, Applebee and his colleges (Applebee, Langer, Mullis, 1987; Applebee, Langer, Jenkins, Mullis, & Foertsch, 1990) present a portrait of students' interpretations of the modern American history classroom in eighth, eleventh, and twelfth grades which agree with what might be called the "traditional classroom" chastised by educational researchers. In an analysis of the NAEP survey taken during the spring of 1986, students reported studying early eras of history more often than more recent eras suggesting that history courses tend to be taught in a chronological order. Students also reported the frequent use of textbooks in a classroom where the teacher emphasized memorization. While weekly use of supplementary materials such as stories or films
was common, few students reported the use of original historical documents. Twelve percent reported using original sources every week while 44 percent said they never used them at all. This finding fits with teacher statements that most original sources, e.g. the Declaration of Independence, were too difficult to use with anything less than the most gifted students (Applebee, et. al. 1987).

Students reported doing some writing in their history classrooms. Forty-seven percent of eighth graders and 36 percent twelfth graders reported writing one or two paragraphs for history class at least weekly. Only 16 percent of eighth and 8 percent of twelfth graders reported writing extended pieces (three or more pages) weekly. Approximately two-thirds of the eighth graders, (Applebee, et. al., 1990) better than two-thirds of the eleventh graders (Applebee, et. al., 1987), and three fourths of the twelfth graders reported never writing papers of three or more pages for their history class (Applebee, et. al., 1990). Although whole class lecture was the classroom organization which students reported the most frequently, students did report working in small groups as well as completing projects. In terms of assessment, 71 percent reported that they took tests over the content being studied about once a week (Applebee, et. al., 1987).

Although the NAEP research occurred ten years ago, more current studies (Downey & Levstik, 1991; Wineburg & Wilson, 1991) report little change in the typical history classroom social studies classrooms. Wineburg and Wilson (1991) note that while most teachers stated that the development of student reasoning abilities was their primary goal, research revealed the use of objective tests using multiple-choice, matching or true false meaning that memorization is still a main objective. Textbooks were frequently the driving force in most classrooms --not teachers-- and determine the subject matter to be taught, serving as a script for classes and the basis for student evaluation. The pattern has been found to be true of elementary classrooms where some
teachers may only accept information from the classroom textbooks. In this situation the textbook limits the amount of information students can access and authorizes correct answers (Levstik, 1986).

There have been three widely publicized and debated efforts to reform the teaching of history, the Bradley Commission, the National Commission, and the National Standards Commission. The Bradley Commission (1988) and the National Commission (1989) sponsored by the National Council for the Social Studies both suggest new national curricula with an emphasis on the content to be taught in history class. The Bradley Commission argues fervently that history has a special role to play in both elementary and secondary education and that no time is to be lost in re-emphasizing the importance of history (Gagnon & The Bradley Commission, 1991). Both commissions suggest new national curricula for history curricula emphasizing the functions of factual narrative, cultural identity, and moral growth and the importance of content, although the reports differ on the specifics to be included. These reports seem to argue that recall of content is historical learning and increased content knowledge ensures student understanding. The underlying notion in these reports is that history is a finished product which students need to learn to create a unified society with a single shared view of history. Although these reformers offer suggestions about curriculum, they fail to address instructional concerns. This approach has been characterized as the teaching, reciting, and memorizing of factual knowledge that ignores students' thoughtful decision making (Ochoa, 1990).

More recent efforts in reforming the history curriculum, such as the National Standards for History (1993) emphasize content to be learned rather than methods that might be used to re-emphasize history in the public schools. After the publication of the National Standards for History Committee’s selection of content an argument over that content erupted. The critics of the National Standards (Cheney, 1994; Leo, 1994)
are appalled that Paul Revere, Daniel Webster, J. P. Morgan, Thomas Edison, and the Wright Brothers are not mentioned in the standards while the Seneca Falls Declaration of Sentiments is mentioned nine times and Senator Joseph McCarthy is mentioned nineteen. The proponents of the standards argue that the standards include the stories of people who traditionally have been marginalized by educational accounts of history (Hancock & Biddle, 1994; Nash & Crabtree, cited in Applebee, 1996). Both sides in this debate again focus on what content is to be taught rather than also discussing the role of student and teacher within the discipline of history.

Taken as a whole, these recent glimpses of history education present a disappointing view of a classroom where textbook-driven lectures call on students to memorize information. The reform movements have focused solely on which content students are to memorize. Certainly content is important, but it seems to me that there should be more to the reform of the history curriculum than a virulent argument over the number of times a historical personage is mentioned. Might not the effort to reform the history curriculum also profit from an examination of the role of classroom context, the roles of teachers and students, and the influence of both teacher-led and small group discussions?

**Research in the Significance of Teachers’ Knowledge of and Approach to Their Disciplines**

Wineburg and his colleagues (Wineburg & Fournier, 1994; Wineburg & Wilson, 1991) have done considerable research into the role that teacher’s thinking plays in his or her teaching in the history classroom. In a close examination of the role that teacher’s thinking played in their approach to creating a context in which to understand primary source documents, Wineburg and Fournier (1994) found there was not a clear cut relationship between the teacher’s undergraduate major and his or her ability to deal fruitfully with documents. Potential history teachers may arrive in college with only
content knowledge and no understanding of the broader issues of historiography; yet it is these fundamental ideas that are heart of teaching the discipline to students. Why is it important for teachers (and by extension, students) to be able to think as historians?

Historical thinking of the type described here, and in particular the disposition to think about the past by recognizing the inadequacy of one's own conceptual apparatus, is essential in teaching people; how to understand others different from themselves. If we never recognize that our individual experience is limited, what hope is there of understanding people whose logic defies our own, whose choices and beliefs appear inscrutable when judged against our own self? (Wineburg & Fournier, 1994, p. 305-306).

In a second study (Wineburg & Wilson, 1991), the importance of teachers' underlying thinking was highlighted. Two teachers, one who led discussions while writing on the board and calling on students, the other who “disappeared” into the classroom organized around cooperative small groups, were equally effective and engaging with their students. The explanation for this paradox lay in the way both teachers’ thought about history. They both saw history as a human construction in which questions of significance make the writing of history an act of judgment. In these two teachers' classrooms textbooks did not have pride of place, rather they were seen as just one interpretation, the foil to the teacher's presentation, or as one of several sources on the topic at hand. Finally, these teachers in their distinct classroom presentations were able to make their ways of thinking available to the students who worked with them (Wineburg & Wilson, 1991).

As a part of a new way of thinking about the history classroom, this research by Wineburg, et. al., (1991, 1994) reveals that the ways that the teacher thinks about the discipline under study must be taken into account. Here teachers who understood history as an ongoing construction of meaning by a community of scholars were able to engage students in more than memorization and recall. They were able to engage students in the ways of thinking associated with historians' thinking about history.
An Examination of Student Learning in the Classroom

This examination of the research that underlies teaching and learning in the history classroom now turns to students' learning in the classroom. Two studies found that teachers can and do influence the learning that occurs in the class. In an examination of three multi-age elementary classrooms, Hickman (1981) found that through the physical environment teachers create and the types of discussions that teachers and students engaged in, teachers were able to influence the types of student response that occurred.

In an examination of eight teachers, two each from American Literature, American history, biology, and physics, Langer, Confer, and Sawyer (1993) found that teachers want students to make connections and ask good questions as well as to analyze materials to provide evidence and to predict future actions. The history teachers in this study monitored student responses and modeled ways of reasoning used by historians. Still teachers were found to have trouble articulating the rules of effective reasoning within their discipline and so their reasoning was embedded in their subject-driven lessons and students had difficulty taking on these disciplinary ways of knowing. If teachers could make their implicit knowledge explicit, their students would more easily take on disciplinary reasoning patterns.

Reading and Writing about Texts

Much is known about the role that reading plays in students' learning. As students read, they interact with the text and construct an understanding of it through making predictions and checking those predictions (Camperell & Knight, 1991). Students' background knowledge, schema activation, and reading strategies are an important part of the process of construction as well (Anderson, 1984; Pearson & Fielding, 1984). As students read, they take different stances toward the text depending on whether it is an literary or expository text (Langer, 1990). Understanding the
demands of the differing approaches to text is significant. For example, since the history curriculum requires students to read expository texts (Alvermann & Moore, 1984) the specific demands of this reading require consideration. Research in reading has tended to focus on the elementary grades (Campbell & Knight, 1991; Camperell & Knight, 1991) or the high school English classroom (Alvermann & Moore, 1984; Campbell & Knight, 1991). The research, albeit sparse, that has been done on reading in secondary content classrooms, such as the social studies class and the history class, suggests that reading plays an important part in inquiry.

Nicholson (1984) examined the reading that New Zealand junior secondary students did in their math, science, English, and social studies classes through extensive observations and interviews. He looked at the types of reading tasks assigned; for example, social studies "students were expected to 'inquire'—to use printed resource material to locate information which could then be translated into summaries, charts, graphs and diagrams" (p.439). After exploring student background knowledge, strategies, and difficulties, Nicholson found that many students were confused by the reading they were given as well as by what they were expected to do with what they had read. This confusion resulted from the mismatch between students' background knowledge and the expert knowledge of the classroom. On the other hand, in a study of 161 sixth graders, Langer (1984) found that through a pre-reading activity which dealt with passage specific background knowledge stimulated by key content improved student performance on comprehension questions.

Traditional expository writing in a history class requires a student to take a position on an historical question, provide appropriate examples supporting that position according to the rules of historical evidence, and write in a logical and cogent way (Sheeran & Barnes, 1991). Soter (1987) points out "...no English class can address
the problem of writing in other disciplines because there is no one text model for writing--there are many” (p. 432).

There is empirical evidence that writing affects thinking and learning. Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod, and Rosen, (1975), Gere (1985), Langer (1986), Langer and Applebee (1987), and Marshall (1987) all agree that writing facilitates learning. The students quoted in a study on the role of reading and writing in tandem (Tierney, Soter, O’Flahavan & McGinley, 1989) saw writing as a powerful tool for learning. One student commented that “writing helped me get my thoughts and opinions together” and another noted that writing “helped me to understand the topic more and my feelings about it as I saw what I wrote.”

In a study that asked high school students to take notes, answer study questions, and write analytical essays about social studies and science texts, Newell (1984) found that writing essays created more extensive thought about the passage and required students to examine and marshal their own ideas. Newell argued that this extended engagement with ideas through analytic writing leads to the construction of new knowledge.

In an extension of Newell’s study, Newell and Winograd (1989) examined the claim that writing analytic essays, unlike answering study questions and taking notes, gave students a chance to represent relationships among the more important ideas of texts through composing connected discourse. They asserted that just asking students to write is not enough, and that the type of writing students do is crucial to the learning and thinking that results.

In case studies of six high school juniors, Langer (1986) examined students’ activities as they answered study questions, took notes, and wrote essays, the same tasks examined by Newell (1984). Her findings suggest that learning is supported by essay
writing because essays promote the combination and recombination of ideas, the integration of these ideas, and time to think about these ideas as the essay is written.

Marshall (1987) continued this line of research as he combined case study research and text analysis to look at the kinds of thinking and learning supported by writing in English class. His most interesting finding was that personal analytic essays were as effective in supporting learning as were formal analytic essays since personal analytic essays give the student the best chance to think about and then embellish or elaborate on an idea, thus supporting their learning.

Finally, in a large scale study of the connections between writing and learning, Langer and Applebee (1987) argued that not only did writing facilitate thinking and learning, but specific kinds of writing contribute to specific kinds of thinking and learning. In addition to examining writing and learning processes they worked with teachers in eight secondary content classrooms (science, social studies, English and home economics) to explore the unique configuration of writing activities in various subject areas. However, they did not link student knowledge construction with the kinds of curriculum and instruction they encountered in the classrooms.

While a number of studies show how writers use other texts to create their own meanings, there have been few about the ways that writers transform their source information or the conditions that affect the way that students combine newly learned knowledge with their background knowledge. Even fewer of these projects look at students' writing within content area courses (Greene, 1993). One exception is a recent examination of writing in the history classroom done by Greene (1993). Recognizing that college history students must learn new knowledge and think critically, he looked at writing in a college European history class where students were asked to write a report and a problem-based essay. The report required the students to interpret and
integrate information from different sources, while the problem-based essay asked students to define a problem, speculate about alternative actions, and support a point of view.

Greene (1993) found that students worked with the two assignments differently. They relied mainly on sources as they wrote reports and included source information and their own ideas as they wrote the problem-solving assignment. Students interpreted the two tasks differently. Since the nature of sources students used was important in understanding the decisions that students made during their writing, Greene recommended that researchers examine how students deal with different kinds of sources. The need to systematically scrutinize classroom dynamics at the same time as we examine students’ writing also seems apparent.

In a 1994 study, Newell and Winograd examined the efficacy of analytical writing in history classrooms. An examination of two social studies classes, one general track and the other academic track, taught by the same teacher, showed that the teacher’s approach varied with the track. General students learned history as a set of historical facts and events organized in chronological order. Academic students learned history as a social construction of meaning by historians in which they, as “junior historians” were engaged as well. Even given the differing approaches to the discipline of history, when either track of students wrote analytically about passages, they were more likely to respond with deep understanding and elaborated details. The analytic writing gave students the opportunity to build connections between the concepts under study, passage information, and their own prior knowledge.

Through an examination of twenty juniors (half average ability, half high ability) in an eleventh grade history class in a suburban classroom, Durst (1987) found an intriguing and significant contradiction in the use of analytic writing. When students thought aloud, they defended their own interpretations of a reading, they made
sophisticated use of the materials at hand: supporting generalizations, making
inferences, planning, asking and attempting to answer complex questions, and assessing
the quality of their ideas and writing. As they composed for this analytic writing, they
refined their thinking through an extensive use of the writing process. Yet when the
written products of analytic writing were compared with summary writing using a range
of text analytic schemes, little difference was found (Durst, 1987).

Students’ thinking and reasoning during analytic writing did not automatically
translate into analytic writing; a narrative representation of the history passages
dominated their writing instead. To write analytic essays about history texts, Durst
argues that students must have more than content knowledge and a chance to talk aloud
about their readings. Students must have an understanding of the ways of knowing
associated with the discipline which will enable them to take a stance outside the
narrative from which to write. Further, too often so-called analytic writing in
classrooms is rather the repetition of a ready-made argument from class notes. Students
must engage in writing tasks which allow them to complete their own analysis (Durst,
1987). Durst’s research reaffirms the need for a study of the type of classroom context
that would best support the development of students’ reasoning about history texts. An
examination of a classroom where the structures of historical reasoning, the tools of
historians, and small group discussions are used seems called for.

Studies of “Reading to Write”

In most history classrooms, students are expected to both read and write about
the matter at hand. Tierney, et al. (1989) argued that reading and writing that revolved
around a controversial topic supported extensive engagement with the information and
revision of the writing at hand, more than with writing alone. Taken together, reading
and writing has the potential of helping students develop multiple
perspectives on the issue at hand. Reading and then writing about a text has also been shown to foster a questioning stance toward the ideas involved, a stance that does not prematurely close off consideration of the text (Tierney & Shanahan, 1984).

Spivey (1990) has argued that a common, yet often overlooked task, occurs when students are asked to compose from multiple sources. Students engage in the task of selecting, organizing, and making connections between their ideas about the text, their own writings, their background knowledge, and their ongoing interpretations of their own meanings (Spivey, 1990). This process is a way that students construct their own understandings of material under examination.

Writing has been encouraged in the social studies classroom and especially in history, as a way to learn, and to generalize thinking. It has been seen as a way to facilitate students' mastery of history content and increase the development of thinking skills and processes (Beyer & Brostoff, 1979). Writing would augment, and to some degree replace, the inquiry approach's original heavy reliance on classroom whole group discussion. This writing might take the form of essays or other extended narratives rather than study questions or note taking as suggested by writing research (Newell, 1984). The use of writing in tandem with reading has been found to deepen the content learning, thinking, and construction of meaning, a result already found with writing alone (McGinley & Tierney, 1989). This use of writing would support student learning and allow students a chance to make their own understandings of history and promote multiple interpretations of history.

McGinley (1992) argued that researchers have not focused on the process involved in composing a text from either a single source or multiple sources, nor the interactions between reading, writing, and thinking as the composing continues. He also recommends that researchers examine the roles of reading and writing depending on the writing topic, the kind of task, and the context in which the writing is being done.
Finally, he suggests that future reading and writing research be situated in more authentic settings including classrooms. "Research of this sort would shed light on how different tasks and different social contexts influence the construction of texts from multiple sources" (p. 243).

Research about the results of the use of reading and writing, both separately and in conjunction, as a part of student engagement suggests that students' learning can be supported in a way that encourages more than memorization and recall. This research indicates the kinds of classroom uses of reading and writing which may best encourage students to take on the habits of mind, support for positions, a critical stance, and the construction of meaning. How might these strategies play on a long term basis in an actual history classroom?

With the exception of Langer and Applebee's study of high school classrooms (1987), the examinations of reading and writing together mentioned here have not yet dealt with reading and writing within the naturalistic setting of the secondary history classroom. In addition, reading and writing have rarely been examined in concert with the role of teacher-led or student-directed group discussions, either whole or small group. Further research may lead to a better understanding of the role that writing plays in students' inquiries into historical issues. Although my research does not deal directly with the role of reading and writing as students work with texts, part of the rational for the shape given to the research is drawn from this research. The teacher-led discussions in the classroom I studied were part of an overall pattern of reading and writing while the small group discussions were explicitly a part of reading and writing episodes dealing with secondary and primary sources.
Whole group discussions are a common part of the history classroom. Teachers intend that discussions allow students the opportunity for interaction and the extended discussion of their own ideas. However, Marshall, in a 1989 study of six English teachers and sixty-seven secondary school students offered a case in which the opposite occurred. In spite of their intentions to allow students to take discussions where they wanted, teachers dominated the discussions and used their turns to question, inform, and respond while students' turns were only to inform and their comments were shaped by the kinds of questions teachers asked. At the end of the discussion, the teacher wove together all the comments and presented this coherent whole for the students' edification. Obviously, teachers intentions and actions were in conflict.

To understand why such contradictions occur, a series of studies of classroom discourse has examined the typical patterns of classroom discourse (Cazden, 1988; Mehan, 1979). One typical and well documented interactional pattern known and expected in school discussions is the initiation-response-evaluation (I-R=E) exchange. One feature of this three part sequence is the teacher's evaluation of students' responses—its presence may signal that their responses are being judged for correctness or conformity. Accordingly, as teachers work to turn more control over to the students, such an effort may be co-opted by tacitly agreed upon patterns of discourse.

In an examination of the effects of teacher-led discussions of literature instruction on literature achievement in fifty-eight eighth grade English classes, Nystrand and Gamoran (1991) described the difference between procedural and substantive engagement to explain what matters most. Procedural engagement refers to how students obey and follow the rules of behavior in class; they may appear to listen to the classroom discourse, yet are not necessarily disengaged. Still there is no apparent
sustained personal involvement in understanding a story or a way of thinking. On the other hand, sustained personal involvement, a hallmark of substantive engagement, occurs most frequently in classes where students are involved in active inquiry and talking to learn.

Nystrand and Gamoran (1991) found considerable evidence of procedural engagement but little of substantive engagement. Where substantive engagement occurred, it was linked with teacher-learner dialogue instead of teacher-as-examiner dialogue (both are Britton et al.'s terms, 1975). Further, substantive engagement had a strong, positive effect on student achievement. Substantive engagement was facilitated by the use by the teacher of authentic questions, the incorporation of earlier student answers into later teacher questions, and the later inclusion of student ideas in following discussions. All of these features establish a sense of interaction between teacher and student with the material at hand.

Classroom discussion was found to have a strong influence on the general track students' reasoning and writing about literature in a 1991 study by Newell and Johnson. Two tenth grade general track classes with a total of forty five students were studied. When students went through a "pre-packaged" interpretation of a story students writing was constrained, however, when students were led through an interpretive discussion students writing reflected the new approach and became a chance for students to expand and take ownership of their ideas about the story.

In concluding their study of secondary school writing, Applebee, Auten, & Lehr (1981) described classroom contexts which seemed best to support talking and writing to learn. The lessons that students benefited from the most asked students to solve problems based on their own understandings and experiences. Working with other students to solve problems posed by the teacher required them to both state their own positions clearly and defend them to other members of the discussion. The openness of
this approach seemed most important in supporting writing. Students had developed valid solutions to the problem on their own rather than having to discover a solution the teachers had already devised. When students wrote about these lessons in which they were deeply engaged, their writing became part of their learning.

These three research projects have much to say about the importance of the kinds of classroom discussions that are engaged in by teachers and students. If teachers engaged students in the kinds of discussions which supported substantive student engagement then student learning was directly affected and supported. Second, that teacher use of interpretative discussions allowed students to expand and take ownership of their own ideas. Finally, when students worked with other students within an open approach to the topic at hand student engagement was encouraged and their writing became part of their learning. Taken together, these pieces of research suggest that further examinations of classroom discussions, especially classrooms beyond the English classroom, would be fruitful.

Small Group Discussion

Discussion groups are an important part of classroom activities, although more teacher-centered methods are commonly used (Downey & Levstik, 1991). As a result of his research, Barnes (1976) suggested that small groups were effective as a method that gives students some physical and intellectual distance from the teacher. This distance allowed students to make their own meanings uninhibited by trying to perform for the teacher.

The importance of Britton’s notion of “talking to learn” was demonstrated by Barnes (1976) in his study of small group discussions. His research was based on the premise that pupils are never passive recipients of social conditioning; every pupil in the class has a unique response to the lesson because each pupil brings to the class something different. He focused on what he called “exploratory talk” which he argued
showed construction of knowledge, is marked by hypothetical expressions: “could have”, “might”, “maybe,” that is, hedges that keep possibilities open.

Barnes (1976) considers questioning as another part of exploratory talk which aids in the construction of thought. As the small group explores and builds meanings, they are constantly interrelating ideas. The use of the hypothetical mode, according to Barnes, leads group members to ask questions, to surmise and discuss, to invite elaboration by others, to see new possibilities, to collaborate, and to construct knowledge within the group setting. He points out the duality of enculturation, that it is the combination of both cultural transmission and cultural construction, when he notes that

Sapir, Vygotsky, and Bruner hold this in common, they all see language both as a means by which we learn to take part in the life of the communities we belong to and a means by which we can actively reinterpret the world around us, including that life itself (p. 101)."

Research by Alvermann & Hayes (1989) showed how stable classroom patterns can be, especially when they are teacher-centered, even if the teachers attempt to change their patterns of interaction. Consequently small groups become even more important as a place where students can work on their own ideas.

In an exploratory study, Smagorinsky and Fly (1993) looked at small group process as they examined four teacher-led literary discussions and then five small group literary discussions within each teacher’s classroom. Their research explored the connections between the ways students spoke in classes in which the teachers were attempting to provide scaffolds for students’ learning and then in small groups. While the patterns of discourse varied greatly from class to class, Smagorinsky and Fly argued that the small group discussions were valuable because of the space they provide away from direct teacher intervention. Still, small group interaction could not be understood without understanding its place in the larger classroom world. Teachers must “set the stage” for small group work by assisting students in learning the kinds of interpretative
strategies they will use in the small group. Working in a small group did not automatically empower students, for whole class instruction must provide students with experience with strategies they will use in the small groups. If the whole class instruction closes off alternatives, then the small groups tend to be equally closed. A key limitation to the studies of whole- and small-group discussions examined here is the fact that they did not examine discussions over an extended period within the broader context of the classroom content.

Other research has shown how powerful small group discussions can be as a part of inquiry. Using three experimental treatments (lecture, class discussion, and student-led small group discussion), Sweigart (1991) examined the role of exploratory talk in high school English classes. Working with fifty-eight college-bound students, he examined how each of the treatments affected students' knowledge, their ability to remain on task as they wrote, and the quality of their writing. Working in small groups was more effective than either class discussion or lecture in assisting students as they assimilated new information on complex topics; thus small groups were more effective in improving students' knowledge as they prepared to write. Moreover, both weaker and stronger writers wrote better after participating in small group discussions than after whole class discussion or lecture. Small group discussion affected more than students writing. Students attained significantly higher knowledge scores, were better able to stay on task while composing, made fewer negative comments about their essay writing, and preferred small group discussion in preparation for writing. Sweigart (1991) asserts, “Results from all data sources converge to indicate that exploratory talk in student-led small groups can provide a power means for developing understanding of complex topics and can facilitate writing about these ideas” (p. 491).

In summary, small groups have been found to be quite useful to teachers who want to encourage more substantive engagement teacher-led discussions can provide.
Small groups provide students with the opportunity to engage in exploratory talk beyond the reach of the potentially censoring eye of the teacher, allowing students opportunities to construct their own knowledge with the support of other group members. Secondly, small groups are not automatic sites for student exploration. The whole class environment must first support, encourage and teach exploration, for that exploration to occur when students are working together. Small group discussions have been found to have powerful effects on student writing, knowledge, and satisfaction (Sweigart, 1991). Given the strengths of small groups, perhaps it is time to explore the uses of small group discussions within the context of an instructional setting where students engage in extended work with their peers.

Research on the Inquiry Method

The first attempt at introducing a more process-oriented structure to the history classroom was through the inquiry method suggested by Fenton as a part of the New Social Studies (Fenton, 1967). Reflecting Fenton's view of the importance of students understanding the structure of the discipline of history, the inquiry method emphasized the use of primary source materials within a student-centered examination of historical issues (Nelson & Drake, 1994). Researches (Sears & Parsons, 1991) and history teachers (Holt, 1990) were attracted to a method which seemed to allow students to use the skills of the historian while learning history content.

Inquiry teaching has been shown to re-assign roles in the classroom with students becoming more active and the teacher stepping into the role of co-researcher (Massialas & Zevin, 1967). However, a number of concerns were raised about its efficacy and its underlying assumptions. Research which explored inquiry teaching produced mixed results. When the concern was student retention of history content, inquiry teaching was only as effective as lecture (Ponder & Davis, 1982), and was not better than other methods in promoting achievement (Martorella, 1977) nor better in
promoting higher order thinking skills (Ponder & Davis, 1982). Perhaps this is one reason the inquiry method as first formulated by Fenton has slipped into disuse.

The inquiry method, as well as more traditional ways of teaching history, was also flawed in that it ignored the students' tacit, personal understandings of history drawn from stories of the past handed down within their own families. In a study of nine students drawn from two eleventh grade classes, Seixas (1993a) found that by tapping into students' family histories he could better understand how students thought and learned about history and their, and their families, place in history. At the same time, students emerged with a clearer understanding of their own learning processes which they applied to the methods of history.

Lack of Development of Disciplinary Thinking in the Modern History Classroom

What kind of thinking do modern history classrooms, which do not use the inquiry method, encourage then? Samuel Wineburg (1991a, 1991b) used think-aloud protocols to examine the differences between eight historians and eight, gifted, college-bound high school history students as they examined primary sources about the battle of Lexington during the American Revolution. The historians consistently read texts (all texts, primary sources to textbooks), not just for their literal meaning, but as constructions of meaning to be critically examined. They used three strategies which he commented upon, three strategies which enhanced the historians understanding of the texts and which reflected profound differences in thinking between professional historians and students. The historians' three strategies were contextualization, the strategy of placing a document in a specific time and location, corroboration, the strategy of comparing and contrasting texts to better understand them, and sourcing, the act of looking first to the source (author, date, location created) of the document before reading the body of the text. Wineburg suggested that their use of these heuristics indicated a basic difference in the way that students and historians approached the task.
ahead of them. The high school students he tested tended to see the materials merely as a collection of facts to be learned. They read consistently for comprehension and tended to trust the high school textbooks which they saw as presenting facts. In few cases did students read critically, looking for the perspective of the author. For historians, reading meant understanding who created the text, why it was created, when it was created. For students, reading meant gathering information.

Rethinking Student Disciplinary Thinking in the History Classroom

With Fenton's inquiry method at least in disuse if not disrespect, if talented history students fail to exhibit more than a superficial understanding of the discipline of history, what next? Seixas (1993b) opined that history teachers must act as mediators between the historians scholarly community and classroom community where learning occurs: “[h]istory teachers’ subject knowledge...entails a bridge between communities, extending outward to historians in one direction and to students in another” (p. 316). Students constitute a community of inquiry where the role of the teacher is critical. In developing my own classroom community, I tried not to be the presenter of authoritative historical “facts,” but rather the mediator of a “community of inquiry in the classroom: establishing criteria for historical evidence, methods of determining historical significance, and limits on interpretive license” (p. 320).

In research conducted in a college level American history class, Holt (1990) acted as this mediator and documented students’ engagement with history in general and primary sources (i.e. journals, diaries, first-hand newspaper reports, oral histories, autobiographies, memoirs) in particular as they worked within an inquiry framework. Holt found that the use of primary sources allowed students to act as historians, empowering them to construct their own meanings.

Primary sources encourage fresh thinking since they allow the students direct access to see and hear for themselves and thus to formulate their
own questions and answers. Such questions arise in the space between the document itself and the reader's experience, whatever she brings to the material. Consequently, one should not be surprised when they do find new and unexpected meanings or raise fresh questions (p. 19).

Because primary sources require students to make choices between various views of history, the use of primary sources can help change students' views of history from a collection of facts representing the "truth" to an understanding of history as a construction based on the interpretations of various historians of various sources of information. This understanding promotes the taking of a critical stance when students read as they ask themselves about the veracity and biases of the sources under consideration (Holt, 1990).

Situated Cognition (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989) and curricular conversations (Applebee, 1993; Applebee, 1996) suggest a classroom in which student learning might be effectively enhanced through reading and writing, within a frame of whole and small group discussions. The key seems to be the establishment of an authentic disciplinary environment; specifically in the history classroom that may focus on historiography. Although the first attempt to incorporate the historian's approach into the classroom, the inquiry approach, has been labeled a failure, at one level this study is one effort to conceptualize classroom inquiry. Certainly, students are not attaining more sophisticated understandings of history as history is currently taught, for not even talented students can infer an understanding of the discipline knowledge of history from the study of history content (Langer, et al., 1993).

Inquiry as a tool for instruction may be improved through the introduction of constructivist theories and expectation, the incorporation of students' understandings, and the explicit instruction in historians methods, specifically in working with primary sources. My research will attempt to both examine the assertions made in current research and attempt to take the field a step further in understanding the complex
interplay of teacher knowledge, classroom activities, and student learning in the day-to-day life of a modern American classroom, a classroom built out of language learning theory and the importance of disciplinary knowledge. Accordingly two key concerns shape this study: how might teacher-led discussions foster a more constructivist-oriented inquiry, and to what extent, if any, do small group discussions reflect such an approach to history. We turn now to the methods and instruments I used to conduct this study.
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CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Over a full school year, I gathered data on teacher-led discussions during my teaching of the history component of Advanced Placement American Studies (APAS), and on one group’s discussions nested within the larger instructional context. Accordingly, the general design is one in which small-group discussions are nested within the broader context of the instructional context which is nested within the particulars of a history curriculum. Cazden (1988) has called for such designs in order to construct a fuller understanding of how and why classroom discourse occurs.

This study took place in an APAS classroom which was shaped by the formal school curriculum and by the teachers who team-taught the course. In the classroom curriculum I created for the history portion of the course, we focused on history content and on issues of historiography—the issues of perspective, interpretation, evidence and validation which surround the writing of history. The classroom interaction, especially the teacher-led discussions, which developed out of the curricular domain I created, were examined and then described. The course structure and content will be presented first in this chapter. A second concern for the study was how the instructional context supported the uses of historical interpretation in students’ small-group discussions of
and inquiry into the meaning of secondary and primary sources. The third section of this chapter will examine the small-group discussions including the overall procedure of the episodes, the materials used, the instrumentations and the data collection.

After describing procedures first for the study of content curriculum and instructional context, the chapter will conclude with a description of the data analyses of the classroom context and the small group's use of heuristics across four episodes. A discussion of these methods of analysis will set the stage for chapters 4 and 5, one which examines the curriculum and the dynamics of the classroom context and the other which analyzes student comments during the small-group discussions of primary and secondary sources.

The Course Structure and Content

American Studies is a long-standing course offering at James Garfield High School (JGHS) in Anandale, Ohio, a suburb near the more metropolitan, Hayes, Ohio. It has been team-taught by an English teacher and a social studies teacher since the mid 1970s. In the 1988-89 school year an Advanced Placement section was first offered creating a three-tiered curriculum: “adjusted” for lower ability, “regular” for average ability and college preparation, and “advanced placement” for students with special interests in literature and/or history. During the year of the study, almost a fourth of the juniors at Garfield took APAS.

The course itself, on each of its three levels, is an interesting mix of content integration and separate disciplines. American Studies appears twice on the student’s grade card, first as “American Studies: American History” and then as “American Studies: American Literature” and students receive one credit and a separate grade for each segment. This makes the course especially attractive on the Advanced Placement (AP) level since AP grades are weighted in the grade point average to reward students
for taking the course. The use of separate grades also recognizes that students may take American Studies because of a special interest in one of the two disciplines involved without the same degree of interest in the other discipline. Grades were very important at JGHS both as indicators of achievement and for college.

The class is two periods long (100 minutes), back to back, and both teachers are in the room for both periods. Since there are two teachers in the room, the classes are double the normal section size, e.g. a regular class would be 25 students so an American Studies class could be 45-50. An AP American Studies might be 40-45 students in the same room for two periods.

The course is organized chronologically, with thematic units based on connections between history and literature inserted throughout the year. For example, the year starts with a unit on how Americans who were not considered part of the mainstream were treated by others. American colonial history, the Red Scare in 1919, and the McCarthy trials in the 1950s are examined in history as students read *The Scarlet Letter* (Hawthorne, 1850/1980) and *The Crucible* (Miller, 1959/1968). A unit on reform looks at the philosophical basis for the early reform movements of the 1830s and makes connections with Romantic and Transcendental literature. In addition, modern reform movements, especially the 1970s mental health reform movement, are discussed as students read *One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest* (Kesey, 1962/1972). Officially, the scope of the course ranges through American literature and history from the 1607 to the 1990s.

The course is organized around a series of units in which episodes of small-group discussions are nested. These units include explorations of the history text readings, supplemental text readings, and the reading of primary and secondary sources. At the start of each episode students are also given the essay topic on which
they would be writing at the end of the unit. Students are asked to examine the literal meaning of the text, and to analyze the secondary sources with a question such as “What position does the historian or historians take toward the topic of interest?” Next, students talk in their small groups about how they might use these secondary sources as they answer the essay. As the episode continues, the same students work together but this time they focus on the primary sources that they read. Students answered the same three types of questions that they used to examine the secondary sources.

At the end of the episode (which is also the end of the unit of study), students write in response to the essay question they had been given when the unit began. They use all of their sources, secondary and primary, to answer the essay. As a part of this research, the essays were collected and Xeroxed. This was the last event actually in the episode. After the unit, members of the small groups were debriefed about their participation in the episode. Given that the course design and research design are moderately overlapping, Figure 3.1 indicates the course framework. Later in this chapter the research design is discussed.
Figure 3.1: Design of the history portion of Tucker/Lehman APAS.
School Site and Participants

James Garfield High School (JGHS) is a large school (over 1500 students and 140 faculty, administration, and support personnel) with a local reputation for excellence. At the time of the study, the school was in the midst of reform, with an eye to encouraging interdisciplinary teaching, writing across the curriculum, performance-based and authentic assessments, and increased use of technology by all members of the learning community. New courses, ways of scheduling, and types of student-teacher interactions are likely from this focus on restructuring. JGHS is located in Anandale, Ohio, a middle to upper-middle class suburb. The population of both the community and school is homogeneous for the most part; the majority of students are Euro-Americans while the largest minority group is Asian-American.

In the 1994-95 APAS class, in which data was collected, there were forty-one highly motivated students; twenty-six girls and fourteen boys. The students' Grade Point Averages (GPA) ranged from a 2.5 to 4.15 on a weighted 4.0 scale, with a mean student GPA of 3.81. Half of the students in this class were taking other advanced placement or honors courses at the same time as APAS. Final grades in the class ranged from “A” to “C”, with five As, ten A minuses, nine B pluses, twelve Bs, two B minuses, and three Cs for the year.

None of these students were grinds or academic drudges, totally absorbed in academics. Ninety-three percent were members of seventeen different sports. Eleven of the thirty-one students were members of two or more teams; three were team captains. Other non-athletic extracurricular activities were well represented; seventy-three percent of the students were involved in twenty-seven different activities; eleven were members of two or more. Students belonged to school clubs, student government, the school newspaper, the school yearbook, the school literary magazine, the “High
School Quiz Bowl" team and "JG Alive", a student-produced show for the local cable television system, among other activities. These students were quite accomplished both academically and athletically.

Of the forty-one students in the class, twenty-two students (15 girls and 6 boys) chose to participate in the taping of the small-group discussions. Their grades ranged from “A” to “B” with one A, six A minuses, six B pluses, and nine Bs. They represented the middle range of the class, with the strongest and weakest students opting out of participation in the research. Their patterns of extracurricular participation were similar to the class as a whole.

Participants in the Small-group Discussions

One group of six of the students in the APAS class became the focus of my analysis of small-group discussions. I selected this group as the first set of tapes to be transcribed. After I had transcribed the tapes, I did a preliminary analysis, found the students’ comments intriguing, and decided to focus on this group. Mitch Blader was very bright and had skipped grades earlier in his academic career so that at fourteen going on fifteen, he was the youngest in a classroom of sixteen- and seventeen-year-olds. Mitch was an eager learner with an excellent memory. Lilly Gardner was a very capable student, lively and outgoing. She was willing and able to defend her thoughtful arguments in heated discussions. She also kept her small group on task but did not dominate or quash discussion. Krystyna Romanov’s family immigrated from the Soviet Union in the late 1980s, and she had difficulty adjusting to the U. S.—both her freshman and sophomore years at Garfield were marked with disciplinary problems. Krys spoke English fluently as a second-language, and she had begun working to achieve
academically. She participated energetically in both teacher-led discussions and small-group discussions on the days she was in class; unfortunately, her attendance was erratic.

Howard Champion was very quiet during class, but a thoughtful writer suggesting an intellectual side he rarely revealed during discussions. He seemed either to want to avoid conflict or to be unsure of himself. During small-group discussions, Howard allowed himself to be overruled even though he was often accurate in what he was saying. Libby Booker seemed similar to Howard in that she too either wanted to avoid conflict or else she was unsure of herself. Frequently in the small groups she understood the issue clearly but allowed her understanding to be over-ridden by her more assertive peers, especially Mitch. Libby asked good questions during both teacher-led and small-group discussions and filled in small-group members on material they had not yet had the chance to read. Roger Knight, like Howard, was quiet during teacher-led discussions. In the small group, Roger revealed his grasp of historical detail, especially about wars and military history.

**Teachers**

Cathy Tucker, the literature teacher and my teaching partner, had taught nineteen years, twelve at Garfield at the time of the study. She earned her undergraduate degree in Secondary Education, with comprehensive communication certification (an English/speech major with journalism minor) and her Master of Arts (MA) in Humanities Education with a specialization in writing; both degrees were from a large land grant university located in a nearby city. She taught APAS and was a Teacher Leader responsible for curriculum articulation and integration in all disciplines and grade levels, K - 12. She was active at the high school serving on the District Strategic Plan committee as well as numerous high school committees.
I was the other teacher in the room. I collected the data for this project as well as taught full time. I earned my undergraduate degree in sociology with comprehensive social studies certification at a small liberal arts college in a neighboring state. My MA is in Educational Theory and Practice with a specialization in reading from the same nearby land grant university that Cathy attended. At the time of the study, in addition to the two sections of APAS, I also taught two sections of Global History for ninth and tenth graders and one section of sociology, open to all grade levels. I was the editor of the faculty curriculum magazine, Horizons, and I, too, served on many high school committees.

