

**Constructing Oneself as a Teacher of History:  
Case Studies of the Journey to the “Other Side of the Desk” by  
Preservice Teachers in England and America**

David Hicks

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State  
University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy  
in  
Curriculum and Instruction

Dr. L. Harris  
Dr. J. Nespor  
Dr. R.A. Niles  
Dr. J. Niles  
Dr. E. Barber

July 16th 1999

Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: comparative ethnography, learning to teach history, teacher education,  
autobiography, teacher narratives, history curriculum

Copyright 1999 David Hicks

Constructing Oneself as a Teacher of History: Case Studies of the Journey to the “Other Side of the Desk” by Preservice Teachers in England and America

David Hicks

(ABSTRACT)

The research described in this dissertation has its antecedents in my own experiences as a student and teacher of history in both England and the USA. Reflecting back on such experiences as a teacher educator in the US has led to a hypothesis that history teaching is conceptualized and performed differently by teachers in England and the US. This study used contrasting case studies of two English and two American preservice history teachers to illuminate and compare how the development of their understanding of history and evolving construction of self as history teacher influenced their everyday pedagogical performances as they began to teach history.

Detailed portraits of teaching developed for this study show how the pedagogical approach to teaching history with an emphasis on developing historical understanding through learning the skills of the discipline of history in England contrast with the American emphasis on content coverage through the pedagogy of telling the tale of the past. The study revealed the participant’s adherence to these two contrasting traditions in the teaching of history. This can be understood by examining two continually interweaving components: 1) well remembered events, and interactions associated with learning history and history teaching that form a "biographic conception" of history teaching, and 2) ongoing experiences and expected outcomes of planning and teaching history in a particular way. Within the scope of this study, particular attention was given to the participant’s contextual understandings of: A) official history curriculum, B) their cooperating teacher and C) their students as they began to plan and teach history within their internship.

The case studies compare and describe how the participants' biographic conceptions of both history and history teaching act as a filter through which the differing expectations of their respective history curriculum, their cooperating teacher and departments were mediated and negotiated. While the biographic conception of history

exerted an enduring influence on their understanding of what it means to learn and study history in high school, the study revealed that the participants' ongoing classroom interactions with their students in conjunction with meeting the expectations of their cooperating teachers and departments constrained and limited the participants' perspectives as to what they believed was possible within the history classroom. The case studies here highlight the interactive forces and complexity of learning to become a teacher of history and have further implications for exploring the possibilities and constraints of two competing traditions in the teaching of history. This comparative study raises questions and opportunities for examining such epistemological questions as What is history? and How should it be taught in high school? The work shows that the role of history teacher can be and should be more than a teller of the tale of the past. It also highlights the problems faced by teachers and students when the primary goal of history is focused on the difficult task of learning historical skills and concepts. However, if the goals of history teaching in the US are truly for the development of knowledgeable, critically thinking citizens, then teacher educators must begin to provide opportunities and create communities of practice which encourage preservice teachers to not only break their attachment to the pedagogy of telling but also develop their skills to think historically to the end of organizing learning experiences that emphasize the doing of history within their classrooms.

Dedication

For Megan☺

## Acknowledgements

There are a great many people who I need to thank for their help and support. The writing of this “thing” (I have used a number of very descriptive terms in the past that we will not go into here) was a difficult task for me. I doubt I would ever have finished this without the constant support of Ruth Anne Niles. Throughout my time at Virginia Tech, Ruth Anne has helped and supported me constantly. I have been very lucky to have such a mentor, colleague and friend. The other “constant” in my time at Tech- in terms of committee members- has been Jan Nespor. I doubt he will ever realize the impact he had on me as I struggled to see the light at the end of the tunnel. I consider myself very fortunate to have had him on my committee. The readings he provided in his courses have had a deep influence on how I approached this work. His support and advice in conjunctions with his critical insights challenged me at every turn.

In the year it took to write up my research (after a year of collecting data) I suddenly found myself in need of three new committee members, they came in the form of Jerry Niles, Liz Barber and my new advisor Larry Harris. I was exceptionally pleased to have Jerry Niles on my committee. Over the years, he has given me advice and direction as to how to be a successful graduate student. Being a little bit of a slow learner, who is easily distracted, this kind of support as we passed in the corridors or bumped into each other in the bathroom in War Memorial ☺ was a Godsend. It was Jerry who put me in touch with Larry Harris, who it seems knew my abilities and me better than I knew myself. Larry, to a great extent became my “closer.” He read my work, listened to my ideas, made me defend my ideas and offered valuable insights and thoughts. This was not an easy task, since he came to my aide after I had collected my research and was in the process of beginning to write. He played his role as my advisor with great tact and insight. When I lacked focus, he redirected me, and when I fell of the pace, his gentle reminders helped put me back on track. The final member of my committee, Liz Barber, came later to the group than anybody. Her support and encouragement as we discussed my work was excellent. One Sunday afternoon discussion in particular played a major role in helping me think about my own practices and ideas as a beginning teacher educator and redirected my thoughts as to how I should

think about closing this work. To all of my committee members I will be forever indebted to them for their help and guidance.

I was also exceptionally fortunate to have had Dr. Robert Unwin as my mentor at Leeds University in England. Without his help, support and PMA I would have been unable to access my English participants and the partnership schools they were learning to teach in. I also would not have been able to carry out this work without my participants, Helen, Jonny, Mike and Amanda. It takes a great deal of courage to allow someone to follow you into a classroom and watch you teach when you are an experienced teacher never mind when you are just beginning. I look forward to them reading this work with a critical eye so we can talk and pull apart these stories.

Finally I would like to acknowledge Megan, my wife, who has put up with my rants, crying, whining, wittering, and panic attacks as I struggled with this “Thing”. Her love, support and tolerance of me have been so important☺. I would quickly like to acknowledge Connor and Sophie -my two children- Connor for being a wonderful distraction- and a key reason to carry out an international comparative study. Since I could (when he was under 2) take him to England -free of charge- to visit Grandma and Granddad Hicks and collect research at the same time. And for Sophie for deciding to not be born until a week after I defended.

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Part 1: Contextualizing the study .....</b>	<b>1</b>
The power of narrative.....	6
<b>Part 2: An educational autobiography: Becoming a teacher of history, and the importance of positioning oneself in the here and now. ....</b>	<b>8</b>
A snapshot of my early years.....	8
Hands on imaginative history .....	10
Ye olde Kinge James School and the power of the exams .....	12
Fig. 1. Understanding O' Level, CSE and the 16+.....	13
The Schools Council History Project 13-16 .....	14
Picking subjects you want to study for the next two years.....	17
On to A levels .....	20
With two suitcases and assorted canned food.....	24
The Leeds experience: Sharing his practical knowledge. It is not what we teach but how we teach that counts .....	27
Teaching practice .....	30
Teaching in America. Not exactly what I had in mind .....	33
Multiple choice tests in history at college.....	39
Moving on: Newfield Middle School .....	41
<b>Part 3: Refocusing and framing the issue .....</b>	<b>44</b>
Research questions.....	46
<b>Part 4: Locating and moving into the research.....</b>	<b>48</b>
Setting the Stage .....	48
Leeds University School of Education .....	48
Virginia Tech College of Human Resources and Education .....	50
At play in the field .....	52
<b>Part 5: Developing a conceptual framework. Using performance as a metaphor ...</b>	<b>55</b>
Playing with Goffman- Framing my autobiography.....	57
Developing pedagogical attachments- Exploring how one approaches the teaching of history.....	58
Moving forward: Shifting one's gaze.....	60
<b>Part 6: Portraits of teaching.....</b>	<b>62</b>
Helen-7K2 alpha- Roman Charioteers and a Day at the Arena.....	63
Jonny- 9Q2- World War I and propaganda.....	72
Teaching in America.....	85
Amanda 11 <sup>th</sup> grade US history: The Progressive Era: Improvement and Reform 1900-1920 .....	86
Mike –Period 6, 11 <sup>th</sup> grade US History: World War II and Propaganda .....	101
Stepping outside of the exhibit .....	112
<b>Part 7: Dimensions of difference in the history classroom.....</b>	<b>114</b>
The nature of the content and concepts of the lessons.....	116
Student / Teacher interaction within the history classroom.....	119
Tracing the provenance of difference. The danger of simplifying the complex.....	125
<b>Part 8: Developing a biographic conception of history and history teaching. On being an audience member: Exploring actions and interactions.....</b>	<b>128</b>
Constructing oneself as a history teacher in England.....	128
From History Student to Prospective History Teacher .....	128
Exploring vocabularies of motive and commitment. Why teach history?.....	134
Conceptions of history .....	138
Moving on up the formal stages of history at school.....	139
Becoming a historian. Learning the rules to play the game.....	142
Choosing to do history. Being chosen to do history .....	145
From apprentice to teacher.....	150

Constructing oneself as a history teacher in America.....	154
From history student to prospective history teacher .....	154
Exploring vocabularies of motive and commitment. Why teach?.....	160
Conceptions of history .....	162
History for the development of knowledgeable citizens.....	163
Learning history in America .....	165
Taking the grand tour of history. The importance of being exposed.....	168
Taking a break from the past. Opening ones eyes and doing a little history .....	172
From knowledgeable critically thinking citizens to teacher .....	174
Acknowledging the importance of past experiences .....	178
Moving beyond past experiences and the knowing of history in the process of becoming a teacher .....	181
<b>Part 9 : Constructing oneself as a history teacher: Backstage: From scripts, rehearsals, settings and stage directions to front stage performances with an audience .....</b>	<b>184</b>
Backstage preparations at Leeds: Locating the methods course and internship within the preparation program.....	185
Immediate immersion into the setting-a practical and experiential approach to developing the role of teacher .....	188
Backstage: The methods classroom- Learning the importance of the official script of the National Curriculum for History in England.....	190
The National Curriculum for History as official script.....	192
Backstage: Direction and rehearsal –Learning how to teach history via the National Curriculum.....	195
Backstage: Preparations at Virginia Tech: Differences in the timing and location of the teaching internship within the preparation program.....	198
Backstage the methods classroom: Differing priorities in direction and rehearsal- Learning how to and how not to teach. ....	200
Backstage: Learning the official script- The Virginia Standards of Learning for History and Social Science .....	202
Backstage in the School: Learning and developing the role of history teacher in England. Translating the National Curriculum for History within the Setting of the School.....	205
The role and expectations that come with being a member of the cast .....	206
Backstage: Fleshing out the role. Extra stage direction and the importance of stage scenery .....	210
Making the role their own. Preparing to go Frontstage - Re-working with the script(s).....	214
Backstage in the schools: Learning the Role; Receiving Teaching Assignments in America. Translating the Virginia Standards of Learning for History within the school.....	218
Backstage: Fleshing out the role. With little specific stage directions-Developing ones own traditional show .....	222
Frontstage in England: Taking the stage at Knottingley and Kettlethorpe. Exploring the reality of the classroom .....	232
Script Difficulties and Audience Reactions.....	232
Seeking a consistency within and between performances .....	237
Frontstage in America: Taking the stage at Salem and Shawsville. Exploring the reality of the classroom .....	240
Script Difficulties and Audience Reactions.....	240
Abrupt endings: Recognizing where idealism and reality clash.....	249
Interactional processes in the social construction of a history teacher. ....	251
Shared goals - Differing conception .....	251
The creation of an “interactional past” .....	251
“Interactional potential” .....	252
Continuity and constraint.....	254
<b>Part 10: Implications, Recommendations and Images of the Possible.....</b>	<b>257</b>
The education of a teacher- when does it begin and when does it end? .....	258
Limitations and possibilities within the history classroom.....	261
Taking notice - Identifying limitations .....	264
Limitations of the “great tradition” .....	264



The limitations of teaching historical skill and concepts.....	266
Teaching history: Concern and conflict in America.....	268
Re-thinking History- Exploring Possibilities.....	269
What is history for? Why bother?.....	271
History as a field of action. What historians do, we all can begin to do.....	272
Crafting the historical text.....	273
Moving toward a perspectival approach.....	274
The ideal of perspectival history.....	276
<b>References.....</b>	<b>280</b>
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>299</b>
Methodology- Developing a methodological awareness.....	299
The Power of the case study.....	300
The settings.....	301
Leeds University School of Education.....	301
Virginia Tech- College of Human Resources and Education.....	303
Participants.....	303
Data Collection.....	304
Interviews.....	305
Classroom/school observations and observations of scheduled university based seminars.....	306
Weekly “journal” by participants.....	306
E-mail/listserv discussions.....	307
Lesson plans and papers.....	307
Researcher journal(s).....	307
Data analysis-At play in the data from the field.....	307
Cooking and writing.....	308
Coding the Data.....	308
Narrative analysis.....	309
Writing.....	310
Research issues.....	310
<b>Appendix B.....</b>	<b>314</b>
The National Curriculum for History as official script.....	314
Figure 2 Historical content (English Order).....	315
<b>Appendix C.....</b>	<b>317</b>
The Virginia Standards of Learning for History and Social Science.....	317
Figure 3. Virginia Standards of Learning for History and Social Science.....	318
<b>Appendix D.....</b>	<b>321</b>
Interview frame.....	321
<b>Appendix E.....</b>	<b>324</b>
Data collection schedule.....	324
<b>Appendix F.....</b>	<b>325</b>
Teacher Statements about the Purpose of History in Secondary School.....	325
<b>Appendix G.....</b>	<b>328</b>
Informed Consent of Participants of Investigative Projects.....	328
<b>Curriculum Vitae.....</b>	<b>331</b>

## Part 1: Contextualizing the study

Learning to teach is not a mere matter of applying decontextualized skills or of mirroring predetermined images: it is a time when one's past, present, and future are set in dynamic tension. Learning to teach-- like teaching itself-- is always a process of becoming: a time of formation and transformation, of scrutiny into what one is doing, and who one can become (Britzman, 1991, p.8).