Describing the Instructional Context and Teacher-Led Discussions

Research during the school year occurred in two interrelated stages. First, daily field notes were kept to build an understanding of the context for the teaching and learning of American history. Second, data were collected during a series of small-group discussions in which students examined secondary and primary sources. Four topics shaped the small-group discussions: the Declaration of Independence as a historical and literary document, the greatness or lack of greatness of Abraham Lincoln as president, the appropriateness of the US entry into World War I, and the best paradigm for understanding the 1960s. For the purposes of this research, each of these four intensive focuses was called an "episode."

The first episode, developed during a pilot study for this study (Lehman, 1993a), occurred early in the year when the students studied the Declaration of Independence during the first semester. The other three episodes occurred during the second semester of the school year. Given the demands of the classroom, unforeseen interruptions, and the differing speed at which students worked, the schedule varied somewhat from episode to episode. In general when the episode began students received the essay
prompt that they would respond to at the end of the episode. By giving students the prompt to begin with, I was attempting to create an authentic task whereby students could emulate historians who start with some idea of the materials about which they are going to write (Barnes, 1976). Next, students read the secondary sources related to the topic, discussed them, and then read the primary sources and discussed them; both discussions occurred within the small-group setting. During the first two episodes, the entire class discussed the prompt and ways that they might respond before finally responding individually in writing to the prompt thus ending the episode. In the last two episodes, students discussed the materials in small groups with the next, and final task being their individual response to the prompt. The episode format is discussed again later in this chapter.

Course Materials for APAS

There were an impressive number of textbooks and novels used in the integrated American Studies Course. In addition to numerous selections from Literature (West, 1986), an anthology of poems, short stories, and a play, students read at least twelve longer works including The Crucible (Miller, 1959/1968), The Scarlet Letter (Hawthorne, 1850/1980) Bartleby: the Scribner (Melville, 1856/1979), One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest (Kesey, 1962/1972), The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn (Twain, 1884/1987), Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave (Douglass, 1845/1986), Native Son (Wright, 1940/1990), Ethan Frome (Wharton, 1911/1987), The Yellow Wallpaper (Gilman, 1899/1973), The Great Gatsby (Fitzgerald, 1925/1972), The Grapes of Wrath (Steinbeck, 1939/1987), and Night (Wiesel, 1960/1986). In history the students read The National Experience (Blum, McFeely, Morgan, Schlesinger, Stampp, & Woodward, 1993), a college text written by six eminent practicing historians; After the Fact (Lytle & Davidson, 1986), a book
focusing on historiography; excerpts from *Only Yesterday* (Allen, 1939/1964) a history of the 1920s; and specific chapters from *American Political Traditions*, Richard Hofstadter's (1948) revisionist look at great political leaders in the United States through Franklin Roosevelt.

The four textbooks used in the history portion of APAS were selected primarily because they are textbooks used extensively in college history courses and were among the instructional materials discussed at Advanced Placement History conferences I attended. The specific texts were selected because of the unique features each offers to the course content. Each of the chapters in *The National Experience* (Blum, et al., 1993) was written by one of the six practicing historians involved in the project. The chapter topics are the historian's field of specialization and reflect each man's writing style and way of making an argument. *After the Fact* (Lyde & Davidson, 1986) examines historical events such as the Jamestown Colony or the decision to drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki with an eye to the differing interpretations of historians writing about the significance of those events, the role of perspective, and specific historical methods of examination, evaluation, and interpretation of data. In addition, the essays in the book are written around stimulating topics that fit well with both the literature and history that we study and are written in a lively style.

Both *Only Yesterday* (Allen, 1939/1964) and *American Political Tradition* (Hofstadter, 1948) were selected because they amplify and allow an in-depth examination of elements of history. *Only Yesterday* supports an intense examination of the decade of the 1920s while *American Political Tradition* examines eminent political leaders of the United States in detail. In addition, Hofstadter was a respected revisionist historian and in discussing his work the students and I can discuss the difference between historical revision and the current Holocaust revisionists.
Instrumentation

Participant observation

One of the strengths of this research is that it occurred over a school year in room 221 where the teacher was both the researcher and the teacher. This double identity allowed for an ethnographic approach and thus a more naturalistic examination of what occurred on a daily basis (Glesne & Peskin, 1992). Throughout the school year I functioned as a participant observer. This allowed me to examine the broad context of my classroom in which the use of reading, writing, discussion and sources occurred. Although difficult, participant observation allows full researcher participation at the research site and gives the researcher a special perspective on events there (Glesne and Peskin, 1992). To ensure that such a project was doable, I conducted a pilot study (Lehman, 1993a).

Student interviews and debriefings.

The interviews and debriefings were developed with Oakley’s (1981) concerns about the power issues that arise in interviews in mind. Students’ questions about the research process before, during, and after the interview were answered. They saw the interview guide; and I tried to make sure that they understood what was happening in the process both by asking them if they understood and by asking them to describe what was happening or going to happen. After all, I was their teacher as well as a researcher.

To understand the students’ view of the classroom, small groups were interviewed about their views of American Studies and their attitudes toward secondary and primary sources. Participants in these interviews were self-selected volunteers from the small groups that were taped. Two different small-group interview schedules were piloted (Lehman, 1993a; Lehman, 1993b) in preparation for this study. For each of the
small-group interviews, a tentative interview guide was used (Patton, 1990) (see Appendix A). Although they were not analyzed for this project, I cannot pretend that the interviews I engaged in with students did not have influence the discussions and thinking described in the next two chapters. I must also be aware that these interviews may have affected my own thinking and so should be noted. For instance, I did use the interviews as a way to triangulate my analysis of both the teacher-led discussions and small-group discussions.

The Researcher's Role

A natural setting is a prime criterion for strong qualitative research (Wilcox, 1982) and it was in such a setting that I worked. The naturalistic approach used in this research allowed for a description of the setting on both a daily and weekly basis which was drawn from daily field notes and occasional audio-recording of discussions that allowed for my extended engagement at the research site (Spindler, 1982).

There are, however, drawbacks to being both the teacher and the researcher in this classroom. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) ask whether teachers can be rigorous and observant in a classroom where they are also the teacher. This rigor and observation are both necessary “to recognize their own points of view and to break through the stereotypical images that may govern their behavior toward others” (p. 216). Patton (1990) raises the concern whether the participant observer can maintain neutrality. He defines a neutral participant observer as a researcher who

does not set out to prove a particular perspective or manipulate the data to arrive at predisposed truths. The neutral investigator enters the research arena with no axe to grind, no theory to prove, no predetermined results to support. Rather the investigator’s commitment is to understand the word as it is, to be true to complexities, and multiple perspectives as they emerge, and to be balanced in reporting both confirming and disconfirming evidence (p. 54).
Since I was both the researcher and the teacher in this classroom it was difficult to separate myself from the research. Certainly my biography as teacher and researcher was part of the background of my project, and is included in this chapter as well as the following chapter on the classroom context, but I did not want to make myself the focus of the research. My research was important and interesting only in terms of how my students responded to the activities I proposed and the classroom framework I established. As for the issues of rigor and observation, my daily field notes and frequent tape recording of both class and small groups, suggest that my research met these criteria. In addition, I believe that part of the validity of my research is apparent in my data display; I have intentionally made it detailed and extensive, leaving the reader to decide on the validity of my conclusions.

The most important concerns for the researcher who is also the classroom teacher are those of neutrality and power. It is hard for any teacher to be neutral about the choices she makes in her classroom. She would not have made them without good reason. But in this research, I was not trying to prove that I made the right decisions; I was trying to show what happened with student learning within the context of those decisions. On a personal level, as a teacher I wanted what I did with my students to work; I believed firmly that if something was not working then I would have to change it. This research would help me improve my teaching no matter how it turned out. Finally, I studied my own teaching only indirectly, as I focused on my students' work with various secondary and primary sources.

The issue of power was more difficult to deal with. As teacher I had considerably more power in the room as I deal with my students than an outside researcher would have. It was power that came from my position and was not easily set aside. To deal with this issue in a general way, I encouraged students' voices, I tried to
give up some of my authority to give students room to take responsibility, I shifted my thinking about teaching to asking more open-ended questions, and I tried to be aware of the positions/power relationships in my classroom, both between students and between students and me. Further, I reassured my students that I would not listen to the small-group tapes until the summer following the school year so as not to be influenced by them. While it would have made the transcription of tapes easier and more accurate if I had transcribed them immediately, this trade-off seemed a small price to pay for my students' peace of mind. I used member checks to enable them some role beyond participants. Two members of the class read the context chapter as well as the analysis chapters and gave me feedback as a form of member check. Finally, since I know these power issues cannot be resolved, I have worked hard to remain aware of the issues and be concerned about it throughout my research. The concerns about power are articulated by Maher & Tetreault (1993).

Harry Wolcott (1973, 1987) noted the difficulty of "backyard research" [Glesne & Peskin's term, 1992]. I had difficulty making the familiar strange to my research eyes (Glesne and Peskin, 1992). On the other hand, Zinn (1979), Metz (1983), Wolcott (1987) argue that the special insight and understanding that the insider brings to the research positions outweighs the dangers and difficulties. I believe that my access to the students' view of the classroom through participant observation and the taping of small groups helped me to better tell their stories. Other researchers have successfully used their own classroom (Wolcott, 1987); it is possible for me to do so as well. I was at the research site every day all day; the American Studies format gave me two hours with the same students year-long and access to the "everyday-ness" of learning (Williams, 1990). I had a better sense of the repeated use of primary sources and the building development of primary source use. Ultimately, I believe I gained a
preliminary sense of how learning from secondary and primary sources was immersed in the rest of the learning that students did; an understanding that I would not have gained if I had isolated primary source use, pulled it out and put it on display.

Collaboration with my teaching partner was a special issue for my research (Noffke, 1990, October). This partnership was, at the time of the research, four years old and continued beyond the dissertation research. My teaching partner and I talked about what we were going to do and planned together, both for this year and for subsequent years. Throughout the year, we discussed the direction of the course, the intersection of our varied course contents, and student progress. Due to pressures of time we did not collaborate on this research project specifically; however, my partner did perform a member check on my research by reading chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6 and commenting.

Data Collection

Participant observation and field notes, audio-taping small-group discussions and some whole-class discussions, interviews, and the collection of student writing were all methods used in this project. In Figure 3.2, I have provided a graphic representation of this design. This display first describes the source of data, then the data collection, the focus of the analysis, and the research question(s) to which the data seem most closely related. The larger classroom conversation data were collected through participant-observation field notes and strategic taping of whole-group discussions. Small-group discussions were audio-taped as part of student participation in the course, but these discussions represent a unique type of data for analysis and interpretation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Focus of Analysis</th>
<th>Research Question(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant-Observer</td>
<td>Daily throughout the school year.</td>
<td>To gain an overall view of the classroom to provide context for the episodes and to describe the learning environment</td>
<td>1. What are the curricular structures and content of an Advanced Placement American course designed to foster entry into a conversation about American history? 2. What is the nature of the course content and how did this content shape discussions? 3. What pedagogical moves does the teacher make that support students’ adoption of particular ways of thinking and speaking about history?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class Small-group Discussions</td>
<td>Four times during the year class explores topic: the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln’s Presidency, W.W.I, the 1960s</td>
<td>To examine small-group processes and to understand students’ exploration of primary and secondary sources</td>
<td>4. How do student in small-groups use various heuristics (Wineburg, 1991a, 1991b) to examine secondary and primary historical sources and how are those usages influenced by the larger instructional contexts for those discussions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interviews and Student Debriefings</td>
<td>Beginning and end of the school year.</td>
<td>To describe students’ notions of history</td>
<td>Not analyzed for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four times during the school year after the focus groups have discussion</td>
<td>To get student perceptions of experiences in the small-groups.</td>
<td>Not analyzed for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Writings</td>
<td>Four times during the project. Student essays, midterm and final exams were copied.</td>
<td>To understand students’ reasoning while writing.</td>
<td>Not analyzed for this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.2: The sources of data and data analysis.
Examining the Use of Heuristics in Small-Group Discussions

Materials for Small-Group Discussions

Over the school year, students participated in small-group discussions as a part of four episodes, each focused on a historical topic. During a pilot study in the first semester of 1993, students read the Declaration of Independence and various secondary sources about the document as both a historical document and a piece of Neoclassical literature. They then worked in small groups discussing the document and finding evidence of whether it is a credible historical record of the colonists' grievances and if it is a good example of Neoclassical writing. Students kept a reader-response journal in which they reacted to the Declaration of Independence and the secondary source that they read, although these materials were not collected. Finally students were asked to respond to the Declaration in writing (Lehman, 1993a). In discussing the small-group work on the Declaration with students at the conclusion, I learned from students that the order of the sources needed amending. Students expressed the desire to read the secondary sources before they read the primary sources asserting that Lytle and Davis (After the Fact, 1985) and Morgan (in Blum, et al., The National Experience, 1993) helped them understand the Declaration. As a result of the students' recommendations in the pilot, I asked students to read first the secondary sources and then the primary sources in the episodes that were a part of this study. There were three episodes in the second semester focused on Abraham Lincoln, World War I, and the 1960s.

In the first episode students worked with only the Declaration of Independence, a document that they had studied in eighth grade and read about from their history textbook, The National Experience (Blum, McFeely, Morgan, Schlesinger, Stampp, & Woodward, 1994); a supplemental text, After the Fact (Lytle & Davidson, 1989), in which they read an historical essay about the historiography surrounding the
Declaration; and the course literature book, Literature, (Brown, 1989). A writing task requiring description and summary concluded the episode.


In addition, students read a variety of primary sources drawn from across Lincoln's career; they included five speeches (the “House Divided” Speech, the “First Inaugural Address,” the “Gettysburg Address,” the “Second Inaugural,” and Lincoln's last address from Commager, 1949); one proclamation (“The Emancipation Proclamation” from Commager, 1949); and one letter written for publication in response to an editorial written by Horace Greeley (Commager, 1949). In this episode students were required to analyze Lincoln's presidency and synthesize multiple materials and widely differing interpretations of Lincoln in an analytic writing task.

The third and fourth episodes also required more complex understandings of multiple texts. During the third episode on World War I, students read, discussed, and wrote about secondary, primary, and for the first time, directly, fictional sources. The secondary sources included a survey discussion of World War I and the US

Students also examined the war through fictional pieces. They read chapter six of *All Quiet on the Western Front* by Erich Maria Remarque (1928/1958); two poems, “Dulce Et Decorum Est” by Wilfred Owen (1918/1979) and “Flanders' Fields” by John MacCrae (1919/1979), each with a widely divergent view of the validity of the war; and “Children's Crusade” by Sting (1992), a modern rock song presenting a different view of the validity of World War I. Students read different genres as they read fiction and poetry written during World War I as well as modern music reexamining the war. They were expected to analyze the validity of the US entry into the war and synthesize these sources from both history and literature to support their opinion.

The fourth episode dealt with the 1960s. Students examined the decade from several interpretations—both positive and negative—of the era. As secondary sources, students read and discussed Schlesinger's rather harsh treatment of the decade in *The National Experience* (in Blum, et al., 1993); Archer's examination of The New Right and the New Left (1986); *Life*'s (1989) listing of television shows and other elements of popular culture; Hugh Sidey's *Time* (1985) article on Johnson and Vietnam: “Vietnam: LBJ's Personal Alamo;” the *Time* (1985) summary of the Vietnam War from the French colonization to current questions of whether the U. S. should recognize

Students also grappled with a variety of primary sources including speeches, announcements and letters by Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon; excerpts from the "Voting Rights Act," the "Equal Opportunity Act," and the "Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam" (in Commager, 1973); as well as oral histories of the civil rights movement and Resurrection City (Moses, 1989). A new element in this episode required the students to choose, watch, and include as evidence for their essay, a video tape that examined an area important to the argument they were making. Once again, as they read, discussed, and theorized about the proper label and paradigm for the 1960s, students juggled multiple perspectives, genres, and media.

This focus on increasingly complex episodes of students working with multiple perspectives and sources, allowed for an examination of how learning develops with repeated practice and new challenges with these materials across time. In addition, this across-time,-topic, and-material approach may reveal how students’ learning patterns differ or change as the amount of scaffolding available lessens. During episode one students worked within a structured examination of the Declaration of Independence, a document they read about but did not read in eighth grade. In episode two, students dealt with less familiar materials—most read about but did not read Lincoln’s writings in eighth grade—but still within the classroom framework of reading and discussion prior to their work with sources. In episode three, students had background from eighth grade American history on the military aspects of World War I but had not had experience with the political history of the era. Episode four presented students with the most varied perspectives on a decade, with the least support from the teaching team; students worked independently in groups and presented their theories in their essays.
Further, as a result of student requests, there were no whole-class discussions of the primary and secondary sources in the last two episodes. Students asserted that they felt constrained and inhibited by hearing what their classmates had come up with. They felt they had to change their ideas to fit with what they had heard from their peers and felt that the writing was no longer their own idea. In effect, students had increasing degrees of freedom as they tackled the topics from the first episode to the last.

Instrumentation

Samuel Wineburg (1991a, 1991b) used decontextualized think-aloud protocols to examine the differences between historians and high school history students as they examined primary sources about the Battle of Lexington during the American Revolution. When the historians read a piece of writing they used three strategies that enhanced the historians’ understanding of the texts and which reflect profound differences in thinking between professional historians and students. Wineburg suggested that their use of these specific heuristics indicated a basic difference in the way that students and historians approached the task ahead of them. The high school students he tested tended to see the materials as a collection of facts to be learned while the historians saw the materials as a social creation by the author which was influenced by the author’s experiences and perspective.

Wineburg’s three strategies were contextualization, the strategy of placing a document in a specific time and location; corroboration, the strategy of comparing and contrasting texts to better understand them; and sourcing, the act of looking first to and discussing the source (author, date, location created) of the document before reading the
body of the text. With some modifications, I used the three heuristics that Wineburg identified as distinguishing between the talk of historians and of students to analyze the small-group discussions of secondary and primary sources.

Still there are differences between my research and Wineburg's work, the high school students who completed the think-aloud protocol in Wineburg's study were very similar to the high school students who participated in my study. Wineburg's (1993b) eight students were all eleventh graders, academically gifted (mean GPA of 3.54), and college bound. All eight had completed a high school history course. The six students in the small group whose small-group transcripts were used in this study were also eleventh graders, academically gifted (mean GPA of 3.6), and college bound.

While Wineburg (1991a, 1991b) used isolated one-time, one-on-one think-aloud protocols to examine historians' and students' use of documents, my research was gathered during ten small-group discussions which occurred over the regular school year as a part of the regular activities that my students were doing. Like Wineburg's subjects, my students examined primary and secondary sources related to a specific topic or theme, but rather than being asked to explain what happened at a certain place on a certain date, my students were asked to use the primary and secondary sources to argue an assertion in a timed writing. The major difference was that my data were collected within the context of students' study of history in a high school course which emphasized the issues of historiography in a form of constructivist inquiry.

"Constructivist inquiry" draws upon the ideas of the New Social Studies and the Inquiry Approach, current ideas about historiography, situated cognition, and constructivist understandings. As such, it emphasizes the perspective of the historian, the role of interpretation, the use of historical imagination, multiple answers to multiple questions of the significance of an historical event, and the role of historians as a
community of scholars. It also assumes that students are active learners who construct their understandings of the methods and content of history out of an on-going classroom dialogue about the tradition of history. As cognitive apprentices, students gain knowledge-in-action when they examine both secondary and primary sources with an eye to the writer’s perspective, interpretation, and membership in the community of practicing historians within a supportive classroom context. The most important element of the students’ apprenticeships is the students’ independent work in small groups: using the tools of historians; taking on the role of historian, developing knowledge-in-action as they write essays in which they support their own interpretations and answers to questions which historians still consider.

I analyzed ten small-group discussions across four episodes of one small group of six students (out of four small groups who participated in the project and contributed data). The group consisted of three boys and three girls. The small-group discussions occurred during class time but were of different duration owing to interruptions and other exigencies of teaching.

**Data Collection**

**Overall Procedures for the Episodes in which the Small-Group Discussions Occurred**

The notion of the classroom curriculum as a conversation (Applebee, 1993) helped frame the study conceptually and methodologically. Over a school year, students engaged in and “eavesdropped” on the conversations of professional historians as they read and discussed various secondary sources written and critiqued by those historians. Teacher-led classroom discussions took up the question of “What is history?” four times for a total of seven class days. Teacher modeling of disciplinary ways of knowing was noted. Daily extensive field notes recorded this context. The third section of this chapter presents an examination of the larger classroom
conversation in terms of overall procedures, materials, the instrumentation, the researcher's role, and the data collection. As a part of my data collection, I debriefed the students at the beginning and end of the year and three times throughout the year. Although I did not analyze the student interviews for this project, I will touch on their role in the process since they were part of the classroom climate and students knew that I intended to include their comments from the interviews in my dissertation.

Students took part in small group discussions all year. During four occasions which I call episodes, students also took part in small-group discussions; these small group discussions which fell during the four episodes involved students in discussion of various secondary and primary sources with their classmates. These small-group discussions were taped. Building from Barnes' (1976) research on small groups, the research specially focused on the work done in small groups as they began their own intellectual conversation by examining secondary sources (e.g. the history text, supplemental texts, journal articles) and primary sources (e.g. letters, speeches, documents, cartoons, journals, diaries, newspaper articles etc.). As Barnes points out, students working in small groups are of special interest since by definition, the students work independently of the teacher and possible demands for a specific, teacher-sponsored response to the question at hand. The small-group setting may then allow students to participate in exploratory talk which may support their engagement with the text.

At the beginning of each unit in which a small-group episode was nested, the history text readings, supplemental text readings, and other secondary source readings as well as primary source readings were assigned. Students were given an essay prompt
on which they would be writing at the end of the unit. The next day, in whole-class discussions, students discussed the events in their readings, setting the background of the unit.

At the beginning of the small-group discussions that followed, students discussed the secondary sources that they had read. Students were asked to examine the literal meaning of the text, anything they did not understand, any confusing vocabulary, or anything that confused them. Next students were asked to analyze the secondary sources using questions such as "What is the historian or historians' slant or interest?" "Did the historian(s) like or dislike the person or event under study?" "Did the historian or historians see this event as important or not?" Finally, students talked about how they might use these secondary sources as they answered the essay. Following the small groups, during the first two episodes, there was a whole-class discussion about the secondary sources using the same questions used to examine primary sources.

As each episode continued, the same small groups worked together focused on the relevant primary sources that they read. Students answered the same three types of questions that they used to examine the secondary sources. Again, the small-group discussion was followed by a whole-class discussion about the primary sources using the same questions used to examine secondary sources. During the last two episodes, the final whole-class discussion after both the primary and secondary sources was eliminated at the students' requests.

At the end of each episode, which coincided with the conclusion of each unit, students wrote in response to the essay question they had been given when the unit began. They used all of their sources, secondary and primary, to answer the essay. The essays were collected and Xeroxed. After each unit, members of the small groups were debriefed about their participation in the episode. The primary focus of my study was
small groups as they grappled with a total of four different sets of secondary and primary resources about four different historical issues over a school year. See Figure 3.3 for a summary of the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST EPISODE</th>
<th>SECOND EPISODE</th>
<th>THIRD EPISODE</th>
<th>FOURTH EPISODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on “Declaration of Independence”</td>
<td>Focus on “Lincoln”</td>
<td>Focus on “World War I”</td>
<td>Focus on “The 1960s”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Observation</td>
<td>Participant Observation</td>
<td>Participant Observation</td>
<td>Participant Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading sources</td>
<td>Reading sources</td>
<td>Reading sources</td>
<td>Reading sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-led discussion</td>
<td>Teacher-led discussion</td>
<td>Teacher-led discussion</td>
<td>Teacher-led discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-group Discussion</td>
<td>Small-group Discussion</td>
<td>Small-group Discussion</td>
<td>Small-group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-led discussion</td>
<td>Teacher-led discussion</td>
<td>Teacher-led discussion</td>
<td>Teacher-led discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Writings)</td>
<td>(Writings)</td>
<td>(Writings)</td>
<td>(Writings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Debriefing of small groups)</td>
<td>(Debriefing of small groups)</td>
<td>(Debriefing of small groups)</td>
<td>(Debriefing of small groups)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.3. Episodes of small-group discussion nested within teacher-led discussion.

Audio-Recording the Small-Group Discussions.

Barnes (1976) focused on small-group work with specific sources for different subject matter, e.g. a poem for literature class or an expository text for history. Smagorinsky and Fly (1993) examined the response of students in small groups to short stories. This research explored students’ responses to secondary and primary
sources throughout the year in an American history class. The audio taping of small
groups working with primary sources on their own as a part of each episode was an
integral part of this project.

The tapes of these small groups recorded students discussing secondary and
primary sources without a teacher breathing over their shoulders, "correcting" them or
redirecting them. The most important clues about connections between the construction
of knowledge and the use of sources come from this type of small-group setting.
During these episodes, students worked in small groups that they selected themselves.
Each of the three small groups' conversations were audio-taped as they discussed the
various sources, both secondary and primary sources within each episode.

The audio-taping of the small groups allowed for a detailed examination of the
student explorations of the history sources that occurred within the parameters I
established. Accordingly, the patterns of discourse as students discussed historical
issues and the ways that students drew upon and reasoned about the secondary and
primary sources were examined.

**Student Writings**

Students engage in internal conversations about history, as they read sources,
think about what others have written and said, create their own interpretation, and then
write it down. In the current study, students put their thoughts about historical
understandings into words; then the writings were collected and copied. Assigned
essays and students' mid-term and final examinations were Xeroxed as well. Although
these materials were not analyzed as a part of the current project, the questions students
addressed in their writing affected the small-group discussions and students knew of my
initial intentions of examining their writing. As a result, the writing had an effect on the data that I did analyze and so I will describe briefly the initial research with students' writings in the section on the small groups.

In all four episodes and throughout the school year, students were asked to write analytic essays, a form of writing that has been found especially effective in supporting and promoting student learning (Newell, 1984; Newell & Winograd, 1989; Langer, 1986; Marshal, 1987; Langer & Applebee, 1987), specifically in the history classroom (Newell & Winograd, 1994). Tasks became progressively more challenging in that the students worked with more documents and the tasks became more open-ended and more analytic calling for student interpretations. These timed writings (in-class essays) that students did at the conclusion of each episode were collected, evaluated for the student's grade, photocopied and then returned. Students' midterm and final examinations were also Xeroxed. Even though these latter materials were not analyzed for this project, their existence is important to note since the essay prompt to which they responded was the essay prompt which they discussed during the small-group discussions which preceded the writings. In effect preparing for the writing assignment became the rationale for the group discussion. My decision to use the writing prompts to shape the small-group discussions was based on my desire to make the small-group task more authentic (Barnes, 1976).

The essay prompt used in Episode 1 ("The Declaration of Independence") follows in Figure 3.4.
THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE IS BOTH AN HISTORICAL DOCUMENT FILLED WITH CHARGES AGAINST GEORGE III AND AN EXAMPLE OF NEOCLASSICAL WRITING. DESCRIBE HOW THOMAS JEFFERSON COMBINES THE CHARGES AGAINST THE KING AND THE NEOCLASSICAL FEATURES TO MAKE A STRONG CASE FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE COLONIES, A STRONGER CASE THAN COULD HAVE BEEN MADE HAD THE DECLARATION BEEN JUST A LIST OF CHARGES OR JUST A PIECE OF NEOCLASSICAL WRITING.

You may use Lytle and Davidson, Morgan, your small-group worksheet, and/or your copy of the Declaration as you write your essay.

Your answer should be concise, focused and precise. Do not try to tell me everything; tell me what you see as the most important evidence which best supports your thesis. Make sure you use specific historical, textual, and literary examples, not generalizations, to support your ideas. Also, as appropriate, refer to the sources you use by name.

Figure 3.4 Writing prompt for episode one.
The precise wording of the writing prompt came out of earlier student activities and the class discussions that led up to the episode. In addition each essay question asked the students to write for the informational function as described by Applebee (1984). Informational writing has different types and several of these were addressed in the essay questions. The essay for the Declaration of Independence episode asked students to summarize and describe literary and historical elements of the Declaration of Independence, a process which they had already attempted as they examined Native American poetry in the context of American history.

The second and third episode essay questions asked students to analyze, first the greatness of Lincoln’s presidency and then the appropriateness of the US entry into what was in reality a European war, World War I. Students had already attempted an activity similar to the Lincoln prompt when they examined the presidency of George Washington. With the World War I prompt, students had had earlier practice as well. Earlier in the year, they had debated the validity of the US’s declaration of war in the War of 1812.

The prompt for the 1960s episode asked students to compare and contrast the presentations of the decade by historians, politicians, activists, soldiers, oral histories, television (through the use of video tapes from and about the period), and song writers and propose a theory about which paradigm represented by a specific label best presented the era. Yet again, students had had earlier practice with this task as we examined the utility of the label “The Roaring Twenties” and theorized about the way that it acted as a paradigm for understanding that decade. Each prompt, then, asked students to deal with a wider range of materials and a different type of informational
writing, and gave them more latitude for their personal opinion. In addition, students used more materials in increasingly complex ways. The writing prompts for the four episodes can be found in Appendix B.

Data Analysis

Analysis of Teacher-Led Discussions

As soon as possible after each two hour block of class time, I sat down and wrote everything that I remembered from class into my field notes. In the pilot of this method (Lehman, 1993a), I was pleasantly surprised by how much I remembered. In addition, I wrote an outline of activities each day that I taught from and this outline served as a handy reminder.

On days that students worked in small groups or individually, I took field notes during class, noting not just what students were doing but also the questions that students asked and their digressions from the task, as a possible insight to what was going on in the small groups (Geissler, 1990; Wolf, 1990). Both during and after I completed my field notes for the day, I reflected on the day’s events using six questions: (1) How do I feel about the quality of the day-to-day discussions that I am having with the students? (2) How are my kids making sense of this? (3) How are my kids talking? (4) How has what the kids do changed? (5) What is their level of comfort with this whole process? (6) What else strikes my attention? By the end of the year, I had compiled a total of 330 pages of field notes, 177 pages first semester and 153 second semester.

I wrote my field notes in a double column format: in the left-hand column I recorded the events of the class and in the right column I wrote reflections based on the
six questions I was considering. At the end of year, I reread my field notes with the six questions in mind and added other thoughts that came to mind. In Appendix C, I have provided an example of a page of my field notes.

Historiography is both the examination of the principles and methodology of historical research and of the writing of history which must be based on critical analysis and the use of source materials with the end product subject to criticism by other historians. Accordingly, I focused on the issue of historiography, coding the field notes and taped class discussions for these issues. Out of the coded field notes I identified four issues that seemed significant as they arose in teacher-led discussions across the school year. The first was that history was a social construction of the facts of the past through the analysis of contradictory information, the addition of new information, and the reliability of primary sources. A second issue that I discussed with my class was the idea that a historian's perspective might be influenced by his or her scholarly background and the era in which he or she lived. The third issue we examined was the variety of interpretations of the same set of facts and that resulted from the reexamination of the past with different scholarly perspectives through the lens of a different time period. Finally, we examined the issue of historians as a community of scholars, an assumption which can be inferred from the earlier assumptions (Collingwood, 1956; Lytle and Davidson, 1985). I then used these broad areas to code the whole-class discussions both from my three hundred and thirty pages of field notes and from four taped and transcribed classes across the year. I examined both teacher and student comments during these classes.

As I wrote about the issues of historiography and how they were reflected in teacher-led discussions, I generated hypotheses about the significance of student comments about these issues and looked for both confirming and disconfirming
evidence. In addition, I completed member checks of my analyses of the teacher-led discussions with Cathy Tucker, my teaching partner and Mitch Blader and Lilly Gardner, two students from the small group upon whom I focused. They were satisfied that my representations corresponded with their memories and understandings of the discussions.

The Small Group’s Use of Heuristics across Four Episodes

Coding Student Turns

Ten tapes of discussions from one group of students were transcribed for this project. I then counted the turns that students took as my unit of analysis. A “turn” was simply a student’s comment until he or she was interrupted by another member of the group or until he or she stopped talking. Turns were the most appropriate unit of measure, given the complex give-and-take between group members, where speakers rarely completed a thought aloud and reacted to what others said in mid-sentence. Over the year, ten small-group discussions produced 4,528 turns.

Each turn was examined as to whether the speaker was referring to the texts or documents under consideration. Besides referring to texts, the students could also be discussing the assigned writing component, engaging in social chatter or asking a procedural question. The references to documents became the focus for analysis of the small-group discourse following Wineburg’s (1991a, 1991b) example.

Number Of Times Students Refer To The Document

Identifying turns that were references to documents was more difficult than it would first appear. It was not always clear when students were talking about the content that the course covered and when they were specifically referring to a document that included that content. I took a conservative stance and included the turn only if students referred to the document by name (Declaration of Independence) or author
(Jefferson) or with the pronoun "it," for example, "I thought 'it' [the Declaration of Independence] meant that just men were equal." During the 60s episode, references to the films that students viewed were counted as references to documents since the films had been introduced as sources for the small groups to examine. The six students made 995 references to the documents during their 4,528 turns. The heuristics, contextualization, corroboration, and sourcing, which Wineburg identified in historians' examinations of documents were used to code student references to documents.

**Inter-rater Reliability**

Inter-rater reliability was established for the coding. Inter-rater reliability was not attempted for the initial labeling of references to documents. I decided that it was too difficult to put the co-rater into the classroom context and separate out the co-rater's own knowledge of history. Thus the co-rater was not as familiar with the quotes and contents of the documents and there were too many sources and documents to read (four books and forty documents ranging from one to five pages long). Accordingly, I identified references to documents and we tested the coding of heuristics. During the first reading of each portion of transcript, I answered any question the co-rater had about why a turn was identified as a reference to a document. See Appendix D for a complete description of the establishment of inter-rater reliability. See Appendix E for samples of actual coded transcripts.

To gauge inter-rater reliability, we coded the first sustained discussion in all ten transcripts. Specifically, the "sustained discussion" began after students started the tape, gave their names, asked procedural questions, and got organized. When students' focus shifted from the documents or from history in general, that was counted as the end of the sustained discussion. These sustained discussions ranged from thirty-four to ninety-seven turns. See Table 3.1 for a more extensive representation of inter-rater
reliability by episode. The number of references to documents in sustained discussions by episode (the combination of references from all the small-group discussions of that topic, e.g. the Declaration of Independence episode) ranged from sixty-one to eighty-eight. The rate of inter-rater reliability for the episodes ranged from ninety-one percent to 100 percent. The mean rater-reliability by episode was ninety-six percent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episodes with individual discussions</th>
<th>Total number of references to documents in sustained discussions</th>
<th>Number of coding agreements</th>
<th>Percentage of inter-rater reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of independence</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary sources</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary sources</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary sources</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary sources</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World war I</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary sources</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary sources</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary and primary sources (1)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary and primary sources (2)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary and primary sources (3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over all total:</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>Total: 269</td>
<td>Mean Percentage of Inter-rater Reliability by Episode 96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Inter-rater reliability using sustained discussions taken from small-group discussions (by episodes).
To determine the inter-rater reliability for each heuristic, the number of coding agreements were divided by the total number of document references that used that heuristic. For example, the total number of references that used heuristics was divided by the number of references the two raters agreed upon plus the number each rater made a mistake on. Since these are independent events the percentages do not add up to 100 percent. The rate of inter-rater reliability by heuristic was eighty-three percent for the contextualization heuristics, seventy-one percent for the corroboration heuristics, and ninety-seven percent for the sourcing heuristic. The mean inter-rater-reliability by heuristic was eighty-four percent. (See Table 3.2.)

The differences between inter-rater reliability for the small-group discussions as a whole (ninety-six percent) and for each heuristic (eighty-four percent) are accounted for by the very small number of references to documents coded as contextualization and corroboration heuristics and the large number of references coded as use of the sourcing heuristic. If we disagreed on one corroboration code the disagreement accounted for fifteen percent of the total. If we disagreed on one sourcing code, the disagreement accounted for only 1 percent of the total. See Table 3.2 for a more extensive representation of inter-rater reliability by heuristic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heuristic</th>
<th>Total number references to documents</th>
<th>Number coding agreements</th>
<th>Percentage of interrater reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contextualization</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corroboration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourcing</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Percentage—interrater reliability for Heuristics

84%

Table 3.2: Inter-rater reliability using sustained discussions (by heuristic).
Contextualization

I coded a reference to the documents as using the contextualization heuristic when students referred to the time period in which the document was written or to the location where the document was written. Time references that indicate the use of contextualization heuristics are emphasized in italics.

Mitch: using the style of writing that supports what they’re trying to say so that makes it—if it were just a list—it [the Declaration of Independence] wouldn’t have been as strong because they don’t have a cause to advocate through the writing and if they are just writing in Neoclassical writing, then...maybe they wouldn’t be...doing something. [Contextualization]

Lilly: what? [laughter]

Mitch: that’s, that’s where we left off... on what makes it better than just a piece of Neoclassical writing. [Contextualization]

Lilly: well, uhm, what about having some like having something to do with George III and the charges against him?

Libby: that made it personal, just like, you know

Lilly: that it, like struck a cord with everybody, you know what I mean? because they were all, I mean, everybody knows who George II was that was England’s thing, so, you know, by them, we’re sharing, we were trying to [unintelligible] so let’s get independent, see what I mean? [Contextualization]

Corroboration

If students used one source to contrast or compare with another source, either directly or indirectly, the references to documents were coded as using the corroboration heuristic. “The Gettysburg Address is similar to the Second Inaugural since...” or “The Gettysburg Address is not like the Second Inaugural in that...” are examples of direct comparison and contrast. I also coded an indirect corroboration if students used the ideas of a secondary source to make sense of primary or other secondary texts since students were not naming both articles but the article could be inferred from what they said. For example, students used the categories that Stephen
Oates (1984) discussed in relation to interpretations of Abraham Lincoln (White Honkey, American Christ, Frontier Hero) to make sense of secondary sources as well as primary sources. Indirect comparisons are emphasized in italics.

Mitch: OK, so for this let’s go back to Oates’ thing and let’s put Lincoln in the categories that Oates said. [Corroboration]

Lilly: Oh gosh

Howard: Oh

Mitch: So was he an archvillian, a tyrant, a white honkey, a real person, a mythic hero, a prairie hero, or the American Christ? [Corroboration]

**Sourcing**

References to documents were labeled as using the sourcing heuristic when students referred to the author, place of, or date of creation of the document. Wineburg (1991a, 1991b) counted a statement as a use of the sourcing heuristic only if it occurred before the individual read the body of the document. The students Wineburg worked with in the think-aloud protocol only occasionally referred to the author of the document and then as one more piece of information, not as the writer with a writer’s perspectives and intentions. Since this was a naturalistic study, it was impossible to tell if students referred to the author before they read the body; students read the sources on their own outside of class rather than in a controlled think-aloud setting. So to code sourcing I looked for students’ use of the author’s name during their references to documents in the small-group discussions. I decided that these statements revealed the same underlying issue as did the initial statements that Wineburg examined: the reader’s attention to the author and the fact that the piece has an author. I accepted “they” as a cue for a sourcing statement when the students were referring to the authors
as a group (e.g. when referring to Lytle and Davidson as the authors). My students did not refer to the time or location of the creation of the document. References to authors are emphasized in italics.

Lilly: So...do we have any questions about what Lytle & Davidson and Morgan are saying...about the Declaration of Independence? [Sourcing]

Howard: Uhm (facetiously) I don’t have any questions.

(Pause. Pages Turning)

Libby: Does anyone know, ah, like, if there was, ah, any events leading up to the actual writing of the work? ‘cause I kind of wondered if, ah, Jefferson just kind of thought up the whole thing himself...you know like all the ideas/

Lilly: Yeah

Libby: Did they collaborate, you know, or talk about the ideas, or did he just go home and make the thing up?

Lilly: (Imitating Jefferson at home) oh, this sounds good.

Krys: I thought it was, like, uhm, you know, the philosophy of all the Enlightenment, like philosophers...like Locke ‘n everybody, that influenced Jefferson, but then in After the Fact that it something like he was the one that wrote it, like [unintelligible] did, but then like a quarter of it was changed... So it was probably like most of his ideas which were not like totally his ideas because he was influenced by all the philosophers. [Sourcing]

Lilly: Plus like the whole...he probably...during the whole second session of the Continental Congress and I can just hear them, like, taking notes about what they’re talking about, then going home and just, you know, putting it in a written form...So, it’s probably you know a big combination of everybody’s ideas at the continental Congress (clears throat) [Sourcing]

[Long pause.............................................. page flipping]

Lilly: Uhm. does anybody have an idea of what we’re gonna...Morgan’s position would be? [Sourcing]

Howard: No.
Sourcing statements, whether made in reference to secondary or primary sources, were coded into two groups: tag statements (the use of the author's name as a handy way to identify the article and distinguish it from other texts) and substantive statements (the use of the author's name as part of a discussion of the meaning of the text or the author's purpose, intention or perspective). Tag statements are emphasized in the following excerpt with italics.

Mitch: Let's do *Wills*,
Howard: We are on *Wills*
Mitch: *Wills*, I said we were doing Wills, didn't I?
Lilly: No, it's just of *McFeeley*

Sourcing statements which were coded as substantive are emphasized in the following excerpt with italics.

Mitch: OK so let's do Foner. OK I really did not like this reading
Lilly: I didn't either.
Mitch: It was very laborious. So this one wasn't really that much on Lincoln, but *his [Foner's] take on Lincoln*
Mitch: So this is saying that Lincoln didn't like slavery because it took opportunities away from the white man
Libby: That's why *he criticized*
Mitch: But it wasn't because he thought blacks were equal and shouldn't be treated like that, *that's what his take on*, that is, I guess
Howard: So *he thinks he's a good leader for being able to get through the Civil War*
Mitch: *He keeps calling him a racist, a little bit.*

Again, I completed member checks of my analyses of the small-group discussions with Mitch Blader and Lilly Gardner, two students from the small group
upon which I focused. They were satisfied that my representations corresponded with their memories of and experiences in the small-group discussions.

Finally, I interviewed students throughout the year and collected student writing from each episode and for mid-terms and final exams. However, for the purposes of this dissertation I did not analyze this data although I read the interview data to triangulate my analysis of the small-group discussions that were part of the episode.

The research I attempted is complex, consisting as it does of multiple focuses for data collection, multiple data collection methods, and two different schemes for data analysis. This complexity will, I hope, allow me to present a more sophisticated picture of this classroom and the student learning that occurred there than would otherwise be possible. The next chapter will begin that intricate picture with an examination of the classroom context of Advanced Placement American Studies in room 221 at James Garfield High School.
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It is 8:00 in the morning, the first period of the school day. In room 221, a large double-sized room, forty students (forty-one, second semester when another student transfers in from a local private school) sit in a double horseshoe in a large blue room with shaded windows that run across the back wall. The large room easily accommodates a variety of chair groupings, especially the use of small groups. For two fifty-minute periods combined, students sit with their backs to the windows and face a double chalkboard and bulletin board covered with newspaper articles with headlines like "Halloween Witches" and "The Magna Carta Arrives in Chicago"--items brought in by students as connections to the class discussions.

There are two teacher desks at the front of the room which close the horseshoe, but once attendance is taken and announcements are read neither teacher sits at them. On one side wall, there is a glassed window covered with a flowered curtain cutting off access to the former business office. Teachers who teach in 221 use the office as a place to store materials and make coffee. The other wall and the bulletin boards around
the room are covered with a variety of projects from this class and the other four courses that share this room. This is the physical reality that students and teachers lived in for the year that my research took place.

Brown, Collins & Duguid (1989) argue that since “concepts are both situated and progressively developed through activity, we should abandoned any notion that they are abstract, self-contained entities” (p. 33). To understand students' behavior in this room as they discuss history and historiography as well as work with secondary and primary sources in small groups, it is important to understand the broader context for that research—life in room 221 across the year. If chapter three sets the intellectual context for this research, then this chapter establishes the school context.

In this chapter I examine the overall formal curriculum for American Studies and the American literature and American history elements. The second purpose of the chapter is to describe what life was like for the teachers and students in room 221, the overall classroom context with its emphasis on an interdisciplinary approach to American literature and history during the 1994-1995 school year. The final goal of this chapter is to examine the formal teacher-developed history curriculum as it established a context for students as they worked in small groups with secondary and primary sources, work that is explored in chapter 5.

My decision to conduct this research within a regular classroom was intentional; the current research on high school students’ uses of secondary and primary sources has ignored the instructional context. Brown, et al. (1989) argue that too many educational settings fail to allow students to participate in the appropriate disciplinary community or domain. It seems that research on students’ work with sources (Wineburg, 1991a, 1991b; Stahl, Hynd, Britton, McNish & Bosquet, 1996) repeats this problem as studies have tended to occur outside the dynamics of the regular classroom. For example,
students were pulled from class and given materials on the Battle of Lexington in Wineburg’s (1991a) comparison of historians’ and students’ handling of secondary and primary sources. Not surprisingly, he found major differences in the quality of thinking of the experts versus the novices.

Stahl, et al., (1996) worked with a group of students from an Advanced Placement American History class where history had been taught as a story and students had not worked with secondary and primary sources. In their study, students were given multiple sources then asked to complete a set of questions, recall the articles, and write an essay. Again, predictably, these researchers found that the students involved in their study did not create models of the readings that matched expert raters and seemed not to benefit from using multiple sources.

As a classroom teacher, it seems obvious to me that learning never occurs in isolation and that researchers need to understand the instructional context as a way to understand the behaviors of individual students. In addition, the Wineburg (1991a; 1991b) and Stahl, et al. (1996) studies used materials that were not a part of the students’ ongoing classroom discussion; Wineburg assumed and Stahl, et al. asserted that neither set of students had received instruction in working with sources or in understanding history as anything other than as a set of facts. The history teacher who participated in the second study said that “history is a story,” and taught with that focus in mind (Stahl, et. al, 1996, p. 435). Is not the basic assumption of the classroom that students need guided experiences with materials or techniques before they can make independent use of them? Would anyone expect chemistry students who had no experience with the research method or laboratory notebook other than reading them to take their first set of chemicals and complete a polished experiment with an appropriate write-up? Why do we expect students in history to think like historians and write like
them without instruction? What would happen in a classroom where issues of
historiography are raised regularly and where students work with secondary and
primary sources throughout the year?

For these reasons, an examination of how students use secondary and primary
historical sources within the context of their classroom activities is an important step in
the research in this area. This chapter, then, will set the context for the research that
occurred.

Curricular Conversations as a Means For Understanding What Is Worth Knowing In
Advanced Placement American Studies

Applebee’s (1996) notion of effective and coherent curricular conversations
with manner, quantity, quality, and relatedness will inform the description of both the
teacher-developed formal American Studies interdisciplinary curriculum and the
teacher-developed formal history curriculum. As a result of the two perspectives on the
daily life of room 221 presented in this chapter, the reader should come away with a
solid understanding of the backdrop against which this research into student use of
primary and secondary sources was carried out.

Applebee (1993, 1996) argues that formal schooling is fundamentally a process
of mastering new traditions of discourse and that each discourse constitutes cultural
tools for analyzing knowledge and experience in a domain such as history. He
discusses the importance of conversations in education that include ways of formulating
arguments and providing evidence. As students engage in such conversations, they
learn how to participate in them and become more and more independent in their
participation. Applebee suggests that the chosen curriculum is a selection of domains
of intellectual discourse including language, history, literature, science, the arts,
mathematics, etc. Domains are the topics or issues chosen by the teacher out of these
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larger areas to give focus and substance to the classroom curricular conversations. The choice of specific domains, then, establishes the importance of various experiences in the ongoing classroom conversation. Applebee argues that as students "learn to act within the curricular domain, they simultaneously learn both the content and the tacit, socially constituted conversations that give shape and structure to the larger realms of discourse—they develop the "knowledge-in-action that is the living tradition of discourse" (Applebee, 1996, p. 42-43).

What makes a curriculum work? In Applebee's studies of how teachers create coherent curriculum several features emerged as characteristics of conversational domains that promote coherent and cumulative conversations (Applebee, 1996). Following Grice's (1975) description of effective conversations, the four principles include manner, quantity, quality, and relatedness. According to Applebee (1996), "manner" includes the ways which teachers scaffold the development of students' ideas during classroom interactions. The teacher's role is to support the students' learning by first establishing structures that support students in solving disciplinary-based problems and then gently removing those same structures as students grow more independent (Applebee, 1993). The teacher must create opportunities for the students to take on those ways of knowing and doing. By returning to conversational topics as new material is addressed, the teacher establishes a pattern that may allow students to rethink their idea as the year progresses (Applebee, 1996).

Also important in a successful curricular domain are the "quantity," "quality," and the "relatedness" of the materials used. Quantity means that there is sufficient material for the classroom conversation to proceed; quality means that the material is worthy of study, and relatedness means the materials express a strong relationship to the issues raised in the on-going conversation. Ultimately, a successful curriculum is one
which encourages students' development of knowledge-in-action. Knowledge-in-action is socially constructed knowledge which arises out of student participation in ongoing disciplinary conversations (in literature or history or science) as students use the tools that the members of the discipline use to make sense of the world. Within a successful curriculum, as students gain knowledge-in-action they can participate in the discipline's conversations more fully on their own as they slowly gain independence (Applebee, 1996).

In this chapter I describe the curricular domains that shaped the development of the interdisciplinary aspects of American Studies, the kinds of structures that history assumed within our American Studies curriculum, as well as the teacher-led discussions and eventually the small-group discussions of the history portion of the course. I begin with the formal curriculum as represented in the school's formal curriculum, our teacher-developed formal curriculum for the intertwining of American literature and history, the teacher-developed formal curriculum for the history portion of the courses including materials and lesson planning. Then I shift to the classroom conversation which represents the dynamics that took place around my teacher-led discussions during one week of the school year, 1994-1995.

The Formal Curriculum

With the features of successful curricula in mind, we will now examine the formal school-written and published curriculum (Anandale City Schools, K-12 Curriculum Guides). The American Studies course was developed out of the school system's initial formal curriculum in 1975 and the Advanced Placement American Studies section was developed in 1987. The larger tradition of discourse which Cathy Tucker, my teaching partner in APAS, and I focus on together is the interdisciplinary examination of literature and history. In a sense, there are second and third
conversations going on in this classroom as well, that is, about the disciplinary approach for literature and for history. These three classroom conversations then direct the selection of classroom activities, discussions, and materials. In this chapter, the interdisciplinary classroom conversation will be examined as will the history conversation. The examination of the interdisciplinary classroom conversation will clarify the general setting for the research, and the history curricular conversation will describe the specific context for the research which occurred in this classroom, including the dynamics of small-group discussions.

My analysis of the curricular conversation in APAS and in American history, which is the central concern of this study, occurs on two levels. The first level examines overall interdisciplinary curricular framework that Cathy and I developed based on the school's formal written curriculum and our experiences of planning and teaching American Studies over a six year period. The second level of analysis focuses on the history materials and the issues of historiography which I used to center the discussions of history content on a daily basis. Any curricular conversation addresses topics that shape its direction: the overall structure of topics, sequence of assignments, and assessments; and the day-to-day playing out of the curriculum (Applebee, 1996). Although these two levels of curricular conversation are inherently interrelated, the instructional process is central to my study of how students learn the discourse of historical analysis. What we learn is in large part a function of how we learn it. Accordingly, if students are in fact to enter into culturally significant conversations about American history, the process of instruction must be orchestrated to allow and support their participation.

The overarching kindergarten through twelfth grade curriculum was developed by teachers and administrators and approved by the Anandale board of Education in the
1960s and built on the system-wide curriculum in effect since the establishment of the school system in 1918. One part of the current system-wide curriculum is the formal curriculum for American Studies within the language arts (Anandale Schools Language Arts, K-12 Curriculum Guide) and social studies (Anandale Schools Social Studies, K-12 Curriculum Guide) courses of study last revised in December of 1995. The description of the course is the same in both publications so the social studies course of study will be cited since the second half of this chapter addresses the history portion of the course specifically.

This course of study described in the Anandale Schools Social Studies K-12 Curriculum Guide is organized according to the Ohio Model For Curriculum published by the state. The course of study begins with a mission statement, a list of the beliefs of the Anandale city schools, and a list of strategies to achieve our district mission—all developed by a parent-administration-teacher-student committee as a part of the development of the district’s strategic plan. Next is a general description of the social studies curriculum followed by a grade-by-grade social studies scope and sequence. American Studies is the eleventh grade requirement for all students and is identified as integrated with language arts. Next follows a social studies program goals and objectives revolving around American heritage, people in societies, world interactions, decision-making and resources, democratic processes, and citizenship rights and responsibilities. The majority of the course of study consists of lists of instructional objectives and performance objectives for the students for each grade. These instructional and performance objectives are the same as the program goals and objectives, but this time they are applied to students on a specific grade level.

American Studies is taught in the eleventh grade and the course content is described as beginning with the historical events of 1607. The six eleventh grade
instructional objectives for history include the American heritage strand with its emphasis on historical events and interpretation, the people in societies strand with a focus on immigrants and other minorities in the US, and the world interactions strand which examines “diplomatic and military efforts to preserve world peace and advance national interests.” (For a complete listing of strands see Appendix F)

The four eleventh grade performance objectives for history identify the behaviors students are to manifest by the end of the year:

1. The learner will prove global interdependence relying on events, personalities, customs, values and institutions from throughout American history.

2. Given historical examples of prejudice, the learner will identify ways to deal with their consequences.

3. Given significant events of American history, the learner will analyze their influence on current situations.

4. Given a series of related historical events or a single historical event, the learner will project how other choices made in those instances would have different consequences for today (Anandale Schools K-12 Social Studies Curriculum Guide, 1995, p. 4).

Without other knowledge about the intentions of the course, a teacher would have only a vague understanding of the course from these curricular materials.

American Studies and A.P. American Studies are described more specifically in the Anandale Program of Studies (1994), the handbook students receive when they are signing up for courses for the following year. Based on these descriptions, and other resources, students decide what courses to take as well as the level to attempt. The relevant portion from the program of studies informs students that
This team-taught course provides an opportunity for the student to study major historical events in relationship to major literary periods. Combining the study of history and literature will enable the student to understand more clearly and appreciate more deeply his/her national heritage. Course activities include class discussion, lecture, improvement of note taking skills, work in composition and English usage, and writing a research paper. Students will integrate knowledge of historical facts as well as political and cultural movements in our country ranging from its discovery to the present (p.39).

In addition, students considering the A.P. level course are informed that

As in all AP courses, students are expected to complete additional readings and write extensively both in and out of class. Students will read from college level history texts and supplementals and will read approximately fifteen major literary works as well as short stories, poems, plays, and essays. Students receive two credits and two weighted grades because of the additional expectations of this rigorous course (p. 34).

Both course descriptions discuss the integration of history and literature, general student expectations, and the credit which students will receive. Beyond these general descriptions, the shape of the course is left up to the teachers involved, all of whom have agreed on the overall shape of the American Literature and the American History course and the major topics to be covered. Some of the agreed-upon elements include the study of American history from exploration to current history, including major wars, presidencies, the treatment of minorities, economic policies, and social history. The literature strand includes major novels and short stories from the Colonial, Neoclassical, and Romantic periods, as well as representative works by Hawthorne, Wharton, Fitzgerald, Hemingway, and Kesey to examine elements of Naturalism and Realism.

Domain Structure Of Tucker/Lehman Advanced Placement American Studies

Unlike the formal written curriculum provided by the Anandale School System with its generalities and claims, the formal teacher-developed curriculum has developed out of the experiences and interactions of teachers and students. Given the vagaries of the goals and objectives of the school system's formal curriculum, the teacher-
developed curricula vary greatly among different American Studies teams. For example, some teams cover the material in a traditional chronological approach from early American history to present, other teams cover the material in a totally thematic approach using such themes as “Racism” or “The Presidency” or “Wars” to cover aspects of American history, and still other teams combine the chronological approach with the thematic approach. Most American Studies teams make at least some attempt to integrate literature and history, even if “integration” consists largely of teaching the history of the time period in which the piece of literature being studied was set or written, e.g. teaching colonial history during the study of The Scarlet Letter (Hawthorne, 1850/1980) the history of the 1930s during the study of Native Son (Wright, 1940/1990).

As part of our formal planning for APAS, Cathy Tucker, my colleague, and I decided that the major goal of our course would be to immerse students in the integrated nature of American Studies. To achieve that goal we have developed eight major topics or units which support that integration: “People Who Are Different,” “The Interaction Of Historical Events And Literary Styles,” “Historical And Literary Impetuses For Reform,” “Racism,” “Women In America,” “Heroism,” “The American Dream,” “Man's Humanity,” and “Modern America.” Each unit is placed in chronological relationship to the other units, but within each unit some topic is taken from the initial time period to a modern end point. Thus students work through both literature and history in chronological order but have the opportunity to deal with topics that are in-depth and relevant to the modern period.

In “People who are Different,” for example, the initial student activities focus on Puritan theology and philosophy and how those belief systems appear in primary source materials from the period. The next step is an examination of the way these ideas
influenced the treatment of people who are labeled as different during the Salem Witch Hysteria, the uproar of Nativism of the 1830s, the anti-foreigner and anti-communist Red Scare of 1919, and the Congressional trials of McCarthyism in 1954. Finally, these beliefs are examined within the context of literature set in colonial America, The Scarlet Letter (Hawthorne, 1850/1980) and The Crucible (Miller, 1959/1968).

In another unit, "Literary Impetuses For Reform," the course examines the ideas of reform in the 1830s and in the 1950s and 1960s while students read Transcendental writing and One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest (Kesey, 1962/1972). In yet another unit, "Racism," we begin with an examination of slavery, then of the Civil War and Reconstruction, while reading Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass (Douglass, 1845/1986), then either Uncle Tom's Cabin (Stowe, 1852/1986), Beloved (Morrison, 1987), or The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn (Twain, 1884/1987), and Native Son (Wright, 1940/1990). During this extended unit we also examine the history of the labor movement, radical groups, and the Civil Rights Movement up to modern day. (For a complete description of the units/topics, please see Appendix G)

We have also developed activities which support students' engagement with historical or literary perspectives as well as activities which combine the two. For example, in the "People Who Are Different" unit, we discuss Puritan theology and the characteristics of a witch hunt. We then examine McCarthyism using these same characteristics. When we discuss One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest (Kesey, 1962/1972), students are expected to find Transcendental and reform ideas (of both the 1830s and the 1960s) in the novel. When we discuss Native Son (Wright, 1940/1990), students listen to Paul Simon's song "Cool, Cool River" (Simon, 1990), examine historical photographs from labor history, the history of radical groups, and the Civil Rights movements; and draw connections between the three sources. Then students
create projects that draw connections from such diverse items as dance or art or music or ceramics or architecture (to name a few) to *Native Son* (Wright, 1940/1990) with a written component which explains their thinking and the connections they have explored.

At the same time that we are emphasizing the inter-relatedness of our curriculum, we also maintain some disciplinary boundaries. As a part of literature, students study the differences between colonial literature, romantic literature, naturalism, realism, and local color. Using the key notes of New Criticism (Applebee, 1996), students examine each of the books for plot, theme, imagery, character development, poetic language, and tone. They read various pieces of literary criticism and write their own critical essays. During the colonial unit, I also direct students' discussion of issues of historiography using *After the Fact: "Serving Time in Jamestown"* (Lytle & Davidson, 1986). Students examine the role of primary source materials in examining the early colony. We question John Smith's veracity as well as ponder the reasons for a variety of laws thought essential to the colony, including one that required that the starving colonists grow corn. During the Racism unit, I include a more traditional section on the military history of the civil war, which includes students role playing civil war generals, making plans and then earning points as they find evidence that their side actually attempted the same plans in the war. We also look at an episode from Ken Burn's *The Civil War,* "The Valley of the Shadow of Death" (1989). The disciplinary approach within the enacted history curriculum will be discussed next.

**Course Goals for Shaping the Curricular Conversation in History**

Two of my goals in APAS are that students will learn the content of American history, and that students engage in the methods of historians and develop historians’
habits of mind: knowledge-in-action. For the first goal, students in the class in question completed a variety of assessments directed at the retention of specific content: multiple choice questions, short answer questions, and identification items. Students' grades, including the six students in the small group examined, remained level. For example, the six students in the small group were identified as being A- to B- students overall and their grades on objective assessments were in this same range. These teacher-generated objective evaluations suggest that students are learning the content as expected by more traditional measures of classroom efficacy. As researcher and classroom teacher, I found the more interesting question to be whether students used the methods and took on the habits of mind of historians, the second part of knowledge-in-action.

The second goal, an equally important one especially for high school students and high school students in an Advanced Placement course, is that, as novices in the study of history, my students learn the ways of thinking, habits of mind, approaches, ways of arguing, and ways of knowing, that are part of the larger field of history. I hope to "invite students to participate in the debates that are currently ongoing" (Applebee, 1996, p. 20) in the field of history. Having students read and discuss historical documents within a supportive classroom frame work, having students read and discuss current interpretations of and perspectives on history, again within a supportive classroom framework, puts them into the conversations that are ongoing in the field of history. Finally I ask students to make decisions about historiographic questions and then write their own historical essays, a final element of knowledge-in-action as well as an application of apprenticeship as described by Brown, et al. (1989).
Cathy and I agree with Arthur Applebee when he raises the concern that in
...looking for commonalities across traditions of discourse, [educators] have lost sight of the differences that are also part of their [traditions of discourse] richness and appeal. Conversations about literature are, ultimately, different than those about history, and both are different from conversations about science, however fruitful cross-fertilization among disciplines may be (Applebee, 1996, p. 65).

Part of Cathy’s and my understanding of the classroom is a sense of the value of interdisciplinary connections between literature and history, between class studies, current events, and students’ lives. Another part of our understanding includes a strong respect for the value of the specific disciplinary approaches taken by literary critics and historians; we both include our own discipline’s ways of knowing as an important part of our teaching. This section of the chapter will deal specifically with the enacted curriculum within the history portion of APAS.

As a teacher, I hope to mediate between the academic discipline of history and my students in a way that will encourage them to join in and contribute to the conversation (Applebee, 1996, Seixas, 1993). My goal is to mediate between the discussions in the field and my students through the behaviors I model, the classroom discussions I initiate, the materials I choose, and the activities that I develop; that is, all the ways that I support students’ learning.

The Teacher-Developed Formal History Curriculum in APAS

There are at least three reasons to focus on the teacher-developed formal history curriculum as I establish context for my research. Given that this research project focuses on issues of history instruction, use of secondary and primary sources, and historiography, an examination of the history curriculum is of central importance. While it would be interesting to also examine the enacted literature curriculum and then examine the way the interdisciplinary, history, and literature conversations intertwined in the classroom, such an examination is beyond the scope of this
dissertation. In any case, I have attempted to present the interactions in room 221 as a complex set of interchanges, interesting in their own right but too complex for a detailed examination in this dissertation. Certainly, future research might build on what I have come to understand about the history portion of the classroom conversation to include the rest, but that is a job for the next round of research.

Secondly, I have a special personal interest in American history. My understanding of what history is about and how to teach it has changed over the last twenty-three years of my teaching. During the ten years that I taught first junior high and then middle school American history, I saw history as a story for eighth graders to be enthralled by, full of exciting people, intriguing twists, and unusual sidelights. When I began teaching high school history in 1985, I looked for ways to teach basically the same course, American history from the explorers to modern, in a way that built on the intellectual growth and maturity of first my tenth graders and then my eleventh graders and made the course new for them. I wanted to offer them new ways of thinking, not just reinforcement of old information or even additional new information. In teaching the AP course, I became fascinated with the ideas of historiography and I have changed my teaching to reflect that fascination. It seemed logical to examine this new way of teaching that I came to later in my career.

Third, from my limited personal experience, it seems that American history is not often taught within an American Studies framework. Teachers from other school systems in the Midwest have visited our school expressly to see the American Studies class in action. In addition, the process Cathy and I use in American Studies is not the same as that used by other teams in our building. Perhaps a focus on the history curriculum will broaden the audience which would be interested in my findings and find something valuable for their own curricula.
In response to my description of some of the events in room 221, Dr. George Newell commented that “the integration of history and literature and your treatment of history as a discipline with certain rules of evidence seems to make students more aware of each discipline's specific features” (Personal communication, July, 20, 1996). A class analysis of the historical accuracy (or inaccuracy) of the portrayal of Puritans in The Scarlet Letter (Hawthorne, 1850/1980) suggested, he believed, “the unique roles of both history and literature in the curriculum—that each teaches different things about our culture and our traditions.” If Dr. Newell is correct in his assessment, then an examination of the teacher-developed formal history curriculum which follows and the ways students received it (discussed in the next chapter) is of special interest.

Drawing from the Anandale School System curriculum, the Anandale K-12 Social Studies Curriculum Guide, the James Garfield Social Studies Course of Study, my own experiences in history classes, and my beliefs about students as active learners who construct their own meaning in the classroom and teachers as mediators, I have developed the history curriculum which follows. My primary goal within the disciplinary framework of history is to encourage students to build upon their earlier American history courses (fifth and eighth grades, as well as Global history in ninth grade and possibly Advanced Placement European History in tenth) and use talking, reading, and writing to begin to solve problems in the study of history, as historians might. I try to create and structure class discussions and activities so that students have the opportunity to begin to use the content they have learned to build broader understandings of history, historians, and what it means to think historically.

In the curriculum I created, I combine coverage and depth. The course is arranged chronologically, partly in acknowledgment of the Advanced Placement Test in history that approximately a third of the students take in May and partly because I
believe that the chronological approach provides students with a familiar framework as they tackle new ways of thinking about history. While we cover American History chronologically from colonization to modern America, we also take frequent opportunities to examine topics such as racism or the role of heroes in depth. There are eleven such topical units connected by chronological content. Within each of these units, I introduce specific historical themes or topics and the classroom materials and discussions address the issues all the way to the role these topics play presently. (See Figure 4.1.)

For example, during the second topic unit, the interdisciplinary topic is "The Treatment of People Who Are Different" and the unit is started during our discussion of colonial America. As students read The Scarlet Letter (Hawthorne, 1850/1980) and The Crucible (Miller, 1959/1968), the history curricular conversation addresses colonial history, the history of peoples’ attitudes about women and witchcraft, Nativism in the 1830s, the Red Scare of 1919, and McCarthyism of the 1950s and ends with modern accusations of McCarthyist attacks. Another example from later in the year is "The American Dream" unit which begins with the study of the 1920s. As students read first The Great Gatsby (Fitzgerald, 1925/1972) and then The Grapes of Wrath (Steinbeck, 1939/1987), the history curriculum examines historians’ differing interpretations of the 1920s and the Great Depression, as well as economic historians’ evaluations of Hoover’s economic policy, Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal, Reagan’s New Federalism, and Clinton’s attempts at a balanced budget.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interdisciplinary Units 1607</th>
<th>Treatment of people who are different</th>
<th>History &amp; literature influence each other</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Literary Impetuses to Reform</th>
<th>Racism</th>
<th>Turn of the Century</th>
<th>Heroism</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to American Studies</td>
<td>History &amp; literature influence each other</td>
<td>Basis for American Culture</td>
<td>Historical &amp; Literary Impetuses to Reform</td>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>Turn of the Century</td>
<td>Heroism</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Focus</td>
<td>Colonial Literature</td>
<td>The Scarlet Letter</td>
<td>The Crucible</td>
<td>Neoclassical Literature</td>
<td>Romantic Literature</td>
<td>Novels about Native Americans</td>
<td>Transcendental Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern American History &amp; Literature</td>
<td>World War II</td>
<td>The American Dream</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Modern American History & Literature | World War II | The American Dream | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present | Present |

Figure 4.1 Integrated structure of Tucker/Lehman Advanced Placement American Studies with thematic units.
Within this content organization the curriculum attempts to engage students in the historian's process. The question "What is history?" centers the course as whole and is the topic of four full class discussions across the span of the year. "What is history?" also underlies the teacher-led discussions of content and the materials chosen for the course in general as well as the small-group discussions during the four carefully structured episodes in which students focus intensely on secondary and primary sources. Each episode is placed within the curricular focus which is in turn a part of a broader interdisciplinary unit. Also, each episode focuses on a question of interest to historians. The first episode deals with the Declaration of Independence within the focus of the American Revolution, which is a part of the Interdisciplinary Unit on Ways Historical Events and Literary Styles influence Each Other and asks students to examine the Declaration of Independence as both a historical document and as an artifact of Neoclassical philosophical thought. The second episode addressed Lincoln's presidency within the context of the history focus on the Civil War as apart of the Racism Unit and requires students to evaluate Abraham Lincoln's greatness or mediocrity. The third episode examines US involvement in World War I within the focus on the broader issues of World War I within an interdisciplinary unit which has heroism as its theme and engages students in the question of the value of American involvement in the Great War. The final episode focuses on the 1960s within the examination of post World War II America as a part of the interdisciplinary unit on Modern American history and Literature and asks students to create their own framework for understanding the decade of the 1960s. (See Figure 4.2.)
Connections between tasks are cumulative

Connections between content are episodic

Figure 4.2: History episodes placed within the broader teacher-developed formal interdisciplinary and history curricula.
The discussions of "What is history?" will be examined in detail at the end of this chapter; the teacher-led classroom discussions of content and the authors and their interpretations will be explored in the beginning of chapter five; and the small-group discussions that occurred as part of each secondary and primary source episode will be discussed in chapter five as well. The materials included in the formal teacher-developed history curriculum and the materials and tasks of the secondary and primary small-group discussions from each episode will be discussed next.

Course Materials and the Formal Teacher-Developed History Curriculum

Applebee (1993) presents the idea of curricular conversations, a metaphor for the interplay of materials, students, teachers, school community, and broader community within the classroom. All of these conversations revolved around what is to be learned and what is to be taught. For classroom conversations to proceed productively and coherently, curricula must have quantity, quality, and relatedness, as well as manner. The feature of quantity means that there is sufficient material for the classroom conversation to proceed; quality means that it is worthy of study, and relatedness means materials used have a strong relationship to the issues raised in the ongoing conversations (Applebee, 1993).

Quantity

During the 1994-95 school year students used a wide range of materials. Through the history enacted curriculum students worked with a main text, The National Experience (Blum, et al., 1993), and three supplemental texts, After the Fact (Lytle & Davidson, 1986) American Political Tradition (Hoftstadter, 1948), and Only Yesterday (Allen, 1939/1964). Four different texts in a year-long high school course would be considered a good quantity for students to deal with, but my students also examined excerpts from One Night Stands In American History (Shenkman & Reiger, 1982) and

In addition to this demanding amount of materials, students read a variety of secondary and primary sources. While secondary and primary sources were examined throughout the year with each unit of study, students concentrated on the Declaration of Independence, Abraham Lincoln, World War I, and the Sixties in each of the four episodes of small-group discussion. They used a total of sixteen different secondary source chapters and articles and nineteen different secondary sources. The complete list of the materials by episode is available in Appendix H. It seems obvious there were sufficient materials for the classroom discussion to proceed, both from the prodigious numbers cited here and the quality of the conversations examined in the first two-thirds
of this chapter as well as in the next chapter. The quantity of these materials also reflects the historian's role of sifting through and choosing the materials which are of significance to the argument she or he is going to make.

**Quality**

In addition, the materials were worthy of study. The main text, *The National Experience* (Blum, et al., 1993), was written by six practicing historians with each individual authoring six chapters on the area of his specialization. Edmund Morgan wrote the chapter on the American Revolution that we read first semester. He is responsible for the reading through the American Revolution. Kenneth M. Stampp addresses the issues of the Federalist period through the middle of the eighteenth century. William S. McFeely presented the events leading up to the Civil War, the war itself, and immediate issues of Reconstruction. C. Van Woodward examined America at the turn of the nineteenth century, while John Blum wrote about the first half of the twentieth century and Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. discussed the second half. These six historians each write with their own distinctive style and the class discusses each author not just as a historian but as a writer with a style all his own. The high quality of *The National Experience* (Blum, et al., 1993) derives from it's providing students with materials from professional historians allowing students to examine not just the facts of history but the styles of those who write about history.

*After the Fact* (Lytle and Davidson, 1986) is a series of essays on issues of historiography. This book was used regularly throughout the year; during the discussion of the Declaration of Independence, students read "Declaring Independence," and while studying the American Revolution they read "The Strange Death of Silas Deane." As the year progressed students read all but three of the eighteen chapters.
After the Fact supports the examination of the writer of history in lively, in-depth historical essays: students regularly comment in class and in their journals that After the Fact is their favorite reading.

Although not used as extensively as The National Experience or After the Fact, both Only Yesterday (Allen, 1939/1964) and American Political Tradition (Hofstadter, 1948) present ideas worthy of study. Only Yesterday (Allen, 1939/1964) offers an intense look at the social and economic history of the 1920s. On the other hand, American Political Tradition was written by Hofstadter (1948) in an attempt to revise the hagiographic descriptions of American political leaders from the Framers of the Constitution to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Students read selected chapters from Only Yesterday (Allen, 1939/1964) to supplement their understanding of the Twenties and support their discussion of the different labels with their attached paradigms that might be used instead of “The Roaring Twenties.” Again students only read selected chapters from American Political Tradition (Hofstadter, 1948), those on Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. These chapters present a refreshingly critical examination of two men who have been idealized in traditional history classrooms for the last century.

One Night Stands in American History (Shenkman & Reiger, 1982) and Dave Barry Slept Here (Barry, 1989) are worthy of class time although both take a humorous stance toward history. The first book includes strange, interesting, and intriguing vignettes from history ranging from trivia about George Washington to campaign stories about Richard Nixon. Even more valuable, each selection is footnoted with the original source. The second book is hysterical and basically historically accurate. Dave
Barry Slept Here is even funnier if one knows one's history, and it gave students the opportunity to differentiate between Barry's accurate statements and his flights of imagination.

The Weaker Vessel (Fraser, 1984), The March of Folly (Tuchman, 1984), Washington, the Indispensable Man (Flexner, 1984), and Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate Biography (Brodie, 1974) were quality materials for students to work with. Each was written by a practicing historian and presented viewpoints or perspectives that varied from those presented in The National Experience (Blum, et al., 1993). These varied viewpoints gave students additional information which would then allow them to start making their own decisions about the historical questions we were studying.

The short story, "The Devil and Daniel Webster," (Benet, 1936/1979) was a valuable addition to the enacted history curriculum as well. This famous story is a clear example of modern romantic writing as well as an enjoyable story to read. In addition, the Devil's foretelling of the future at the conclusion sets the stage to discuss Webster's role in the passage of the Compromise of 1850 and his attempt to save the union, even though he would be vilified for the rest of his life for his actions.

The slides from Facing History: (McIlroy, 1993), How the Other Half Lives (Riis, 1901/1971) and Dorothea Lange: Pictures of a Lifetime (Coles, 1992) gave students the opportunity to engage in analysis as a whole class. Students made connections to the issues of latent racism, the Gospel of Wealth, the New Deal, and Steinbeck's The Grapes of Wrath (1939/1987) as they examined each slide.

Materials other than books were used as well. Students examined primary sources such as political cartoons, the New York Times stock market page, and secondary sources such as New York Times columns on the Oklahoma City bombing. The materials from the New York Times were high quality but even more importantly
provided in-depth material and new perspectives on issues being studied. The Newsweek articles, especially those on the controversial book *The Bell Curve* (Herrenstein & Murray, 1994), invited students into the current discussions of the issues of race that related to our Racism unit. Each of these materials provided more in-depth information about topics raised by the standard course materials. These materials provided sufficient information to support the curricular conversation.

Finally, the secondary and primary sources used in the four episodes were also of high quality. The secondary sources were all by respected historians, current (within the last ten years), and some cutting edge. The primary sources were all taken from *Documents in American History* edited by Henry Steele Commager (1949, 1973). Historians work from both secondary and primary sources and read and critique each other’s work. The quality of the materials students examine reflects the quality of works with which historians deal.

**Relatedness**

When Applebee (1996) refers to relatedness as a quality of effective curricular conversations, he means that materials used have a strong relationship to the issues raised in the ongoing conversations. The issues that were examined in the two weeks that are focused on here are issues that develop out of the various sources, that are important to the local community, and continue to be examined in the wider academic community. All of the broader issues mentioned in the section on quality arise directly from the materials being examined. Neoclassicism and Post-Modernism arise from the study of the Declaration of Independence and of Neoclassical writers. The place of women in modern society and the various ways of representing women historically is directly related to the questions raised about Morgan’s decision not to discuss the role that women played in the American history (Blum, et al., 1994).
In their study of historiography during this representative time period students examined *After the Fact* (Lytle & Davidson, 1986), the role of interpretation in writing history, the decisions historians make, and the importance of re-examining history as new evidence is discovered. These issues have validity for writing in a classroom that values the construction of learning and which sees students as apprentice historians. Students who have experienced these issues are better prepared for the study of history at college and begin to think more like historians than their peers do as they learn to think about the text within the discipline of history and talk about the text as an ongoing social construction rather than as the truth (Holt, 1990).

Excerpts from the two humorous books, *One Night Stands In American History* (Shenkman & Reiger, 1982) and *Dave Barry Slept Here* (Barry, 1989) were used throughout the year as they related specifically to the material under discussion. *The Weaker Vessel* (Fraser, 1984), *The March of Folly* (Tuchman, 1984), *Washington, The Indispensable Man* (Flexner, 1984), and *Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate Biography* (Brodie, 1974) directly related to the topic under discussion in the classroom as well as an important part of my modeling the use of different sources and in students’ examining the methods and tools that historians use as a part of situated cognition (Brown, et al., 1989).

Also the three sets of slides dealing with African-Americans and art, poverty at the turn of the nineteenth century, and the Great Depression offered students new pieces of information related to the topic under discussion. These slides and the classroom discussion of the artist’s or photographer’s intention and underlying premise related to our on-going discussion of historiography and allowed students three different occasions in which to use those skills. Once again students had the opportunity to re-examine topics or skills as they developed as thinkers (Applebee, 1996).
The thirty-five secondary and primary sources students read and discussed were all integral to the historian’s task students faced in each episode. These sources gave students evidence to support different takes on the essay question with which they were grappling. Without these sources, students would have had no alternative but to parrot back what I had said in class in the essays they wrote as a part of each episode and would have had no reason or opportunity to use historians’ methods and tools.

Episodes and the Teacher-Developed Formal History Curriculum

Students worked extensively with secondary and primary sources during four episodes during the school year. An episode is an essay prompt, a set of readings, teacher-led discussions, small-group discussions, and essay writing which revolve around an issue of interest to historians. All essay prompts used in the episodes included a reminder of the names of the historians and sources which we read for this task. Students were allowed to use all materials to write their essay and bring in an outline for the essay that they completed ahead of time. Students always knew the topic and in the case of the source tasks, the actual prompt for the writing ahead of time. The prompts also included the following type of reminder about the structure of the finished piece:

Your essay should be a clear argument based on a balanced use of secondary and primary sources. Refer to the sources you use by the name of the author. Make sure you include specific evidence of actions taken by the people and nations involved. Specifics, details, examples will all make your essay stronger.