What future teachers experience in schools and classrooms during their years as students profoundly shapes their later beliefs and practices. As teachers they follow closely the models they have observed. Mental stereotypes developed over years of observing their own teachers are not challenged or fundamentally changed, apparently, by their experiences in formal teacher preparation programs. Current practice exerts virtual tyrannical control over neophyte teachers, and, consequently, considerable influence over their teaching performance later in their careers as well. (Goodlad, 1990, pp. xiii, xv)

While wanting to agree with Britzman, my experiences working with history/social studies preservice teachers in the USA have left me with a concern that is reflected by the words of Goodlad. More often than not over the last four years it seems that the majority of preservice teachers I have supervised begin their teaching careers with a strong attachment to the pedagogy of telling the tale of the past. Despite the student teachers' oft-expressed hopes and beliefs that they will teach history with the use and analysis of various historical sources in conjunction with debates and discussions to develop critical thinking, I often feel that "something strange seems to have happened to them on the way to the classroom" (Goodlad, 1984, p.212). Actually, "strange" might not be the most appropriate word because what I have seen from many preservice teachers in the classroom, who as Thornton (1994) points out are future curricular instructional 'gatekeepers,' has been observed by generations of students and detailed in many research reports. (Newmann, 1991b; Goodlad 1984; Shaver, Davis and Helburn 1979; Wiley and Race 1977; Baxter, Ferrell, and Wiltz, 1964). Where

the typical history classroom is one in which they [students] listen to the teacher explain the day's lesson, use the textbook, and take tests. Occasionally they would watch a movie. Sometimes they memorize

information or read stories about events and people. They seldom work with other students, use original documents, write term papers or discuss the significance of what they are studying (Ravitch & Finn, 1987, p. 194).

Such a patterned process of teaching and learning history is not how I remember my own experience as both a student and student teacher in England, or as a beginning teacher in America. It was not, however, until I moved to America that I experienced a very real tension between what I believed and understood history to be and how to teach it within the social studies classroom. Jay Lemke (1995) in his book Textual Politics plays with the idea of action genres, which are the “typical doings of a community which are repeatable, repeated and recognized as being of the same type from one instance or occurrence to another, such as a baseball game, a train ride, writing a check” (Lemke, 1995, pp.31- 32). As I began to teach in America, I realized that my understanding of both history and my role as a history teacher was not of the same ‘genre’ as that represented to me through my interactions with my colleagues, my students, the history curriculum, and the assigned textbook. My observations of and work with preservice teachers and their cooperating teachers in America mirrors a genre of teaching that Goodlad (1984) detailed fifteen years ago in his study of teaching in American schools.

Similar to my own experiences, Goodlad points out that although the teachers in his research listed the importance of developing reasoning (of having audience involvement and participation) as a main goal in their lessons, what was observed within their classrooms was quite different “Their test's reflected quite different priorities. The tests we examined rarely required other than the recall and feedback of memorized information-multiple choice, true or false, matching like things, and filling in the missing words or phrases” (p. 212). This difference he suggested, had much to do with the fact that when the topics of study were presented in the classroom, they were for the most part “removed from their intrinsically human character, reduced to the dates and memorizing for tests” (p. 212). It is such “typical doings” in the history classroom - where history is experienced as a delivery system with the teacher as the all-knowing imparter of knowledge to students - that contradicts my understanding of my role as a history student and history teacher.

When I moved to America (New York state) after completing my teacher preparation program at Leeds University in England, there was little room or encouragement in my new role as a World history teacher for anything but the regular transmission of a unitary story of the past. It was a genre of teaching that I came to see as expecting more of me than of my students, who, in my mind were merely taught how not to doubt and how not to question. Ira Shor (1992) notes that such an approach to teaching is based upon the assumption “that education is more serious when the teacher talks and students listen” (p. 102). While I seemed to learn a lot of history during this initial period of teaching, I was never quite sure what my students were learning or if they were learning at all. My assumptions about the discipline of teaching history in America never truly evolved in my classroom, as I believed it had in my student teaching practice in England. Perhaps the realities of schooling, the impact of pupils, parents, and the departmental subculture, and the expectations of the syllabus caught up with me in America just as they would have if I had taught in England under the National Curriculum. I still feel, however, that much of the tension I continue to experience is due to very different understandings and experiences between what it means to become a teacher of history in England and the state where I now live, Virginia. It is from this perspective that my study has slowly taken shape.

The origins of this study can be found within the conversations, rants, and exchanges with friends and colleagues at Virginia Tech as we talked about our roles, expectations and responsibilities as preservice teacher supervisors and educators. During such interactions, like a broken record, I found myself reflecting upon my experiences of learning and teaching history and wondering how the activity of teaching history and the role of the history teacher in American was so very different from England. In this sense it is a study based upon recognition that, “Research itself is essentially a social activity, not somehow removed from and outside of social life...Its concern is not simply to say why the world is as it is but to provide us with space to think how it could be different” (Schatz and Walker. 1995, p.125). Wolcott (1994) contends that “it is instructive and provocative to examine cases that are open, confounding, and of immediate consequence, rather than retreat always to cases where known outcomes make us so much wiser in our ability” (p. 365).

It is with this in mind that I set out to develop case studies that sought to unpack and compare how the activity of history teaching is negotiated, percolated, and constructed over time and space by four preservice teachers. A key feature of these case studies is that they focus on participants, who through enrollment in their respective graduate teacher preparation programs at Leeds University's School of Education in England and Virginia Tech's College of Human Resources and Education in America, were beginning their journey to the other side of the desk in two different countries. In this sense it is a study designed to represent these beginning history teachers' voices comparatively and contextually in order to trace the cultural, historical and institutional patterns of influence that are negotiated as they construct themselves as history teachers (Hargreaves 1996; Vaughn, 1992; Ragin and Becker, 1992; Wilson and Gudmundsdottir, 1987).

Nespor (1997) has argued that the specifics of a case study are in and of themselves "only a flat surface until a reader provides "the other half of the picture from the fleeting images of his or her lived experience"" (p. xx quoting Buck Morss 1989, p. 292). The value of case studies lies in their ability to provide material rich enough in detail that the reader can begin to critically examine and explore the constitutive elements of not one but several stories of meaning and action about becoming a history teacher. These case studies should serve as a point of entry through which we as history teachers, curriculum designers, policy makers and teacher educators can compare our own understandings and experiences with those in the case studies, and start to explore the possibilities and consequences of teaching history and learning to teach history in particular ways. (Nespor 1997; Feagin, Orum, and Sjoberg, 1991; Bullough, Jr., Knowles and Crow, 1991; Bullough jr., 1989; Hammersley 1980).

Because this research is born out of my own experiences as a history teacher it is essential that I avoid falling into the trap of assembling cases that glorify and generalize my educational experiences in England at the expense of my experiences in America. This is no small task. As I begin to write up these cases I am reminded of John Henry Newman's fable of the Man and Lion in which the man invited the lion to be his guest. He received the lion with great warmth and hospitality and gave the lion the run of his magnificent palace. Each room and connecting hallway was richly furnished and

decorated with many fine sculptures and paintings by master artists. As the lion stalked around the palace, he noted that every single piece of art actually represented a lion or a lion pride in one way or another. There was, however, one remarkable feature in all of the pieces that the host failed to mention as he showed off his treasures. Diverse though these representations were they agreed in one way: man was always victorious. As the lion's tour ended, the man asked the lion what he thought of his palace. The lion choose his words carefully to give full justice to the riches of its owner and the skill of its decorators. It was only in taking his leave that the lion wondered aloud if the beasts represented in the fine works of art would have fared better had the lions been the artists.

Similarly, there is always a point of view in the writing of an ethnography. Coffey (1996) contends that rather than simply being a neutral describer of reality, the ethnographer takes on the role of author in constructing and creating a story from an account of what has been observed. "The author has a unique place in the proceeding by bringing personal meaning to the creation of the accounts...As author, the ethnographer sifts solves, analyses, remembers, and writes. In doing so it is impossible to eliminate one's own consciousness from the activities one observes and records in the field" (p. 66). With this in mind, an important building block to this study is to provide the reader with a vantage point from which to understand my own ideas and assumptions that have served as the foundation for this work (Schratz and Walker 1995). I hope to achieve this by crafting my own educational autobiography about how I learned to become a teacher of history in England and then in America. This account should also serve as an avenue to help build a fuller contextual understanding of the activity of learning and teaching history through which to develop the case studies.

To capture the essence of becoming history teachers, an important focus of this study is the the contextualized original voices of those in the research. In qualitative research, there is the danger of decontextualizing, dehistoricizing and colonizing the voices of participants by clipping, framing and manipulating them with a narrative filled "exclusive registers, arcane genres and specialized discourse" (Schratz & Walker, 1995, p. 124). The power of case studies is that they have a unique ability to present insights into the "essence of schooling" (Bullough Jr. Knowles & Crow, 1991; p.13). As Butt, Raymond, McCrue and Yamagashi (1992) suggest, "In a political sense the notion of the

teacher's voice addresses the right to speak and be represented. It can represent both the unique individual and the collective voice; one that is characteristic of teachers as compared to other groups” (p.57). The teacher's voice, however, can easily be lost within a text if the participant's words, phrases and colloquialisms are not maintained and woven into the text as a whole. I will seek to avoid this danger in both my autobiography and the case studies. I do, however, want you to hear my voice, and in writing up the case studies I have the ethical responsibility of trying to maintain the context(s) and texture of the participants' voices within their own communities and socio-cultural networks.

### The power of narrative

The writing of teachers' “stories, ” including my own is more than a nod of acknowledgement to the power of narrative. We use words and images to interpret our life, our experiences and our sense of self (Mahlios and Maxson, 1995) not only in our own lives but also in educational research that seeks to represent teacher voices in critical and contextual terms ((Kridel, 1998; DeSalvo, 1998; Goodson, 1997; Hargreaves, 1996). For as Stephen Marble (1997) argues, “Narratives ... are crucial not only for providing insight into what teachers think and do, but for helping teachers themselves... make sense of what they think and do, as well” (p.56).

The power of the narrative lies in its ability to make sense of human action to describe events, happenings, and actions that produce knowledge of particular situations. As such, narrative knowledge is more than mere emotive expression, it is a legitimate form of reasoned knowing (Bruner, 1985, 1990). Fenstermacher (1994) contends that such a “deliberative reflection of the relationship between means and ends ...serves as a means for transforming the tacit quality of the teacher’s knowing to a level of awareness that opens the possibility for reflective consideration” (p45).

My initial goal here is to reconstruct and reexamine how I became a history teacher and to explore the extent to which my own perspectives toward the discipline of history developed and informed the planning and delivery of my history lessons in both the England and America. Before I can begin, I need to acknowledge that what will be represented here cannot be the authoritative story line of how my teaching affected and was affected by my own beliefs about the purpose for learning the subject, how one

comes to know the subject, and the locus of authority for knowing. For as Bullough and Gitlin (1995) acknowledge; “[w]riting an educational autobiography brings with it the realization that there is no single authoritative story line- that the text evolves over time and in response to changing conditions and understandings. One’s history, one’s conceptions of self-as-teacher, can and do change” (p. 26).

In writing my disciplinary autobiography I can begin to explore my own practical reasoning for the how and why of my teaching. Such an endeavor is a highly appropriate starting point, although it risks being seen as a self-indulgent lapse of the researcher. This is a difficult line to traverse, but as Schratz and Walker (1995) note in examining some of the problems of qualitative research, “not many interpretive studies attempt to interpret the interpreter.” (p168). Therefore, it is important to include my educational autobiography because I would not be ready to move my work forward to hear and study the voices of other history teachers if I ignored my own voice, for as Mary Renck Jalongo (1992) contends, “stories about teaching enable us to organize, articulate, and communicate what we believe about teaching and to reveal, in narrative style, what we have become as educators” (p. 69).

Through the presentation of my educational autobiography it becomes possible to 1) frame the research questions, 2) locate the participants within the context of their respective teacher preparation programs at Leeds University in England and Virginia Tech in the USA and 3) provide a lens through which to examine how the participants begin to construct themselves as history teachers over time and space. It is only then that Jonny, Helen, Mike and Amanda can be properly introduced via a detailed portrait of their teaching of history. Each portrait is designed to serve as a point of entry through which to identify the dimensions of difference that exist within their teaching. The result will be four stories of how past and present context(s) interact and weave together to influence each participant’s activity of teaching as they move from history major to history teacher.



Part 2: An educational autobiography: Becoming a teacher of history, and the importance of positioning oneself in the here and now.

“Some people are honest as far as they can see, but they do not see far enough; in particular they do not see around themselves” (Barzun and Graff, 1992 p. 46).

To develop any understanding of how I began to negotiate the social process of becoming a history teacher, I cannot purely focus on the period from student teaching onwards. Attention needs to be given to the interactive and socially constructed nature of what it means to become a teacher. In seeking to understand my own perspectives toward history that come together to inform my activity as a history teacher, particular attention needs to be paid to the interaction between life experiences and biography; my initial perspectives, goals and expectations toward history and history teaching; and my subsequent teaching of history and social studies in two very different educational contexts. It is only in doing this that it becomes possible to understand the differences in the genres of history teaching that I experienced in moving from England to America, and why my understanding of how to teach history in England seemed often frustrated in America.

A snapshot of my early years

I grew up in the North of England in an old textile town called Huddersfield in the foothills of the Pennines. My parents left school at 14 and worked in the textile mills; my mum was a cloth mender, and my dad was a loom fitter/mender. When the mills closed down, my Dad went to work in the power station; he worked shifts while my mum stayed home to look after my sister and me. We were definitely not middle class, for our home was not as big as, or as new as, some of the houses being built in our village, but we did not live in a council house, which we learned were for people who could not afford their own homes.

I always look back fondly on my schooling in England. I think of the uniforms we had to wear from middle school onwards and the teachers at high school whom we called sir or miss.

“Excuse me, Mr. Bush.”

“I beg your pardon, Laddie?”

“ I mean, excuse me, sir.”

My primary school and middle school were each a 5-10 minute walk from my home, and my high school was just across the valley in the next village. The friends I had in primary school are still my best friends today, and we all know each other's families. I was fortunate in my friends; not only were they bright and able to stay out of trouble, but they were also acknowledged as the “hardest” (toughest) in the school. It seems this was unusual, for the “lads” in other years were generally considered the toughest. The lads at our school typically came from the villages of Grangemoor and Flockton and the Council houses in Lepton. But in my year even, as one of the youngest and smallest in middle and high school, I was not worried about the lads. The only people who were going to hang me upside down by my shoelaces from the ball wall were my friends; any one else who tried would have to suffer the consequences.

At school I was considered a well-behaved, polite hardworking pupil. I had been brought up to respect my elders and until I somehow passed all my O (Ordinary) levels at 16, I feared my teachers. Many of my friends were in the top set or A stream; I was in the upper level of the B stream, meaning that I was above average but not truly considered academic material. In my final year of middle school I was put in the upper math set. While this sounded impressive (my mum and dad were impressed), the reality was that I was at the bottom of the class. Resounding proof of this came at the end of my final year at middle school; I failed my math test and went home crying knowing that this would impact the stream I would be placed in at King James’s High School.

While I was disappointed that I was not in the A stream with many of my friends who lived on the same street, the reality was that I fared a great deal better being considered a hardworking student in the B stream than the worst student in the A stream. But being a hard working B streamer did not mean that I would be successful in my O levels. One of the main reasons I passed my exams at 16 with 6 C’s and 2 B’s was that for the last nine weeks before the exams, my best friend Stuart McClellan, who would pass with a relatively-unheard-of 9 grade A’s, would only venture out of his house to walk his dog. The rest of the time he refused to come out because he was revising (reviewing). I felt so guilty whenever I went to see if he wanted to “play out” that I went home and started to revise as well. Two years later the same thing happened with the A

levels. As a result, for a good two and a half months before the exams I would go home with little to do but revise.

### Hands on imaginative history

I found the majority of the subjects I studied at high school difficult except English and history. English with Mr. Thornton was great. We made speeches, read plays, and presented court cases. He laughed a lot and always seemed to remember what our speech was about and would often remind us months later of the bits he liked best. I also loved history because of Mr. Hargreaves (who was called “Sid” behind his back by students and staff due to of his resemblance to British comedian Sid Little). I hardly ever called him Sid, but in the last two years of high school I did call him “chief.” I never set out to emulate him, for he always wore a brown suit, walked quickly with his briefcase out in front of him, and put up with a lot of bullshit from the “lads.” However, I believe five years of his teaching molded my understanding of what history is and what it meant to study and teach history. In most secondary schools in England, students remain with the subject teacher they began with. This is based to a great extent on how the classes are tracked. I was not, however, a tough sell, for before I even met Mr. Hargreaves at the impressionable and rather spotty age of thirteen, history was more real and hands on than math had ever been.

My enthusiasm for history, and in particular my interest in local history and modern British history, began in primary school and continued through the rest of my education. I connected with history. It stirred my imagination about people who once lived where I now lived. My bedroom window looked out across the valley onto Castle Hill, where now is a large tower (built to commemorate the silver jubilee of Queen Victoria) and a great pub. But it was also the site of an Iron Age settlement and a Roman fort. At Lepton Church of England School I remember learning about the Roman invasion of England, Hadrian’s Wall, and York and its Roman Wall. I had also seen films on TV about Romans such as Spartacus and Ben Hur. As I looked out my window it was amazing to think that Romans had been on Castle Hill. They had been right there.

My primary school class would often walk to the local 13th century church to take grave rubbings. The old gravestones were of people who had lived in Lepton

hundreds of years before me. I often wondered if the layout of the land, the hills and the lanes would have looked the same to them as it now did to me. What was it like for them to live then? What would it be like if I went back in time? What would I see?

One of my most well-remembered events (Carter and Gonzalez, 1993) of primary school was our class trip to the Colne Valley history museum. Colne Valley is on the other side of Huddersfield. Small white cottages still scatter the hillside of the Valley as a reminder of the once thriving domestic woolen industry. The museum's focus was on the lives of the people in the Colne Valley as the area developed into a major textile center. We had to dress as child workers who worked in the textile mills. Most of the boys wore their granddad's flat caps, collar-less shirts, and woolen trousers tucked into socks, while the girls came in long skirts, blouses, shawls and light cotton hats. At the museum we were given the chance to become textile workers who had to wash the wool and use thistles to straighten the wool, which then had to be spun before it could be placed on the loom. We also played the types of games children of that day would have played after they had been working. This was a great day; not only had I gone back in time, just like the men in the TV series called Time Tunnel, but the local newspaper came and took our photograph. Trying to imagine what it was like to live in Huddersfield in the past was exciting; it connected me to where I lived and showed me what life was like for my grandparents or great grandparents.

It was around this age that I remember seeing a children's news program, John Craven's Newsaround. He reported that a young boy somewhere in England had found an Iron Age sword on a river bank. I was amazed and envious, for he had not just been in the same place as people from the past, he had found something belonging to them! I immediately started to dig in our garden; I found bits of pots, however, my mum informed me that they were probably not that old. But she did tell me that archeologists found things on Castle Hill from the Iron Age and the Roman fort. For years afterwards, when my friends and I carried out the daily ritual of walking the dogs in the wood, I hoped and prayed that I would find an Iron Age sword in the stream. I would then have a piece of the past; I would not sell it, but I would find out how much it would be worth because I knew it would be valuable. For the same reason, I wanted my

Granddad's World War I medals and that was why my dad bought some real silver jubilee coins in 1977 for us to keep.

The nearest I came to "finding" pieces of history that I could keep was during a trip into the Yorkshire Dales to Kettlewell in my middle school years. While hiking, the class came across a lot of fossils scattered around the hillside, which were quickly plundered. I wanted to be an archeologist. My dad expressed some concern about my future employment prospects if I followed such a path because the key for him was to get a steady job with security and a regular income. The importance of security and a regular income was pushed by my Dad throughout my school years, so much so that from 16 years onwards I have had to constantly explain the practicality of what I could do with an A level in history and sociology, a BA in Social History, an MA in history, and a Ph.D. in education. What type of work could I get with these qualifications? When was I actually planning on getting a job? Between the years 1988-89 my dad was content that I was taking a Postgraduate Certificate in Education because it meant I could be a teacher.

#### Ye olde Kinge James School and the power of the exams

I went to King James' High School in 1980 as a 13 year old. The school was founded in 1608. That part of the building is still there and now serves as the headmaster's office. A number of extensions have been added over the centuries. Until the 1970s it had been a Boy's grammar school. Students had to pass exams at 11 to go there. By the time I arrived it was a mixed comprehensive (state run) for 13 to 18 year olds. However, the headmaster, deputy head and many of the staff had been there in the 1970's; as a result, many of the old ways were still much a part of culture of the school: during assemblies the headmaster and deputy head wore their academic gowns, we had a school song (sections were in Latin), and we celebrated Founder Days and Speech Day every year. Each student was assigned to one of the four house groups within the school. I was in Dartmouth house. We met as a group every Wednesday morning for a house assembly and, depending on the time of year, selected members of the house to participate as a sport team against the other houses.

Though the year numbering system has changed, as a 13 year old I was considered a 3rd former, 14 year olds were 4th formers and 15 year olds were 5th

formers. It was at the end of the 5th form that students took O level exams in the 8 to 9 subjects they had chosen as they began the 4th form. The course that prepared them to take the exams lasted two years and was taught by the same teacher for the duration. If students were in a higher level stream (track) they took all O levels. If they were in a middle stream, they would take a mixture of O levels or C(ertificate) of S(econdary) E(ducation) exams or what was called the new 16 plus (see figure 1), which blended the O level and CSE exam together to become the fore-runner to the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) which was introduced in 1988. Lower level students generally took CSEs.

Fig. 1. Understanding O' Level, CSE and the 16+

<b>O levels</b>		<b>CSE</b>	<b>16+</b>
Pass _____			
A		----	A
B	A-C= pass	----	B
C		1 (O Level equivalent grade C)	C
Fail _____			
D		2	2
E	D-E= fail	3	3
		4	4
		5	5
		6	6
Fail _____			

If a student took, an O level in history and received a D or an E, s/he failed the two-year course. If a student took CSE history and received a grade 1, which was the highest grade possible in a CSE exam, it was considered the equivalent of an O level pass at

grade C. Students did not really fail CSEs; everyone received a number level. But it was known that CSE exams were for non-college bound students. The 16 plus exam merely combined the two exams. In a sense a student no longer “failed;” instead of getting a D or E at O level s/he received a grade 2 or 3. The 16 plus no longer limited the high grade for a CSE candidate to an equivalent of a grade C at O level; they could get an A or B at O level depending on how they compared with everyone else. The 16 plus exam in a new format called the GCSE is in place today.

These exams impacted what would happen to us at the age of 16, for the results determined which students were advised to stay on in the 6th form and served as a source of information for prospective employers. Those who received a minimum of four or more O Levels were presented with the option of staying on and going into a two year Advanced level examination course (A levels). Approximately 70 % of the students leave school at 16 years of age (Statistics of Schools, 1989, p. 133). Not all who left had done poorly in their exams. A number of my friends actually did well and went into banking or took industry based exams which determined their eligibility for management training. Others chose to go to vocational schools like Huddersfield Technical College.

Becoming a 6th former and taking A levels at King James’ brought with it a number of “perks.” We were given lockers and did not have to wear school uniforms. We did not have to line up to wait for lunch; we could walk up to the front of the dinner line and get in front of those in uniform. We could also be made prefects, who stood at various entrances to the school during lunch time and made sure that no 3rd or 4th formers entered the school until the bell rang. We also had our own common room where lunch was provided, and it seemed that the 6th form males had the pick of the best-looking females in the lower grades. But I’m getting ahead of myself, for before I could become a sixth form ‘stud’ I had to get through the 3rd, 4th and 5th form.

### The Schools Council History Project 13-16

While King James' was an old established school, the history curriculum by Mr. Hargreaves was part of an ongoing effort by the Schools Council History Project to redefine the nature of school history (though I did not know it at the time). As Chris Husbands (1996) notes,

in place of a justification for history organized solely around culture and content, the Project offered an explicitly constructivist model of learning history. Whilst history lacked the clear conceptual structure of mathematics or science, the Project nonetheless defined a curriculum rationale for school history based on organizing concepts and historical skills: pupils would learn history as historians did, by practicing, or constructing it in the classroom. (p.131)

As a third former, I began the three-year sequence of courses within the history project. The first course was an introductory course on the nature of history as a discipline. At times this was a little tedious, as it seemed we had to constantly go through our booklet, and identify and distinguish between primary and secondary sources. This course was based on a sort of a series of practice booklets that set out to introduce us to how to be historians. We were asked to read sections aloud and discuss which of the examples fit our definitions of primary and secondary sources. In this learning format, we were also introduced to such concepts as bias, truth, empathy, continuity and change, and cause and effect. I remember enjoying answering the questions posed by Mr. Hargreaves and working with my partner to correctly identify such concepts. I also remember a level of frustration in trying to get the correct answer to what was a piece of primary evidence or in explaining why I thought a source was biased. Our class spent much time discussing and explaining what we thought. One particular fun activity that was part of this course was the “Mystery of Mark Pullen” in which the students played detective. We were all provided with documents that had been found on a dead body found in a quiet lane. Mark Pullen had died in an accident and it was our job to trace where he had been, what he had done, and where he was heading on the day he died (based on the documents and maps of the area). It was exciting to build a chronology, check through the contents of his wallet and document the findings. This was only slightly improved upon when we looked at how similar work had actually been carried out by historians with the discovery of “Tollund Man.” The booklet provided photographs and details of what was found in his stomach as evidence of his last meal. I realized I would love to do this for a living. History was useful, I could be an historian, or if that did not work out, a detective.



Another thing I enjoyed was reading the extracts of primary source materials because it gave me the foothold from which to imagine what it must have been like in that day. This was a key skill that was pushed. We had to be able to use empathy to think and write about what it was like and use the descriptions and details within sources in our own imaginative writings in class. Even at this time, I was developing an understanding that history was about using source material to find and give explanations. I loved to stick my hand in the air to answer questions about what I thought or understood certain sources or extracts to mean.

The Schools Council History Project was based upon the study of various themes and topics within history that students were expected to explore based upon the material provided. The next section of the course was based around the topic of the history of medicine. This was a course that I truly enjoyed and remember vividly. It was based on three booklets that went in chronological order. I remember being amazed by looking at photos of skulls with holes drilled into them as evidence of early operations and reading descriptions of Roman hospitals and extracts of the Hippocratic oath. The course covered a lot of material and followed a chronological path, but at each turn the booklets provided source material to be read and interpreted by the students. We were always expected to identify if and how certain extracts could be viewed as biased.