In addition, each essay prompt reminded them of our classroom discussion, including the names of the source’s authors, names which we used in class as practice for citing sources. While it was up to each student to include all of these
recommendations in their essay, this portion of each writing prompt (both for the source essays and regular essays) was a gentle reminder. For complete texts of the writing prompts used in the episodes, see Appendix B.

The Development of Tasks

The tasks that each episode asked students to complete were planned to ensure support for the students. The tasks were cumulative while the content examined was episodic. For example, the essay prompt on the Declaration of Independence asked students to describe how Thomas Jefferson combined the charges against the King and the Neoclassical features of the Declaration to make a strong case for the independence of the colonies, a stronger case than could have been made had the Declaration been just a list of charges or just a piece of Neoclassical writing. Cathy and I both discussed the features of Neoclassicism. Cathy asked students to examine other pieces of writing from the period and identify the Neoclassical elements they revealed. I discussed the events leading up to the American Revolution and the specific grievances that colonists expressed. The day before the essay was completed in class, each small group shared their ideas for answering the prompt with the rest of the class. Questions about Jefferson and Neoclassical ideals are part of an authentic task since they are still being asked by historians such as Joseph Ellis' in his recent biography of Jefferson, American Sphinx (1997), which questions the traditional view of Jefferson’s commitment to Revolutionary ideals and argues that Jefferson was both radical and reactionary (Gergen, 1997).

The task of the second episode asked students to assess whether Abraham Lincoln was a great president. This task was more difficult for students in two ways. First they had more sources to consider. For the Declaration of Independence essay,
students had Lytle and Davidson (After the Fact, 1986), Morgan (in Blum, et al., The National Experience, 1994), and the Declaration itself. For the Lincoln essay, students read the essays of six historians and seven documents written by Lincoln himself.

The second feature that made the task more demanding is that it is an opinion question rather than just a description. Students had to form an opinion about Lincoln’s efficacy in office and then defend that opinion using the materials they had at hand. While students could and did argue either Lincoln’s mediocrity or efficacy, most students presented the easier case for his greatness. In addition, once again, each small group shared their ideas about the prompt with the entire class the day before the essay was completed in class. The question about Lincoln’s position in history is not a moot one; historians are still examining the role that Lincoln played in American history. After Jesus of Nazareth, Lincoln has had the most books written about him. All of the essays that students read about Lincoln have been published in the last ten years. The most recent major biography, Lincoln, was written by David Herbert Donald (one of the authors whose essay we used) and was published as recently as 1995.

The third episode task was even more challenging. Students were asked to examine the causes of World War I, reasons for US involvement, experiences of the war, and the consequences and ramifications of the war up to 1920 in order to decide if the US was right in entering the war. Because students requested that we not take class time to share each group’s decision their work on World War I and because Cathy was completing the Women’s Unit literature at this time, there was less class time devoted to providing students with support. Finally, this question was truly open-ended. Students had sufficient evidence to argue either for or against the US entry, although they had to choose one position. As suggested by the BBC’s recent epic documentary on World War I (1996), this war continues to be a focus of historical research.
The final episode task was the most demanding of all, as students had to decide upon a label to attach to the period of the 1960s and describe the paradigm the label suggested to understand the diverse events of the times. As always they were asked to give specific evidence which supported their interpretation of the time. The students had worked first with a document associated with one year (the Declaration of Independence), then with documents associated with one man (Abraham Lincoln), then with documents associated with one war (World War I). Now students were working with documents associated with an entire decade: 1960s. This question was also the most open-ended. Students had to go beyond a pro or con position and create their own understanding of the decade under discussion. In addition, while the small groups had sufficient time to work, there was little class discussion time devoted to this essay given the rush of the end of the year. During this final episode students engaged in one of the most difficult of historians' tasks, the interpretation of an era with its contradictions and complexities.

This general discussion of the teacher-developed formal interdisciplinary and history curricula gives an overview of Tucker-Lehman American Studies. A closer examination of daily classroom life will provide a sense of the manner (Applebee, 1993) of the classroom through the interactions between teachers and students both as a part of the interdisciplinary American Studies curriculum and as a part of the history curriculum.

APAS: An Examination of Classroom Life

In order to describe the discussion conventions we developed for teaching and learning, the disciplinary integration we strove for, and the interactions of teachers and students on a more daily basis, I will examine one week (October 31 through November 4) of classroom life in some depth with a special focus on two class days, October 31
and November 2. The description provides a general overview of interaction between the two teachers and between teachers and students. Some specifics are presented as well, including ongoing activities in both Literature and History such as “Monday Musings,” “Friday Fun Facts,” “Vocabulary,” “Connections,” and five-minute writings as well various assignments such as the Scarlet Letter papers and reading assignments. Further into the description of the day, the topics that the class and teachers discuss are examined, both in terms of student involvement and teacher modeling of appropriate behaviors. Under the topic of the integration of history and literature, I present what I call "invisible" integration: when the content and the discussion of the content moves seamlessly from history to literature and back again without teachers calling attention to the shifts in perspectives. Finally, the reading, writing, and evaluation during October 31 and November 2 are also discussed. Once I have developed a sense of the classroom interactions which create the context for student learning, I will examine student activities in the American history portion of the course, the topics more bound by the traditional discipline, in detail as well. The week under examination occurred toward the beginning of the school year. In this week, the activities spilled over to following classes and so another day has been included in this chapter to give the classroom discussion a sense of coherence and closure. A flavor of the class is suggested by the activities, specific assignments, topics under consideration, including how issues of historiography were addressed during the week. The focus on the two days also provides a first glimpse at examples of how knowledge-in-action was developed through the various activities, but especially by the teacher-led discussions.

One note on the dense description of classroom life is important to make. The description of the daily life of the classroom is necessarily from the perspective of the teacher/researcher. After reading this chapter, my teaching partner, Cathy, agreed that
this description represented a typical day. Although the research presented in this
dissertation focuses on student learning, this classroom description is from one of the
teacher’s perspective. Students who have read this description agree that it is accurate
according to their memories, but it certainly does not reflect their personal experience of
the classes.

Weekly and Daily Patterns of Teacher-Led Discussions

Every teacher creates patterns and routines for classroom activities in order to
give students a sense of expectation for the form and context of discussion. Cathy and I
had both weekly and daily patterns. The week of October 31 began with “Monday
Musings” and ended with “Friday Fun Facts” as did the other weeks of the year.
“Monday Musings” are articles, cartoons, and essays that relate to the literature content
which Cathy brings in, reads aloud, and discusses with the students. For example, on
October 31, Cathy read aloud a “Monday Musing” on grammar rules and editing
entitled “How to Write an F Paper,” a humorous essay pointing out a variety of
mistakes students make in their writing (Patterson, 1993). Flaws such as vague
pronouns, excessively flowery language, and lack of citations were illustrated in an
amusing way which was meant to clarify writing conventions students were expected to
follow.

Cathy began using Monday Musings the first year we team taught (1987-88)
when she saw how much students enjoyed Friday Fun Facts. Friday Fun Facts are
newspaper or magazine articles that amplify some historical topic. For example, when
studying colonial life and the influence of the English Civil War and Restoration, I have
used a Friday Fun Fact about the medical care that Charles II, the Restoration King,
received as he lay dying from a stroke. The care included blood-letting and hangman’s
rope ground up in a glass of wine. On Friday of this week, November 4, 1995 as a
result of our study of the Declaration of Independence, the students had a Friday Fun Fact that described what happened to the signers of the Declaration during and after the American Revolution, if they survived.

The pattern of day-to-day classroom life was a bit more complex. Every day of the year, except Thursdays when students had homeroom, Cathy or I read aloud the morning announcements sent from the office as required. On October 31 and November 2, we then took attendance and reviewed the assignments that were maintained in a running list on the front chalkboard. Students were to read Neoclassical pieces by Benjamin Franklin, Patrick Henry, and John Adams (in Johnson, 1750/1989) as well as reading assignments in Morgan’s chapters in The National Experience (Blum, et al., 1993) and a chapter in Lytle and Davidson’s After the Fact (1986). Students were assigned reader response journal entries for their reading and were also to polish their Scarlet Letter (Hawthorne, 1850/1980) paper.

Next, we did “Connections.” We take a few minutes at the beginning of the two-period block of class and ask students if they have seen any connections between something we have studied and the rest of the world. These connections might be a newspaper or magazine article they have found, or something they saw on TV or heard on the radio. A number of Monday’s “Connections” were on witches (connecting to the Salem Witch Trials), I was glad that Halloween would soon be over. As another “Connection,” one student talked about a portion of the film 1776 he saw which mentioned Sam Adams. (Cathy quipped that he was just the name of a type of beer and I explained that he was the cousin of John Adams and had been at the Second Continental Congress also). Another “Connection” related to the students’ study of vocabulary. A student had found an article that said that turning off the electricity in a building was tantamount (a vocabulary word they had struggled with) to murdering the
occupants. Yet another student brought in a magazine article that discussed the possibility of an invisible binary star to our sun which was called Nemesis, another vocabulary connection.

On Wednesday, during “Connections,” students mentioned President Clinton’s use of a vocabulary word in a recent speech, another Salem connection, and a story of a man killing his wife and getting only eighteen months in prison. This last item connected to our discussion of the subordinate role of women in colonial times as well as to our discussion of women in the Revolution. So we talked about mitigating legal factors in the jury’s mind, the use of deadly force, and attitudes toward women in general (and I reminded them that I was not a lawyer). Connections provides us the opportunity to deal with other student-generated issues beyond classroom topics, providing an open-ended student-centered discussion of connections between history, literature, and contemporary life.

Vocabulary is a part of the daily routine as well. Cathy assigns five vocabulary words drawn from the SAT/ACT lists, the literature, and my suggestions from the history reading each Monday. On Tuesday, students define each word. In class, definitions are shared and Cathy, and sometimes I, provide a sample sentence. For the rest of the week, the first 10 minutes of class are spent reviewing the words and having the students use the words in sentences showing that they understand each word’s meaning and can use it. On Wednesday (the second day of this set of days) students made up sentences using the current vocabulary. The funniest sentence came from Mitch Blader. In history, we had talked about Benjamin Franklin and his sexual peccadilloes before his common-law marriage with Deborah Reed Franklin and after her death. Using the vocabulary word “chaste”—Mitch came up with “It took Benjamin Franklin a lot of energy to remain chaste.”
Once the daily activities are out of the way, one or the other of us goes first. The decision is based on what we are doing that day; for example if one of us is giving a test or if the conversation from the second half of the day before is to be continued, or if class presentations are due, that person goes first. While we team teach and are present and participate in the classroom both periods, one of us has the lead, so to speak, each period. When Cathy is in the lead I help with chores, work with individual students, write discussion comments on the board, and ask questions and vice versa. These divisions of labor allow for both integration of the topics under consideration and for a maintenance of the integrity of the disciplines involved. Our concern is that our style might turn into one period of history and the other of literature or into two periods of a general discussion of American culture without the special ways of thinking that go with the examination of history and literature. The two periods are back-to-back, fifty-five minutes long, and we must stop and start with them. But the 110 minutes are flexible; if we finish one topic early we take an early break, if one topic runs long then we take a late break. We always take a five-minute break at some point in the two period block of time.

For both of us, the most common classroom approach during this week and throughout the year was lecture-discussion on the days that we shared the lead during the two hour block; however, lecture-discussion was not the only approach we used. Working together we had the students play games, do simulations, watch films, work in small groups or with partners, debate, hear outside speakers, peer edit, share during a round robin discussion, and present projects, among other activities.

Another aspect of our pedagogical approach to American Studies is the way that student learning is supported in the classroom. At the beginning of the year, each student is required to acquire a study partner. They exchange phone numbers and are
expected to contact their study partner for assignments they have missed and as someone with whom they can clarify topics discussed in class and study for tests.

Beyond requiring that students exchange phone numbers, students must complete their first presentation, either on The Crucible (Miller, 1959/1968) or The Scarlet Letter (Hawthorne, 1850/1980) with their study partner and exchange their reader response journal with their study partner at the end of the first nine weeks. These requirements are intended to encourage study partners to work together and to facilitate their support of each other. During the week under consideration, students worked with their study partners on revising each person’s literary analysis paper on The Scarlet Letter.

**A Week in the Life of AP American Studies**

It is first semester, Monday, 10/31/94. The discussion begun today would be completed Wednesday, 11/2/94 and so that day is included here as well as references to Tuesday, 11/1/94 to bridge the gap. Cathy discussed Benjamin Franklin’s writing on Monday. Students finished discussing “Moral Perfection” by Benjamin Franklin (In Johnson, 1750/1989). Franklin had listed all the changes that he wanted to make in his life, all the characteristics that he hoped to improve and those that he hoped to conquer. The class discussed Franklin’s reasoning and what it suggested about him as a person. Students were also asked how this essay might be a Neoclassical piece. Students talked about the personal characteristics of logic and self-control that a Neoclassical writer might prefer. Students also pointed out the Neoclassic characteristics shown in the style of writing Franklin used.

On Tuesday when I was absent, Cathy discussed a speech by Patrick Henry to the House of Burgesses (Johnson, 1775/1989). Students analyzed the writing both as a piece of Neoclassical writing and as a persuasive piece filled with rhetorical devices.
Wednesday, Cathy did vocabulary and then worked through an activity on grammar. Students corrected sentences with grammar errors; all of the sentences came from student papers on *The Scarlet Letter* (Hawthorne, 1850/1980).

On the same Monday, I started the discussion of the American Revolution and completed the initial discussion on Wednesday. To begin, I wrote on the board: “Historians have to make decisions about what to leave out of their writings. Morgan makes the decision to leave women out of his chapter on the American Revolution. Did he make the proper decision?” We went over the statement in class, and I reminded them of all they themselves had had to leave out in the *Newsweek* activity we completed the first three days of class. Each small group had examined *Newsweek* magazines for one year between 1988-1994 and had written a summary of the events of that one year to be included in an imaginary revision of their text, *The National Experience* (Blum, et al., 1993). One of their main complaints had been that they had had to leave so much information out and that they had not always known what criteria to use to make their choices.

I said then that I was going to talk about the American Revolution from the perspective of the role that women played in the war, and they would decide if Morgan made the proper decision. I put up transparencies of two “Sally Forth” cartoons, one commenting that the only woman any one had heard of was Betsy Ross and did not the women do a bit more. The other cartoon depicted men as doing important things and Betsy Ross who did not really sew the flag, as holding out for more responsibility. Next, I asked students to tell me what women they knew from the Revolutionary period and they named Betsy Ross, Martha Washington, Abigail Adams and Molly Pitcher. I praised them for going beyond Betsy Ross.
To support the lecture-discussion and their note-taking, I handed out a sheet (the notes for this sheet came from *We, the American Women* by Millstein and Bodin, 1977) which began with a quote from a monument to the “Mothers of the American Revolution”: “They also serve who only stand and wait.” We talked about the underlying attitude that this quote suggests. Charlie Cost pointed out that this quote reinforced the perception that women did nothing when they indeed did a lot—women did both their traditional jobs and the men’s jobs and supported the army.

Then in lecture discussion mode, I worked my way down the handout identifying the women and their contributions. Sybil Luddington rode thirty rough miles through bad weather to warn the colonists that British troops were on the way, Lydia Darragh was a spy, and Deborah Sampson disguised herself as a man and was wounded in battle (Millstein & Bodin, 1977). About half way through the list, I asked students why I was making this argument if there were only ten women to talk about. The kids responded that there were more women involved in the war and that these women just showed what lots of women did and I agreed and pointed out that by giving these specific women as examples I was strengthening my point about women being active in the Revolution.

I had three women to go when Cathy asked “Well, if these women did these things, then why haven’t we heard of them?” My response included a mention that Paul Revere was not famous nationally until Longfellow and his poem; that there was not good communication so that people in the area knew of the women’s deeds but they were not widely known. Then I commented that there was a theory that if the people in power [men] had acknowledged what women had really done, then they could not have written a Declaration of Independence and a Constitution that left women out.
Recognition of women's roles in the war would have entailed a shift of power. I emphasized that the first was the mainstream argument and the other was more theoretical.

Just before the tone sounded, I asked students if they had studied the American Revolution before (and of course they had, in fifth and eighth grades). Then I asked if it had been studied then, why not assume that and write the chapter totally from the perspective of women as Hartsock (1987) suggests in her discussion of Feminist Standpoint theory. There was a stunned silence and the tone sounded.

One thing to notice within this examination of the first class discussions of the week in American studies is the way history curriculum is entangled yet separate from the integrated nature of the broader American Studies curriculum. The literature discussion adds to the background knowledge that students bring to the discussion of the role of women in the American Revolution while the history discussion questions, at least in a small way, the wisdom of these great Neoclassical thinkers as well as of the historian whose account ignores women.

On Wednesday, 11/2/94 I had students write for five minutes their response to the question I had posed originally: Was Morgan (in Blum, et al., 1993) justified in his exclusion of the role of women in the American Revolution? With a show of hands, about half said it was a proper decision and about half said improper. Students who argued that Morgan was right to leave out women had the following arguments. The thesis of Morgan's chapter is that the British had foolishly neglected the colonies and were now reaping the results, and adding a section about the role that women played does not fit his thesis. Morgan's supporters also pointed out that the text is a survey of American history and Morgan has to leave some things out. He does not include men who do such limited things as spying or raising money and he does not include the
names of individual soldiers, only their commanders. He leaves out Benedict Arnold as traitor, assuming the reader studied Arnold in high school and perhaps Morgan also assumes the study of the role of women at the same time. If he does not mention the traditional roles of men then why should he mention them about women?

Students who argued that Morgan’s (in Blum, et al., 1993) decision was improper had strong arguments as well. Leaving women out entirely suggests that women did nothing, although they did many important things and so Morgan should have made some slight reference to women’s efforts. Morgan detractors argued that by assuming that women were already covered in high school, Morgan shows a lack of understanding of what happens in most high school history courses. Anti-Morgan students’ final argument was that as the author, Morgan had decided on the focus for the chapter. He could just as easily have re-focused his thesis so that including women would make sense. With this discussion the period ended.

Potential Influences on Student Use of Disciplinary Ways of Knowing and Thinking

There are several points I want to raise about the two days of classes just described. First, Cathy and I engaged students in discussions and ways of knowing we hoped the students would take on. Cathy modeled an integrated view of literature when she discussed Benjamin Franklin and Patrick Henry as historical figures, as writers from a certain literary period, and as authors with intentions as they write. The handout I used for the discussion of women in the American Revolution had the reference “Millstein and Bodin, We The American Woman: A Documentary History (1977)” at the top of the page which I pointed out, indicating that issues of sources are important in my classroom. Students and I talked about the various authors of The National Experience (Blum, et al., 1993) by name according to the chapter that we were reading, and we talked about Lytle and Davidson as authors of After the Fact (1986).
Secondly, and more specifically, both Cathy and I used discussions to illustrate how to make an argument. As a part of Tuesday’s discussion of Patrick Henry’s “Speech to the House of Burgesses” (Johnson, 1775/1989), Cathy had students identify various rhetorical devices (parallelism, appeal to emotion, hyperbole, etc.) and then discussed which of them Henry used and asked them how students might use them in their own writing. I modeled making an argument on Monday and Wednesday as I argued that Morgan (in Blum, et al., 1993) was incorrect in leaving women out of his discussion of the American Revolution. I presented specific, detailed evidence to support my position and cited my source as well.

By discussing Henry’s choices of rhetorical devices and asking students to consider them for their own writing and by examining what Morgan left out of his description of the American Revolution and what Millstein and Brodin (1977) included, we examined all four writers as authors who made decisions and constructed arguments based on their knowledge, experience, and beliefs. Further, this classroom discussion suggests that students have the option of questioning and disagreeing with an authority. Within the context of Henry’s rhetorical strategies, students are given the opportunity to consider their own persuasive writing. The discussion of Morgan’s decision concerning women suggests knowledge-in-action as students not only learn that Morgan, Millstein, and Brodin make decisions but discuss the validity of those decisions with additional information from which they can draw their own conclusions both about his decision and about the role that women played. Rather than merely discussing the fact that historians have different perspectives on the role of women in the Revolution, students made that decision for themselves.

To illustrate how and why interpretation is critical to historical understanding, I compared the approaches of different historians to the same era during the week under
discussion. For example, when students read, "The Strange Death of Silas Deane," (Lytle and Davidson, 1986) as a part of their reading on the American Revolution they were exposed to the issues of interpretation as well. Silas Deane was a secondary American diplomat during the American Revolution who fell into disfavor because of shady dealings and then died during his return to the US after the war. His contemporaries assumed that this death was either natural causes or suicide. Historians have developed sources that suggest that he was murdered. The importance of historical evidence and the way that new evidence can change our understanding of an event are stressed in the article. Again, I asked students which explanation they found the most compelling and had them defend their position, another example of how routines were used to demonstrate the content and form of discussions of histories and of how students were again allowed to make their own decisions about a question of historical significance.

I touched on the idea of different perspectives when I brought up the idea that perhaps we should study the American Revolution entirely from a woman's perspective. Later in the course, I discussed the traditional feminist tradition (Millman & Kanter, 1987), Standpoint (Harding, 1987, Hartsock, 1987), and Post-Modern (Haraway, 1988) with students as we examined the Suffrage Movement at the turn of the nineteenth Century.

Finally, Cathy and I modeled the interchange of ideas and the importance of raising questions. Cathy's question of "Why didn't we know about these women in the Revolution if they did important things?" raises an interesting set of issues for the class to discuss. The fact that Cathy and I ask each other questions encourages students to do the same.
Integration of Literature and History

Another point I would like to raise is the amount of integration of literature and history that occurred during these class days both by students and by teachers. Without our suggesting it, students regularly combined history and literature in their sentences for vocabulary, as Mitch did during this two-day set. Although my emphasis in this research is on the disciplinary approach I use in history and my hope is students will adopt it, the integration of literature and history is another important aspect of Tucker/Lehman American Studies and is the backdrop to the disciplinary aspects of history instruction. Both Cathy and I had discussed with the students the characteristics of Neoclassicism and they had applied it to the Declaration in their small-groups during the episode. They then wrote on the Declaration as an historical document and as a Neoclassical document in their essay for the first episode of the year.

Another example of integration occurred Wednesday when I returned to class. The students wanted to know if Henry had been a Deist; they wondered if a man who believed that God was not active in the world would appeal to God in his writing. I said no, nominally he was an Anglican, but he was influenced by Deist ideas. The kids decided that he might appeal to God, if only because his audience would expect him to. This discussion shows the almost invisible integration of the two subjects. We shifted from the literary perspective (Neoclassicism) to the historical perspective (Henry's religious background) and both support students' understanding of the piece under discussion.

Teacher Support for the Development of Student Background Knowledge

Through our attempts at integration, we provide support for each other's course as well as for our own. Again, this topic may seem tangential to my focus on disciplinary learning in history, but this discussion of the ways that Cathy and I provide
content support for the other’s disciplinary discussions gives insight into the background knowledge students brought to the small-group discussions which were part of the research reported in this paper. When students understand the qualities of Neoclassical literature it adds to their background knowledge about the Declaration of Independence, how and why it was written, and thus makes students better able to discuss the document as a historian would as they work in their small groups.

I also lay the background for the different novels that we read. In the weeks before the discussion of the American Revolution, we read Arthur Miller’s The Crucible (1959/1968) and The Scarlet Letter (Hawthorne, 1850/1980) as a part of our study of colonial America. But to understand the play and the novel students also need to know about historical perspectives on women, beliefs about witchcraft, McCarthyism in the 1950s, and the belief systems of the Puritans. We also discuss how historically accurate these novels are and differentiate between the goals of historians and novelists. The examination of the historical accuracy of a novel presentation of a historical personage or period is a task historians take on (Lytle and Davidson, 1986) and thus becomes yet another authentic task for students as they explore the historian’s ways of knowing and thinking.

Reading and Writing Assignments and their Role in Discussion

Beyond the teacher-led discussions, which may limit students’ opportunities to contribute, reading and writing tasks are key components of the course. Reading and writing are means for ensuring that students practice ways of organizing and presenting ideas that are appropriate for the study of history. Accordingly, at any point in the year, including the two days under discussion, students do a great deal of reading for APAS. For the week of October 31 - November 4, students read Neoclassical pieces by Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Paine and Patrick Henry (Johnson, 1989). They read
letters Abigail Adams wrote to John Adams at the Second Continental Congress (Johnson, 1989) later that week. In addition students were reading quite a bit on their own time in history. They read the chapters in The National Experience (Blum, 1993), written by Edmund Morgan on the American Revolution and the Experimental period, and a chapter by Lytle and Davidson in After the Fact (1986), a text on historiography, called “The Strange Death of Silas Deane.” Across the year, students read fourteen major works and numerous shorter pieces for literature, and one main text and four supplemental texts with fifteen shorter pieces for history.

Students complete these specific readings for two reasons. First all of the material provides students with content knowledge about the people, events and ideas of the Revolutionary Period, content knowledge that will come into play as students take on the historian’s tasks of examining sources for the author’s perspective and interpretation (Lytle and Davidson, 1986), considering the Declaration of Independence as a Neoclassical document (Franklin, Paine, Henry, [in Johnson, 1989]; Morgan, in Blum, et al., 1994), and deciding on whether women should be included in the history of the American Revolution (the Adamses’ letters [in Johnson, 1989], Morgan, [in Blum, et al., 1994]). Second, After the Fact (Lytle & Davidson, 1986) explicitly and The National Experience (Blum, et al., 1993) implicitly model the methods historians use. The chapter on “The Strange Death of Silas Deane” (Lytle & Davidson, 1986) discusses what historians do, how they examine and select facts as a part of their argument, and the ways that historians’ interpretations may change as new facts come to light. The National Experience (Blum, et al., 1993) is written by six eminent historians who compose chapters that deal with their areas of expertise. Each man writes in his
own style using his own way of making a historical argument. Teacher-led class
discussion allows students to examine these chapters and to see what they reveal about
historians and their work.

Students also write a great deal, both in class and out of class. To remind them
of Monday’s (10/31) discussion of Morgan’s decision to exclude the role of women in
the American Revolution, I had them do a “five-minute writing” on Wednesday during
class. Five-minute writings are a way to reactivate the schema students have developed
around a certain topic (Langer, 1986). They are also a way to have students think about
a topic before participating in a class discussion and a way to reinforce what students
have learned that day at the end of class. (Langer, & Applebee, 1987). In this case,
students wrote about whether they thought Morgan had made the proper decision in not
referring to the role that women played in the Revolution based on the class notes and
discussion over the previous two days. Students also complete in-class timed writings
and essays as part of larger tests within the classroom setting. The five-minute writing
that students completed allowed them the opportunity to make up their own mind about
Morgan’s decision about women in the Revolution before they were influenced by other
students’ opinions and writing about it.

By October, students had read The Scarlet Letter (Hawthorne, 1850/1980),
discussed it in class and written a paper on it outside of class. For this paper, students
found an angle in The Scarlet Letter which interested them and then wrote a literary
analysis paper. As homework for Tuesday of this week, students re-edited their
“Scarlet Letter papers” using Cathy’s indications of grammar, spelling, or punctuation
errors in certain paragraphs. Students found the errors and made the corrections. This
was the final stage in the process they have been following in writing the paper. First,
each student proposed an angle, ranging from the flower symbolism to the depiction of
women in the novel. Then students completed an "SRD," a strong rough draft, which was read and edited by their study partner during class time. Students revised their pieces at least once more and turned in their final draft. During the week under examination, students polished the graded piece as a preliminary to placing the writing in their K-12 Writing Portfolio (which includes writing from history as well, in this course).

The assignment board indicated that students had Reader Response Journal entries to complete in response to the Neoclassical writings (in Johnson, 1989), Morgan (in Blum. et al., 1993), and Lytle and Davidson (1986). The Reader Response Journal requires students to respond in writing in some way, with a teacher-suggested prompt or with the student's own angle, to each piece of reading. Across the year, students respond to each literature piece read, with longer pieces and books requiring three to four responses, and each chapter read in The National Experience (Blum, et al., 1993), After the Fact (Lytle & Davidson, 1986), Only Yesterday (Allen, 1931/1964) and Hofstadter’s American Political Tradition (1948) as well as to each set of secondary and primary documents.

Reader Response Journals are another way that student learning is supported. At the beginning of the year, topics are assigned specifically and the evaluation of the journal is detailed including a copy of the holistic scoring guide marked for their specific journal. During the second and third nine weeks, they are required to find a peer reader (Geissler, 1990) who also provides feedback about the quality and responses to the ideas raised in the journal. By the end of the fourth nine weeks, students are creating their own topics for assignments and will have a minimum of two peer readers.
who will provide the majority of feedback on the quality of the journal. Unless there is a major discrepancy between both peers' assessment and the teacher's assessment, the peers' evaluation becomes the grade for the journal.

The journal prompts, which students receive at the beginning of the school year and which they may choose to write from, give them the opportunity to try on some of the habits of mind associated with historians and historical inquiry. Some of these prompts include:

Do you feel there is an opinion expressed by the author through this work? Or what opinion is expressed by the author through the history chapter? How do you know this? Do you agree? Why or why not?

Do you think the title of this work or of the history reading is appropriate? Is it significant? Explain. What do you think the title means, or why do you think the history writer chose this title?

What do you feel is the most important word, phrase, passage, or paragraph in this work? Explain why it is important.

Would you like to read something else by this author? Why or why not?

How would a historical figure act differently or be viewed differently if he or she were in a different time period?

Does this work or chapter remind you of any current events?

The first four prompts encourage students to think about the authors of their history textbooks as writers with styles, perspectives, and choices rather than as purveyors of fact. The last two prompts encourage students to use elements of historical imagination which may allow them to construct their own connections to the content and begin their own interpretation of the significance of the person or the event.

Journals are graded on their completeness, the balance between history and literature, higher level thinking, intellectual risks, and a variety of genres. If students
meet the last three criteria for the journals as they write in reaction to the prompts listed above, their journals become yet another place where they entered into the conversation of historians.

Summary

During this week, we tried to establish issues and topics for later discussions and to support students’ learning and behavior as the year progressed. Cathy reinforced the ideas of the writing process, of making one’s own argument, as she had them write. She also encouraged them to try on the rhetorical devices used by the Neoclassical writers as another way to develop their own writing styles. In the class discussion I led, I attempted to set up issues of historiography such as the historians’ choice of data and the structure of the historian’s argument. I hoped they would take on the historian’s task as they began to make their own decisions with evidence and act like historians by critiquing Morgan’s choices. The discussion this week also served to lay the groundwork for later discussions. By raising the issues of women early in the year, we turn students’ attention to them and then revisit them when we study the American Civil War, World War I, and World War II. Students ask about the role of women in the Civil War since McFeely (in Blum, et al., 1993) only mentions it and we discuss his decision in light of additional information I supply about the Civil War activities of women. In Blum’s chapters on World War I (Blum, et al., 1993) and in Schlesinger’s chapters on World War II (Blum, et al., 1993), both historians detail the roles that women played during the wars. Also we do a unit on women writers and the women’s movement at the turn of the twentieth century and the issue arises again.

This discussion of the two days in the life of room 221 is important for a second reason. The discussion presents examples of the development of knowledge-in-action, examples of what students were exposed to and engaged in throughout the year.
Students were asked as early as October to begin making their own decisions, based on the evidence in front of them, with no one right answer to these questions even hinted at. The curricular conversations being established here supported the students' small-group discussions which I used both for class and for research. The description of the class sessions also suggests the situatedness of the learning which occurred over the year as teachers modeled behaviors, supported student use of those behaviors, and then gave students the opportunity to work independently (Brown, et al., 1989). Implicit in my assertion that these two days were typical days is the notion that therefore these patterns and behaviors occur regularly and therefore support student learning.

The formal curriculum, the general framework and formal teacher-developed curriculum with its interdisciplinary flavor for the student work which occurs in room 221 has been described. Although we emphasize interdisciplinary links as we team-teach APAS, Cathy and I also maintain disciplinary boundaries which we believe are equally important for our students to appreciate and work within. The next step is to examine the enacted curriculum for the history portion of the course. It is this enacted curriculum that most closely connects with student work with secondary and primary sources in small groups which is one of the focuses of my research.

Fostering a Discipline-Based Conversation about American History

The broader history curriculum consisted of a chronological approach with thematic units which allowed the examination of historical themes across American history. A central issue throughout the year was the question “What is history?” This permitted discussions of historiography, including the role and importance of sources. In class discussion, I consciously called students’ attention to the issues or historiography and sources early in the school year and then throughout the year. Classes started August 30, 1994 and during that first class session I talked about their
history book, a text used on the college level which is written in "chunks" by six different historians. The preface identifies the author of each chapter; I pointed out that Edmund Morgan would be the first historian they would be reading in The National Experience (in Blum, et al., 1993). On September 1, I first asked the students the question "What is history?" pursuant to raising the issue of historiography. The study of historiography was continued as we read After the Fact, by Lytle and Davidson (1986). The first chapter in Lytle and Davidson, assigned September 6, deals with the Jamestown colony and the issues raised by John Smith's description of Virginia and the perspective that he brought to his writing. On 9/8 and 9/9 we discussed Morgan's theme in chapter one of their text. An extended excerpt from my expanded field notes for Friday, the ninth, describes what occurred.

Friday 9/9/94

We talked about Morgan's theme. We had started it yesterday and I reminded them that they had said it was related to the land and I asked them to look at Morgan's title, the first paragraph under exploration, and the last paragraph in the chapter.

Judy Stanton went "OOOHHH" and so I called on her. She said that Morgan's theme had to do with the ways that different people used the land, specifically that the Vikings did not use the land and the Spanish did. I asked her then to make it broader, what was Morgan saying about land and land use with all of the people he talks about in the text?

Then we talked about the other Europeans and Caroline said that Morgan was saying that the Europeans made better use of the land than the Vikings and then she said that the Spanish made better use. I asked her if that was what Morgan was saying and another student said no, that the English made better use.

John said that the English tried to learn from the Native Americans and the Spanish just destroyed them. So then I said that learned seemed rather reverential and was that the English view? Another student said that the English exploited the Indians not learned from them. Then I pointed out that if you compare the three countries, a shorthand way to remember them might be: Spanish-murder, English-exploit, and French-learn/trade.
Next we talked about perspectives. I asked them what a Native American perspective would be and they said "we tried to help them and they came and pushed us off and killed us. We shared the land and they destroyed the land."

Then I asked them for a seventeenth century English view and they said "We are better than these savages/non-Christians. We are making the right use of the land and these Indians keep attacking us. We must protect ourselves and our land from them."

Then I asked about Morgan and told them that his was a twentieth Century Euro-American perspective. I explained why I like the phrase "Euro-American" in that it acknowledges that everyone is an immigrant including white Americans.

The kids pointed out that Morgan had pieces of both those perspectives, Native American and seventeenth Century English.

Judy pointed out that having all these perspectives is hard to decide what is the one that is right, that you follow.

Then Judy asked if Morgan’s perspective was the one we have always had and kids came up with examples of other perspectives. I commented that usually after 300 years that people can admit the wrongs of their ancestors.

Judy said that in Germany they did not admit the Holocaust and I pointed out the Japanese called the attack on Pearl Harbor and China "an advance."

We talked about what might show that these were problems and Krys pointed out that all the uproar when other people heard it, the criticism, would show there might be something wrong.

Then Judy said that the US did not admit our concentration camps. I told her that they were not exactly concentration camps but "relocation camp" was too soft and that certainly we do not always admit it.

Kell pointed out that even though colonization was 300 years ago, Native Americans and the government have been in conflict up until recently, and I agreed even in the 1970s with AIM (American Indian Movement—Leonard Peltier), and he said so it’s been real recent with the problems so it would be harder to admit mistakes and I agreed.

Under my direction, students showed that they understood the importance of theme and perspective as they were able to identify Morgan’s theme as he wrote the first chapter in The National Experience ("The English made better use. . ."). They were
also able to identify, in response to my question, the Native American perspective on contact with Europe ("We tried to help them and they came and pushed us off..."), the seventeenth century English perspective ("We are making the right use of the land and these Indians keep attacking us...") and Morgan's perspective as a twentieth century historian ("Morgan had pieces of both of those perspectives."); a discussion which indirectly discussed the importance of knowing about the source of a document. At the end of the discussion, I raised the issue of the way that interpretations of history change over time: "usually after 300 years that people can admit wrongs."

"What is history?" was the main discussion topic for the class three more times that year for a total of seven different full class periods (September first, second, and seventh, November fourth, January third and fourth, and June sixth). The issues of historiography were also raised as a part of numerous other discussions of topics ranging from Andrew Jackson's presidency to the photographs of Jacob Riis. These further discussions are discussed at length in the next chapter. The ongoing discussion set a framework for the course, allowed students to re-examine their ideas on historiography, and work out their own ideas. These discussions also situated student activities within the domain of history and established a context for their learning (Brown, et al. 1989).

**Reading assignments and the Formal Teacher-Developed History Curriculum**

I used students' readings in Lytle and Davidson (After the Fact, 1986) as another opportunity to discuss issues of historiography and ultimately the question of "What is history?" As a part of the discussion of each chapter they read, I asked students to examine the content that Lytle and Davidson present, the point that they are making about historiography, and what they themselves think about Lytle and Davidson's position. This pattern is shown in the discussion of the third chapter of
After the Fact. Students discussed their own ideas about “The Strange Death Of Silas Deane” (Lytle and Davidson, 198?). Students were struck by the way new information about Deane's death could affect the theory proposed.

Judy: The most interesting part was the list of most important, somewhat important, and least important facts but the least important facts became very important to proving that he was murdered. The prologue really shows how important it is to not to so many ways to interpret, everyone decides what's important.

Charlie: It seems like that with every point they made with suicide they had a contradiction, so you could see how each person could see it differently for each theory.

Carol: This goes along with what we've been saying all year, but that the more important people, people, discuss the suicide, so we go along with what they say, so historians get influenced by this.

Lehman: Are these important issues?

Paula: Kind of. Like what Judy says, that they use facts that are seemingly unimportant and how they did things, it didn't seem like that, it was important that he did research on poisons, but then it becomes very important.

When students are asked which of the possible causes of Deane's death they think Lytle and Davidson (1986) believe as writers, the following discussion developed.

Angela: They think murder
Ryan: They build the argument
Charlie: They spend so much time on it
John: They present such strong evidence and dwell on it
Tom: Could they do testing?
Lehman: Not in this time period and Bancroft could have used unusual poisons.
Judy: I don't think they were trying to prove murder, I think they were spending so much time trying to convince us that you can't just be led into. go into the motions of just taking in history. They are trying to show us what historians do

Carol: I agree with Julie, they didn't, the reader, it wasn't that they were trying to prove murder but that you should examine what you read. That if they are pushing murder then they aren't pushing the process of what they claim is historical process.

Finally, when pressed for their own decision about how Deane died, most students said that they did not know enough to really disagree with the historian authors. Then Joann added, "They are saying that you should have a doubt always, you have to know that it could be different, like you're a lawyer, so you keep looking."

This discussion engaged students in issues of content, perspective, interpretation, critical thinking, importance of new evidence, and their own role given their sense of lacking all the evidence that surrounds Deane's death. Again, through ongoing discussions of the issues of historiography, students had the opportunity to revisit the topic and re-examine their thoughts in light of new information.