The next course looked at the Arab-Israeli conflict. We read sections of the Balfour Declaration and the Sykes Picot agreement; we were expected to examine and discuss how different groups would interpret such statements. We were often expected to write a story based on the material in question from a particular standpoint. In this sense, history was often an imaginative endeavor. I enjoyed being able to participate and give answers that I could defend and explain, something that was not so easy in the science or math classes.

If a teacher asked a question in school, we knew that if we did not put our hands up, we would be asked for the answer. In many classes timing was everything. We had to time our hands to go up after the first couple of people who really knew the answer and before the last people who suddenly realized that they were the only ones with their hands down. Then we just hoped we were not the one picked to answer the question. In history, my hand was up first, for I was good at looking at sources and answering such

questions as: What is happening to the king in the picture? Do you think the author of this letter was justified in believing this? In reading this description, why do you think this happened and does the evidence suggest that it is right to believe that? This was not the way I was taught or thought about French, physics, or chemistry. In those classes, success meant having memorized the right verb, the right equation, or the right chemical symbol. The only time I really enjoyed physics was when a volunteer was needed to do push-ups. I volunteered, and measurements were taken of the distance my arms moved as I did a push-up. I was then timed as I did 20 push ups. This information was put into an equation, and it was calculated that I had generated just under 100 watts. I could have lit a light bulb. It was this type of information that left me thinking "So what? Why should I care how a pulley or a piston works?" History was so very real and it was relevant- at least to me.

#### Picking subjects you want to study for the next two years

By the end of the first year, 3rd form, we had been introduced to many school subjects. I took physics, chemistry, and biology, plus maths, English, history, French, technical drawing, design and technology, art, classical studies, religious education and history (classes were not timetabled everyday). At the end of the year, we took exams in all subjects and received report cards. While maths, English language, English literature and one science were mandatory courses, we could choose four or five other subjects based on our exam results to take for the next two years. History was an obvious choice for me; I liked the teacher and I had done well in my exams, so I would be in the O level class. I also chose physics, biology, French, and design and technology.

My hope was to get some O levels at any grade in order to stay on in the 6th form; I wanted to push in front of the lunch queue. History was the class in which I thrived. We took a course that looked at modern Britain from 1815 to the present day and dealt with the impact of the Industrial Revolution. Extracts in the booklets described the conditions and the work of workers and the middle class, and the efforts of such working class groups as the Chartists to gain political and economic rights. For me, it was the history of working class people in the industrial north of England; it was my history. It was about who I was and who my Dad was. This pertinence was driven home when Mr. Hargreaves brought in a pack of primary sources that he had collected with another

historian for use in schools. The twelve primary sources were copies of original documents that detailed the rise and rather messy fall of the Luddites in Huddersfield. We had the chance to read through the documents, and, guided by Mr. Hargreaves, we began to build explanations of what had occurred. I was impressed that Mr. Hargreaves had pulled this together. It meant that he really knew his stuff. He did not have to do this but he chose to. It was like having a PE teacher who ran competitively or played for a local football team.

We spent a lot of time writing down our thoughts or ideas of what it must have been like to be displaced from work by machines or what it was like for a factory owner in the 19th century to have machines that would make the product quicker and cheaper than in the past. These essays were done in class and finished at home. When the work was turned in, it was handed back with comments but no grade. If it was not turned in, it was discussed in class. We did not have quizzes or tests each week; instead we had written work. We had exams at the end of each term. I did the work because it was expected, I was interested, and I wanted to do well in school and pass my O levels.

The major exams came at the end of the 5th form. They included a mixture of multiple choice questions and essays. About 5 months before the O levels we took mock O levels in the form of the previous year's exams. During the 5th form, as we neared the mocks we began a local history project, that went into our exam portfolio for our O levels. The project was read by Mr. Hargreaves, but again it was not graded. He collected the history projects and sent them to be marked by the external examining board.

The local history project was the culmination of the course. We had to prove that we could be historians. Our project revolved around the history of the school. Initially we explored the school going in search of the Charter granted by King James I, stone inscriptions in Latin over doorway entrances, and old desks with "old boys" names carved in them. While some of these items were under our noses, (though in the past I had never really taken much notice), others were in rooms or offices where I had never been. Each of us had to create a scaled map of the school which noted how the school had grown over the centuries. We also had to read about different aspects of the school's history in a book that had been recently published by a local historian. We then had to explain in writing what we had found and what types of evidence we had used. Often as

we went around the school, groups of us would team up to find evidence. I know that being in an O level class helped with the quality of the team members, but even in our class a number of students ran wild and failed to get the work done. This came to a head when they were told that they would not be allowed to take the exam if they had not completed their portfolio. I had all my work in on time, and Mr. Hargreaves spent time with those who were on schedule, talking about what we had found. He also gave us time to rework pieces in order to improve our portfolio. For me this was an advantage of being responsible, for the more effort I put into my work the more feedback I was given. While the students who procrastinated had to scramble to get work done, those of us on schedule had the luxury to joke around, chat, and begin to revise in class for the exams. I knew that the work done by those who had messed about was not as good as mine. I was going to do better than them in the exam. This was fine by me, for how well I did was in comparison with the rest of the nation, and it helped me to see the competition.

The goal for me was to pass as many O levels as possible. It was up to me to go through my notes and papers and try to memorize and work out what I needed to know and remember in order to get through these exams. In certain subjects, such as biology and physics, passing the exams was very much based on memorizing details; in history I already seemed to know a lot of the content. Knowing the content came as a by-product of looking in detail and exploring certain topics. The history exam was made up of multiple choice questions and essay-based work. The exams came thick and fast during a two week period at the end of June. The results came out in mid-August, and on that day, all over England, students set off to school to find out what future paths were now open or closed to them. The answer was found on a slip of paper given to us at the school. I truly did not expect to do as well as I did. My Dad went into shock: he was prepared to give me the talk about how to look for a job, but I had passed all my O levels: history and French, grade B; biology, physics, design and technology, and English language, grade C; and maths and English literature CSE grade 1.

These were very good exam grades for me. No one got all A's (unless they were the likes of Stuart McClellan). An A grade, as noted by Sarah Freedman (1994), is a very rare examination grade; passing with a grade C or above is quite an achievement. In her research of English classes in both America and England, she noted that in the three

British classes taught by three experienced teachers, “Philippa’s class had the highest percentage of students who passed the language examination with a C or better (32 percent as compared to 19 percent for Peter and 18 percent for Gillian).” Out of a total of 49 students within the three classes who took the exam only two received a grade A, four received a grade B, and ten received a grade C. (p. 206)

### On to A levels

The path was now open for me to go on to A levels. I had put in the work, taken the responsibility to revise, and deserved the privilege of becoming a 6th form student. Those who did not want to work had failed. I saw many people in the A stream who were brighter than I failed because they had chosen to hang out and party with the lads. The 6th form class size was considerably smaller than the 5th form. We had only around 40-50 people, and throughout the first year, the number decreased as people left to enter the job market. My success came less from natural ability and more from the fact that I bought into the ethos of an old grammar school and chose to work hard because I did not want to work in a factory or leave school.

I went with my Dad to meet with some of the faculty to discuss what I should take for my A levels. I still did not really know what I wanted to do for a living. All I knew was that I wanted to take history. The French teacher seemed surprised that I had done so well and was not very supportive of me taking French at A level; nor did I feel comfortable taking any of the sciences. It was suggested that I try sociology, because it blended nicely with history, and my Dad suggested I take economics just in case I wanted to go into business. The next two years were now set, though I initially applied for several jobs (as my Dad was concerned what I would do if I failed my A levels and as a result “wasted” two years).

Our teachers made it clear that A levels were going to be the hardest exams we would ever take. Even today I feel the leap from O level to A levels was massive. So much material was expected to be covered; at times it was truly mind-boggling.

I enjoyed history and sociology, but, I used to dread going to economics. Mrs. Stevenson would be seated at her desk with a massive folder in front of her and she would basically read from her file line by line, while we would write verbatim. The class included people who had taken economics at O level and people who had not. I was one

of the latter and did not have a clue what was going on. Each week we had an essay to complete on the week's work. One thing that helped was a folder of O Level standard notes that were provided to all non-O level students. We had to read this in our own time and also prepare to take the O level exam at the end of the first year.

Sociology was taught differently. Handouts, notes, and a massive textbook were provided. We started by looking at the perspectives from which sociologists study man and society. Once this foundation had been built, we set out to cover a number of themes within the A level syllabus as deeply as possible. It was clear that we would have more depth than breadth. Since the final exam was all essay, the goal was for us to have the material from which we could develop solid arguments. The risk was that Mrs. Bradford could not guarantee that the themes we chose would be on the exam.

We chose a number of themes, including the sociology of education, race, gender, development studies, power and politics, medicine, the family, work and leisure, and religion, and tried to understand and discuss them from a functionalist, interpretive, or Marxist perspective. Each week we completed essays based on past exam questions, which were collected and graded as if they were exam questions. What was more important than the actual grade, she pointed out, were her comments and suggestions. We were also expected to read sections from our text book and develop notes that would then be used in class discussion and as material and examples to support arguments. The majority of class time was spent discussing details and ideas from our notes and the information we had to look over from the handouts. With only nine people in class, you had to hold your own. The amount of material given provided us with very little chance for respite. This class opened my eyes to ideas and thoughts of the world in which we lived; I was introduced to Paul Willis, Bowles and Gintis, Illich, and Bourdieu.

I tried to begin my essays with some quotation from Marx, and I often tried to frame my arguments from what I understood to be a Marxist perspective. I saw myself as coming from a staunch labour background and I felt very comfortable playing with such ideas. At times the classroom became a battleground of ideas and ideologies as we argued about such things as the class-based nature of the education system, the position of women in the labour market, and the functional role of religion.

In class we watched One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest and read sections of such work as "Being sane in insane places." There was so much material that at times it was difficult to take it all in, and I found much of what was given was useful when I studied sociology at University. Much of the reading was done out of the classroom; within the classroom new ideas and material were introduced and discussed. It was impossible to memorize material, though I tried to memorize quotes from Marx on certain topics. Content knowledge was not the be-all and end-all of the course. Success meant the ability to demonstrate, for want of a better word, *mindfulness*. We were expected to use certain ideas and details to reason with and to support ideas and perspectives. We were expected to refer back to specific studies, constructing meaning for those who read and listened to our ideas and arguments. Many of us did become mindful; even on weekends we used to go out to pubs and sit and argue about politics, the coal mine strike, etc., and use ideas and arguments discussed in class. I felt armed and dangerous in a discussion because I would often fire out what I had read about or heard about in class.

For history, I had Mr. Hargreaves and Mrs. Walshaw. Mr. Hargreaves taught Britain 1815 to the present day, while Mrs. Walshaw taught Modern European History from the French Revolution onwards. They also made clear that this would be a very different two year course than our O levels. Everything would depend on two separate three-hour exams that required the student to both analyze primary sources and write three essays based upon specific questions.

The key to success was to read as much as possible. The more histories we could read on a set topic, the more material and ideas we could use. It also became important to know which historians had said what about a topic. Over the next two years we moved chronologically through Modern European and British history. I was more comfortable with British history. We had already covered the basics in the 5th form and now we were delving more in depth. Mrs. Walshaw provided us with a couple of text books and then suggested we buy Europe since Napoleon by David Thomson and start reading it. As in sociology, we were often provided with a synthesis of major ideas and events as a way to get a handle on certain topics. Many of the class also bought A level Course companions for A level history. This was a life saver for it provided us with 30 unit topics on European and British history with a chronology of events, an introduction to the

era, a commentary and essay and document practice questions with essay plans. As Weigall & Murphy (1982) noted, the responsibility for success was down to us for

A sound piece of work for A level history will show an intelligent understanding of the past, a clear analysis based on a sound grasp of fact and a capacity for lucid expression. The criteria by which you will be judged in your examination will be: the relevance, accuracy, and quantity of factual knowledge; its effectiveness or presentation and the ability to communicate knowledge in a clear and orderly fashion with maximum relevance. You should be able to show that you can present and justify a historical argument, that you are capable of exercising historical judgment and are aware of period and context. These are a variety of skills. They can only be acquired over the course of time with wide reading and much practice (p 7).

Each week we were expected to write essays based upon such questions as: "Would you agree that Lord Liverpool's government 1822-7 was a 'liberal Tory' administration?" or "In what ways did the internal unification of Italy remain incomplete in 1870?" Again, a great deal of reading and note-taking was expected both in and out of class. It was at times amazingly humdrum. Most classroom discussions were based on readings and how we would answer this week's essay question. My problem in writing essays was that I had too much information and I failed to build a strong balanced argument because I tried to throw in too many facts. It seemed so much was expected from us; while information was often given to us a great deal of emphasis was placed on using salient aspects of this information to develop historical arguments.

Throughout the two years I grew more and more nervous about the amount of material I needed to know for the exam. The problem was not just trying to work out what areas I needed to know, but also being able to use this material to answer the questions well. As I entered the second year, I felt strong with British history, but I grew more and more concerned about European history. As a result, I made the decision to specialize in a few topics like the French Revolution, the Unification of Germany and Italy, and World War 1. My intention was to know these well, and to have a grasp on other events for the primary document analysis section of the exam.

During the second year, decisions had to be made about what would happen after the A levels. I decided with the encouragement of Mr. Hargreaves and Mrs. Bradford to



apply to read history at university. My top choice was Lancaster, which made me an offer conditional upon getting 10 points on the A levels. I was also offered places at three other universities and two polytechnics. Now it was down to revising, writing essays each week, and hoping that the right questions were asked in the exams to be taken in the summer of 1985.

Like the O levels, A level exam results come out in August, and again, one's future depended on them. I was not sure I could get 10 points even if I felt the exams went well, that I had guessed the right areas to study, it all depended upon what an external examiner thought of my essays in relation to all the others he graded. A level grades ranged from A- E: an A was worth 5 points while an E was 1 point. I received a B in history, a C in economics, and an E in what was called General Studies, an exam we were required to take. The sociology results were late. In the previous year's sociology A level class, the highest grade had been a D. I needed a minimum of a D to make ten points and head to Lancaster. I received a B and prepared to head to Lancaster in October of 1985 to read history.

#### With two suitcases and assorted canned food

Going to university was a big deal. No one in my family had been and I did not know many other people who had been. All of a sudden, however, my friends and I were going to be university boys. I did not know what I was going to do afterwards, but that was three years away. All I wanted was to get a Bachelor's Degree. Teaching was an option, perhaps I thought I could teach at King James's. But I could also go into management training for any one of the large companies that recruited college students to be trained in their graduate training programs.

The university academic year is based upon three ten-week terms, taking the same course through the whole year. In the first year at Lancaster, we were expected to choose three subjects. I chose to study history, economic history, and sociology. In history, I decided to study Colonial America and pre-industrial England, while the economic history and sociology courses were year-long introductory courses. Each class consisted of a one hour lecture twice weekly and a weekly seminar with the discipline tutor. Basically, we were expected to write three papers for each course over the year and then take end-of-year essay based exams. We were also expected to fulfill all the reading

requirements for each weekly seminar to participate in a general discussion or to present an official paper.

There were four to six students in each seminar. In the history seminars, we were assigned general readings as well as specific readings that offered various interpretations and positions on a topic. We were expected to synthesize these ideas for the other members of the seminar who in turn brought their own readings and interpretations. I loved these seminars. I enjoyed sitting in the library and reading what other historians had said and then coming to class ready to discuss how it built our understanding of the topic in question.

Lectures were times to catch up with friends, write as quickly as possible, and hopefully return to the chicken scratchings when it came to the exams. (This never seemed to work for me as I could not understand my notes). Different lecturers provided us with details about their specialty. They were there, I was there, they talked, I listened, they left, I left. They did what they were supposed to do, and I did what I was supposed to do. My first year did not go without a hitch. While my seminar participation was considered strong, my history teacher was upset with my handwriting and fondness for run-on sentences. I never really checked my work, and transferring my ideas to paper was not easy. Although I loved to try and craft arguments, it 'hurt' to write them down in a clear manner. This was something I had to constantly work on.

After the first year, I spent the next two years taking a total of nine year-long courses. I decided to do a combined major in history and sociology due to the fact that I had done so well in my first year exams in sociology. In reading (majoring in) Social History I was expected to build the degree around a set theme. My theme was based on the study of industrial society. This topic gave me the excuse to study what I was already comfortable with—modern British and European history. I also took a special course that focused on events in England from 1830-46. Here I was expected to go into great depth on certain aspects of the period. A great deal of emphasis was placed upon being able to recognize and analyze primary sources from the period and use them in research papers. From the sociology department, I took courses on industrial societies, medicine and health, women, race, and computers and technology in society. Across these courses it was easy to identify and play with different perspectives and interpretations in the writing

and debating of history. I enjoyed this. Doing history for me at this point was a process of going to journals such as *Past and Present*, reading as much as I could about a topic, and then pulling together my own understanding of the material. I felt that as long as I could defend my position with a strong critical awareness of the sources, I was a good student. At one point a lecturer commented on one essay that I had obviously been reading and listening to one too many Marxists. I took this as a nod of encouragement but also as a warning of the danger of viewing the past through one specific lens.

History at Lancaster was about writing and crafting defensible arguments. It was a highly imaginative endeavor that required a great deal of reading before developing a coherent argument. It had little to do with pure memorization and was more focused on creating an organized product based on an interpretation of the work of other historians and primary sources.

This approach was driven home during a seminar when I was scheduled to present my paper on the Poor Law Amendment Act. I had done a great deal of reading and had made many notes and sketched down ideas. I had pulled together a basic framework and had a mixture of primary sources and historians' interpretations to back up my ideas, but I had not written them into a completed piece of work. I had the material and knew what I wanted to say, but that was not enough to present a paper and lead a discussion. The imaginative crafting of a history text had not occurred; mid-way through my 'paper' I stopped and said I could not go on. When Professor Evans took over, I kept interjecting facts and ideas. At the end of the seminar, he noted that I knew my material but that doing history was more than knowing the facts. The facts were at my fingertips; whenever I needed to back up a point, I could pull it out of my notes. But when I tried to build on points more than I had planned, I had to shuffle through my notes to find the evidence as my classmates looked on. My papers got more and more shuffled, and the time spent trying to find the evidence got longer and longer. I had a captive audience but I did not know my lines. It was awful.

During my final year I applied to Leeds University to do a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE). I knew that I wanted to become a history teacher; I wanted to teach what I had learned throughout my schooling. I even imagined myself teaching at King James', teaching students to 'do' history, although I had just gotten

engaged and planned to move to America. I was unperturbed about where I would teach; a British or an American classroom, it did not matter, for being a history teacher was something I believed I could do well. I was accepted and entered Leeds in 1988.

The Leeds experience: Sharing his practical knowledge. It is not what we teach but how we teach that counts

The key person at Leeds for me was Dr. Unwin. He was my history methods tutor, a quick-witted whirlwind of activity and ideas who stressed the importance of guiding and involving students. The methods classes - history and social science - were designed to provide us with insights into how to teach. Our undergraduate work had provided us with the content knowledge of history and the ability to continue building that knowledge. We now needed to learn to be comfortable in front of students. Besides the methods classes, we had weekly general education lectures, in which lecturers who specialized in the history of education, educational psychology, and sociology came in to give the whole PGCE course their insights into education. I actually enjoyed the lectures on the history of the British education system. By the end of the history series it appeared that not everyone shared my interest for while the lecture hall started out as full, the audience was diminishing. I think many viewed the general educational lectures as fluff. I eventually stopped going during the sociology series. The material presented was “stuff” that I had already been introduced to: the perpetuation of class-based inequality, blah, blah, gender, blah. In order to convince us of the importance of sociology/psychology, one lecturer told us that by the end of his lecture we would know how to deal with a young student who came to us and told us he was gay. He either forgot to give us the answer or I missed it, because by the end I was still no wiser, though it was an interesting problem to think about. Occasionally I would wander back into the lectures, depending on who was lecturing and the title of the lecture. If lectures got switched around, people would actually leave depending on the lecturer who came in.

In was an unsettled time to train to be a history teacher. The National Curriculum was coming. Debate was raging as to whether history would even find a place in the curriculum; no one could guarantee what history might look like. The Right had criticized the Schools Council History Project for failing to introduce pupils to the cultural traditions and heritage that was Great Britain (Crawford, 1995). We were not

tied by any specific curriculum constraints because no one knew what was going to happen in the next year so we played with and looked at how to teach history. The methods class talked a lot about why history was important. Dr. Unwin introduced the class to the ideas of the Schools History Project: i.e. history was about the critical use of evidence, analyzing sources, becoming empathetic, and developing explanations for past events. The teacher was the guide, the instigator that gave students the opportunities to imaginatively explore and interpret the past in the present. It was everything history had been and was to me.

The key to being a good history teacher was to tap the students' knowledge of what they knew and make the link back to the past, so they could begin to make sense of the experiences of other people in a very different setting. The pupil in this scenario was an active learner who learned to engage in a dialogue with evidence from the past in the classroom. The teacher was responsible for introducing and motivating the students at the beginning of the lesson. From this point a number of activities could be developed to involve the pupils - giving them tasks to accomplish which they could then present to the class or hand in to the teacher. Students had to be motivated, which meant finding ways to actively involve them in the doing of history. For me that meant classroom discussions, writing diary extracts, role plays and debates. It also meant building on and doing more of what I had enjoyed when I was in school.

Our methods class carried out mini-teaching lessons. I did my first lesson with another student teacher, on the development of the National Health Service. I truly enjoyed the planning as much as the teaching. I tried to follow the rules of good teaching as laid down by the methods class and Dr. Unwin: Tap the knowledge of the students and draw them into the lesson, provide them with a foundational understanding of the material, and then get them to work individually or in pairs to use this material to share with the class.

During the mini-lesson the class was meant to behave like 14 year olds, and I quickly learned the importance of appearing relaxed, self confident, and quick witted. I started the class with the line; "Who has ever had diarrhea , flu, chicken pox?" One student started talking, I resumed, "No, no, Katherine not verbal diarrhea - though I've

had that a few times myself. Okay Richard tell me what childhood illnesses you have had and where did your parents take you?”

People laughed and I continued to ask them about their doctors and how much it cost to go to the doctor, and I pointed out that previous to the work of the Labour Party in the 1940s it was not that easy to get free treatment.

It was at this point that we started to introduce the topic of the National Health Service in relation to other reforms made by the Labour Party between 1945-51 via a chart. We also provided a handout with quotes from politicians of the time that looked at the cost and benefits of the NHS. The mini-lesson ended with students writing a letter or editorial from either a politician, parent, or doctor in support of or against the 1946 National Health Service Act, using some of the material presented in class to support their arguments

The lesson was stuff that I had seen done by Mr. Hargreaves, Mr. Thornton and Mrs. Bradford. Dr. Unwin saw it as an ‘excellent’ start. He praised the use of humor as a form of classroom management and the pacing and enthusiasm of the lesson. We looked and acted as if we were comfortable in a classroom and had found ways to involve students. In our plan we had acknowledged and tried to include such concepts as empathy, cause and effect, and chronology. I was fortunate that what I had seen and enjoyed as a student in my history classes at high school and in the seminars at university was what Dr. Unwin hoped for.

My main concern at this time was that I did not want to become a pushover and/or an easy target for the lads. I had seen that happen to Mr. Hargreaves. He did not seem to notice when students were getting out of hand before things escalated and he had to lose his temper. In his classes I knew when someone was going to do something; you would hear little whispers, other students would glance over. I used to wish he would see it; I wanted him so badly to walk near them, or be ready to redirect an initial comment or joke away from him and back onto them. I truly respected this man and felt badly when students took advantage of him. Mrs. Bradford did not have that problem because she was enthusiastic, funny, and in possession of a look that let us know we were going too far. She saw what was going on in the class; no one ever had the chance to create a major problem. When I was up in front doing the mini-lesson I could see everyone. I felt ready

to act and move to extinguish disturbances. I was too competitive to have someone, either a graduate student or pupil, get the better of me.

### Teaching practice

Teaching practice started in January and went through March. I was placed at Outwood Grange in the outskirts of Wakefield, eight miles up the road from Lepton. It was a comprehensive school whose pupils came from a wide range of backgrounds. Wakefield had a number of coal mines, many of which were closing down, so many of the pupils' parents had or did work in the mines while others had more affluent jobs in Leeds as lawyers and bankers. I taught 3rd, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5th form history and economics classes. The 3rd form was a mixed ability class, while the 4th and 5th forms were streamed. While one teacher was my official school tutor, I took over three other teachers' classes. I had a full schedule immediately on January 2nd, which was not what I was supposed to do, but I did not want to make any waves at the school. For me a lot of it was a show. Appearing confident with a "can do" attitude led to less scrutiny by the teachers whose classes I was now teaching. However nerve-racked I was, the pretense of being confident deflected any initial impression or concerns that I may not be comfortable in the classroom. In one class I was given the choice of what topic I would like to teach. I chose the industrial revolution. The teacher provided me with a booklet (textbook) on the industrial revolution. Every couple of pages focused on a specific topic dealing with the period - conditions of the working class, growth of the textile towns, etc. - that included description, diagrams, primary source extracts, and short plays. I also taught a class on the Tudors and another on the Romans; again I was provided with a booklet based on the same design.

I was warned about the 5th form class. The teacher was unsure whether to give it to me when I first went to visit the school before Christmas because the students were generally regarded as discipline problems. They were studying the history of medicine for (G)CSE. It was eventually decided that I should try to see how I would do. This class was full of lads/lasses from working class families; their dialect was thicker and broader than the middle class students. Even though they wore school uniforms, their upturned collars on their school blazers and the way they choose to tie their ties with the thin end on display marked them as lads. They were the same type of lads as from the

villages of Flockton and Grangemoor who I never saw again after they left King James School at 16. I was informed that my only goal was to get them to accomplish set tasks that went into their portfolio for their exams.

In relation to the 5th form my other classes went smoothly. I was left to my own devices and barely interacted with the teachers whose classes I was teaching. Mr. Winters, my mentor teacher, observed me a couple of times; he said everything looked good and disappeared.

The 3rd formers were just plain fun. This did not mean that I did not punch the blackboard in a fit of temper after a couple kept stabbing each other with a pencil, but they were always ready to participate and do “something” in class. I developed a routine in which I used the textbook as a way to introduce the lesson. From this point we spent time either developing skits to advertise the advantages of new machines, writing diary extracts that detailed the life of a worker or factory owner, or writing editorials that detailed the conditions of the working class in the cities. Their work had to be grounded in the initial information I had given them.

One of my favorite lessons was on detecting bias and the difficult nature of interpreting sources from the past. I showed the class a short clip of a film depicting the murder of Julius Caesar. Half the class became supporters of Caesar and the other half opponents. I was the historian who had to unearth what had happened. I asked a student what they had seen.

“Well, these men just...”

“Hang on a minute! If you saw the murder you’re long dead, so I can’t talk to you, and you’re dead, you’re dead, you’re dead. How can I get any evidence as to why Caesar died if you are all dead?”

They then suggested that I might find a diary or a letter written at the time, so everyone in the class got out a sheet of paper and wrote about what they saw happen and who was involved. These were quickly collected, and I threw half in the dustbin.