Historical Patterns and the Formal Teacher-Developed History Curriculum

Later in the year (May second, third, and fourth) one last broad historical issue was examined during the second semester, the notion of paradigms and paradigm shifts. Students examined the label "The Roaring Twenties" as an example of a paradigm which historians use to understand an era of history. We defined "paradigm" as a framework which shapes our thinking about something or helps us understand something. We listed new labels in addition to "The Roaring Twenties": Esoteric 20s," "Blind 20s," "White 20s," "Decade of Denial," "Dual 20s." All of the student suggestions tended to focus on elements of the era that were left out of the "Roaring" label. After we discussed what new information would be added to our thinking about the decade as a result of each paradigm, students voted for the one which they thought
best framed all the events of the 1920s. The “Dual 20s” and the “Blind 20s” were the top two labels. Their essay on the test over the 1920s asked students to support one of these labels with substantial historical evidence for their position. We also discussed the notion of paradigm shift and talked about the modernist and the post-modern paradigm for understanding social science research and the world in general.

This issue introduced students to the kinds of issues that will be raised in their college communities and prepared them to begin thinking about the ongoing debate in both the literature and history disciplines. Again students had the opportunity to think and talk as historians as students worked within a disciplinary context and thought about social constructions rather than truth.

This discussion of paradigms, a difficult topic, was set up in a familiar format for students. Throughout the year, students were asked to brainstorm an opinion, and find evidence for each opinion; then the class voted for the one that they felt best fit the criteria. By using this familiar framework, this discussion of paradigms supported students’ tackling of a difficult concept. Finally, this teacher-led discussion created the basis for the final small-group discussion of secondary and primary sources when students were asked to create a label which they felt would provided the best paradigm for understanding the 1960s.

Teacher modeling in the Formal Teacher-Developed History Curriculum

Approaching a Text

Throughout the year, I modeled an approach to a piece of text, an approach which more directly presented the importance of paying attention to the author of the piece under consideration. An example of this modeling is presented in the following excerpt from my expanded field notes for Friday, February 10, 1995.
Rachel asked me how to read Foner [author of *The New American History* (1990) and a chapter they were reading on the Civil War]. I thought she wanted to know how they were going to be tested on it, so I sort of dodged the question and told her to underline as she read and to read for each person’s main argument and how they made that argument.

I then elaborated and said with Foner he is going at it in a scholarly way not a narrative way, so he is going to be talking about how historians construct history and specifically how slavery affected the American Civil War and Reconstruction. I pointed out that he is writing currently, with a 1992 copyright.

With Hofstadter, I told them he wrote in the 1940s and he was a revisionist.

We talked about what a revisionist was, one of the kids said it was someone who rethought history and I agreed and added that specifically revisionists try to figure out what the popular idea is and then to puncture it and give a more complete or accurate picture in their minds.

Later in the same discussion

I pointed out that they would be reading other secondary sources and that we would be reading primary sources as well and that this would be the next great focus week. I pointed out that Foner mentioned Stampp [one of the authors of *The National Experience*, 1994].

In this discussion, which grew out of a student question about reading the different sources under consideration, I attempted to call attention to the author of the piece and what we might know about that author that would have affected what he wrote.

**Critical Reading of Materials**

Another habit-of-mind useful to historians, which I modeled, is the critical reading of the materials and content under consideration. By talking about the decisions that historians make and suggesting alternative positions taken by other historians, I was suggesting that there is more than one interpretation to an event and that students must be aware of that. We compared Morgan and Millstein’s perspective
on the role of women in the American Revolution, as described above. We examined Morgan (The National Experience, 1993) and Brodie’s (Jefferson: An Intimate Biography, 1974) views of the Sally Hemings controversy. During the discussion of manifest destiny we compared Woodward’s (The National Experience, 1993) take on the morality of American Westward movement to Perret (A Country Made By War, 1990) position.

Modeling the Reference to Multiple Sources

Historians read and work from a wide variety of books as sources. I attempted to model this process throughout the year by making recommendations of books, having students add them to our recommended reading list by author and title. Each book was connected to the topics we were discussing in class and a number of them were books that I identified in class as sources that I used in my preparation for that day’s class. Each of the ten times, I deliberately discussed the author and his or her perspective as part of the description of the book that I was recommending. As early as the end of September, I started students on their recommended reading list.

The books recommended ranged from The Weaker Vessel (1984) and Royal Charles (1979) by Antonia Fraser (both about England in the sixteenth and seventeenth century) to James Flexner’s (1984) biography of Washington: the Indispensable Man to Anthony Lewis’s Gideon’s Trumpet (1964) and Make No Laws (1991) about US Supreme Court cases which led to landmark rulings. Other books recommended during the year included Son of the Morning Star (about George Custer and the battle of Little Bighorn) by Connell (1984), Pioneer Women (drawn from frontierwomen's journals, letters, and memories of frontier life) by Stratton (1981), Uncle Tom's Children, a book of short stories by Richard Wright (1936/1963), and Son of the Middle Border (1917/1978) and Main Traveled Roads (1899/1976), tales of life in the Upper Midwest.
at the turn of the nineteenth century by Hamlin Garland. I also recommended *The Republican Roosevelt* (1974) and *Woodrow Wilson* (1956), political biographies by Blum (one of the authors of *The National Experience*, 1993), Erich Maria Remarque's stark depiction of life in World War I German trenches in *All Quiet on the Western Front* (1928/1958), and depictions of the war in Vietnam including *Vietnam*, by Kornow (1983) (a history of the war), *A Rumor of War*, by Caputo (1977) *Going After Cacciatic* (1978) and *the Things they Carried* (1990) by Tim O'Brien, *Fields of Fire*, by Webb (1978), (all are fictional treatments of the war), *Everything We Had*, by Santoli (1981) (oral histories) and *Dispatches*, by Herr (1977), a journalist’s experiences of the war. Overall, forty books in addition to the texts in the course were recommended, discussed, and written on their list.

By maintaining a recommended reading list throughout the year, I introduced students to the possibility of sources in addition to all of the ones we looked at in class and encouraged student reading of historians' writing on their own (and students have told me that they did indeed read some of the books off the list after the course was over). I modeled the use of sources in my own work, and reinforced the idea of history as having different interpretations, historians having different perspectives, and all of it being a social construction.

**Support for Student Learning in the Formal Teacher-Developed History Curriculum**

Quite a bit of work is completed in small groups in addition to the work that students complete in the episodes. Students prepare for the War of 1812 debates, discuss the material they have been reading, role play different historical figures reacting to historical events (William Lloyd Garrison, John Calhoun, and Theodore Weld, reacting to the Missouri Compromise, the Compromise of 1850, the Dred Scott decision, and the publication of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (Stowe, 1852/1986), for example,
play the Civil War Generals game and throughout the year discuss *The National Experience* author's perspective, intention, theme, and thesis. These uses of small groups are in addition to the four episodes where students examine historical topics (the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln, The Great War, and the 60s) through secondary and primary sources. This additional small-group work is intended to support students as they explore new materials and new perspectives within what can be an intimidating course.

The modeling of the issues of historiography and sourcing was done in each writing prompt students received for their essays which they answered as a part of each chapter or unit test as well as for their essays written solely using secondary and primary sources (episodes) as discussed earlier. In addition student writing was supported through the use of a holistic scoring guide which was originally developed by Cathy Tucker for the Language Arts Department and which I revised to include historiographic elements. For the complete scoring guides, literature and history, see Appendix I. The guide presents five grade categories with descriptions: 8-9 Demonstrates Outstanding Achievement, 6-7 Demonstrates Competence, 4-5 Demonstrates Progress Towards Competence, 2-3 Demonstrates Strong Need For Intervention and 1 Unacceptable.

An examination of the highest category will show the inclusion of specific historiographic approaches. To receive a nine, the highest possible score, student's writings must show higher level thought; reveal excellent reasoning and insight, work from a precise thesis/angle, be written with an appropriate voice, and have a clear focus and thoughtful organization. In addition, students' writings must answers all elements
of the question posed, contain few or no punctuation, spelling, or usage errors, and exhibit no sentence fragments or run-ons and a variety of sentence types and interesting, fresh, clear diction.

Beyond these requirements for any good piece of expository writing, students must cite source(s) throughout the paper at the appropriate level of attribution, include well-developed ideas with extensive accurate supporting evidence, use precise historical detail, and make appropriate use of historical imagination, historical perspective, and/or the modern viewpoint. Each of the requirements reflects the issues of making an historical argument.

Characteristics of the Instructional Context that May Foster the Learning of History

Given the exploratory nature of my research, at best I can only generate hypotheses, rather than draw any conclusions about the relationship between the formal teacher-developed integrated curriculum that my teaching partner and I developed, the history curriculum I developed, and the ways that students discussed issues of historiography in teacher-led discussions and examined secondary and primary sources. More conclusive evidence about these relationships can come only from research that starts out with the goal of establishing a cause and effect relationship between these conventions and student learning.

First it seems that the classroom teacher-led discussions were important as curricular conversations that displayed and engaged students in the conventions that govern ways of knowing and doing that were encouraged and required on day-to-day basis. The examination of teacher-led classes in this chapter suggests some possible ways I hoped to shape students’ reading and thinking about historical texts. For example, one convention of historical conversations is the citing of one’s sources by using authors’ last names. When I led discussion of their reading I referred to
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“Morgan,” instead of “The National Experience” (Blum, et al., 1993). By bringing in outside materials and discussing the authors’ perspective and interpretation as well as by giving students multiple secondary and primary sources, it seems fair to suggest that students may have begun to think about history as a construction of a community of scholars.

Perhaps more directly, the class discussions of the question, “What is history?” engaged students in discussions of a topic about which historians continue to write (Collingwood, 1956; Carr, 1961). During these discussions I asked students their own ideas about issues of historians as a community of scholars, historical fact, the social construction of history, perspective, and interpretation; again, all issues of concern to modern historians (Collingwood, 1956; Carr, 1961; Lytle and Davidson, 1986).

Still another aspect of the classroom conversation that may have influenced students’ understanding of and engagement in the historian’s conversation was the type of activities that students completed. The Newsweek activity and the episodes were activities mentioned in this chapter which put secondary and primary sources in students’ hands and set them to a task which an historian would likely tackle. In the light of research which suggests the role of writing in developing students’ thinking, possibly the most important activity was the writing that students completed as they made, wrote about, and shared their own decisions about what should be a part of history.

Another aspect of the classroom conversation which may have supported student learning was the structure of the conversational domain. While the content was organized in an episodic format due to the broader interdisciplinary goal of the course, the discussions and tasks were cumulative. By revisiting the issue of “What is history?” and re-examining all materials including textbooks as secondary or primary sources that...
need to be addressed critically, the structure of the classroom conversational domain may have encouraged students to rethink issues or build on their initial positions. Tasks, especially in the episodes, were cumulative as well. The fact that students were faced with increasingly difficult tasks using an increasing number of secondary and primary sources may have supported students' deeper engagement in the curricular conversation and allowed them to become a sort of cognitive apprentice, to use Brown's term (Brown, 1989). Ultimately the structure of the classroom conversation may enable students to participate in the conversation of history independent of that very structure.

The high quantity and quality of materials used may suggest to students that there is more than one interpretation of the significance of an historical event or person. Students may engage vicariously in the historians' conversation as they read and think about the materials assigned. The social dynamics of classroom culture seem to have been conducive to learning. The examination of the classroom conversation in room 221 suggests that through more open-ended discussions students have the opportunity to engage with the discipline of history rather than looking for the right answer.

The nature of the literacy tasks students were engaged in—reading, writing, whole group and small-group tasks—may have provided support for students as they engaged in the classroom conversation. The readings were all by historians (rather than textbook-creation committees) or were primary sources of recognized value (taken from Henry Steele Commager's collection, Documents In American History, 1949, 1973). The task as students read was not just to collect information but to understand the writer's perspective and interpretation as well as the way the author made his or her argument. The small-group tasks asked students to assume some, but not all, of the chores of historians: analyzing documents, examining sources, synthesizing information, and writing out one's thoughts.
Students were put in a situation where they "handled" the tools historians use to analyze the past as they worked with secondary and primary sources. By discussing the habits-of-mind associated with historical analysis, historians as a community of scholars, historical facts, social construction of knowledge, perspective and interpretation, students may have been slightly more able to try on these ideas as they created their own understandings of history. All of this is said recognizing that simply watching teachers model behaviors is insufficient to ensure that students try it themselves (Langer, Confer, and Sawyers, 1993; Smagorinsky and Fly, 1993). More to the point, perhaps, students acted as a community of scholars as they examined the secondary and primary sources related to each episode, discussing the ideas of the authors as well as their own ideas of how to tackle the writing task that faced them. Perhaps by both discussing and using historians' tools, students may begin to see these tools as their own. This is the question I consider in chapter 5.

Thus there is another way to see this description of interaction in room 221 and that is in light of situated cognition. When taken with the contents of the following chapter as students work independently with secondary and primary sources, this description fits the criteria for cognitive apprenticeship which Brown, et al. (1989) describe as an important part of student learning. In a situation of cognitive apprenticeship, the teachers discuss their underlying understandings of the nature and structure of the curricular domain and model their strategies for working in that domain through the performance of authentic activities. Next, teachers support students' attempts at completing an authentic task. Finally, students are enabled to continue the task independently. In this chapter you have seen the teachers' attempts to model the
ideas and methods of their particular curricular domains as well as support student learning within that particular domain. In chapter 5 we will see students working on their own.

If Applebee (1993, 1996) and Brown, et al. (1989) are correct then we should find evidence that students from this context take on the ideas, methods and tools of historians as they work independently as a part of the enacted curriculum. This is the primary issue explored in chapter five.
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CHAPTER 5

THE STUDY OF HISTORY IN SMALL-GROUP DISCUSSIONS

As historians examine various historical events with an eye to explaining their significance, they do so with the understanding that interpretations vary according to the philosophical background each historian brings to the topic, the sources upon which they are drawing, and the social and political contexts in which historians are writing. Historians then examine or question each other's work and evaluate what the work has to offer about the issue in question (Collingwood, 1956). In effect, historians are engaged in a conversation about the significance of an event or person and the variety of possible interpretations now current. Carr argues that "[History] is ... a continuous process of interaction between the historian and his [sic] facts, an unending dialogue between the present and the past" (p. 35). Furthermore, within the community of historians there are accepted interpretations which have been examined and critiqued by other historians' theories that were constructed within a community of scholars (Collingwood, 1958). If this is the way that historians know and do their work, it seemed to me that informed students should know these habits-of-mind, examine them as a part of their reading, and discuss them and their ramifications within the context of classroom discussions. The classroom curriculum and instructional context I described
in chapter 4 were intended to introduce a group of eleventh grade students to such ways of knowing and doing. However, I also wondered to what extent the students had internalized these ways of thinking. Accordingly, in this chapter, I examine one group’s discussion of history over a school year.

Samuel Wineburg (1991a) suggests that there are three strategies which enhance historians’ understanding of texts: contextualization, corroboration, and sourcing. Wineburg then argues that the use of these strategies reflects historians’ understanding of history as a social creation by the author which was influenced by the author’s experiences and perspective. If these are the specific strategies that historians use to understand both primary and secondary sources, then students who are “thinking as historians” might also use these strategies as they work with primary and secondary sources. Their use of these strategies would be revealed in the ways that they talk about the sources as they work on their own.

My analysis of the materials from my one-school-year study of students learning history in an Advanced Placement American Studies classroom revolves around three issues. In classroom discussions, do the students begin to show an understanding of issues of historians as a community of scholars, the distinction between historical fact and historical writing, and the issues of interpretation and perspective? Then, if students have internalized such ways of knowing, how do their small-group discussions reflect the use of these strategies that Wineburg (1991a) identified as showing a historian’s mind-set? Finally, if students have taken on the historian’s mind-set during the school year, what issues might they initiate in discussion by the end of that year?

In this chapter, I attempt to explain how, when, and why general historiographic ideas and historians’ strategies are used in small-group discussions. My argument will be that the processes used in small-group discussion are related to students’
participation in the discourse used to study history over a school year. Accordingly, to explore how students use the heuristics for historical understanding, I will look first at students' comments during teacher-led discussions of “What is history?” that will include a consideration of concepts such as community of scholars, the writing of history, and historical perspective. Then I examine students' use of these concepts and other heuristics as they work independently in small groups at the beginning of the year (September, 1994), in the middle of the year (January and February, 1995) and again at the end of the year (June, 1995).

Students' Understanding of the Concept of Historians as a Community of Scholars

Perhaps the most difficult issue for students to grasp was the notion of historians as a community of scholars. At the end of the first discussion in September, the notion of historians as a community of scholars was explored, only because I brought it up. Students acknowledged that historians record events, happenings, people; sort through and identify the most important events; find ways to connect events through cause and effect; and use primary and secondary sources. When I asked “Why is history not just opinion?” students responded that there are certain things everyone agrees upon, that different groups look at what is done, and that historians generalize statements and use specifics to support their statements. In this first class discussion, it did not occur to students that historians communicate with each other. When I suggested that this was the case, Jack exemplified the students’ surprise at the idea, “So it’s like a discussion of what's important and what's not?” In the follow-up discussion on September 7, students again ignored the importance of a group of historians as a community of scholars as we discussed differing interpretations of history.

In later discussions, we discussed the issue of historians as a community of scholars regularly in class and the students seemed to begin to include it in their
thinking. During the January 3, 1995 discussion of “What is history?”, Jack alluded to historians as a community of scholars when he responded to my question about what are major "things" in history: “They have to decide that.” Then I asked who decides and he responded, "Historians." Students spoke more directly about historians as a community of scholars in a later section of the same discussion about the differing treatments of the Salem Witch Trials by Miller in The Crucible (1959/1968) and Morgan in The National Experience (Blum, et al., 1993).

Mitch: History is the consensus viewpoint of historians not just the view of one historian. Interpretations, you need stuff to back it up. We have six different historians in this book and they must agree with [each other].

Charlie: When they write it down they have to have evidence and they have to agree

Kell: I would agree with Mitch except that it doesn’t mean that all historians agree with it. There are historians that may disagree. Some sort of respected communities and it is their consensus that becomes history.

Lehman: Yes there are mainstream and fringe historians. For example, according to fringe historians there was no Holocaust, even in the face of all the evidence and people who live through them, such as the book Night by Elie Wiesel.

Judy: A consensus of a majority of historians but individual historians take a lot of liberty. . . for their purpose they use different parts of history, for their own opinions.

Mitch: They talk to each other and come to a consensus

Krys: Are there historical conventions getting together to share ideas? I sort of saw them getting together and sharing their ideas. Otherwise stuff would get lost.

In this class discussion students explored the notion of a community of scholars, and they seemed to understand how it might help explain differing interpretations of events. One would hope that these understandings would intensify and be an automatic
part of their understandings by the end of the year. However, students referred to the
notion of a community of scholars only once when we discussed “What is history?” on
June 6, 1995.

Tracy: I didn’t realize in the beginning of the year that historians
determine what the students or people in general learn in history
because we read about things in After the Fact that were never
mentioned in The National Experience. So I have a higher
respect for that and for historians now because we only get what
they want to talk about, all the circumstances of the entire era.

These discussions suggest that students were able to transfer the notion of the
community of scholars to the six historians who wrote their main textbook. It is
interesting that Krys explores the way it works, when she asks “Are there conventions
getting together to share ideas?” as a follow up to Tracy’s comment. Having a nascent
understanding of this community opens students to the idea that history is a construction
by both a community and the members of that community.

This idea of a community of scholars was seemingly the most difficult for
students to take on during teacher-led discussions. Perhaps it was the least interesting,
or the least modeled, or the hardest to see from an isolated high school classroom. I
assumed they understood about journal articles, responses, books and sharing papers at
conferences and discussing them, but that is based on my experiences in college and as
a professional. I did not not discuss the way that historians function as a community of
scholars until Krys asked in class well into the year. In spite of their limited
experiences, however, my students seem to have begun to include the concept of
community in their thinking about historical interpretation.
Students' Understanding Historical Fact Versus Social Construction of Writing

During the very first discussion of "What is history?" (9/1/94), students discussed the importance of fact to history and the part fact plays in historical writing. Students presented facts as important in history’s record of events, people, and ideas that are somehow significant today. They also mentioned issues such as interpretation and perspective, if not in any detailed way.

On January 3, nearing the end of first semester, I took the class through a discussion of “What is history?” The following is an excerpt from that audiotaped discussion. In this teacher-led discussion, students examine not just the importance of facts, but the relationship of facts to the idea of social construction in historical writing. Jack grapples with notion of significance in terms of historical facts, Miriam raises the issue of opinion and finally Grace makes a clear distinction between historical fact and the social construction of history.

Lehman: What is history?
Jack: Collection, organization, and interpretations of historical facts
Lehman: What are historical facts?
Jack: Facts that happened in the past, known things
Lehman: What do you mean, “known” things?
Jack: Things that happened, events that happened.
Lehman: Jefferson sneezed, that’s a historical fact?
Jack: Significant events that happened
Lehman: What does it mean to be “significant”?
Jack: Major things.
Lehman: What does “major” mean?
Jack: They have to decide that
Jack: Historians

Miriam: What's major? The opinion of historians

Lehman: What's “opinion”? 

Miriam: Facts that, not, well it could be facts, what the historian thinks is important.

Lehman: What they decide to write down?

Miriam: Historians have to make a choice.

Grace: I don't want to add to that. I want to make a distinction between the writing of history and history. Historians write about what happened. We are talking about what they write, not what happened.

Lehman: You’re making the distinction between the content and the writing?

Grace: Yes.

During class discussion on June 6, 1995, students spoke at length about the issue of historical facts and the social construction of history; this was the last class day before exams and the end of the school year. The initial response, by Judy, to my question of "What is history?" raises the issue of facts. To assist the reader with this extended transcription from the taped teacher-led discussion, I will present comments from the teacher-led discussion in a double column format next to my analytical comments.
Teacher-led discussion, June 6, 1995

Judy: At the beginning of the year I really had the opinion that history was just basically fact, and I guess that I thought most things were presented in the same way, that historians had to write the actual truth, now I really because of all of the sources that we read.

Rachel: I was just going to say that the one thing that sort of, not changed my idea, but added to it was the pictures that Jacob Riis (1901/1971) took and how he sort of made it so it, they would project the idea that he wanted, even though it was a good idea, everyone was morally correct, still it had such obvious opinion. And that was like the one thing that made me see that historians and people in general can give you an idea by the way they present information.

Leah: I think it is a lot harder than I thought it would be, because you are doing so many different sources and everything. I always thought that you had the facts that everyone agreed on and that have always been the accepted in the communities but it is actually a lot more in-depth than I thought it was. You have to actually formulate your own ideas about what happened. But those, they come out anyway, but you have to kind of deal with those, and not put them in too much but not ignoring them.

Commentary
Judy begins the discussion with comments about how she sees her thinking about history changing over the year.

Rachel couched her thoughts about social construction with a reference to historical fact.

The discussion shifted to a comparison of the historians they read this year. Leah responded with a comment about the difficulty of dealing with historical facts.
Paula: I think it is harder because before I would just use the book or whatever, to support what I was thinking but now, especially with the 60s one [fourth episode], more of it, with all of the secondary sources and all the primary sources and the films and everything that you could use instead of making it easier it was harder to do, because like Caroline said about picking through and picking and trying to find things that best represent what you think or what everyone else was thinking, I think, I liked this book better in the end than in the beginning but it is harder to get one idea.

Grace: I was just going to say that I really liked this book *After the Fact* because it really shows what historians have to go through like the seeming fact but *After the Fact* you see all those other things that point in other directions and that is sort of what we did with our timed writings and all this work and we had to look at different perspective and why we chose which one we picked and so I really like that book.

Rachel: I wanted to comment on what Paula said? I didn't like having all the resources. I just found it, I mean, of course it was much better in the final product but I found it hard, how do you figure out who is right and who is wrong and everyone's opinions contrast, you know when I was watching the video for our last timed writing, the woman said one thing and the video said another and then someone else said another and it was just so complicated. Of course in the end it was better because you should get lots of information but I just found it was hard to extrapolate information.

Krys: I was going to say that in beginning of the year, when we did that little exercise where we had to

Lehman: The *Newsweek*?
Krys: Right, I think that that exercise really showed me how difficult it was to sort out information that was important, like some people before then. Sometimes it seems that there are things that have to be put in the history and, there are, but there are some things that can be excluded and it is so hard to decide because it might be really important and it might not be and you don't know and you don't know the perspective of the year that the people have later and I think that this has really shown that. And the other comment I had was I agree with Grace that After the Fact is probably the best history book that I have ever read so far because it just made it so interesting to read about it. And it really showed a different perspective about history.

Rachel, Leah, Paula, Grace, and Krys all include the relationship between historical fact and social construction as they examine the issue for the last time in the year. Again, having made this distinction may predispose students to a shift in their understanding of history from a bunch of facts to be memorized to a text that is written by an author. Further, the thinking that students revealed in these quotes suggests that students are coming to see that history might be interpreted not as truth but as tentative interpretations of what happened (the "facts") and why. As Krys said, "... it is so hard to decide because it might be really important and it might not be, and you don't know, and you don't know the perspective of the year that the people have later."

Students' Understanding Of The Concepts Of Interpretation and Perspective

Students' favorite historiographic topic was the role of interpretation and perspective. They came into class with some awareness of this issue. In the very first class discussion of "What is history?" on September 1, students were already making comments such as, "History is the interpretation of actual events through regular people and through historians." Another student commented in that early discussion that "History is the interpretations of past scenarios or actions, the thoughts, the spoken
word, generation by generation history changes." Most students agreed with the student who said that "History is the opinions of people, even a primary source, you have an opinion in it."

In the class discussion on Tuesday 1/3/95, students grappled with an understanding of the ideas of interpretation and perspective. Miriam raised the question of people at the same time but on different sides of an issue as having different perspectives while Krys raised the idea of international perspectives.

Lehman: Someone mentioned perspectives

Miriam: The person that was there and was on one side has different ideas than the person on the other side who has his own ideas.

Lehman: So one perspective is the people who have actually been in the event. The slave’s perspective (Slave Narrative), the owner’s, the abolitionists. Any other perspectives.

Linda: Well the perceptive of the modern world, and then what they think about the future. There might be a lot of cults around in the future and they will think Waco’s important and we don’t.

Lehman: The modern world is always changing so its’ perceptive is always changing.

Krys: Different countries have different perspectives. Like I was talking to my dad and the Dispatch said that the Americans did something and that wasn’t so, it was the Russians. So I was talking about how it is different from different countries’ views. Americans have different interpretation of leaders of Russia.

In another take on the issue of perspective, students discussed the styles and themes of the authors of their text (the sources). Students not only discussed one of our historians and his style but compared him to an earlier historian we read. The following example comes from expanded field notes. Friday, February 10, 1995

We talked about McFeeley [The National Experience] as well. Yesterday before the test Alice came up and said that we had changed authors but that we had not talked about it. [Today] I gave her credit for that and then I asked how many kids had noticed the change. About a third said they had.
Then we talked about McFeeley's style. The responses were mixed, leaning toward favorable. The kids said that they noticed that he did more zingers and had fewer quotes than Stampp. Others thought he flowed more smoothly than Stampp.

Leah did not like his descriptive style, she pointed out that he talked about how tall everyone was and she thought that was stupid, that it was unnecessary information and why did she have to wade through it?

Other people responded to the issue of McFeeley's descriptive style and said they liked it, one student said it connected with her early experience with history and reminded her of how much her thinking has changed. Other students said that McFeeley is hard to tell what his thesis is. That Morgan said it up front, Stampp put it at the end and now McFeeley sort of weaves it all through so you have to read all of it very carefully to get his ideas.

On February 24, 1995, students showed that they had paid attention to the modeling and were aware that they were supposed to be paying attention to the notion of sources and perspectives, at least under my watchful eye during this discussion of Lincoln and the historians who wrote about him. Students showed their awareness by mentioning historians by name, discussing the historian’s interpretation, and using specific historical examples at my instigation. All of these discussions occurred after students had worked in small groups with the secondary and primary sources under consideration. Because the excerpts from this discussion are lengthy, I have presented the discussion and my commentary in a double column format.
Februar} , 1995 teacher-led discussion

Lehman: So what did you decide was McFeeley's take on Lincoln?

Matt: Didn't McFeeley say he was a strong person because he didn't let himself be dominated by his cabinet?

Lehman: Very good. He made a strong cabinet for the most part but didn't knuckle under to them or under to the military.

Bess- Can I say one thing on the positive? McFeeley was saying that he was concentrating on saving the nation while everyone else panicked. How strong he was and had a goal.

Lehman: How about Hofstadter? A different perspective, especially compared to McFeeley? Rachel?

Rachel: Hofstadter compared him by displaying the myths about Lincoln and downplaying them. I think he was saying Lincoln was a real person.

Lehman: What is some of the evidence that he uses to shatter the myths about Lincoln? not flattering?

Kell: The time he gave the two speeches close in time but in different geographical and they said different things. exactly, same issue, different speeches.

Mitch: He said that he was lazy, used Herndon, said not practice law just sit outside and think about political future.

Carol: Our group came to a consensus that Hofstadter said that Lincoln was using tactics to make himself look like a normal guy, little engine that could.
Lehman: Is that he was a politician something to discredit him or is it something that made him good? Are you going to buy Hofstadter or are you going to buy Wills.

Judy: Basically Hofstadter is offering information to let you make up your mind whether you think it is good to be a politician or not.

Rachel: Wills is making the exact opposite thing.

Lehman: Anything you wanted to ask about for the Primary sources. I think they are self explanatory.

Rachel: It's kind of hard because they all back up the point that Lincoln was a politician because one contradicts the other.

Lehman: They contradict each other?

Rachel: I think they do.

Lehman: What's happening with the speeches?

Rachel: What our group decided is that at the beginning he needed the votes so he was neutral and didn't say true feeling but at the end he could say what he really thought.

Miriam: I think you can argue either. Either that he wanted support because he had the view all along or that as time passed he grew and changed.

Lehman: And that he grew as president.

Rachel: But we don't really know.

Miriam: You don't know, you don't know all along, because he had a vision, but he criticized Blacks and was accused of racism and you don't know if he was doing that to get people to like him or because he believed it and changed over time.

Lehman: And no one can ever really know those questions.

Miriam: Right. I just think from the speeches you can't tell what he really thinks.
Tuesday, June 6, 1995 was the last day of the regular school year prior to final exams. And for one last time, I asked students the question "What is history?" Again students found the notion of interpretation and perspective intriguing. They seemed to enjoy a return to their favorite historiographic issue. They showed their awareness of the role of interpretation and perspective in history in the following excerpts.

June, 1995 Teacher-led discussion

Judy: That historians didn't have any opinions in which manner they were going to present it and that basically they were all the same, but now after the different sources we read from and all the different authors I changed that opinion, I believe that history and the way they presented has a lot to do with who the person is and what they believe and how they interpret it, our opinions about history are influence by how the historians present the information, you know different view points on it, different angles or issues, I don't think that there is just one way of looking at it.

Lehman: Other reactions?

John: I agree with Judy, as in the beginning of the year, I thought history was a straight forward interpretation of this happened then and this happened next. But then I especially saw, when we got to Abraham Lincoln and there were so many different perspectives of just one man, that kind of represented how history has many perspectives of one event. And we talked about historical perspective, and we talked about another, I forget what the other one was

(Laughter)

Lehman: And historical imagination,

John: Yeah, like how that interprets the time and how some people are treated, and they are going to have a different interpretation of that one thing than maybe another group. may have one interpret and people another. I just think it all depends on who you are and what you think at that point in history.

Commentary

Both Judy and John indicate how their ideas about interpretation and perspective have changed over the course of the year as they worked with multiple primary and secondary sources.
Kell: I think that is interesting when looking at different historical perspectives in that sometimes historical perspectives contradict one another? And that implies that at least one of them is incorrect and I think that that is interesting and we never know which one is closer to the "truth" of what happened.

Grace: Well I still think that what everybody is saying is more the writing of history and the interpretation of history rather than history itself. I mean, to me history is still what happened in the past but the writing and the interpretation of history is what everybody else has been saying, with different angles and the materials that you use and your own bias.

Libby: I agree with that and I also learned that historians often take themes with their writing, like in The National Experience, we interpreted who the writer was and you could tell what their perspective was, kind of like personal things they put in their writing.

Kell: I was just thinking how interesting it was listening to other people talk when you listen to people talk its almost like you ask "What is history?" and its like they are saying that historians create history instead of historians study history.

Lehman: So what do you think?

Kell: I think historians study history.

Lehman: What do you see the distinction between those ideas as being?

Later in the discussion students returned to their awareness of historical interpretation and perspective. Kell is intrigued by the possibility of conflicting interpretations. Grace makes the distinction between the past and the social construction of interpretations while Libby brings up her new view of our main textbook.

At the end of the discussion, Kell brings the discussion back to the awareness of the role of interpretation in the writing of history.
Kell: I see history more as the events and historians study and apply interpretations to those events. And the difference with historians creating history is if historians create history then history is the interpretations. I just think that is an interesting distinction to look at.

John: Yeah, like how that interprets the time and how some people are treated, and they are going to have a different interpretation of that one thing than maybe another group. may have one interpret and people another. I just think it all depends on who you are and what you think at that point in history.

Miriam: I think maybe its your own interpretation of it. Because, after reading all the different sources you have to decide what perspective, or you might not even decide it but its’ whatever one sticks in your mind, that’s the way you are going to view it. So it really depends on you.

Tracy: I agree with all, history is a bunch of perspectives, One thing I think is important is that as a reader of history, you have to decide who the audience of the historian is supposed to be. If its a history book and its a general overview and fairly unbiased, not necessarily biased.

Leah: It kind of made me mad to think about that, because there are so many things we might have lost a long time ago, when there were just white historians, like about the slavery, you know, we ‘re probably never going to get the full story of what went on even though there is, some accounts. like we read that one in After the Fact where they set up the two interviewers, I just think that it kind of makes you angry that you are never going to get the full story out of things, because there were so many, there was one perspective at sometimes, that you are not going to get everyone else’s.
Rachel: I think one thing that Leah said earlier about how she didn’t like how before she wasn’t getting that many perspectives and now there are a lot of perspectives and how there was one point of view mostly around Native American history. I agree with her, and I don’t, now we are getting so many perspectives that a lot of people are going to think that, well we did get perspectives back then and that’s just the only side of the story I mean we get so many sides of the story, so many perspectives now and I just think someone who didn’t realize how limited they were back then aren’t going to realize how much they are missing.

Howard: I was just going to say, we were talking about how it was interesting that there are different perspectives and you had to choose which one we were going to use, I was just going to say you really do have a limited perspective of what you are learning, I guess that’s why we have so many sources, your experience, there are certain things that are left out, that’s probably what surprised me, comparing our textbook and *After the Fact* and stuff like that. I just thought that that was, I never thought about that about how we are only learning what an historian wants to tell you.

After a lengthy discussion comparing various historians that we read this year, Rachel brings the talk back to concerns about the role of interpretation shares similar concerns with Leah.

Howard has the final concern about interpretation. He, too, seems justly upset in the limitations he faces and the role that interpretation plays.

When students talk about the notion of interpretation and perspective they come close to actually talking about the issue of sources and the need to identify the author of the text to better understand the text. In this extended excerpt, students are closer to talking about history as a social construct rather than a set of facts. These comments are the best example of students’ own social construction of history as they point out their concerns, so students are not just aware of the historiographic topics but of the concerns about the ramifications of history being written in this manner, all of which suggests students have a deeper understanding beyond recognition.
It seems that my teacher-led discussions taught students several things. I attempted to focus their attention explicitly on the analytic procedures of checking for sourcing and noting the context of the piece. In response to my questions, students elaborated upon their answers and I hope they developed some personal authority for their interpretation by exploring their own lines of inquiry and interpretation. Still, all of these discussions occurred under my directions. It is obvious that students at least "knew what I wanted to hear." It is less obvious how much students are taking on these ways of thinking for their own. An example of students' discussions in independent small groups may begin to give us an idea of how much students are internalizing their habits-of-mind.

**Students' Use of Historiographic Strategies in Small-Group Discussions**

To examine my students' independent use of the historians conventions in small groups, I used Wineburg's (1991a, 1991b) research into the differences between experts and novices using primary and secondary sources. Beginning in November and ending the first week of June, the ten discussions focused on the Declaration of Independence (2), Lincoln (2), World War One (3), and the 1960s (3). In each taped session, students were directed to examine the primary and secondary materials related to the topic at hand in preparation for an essay question to which students would be asked to respond in writing at the end of the unit. The questions, the tasks that they implied, and the overall rationale for the organization of each episode were discussed extensively in chapter 3 and chapter 4. Each small-group discussion was coded for student uses of the strategies that Wineburg identified in the responses of historians: contextualization, corroboration, and sourcing. Although my research does not follow the same
methodology as Wineburg's, his study of historians' strategies is valuable to illustrate how, if at all, students have internalized historians' ways of knowing, especially when they are not under the "teacher's thumb."

Wineburg (1991a, 1991b) has argued that historians internalized certain strategies which they used to understand unfamiliar history texts. The use of these strategies then suggested the historians' belief that history is a construction rather than a set of facts. It is obvious from the extended excerpts of teacher-led discussions already examined that in class the students saw historians' methods modeled and then tried them themselves. My students, at least tentatively, seem to have taken on this mind-set based on their comments in classroom discussion.

Two questions give focus to this part of my research: (a) To what extent have my students internalized ways of knowing of historians after participating in class discussions; and if they have internalized them, how and in what form do the strategies appear in students' small-group discussions? Do they take forms similar to Wineburg's historians or are my students perhaps using other strategies? If sourcing, corroboration, and contextualization are used in small-group discussions this would support the idea that my students have begun to acquire a deeper understanding of history, that is, an understanding of history as an interpretation and as a social construction rather than as a collection of facts. The analysis of small-group discussions examined the extent to which my students began to think about history on a conceptual level that included habits-of-mind developed by historians. Before turning to a discussion of how the students negotiated their understandings of various historical texts, I will review patterns of turn-taking across the ten discussions.

205
Speaker Turns

The small group that became the focus of my analysis consisted of six high school juniors, three boys (Mitch, Howard, Roger) and three girls (Krys, Libby, Lilly). Over the school year and across ten discussions the group produced 4,528 turns and 998 references to the documents. A 'turn' is defined as a student’s spoken comment uttered until she or he is interrupted by another member of the group or until he or she stops talking. Given the complex give-and-take between group members in which students rarely complete an utterance due to interruptions, I decided to use turns as a boundary for oral discourse. Since there was no teacher present, the group conversation could be expected to be more “natural.”

Broadly speaking, Table 5.1 suggests that the turns taken by each group member as well as by the male and female members of the group show that group discussions were usually democratic. Mitch talked the most often, ranging from nineteen percent to thirty-two percent with an overall average of twenty-three percent (1060 turns) from the ten discussions. Even though Lilly was absent for one of the small-group discussions, she had the second most turns (908), and her involvement ranged from ten percent to twenty-seven percent with an average twenty percent of turns. Roger spoke the third highest percentage with a year average of seventeen percent, Howard was fourth with fourteen percent, Libby fifth with ten percent and Krys took nine percent of the turns over the year. As Cathy Tucker and I made the rounds of the group and answered questions, we made an average of five percent of the comments counted as turns across the ten discussions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episodes</th>
<th>Howard turns/total=</th>
<th>Mitch turns/total=</th>
<th>Roger turns/total=</th>
<th>Lilly turns/total=</th>
<th>Libby turns/total=</th>
<th>Krys turns/total=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Independence</td>
<td>22/229</td>
<td>59/229</td>
<td>2/229</td>
<td>60/229</td>
<td>39/229</td>
<td>33/229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Independence</td>
<td>45/431</td>
<td>109/431</td>
<td>45/431</td>
<td>76/431</td>
<td>48/431</td>
<td>69/431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Secondary Sources</td>
<td>139/608</td>
<td>189/608</td>
<td>47/608</td>
<td>137/608</td>
<td>64/608</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Primary Sources</td>
<td>82/325</td>
<td>97/325</td>
<td>42/325</td>
<td>78/325</td>
<td>21/325</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War One Secondary Sources</td>
<td>40/429</td>
<td>116/429</td>
<td>88/429</td>
<td>85/429</td>
<td>18/344</td>
<td>72/429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%*</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War One Primary Sources</td>
<td>24/449</td>
<td>99/449</td>
<td>87/449</td>
<td>99/449</td>
<td>32/449</td>
<td>86/449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War One Fiction</td>
<td>37/483</td>
<td>95/483</td>
<td>99/483</td>
<td>87/483</td>
<td>25/483</td>
<td>93/483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s Second Episode</td>
<td>49/254</td>
<td>81/254</td>
<td>66/254</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>50/254</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s Third Episode</td>
<td>130/875</td>
<td>132/875</td>
<td>202/872</td>
<td>240/875</td>
<td>92/875</td>
<td>32/208*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>695/</td>
<td>1060/</td>
<td>754/</td>
<td>908/</td>
<td>443/</td>
<td>427/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean percentages</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to rounding and the absence of teacher comments, the percentages do not add up to 100 percent.

*Left class early to participate in an assembly.
†Arrived in class more than halfway through the period.

Table 5.1: Number of turns by each small-group member for each episode.
Table 5. 2 indicates that when females were compared to males, the percentages for the year were fifty-five percent for males and thirty-nine percent for females. Although men had sixteen percent more of the turns, there were three episodes with one of the women absent for at least a part, if not all of the period (Lincoln secondary sources, Lincoln primary sources, W.W.I secondary sources) and one episode when two women were absent [1960s (2)]. During the second discussion of the episode on the 1960s, however, the turns were roughly even at nineteen percent (Howard), thirty-two percent (Mitch), twenty-six percent (Roger), and twenty-two percent (Libby). Also if only the turns that Lilly, Libby, and Krys were able to participate in are examined, Lilly participated twenty-one percent of the time. Libby, ten percent and Krys, fifteen percent, making the findings even more democratic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episodes</th>
<th>Mean Percentage of Turns Taken by Male Members of the Small Groups</th>
<th>Mean Percentage of Turns Taken by Female Members of the Small Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Independence—Secondary Sources</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Independence—Primary Sources</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln—Secondary Sources</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>33%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln—Primary Sources</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>30%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War One—Secondary Sources</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>41%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War One—Primary Sources</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War One—Fiction</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960S (1)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960S (2)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>22%§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960S (3)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to rounding and the absence of teacher comments, the percentages do not add up to 100 percent.

*Krys absent
**Libby left class early to participate in an assembly.
§Lilly and Krys were both absent.
§§Krys arrived in class more than halfway through the period.

Table 5.2: Percentage of turns taken by male and female small-group members.
While Mitch and Lilly took the floor more often than their peers, I would not say that they dominated the discussion. Consider that when Krys was present for an entire small-group discussion, she took between 14 percent and 19 percent of the turns. Another example of the even-handedness of the discussions was Roger's number of turns. He started as the quietest group member (Declaration of Independence, secondary sources—0.9 percent) and ended as having the third highest number of turns (Year total—17 percent). (Refer back to Table 5.1.)

In addition, the total number of turns in each episode varies, sometimes dramatically, from episode to episode. This variability was a result of the exigencies of the instructional context: longer or shorter periods due to fire drills, tornado warnings, announcements, assemblies; work from the day before to finish; calendar conflicts; and Cathy, my teaching partner, taking longer to complete an activity than was originally planned. As a result the length of time that students had to work in the small groups was shortened or lengthened.

References to Documents

Wineburg (1991a, 1991b) compared the references that historians made to the documents being read to the references that students made to the same documents. It was in the references to documents that Wineburg found the biggest differences between the two groups: the differences, he believed, indicated significant differences in the way the two groups thought about history. That is, the historians were more likely to use one of three heuristics during references to documents than the students. Accordingly, I focused my research into the small-group conversations on the students' references to documents as well.

Table 5.3 indicated that across the year twenty-two percent of students' turns in the small groups were references to the documents under discussion. In the first
episode, the Declaration of Independence, twenty percent of the students’ statements referred to documents. In the second episode, Lincoln, thirty-two percent of student’s statements are references to the documents under consideration. The percentage of references to documents dips a bit in the discussions of World War One (the third episode) when twenty-six percent of the comments refer to documents and drops dramatically in the discussions of the 1960s (the final episode) when only thirteen percent of the comments refer to the documents. Since I examined a small group of six students, I assumed that if a behavior occurred more than ten percent of the time, that behavior was worthy of a closer examination. Students referred to the documents twenty-two percent of the time with a high of thirty-two percent and a low of thirteen percent, but were they dealing with them as historians would? In order to examine this question, Wineburg's (1991a) strategies of contextualization, corroboration, and sourcing were used to explore students’ references to the various secondary and primary sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episodes with individual discussions</th>
<th>Number of turns for each episode/small-group discussion</th>
<th>Number of turns which were references to the documents used</th>
<th>Percentage of turns which were references to documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Independence</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War One</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary and primary sources (1)</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary and primary sources (2)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary and primary sources (3)</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4528</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>23% mean percentage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Number of turns and number of references to the documents.
Contextualization

Contextualization refers to placing a document in a specific time and location, for example “This speech refers to slaves, so it must have been written before the Civil War” or “Since this author lived in the South, he would have had specific ideas about slavery.” An examination of Table 5.4 shows that my students only occasionally put their documents into context as Wineburg (1991a) describes it. Only once are ten percent of the students’ statements attempts to set the document’s context, and that occurs in the very first discussion of the Declaration of Independence. As the year progresses the percentage of contextualizing statements diminishes to zero. At first this was a troubling finding. On further consideration, however, I thought perhaps that the diminishing use of contextualization is partly the result of the fact that all the materials were read within the framework of a chronologically organized course. The later in the course, the closer to the present the materials would be, and so at least their time period would be of less interest to the students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episodes with individual discussions</th>
<th>Number of turns which were references to the documents</th>
<th>Number of references to the document which included the time period of the document</th>
<th>Number of reference to the location where the document came from</th>
<th>Percentage of contextualization references to documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Independence</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War One</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s second/primary sources (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s second/primary sources (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s second/primary sources (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 Contextualization results
Corroboration

Corroboration refers to comparing or contrasting texts either directly or in a manner which can be inferred from the statement. Hypothetically, a direct comparison might be "Civil War America's ideas about the war seem very similar to Why the South Lost the War." A direct contrast would suggest that the presentations of the two books are not very similar. An indirect comparison or contrast is a comparison or contrast where the second document is not referred to by name but can be inferred from the context. For example, "Civil War America's presentation of the war seems very like (or unlike) the view that the South lost the war rather than that the North won" (a theory argued explicitly by the book Why the South Lost the War that students read earlier in this hypothetical classroom).

Table 5.5 reveals that, with one exception, no striking pattern of corroboration appears in my students' references to the documents. The one exception was a sharp increase in corroboration during the small-group discussion of the "Lincoln" secondary sources in the third episode when twenty percent of students' references to the document were couched in the form of corroboration statements. A closer examination of the discussion of the Lincoln secondary source reveals, however, that many of the corroboration statements come out of a misunderstanding on the part of the students, which is interesting in itself. This requires some explanation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episodes with individual discussions</th>
<th>Number of references to documents</th>
<th>Number of references—comparison to another source</th>
<th>Number of references contrasted to another source</th>
<th>Number of references indirectly compared</th>
<th>Number of references indirectly contrasted</th>
<th>Percentage of references—corroboration statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Independence</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War I</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary &amp; Primary Sources (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary &amp; Primary Sources (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary &amp; Primary Sources (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: Corroboration results.
In class I had presented Stephen Oates’ overview of all the different historical perspectives that have been used to understand Abraham Lincoln and his presidency presented in *Abraham Lincoln: The Man Behind the Myth* (Oates, 1984). These perspectives included Lincoln as “the American Christ,” “Frontier Hero,” “Arch-villain,” “White Honkey,” and “Real Person Who Overcame his Background and Society to Change America” (the most modern interpretation). I thought it was clear from my presentation that the other perspectives were popular before 1970 and all of the secondary sources they read for this episode, with the exception of Hofstadter (1948), took some form of the “Real Person Who Overcame His Background and Society to Change America.” Hofstadter, I pointed out, was the first historian to reject the earlier interpretations of Lincoln and lay the groundwork for the modern perspective. The students either did not remember or did not understand my presentation and proceeded to try to label the documents of the modern historians according to the various historical interpretations—as a result of their misunderstanding, the students ended up working back and forth between documents comparing and contrasting them. For example, the students attempted to identify McPherson’s (1991) view of Lincoln in terms of Oates’ (1984) different historical perspectives on Lincoln. Given that only someone who has read Oates’ analysis would see the direct and indirect comparisons between Oates’ presentation and the other texts students had read, I have italicized the pertinent passages and coded them according to the corroboration heuristic.
Small-group discussion of “Lincoln” Secondary Sources
(During the second episode.)

Mitch: so MacPherson does have a positive view

Libby: It’s more like

Howard: This is really complicated

Libby: *MacPherson doesn’t really fit in with any of Oates’ interpretations but it’s sort of Lincoln as a hero*

Mitch: *I think it’s a cross between Hero and real person*

Libby: Yeah

Lilly: *A prairie hero or a mythic hero?*
Libby: Not

Mitch: We could do that on the back, oh there isn’t a back is there?

Libby: It doesn’t, like, vilify

Howard: *I think it’s hero because*

Libby: The beginnings

Howard: “Everyone else panicked”

Lilly: It says that “he didn’t consider abolishing slavery until it became the way of serving the union.”

Mitch: *Yeah and (reading) MacPherson deftly and convincingly sketches out how Lincoln’s vision and leadership made the necessary revolution possible. Hero!*

Libby: *Hero!*

Mitch: I think it would be, it doesn’t talk about his past

Libby: Yeah

Mitch: It just talks about his present

Howard: I think it’s more than just a real person
Mitch: *It's a cross between* indirect comparison

Lilly: Well it could kind of be

Howard: *It's not an American Christ* indirect contrast

Lilly: Democracy

Mitch: *You know, I think it is almost an American Christ.* indirect comparison

*He doesn't talk about vulgar stories*

Howard: He doesn't talk about

Lilly: But this talks about his death, this is all about after his death

Libby: Yeah, I think that we should just make our own

Lilly: I think this should be

Howard: More what he did and

Mitch: *I think it is between a hero and a real person* indirect comparison

Libby: It glorifies what he did

Mitch: Or just say a real positive view of him

It is interesting that students made the most use of corroboration when they were operating under a misconception which created an uncertainty in the students. Wineburg's (1991a, 1991b) historians and students were operating in an unfamiliar and uncertain situation as well. For my students, the course curriculum usually provided support and a rich context for the discussion. In this case, however, a misconception and challenging materials offered dramatically different interpretations of an historical figure the students had thought they knew well. Perhaps the students’ misunderstanding is a sign of growth; they are trying to use the strategy but simply misunderstood my
presentation. In effect, they over-generalized their use of historians’ strategies. Inadvertently, the confusing situation allowed students to engage in a good example of problem-solving in history.

It is obvious from the numbers presented in Tables 5.4 and 5.5 that my students do not use either context or corroboration often, and when they did use corroboration, it was due to confusion on their part. One explanation would be that I did not model the use of contextualization and corroboration enough, that the students did not understand as they had had no explicit instruction in the strategies themselves.

Another, more plausible explanation, I think, is that unlike students (or historians, for that matter) asked to do a think-aloud protocol and isolated from the classroom (Wineburg, 1991a; 1991b), my students studied history in an instructional context that provided a chronological structure. A structure in which documents were already tacitly placed and which provided corroboration for documents through class discussions. Put another way, these two strategies were provided by and thus assumed by the classroom context. It is possible that the use of context, especially, was an artifact of Wineburg’s research design.

**Sourcing Statements**

Sourcing is the act of looking first to the source (author, date, location created) of the document before reading the body of the text (Wineburg, 1991a). Given the naturalistic setting of my research, I modified the definition of that heuristic to looking to the source of the document (as discussed in chapter 3). Of the 998 references to documents, 300 included at least one reference to the author of the text, meaning that 30 percent of all references to the documents were sourcing statements. Across the year, the numbers of sourcing statements increase, reach a peak during the “Lincoln” episode, remain steady in the “World War One” episode, and then drop during the “1960s”
episode. Students referred solely to the author of the text they were discussing rather than to the date of or location where the text was created. I would argue again that the instructional context which students shared precluded their references to the date or location where the text was created. This finding is interesting in light of comments I made in my field notes early in the year. I noted the students' proclivity to talk about content rather than about the author.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episodes with individual discussions</th>
<th>Number of references to the documents</th>
<th>Number of references which referred to the author of the document (sourcing statements)</th>
<th>Percentage of references which were sourcing statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Independence</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War One</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary and primary sources (1)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary and primary sources (2)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary and primary sources (3)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: Sourcing heuristics by discussion.
When students do not make sourcing statements.

To understand what happens when students do refer to the source of a document, it is instructive to first look at what happens when students do not refer to the author of the text, or more specifically when they refer to the text as merely "it" rather than as a text written by an author. Students most often referred to texts using the pronoun "it" when they were completing procedural work: that is receiving help from the teachers; talking about how to work with the essay; and discussing how to function in the small group. When working procedurally, they were developing a factual understanding of the texts and, only occasionally, giving an opinion.

While the students did not always refer to the author, across the year students' use of sourcing strategies did increase when they discussed secondary and primary materials up to and including the materials related to "World War One," a discussion that occurred at the end of April, 1995. Their attention to sources dropped during the final small-group discussions of the "1960s." There are several explanations for this pattern. The most obvious reason is that this set of small-group discussions was done during the last eight days of the school year before final exams when students' patience and energy were declining. In addition, one of the sources was a list of popular movies, songs, and TV shows from the 1960s, and students found the list very attractive. They sang the songs, talked about the shows, and tried to hold conversations made up exclusively of titles from this list. Finally, during this last episode, as an additional source, students were asked to select and view a movie on the 1960s. Students spent a fair amount of time deciding on a movie and then arranging the logistics of watching the film outside of class hours. So again procedural issues distracted the students from examining the materials more substantively.
Another reason students did not discuss the materials during the 1960s episode, however, is that they had not done the reading before discussions. They acknowledged this and took time to read a section that they could have discussed but then did not.

Howard: Roger, what do you think about Ho Chi Minh?
Roger: Ho Chi Minh?

(laughter)
Howard: I'm just kidding. Well I think, I don't think we can do much more without reading our secondary sources.
Roger: well,
Mitch: the videos will help tonight, a lot.

(laughter)
Mitch: here we go, we can read "A history of turmoil" in a couple of seconds and talk about it.

(laughter)
Howard: there was one interesting part in the book and we could talk about it. I'll get back to you.

pause........................................
Howard: if I could just find this part
pause........
Howard: all right, I found it.
pause........
Howard: all right, here is the part in the book that I was looking at.
Mitch: Yeah that's interesting.
Howard: the bombing
Roger: yeah you're right
pause.................
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Even after taking time to read the selection Howard suggested, students did not go on to talk about the reading but rather about the logistics of the essay and getting together to watch the selected tape. That the students did not complete all the readings is not a surprising finding—after all they are faced with the press of work at the end of the school year. They are also preparing for exams and they are “slacking off” in preparation for the summer. Such are the exigencies of classroom research. Thus, when examined over the year, at first glance the sourcing results are not what I would have hoped. Although the percentages of sourcing statements are strong early in the year, the drastic drop in the last set of discussions is disappointing, if not unexpected.

Number of sourcing statements when dealing with secondary and primary sources.

Prior to eleventh grade, students have more experience with secondary sources than with primary sources, and so might be expected to experience more ease in adopting the sourcing heuristic with secondary materials than with primary. My findings do not bear out this potential pattern, however. Whether students are talking about secondary or primary sources, they use approximately the same level of sourcing statements, fifty-one percent of references to documents were sourcing statements when secondary sources were discussed and forty-nine percent of references were sourcing statements when primary sources were examined. Where a pattern in students’ use of the sourcing heuristic might be expected to appear, none did. (See Table 5.7.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episodes with individual discussions</th>
<th>Number of references which referred to the author of the document (sourcing statements)</th>
<th>Percentage of references to documents which are sourcing statements—secondary sources</th>
<th>Percentage of references to documents which are Sourcing Statements—primary sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Independence</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War One</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s secondary and primary sources (1)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s secondary and primary sources (2)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s secondary and primary sources (3)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7: Use of sourcing heuristics when students discuss secondary sources and when they discuss primary sources.
When the sourcing statements themselves are more closely examined, however, an interesting pattern emerges. Sourcing statements, whether made in reference to secondary or primary sources, can be broken into two groups: tag statements (use of the name of the author as a handy way to identify the article and distinguish it from other texts) and substantive statements (use of the author's name in a substantive way to discuss the writer's meaning or perspective or social construction of history or membership in the community of scholars). Examples of both tag statements and substantive statements follow.

**Pattern of student behavior when making tagging statements.**

Table 5.8 includes percentages for use of both types of sourcing statements across the ten discussions. Statements in which students use the author's name as an abbreviation for the piece under consideration are coded as tag statements. An obvious example occurred during students' discussion of the "Lincoln" secondary sources in which thirty-one percent of the sourcing comments were tags. This same pattern occurs in a less dramatic way in other discussions of both primary and secondary sources. Howard, Libby, and Lilly's use of tags almost takes on a bantering tone.

Howard: Oh, McFeeley.
Libby: McFeeley
Howard: OK. McFeeley
Howard: Feeley time
Howard: No one will help me out with McFeeley?
Lilly: No, it's just of McFeeley

Here students are using the author's names in lieu of the longer titles of "Dishonest Abe" or *The National Experience*. Also since there were articles from five
new historians (Wills, February, 1991; Hofstadter, 1948; Foner, 1990; Oates, 1977, 1984; McPherson, 1991; and McFeeley, in Blum, et al., 1993), they had six historians and each of the historian’s interpretations to keep straight. The key point is that students are paying attention to the names of historians and separating their arguments according to author; they see the historians as having different arguments, and thus they realize the need to distinguish the historians from one another. This use of authors’ names is important in its own right, for it represents a shift toward a valuable heuristic that historians employ as identified by Wineburg (1991a, 1991b).

Tag statements would seem the easiest to make as a sort of logical first developmental step between not using sourcing statements at all and using sourcing statements as historians would. They would thus be expected to be the most common: this was not the case, however. Students made many more substantive sourcing statements than tag sourcing statements, and an interesting pattern of substantive use of the author’s name appeared as students discussed the author’s text. An example of substantive use of the sourcing heuristic follows.

Krys: In the way he [Lukacs] means it, he is right. I disagree with it. The others, Clemenceau and Lloyd George were strong in that they wouldn’t bend down for what they want. Like they wouldn’t negotiate for peace because they wanted revengeful things. (disagreeing with the author’s interpretation)

Krys: Maybe he’s saying that we were right in the sense that it became like known that America is such a (examining the author’s general point).

Lilly: And maybe

Mitch: Plus he blatantly states, right before the “O,” that “Because of the Treaty of Versailles,” that’s it’s Wilson’s fault that Hitler came into power. So (examining the author’s assertions).

In these substantive statements, students are using the historian’s name as part of an examination or evaluation of the writer’s meaning. Across the year, the rate of
substantive sourcing statements began high, dipped slightly, then returned to a high of ninety-four percent (see Table 5.8) during the World War I episode. In the following excerpt from that episode, Krys, Lilly, and Mitch vehemently critique Lukacs' ideas presented in "1918" (November, 1992) in statements that make reference to the author. These references show that the three students are thinking of Lukacs not just as an author (as is suggested by tag statements) but as an author with an interpretation that he is going to argue rather than as a writer of a set of facts and they examine his writing as such.

Unexpectedly, when all sourcing statements are examined, only twenty percent are tag statements while fully eighty percent are substantive. If the last episode on the 60s is excluded, the average rises to ninety percent. These percentages in Table 5.8 are even more intriguing when one remembers that the students had no direct instruction in using the source of the document to understand the document. The use of substantive sourcing statements may have been affected by the integration of history and literature in the American Studies classroom. This high use of sourcing statements in a substantive way reveals a thoughtfulness in students' exploration of texts and suggests something about how the students are coming to think about history as a social construction of authors with perspectives and interpretations that the sophisticated reader examines and might disagree with.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episodes with individual discussions</th>
<th>Number of references which referred to the author of the document (sourcing statements)</th>
<th>Sourcing Statement used as a tag.</th>
<th>Sourcing Statement used in a substantive way.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Independence</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War One</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sources</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary and primary sources (1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary and primary sources (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary and primary sources (3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Three Episodes</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Total Sourcing Mean Average</td>
<td>Mean Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8: Sourcing statements as tags or as part of substantive statements.
Pattern of student behavior in substantive sourcing statements—primary sources.

This important pattern of thoughtful examination of the texts as social constructions of the authors appears when the substantive sourcing statements are examined in small-group discussions of both primary and secondary sources. In the Lincoln primary source discussion of February 23 and 24, most (ninety-three percent) of the sourcing statements were made in reference to Lincoln's meanings as the author of the text, only seven percent were tag statements, such as when Mitch refers to "Lincoln house divided" as a way to identify which of the primary sources the group is address first. What follows is an excerpt from that primary source discussion which shows students treatment of Lincoln as an author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small-group discussion of the “Lincoln” Primary Sources</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libby: Yeah I, is that what he's saying?</td>
<td>Here Libby and Mitch examine Lincoln's meaning rather than listing content to be remembered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch: He's saying that the union is older than the government and so it is indestructible</td>
<td>Libby and Mitch continue with an examination of Lincoln’s intentions as he writes the speeches they have read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby: So what he's saying is, that even if the government is dead the union still exists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby: This part, he talks about God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch: So he's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby: He's moral suasion...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitch: But wasn't Lincoln basically saying that he really wants the end of slavery, just as much as the Gettysburg Address? I don't remember. I wasn't

Mitch mentions Lincoln’s goals.
Mitch: Even though he (Lincoln) wrote a hundred years after Jefferson, I liked the style (Lincoln) better.

Lilly: I was kind of anxious to read what he said and not hear what everybody else says and hear all this crap, tell all these legends, it's like just straight Lincoln. Straight up.

Howard: I think he's a great president because of the stuff he said in the speeches, he really wanted to keep the Union together

Lilly: He's so genuine

Howard: His stand, he didn't just sit back and let things happen, so

Lilly: I think he wanted what was best for everyone, in the long term

Roger: Lincoln was a great president because he tried to end slavery and he did a lot of great things for the country like the Civil War, but he looked like he grew

In this excerpt, the students make several points about Lincoln. First students approach his writing as something more than content to be learned. Students approach Lincoln’s writings as texts that he composed with specific intentions, and that can be appreciated for their literary as well as historic merit. Thus students discuss Lincoln as both a writer and actor in history, rather than as a distant historical figure whose importance is pre-determined. When Roger says that Lincoln was a great president “but he looked like he grew,” he exemplifies the group’s efforts to use its understandings of Lincoln’s writings, style, and intentions to develop their own appraisal of the man. Students are including Lincoln as a part of their construction of history. They are also using the historiographic notions of interpretation and perspective as they discuss our sixteenth president.
Pattern of student behavior in substantive sourcing statements—secondary sources.

In the "World War One" secondary source discussion of April 27, ninety-eight and one half percent of the sourcing statements are references to the authors of the secondary sources (and to one historian in particular, John Lukacs author of "1918," November, 1992) and of those references to the secondary authors, five percent are tag references to identify the article under consideration, while ninety-five percent of them are substantive rather than tag references. Again students examine the author's meanings and reveal a basic historiographic approach to the reading and discussion of historical texts, one in which they examine the text as something more than a set of facts to be remembered.

Small-group discussion of "World War One" secondary sources

Krys: In the way he means it he is right, I disagree with it, the others, Clemenceau and Lloyd George were strong in that they wouldn't bend down for what they want, like they wouldn't negotiate for peace because they wanted revengeful things

Roger: His thesis is very clear

Krys: I think he was being so haughty in "1918," it was being, yeah we know we are the best

Krys: It is right here it says that some academic, Henry Levendor, wrote about President Wilson, "he will remain one of the legends of history, he will appear in the poetry of coming ages like the Dante-home-hero he resembles in profile." Then he says, Levendor needed better glasses, but that is beside the point. I don't know but that makes me, such snotty comments make me so mad

Lilly: He is very, like not, he's very American, like "there is only one first class civilization in the world; it is here in the United States"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>At the start of this excerpt, Krys and Roger examine the author's way of making an argument. Krys was struck by and examined Lukacs' tone as a writer. Lilly referred to the author's perspective.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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By the fifty-eighth turn out of 449 turns, students have made references to all of these issues. Rather than dealing solely with the information that Lukacs presents in his essay, their discussion also examines the issues of Lukacs' perspective, interpretation, and role as a writer of history, that is, Lukacs' dispositions and beliefs as a historian.

A further examination of the World War I secondary source small-group discussion will further illuminate how students dealt with the sources and will show how they recognize the constructed nature of history.

Further examination of substantive sourcing statements—secondary sources.

This second examination of students as they work with a secondary source allows us to see a new pattern. At this point, it is clear that my students are using strategies differently from both Wineburg's (1991a; 1991b) students and his historians. Unlike his students, they consistently recognize the author of the source under consideration without instruction in the strategy, and unlike Wineburg's historians they work 'backwards.' Rather than using the author or source to understand the text, they use the text to try to understand the author whether they are evaluating Lincoln or figuring out Lukacs' perspective. Although in the discussion which follows students never refer to the author of the source directly, it is clear that they are thinking about the article as something constructed as they talk about the article. They call Lukacs "he," most likely because the article is in front of them, they had only a few articles to handle, and Lukacs is hard to pronounce. But unlike Wineburg’s historians who use the name of the author to help them understand the text they are reading, my students use the text to help them understand the author’s perspective, interpretation, and intention.
Small-group Discussion of “World War One” Secondary Sources

Libby: Listen to this: “Was the American intervention decisive? Yes, but the British and French Armies, weary and torn as they were, had halted the great German spring offensive by June 1918 before the mass of Americans moved up to combat.” So he’s kind of suggesting that we weren’t.

Mitch: To clean it up

Libby: What?

Mitch: We were there to clean it up

Libby: We weren’t really that important, we were just a clean up effort?

Comments

Libby referred to Lukacs (“he’s kind of suggesting”), the author of the text, in a substantive, way as she examined what point he was trying to make in his essay. She is examining Lukacs’ factual meaning and expressing an opinion about it in her incredulous question, “We weren’t really that important, we were just a clean up effort?”
Mitch: I thought, its not a big deal, but I thought the line “he was no match for Clemenceau or Lloyd George” talking about Wilson, “and the result was one of the worst botched peace treaties in modern history” and I thought that Wilson was the strongest

Krys: The strongest

Mitch: and that’s what, I thought Clemenceau, Orlando, and Lloyd George were just back figures.

Krys: In the way he means it, he is right. I disagree with it, the others, Clemenceau and Lloyd George were strong in that they wouldn’t bend down for what they want, like they wouldn’t negotiate for peace because they wanted revengeful things

Krys: Maybe he’s saying that we were right in the sense that it became like known that America is such a

Lilly: And maybe

Mitch: Plus he blatantly states, right before the “O,” that “Because of the Treaty of Versailles,” that’s it’s Wilson’s fault that Hitler came into power. So

(laughter)

Mitch: Blaming him for Hitler.

(laughter)

Krys: I don’t like that he did that
Mitch: Or maybe this guy is thinking that the ideal American leader is some arrogant pig who will lead us and kind of punish everyone else and so maybe in that sense Wilson would be a bad president or a weak person.

Krys: Well Wilson didn’t really accomplish a lot.

Mitch: Of what he wanted.

Roger: He failed in his great goal but he made progress.

Krys: Failed?

Roger: Yeah, but he made progress toward making, he had in his mind what he wanted to do and he made progress toward it even if he didn’t succeed.

Krys: So far as the Second World War happened, and they realized that he was right.

Roger: His thesis is very clear.

Lilly: Well why don’t you read me that.

Roger: Well it is right here. I’ll read it if you want, that was “more than a milestone in the history of the United States, it was a turning point, the greatest turning point in its history since the Civil War, and perhaps the greatest turning point since its establishment.”

Krys: I underlined, I didn’t think that was his thesis.

Roger: That was his thesis.

Here Mitch, Krys and Roger use what they have read to try to understand Lukacs the writer, the opposite of Wineburg’s (1991a, 1991b) historians, as Mitch says “Or maybe this guy is thinking.”

As part of understanding Lukacs’ perspective as a writer, they talk about his thesis.
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Krys: I think he was being so haughty in 1918, it was being yeah we know we are the best

laughter

Krys: He was like, he was like, America has to share the victory with Russia, I mean that is such a stupid thing to say, I mean, share the victory, whatever. Other than the fact that they didn’t have to share.

An interesting point is their discussion of Lukacs’ tone. They point out how haughty he sounds as they continue to try to understand him as the writer of the piece.

Lilly: He is very, like not, he’s very American, like “there is only one first class civilization in the world; it is here in the United States”

Krys: Yeah and at the end he says like that “America was not only like a great power, but it was the only super power.” I mean he is kind of right in some senses, but not in all senses.

Again, by discussing Lukacs’ perspective as a writer, students are trying to understand him as the author of the piece.

Mitch: Well, classified we are the only super power left

Roger: Pretty much

Krys: What?

Mitch: Classified, they are the only super power left.

Krys: I know, but the way he states, I’m not saying he’s not right

Mitch: Right, yeah, yeah, I see that, how they are saying it

Krys: And he

Mitch: He’s kind of, a touch of elitist attitude or whatever, also it’s kind of a factor

Mitch: ‘Cause he is writing from today’s perceptive and I mean if we hadn’t done that
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Lilly: So like doesn't it kind of, if he didn't like Wilson and how he did it but he still thought American was the best? That's kind of weird. I mean, cause if you think that if he didn't like the president he's like man America is going down the drain, you know what I mean?

Roger: Yeah

Lilly: He thought Wilson was acting bad, making bad decisions and stuff, kind of weird, I mean normally he wouldn't be critical like that, it's not really important

Krys: Right, he doesn't come out against it, he is for it

Lilly: He doesn't come out and say it directly

Roger: Yeah

Krys: He doesn't give a lot of evidence

Roger: Yeah, "it was the turning point, and perhaps the greatest turning point in history," after he said that "In 1918 a decided outcome of war, by Armistice Day the United States was more than a world power, it was the greatest power in the world." And right below that he says that it was a turning point.

Lilly: They're that its the greatest

Krys: (unintelligible)

Lilly: And yet, does it take the war to do that?

Roger: Yeah

Lilly: Where is it saying that?

Mitch: Where was it?

And since they are thinking of Lukacs as an author with a perspective to be understood rather than the purveyor of facts, students join in the community of scholars and critique his position by pointing out what seem to them contradictions in his argument. They question his evidence and the way he uses it.
Libby: listen to this: "Was the American intervention decisive? Yes, but the British and French Armies, weary and torn as they were, had halted the great German spring offensive by June 1918 before the mass of Americans moved up to combat.” So he’s kind of suggesting that we weren’t

Mitch: To clean it up

Libby: What?

Mitch: We were there to clean it up

Libby: We weren’t really that important we were just a clean up effort

Lilly: So he’s kind of contradicting himself. Figure it out buddy!

laughter

pause....

Krys: His last paragraph, he can’t decide which was the better year, 1918 or 1945

Lilly: Yeah, that I didn’t understand, like why did he even get into that

Libby: He goes back and forth

Libby: The thing about “1918” is that it gives a bunch of examples after the war

Mitch: If he would just make himself clear it would be so good to use

In these cases, unlike Wineburg’s (1991a; 1991b) historians, my students lack the background about the historian or writer to help them understand the piece. However, the students demonstrate that they recognize the constructed nature of the piece in front of them when they use the information in the text to decipher the historians’ perspective. They recognize that the historians have created these documents
and have a perspective that they illustrate in the texts. For these students, the source of the document is not just another piece of information; it is a person with a perspective to better understand.

When my students examined the content in order to understand the author, this may suggest an intermediary step in their use of inquiry strategies. They are perhaps a step beyond many students who see materials as only compilations of facts to be memorized, but my students still lack background knowledge about these writers as they approach the documents. Two implications seem possible. As students gain additional background knowledge, I would expect them to retain the idea of the importance of source shown above but begin to use their prior knowledge about the source to begin to understand new pieces by the same person. Second, it would seem likely that when given materials by more accessible authors (an unknown farmer, a teenager during World War II) students may use their knowledge about those lifestyles to inform their understanding of the text they are to read. All of these findings are interesting given my early concern, noted in my field notes, that students “don’t talk about Morgan, they talk about content.”

Student-Initiated Historiographic Issues as Shown in the Classroom Context

If students have taken on the historian’s mind-set during the school year, what issues might they initiate in discussion by the end of that year? To address this question, I will return to the qualitative examination of students’ classroom discussions. Wineburg (1991a) suggested that by using heuristics, students were revealing their deeper understandings about history. While the findings from the small-group discussions suggest strongly that my students are beginning to take on the habits of historians, there is some further support for the notion that they have developed an understanding of history as a construction rather than as a set of facts. During a
teacher-led discussion in June 1995, the students initiated topics that went beyond the issues that I raised. These student-initiated topics seem especially revealing of students’ evolving notions of what constitutes history.

Comparing The Styles Of Historians

I asked students to comment on Schlesinger (in Blum, et al., 1993), their last historian. They then each began their own comparison of historians whom we had read during the year. Libby initiated the new type of comparison.

Lehman: Well can I ask you a quick question? What did you think of Schlesinger as a writer, we haven't gotten to that yet. What do you think of Schlesinger as a writer? Leah, you had a real strong reaction.

Leah: His word, I don’t know, he just seems to have a lot more to say, his chapters are a lot longer than the other chapters that we read, he kind of skips around.

voice: He does

Leah: He’ll be talking about the government and then he’ll be talking about the hippies.

Lehman: Other reactions?

Libby: I think he is kind of like Morgan, in a way. I think that because in the beginning he introduces his theme, what his focus is going to be, and that’s what Morgan did a lot, instead of adding a bunch of quotations, he gives examples to support his thesis.

Lehman: Mitch?

Mitch: I liked him because he seems to be like a controversial figure. at least he was viewed as that when he was writing. Like the movie that I was watching, or that I watched was called “In the Year of the Pig” and they did this whole other section on Schlesinger and they compared him to all the other liberal and rebellious thinkers of the time, and I thought that was pretty cool that he would go out on a limb and make those statements before the ideas caught on.

Libby: I kind of liked that his zingers were discrete, the stuff that he said about Nixon, showed what he thought of him.
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After I make my own comparison of Schlesinger and Morgan the students continue the topic bringing in earlier historians.

Lehman: As I said, Schlesinger reminded me of Morgan in that I think he has the most obvious zingers since Morgan, opinions about hippies or his opinions about the President, I think are, I think he makes them very clear.

Libby: I thought Blum...

Lehman: Go ahead

Libby: I thought Blum had kind of strong opinions. He made his opinions about Wilson very clear. He like, showed really, really great support for the US going into the war, and we don’t really know that, you know, how other countries interpreted those events and that possibly we were more the aggressors. But I thought that he was really, really, showed great support for the US.

Lehman: And maybe the difference is that he likes Wilson really well and that he is like one of his most important books is about Wilson. And I don’t think likes much about the 60s at all. So maybe that’s what we are hearing.

Judy: Well when I was writing my history paper and I was looking back at what I was writing about, way back to the first chapter about Massachusetts Bay and I was rereading it, and I caught more of the zingers and I thought that was interesting, that when you know more about it, its really, I mean, I didn’t notice much to begin with, in the first chapter but now that I know things and I look back the zingers are so obvious.

Students are quite astute in their comparisons of historians’ writing styles as well as the ways that they made their arguments. Students draw strong comparisons between Morgan, the historian who wrote the first six chapters of their text, and later historians Blum and Schlesinger. When students describe the historians use of stinging comments (“zingers”), they are making points about the historians' strong opinions of various historical actors and events. Further, Judy’s comment that when she looks back at earlier readings she sees “zingers” where she did not before suggests that Judy is
reading with a more sensitive eye. Here in the topic that students raised, they treat the
texts of history as constructions and the authors as writers whose styles can be
compared or contrasted.

**Students Seeing Themselves Constructing History**

The issue of interpretation took a personal twist for my students as well. In the
excerpts from the class discussion of June 6, 1995 which follow, students articulately
demonstrate that they are aware of themselves as having personal interpretations as
well. Students see themselves as active participants as they construct their own
understandings. The issue of the need for a personal interpretation of the materials
under study comes up throughout the discussion.

Miriam: I think maybe it's your own interpretation of it. Because, after
reading all the different sources you have to decide what
perspective, or you might not even decide it but it's whatever one
sticks in your mind, that's the way you are going to view it. So it
really depends on you.

Tracy: I agree with all, history is a bunch of perspectives. One thing I
think is important is that as a reader of history, you have to
decide who the audience of the historian is supposed to be. If its
a history book and its a general overview and fairly unbiased, not
necessarily biased

Lehman: Bias has a negative connotation. Its not supposed to be
propaganda

Tracy: Right. but then you read other sources, like some of the things
we read about Lincoln was supposed to be propaganda, so its
recognizing where your perspectives are coming from and then
drawing your own conclusions.

Caroline: I think it is a lot more interesting than I thought it was going
to be. Because you get to kind of solve a puzzle. You find what
evidence you need to support your opinion.

Each young woman sees herself as an integral part of constructing a personal
interpretation of history. Miriam, Tracy, and Caroline are taking a metacognitive step,
as they 'think about their own thinking.' Miriam notes that "it really depends on you"
while Tracy points out that the reader of history has a responsibility to recognize "where your perspectives are coming from and then drawing your own conclusions." Caroline sees herself as a puzzle-solver--a nice metaphor for an active learner. These students' comments suggest that they are taking on the habits of mind that Wineburg (1991a; 1991b) saw represented by the use of the strategies of sourcing, corroboration, and contextualization.

**Discussion**

I would argue that historiographical concepts such as "historians as a community of scholars," "fact versus writing," and "interpretation and perspective," give students new ways of thinking about historical text as something created by others. Student comments during teacher-led classroom discussions demonstrate that my students are aware of and display understandings of historiographic issues of historians as a community or scholars, historical fact and historical writing, perspective and interpretation. Student comments at the end of the year on issues that they have generated themselves suggest that students have indeed taken on the habits of mind of historians.

Students' small-group discussions often illustrate that they are aware of the sources of their texts, talking about them not just as tags but in substantive ways. And their discussions show their thinking skills (trying to understand the author's stance rather than treating the text as a set of facts). They are doing what they will have to do as aware adults when, without the author's explanations, they will need to arrive at their own interpretations. Perhaps as critical thinkers, they may now read for the author's intent and use the text to explain the author, processes that I hope will last a lifetime.