“Let’s just say that these got lost over time, so now I only have half left.”

I gave the rest of the papers back and had students read them aloud. I started to point out the differences in how many men were involved in the murder and their own evaluations of Caesar. From this point we talked about bias and truth. Out of this came



the point that there may be many different reasons why events occur and that there is not always one truth. The lesson was fun because the students kept supplying me with answers and ideas and questions as we progressed through the activity. They also started to use the terms *bias* and *evidence* in the right context. This lesson was the type of lesson that I had enjoyed with Mr. Hargreaves, who had led the class to develop an understanding of primary sources and bias in a very similar way. At each turn it was input and ideas from the students in the class that allowed the discussion to continue. We covered content, but the content itself did not drive the course of the lesson. I had done a lot of talking, but so had the students. It felt good, exciting.

It was harder with the 5th form, though one event early on in my teaching practice changed the class's attitude from being out of control poster boys for Paul Willis (1981) to being just poster boys for Paul Willis. At the end of the first week, a couple of the lads jumped up at the end of the class and started wrestling. One pulled the other on top of him. I shouted at them to quit, and by the time I got to them they were writhing on the floor. I crouched down and whispered, "No sex in class." The students stopped and got up, and I walked away. As they left the class, I heard Shane shout to his mates what I had said. I saw them at lunch time and just smiled and shook my head. The next day they came to class in a good mood; a truce existed based on the condition that a couple of the loudest lads could tell me one joke, and in return they would do their work. I had already made a list of what they needed to do complete their portfolios. I had gone through their textbook, photocopied it, and created handouts that formed the introduction for each theme. Using the primary sources and information in the handout as a base, the students were provided with options for what they could write about for their portfolio. I made it clear that it was their responsibility, that this was what had to be done and that they were all capable of doing it. Work came in and I returned it with encouraging comments and suggestions. While it seemed they functioned at an intellectually lower level than some of my third and fourth formers, history was still about interpreting and using various texts and developing explanations.

At the end of my teaching practice I was nominated for a distinction. An external examiner was scheduled to observe my 5th formers. It was suggested that classes could be switched around; I said no and taught the class as usual. I was told that when the

teachers, Dr. Unwin, and the external examiner met afterwards, that the examiner had commented that what he had seen was not a lesson meriting a distinction. At that point the teacher of the class told him that just having the students in their seats writing and answering questions was worth a distinction. I left Leeds with Distinctions in theory and in practice.

My understanding of history and what it was to be a teacher of history had developed rather consistently since my high school years. Dr. Unwin's methods course at Leeds had a major influence on developing practical ideas and goals for teaching. He had a greater influence on me than my cooperating teacher, even in my teaching practices, which is different than Kagan's (1992) observation of the influence of the cooperating teacher. After my experiences with Dr. Unwin, and the confidence he showed in me, I had the foundations from which to become a really good history teacher. The strategies, new information, and ideas on how to structure a lesson expanded my ideas and options. I left Leeds feeling more than prepared to teach history anywhere – including America.

#### Teaching in America. Not exactly what I had in mind

I was not prepared, however, for teaching history in the United States. I spent my first year sorting out New York Certification, substituting in a couple of local high schools and then working as a permanent substitute in Job Corp. It was at Job Corp that I learned the importance of looking like I knew exactly what I was doing as a way to maintain good classroom management. The students were always trying to read how I would react to certain situations. If I let something slide, that was a cue for them to push the envelope a little further. If they asked to go to somewhere during class time and I paused to think before giving a negative answer, they would whine and push to know why. However, if my answer was quick and direct with a built-in explanation, they would often pout and get back to work. It was all about playing a role. If I did not give the impression of a teacher who was in control, I became a target for student manipulation. I think after my experience at Job Corp, which I would describe as a baptism by fire, my ability to read students and prevent major classroom disruptions through my initial interactions with very street-wise students was well-developed.

The goal of Job Corp was to prepare students to gain their GED while also providing them with vocational training. It was here that I saw the reliance on the multiple choice test as a way to prove an understanding of the facts. I had not taken a multiple choice test since the age of 16 and I was surprised at the heavy emphasis on factual recall on exams that students took at the end of their high school career.

After blanketing much of upstate New York with applications, I received a call from a small rural school named Oxford High School, which was surprising since I had tossed the unopened letter in the ever-growing rejection pile. (This had a lot to do with how light the letter felt: light weight letters implied rejection, heavier letters included directions to the school for interviews.) The principal wanted me to go to the school for an interview, as they were looking for what he termed in the now opened letter a European History teacher. The interview was interesting; he told me about the job and called in the 11th grade American History teacher. He then told the teacher I was from England and had courses in European History. The American history teacher asked if I would be interested in helping him coach his varsity soccer team. I said yes. Within a few days I was the new JV soccer coach and 10th grade World History teacher in that order.

There was very low turnover in faculty; I turned out to be the youngest member of the faculty by about 15 years. Many of them lived in the community and had taught the parents of the kids who were in school today. I shared a room with the economics and government teacher who would serve as my mentor; the 11th grade American History teacher and 9th grade World History teacher were in the next two rooms up. I was provided a copy of the social studies syllabus for World History. Because of the size of the school, I taught a combined Regents and non-Regents World History class, a two-year course that culminated in an exam in the 10th grade. My “mentor” was really a non-factor for me. He was friendly and would ask how I was doing, but I rarely saw him because when he was not teaching I was, and vice versa. During his free periods he went home or was busy trying to find handouts or his glasses that he had mislaid or were now being worn by one of his senior students. The soccer coach, 11th grade social studies teacher, spent more time helping me out. He provided me copies of old Regents exams, a World History Regents’ review book and a number of World History textbooks that had

been given to the school. The 9th grade teacher told me he taught Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East, but had not actually covered Latin America. This was interesting, for according to the syllabus I was supposed to cover the Middle East and Europe (west and east). The textbook I was provided also only covered that section of the syllabus, and the textbook he was to use only covered Africa, Asia, and Latin America. It turned out that while he used the textbook, he now based his lessons on current events and then linked them to the syllabus. While this sounded quite innovative, what it actually meant was that he listened to National Public Radio in the mornings and busily created overheads on the day's news when he got to school. He spent 45 minutes expanding on the events and the people in question, and Friday he gave a current events quiz, sometimes with a blank map of a specific region which the students would then have to complete. I was told he had problems with discipline and organization in the past, but now it seemed he had found a way to have his students take notes and listen to him. A routine was established and everybody knew what was expected since NPR had spent a lot of time covering the ongoing events in South Africa, the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Persian Gulf crisis, and the trade war between the USA and Japan. Thus, he had covered Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.

From the beginning I was critical of the syllabus. How could I possibly cover both Middle Eastern and European history in one year and not forget Latin America, when it had taken two years in England to cover Europe since Napoleon? Teaching world history also included teaching the geography of the region. It was about covering.... everything. I was not concerned about knowing the content myself; I had the discipline and ability to learn the content quickly. I was concerned with how to make the material teachable. The soccer/ American history coach showed me what he did year after year. He basically made lecture notes from the students' US History textbook. He lectured; students were expected to read the textbook and answer specific questions from the text. He was animated in his explanations, and at times went into great depth and detail about events and characters. The students sat at their individual desks, some took notes, some did not. The good kids asked questions, the others did not. Some put their heads on the desk until they were told to lift them up.

I was caught in a quandary. I had so much material to cover. I had to get them through their Regents exam, which I was informed was important because it affected what college they would go to. I was very uncomfortable with how I was going to teach. I had never contemplated using the teaching methods I was now being shown as the basis for teaching history and social studies. I had also never contemplated teaching the history of an entire region, never mind two or three of them in one year. To make things worse, the textbook I was to use lacked any depth. It offered a light coverage of the geography and history of each region- this happened, then that happened, and then this happened. The book then dealt with various aspects of the nation's/ region's culture and ended with a chapter on life today. It was all well and good, but it bore very little resemblance to content stressed in the curriculum.

Meeting the students also proved to be a bit of a shock. First, there was no uniform. Each student had his/her own individual desk, where at King James' students sat at a large desk together. I was surprised to find out that a number of these students were retaking the course and that a couple of them were 18 years of age or over. This course was not purely an individual subject that one studied and either passed or failed, it was part of a set of requirements for graduation at 18. It was the teacher who passed the student in the course and it was the teacher who graded the state test. Such a situation placed a great deal more pressure on me as a teacher than if I had remained in England. In the UK students only had to pass the exam, and the course moved us towards this goal. It was expected that we would do school work in order to be prepared for the exam, and I did the work I was asked to do. I did not expect to have a grade for every piece of work, and I did not expect to hand in every piece of work. We were tested at the end of each term; the results, along with an effort grade and written comments, went home. In the big picture such report card grades did not directly impact our future. Everything came down to passing the exam which was graded by an external examiner. Our own teachers had nothing to do with the grading of our exams, neither the actual tests or any prior portfolio work. I could not go up to my teacher at the end of each term and ask him what I needed to hand in to pass, and subsequently point out to him that I needed this class to graduate. Mr. Hargreaves did not have to look at my work knowing that my future hung in the balance and feel a sense of pressure to find five extra marks to bring me up to a passing

grade on my test or on my course average. The responsibility for the grade was the students'. The teacher was there to make comments and suggest ways to improve arguments and ideas. The teacher did not have the explicit "power" to pass or fail students. The power to pass or fail, in my experience, lay with the student.

Teaching history was no longer, it seemed, about trying to support the generation of "historical" understanding and thinking within the classroom through an exploration of sources and text. My responsibility was to transmit facts and details of history into the students. I was here to cover the basic material and make it as simple and clear as possible to all students...there was no room for much more than teacher talk; everything was to be in black and white. How I represented the past was the way it was, and there was no gray area in which students could seek to develop ideas and explanations themselves.

The 11th grade history teacher talked about lecture and discussion, but discussion was a buzz word that really meant he would fire out an occasional question that required a set answer. Anything that required more than just the facts often led to an uneasy silence, and a puzzled look from students that I was not doing what I was supposed to do. A real danger existed that I would be seen as a 'bad' teacher for leaving students frustrated and confused in an effort to make them think and develop their own understanding of the past.

The problem for me was that I was not going to lecture. A process in which I was the one doing all the work and they just came in, sat there, and just left. However, I did feel I had to provide them with the information needed, and I had to prove I had given them the material. I resorted to the idea of developing handouts. I spent Saturday and Sunday afternoons going through school textbooks, my own history books, and a book of primary source data to pull together what I considered to be appropriate material that represented the period in question. I basically started with geography and then moved chronologically through different periods. The handouts served as the basis for the course. I enjoyed gathering the material and trying to organize ways in which students would use this material. The handouts served as a way for me to prove that I had covered what I was supposed to cover. Each handout ended with specific tasks or questions pertaining to what appeared on the handout. Many students wanted to just read the

questions and try to find the answer within the text so they could complete the work as quickly as possible and then hand it in to me. I was shocked that they expected me to take in their work. I did not see a need to grade every piece of work, and they did not see a need to do the work if I did not take it in.

At the beginning of class I discussed some of the ideas in the handout to give a quick overview of the lesson. My goal was to get the students involved in working with specific ideas related to the text. I spent a lot of time doing group work. I often split the class up so that each group had to find different events or ideas on which they would report. For example, in a handout on the dark ages, groups were organized into peasants, clergy, lords, knights and kings. Each group had to then present their view of the world in which they lived. Following this, homework would include answering the questions on the work sheet. As the year progressed I became more and more obsessed at playing with ways for students to represent their work back to me in various forms. The importance of imagination and empathy played a major role in my lessons. This was what I had enjoyed in school; I liked working with other people and then presenting or talking about what we had found. As the teacher, it was my way to have them doing history.

Generally such work was carried out on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. Mondays and Fridays were vocabulary days. Each Monday I gave them vocabulary via the overhead. The Regents syllabus dealt with a number of overriding concepts such as change, culture, interdependence, environment, etc. The Regents test also included a number of essay questions that were based on such themes as revolutions, international organizations, and individuals. The vocabulary was structured in such a way that students would be given notes on the causes and effects of various revolutions on Monday, and tested on them the following Friday. The topics in question were all listed above the blackboard under concept headings from the syllabus. These weekly vocabulary tests served as important grades to determine who would pass the course. The vocabulary notes in the last half of the course served as essay plans from which students would write weekly essays to prepare for the test.

Throughout my first year, I felt a great deal of tension between my own developing understandings and assumptions of what it meant to teach history in England and what now seemed to be expected of me as a history teacher in America. My idea of

history and image of myself as a history teacher was subject to what I perceived to be the expectations of my students and the expectation of Oxford's other social studies teachers. The actual content that needed to be covered in order to prepare students for the Regents exam also played a major stumbling block toward providing students with anything more than an uncritical shallow unitary story of past events.

My father-in-law, who was an English teacher, once said that he thought history must be a fun subject to teach because it was about telling interesting stories. I initially balked at this view of history teaching which implied sitting and listening passively to what the history teacher had to say. Doing history in a classroom was more of an active process that went beyond teacher talking and students listening. But in thinking about his comment, I realized that talking and thinking about events in the past takes the form of a story. However, the telling of the story, whether in a handout or in a lecture, was only a foundation from which to work. In my own experience in high school, and even at university, there was more to the study of history than just receiving. More was expected; we were not left to merely think about the sequence, the characters, and the eventuation. Something else was needed at that point; the history teacher could not just tell the story and then move on to the next story hoping that their students had actually listened and thought. From high school onwards I had been pushed to go further than the initial story: questions were posed about it, and we examined evidence pertaining to its authenticity. As such we began to play with the story, represent it, and make sense of it for ourselves. This process was not happening in my class to the extent I wanted it to, but I don't think the principal and other social studies teacher expected it to happen. This became clear to me as a result of a number of the classes I took when I began my MA in history just after I moved from Oxford.