Student behavior in small groups during the episode discussions shows that students are perhaps a developmental step away from professional historians (using the
text to understand the author, which is a step away from using the author to understand the text). They are at an intermediary stage, which makes sense, since they do not have the information or practice to be historians. They are “apprentices,” they are learning about historians, and they are beginning to construct their notions of history and of the historians who write history. Perhaps, when they read MacPherson or Lukacs or Morgan or Schlesinger again, they will have both the background and the mind-set to look at the source and then use the source to interpret the text.

One final comment. It seems to me that it is the mix of the classroom, materials, modeling and small-group discussions that support these behaviors as well as possible “cross-fertilization” between history and literature. Without this instructional context, perhaps students would not have made as many sourcing statements, and more of the sourcing statements would be tags. There is an argument to be made that the specific context of working actively with primary and secondary sources within a supportive classroom environment over a school year enables students to move a bit closer to the habits-of-mind of historians. All the elements of the classroom come together to foster the internalization of ways of knowing—not just the discussions, not just the materials, not just the modeling, not just the small groups, and not just the assignments.

Patterns of conversation during teacher-led and in small-group discussions illustrate the students beginning to see themselves as active learners of history constructing their own understandings of history. It is apparent that the students are aware of the ways they are to talk about authors and texts. Students are also aware of historiographic issues and discuss them within the classroom discussion at my prompting. They even bring in issues beyond the ones that I have raised in our discussions. Finally, when working on their own, small groups used at least one of the strategies that Wineburg (1991a) identifies with an historian’s approach to document
and thus to the historian's more sophisticated understanding of texts. All of this evidence supports the idea that my students are developing as critical thinkers and taking on historians' habits of mind.
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CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

There are several debates raging in the field of history education. One is a longstanding disagreement over what specific content should be taught. Another debate revolves around the role of thinking skills in the history classroom. However, these discussions reflect a fundamental misconception of knowing history. In response to such debates, constructivist theories of teaching and learning emphasize learning as meaning-making that is anchored in conversations about significant ideas, events and dates and have suggested that, rather than an isolated activity, learning is a result of social interactions, such as classroom and small-group discussion.

Reality is messy; each teacher makes decisions about the content, about the skills, about the classroom organization; the student makes decisions and choices as well. Students participate in class activities, build their sets of data, and construct their own understandings of the discipline being taught. It is only in this real life mishmash of choices and decisions by teachers and students (as well as administrators, parents, board of education members, and lawmakers) that we can move beyond sterile arguments and try to begin to understand what is happening when students build their historical understandings within a classroom structure of teacher-led and small-group discussions that assumes the active nature of learning and the importance of disciplinary ways of
knowing. Once there is that understanding then perhaps the groundwork will have been laid for recommendations for changes beyond the current status of secondary school history teaching and learning.

This ethnographic study first examined a high school Advanced Placement American Studies classroom and then focused on both the formal school curriculum and the formal teacher-created curriculum for integrated American Studies and, specifically, for the history portion of the course. The study next looked at teacher-led discussions and the student exchanges in small-group sessions across the school year. An examination of the formal school curriculum for history and the activities in the classroom as drawn from teacher/research field notes allowed an examination of the interrelationships among formal curriculum, the teacher-created American Studies, the teacher-created history, and the enacted classroom curricula. From this examination of the classroom, the curricula, and teachers’ and students’ conversations came my idea of “constructivist inquiry.”

Constructivist inquiry draws upon the ideas of the New Social Studies and the Inquiry Approach, current ideas about historiography, situated cognition, and constructivist understandings. As such, it emphasizes the perspective of the historian, the role of interpretation, the use of historical imagination, multiple answers to multiple questions of the significance of an historical event, and the role of historians as a community of scholars. It also assumes that students are active learners who construct their understandings of the methods and content of history out of an on-going classroom dialogue about the tradition of history and its scholarship. As cognitive apprentices, students gain knowledge-in-action when they examine both secondary and primary sources with an eye to the writer’s perspective, interpretation, and membership in the community of practicing historians within a supportive classroom context. The most
important element of the students' apprenticeships is the students' independent work in small groups. Using the tools of historians; taking on the role of historian, and developing knowledge-in action as they write essays, they learn to support their own interpretations and answers to questions which historians still consider significant to the discipline.

Summary of Findings

My research dealt with four questions. What are the curricular structures and content of an Advanced Placement American Studies course designed to foster entry into a conversation about American history? What is the nature of the course content and how does this content shape discussions? What pedagogical moves does the teacher make that support students' adoption of particular ways of thinking and speaking about history? How do students in small groups use various heuristics (Wineburg, 1991a, 1991b) to examine secondary and primary historical sources and how are those uses influenced by the larger instructional contexts for those discussions?

Curricular Structures in an Advanced Placement American Studies Course Designed to Foster Entry into a Conversation about History

The curricular structures designed to foster entry into a conversation about American history included a combined chronological and thematic organization. The chronological approach provided students with a framework for remembering and working with content while the thematic approach gave students the opportunity to examine issues from the origins of America to modern day. The constructivist nature of the curriculum which assumes that students are active learners with a stake in the classroom discourse as they read, write and talk to solve problems, allowed students to use the classroom as a site for their construction of their understandings of the significance of history. As the teacher, I acted as mediator between the academy and the
classroom (Seixas, 1993) by assembling wide-ranging materials, setting the topics for discussions, and shaping the tasks students completed. This mediation allowed me to create a setting in which my students had the opportunity to become cognitive apprentices within the curricular conversations associated with the broader cultural tradition of history. The situated cognition and cultural conversations were mediated, negotiated, and experienced within the teacher-led as well as the small-group discussions.

As the teacher-led discussions revisited the issue of “What is history?” three times during the school year and re-examined classroom textbooks as secondary sources that need to be addressed critically, the structure of the classroom conversation may have encouraged students to rethink issues and engage with secondary sources in a way that was similar to that of historians. Tasks for the small-group discussions that occurred during the four episodes wherein students examined secondary and primary sources were cumulative. The fact that students were faced with increasingly difficult tasks using an increasing number of secondary and primary sources may have supported students deeper engagement in the curricular conversation allowing them to become cognitive apprentices in the study of history.

Content of an Advanced Placement American Studies Course Designed to Foster Entry into a Conversation about American History

The content of an Advanced Placement American Studies course designed to foster entry into a conversation about American history was composed of multiple historical texts which were both secondary and primary sources. The most useful secondary sources were materials written by practicing historians which explicitly addressed the conventions of historical analysis such as data collection, interpretations, perspective, and the writing of history. The primary sources were important as a way of fostering students engagement with the disciplinary conversation of history in another
way: they presented students with “raw data,” as it were, which reaffirmed the students’ roles as builders of their own understandings of a document, a person, an event, or a decade. As Lilly said during the small-group discussion of the Lincoln primary sources, “I was kind of anxious to read what he said and not hear what everybody else says and hear all this ‘crap’, tell all these legends, it’s like just straight Lincoln. Straight up.”

The particular patterns of discourse in this classroom were shaped by the nature of course content and by the constructivist nature of the classroom curriculum. The teacher-led discussions were set up in such a way as to encourage substantive engagement (Nystrand and Gamoran, 1991) with students. Students were involved in active inquiry as they discussed issues of historiography, alternative interpretations of what is significant in history, and their own interpretations of the past based in the historian’s method. Students also engaged in “talking to learn” in both teacher-led discussions and small-group discussions which allowed for the varying student understanding. Authentic questions concerning “What is history?” “What is Morgan’s perspective?” What is McFeeley’s interpretation? and “What did people from the time period believe?” allowed students to engage in an inquiry into the meaning and significance of history. Another authentic task was the essay question that each student tackled during the small-group discussions which were a part of the four episodes students worked through during the school year. The writing assignments, which asked students to describe, evaluate, and synthesize various sources, may have shaped the small-group discussions of secondary and primary sources so as to allow students to engage in the ongoing conversation about the content and process of historical understanding.
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Pedagogical Moves that May Support Students’ Adoption of Particular Ways of Thinking and Speaking about History

Explicit discussions of the discipline of history may have allowed students to adopt particular ways of thinking and speaking about history as I encouraged them to use historians’ names in their comments, provide specific historical evidence to support their assertions, and consider the perspectives that they themselves brought to the reading. Asking students to make up their own minds about issues of historical significance reinforced their own active part in the discussion of history, and, in a sense, made them peers of the historians we were using to study history. When I modeled the methods that historians use by citing my own sources, sharing a variety of additional sources, or asking students to critique their authors and my own decisions in making an historical argument, I treated students as participants in the discipline who were worthy of an active role. Both formal and more impromptu writing assignments were also used to provide the students with opportunities to engage in historical analysis and exploration of various issues and topics.

Participation in small-group discussions enabled students to adopt particular ways of thinking and speaking about history, as well. Smagorinsky and Fly (1993) found that the classroom context is significant in the effectiveness of small groups in encouraging student exploration of issues. Sweigart (1991) found that in a classroom that utilized student-led small-group discussions this activity had the strongest effect on all aspects of student understanding and writing. I used small-group discussions extensively as students read, talked about, and wrote about issues of historical interest using primary and secondary sources. In a sense, we created both a whole-class community of scholars and a small-group community of scholars as students worked together across the year.
Use of Heuristic Strategies in Small-group Discussions

Student-led small groups examined secondary and primary sources four times across the school year during the four episodes that dealt with the “Declaration of Independence,” “Abraham Lincoln,” “World War I,” and the “1960s.” A close examination of their comments during those small-group discussions shows that they do refer to the documents under discussion. In these references students were found to make some use of contextualization and corroboration heuristics; however, they also made considerable use of the sourcing heuristic, one of three heuristics that Wineburg (1991a) argued reflected a qualitative difference between the underlying thinking of historians and high school students as they worked with sources. This finding is especially interesting given that, according to my field notes, students began the year ignoring the authors and simply discussing the content of the reading.

My students’ extensive use of the sourcing heuristic suggests that their thinking about history is closer to the historians than to the students Wineburg (1991a, 1991b) studied. Further, while my students might have been expected to make facile use of sourcing references by simply using the author’s name as a tag to identify the piece under consideration, these students made significant use of sourcing references as substantive statements that consider the writer’s intent, perspective, interpretation, and historical period. These findings suggest that these students have begun to see history as a social construction written and revised by historians rather than as a set collection of facts to be learned.

When students’ use of sourcing statements were examined further, another pattern emerged. The historians Wineburg studied used the sourcing heuristic as a way to understand what they were going to read in the text in front of them. My students seemed to work backward, in a sense. They referred to the source but then used the text to help
background knowledge about the historians and writers of primary sources which would allow them to approach documents in the same way as practicing historians. They have learned to make use of the sourcing heuristic and seem to be acquiring the necessary background knowledge.

The exact role of development in these students’ thinking is a tricky one. While the shift from seeing facts to taking authors in account may seem developmental, perhaps this is a surface feature of an underlying, truly developmental change. The students seemed to shift from thinking about various interpretations as discrete entities to thinking about interpretation as a result of an ongoing discussion by a community of scholars. It would seem that the students’ attention to authors would be one indicator of this deeper shift. Further research in this area is warranted.

Possible Influence of the Larger Instructional Context on the Use of Heuristics in Small-Group Discussions

Rather than assuming that students’ use of sources does not provide support for students to use historian’s methods (Stahl, Hynd, Britton, McNish, and Bosquet, 1996), my research suggests that classroom context can provide the support that facilitates students’ learning from secondary and primary sources, and that with instruction students can learn to use sources independent of teacher guidance. Although my research does not provide a causal link between the classroom context and student learning, I think I have created a strong circumstantial case for the relationship between teacher-led discussions and small-group discussions of historical texts.

First, it seems that the classroom teacher-led discussions were important as curricular conversations that displayed and engaged students in the conventions that govern ways of knowing and doing that were encouraged and required on a day-to-day basis. I called texts by the names of their authors, introduced new secondary sources and
emphasized the authors' names, and asked students to talk about the texts we were reading using the authors' names. The class discussions of the question, "What is history?" as well as the challenge of interpreting different historians' perspectives may have directly engaged students in the historians' conversation. Perhaps students were then better prepared for their roles as apprentices during the small-group discussions.

The classroom curriculum put secondary and primary sources in students' hands and set them to an authentic task similar to the work of historians. An important activity was the writing that students completed as they made, wrote about, and shared their own decisions about what should be a part of history just as historians do as a part of the community of historical scholars. The discussions and tasks were cumulative across the school year, offering students support as they tackled more difficult materials and tasks. The examination of the teacher-led discussions about history in room 221 suggests that more open-ended discussions offered students ways to engage with the discipline of history, allowing them to take on the strategies of historians as they worked in small groups using secondary and primary sources. The materials, tasks, and literacy activities encouraged students to compare their own ideas to those presented in a variety of sources by a number of authors in order to make their own decisions. Work with these materials and activities may have made it easier of students to focus on sources and compare their ideas as they worked in small groups.

The research described here raises the question of what is actually "authentic" within the institutional structures and conventions of formal schooling. If we accept that authentic tasks include real-life questions, processes, and audiences, then the issue of the authenticity of the classroom practices described in this study must be considered. Certainly, as students work with new information, new ways of thinking, and new ideas,
the tendency for the teacher to transmit information without regard for authentic
ingagement on the students' part seems very real.

I would argue that the procedure used with students in this project meets two of
three criteria for authenticity. First the questions students were asked to address were
part of the current discussion within the community of history scholars; further, students
knew that these questions were still being debated and read or learned about the different
arguments that are occurring. The process students learned and engaged in was authentic.
Students worked with the materials used by members of the larger discipline, including
materials still hotly debated. They used both secondary and primary sources. The
questions that students attempted to answer were open-ended with a variety of valid
responses. Students worked in small groups, relatively on their own, discussing the
materials with other members of the same ongoing "community of scholars." Finally
students wrote an essay using the rhetorical style of published historians.

The audience that students wrote for—the teacher—was only relatively authentic in
that students did not write for a broader audience. As a result, students perceptions may
have been that they were just writing another essay to please the evaluator rather than
writing to a larger community of scholars. An implication for the classroom would be to
find ways to make the audience more authentic and thus enhance the authenticity of the
students' experiences. For example, students might involve the compile the best student
essays, as decided by the classroom community, into a book to be published as well as
installed in the school library. Another way may be the creation of a conference
experience for students, which engaged adults (parents, educators, professional
historians) and students in paper and panel presentations. Such an experience, with the
requisite keynote speaker and dinner presentation, might suggest the notion of a larger
community of scholars and make students feel that their ideas and insights are a part of
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that larger community. Of course, student attendance at an actual professional conference would be a helpful adjunct to this process.

What if my students do not go on to be practicing historians? Students who develop the idea of history as a social construction, which changes as new evidence is uncovered or new interpretations are presented, have a better mind-set for understanding history as informed citizens. This critical approach to history should stand them in good stead as adults when most of the time they will read materials, not as expert, but as informed novices. I would also argue that the kinds of learning my students engaged in is "authentic," that is, disciplined inquiry with high intellectual quality that has value beyond grades or school evaluation.

**Constructivist Inquiry as Implication for Practice**

Out of the research described and examined here, I developed a revised way of thinking about inquiry into history, not as a set of exercises, but as ongoing engagement with historical texts during teacher-led and small-group discussions. I suggest "constructivist inquiry" as a helpful way of rethinking the issues of history instruction. Constructivist inquiry owes part of its conception to Fenton's (1967) inquiry method of the 1960s and 1970s. Working from the notions of historical scientism, Fenton argued that practice with disciplinary ways of knowing would enhance students' learning of history. Unfortunately, Fenton proposed a narrow use of historians' tools as students worked only with primary sources to arrive at the teacher's predetermined single answer to the teacher's questions. The inquiry method has been rightly criticized for emphasizing a single solution and question and tending to address traditional historical topics at the expense of issues of the working classes or people of color. As a result of a dearth of teacher preparation and general acceptance of the method by students and the larger community, the inquiry method did not achieve wide spread use.
In constructivist inquiry, I attempt to broaden the narrow focus of Fenton’s inquiry method and frame the question of history instruction within the understandings of Post World War II historiography and situated cognition theorists. These historiographers reject the notions of scientific historicism whereby there was one correct answer to a historian’s question that could be arrived at by the historian who went through the most rigorous process. Instead, historians such as Collingwood (1956) and Carr (1961) presented an understanding of the field of history that emphasized the perspective of the historian, the role of interpretation, the use of historical imagination, multiple answers to multiple questions about the significance of an historical event, and the role of historians as a community of scholars. Cognitive theorists Brown, Collins, and Duguid (1989) proposed that students, as active learners, might effectively take on the role of cognitive apprentice within a constructivist notion of history. Working out of this framework, Applebee (1993, 1996) suggests that curricular “conversations” are the primary means for teaching and learning. Students, teachers, and professional historians all engage in a conversation, spoken and written, to enter into culturally significant traditions of knowledge-in-action, such as the kinds of historical understanding explored here. Both metaphors of “apprenticeships” and “conversations” understand the student as learning both subject area content and habits-of-mind associated with the discipline of history.

Constructivist inquiry as I propose it includes as much of the historian’s process as possible within a scaffolded classroom context. Issues such as perspective, interpretation, multiple answers, and a community of scholars raised by Collingwood (1956) and Carr (1961) are addressed explicitly during teacher-led discussions. As cognitive apprentices (Brown, et. al, 1969), students gain knowledge-in-action (Applebee, 1996) when they examine both secondary and primary sources with an eye to
the writer's perspective, interpretation, and membership in the community of practicing historians. The most important element of the students' apprenticeships is the students' independent work in small groups: using the tools of historians; taking on the role of historian, again developing knowledge-in action as they write essays in which they support their own interpretations and answers to the question under consideration. Ultimately, students construct their own understandings of questions of significance within the cultural conversation of the field of history. More research is necessary before this approach can be suggested beyond the limited type of classroom used in this study; however, the research described here seems to have provided a fruitful start. Perhaps further research which examines underlying developmental changes could suggest ways to engage students in a more authentic experience.

Limitations of the Study

In looking back at this research, I realized that the way I framed the analysis of the small group work is open to criticism. While interesting and seemingly fruitful, my use of Wineburg's (1991a, 1991b) research may also have limited my research. Wineburg's work and the research that extends his findings (Stahl, et al., 1996) relied on isolated interactions without attention to the larger intellectual context. Also, these researchers seemed to be unconcerned with the classroom context from which these students were drawn; the researchers' assumption seemed to be that students' knowledge base was the only issue that mattered. As a result, Wineburg's and Stahl, et al.'s research was decontextualized. When I used Wineburg's notions of historians' heuristics to examine my students' learning, like Wineburg and Stahl, I also decontextualized their work with sources. While this strategy was an attempt on my part to illuminate the fine
features of students’ learning, this discontinuity may have disrupted the qualitative picture of the students’ work within a high school classroom that I had worked so hard to create.

There are, of course, other limitations to this study. I looked only at one classroom and studied intensely a small group of only six students. Although I worked with talented students in a suburban advanced placement classroom which limits the applicability of my research to other history classrooms, I have had students in two different “regular” (or more mainstream) American Studies classes use secondary and primary sources and we have discussed “What is history?”; these students seemed to handle both the materials and the theoretical discussion well. Systematic research into the use of constructivist inquiry for all students is a necessary next step. Another limitation to my study is the lack of direct connection between small-group members’ comments in their group discussion and their statements during teacher-led discussions. By following the six small-group members more closely in their behaviors and comments during teacher-led discussions, I might have been able to suggest a stronger link between classroom discussions and student learning as revealed in the small-group discussion.

Even with the strengths and justifications I have presented in chapter three, the dual roles of teacher and researcher presented certain challenges. Readers may question my report of classroom events, even though I completed member checks with two students and my teaching partner, given the investment I made in instruction as the teacher. With the stresses of the classroom, it was demanding to complete daily field notes and take meticulous care of the data I collected, care that was necessary to ensure
that my data adequately reflected the events in the real classroom. Certainly there may be
times when any researcher-teacher may be tempted to abandon the rigor of her research
under the constant bombardment of professional demands.

There are limitations to my claims as well. I certainly make no cause and effect
claims due to the fact that I conducted a case study in a single classroom. As a result of
the small sample size, no tests of statistical significance were run, which perhaps makes
my findings anomalous. Finally, the integrated nature of American Studies confounds to
some degree any single influence I might use to explain connections between curriculum
and student behavior. It is not completely clear whether the changes I discuss occur
because of the history curriculum, because of the literature curriculum, or because of the
integrated nature of American Studies. Without a control group, I cannot assert that the
changes I documented in student comments might occur over the course of time, simply
because of the instruction I provided.

Another set of potentialities and limitations are apparent when the team-taught
aspect of American studies is considered. Certainly team-teaching offers benefits: having
another adult in the classroom, allowing interaction and modeling by both adults, new
ways of understanding students' ideas and concerns. Beyond an examination of the
interaction of teachers and content, future research might look at the ongoing
collaboration and negotiation between teaching partners to see how the process might
shape students, both during teacher-led discussions and during small-group discussions
with their own levels of collaboration and negotiation.

Still I would argue that, within the limits of my efforts, my research has value. I
believe it has something to say to other teachers who see similarities between their
understanding of history and mine or who see similarities between their classrooms and
mine. I believe I have made a strong case for the argument that the use of historiography
in classroom discussions combined with students working with secondary and primary sources may have a positive effect on students understanding of history as a social construction.

Future Research

There are a variety of future research possibilities for this line of work. For example, how do two disciplinary approaches in one classroom affect each other and the student’s use of them? In this study, Cathy Tucker’s New Critical approach to literary texts did not always reinforce my more constructivist inquiry approach to history texts. What might happen in a classroom where reader-response theory with its emphasis on the transaction between the reader, the text, and the author (Rosenblatt, 1978) is the basis of the literature portion of the integrated course? It may be that when students have to shift back and forth between two different ways of knowing literature and history that they are not able to take on either perspective well. The use of such differing approaches in an integrated classroom may be, at times, conceptually confusing to students’ efforts to use each approach.

The reality in room 221 was that there were various tensions between the teaching partners and their approaches to learning. In the research described here, as Cathy’s teaching partner, I could not be explicit with either her or the students about those tensions and ways that those tensions might be affecting the classroom interactions. Consider what might happen in a classroom where those tensions are made an explicit part of the classroom discourse and fodder for students to understand the teachers, the instructional and disciplinary processes, and themselves. This seems both a worthy pedagogical approach and topic for future research.

Certainly an examination of any differences between male and female students’ ways of knowing history is a useful path. As Applebee, Langer, and Mullis (1987)
pointed out, traditional sex roles and interests still affect student behavior and learning in the study of literature. A similar examination of gender roles in learning history within a constructivist structure would be valuable.

The use of heuristics in the small group’s discussions during episodes seemed to develop across the school year. It would be interesting to use think-aloud protocols, a la Wineburg (1991a, 1991b), at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year to consider how, if at all, students display sourcing, contextualizing, and corroborating heuristics in their reading and oral analyses. This research might offer more direct evidence of a connection between classroom activities and students’ independent behavior.

Longitudinal studies of historical understanding are largely non-existent. It would be interesting to follow the same six students who worked in the small group to see if they continue to use heuristic strategies beyond the eleventh grade. A further extension would study the same students as they enter college and use the same historical sources. Would they use their background knowledge about the authors to understand what the authors are saying as did Wineburg’s historians? For example, are they trying to establish differing types of authority using specific kinds of evidence?

The data already collected also offer various research opportunities. The writings collected during the year could be examined to see whether they reflect a change in students’ thinking about history and historians. Since only about twenty-three percent of student comments were references to the documents, what else is going on in the small groups? Do these other activities influence student learning? Since at most 30 percent of student references to the documents reflect the use of heuristics, what else are students doing as they refer to the documents?
Finally, if students develop as historical thinkers within this very structured classroom, a future research study might allow students more decisions as the year goes on. The fact is that I set the classroom agenda, established the questions, chose the sources, framed the questions that students were to address. Further research might examine whether, as Applebee and other constructivist thinkers believe, this support can be gently and successfully withdrawn after which students would take on more responsibility and become independent of this instructional scaffold. Or might the instructional scaffolding reinforce student dependence upon the teacher and thus pre-empt for the entire year students' move out of the traditional mold of dependent novice toward independent expert?

At this point, studies might examine the type of classroom approach which would both support student learning and student independence. The teacher/researcher could have students act even more as historians, finding their own documents and working through them in their own ways as suggested by McGinley and Tierney in “Traversing the Topical Landscape” (1989). If students were allowed to be independent in their work with sources, would they develop a more sustained use of the corroboration and contextualization heuristics or would they founder in a sea of information and turn back to simply memorizing content? An examination of the difficulty teachers have in negotiating between being an “expert” who sets the agenda and perhaps transmits information and being a facilitator who is trying to facilitate a community of scholars (who each have an authoritative voice) would be another valuable tack for researchers to take.

I began this document with the case of a man who had “lost” his history; I would like to close with a vignette featuring one of my students (with her permission) who was gaining a new sense of history. Mary Johnson was in my Advanced Placement American
Studies class the school year after the year addressed in this research. Mary found me in
the hall early in her senior year after having made a series of college visits that summer.

"I visited colleges this summer and I went to Princeton. Guess who is teaching at
Princeton!"

She looked at me expectantly and, when I had no answer, she went on.

"Lincoln's MacPherson teaches at Princeton! I was in the motel room and I was
reading the names of the faculty, and I started screaming, 'Mom! Dad! Guess who
teaches here! Lincoln's MacPherson teaches here! I could take a course with Lincoln's
MacPherson!"

Mary's excited report is significant. MacPherson is one of five historians we read
when we examined sources about Abraham Lincoln; Mary is remembering one of those
historians and thinking about him as an historian, as a person, as a teacher, as someone
with whom she might interact. Even more significant was her choice of word order to
indicate possession. Historians might speak of MacPherson's Lincoln, the unique
interpretation that MacPherson gives to Lincoln. Mary, on the other hand, is delighted
with the prospect of having a class with Lincoln's MacPherson. She is speaking about
the historian in terms of his subject; she is suggesting that what MacPherson writes about
Lincoln reveals something about MacPherson. Mary continues to construct her own
understanding of history and historians; eventually she is likely to develop her
understanding of the field of history and speak of MacPherson's Lincoln as historians
would. Regardless, her comment shows a significant development in her thinking about
history as this research effort tried to demonstrate, and perhaps, the constructivist inquiry
used in Advanced Placement American Studies was a part of Mary's intellectual growth
as a student and as a citizen.
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INTERVIEW GUIDE ON THE USE OF SECONDARY AND PRIMARY SOURCES IN SMALL GROUPS

Materials needed:
1. tape recorder and cassette tape
2. copies of primary source: The Declaration of Independence (or other primary or secondary sources depending on the episode.)

I. Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my project. I am interested in your ideas about the use of small groups and the use of primary sources, particularly the Declaration of Independence [or other primary or secondary sources, depending on the episode], in our class. There is no right answer nor any one answer that I'm looking for.

You and the high school will be anonymous.

II. Interview:

1. One of the learning strategies that we use in American Studies from time to time is small groups.
   a. What did you think of working in small groups?
   b. In your opinion, how effective was today's use of small groups?

2. In class from time to time, we use primary [secondary] sources.
   a. In your opinion, why do we use primary [secondary] sources?
   b. What do you think about the use of primary [secondary] sources?

3. Today, for example, you looked at the Declaration of Independence as a primary source (or other primary or secondary sources depending on the episode)
   a. What was it like reading The Declaration of Independence (or other primary or secondary sources depending on the episode) last night on your own?
   b. What was the experience of working with The Declaration of Independence (or other primary or secondary sources depending on the episode) like for you in the small groups?
   c. What did you learn from the other group members? from the discussion? What did the other group members learn from you?

III. Conclusion

1. As you think back over today's activity what else would you like to say?
2. Any comments on the process?
3. Any questions about what we did or about my project?

Thank you! Thank you! Thank you!
APPENDIX B

COMPLETE WRITING PROMPTS FOR THE FOUR EPISODES

The Declaration of Independence Episode Writing Prompt

The Declaration of Independence is both an historical document filled with charges against George III and an example of Neoclassical writing. Describe how Thomas Jefferson combines the charges against the king and the Neoclassical features to make a strong case for the independence of the colonies, a stronger case than could have been made had the Declaration been just a list of charges or just a piece of Neoclassical writing.

You may use Lytle and Davidson, Morgan, your small group worksheet, and/or your copy of the Declaration as you write your essay.

Your answer should be concise, focused and precise. Do not try to tell me everything; tell me what you see as the most important evidence which best supports your thesis. Make sure you use specific historical, textual, and literary examples, not generalizations, to support your ideas. Also, as appropriate, refer to the sources you use by name.

Abraham Lincoln as President Episode Writing Prompt

Historians consistently identify Abraham Lincoln as a “great” president, second only to George Washington.

Was Lincoln a great president or was he a mediocre president who happened to be in office during the Civil War and was assassinated?

To make this assessment, historians use specific criteria to analyze a president’s behavior in office or they examine interpretations of his behavior and compare and contrast his strengths and weaknesses accordingly. Consider Lincoln in the light of this criteria or by comparing his strengths and weaknesses.

Defend your position using evidence from McFeeley and Hofstadter, the secondary sources (Oates, Wills, and McPhearson), the primary sources (the First Inaugural, Greeley and Lincoln’s public letters, Emancipation Proclamation, Gettysburg Address, and the Second Inaugural), the notes on differing interpretations of Lincoln.
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The Great War Episode Writing Prompt

In 1920 Warren G. Harding and the Republicans took power. The US Senate launched an investigation of the US involvement in the Great War. They attempted to examine the causes of the war, reasons for US involvement, experiences of the war, and the consequences and ramifications of the war to decide if the US had been right in getting involved.

For this essay, you are to attempt the same process. Examine the causes of the war, reasons for US involvement, experiences of the war, and the consequences and ramifications of the war up to 1920.

Was the US right in getting involved?

Use your secondary sources (class notes, Blum, Luckacs, Kadashian, and Mayer) and primary sources (Wilson's speeches, the Zimmerman Note, Empey's memoirs [Over the Top], and the fictional pieces [All Quiet on the Western Front, "Dulce Et Decorum Est," "Children's Crusade"]) to support your evaluation of US involvement in the Great War.

Your essay should be a clear argument based on a balanced use of secondary and primary sources. Refer to the sources you use by the name of the author. Make sure you include specific evidence of actions taken by the people and nations involved. Specifics, details, examples will all make your essay stronger.

Focus on the Sixties Episode Writing Prompt

The 1960s have been lauded and vilified, analyzed and ignored, remembered with awe, embarrassment, and disdain. With all of this emotional response, however, the sixties still haven't received a lasting label, a paradigm which will allow us to understand the decade that lasted from 1960 to 1974.

When we examined the 1920s, we examined the standard paradigm for the 20s—"Roaring" and proposed alternatives that we thought better included the range of events from the era.

For this essay, you are to attempt the same process. Examine the events of the 60s with a special eye to your area of focus (the Presidency, the Civil Rights Movement, social history, or the Vietnam War) and decide what label to attach to the period, what paradigm to use to understand the diverse events of the times. Then give specific evidence that supports your interpretation of the time.

Use your secondary sources (Schlesinger, Archer, Life, Sidey, New York Times, and Moyers) and primary sources (Kennedy's, Johnson's, and Nixon's speeches, announcements, and letters; Voting Rights Act, Equal Opportunity Act, and the Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam) and the visual your group watched to support your argument for a specific label and paradigm.
Your essay should be a clear argument based on a balanced use of secondary and primary sources. Refer to the sources you use by the name of the author. Make sure you include specific evidence of actions taken by the people and nations involved. Specifics, details, examples will all make your essay stronger.
APPENDIX C

SAMPLE FIELD NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First hour we did the totems. Totems with 43 people took the first hour.</th>
<th>Kids were very creative. Best one was one with vegetables that represented her personality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did FFF—A short article on Hirsch’s cultural literacy with a list of things they should know. Just read it and didn’t go over with they really knew it or now. Handed out the notes that I had grouped together from our “What is History?” discussion. Talked briefly about them.</td>
<td>Didn’t spend as much time on FFF as I would normally. I really feel C’s presence this time. I wonder how this is affecting my teaching and my decision making. Students seem interested in this discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let them divide into groups for the Newsweek activity. Small groups worked with the magazines. I went around and suggested to each that they organized them by month at least, none had thought to do that. Worked all period, including the time that should have been B so on Tuesday we will let her take a the time she wants and I’ll try to finish the assignment, Tuesday and Wednesday.</td>
<td>In the groups we talked about opinion and we talked about working with other historians and working and being critiqued in public and responding to that critique so that people don’t just give opinion. So I think this is the direction that we will go in the class discussion on Tuesday.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I also wonder how I'm being affected as a researcher. When they got into their groups I didn’t tell them anything, just get into self selected groups and when b started encouraging people I got upset and I realize now I wasn’t helping so it would be naturalistic but in reality as a teacher I would be in their encouraging people to work together. So where do I draw the line? How do I draw the line, I’m the researcher and the teacher.

*

Opinion
Historians as a community of scholars
Interpretation

As I look back on these notes, I’m surprised by how comfortable students were in examining the issues of historiography.

September 6, 1994
Reflexive Journal

TUESDAY

Took attendance, still getting used to the horseshoe and being next to the right people to help us with attendance since we don’t know names yet.

Cathy took the majority of the two hours since I ran over on Friday.
Cathy did vocal because of the word muse. Had students read their definitions of the words they looked up for today. Gave sample sentence and talked about the word.
I gave students who participated a + next to their names on the roster and will transfer it to the grade book.

Cathy finished her lecture on Learning how to Learn. Went late so they went for a late break.

Even though she wanted to start a poem, she didn’t and I went ahead with the Newsweek activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I assigned ATF Ch 1, Serving Time in VA for Thursday. They will do a journal entry on it for Thursday.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students got into groups and picked up from yesterday. They worked with the magazines getting ready to write their essays. Stopped them with 10 minutes to go and talked about “What do H do?”. What is H? Opinion vs Interpretation, How can we have a H book?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We talked about opinion vs. interpretation, I asked them if history could just be opinion from their small groups and we talked about talking to other people and the group agreeing before anything could be written down. I’ll assign them to write about this in their journal. We talked about opinion vs. interpretation, I asked them if history could just be opinion from their small groups and we talked about talking to other people and the group agreeing before anything could be written down. I’ll assign them to write about this in their journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been thinking about the class discussions over the last couple of days and at first I thought how sophisticated my students were, arguing that history is opinion. Some of course see history as a list of facts. But it seems a pseudo-sophistication the more I think about it. Students weren’t thinking about the criticism that occurs within the community or the fact that stuff that’s published draws other responses. There weren’t thinking about the community of scholars that historians work within. I’m not sure they really meant opinion either. When pressed on opinion they sort of backed up and said well facts. And when just talking about history, it turns into facts as well...they don’t talk about Morgan they talk about the content. They aren’t struck by the oddity that if it is all opinion then how come it is so similar, how can there be a standard history that most people agree to.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of interpretation
Community of Scholars

OK. Still seems like a pseudo-sophistication, but it was early in the year. So this is where students were starting from. They were at least raising the ideas of historiography: interpretation, perspective, construction of facts, but when they were pressed they seemed to fall back on the idea that history is facts. They certainly sounded more sophisticated by the end of the year, and when their ideas were probed then, they were better able to explain the ideas of interpretation, perspectives, construction of facts, and community of scholars. They didn't fall back onto the idea of history of facts.
APPENDIX D

ESTABLISHING INTER-RATER RELIABILITY

A fellow graduate student acted as a co-rater for this project. For the co-rater to enter the classroom context, she would have had to read the four history textbooks and the forty secondary and primary sources (from one page to five pages long) that students read. Even then she would have had difficulty distinguishing whether students were referring to the materials that they had read or to classroom discussions or to students' background knowledge. Given this difficulty, I identified references to documents on the transcript from which the other rater worked. The co-rater and I discussed any questions she had about why a specific student turn was identified as a reference to a document.

Next, we read over the coding directions (reproduced at the end of this appendix) and discussed the examples and any questions she had. As a training exercise, she and I coded the references to sources for all three of the heuristics in the first sustained discussion of the first small group discussion of the Declaration of Independence, a discussion of the secondary sources. A sustained discussion occurred when student turns focused on the documents or materials at hand until students were distracted onto a non-educational topic (e.g. "Say do you remember who the foreign exchange student was who...? "I wish the weather would stay warm.").
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Then we scored the first sustained discussion in all ten small group discussions, except that in place of the sustained discussion that we used for training, we scored the second sustained discussion that occurred during the secondary source discussion within the Declaration of Independence episode. We identified heuristics (contextualization-reference to time and location; corroboration - direct comparison, direct contrast, indirect comparison, indirect contrast; and sourcing) on a sustained discussion from each of the discussions, the results were then compared. There was no need for retraining. Finally, since student turns were most often coded as using the sourcing heuristic, the raters differentiated between the meanings of tag sourcing statements and substantive sourcing statements and the raters went back over all ten sustained discussions that were initially scored and labeled the already identified sourcing statements as either tags or substantive. There was no need for retraining.
Coding Directions: Indicators are emphasized in italics.

CONTEXTUALIZATION: turns in which students referred to the sources and placed the document in a specific time and location.

DT: reference to time period of the document

DT: The Declaration is certainly a neoclassical document. (Students are situating the document within a specific literary period and thus into a specific time period.)

DT: As a colonist, Jefferson didn’t care about England’s concerns when he wrote the Declaration. (By calling Jefferson a colonist, students are situating him in the Pre-revolutionary period.)

Some seeming references to time or location could not be counted as such since the reference did not focus in on a specific time.

Jefferson’s ideas in the Declaration sure sound like Locke’s ideas. (Locke wrote prior to Jefferson but there is nothing in the student’s comments that indicate that they know this. A similar statement might refer to Aristotle which would clearly not be a use of the contextualization heuristic.)

DL: reference to the location where the document came from

DL: It surprised me that writing in the colonies, Jefferson reflected the ideas of Europeans like Locke and Diderot.

CORROBORATION turns in which students referred to the sources and directly compared texts, directly contrasted texts, indirectly compared texts, indirectly contrasted texts.

DCM: Direct Comparison. Students used words such as “like,” “similar,” and “the same” and mentioned the other text.

DCM: Here Jefferson writes just like Locke did in his essays.
DCM: Morgan's ideas about the Declaration sound *the same* as Lytle and Davidson's.

DCN: Direct Contrast. Students used words such as "not alike," "dissimilar," "not the same," and "different" and mentioned the other text.

DCN: Jefferson's essay is *not the same* as Locke's essay.

DCN: Morgan's and Lytle and Davidson's theories are *not alike*.

DICM: Inferred Comparison. Students used words such as "like," "similar," and "the same" but the other texts were not mentioned by name.

DICM: Jefferson's ideas sound just *like government by contract* [idea discussed in essay by Locke that students read].

DICN: Inferred Contrast. Students used words such as "not alike," "dissimilar," "not the same," and "different" but the other texts were not mentioned by name.

DICN: Morgan is *different, he doesn't talk about when the Declaration was signed* [a major focus of the article by Lytle and Davidson].

SOURCING: turns in which students referred to the authors of the sources by the author's name. The reference is to the person as an author not as a fact in history. Turns in which students used the sourcing heuristic are also scored as either tag statements (use of the author's name as a way to identify the article) or as substantive statements (use of the author's name in a statement that discusses the writer as an author).

DS: reference to the author of the source
DS: Hofstadter [author of *American Political Tradition*] was critical of Lincoln’s presidency.

Some seeming references to people could not be counted as sourcing statements since the reference did not focus on the person as an author of the source.

The article was about Lincoln. (The reference to Lincoln is a reference to his role in history not to him as the author of the article.)

DSA: (Tag) Turns in which students use the author’s name as an author but only as a handy way to identify the article or in a way that is unclear.

As indicator of article

DSA: Let’s start with Wilson’s 14 Points (the name of one of the articles).

DSA: I can’t find Foner (the author of one of the sources) anywhere in my backpack.

Unclear:

DSA: Wilson!

DSB: (Substantive) Turns in which students used the sourcing heuristics and discussed the person as the author, indicating perspective, interpretation, attitude, etc.

DSB: Hofstadter [author of *American Political Tradition*] was critical of Lincoln’s presidency.

DSB: Lytle and Davidson (authors of *After the Fact*) see Wilson as an important president.

DSB: What is Schlesinger’s (author of chapters on the 1960s in *The National Experience*) take on the Vietnam war?

DSB: He (Schlesinger) says that Johnson was wrong about Vietnam.

DSB: They (Lytle and Davidson) make a strong argument about the FDA.
This sample of a coded transcript is an excerpt (lines 15 through 70) from the small group discussion on the Declaration of Independence: the first small group discussion of the year. This excerpt was chosen since it showed all three heuristics, contextualization, corroboration, and sourcing. It did not, however, show examples of all the elements of each heuristics. No transcript did.

The same excerpt is shown for each of the heuristics and the aspect of the statement which indicated the type of heuristic that was coded is in italics.

Coding for Contextualization

\[ \text{D} = \text{reference to document} \]
\[ \text{DT} = \text{reference to document which includes a time marker, an example of one form of contextualization.} \]
\[ \text{DL} = \text{reference to document which includes a reference to the location the document comes from, an example of the other form of contextualization.} \]

Group members are Mitch Blader, Lilly Gardner, Krystyna Romanov, Howard Champion, Roger Knight, Libby Booker.
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15. Howard what are we doing?
16. Lilly Uhm. We’re supposed to answer those three questions.
17. Mitch ok
18. Lilly (laughing) I feel really stupid with this mic here, cause I feel like I have to say everything, like, right, have it be the right answer, like: (with emphasis) And this is my answer!

Group laughter.

19. Krys (laughing) Wrong!
20. Libby right, yeah.

[pause-throat clearing, page turning]

D
21. Lilly So...do we have any questions about Lytle & Davidson and Morgan are saying...about the Declaration of Independence?
22. Howard Uhm (facetiously) I don’t have any questions.
23. Lilly Ryan, wake up.
   (laughter)
24. Lilly any questions? Anybody think of anything?
   (pause)
25. Lilly Oh (as if just found or thought of something)
   (mumbling)
26. Lilly Uh, Anything personal you want to tell us?
27. Howard Is there a position?
28. Lilly Ok, yeah, let’s get each groups perspective.
29. Libby So, this is just to prepare for our timed wring thing?
30. Lilly I believe it is. Uhm
   (Pause. Pages Turning)

DT
31. Libby Does anyone know, ah, like, if there was, ah, any events leading up to the actual writing of the work? “cause I kinda wondered if, ah, Jefferson just kind of thought up the whole thing himself...you know like all the ideas/
32. Lilly yeah

D
33. Libby did they collaborate, you know, or talk about the ideas, or did he just go home and make the thing up?
34. Lilly (Ilimitating Jefferson at home) oh, this sounds good.

DT
35. Krys I thought it was, like, uhm, you know, the philosophy of all the Enlightenment, like philosophers...like Locke ‘n everybody. that influenced Jefferson, but then in After the Fact that it something like he was the one that wrote it, like Locke did, but then like.......a quarter of it was changed..So it was probably like most of his ideas which were not like totally his ideas because he was influence by all the philosophers.

DL
36. Lilly Plus like the whole...he probably...during the whole second session of the Continental Congress and I can just hear them, like, taking notes about what they’re talking about, then going home and just, you know, putting it in a written form...So, it’s probably you know a big
combination of everybody’s ideas at the continental Congress (clears throat)

[D37. Lilly] Uhm. does anybody have an idea of what we’re gonna...Morgan’s position would be?


[D39. Lilly] kinda, like that the Declaration was long awaited...like it was something that you know, that t that they’d been building up to for years, you know, through all the problems that they’d had 'n all the tax revenues and all that stuff...well, then finally they got this Declaration that was separating them from

[40. Krys] England

[41. Libby] and so, like, our...

[D42. Howard] he thinks its good, I mean

[43. Krys] yeah

[44. Mitch] yeah, cause its like

[D45. Krys] yeah he thinks, like, in the last paragraph its saying...the whole paragraphs tailing about how...it was, like, uhmm, you can, you know, it was a little...because of, like unjust treatment

[D46. Howard] yeah

[D47. Krys] so you wonder you know... you could think that, like it it was to do with was was going on

[48. Mitch] I’m ah

[49. Libby] Oh yes. I have that (laughter)

[D50. Lilly] Uhm. But then again who would think that the Declaration was bad though.

[D51. Libby] yeah. That’s what I’m saying, what do you think Lytle and Davidson thought. Like, they didn’t really discuss the actual events.

[D52. Krys] Yeah, they just kind of dissected the the whole Declaration, like, saying, like, who wrote what and when and, like, what are the controversies.

[D53. Lilly] Well, we can just say their perspective of it, which it is, is just that they

[54. Libby] there was good causes, there was a reason

[55. Lilly] yeah

[D56. Libby] and that yeah but like they, some authors said how it was just sorta built up. you know what I mean. You know, changed it and changed it until they got what they wanted.

pause]

[57. Howard] what’s it [the essay prompt] mean by Neoclassical features...of writing/

[58. Krys] You know the, like the neoclassical its what we are talking about .....how they have come back to the classical way of writing, so its like/
59. Libby philosophy/
60. Lilly yeah/
61. Howard huh (indicates understanding)
62. Krys Yeah like the Greek and the Romans/oh yeah. So the question is like how is the Declaration compared to that, the new way of like this Neoclassical way, right?
63. Mitch So how does the Neoclassical thing...help it get its...point across?
D64. Krys well its just well-written I think..
D65. Mitch well what makes it get it point across? I'm not, I mean
D66. Krys well if it had been badly written, like, bad writing them...
D67. Mitch you could write it like Hawthorne wrote it and it would still be good writing but it wouldn't get its point across and stuff...
68. Lilly (considers hmmmm) well the answer is...
[cothing/mumbling]...............
D69. Libby well it presents everyone's beliefs, their philosophy was what everyone had
D70. Krys but I see what Ryan's saying, like it could have been like in a different, you like, like the the Romance kind of writing and still would get the point across.

Coding for Corroboration

D = reference to document
DCM = reference to document which is a direct comparison with another document, an example of corroboration.
DCN = reference to document which is a direct contrast with another document, another example of corroboration.
DICM = reference to document which is an indirect comparison with another document, the third example of corroboration.
DICN = reference to document which is an indirect contrast with another document, the final example of corroboration.

15. Howard what are we doing?
16. Lilly Uhm. We're supposed to answer those three questions.
17. Mitch ok
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18. Lilly (laughing) I feel really stupid with this mic here, cause I feel like I have to say everything, like, right, have it be the right answer, like: (with emphasis) And this is my answer!

Group laughter.
19. Krys (laughing) Wrong!
20. Libby right, yeah.
[pause-throat clearing, page turning]

D 21. Lilly So...do we have any questions about Lytle & Davidson and Morgan are saying..about the Declaration of Independence?
22. Howard Uhm (facetiously) I don’t have any questions.
23. Lilly Ryan, wake up.
(laughter)
24. Lilly any questions? Anybody think of anything?
(laughter)
25. Lilly (mumbling) (pause)
26. Lilly Uh, Anything personal you want to tell us?
27. Howard Is there a position?
28. Lilly Ok, yeah, let’s get each groups perspective.
29. Libby So, this is just to prepare for our timed thing?
30. Lilly I believe it is. Uhm (pause. Pages Turning)

D 31. Libby Does anyone know, ah, like, if there was, ah, any events leading up to the actual writing of the work? “cause I kinda wondered if, ah, Jefferson just kind of thought up the whole thing himself...you know like all the ideas/
32. Lilly yeah

D 33. Libby did they collaborate, you know, or talk about the ideas, or did he just go home and make the thing up?
34. Lilly (imitating Jefferson at home) oh, this sounds good.

DCM 35. Krys I thought it was, like, uhm, you know, the philosophy of all the Enlightenment, like philosophers...like Locke ‘n everybody, that influenced Jefferson, but *then in After the Fact* that it something like he was the one that wrote it, *like Locke did*, but then like...a quarter of it was changed...So it was probably like most of his ideas which were not like totally his ideas because he was influence by all the philosophers.

D 36. Lilly Plus like the whole...he probably...during the whole second session of the Continental Congress and I can just hear them, like, tailing notes about what they’re tailing about, then going home and just, you know, putting it in a written form...So, it’s probably you know a big combination of everybody’s ideas at the continental Congress (clears throat)

[Long pause........................................... page flipping]

D 37. Lilly Uhm. does anybody have an idea of what we’re gonna...Morgan’s position would be?
38. Howard no.
kinda, like that the Declaration was long awaited...like it was something that you know, that that they’d been building up to for years, you know, through all the problems that they’d had 'n all the tax revenues and all that stuff...well, then finally they got this Declaration that was separating them from England and so, like, our...

he thinks its good, I mean

yeah, cause its like

yeah he thinks, like, in the last paragraph its saying...the whole paragraphs tailing about how...it was, like, uhm, you can, you know, it was a little...because of, like unjust treatment

so you wonder you know... you could think that, like it it was to do with was was going on

I’m ah

Oh yes. I have that (laughter)
[long pause]

Uhm. But then again who would think that the Declaration was bad though.

yeah. That’s what I’m saying, what do you think Lytle and Davidson thought. Like, they didn’t really discuss the actual events.

Yeah, they just kind of dissected the the whole Declaration, like, saying, like, who wrote what and when and, like, what are the controversies.

Well, we can just say their perspective of it, which it is, is just that they there was good causes, there was a reason

yeah

and that yeah but like they, some authors said how it was just sorta built up. you know what I mean. You know, changed it and changed it until they got what they wanted.

what’s it mean by Neoclassical features...of writing/

You know the, like the neoclassical its what we are talking about .....how they have come back to the classical way of writing, so its like/

philosophy/

yeah

huh (indicates understanding)

Yeah like the Greek and the Romans/oh yeah. So the question is like how is the Declaration compared to that, the new way of like this Neoclassical way, right?

So how does the Neoclassical thing...help it get its...point across?
D64. Krys well it's just well-written I think.

D65. Mitch well what makes it get it point across? I'm not, I mean

D66. Krys well if it had been badly written, like, bad writing them...

D67. Mitch you *could write it like Hawthorne* wrote it and it would still be good writing but it wouldn't get its point across and stuff...

68. Lilly (considers hmmm) well the answer is... [coughing/mumbling]..............

D69. Libby well it presents everyone's beliefs, their philosophy was what everyone had

DICM70. Krys but I see what Ryan's saying, like it could have been like in a different, you like, *like the the Romance kind of writing* and still would get the point across. [Hawthorne's The Scarlet Letter is the quintessential example of Romantic writing and the students had just finished it]

Coding for sourcing statements

D = reference to document

DS = reference to document which includes the name of the author of the piece.

15. Howard what are we doing?
16. Lilly Uhm. We're supposed to answer those three questions.
17. Mitch ok
18. Lilly (laughing) I feel really stupid with this mic here, cause I feel like I have to say everything, like, right, have it be the right answer, like: (with emphasis) And this is my answer!

Group laughter.

19. Krys (laughing) Wrong!
20. Libby right, yeah.

[pause-throat clearing, page turning]

DS21. Lilly So...do we have any questions about Lytle & Davidson and Morgan are saying..about the Declaration of Independence?
22. Howard Uhm (facetiously) I don't have any questions.
23. Lilly Ryan, wake up.
(laughter)
24. Lilly any questions? Anybody think of anything?
(laughter)
25. Lilly Oh (as if just found or thought of something)

(mumbling)

26. Lilly Uh, Anything personal you want to tell us?
27. Howard Is there a position?
28. Lilly Ok, yeah, let's get each group's perspective.
29. Libby: So, this is just to prepare for our timed writing thing?
30. Lilly: I believe it is. Uhm

(Pause. Pages turning)

31. Libby: Does anyone know, ah, like, if there was, ah, any events leading up to the actual writing of the work? "cause I kinda wondered if, ah, Jefferson just kind of thought up the whole thing himself...you know like all the ideas?

32. Lilly: Yeah.
33. Libby: Did they collaborate, you know, or talk about the ideas, or did he just go home and make the thing up?

34. Lilly: (imitating Jefferson at home) Oh, this sounds good.

(imitating Jefferson) Kind of thought up the whole thing himself, you know like all the ideas?

35. Krys: I thought it was, like, uhm, you know, the philosophy of all the Enlightenment, like philosophers...like Locke 'n everybody, that influenced Jefferson, then in After the Fact that it something like he was the one that wrote it, like Locke did, but then like...a quarter of it was changed...So it was probably like most of his ideas which were not like totally his ideas because he was influence by all the philosophers.

36. Lilly: Plus like the whole...he probably...during the whole second session of the Continental Congress and I can just hear them, like, taking notes about what they're talking about, then going home and just, you know, putting it in a written form...So, it's probably you know a big combination of everybody's ideas at the continental Congress (clears throat)

[Long pause............................................. page flipping]

37. Lilly: Uhm. Does anybody have an idea of what we're gonna...Morgan's position would be?
38. Howard: No.
39. Lilly: Kinda, like that the Declaration was long awaited...like it was something that you know, that, that they'd been building up to for years, you know, through all the problems that they'd had 'n all the tax revenues and all that stuff...well, then finally they got this Declaration that was separating them from England

40. Krys: and so, like, our...
41. Libby: [Morgan] thinks its good, I mean
42. Howard: He [Morgan] thinks its good, I mean
43. Krys: Yeah.
44. Mitch: Yeah, cause its like
45. Krys: Yeah. He thinks, like, in the last paragraph its saying...the whole paragraphs tailing about how...it was, like, uhm, you can, you know, it was a little...because of, like unjust treatment
46. Howard: Yeah.
47. Krys: So you wonder you know...you could think that, like it it was to do with was was going on
48. Mitch: I'm ah
49. Libby: Oh yes. I have that (laughter)
Uhm. But then again who would think that the Declaration was bad though.

Yeah, that's what I'm saying, what do you think Lytle and Davidson thought. Like, they didn't really discuss the actual events.

Yeah, they just kind of dissected the whole Declaration, like, saying, like, who wrote what and when and, like, what are the controversies.

Well, we can just say their perspective of it, which it is, is just that they there was good causes, there was a reason.

And that yeah but like they, some authors said how it was just sorta built up. You know what I mean. You know, changed it and changed it until they got what they wanted.

what they mean by Neoclassical features...of writing

You know the, like the neoclassical its what we are talking about, how they [Framers of the Declaration] have come back to the classical way of writing, so its like/philosophy.

Yeah like the Greek and the Romans oh yeah. So the question is like how is the Declaration compared to that, the new way of like this Neoclassical way, right?

So how does the Neoclassical thing...help it get its...point across?

well it's just well-written I think..

well what makes it get it point across? I'm not, I mean

well if it had been badly written, like, bad writing them...

you could write it like Hawthorne wrote it and it would still be good writing but it wouldn't get its point across and stuff...

(considers hmmmm) well the answer is...

well it presents everyone's beliefs, their philosophy was what everyone had

but I see what Ryan's saying, like it could have been like in a different, you like, like the the Romance kind of writing and still would get the point across.
Coding for Tag Sourcing and for Substantive Sourcing

**DSA** = Turns in which students’ references to the document included the name of the author of the piece as a handy way to differentiate between items.

**DSB** = Turns in which students’ references to the document included the name of the author and a comment on the writer’s style, intent, perspective, interpretation, etc.

15. Howard what are we doing?
16. Lilly Uhm. We’re supposed to answer those three questions.
17. Mitch ok
18. Lilly (laughing) I feel really stupid with this mic here, cause I feel like I have to say everything, like, right, have it be the right answer, like: (with emphasis) And this is my answer!

Group laughter.
19. Krys (laughing) Wrong!
20. Libby right, yeah.

[pause-throat clearing, page turning]

**DSB**
21. Lilly So...do we have any questions about Lytle & Davidson and Morgan are saying...about the Declaration of Independence?
22. Howard Uhm (facetiously) I don’t have any questions.
23. Lilly Ryan, wake up.
   (laughter)
24. Lilly any questions? Anybody think of anything?
   (pause)
25. Lilly Oh (as if just found or thought of something)
   (mumbling)
26. Lilly Uh, Anything personal you want to tell us?
27. Howard Is there a position?
28. Lilly Ok, yeah, let’s get each groups perspective.
29. Libby So, this is just to prepare for our timed wring thing?
30. Lilly I believe it is. Uhm
   (Pause. Pages Turning)

**DSB**
31. Libby Does anyone know, ah, like, if there was, ah, any events leading up to the actual writing of the work? “cause I kinda wondered if, ah, Jefferson just kind of thought up the whole thing himself...you know like all the ideas/
32. Lilly yeah
33. Libby did they collaborate, you know, or talk about the ideas, or did he just go home and make the thing up?
34. Lilly (imitating Jefferson at home) oh, this sounds good.

**DSB**
35. Krys I thought it was, like, uhm, you know, the philosophy of all the Enlightenment, like philosophers...like Locke ’n everybody, that influenced Jefferson, but then in After the Fact that it something like he was the one that wrote it, like Locke did, but then like........a
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which were not like totally his ideas because he was influence by all
the philosophers.

**DSB36. Lilly** Plus like the whole...*he* probably...during the whole second session
of the Continental Congress and I can just hear them, like, taking
notes about what they’re talking about, then going home and just, you
know, putting it in a written form...So, it’s probably you know a big
combination of everybody’s ideas at the continental Congress (clears
throat)

[Long pause............................................................ page flipping]

**DSB37. Lilly** Uhm. does anybody have an idea of what we’re gonna...*Morgan’s*
position would be?

38. **Howard** no.

39. **Lilly** kinda, like that the Declaration was long awaited...like it was
something that you know, that, that they’d been building up to for for
years, you know, through all the problems that they’d had ‘n all the
tax revenues and all that stuff...well, then finally they got this
Declaration that was separating them from

40. **Krys** England

41. **Libby** and so, like, our...

**DSB42. Howard** *he* [Morgan] thinks its good, I mean

43. **Krys** yeah

44. **Mitch** yeah, cause its like

**DSB45. Krys** yeah *he* thinks, like, in the last paragraph its saying...the whole
paragraphs tailing about how...it was, like, uhm, you can, you know,
it was a little...because of, like unjust treatment

46. **Howard** yeah

47. **Krys** so you wonder you know... you could think that, like it it was to do
with was was going on

48. **Mitch** I’m ah

49. **Libby** Oh yes. I have that (laughter)

[long pause]..................................................

50. **Lilly** Uhm. But then again who would think that the Declaration was bad
though.

**DSB51. Libby** yeah. That’s what I’m saying, what do you think *Lytle and Davidson*
thought. Like, *they* didn’t really discuss the actual events.

**DSB52. Krys** Yeah, *they* just kind of dissected the the whole Declaration, like,
saying, like, who wrote what and when and, like, what are the
controversies.

**DSB53. Lilly** Well, we can just say *their* perspective of it, which it is, is just that
they

54. **Libby** there was good causes, there was a reason

55. **Lilly** yeah

**DSB56. Libby** and that yeah but like *they*, some authors said how it was just sorta
built up, you know what I mean. You know, changed it and changed
it until they got what they wanted.
DSB57. Howard what they mean by Neoclassical features...of writing

DSB58. Krys You know the, like the neoclassical its what we are talking about
...how they [Framers of the Declaration] have come back to the
classical way of writing, so its like/

59. Libby philosophy
60. Lilly yeah
61. Howard huh (indicates understanding)
62. Krys Yeah like the Greek and the Romans oh yeah. So the question is like
how is the Declaration compared to that, the new way of like this
Neoclassical way, right?

63. Mitch So how does the Neoclassical thing...help it get its...point across?
64. Krys well its just well-written I think..
65. Mitch well what makes it get it point across? I'm not, I mean
66. Krys well if it had been badly written, like, bad writing them...
67. Mitch you could write it like Hawthorne wrote it and it would still be good
writing but it wouldn't get its point across and stuff...
68. Lilly (considers hmmm) well the answer is...
[coughing/mumbling].............
69. Libby well it presents everyone's beliefs, their philosophy was what
everyone had
70. Krys but I see what Ryan's saying, like it could have been like in a
different, you like, like the the Romance kind of writing and still
would get the point across.
APPENDIX F

STRANDS AND ELEVENTH GRADE INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

Taken from the Anandale City Schools, Course of Study, Social Studies, K-12.

The eleventh grade examines American history in the time period from 1607. This year provides learners with the opportunity to investigate the backgrounds and clarify the issues of the twentieth century. This is a complementary course to eleventh grade language arts.

American Heritage
The learner will
1. identify key events and explain their impact on subsequent developments.
2. identify significant individuals and groups in history, gauge their impact on specific historical events and assess how they came to have such influence.
3. demonstrate historical continuity and/or change with respect to a particular historical development of theme by reconstructing and analyzing the chronological succession and duration of events associated with it.
4. evaluate major debates among historians concerning alternative interpretations of the past and project the consequences of broad acceptance of a particular position.

People in Societies
The learner will
1. identify various groups of immigrants that came to the United States between 1607 and the present and trace the social, political, and economic developments that led to the migrations.
2. describe the changing economic, political, and social situation of immigrants, women, Africa-Americans and Native Americans in the United States from 1607 to the present.
3. describe the efforts by African-Americans, native Americans, women, and other minorities during the twentieth century to achieve economic and political equality.

World Interactions
The learner will
1. utilize a variety of references to analyze and develop plausible explanations for historic and current events.
2. examine technology, transportation, and communication systems and their impact on the diffusion of people, ideas, products, and historical events.
3. evaluate how different governments and international agencies treat the problems of human rights
4. analyze diplomatic and military efforts to preserve world peace and advance national interests.

Decision Making and Resources
The learner will
1. compare traditional, market, command, and mixed economies in terms of how the fundamental economic questions are addressed.
2. explain the reasons for the rise of labor organizations between 1815 and the present and describe their impact on the economic development of the United States.
3. analyze the social and economic impact of the transformation from an agrarian society to an industrial/technological society.
4. explain how the lessons of the Great Depression have affected United States economic policy since the 1930s.
5. compare the laissez-fair attitude of the US government towards the economy through much of the nineteenth century with the increased activity of government in the economy during the late nineteenth century during the Progressive Era.

Democratic Processes
The learner will
1. identify consequences resulting from provisions of the United States Constitution.
2. examine the role of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the 14 Amendment to the Constitution in the expansion of individual rights and cite applications of "judicial review."
3. differential democracies and totalitarian regimes with regard to purposes, processes, and structures and compile examples of each type.
4. place the development of individual rights in the United States during the twentieth century.

Citizenship Rights and Responsibilities
The learner will
1. evaluate the role of political parties in the United States between 1789 and the present on the basis of the following criteria
   - effectiveness in influencing governmental policy
   - efficacy of efforts to achieve the public good.
   - relationship to the essential characteristics of American democracy.
2. distinguish between the powers held by each branch of government and determine when particular checks and balances are appropriate.
3. identify and critique the responsibilities of citizenship in a democratic society.

ELEVENTH GRADE PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES
1. The learner will prove global interdependence relying on events, personalities, customs, values and institutions from throughout American history.
2. Given historical examples of prejudice, the learner will identify ways to deal with their consequences.
3. Given significant events of American history, the learner will analyze their influence on current situations.
4. Given a series of related historical events of a single historical event, the learner will project how other choices made in those instances would have different consequences for today.
## COURSE OUTLINE, ADVANCED PLACEMENT AMERICAN STUDIES, 1994-95 (BY UNIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Year</th>
<th>American History Content</th>
<th>American History Materials</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>American Literature Materials</th>
<th>American Literature Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Year</td>
<td>Historiography Explorers and Early settlement</td>
<td>The National Experience by Blum, et. al.</td>
<td>H - Newsweek Activity</td>
<td>Literature edited by Johnson</td>
<td>How to Study Writing Native Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic: An Introduction to American Studies and America</td>
<td>After the Fact by Lytle and Davidson</td>
<td>L- analysis of poetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integration: The purpose of this unit is to introduce the course and the similar expectations between the disciplines, introduce critical thinking (both literary and historiography), and to introduce the study of American culture.
### Time of Year: Early September

| Topic: The Treatment of People who are different | Colonial America and examples of Mass hysteria through 1950s | The National Experience by Blum, et. al. | H - detailed discussion of the Puritan religious philosophy |
| American History | American History Materials | | American Literature Materials |
| Content | | | Content |

**Activities**
- **H** - detailed discussion of the Puritan religious philosophy
- **L** - Scarlet Letter Activity where students create and share letters symbolic of minor personal secret sins

**Materials**
- **H** - The National Experience by Blum, et. al.
- **L** - Scarlet Letter by Nathaniel Hawthorne
- **The Crucible by Arthur Miller**

**Integration:** The purpose of this unit is to present students with the ways that American society had treated people who are perceived as different. The discussion begins with the Puritans but includes an examination of Nativism, the Red Scare after World War I, and McCarthyism after World War II at the start of the Cold War.

### Time of Year: Late September

| Topic: Ways that historical events and literary philosophy influence each other. | Events leading up to and the American Revolution | The National Experience by Blum, et. al. | H - Declaration of Independence Focus Groups |
| American History | American History Materials | | American Literature Materials |
| Content | | | Content |

**Activities**
- **H** - Declaration of Independence Focus Groups
- **L** - small groups comparing neoclassical documents

**Materials**
- **H** - The National Experience by Blum, et. al.
- **L** - After the Fact by Lytle and Davidson
- **The Declaration of Independence**

**Integration:** In this unit we show how literature and history influence each other through an in-depth study of the Declaration of independence, and other writing of the pre-Revolutionary era.
### Time of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early October</th>
<th>Late October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### American History Content
- **Basis for American Government**
  - Articles of Confederation
  - The Constitution
  - Washington and Adams presidency

#### American History Materials
- *The National Experience* by Blum, et. al.
- *The Constitution*

#### Activities
- **H - Constitution Casebook Activity**
- **L - Native American**
  - Native American book group meetings and videotaped museum curator's talk
- **H - Constitution Casebook Activity**
- **L - Class discussion on modern altruism**
- **H - War of 1812 Debate**
- **L - Class discussion on modern altruism**

#### American Literature Materials
- **H - Constitution Casebook Activity**
- **L - Native American**
  - Native American book group meetings and videotaped museum curator's talk
- **H - Constitution Casebook Activity**
- **L - Class discussion on modern altruism**

#### American Literature Content
- **H - Constitution Casebook Activity**
- **L - Native American**
  - Native American book group meetings and videotaped museum curator's talk

### Integration:
- In this unit there is less integration between literature and history. History focuses on the Constitution (which is discussed as a neoclassical document) and the establishment of the government and in literature students choose a Native American Novel to read and create a project on.

#### Time of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late October</th>
<th>American History Content</th>
<th>American History Materials</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>American Literature Materials</th>
<th>American Literature Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis for American Culture</strong></td>
<td>Presidents Jefferson through Jackson</td>
<td><em>The National Experience</em> by Blum, et. al.</td>
<td><strong>H - Class discussion of different historian's interpretation of Jefferson</strong></td>
<td>Romantic writing by Melvile, Hawthorne, and Irving. <em>Literature</em> edited by Johnson</td>
<td>Romanticism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **H - Class discussion of different historian's interpretation of Jefferson**
- **H - War of 1812 Debate**
- **L - Class discussion on modern altruism**

#### American Literature Materials
- **H - Class discussion of different historian's interpretation of Jefferson**
- **H - War of 1812 Debate**
- **L - Class discussion on modern altruism**

#### American Literature Content
- **H - Class discussion of different historian's interpretation of Jefferson**
- **H - War of 1812 Debate**
- **L - Class discussion on modern altruism**

### Integration:
- We look at a symbiosis of history and literature and a truly American culture. We look at the presidencies of Washington, Adams, and Jefferson's and decide if their actions and outlook are neoclassical or romantic as well as a more traditional examination of the different Presidents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Year</th>
<th>American History Content</th>
<th>American History Materials</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>American Literature Materials</th>
<th>American Literature Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>H</strong> - Small group examination of similarities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Impetuses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and differences between the Declaration of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independence and the Declaration of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sentiments as well as the validity of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Declaration of Sentiments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>L</strong> - Commital trial for McMurphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We examine the impetus for reform in the US as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shown by movements and literature. We begin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with reform movements of the 1830s and 1840s and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>look at the reforms of the 1950s and 1960s as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in historical movements and literature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Year</th>
<th>American History Content</th>
<th>American History Materials</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>American Literature Materials</th>
<th>American Literature Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>H</strong> - Lincoln Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism Unit, Part I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slide show on &quot;Facing History&quot; the portrayal of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>African-Americans in American art-colonial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>period to modern.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>L</strong> - Group discussion of Douglass' writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and historical significance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This unit is a major focus of our entire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>curriculum. We examine the issue of racism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from three historical time periods and a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>variety of perspectives. This is the pre-civil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>war time period and the perspective of an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>escaped slave from Frederick Douglass'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>autobiography.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Time of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Focus:
- **Racism Unit, Part II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Year</th>
<th>American History Content</th>
<th>American History Materials</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>American Literature Materials</th>
<th>American Literature Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>The American Civil War</td>
<td><strong>The National Experience</strong> by Blum, et. al.</td>
<td>H - Civil War Era Book Talk</td>
<td><strong>Beloved</strong> by Toni Morrison</td>
<td>Novels with a Runaway Slave Motif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>We the American Women</strong> by Millstein and Brodin</td>
<td>The Valley of Death from the Ken Burns Civil War documentary</td>
<td><strong>Uncle Tom's Cabin</strong> by Harriet Beecher Stowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L - slave novel small groups</td>
<td>L - slave novel small groups</td>
<td><strong>The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn</strong> by Mark Twain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Integration:** In the second portion of this unit, we examine the issue of racism through a variety of descriptions of slavery and of the war that was fought, in part, to end slavery. The development of the literary styles of realism and naturalism as a consequence of people's experience of the Civil War is also emphasized.

#### Focus:
- **Racism Unit, Part III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Year</th>
<th>American History Content</th>
<th>American History Materials</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>American Literature Materials</th>
<th>American Literature Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Reconstruction and the treatment of African-Americans through 1960s</td>
<td><strong>The National Experience</strong> by Blum, et. al.</td>
<td>H - Slide show combining music and photos of labor unions, radical groups, and civil rights movement</td>
<td><strong>Native Son</strong> by Richard Wright</td>
<td>Treatment of African Americans in literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The Man Who Saw the Flood,&quot; by Richard Wright</td>
<td>L - Whole group discussion of the purpose of Bigger Thomas' character depiction.</td>
<td>Newspaper articles, columns, editorials on the issue of Racism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Integration:** In the final portion of this unit, we examine the issue of racism by looking at the success and failure of Reconstruction and how it showed up in people's lives in the 1930s and today. We also look at the history of labor unions, racial groups, and the civil rights movement as support for students' understanding of **Native Son**.
### Time of Year

#### February

**Focus:** Turn of the Century - History and literature

**Women's Unit**

- Industrialization, Urbanization, The Old West Populism
- Women's Rights Movement at the turn of the Century

**American History Content**

- The National Experience by Blum
- We the American Women, by Jeanne Brodin

**Activities**

- H - Slide show on Jacob Riis photos
- L - "My Daddy Might Have Loved Me" activity

**American Literature Materials**

- Ethan Frome by Edith Wharton,
- The Yellow Wallpaper by Charlotte Gilman Perkins,
- "A Jury of her Peers," by Susan Glaspell
- "Disappointment Is the Lot of Women," by Lucy Stone
- "Wagner Matinee," by Willa Cather,
- Emily Dickinson Poetry

**Integration:** Our study of Turn of Century America provides the backdrop for the conclusion of the racism unit. We study the history of the women's movement and read literature by and about women.

### Time of Year

#### Late March

**Focus:** Heroism

**The Great War**

**American History Content**

- The National Experience by Blum, et. al.
- The American Political Experience by Richard Hofstadter
- World War I Focus Materials

**Activities**

- H - World War I focus groups
- L - Discussion of what a hero and a code hero is.

**American Literature Materials**

- A Farewell to Arms, "A Day's Wait," "The Old Man at the Bridge" by Ernest Hemingway
- "Barn Burning," and "The Bear," by William Faulkner

**Modern American Novels and Short Stories**

**Integration:** Here the literature is used to amplify and expand the students' understanding of World War I beyond a knowledge of the historical and political forces at work.
### Time of Year: April

**Focus:** The American Dream  
**Content:** Years between the Wars  
**Activities:**  
- The National Experience by Blum, et al.  
- After the Fact, by Lytle and Davidson  
- Only Yesterday, by Frederick Lewis Allen  
- The Stock Market Game Slide Show of Dorothea Lange's Depression Photography  
- The Great Gatsby  
- "Bernice Bobs Her Hair" by F. Scott Fitzgerald  
- The Grapes of Wrath by John Steinbeck  

**Integration:** The American Dream is examined from an historian's view, a dream that changed in the 20s from equality to economic success and was then shattered in the 1930s by the depression. Students find these same themes in their literature.

### Time of Year: Early May

**Focus:** Man's Humanity  
**Content:** World War II  
**Activities:**  
- The National Experience by Blum, et al.  
- After the Fact, by Lytle and Davidson  
- Night, by Elie Wiesel  
- Night and Fog a movie using archival footage of the concentration camps  
- L - Small group presentations of modern poetry  
- Poetry by e.e. cummings, Wallace Stevens, Edward Arlington Robinson, Anne Sexton, Sylvia Plath, Robert Frost, Nikki Giovanni, T.S. Eliot, Allen Ginsberg from Literature, edited by Johnson  

**Integration:** People's responses to the causes of and experiences of World War II are examined as they showed up in the poetry and short stories written after the war. In addition we compare the general public's reaction to the Cold War and the way the period is examined in the literature.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Year</th>
<th>American History Content</th>
<th>American History Materials</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>American Literature Materials</th>
<th>American Literature Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late May through early June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus: Modern America</td>
<td>The Cold War through the 1990s</td>
<td>The National Experience by Blum, et. al.</td>
<td>H - Discussion of effects of Cold War</td>
<td>Short stories by Kurt Vonnegut, Arthur C. Clark, Isaac Asimov, John Updike, John Cheever, Toni Morrison, Alice Walker</td>
<td>Modern American Short Stories and Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After the Fact, by Lytle and Davidson</td>
<td>L - Presentation of short stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The '60s Focus Group Materials</td>
<td>End of the year slide show of the students' year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integration: We draw the course together, looking for themes from both history and literature that have re-occurred this year.
APPENDIX H

LIST OF SECONDARY AND PRIMARY SOURCES USED IN EPISODES

Secondary Sources

The Declaration of Independence Episode


Abraham Lincoln Episode
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**World War I Episode**


**The 1960s Episode**


**Primary Sources**

**The Declaration of Independence Episode**


**Abraham Lincoln Episode**
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World War I Episode
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The 1960s Episode


APPENDIX I

APAS LITERATURE AND HISTORY ESSAY HOLISTIC SCORING GUIDES

APAS Literature Essay Holistic Scoring Guide

Directions: This scoring guide should be applicable for most essays evaluated. A poorly written essay would be scored no higher than a “3.” An exemplary essay would receive a score a “9.”

8-9 Demonstrates Outstanding Achievement
Strong voice
Stays on the topic
Strong organization
Well-developed with specific and pertinent details
Few or no punctuation and/or spelling errors
No sentence fragments or run-ons
Variety of sentence types and interesting diction
Direct references to historians and their work.

6-7 Demonstrates Competence
Strong voice
May stray from the topic somewhat
Good organization
Minor lapses in specific and pertinent detail
Some punctuation and/or spelling errors
No sentence fragments or run-ons
Some variety of sentences types and interesting diction

4-5 Demonstrates progress towards competence
Fairly strong voice
More than one main idea, strays from the topic
Fair organization
Lacks sufficient supporting detail
Several punctuation and/or spelling errors
Very few sentence fragments or run-ons
Little variety of sentences types or interesting diction
2-3 Demonstrates strong need for intervention
Weak voice
More than one idea, no specific topic
Weak organization
Generalizations not supported by details
Many punctuation and/or spelling errors
Several sentence fragments or run-ons
No variety of sentences types and interesting diction

1 Unacceptable
Does not meet the above descriptors in terms of quality or quantity

APAS History Essay Holistic Scoring Guide

Directions: This scoring guide should be applicable for most essays evaluated. A poorly written essay would be scored no higher than a “3;” an exemplary essay a “9.”

8-9 Demonstrates Outstanding Achievement
Precise thesis/angle, higher level thought; excellent reasoning and insight
Cites source(s) throughout at the appropriate level of attribution, appropriate voice
Clear focus and thoughtful organization
Well-developed ideas with extensive accurate supporting evidence
Uses precise historical detail
Appropriate use of historical imagination, perspective, and/or modern viewpoint
Answers all elements of the question posed
Few or no punctuation, spelling, and/or usage errors
No sentence fragments or run-ons, a variety of sentence types, interesting, fresh, diction

6-7 Demonstrates Competence
Clear thesis/angle, higher level thought; good reasoning and insight
Cites source(s) at the appropriate level of attribution, appropriate voice
Focused and organized
Minor lapses in amounts or accuracy of supporting evidence
Occasional inaccurate details
Appropriate use of historical imagination, perspective, and/or modern viewpoint
Answers all elements of the question posed
Few punctuation, spelling, and/or usage errors
No sentence fragments or run-ons, a variety of sentence types and fresh, clear diction

4-5 Demonstrates progress towards competence
Indistinct thesis/angle, inconsistent insight and reasoning
Cites source(s) occasionally at the appropriate level of attribution, inappropriate voice
Slight loss of focus or organization
Insufficient accurate supporting evidence
Several inaccurate details
Inappropriate use of historical imagination, perspective, and/or background knowledge
Fails to answer a small element of the question posed
Some punctuation, spelling, and/or usage errors

334
Few fragments and/or runs-ons and some lapses in sentence variety, fresh, clear diction

2-3 Demonstrates strong need for intervention
Unclear or missing thesis/angle, lacks insight and reasoning
Rarely cites source(s), lacks voice
Many ideas; without focus or organization
Insufficient accurate supporting evidence
Lacking details or many details inaccurate
Inappropriate use/no use of historical imagination, perspective, background knowledge
Fails to answers all elements of the question posed
Many punctuation spelling, and/or usage errors
Several fragments, run-ons, lacks variety in sentence types, interesting, clear diction

1 Unacceptable
Does not meet the above descriptors in terms of quality or quantity
APPENDIX J

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ALL INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CITED


336


Civil War Generals Game. (1974). In the Columbus City Schools Activity Guide, (pp. 155-157), Columbus, Ohio: Board of Education.


Harvey, P. The Signers of the Declaration of Independence. Obtained from another teacher at James Garfield High School, no citation available.


(pp. 722-724), Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

war. New York: The Viking Press.

(pp. 267-269), New York: Octopus Books.

(pp. 667-669), Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

(pp. 670-671), Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

(pp. 654-656), Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Books.


Lincoln, A. (April 11, 1865/1949). Last Public Address, In H. S. Commager
(Ed.). Documents of American history, fifth edition (pp. 448-450). New York:
Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.1949

341


342