#### Multiple choice tests in history at college

In the summer of 1992 I began my M.A. in history at SUNY-Cortland. I took a number of distinct courses, including the Holocaust, the Age of the Robber Barons, The Coming of the Civil War, America Since 1945, Historiography, and seminars in European and American history. My plan was to take as many non-European classes as possible. The Holocaust was suggested by my adviser as he was teaching it and he wanted to see how I fared. My other choices were limited by availability during summer



sessions and timing during the academic year. I was surprised to see the great emphasis on lecture. With the exception of the seminars and historiography, the courses were taught via lecture. These lectures were for graduate and undergraduate students. The only difference was that graduates were expected to complete research-based papers, while undergraduates in the class had to complete the reading, attend the mandatory lectures and take the tests. I was a little shocked to see that the tests included multiple choice questions. The implication was that only graduate students could carry out historical research. For everyone else, history was merely regurgitation of the story told by the lecturer; everyone read the same texts, and their success in history was based on how well they did on the multiple choice test. There was really little chance for any interaction and dialogue within the lecture theater; our role as students was to listen and learn from our history professors. This scenario only changed when enrollment in a class was small. In two specific courses, the Age of the Robber Barons and the Holocaust, time was given on a regular basis for either individual presentations or group work based on what had been discussed. Being able to participate, discuss, and share ideas gave these courses an added dimension. Giving voice to one's ideas and listening to other positions gave me the chance to play with ideas, to become excited about what was being taught. I left class thinking and talking about ideas. Such classes raised the study of history above what could otherwise be described as the weekly ritual of making sure you were where you had to be at that time of the week, which is what was expected of the undergraduates who attended lectures with the graduates.

The highlight of the course was two research seminars required for graduate students. The European history seminar required little more than turning up at the end of the semester with a research paper based on primary source material of anything to do with European history. Since I had planned to go home that summer, I decided to research the Luddites. Armed with a letter of introduction from Cortland that I presented at the history archives in Huddersfield and Sheffield, I began to follow a trail of events that resulted in the hanging of a number of Luddites for murder in 1812. The events all centered around Huddersfield, which was labeled in a government report "a metropolis of discontent." The act of locating and reading sources, following leads found in other

histories, and crafting of a paper that set out to look at whether Luddites were rebels or mere rioters was, it felt, what I had always been taught to do.

The American history seminar, however, was more structured. A group of graduates met weekly to discuss a range of readings on the Cuban Missile Crisis and also carried out individual research on a specific area of the Missile Crisis. Each week, we shared our progress, thoughts, ideas, and leads. I focused on Operation Mongoose and the efforts to destabilize the Castro Regime by the CIA. The final papers were presented and discussed with the group. The sharing of our understanding of the past with a group was a powerful learning experience and reinforced my view that the learning of history, while requiring individual discipline and motivation, has little to do with the learning of facts, dates, and set stories of the past. Doing such work was an important reminder that as a history teacher, my role was to develop lessons that gave students the chance to begin to make sense of, and present their understandings of, the past. My role as a teacher was not to create a lecture/story of the past and provide them with a year of all they ever wanted (or did not want ) to know about history but were too dumb to ask. Although it was naive to think that I could train a whole class to be little historians, I did not have to develop lessons that implied that the majority of students were incapable of developing explanations, arranging ideas, and understanding the interpretive problems and puzzles that arise as one seeks to develop a personal understanding of people and events in the past.

#### Moving on: Newfield Middle School

After two years at Oxford, I took another teaching position at the same time as I began my Master's. I was to teach American History as part of a Middle School 8th grade team, and I was also given one 9th grade World History class. After teaching the content of World History, the 8th grade syllabus allowed for a more focused coverage. I was expected to cover Reconstruction to the present day since the 7th grade teacher had covered up to the end of the Civil War. The school itself had only just begun the move to the middle school concept; half the middle school was housed around a corridor in the elementary school while the other half resided around a corridor of the high school. The middle school had its own principal, but he seemed to spend most of his time somewhere between the two corridors talking to community members about how well things were

going. The 8th grade team had one experienced language arts teacher, two first year math and science teachers, and myself. I met with the team everyday and we shared ideas about what we were going to teach. We tried to link our content on a regular basis. Also, with the aid of an enrichment teacher who visited once a week, we began a year-long archeology project. I worked closely with the language arts teacher on a number of projects throughout the year. Working with an 8th grade in a newly forming middle school as opposed to within a single subject department provided a number of opportunities and freedoms for interaction with different subject specialists. The importance of passing tests ran second to trying to provide a student-centered middle school experience. I did have a test at the end of the year that covered material from both 7th and 8th grades, but I was told it evaluated the program and did not really impact the kids. I decided to spend the last couple of weeks prior to the test preparing them to take the exam by using copies of two past tests for review. The rest of the year was pretty much up to me, the teaching team, and the students.

I did not use the textbook. Instead, I went back to idea of developing handouts as a way to introduce students to the ideas of the period in question. The handouts served as a basis from which we would explore various aspects and events that would have to be researched and presented to the rest of the class. The library was untouched by the school's teachers, so I was given free use by the librarian whenever I needed it. Through the library I identified and used various sources as a way for students to explore and explain the past as they understood it. While working generally chronologically, certain topics spun off into longer term projects that allowed students to explore and write their own Supreme Court decisions on past cases; look at issues of censorship by evaluating and reading elementary children's books that had been banned in certain areas; and to research, organize and present group lessons on a decade of the 20th century. During each of these projects, it was the student who was expected to interpret and present their findings; I served only as a guide and devil's advocate.

The archeology project, which resulted in an archeological dig of an old schoolhouse, served as another way for students to participate in an exploration and reconstruction of the past. The year ended with a final oral history project organized as a joint final exam in social studies and language arts. Here students carried out an oral

history interview with a relative or family friend about their teenage years and the events surrounding them. Using the interviews as a key, they were to explore three issues and events or people that had been detailed in the interview by carrying out research in the library. In doing this research, what soon became apparent to many of our students was that the truth is never pure and rarely simple: many details, dates, and accounts of events differed not just between the interviews and secondary sources but also between a number of secondary sources. The final project ended with all students writing their research findings and presenting their work to the class. It was at Newfield that I really began to feel that I was becoming the history teacher that I wanted to be, for at the end of each year my students had established a relationship with the past and had begun to make sense of the experiences of teenagers at a different time. They were doing history in ways that I had done history as a student, had tried to teach history as a student teacher, and now hope to encourage with the pre-service history/social studies teachers with whom I work.

### Part 3: Refocusing and framing the issue

My experiences as a beginning history/social studies teacher in England and America highlight the inadvisability of assuming a common understanding of what it means to take on the role of teacher. My understandings of what it means to be a history teacher was constantly re- shaped, re-negotiated, and reconstructed by experiences and contexts over time and space. It is important to recognize that, just as with educational terms and concepts that make up our professional discourse, it is a mistake to assume a common understanding of educational roles. (Cherryholmes, 1988). Attention needs to be given to the interactive nature of what it means to become a teacher. Henri Lefebvre (1976) notes that space - in this case, the schools and particularly the history classrooms in which I was taught, later taught in, and now supervise in - tend to have an air of neutrality, "because it has already been occupied and used, and has already been the focus of past processes whose traces are not always evident in the landscape"(p.3). A problematic assumption that arises from this neutrality is that the way history is taught in the compartmentalized space known as a classroom is part and parcel of the normal way history is taught and learned wherever one goes. Such an assumption offers little room to explore the evolving processes, activities, and negotiations over time and space that are experienced as one learns to become a history teacher. My own experiences of learning to teach within two different cultures demonstrate that much can be gained from exploring the relationship between the actions of pre-service teachers and the meanings they make as they move from history majors to history teachers. Such a study would offer insights into what it means to be a pre-service history teacher in a decade that has seen great educational change in both the UK and the USA.

In England, schools still felt the impact of the 1988 Education Reform Act. As Richard Haigh (1996), an English headmaster, noted "the notion is now established that teachers are merely the means by which the curriculum is delivered, rather than the people to whose professional care we can entrust the education of our child". He added that teachers are faced with a constant "inability to plan because of frequent changes in the national curriculum, or more perniciously the likelihood of change on some ill-defined, yet to be decided date" (pp. 11-20). The implementation of the history curriculum has been far from smooth; since 1988 debate has raged over what should

actually be taught in history (Crawford, 1995, pp. 433-456). It is only since the recent report of Sir Ron Dearing's Committee on the National Curriculum that a promise was made for five years of "no more change" in order to give teachers a chance to come to terms with the official script of the National Curriculum.

In America, conservatives reacted with fury to the publication of the National Standards for United States History in the fall of 1994. They accused the authors and sponsoring body of pursuing a left wing, revisionist, politically correct agenda (Weiner, 1995). In January 1995, the Senate went on to repudiate the standards on a vote of 99 to 1 as controversy continued to rage about the nature of history and how it should be taught (Nash, Crabtree, and Dunn, 1997). On the state level in Virginia, the Republican-led new Standards of Learning in history and social science are being implemented in the schools. This process has not been without a great deal of controversy; issues of teacher input into the new curriculum and the specifics of what should be taught have been major points of debate (Fore, 1995). It becomes very clear, as Husbands (1996) notes, that many of the debates surrounding the teaching and learning of history are highly political because at the very core exist issues over "the nature of national 'culture' and 'civilization'. They are debates about what counts as 'significant knowledge' about the past, about how we select some historical knowledge and some historical events for their significance to our, and succeeding generations" (p.130).

During this period of change in both the England and USA a major issue that faces K-12 schools and colleges of education is how to help pre-service teachers learn to teach their chosen subject. In my own academic experience as a student, pre-service history teacher, graduate student, and beginning history teacher, the move from being a history major to a history teacher is not without a significant amount of constraint. The "move to the other side of the desk" as one learns to teach is a highly complex affair that can be viewed as a "social process of negotiation rather than an individual problem of behavior" (Britzman 1991 p.8). The process of learning to teach goes beyond learning the traits and characteristics of a good teacher. Rather, becoming a teacher is a culturally mediated process where one's past and present relationships and experiences come into play as the subject matter specialist moves around to the other side of the desk for the first time.

In the last fifteen years, research on the teaching and learning of history has developed along two distinct, though not necessarily exclusive, paths. One set of studies has focused on the process of *how children* come to develop knowledge. These studies have focused upon students' capabilities in the study of history (Levstik & Barton 1997; Van Sledright & Brophy 1992; Leinhardt 1994; Booth 1993; Levstik & Pappas 1992; Downey & Levstik 1991, 1988; Evans, 1988). The second set of studies has focused attention on *teachers'* understandings, ideologies, content knowledge, and classroom practices (Evans 1994, 1989a, 1989b; Wilson & Wineburg, 1993, 1989, 1988, Downey and Levstik, 1991; Gudmundsdottir 1991a, 1991b, 1987b; Gudmundsdottir & Shulman, 1989; Shulman, 1986; Gudmundsdottir, Cary & Wilson 1985). As a result of the latter studies, Stanley (1991) noted that a solid research base has begun to emerge concerning the history teacher's knowledge of subject matter and how subject matter knowledge relates to teacher competence. Within the literature, however, there is a gap. Currently, no research exists that compares how pre-service teachers within very different educational settings begin to reorganize, reconstruct, and transform their own experiences, knowledge, and perspectives of history and history teaching as they negotiate the process of learning to teach history. This study will seek to carry out such an exploration by focusing on the experiences of two pairs of pre-service teachers, brought up in different educational settings, as they begin their "very difficult journey" of learning to teach secondary history.

#### Research questions

This study will explore what it means to begin the process of becoming a teacher of history from the perspective of the student teacher. This involves exploring the factors and experiences that shape a pre-service teacher's understanding of history and history teaching as well as the factors that impact the pre-service teacher's planning and delivery of instruction during their teacher internship. It is a study that seeks to unpack the following question: How is each participant's understanding of history and activity of history teaching located, filtered, and mediated within and through: a) what Berk (1980) terms their "biographic conceptions" of history and history teaching, and b) the context(s) of their teaching internship as they begin to construct themselves as history teachers? In other words, how have the pre-service teachers within this study come to understand

history and history teaching, why do they want to teach history, and how do they believe history should be taught? Answering these questions requires moving with the participants into their classrooms as they take on the role of history teacher in order to explore how their understandings of history and history teaching are influenced and shaped within the context of their teaching practice placements. An exploration of how a preservice teacher makes meaning and develops an ongoing understanding of what it means to be a teacher of history is salient for those in teacher education and curriculum development and implementation.



#### Part 4: Locating and moving into the research

"What matters is that teachers' voices are heard and re-presented comparatively and contextually, so that claims regarding the teacher's voices can be built through cumulative generalizations, not moral assertions" (Hargreaves, 1996, p.17).

In order to explore how beginning teachers develop an understanding of the practice of teaching history, I sought out participants who were willing and able to spend time in interviews and to allow me into their classrooms as they began to teach history for the first time. While a detailed methodology that guided my entry into the field is provided in Appendix A, I think it is important to offer a brief outline detailing the settings in which I came to know my participants and the structure of my fieldwork as I came to an understanding of the above research questions.

#### Setting the Stage

All the participants in this study were enrolled in teacher preparation programs in the 1997-98 academic year. In England, Jonny and Helen volunteered to be participants. I gained access to them through ongoing communications and links with Dr. Unwin in the School of Education at Leeds University, he had been my history methods tutor in 1988-89 and now served as Jonny and Helen's methods tutor. Amanda and Mike volunteered themselves as participants from the secondary social studies methods class in the College of Human Resources and Education at Virginia Tech. I was the graduate assistant for the class and asked at the beginning of the year for volunteers who would be interested in participating within this study.

#### Leeds University School of Education

Leeds University in the north of England offers the Post Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE), which is equivalent to 30 U.S. graduate hours in education. Pre-service teachers who enter must already hold a minimum of a Bachelor's (B.A.) in history. Pre-service teachers have also been accepted with undergraduate degrees in such courses as politics, archeology, humanities, and art history; acceptance of degrees is left to the discretion of the history methods tutor. The course is a 36 week program in three terms taught jointly between tutors at the university and teachers in partner schools. All preservice teachers enrolled in the secondary (11-18 years of age) level PGCE courses begin the first term (September-December) with a preliminary school experience. This is

undertaken in a primary school, normally in the novice's home area, and consists of a structured task-oriented program of observation during the last two weeks of September. This initial experience with a primary school is designed as an orientation to the organization and implementation of the National Curriculum for history at the primary level. Upon completion, pre-service teachers then register at the university at the beginning of October. They are expected to take two teaching subject courses. The main method subject course would be in their undergraduate major, and their subsidiary study method course often would be in their minor. Both Jonny and Helen's first method was history, with games (P.E.) as Jonny's second method and geography as Helen's.

The history main methods course, which meets all day Tuesdays, is made up of workshops, tutorials, and lectures covering the National Curriculum key stages, lesson planning in relation to the national curriculum, teaching and learning strategies, information technology, and student teacher presentations. The subsidiary (second methods) courses are held on either Monday or Friday mornings. After meeting with methods tutors, students are assigned to a partner school for the year. The partner school relationship is organized to take a number of pre-service teachers from different curriculum subjects. A senior member of the partner school's staff serves as a primary coordinator for the full group of students within the school. The pre-service teachers are also assigned to a teacher tutor/mentor in their main subject area for the whole year. The School of Education at Leeds University also provides the cohort of students within the partner school with a link tutor who is responsible for coordinating the work of the pre-service teachers, the school, and the university to produce a coherent course experience.

Throughout the first term, pre-service teachers are involved in what is known as the *Serial School Experience*. They spend two days per week in their assigned school (Wednesdays and Thursdays). Their link tutor is in the school on one of those days. A typical program during the serial school experience involves having Wednesday morning devoted to broad or whole school educational and professional studies with input from a specialist member of the school staff, followed by a group discussion led by the link tutor. The remainder of Wednesday and Thursday is spent in subject departments observing lessons and working with assigned mentors.

The School of Education also runs a core university course taken by all pre-service teachers, Educational and Professional Studies (EPS). History main method pre-service teachers attend the EPS lectures on Monday mornings. The program of EPS lectures is designed to be followed up in the group discussions held at the partner schools on Wednesday mornings.

The entire spring term (13 weeks, January-March) is spent in the partner school teaching a full class schedule, with the exception of two days during which the teacher interns return to the university for classes in their main teaching subject. Upon completion of the block school experience, the pre-service teacher spends the third term (April-June) in a negotiated further school experience. The negotiated experience is organized by pairing up pre-service teachers in the same main method group so that each can have experience of teaching in the school where the other has undertaken the block experience. During this final term, students again attend both methods classes and EPS lectures for workshops on different educational topics, advice and preparation for teaching post applications and to complete course assessment portfolios (Unwin & Foster, 1997-98).

#### Virginia Tech College of Human Resources and Education

Virginia Tech in southwest Virginia offers a Masters in Education: Social Studies. The Masters (MA) program is designed to prepare social studies teachers for teaching the secondary level. The Social Studies program is open to qualified students who hold a B.A. in one or a combination of the following: History, Political Science, or Geography. The program requires a minimum of 39 semester credit hours and can usually be completed in three semesters. Pre-service teachers build a program of study that requires courses to be taken in educational foundations, educational research, the cognate area (i.e. history or political science), and within their education and curriculum concentration area. Each course is designated as a three credit hour course, and the maximum number of credit hours that can be taken per semester is fifteen. Ideally, the majority of these academic courses are taken in the first two semesters of the program beginning in the spring or summer and then onto in the fall. This leaves the next spring semester clear for the nine credit hour internship that serves as the capstone for the program. The

educational foundations and educational research courses are the equivalent of the EPS lectures at Leeds. In the fall and spring semesters, a key requirement in the program is Teaching in the Secondary School - Social Studies Methods - Part I & II. This is a graduate seminar that meets for three hours twice a week for the first five weeks of the course. In the fall semester this seminar includes an introduction to the “fundamental concepts and strategies of curriculum and instruction at the middle and high school levels. The course content will include an overview of social studies teaching, lesson and unit planning...and a basic introduction to a variety of teaching, classroom management and assessment strategies” (Syllabus EDCI 5784 Teaching in Secondary School I Fall 1997). The next ten weeks consist of an aide experience, which closely parallels the serial school experience at Leeds. Pre-service teachers observe and aide in local middle school classes twice a week. During the spring semester, Part II of the graduate seminar is followed by a teaching internship in a local high school. The initial five weeks is designed to

build on the earlier social studies methods course, the social foundations courses and the educational psychology course. Prospective teachers will have the opportunity to develop their repertoire of teaching skills by observing, designing and implementing micro teaching lessons...Student teachers will have the chance to develop their skills in lesson and unit planning as they design units to be used during their student teaching experience (Syllabus EDCI 5784 Teaching in Secondary School II Spring 1998)

During these first five weeks of the spring term, the pre-service teachers visit their assigned practice schools twice a week. At the end of the five week formal university classroom component, the pre-service teachers begin their ten week student teaching internship, which can be seen as the equivalent of the block teaching experience at Leeds. A key difference, however, is that while Helen and Jonny remained within the same school for both such experiences, the program at Tech places them in different schools for each experience. Another difference is that, for Mike and Amanda, the teaching internship served as the capstone to their program; upon completing the internship, Helen and Jonny return to the university for a final third semester of their negotiated study and the development of their portfolio.

Upon completion of the program, pre-service teachers at Virginia Tech receive either a full social studies license that permits them to be hired to teach social studies in grades 6-12 (ages 11-18) in Virginia or specific subject licensure that permits them to teach only the subjects (history and government) in which they are certified. Full or specific licensure depends on the amount of undergraduate credit hours in history, political science, geography and economics within their undergraduate degree. Mike held enough hours for full social studies licensure, while Amanda held enough hours for a licensure to teach history and government.

#### At play in the field

Within both settings, issues of time and distance; specific requirements, timings and routines of the preparation courses; professors, practice schools and departments, in conjunction with my responsibilities at Virginia Tech, created stumbling blocks to maintaining a perfect balance of data collection. Both Mike and Amanda were easily accessible, which was not the case with Helen and Jonny. I met Amanda and Mike as they began the graduate seminar in social studies methods in August 1997, and I was fortunate to meet Helen and Jonny and spend the first two weeks of their program with them in mid September. When I returned to Virginia Tech, I maintained contact with Jonny and Helen through e-mail and phone calls until I visited again for four weeks in January and February 1998. The whole of these four weeks were spent in the schools with Helen and Jonny as they did their serial school experiences. From the vantage point of their half-term holiday, Jonny pointed out “I’m beginning to see the light at the end of the tunnel.” I left for Virginia Tech just as Helen and Jonny broke up for half-term with another four weeks of teaching remaining after their week off. I continued to keep in touch with Helen and Jonny throughout the rest of their program via e-mail and phone calls while working with Mike and Amanda as they finished up the last week of their graduate seminar and began their ten-week internship. During my time with them, I spent every day with either Helen or Jonny as they underwent their teaching internship. While the time spent with Mike and Amanda was equivalent in days, they were spread throughout their internship.

Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) contend that “research is a practical activity requiring the exercise of judgement in context” (p. 25). Within both settings my goal was

to collect as much quality data as allowed by the limited time. However, in utilizing the following key methods of qualitative research: regular formal and informal interviews, audio recordings / transcriptions of the activity of teaching history, observations of their lessons, and departmental meetings and collection of such documents as their lesson plans, schemes of work, and lecture notes, I sought not to overwhelm or distract the participants as I collected data (Kvale, 1996; Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995, Emmerson, Fretz and Shaw, 1995; Silverman, 1993; Delamont, 1992). During my own teacher preparation at Leeds University I would not have been comfortable having somebody observe me, tape me, and follow me into the classroom as I began to teach history. To have someone observing within the confined space of the classroom is not an experience teachers relish. Goodson (1991) notes that classrooms are spaces that for all teachers are the “most exposed and problematic aspects of the teacher’s world” (p. 141). Though many beginning student teachers cite their time teaching as the most useful part of their preparation, it can also be a very difficult and uncomfortable period as they take on the role of teacher (Lortie 1975, Grossman 1990, Lanier & Little 1986, Strehle 1996). For the participants in this study, there was no guarantee that they would be evaluated by their supervisors as successful classroom teachers. As Helen noted when we met up in January, “We have only been teaching two weeks full time. I only had eight actual teaching days last term, and now I am teaching twelve periods a week and it is ludicrous. I knew it was not going to be easy, and all of a sudden I am here not helping and watching but teaching and they now expect so much of you.” Throughout this study I remained constantly amazed and thankful that Mike, Amanda, Helen, and Jonny appeared so willing to allow me “to get close to and participate in a wide cross section of their every day activities” (Emmerson, Fretz & Shaw, 1995, p. 10).

Field notes based on my observations and conversations in the field served as a primary source of data. Whenever possible I taped both formal and informal interviews in numerous locations ranging from their homes, their cars as we drove to school, the staff room and local pubs and coffee shops. While the first and last interviews were scheduled and officially served as formal signs by which I entered and exited the field, numerous informal interviews came in the form of ongoing conversations which I taped. As I immersed myself deeper into the field, I took every opportunity to ask if I could turn

my tape recorder on in the hope that I could, as Kvale (1996) notes, “return from the stages of (my) inquiry with a tale that does justice to the subjects’ stories of their lived world... with data describing their lived experiences and self understanding” (pp. 80-105). The majority of my time with Helen and Jonny was spent in their classroom observing and writing about their history teaching. I also audiotaped their lessons to gain more data on their experiences within their history classroom. This in turn was supplemented by copies of their handouts, lesson plans, curriculums, schemes of work, and teacher evaluations. The result was thousands of pages of transcripts and field notes with which I played, explored, became frustrated, and then played again, always trying to remember that immersing oneself in data is like a dolphin at play in the ocean, requiring a sense of balance as one moves down, through and around in the sea of data: exploring, coming back, changing one’s position and perspective to gain a greater appreciation of what is all around, while remembering to come up for air. It was during this time that I was struck by the extent to which the metaphors of performance and performativity were layered within and through the data.

Part 5: Developing a conceptual framework. Using performance as a metaphor

All the world's a stage,  
And all the men and women merely players.  
They have their exits and their entrances,  
And one man in his time plays many parts.  
Shakespeare,  
As You Like It.

Ervin Goffman's (1959) appropriation of the metaphor of performance as a device through which to explore and describe social behavior in Performance and the Presentation of Self, though nearly 30 years old, continues to hold a great deal of potential and influence as a valuable conceptual framework for researchers working within an interactionist perspective. Though Goffman is what Richard Schechner (1990) would call an "outsider" theorist who held little interest in studying deliberate and intentional artistic performances, his application of the theatre/ performance metaphor can serve as an powerful lens through which to understand how students of history construct themselves as history teachers. The use of performance as a metaphor in recent years has not only been applied to conceptualizing our understanding of teaching (Talbert, 1997), but to such varied areas as how scientists present an occupational self (Hermananowicz, 1998), the actual process of scientific experimentation (Crease, 1993) and how specific attachments to various locations and sites such as coffee houses develops among employees and customers (Milligan, 1998). However, the use and development of metaphors is not exclusively the product of researchers trapped in their ivory towers desperately developing some framework to explain their research, for as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) point out, "our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature" (p. 3). We all use metaphors to create our world, for as Johnson (1993) suggests, "the way we frame and categorize a given situation will determine how we reason about it, and how we frame it will depend on which metaphorical concepts we are using" (p. 2). What needs to be remembered in doing research, however, is that though a singular metaphor itself cannot capture the essence of the whole process being studied, its power and utility lies in the recognition that a metaphor provides a point of entry through which to approach and



explore a particular phenomena. It was a point that Goffman (1959) was very clear about within his own work.

And now a final comment. In developing the conceptual framework employed in this report some language of the stage was used. I spoke of performers and audiences: of routines and parts; of performances coming off or falling flat: of cues, stage settings and backstage; of dramaturgical needs, dramaturgical skills, and dramaturgical strategies. Now it should be admitted that this attempt to press a mere analogy so far was in part a rhetoric and a maneuver... and so here the language and mask of the stage will be dropped. Scaffolds after all, are to build other things with, and should be erected with an eye to taking them down (p.254).

Within the scope of this study Goffman's dramaturgical approach is a conceptual framework that is well worth revisiting. In The presentation of self in everyday life (1959) Goffman's dramaturgical metaphor views our everyday social interactions as a series of performances given by individuals he sees as social actors. He defines performance as "all activity of a given participant on a given occasion that serves to influence in any way any of the other participants" (p.26). Within his work he presents the individual as divided into two parts. The first is the performer, "a harried fabricator of impression in the all-too-human task of staging a performance." The second is the character, "a figure, typically a fine one whose spirit and strength, and other sterling qualities the performance is designed to evoke" (p.222).

A key feature of Goffman's perspective on understanding social behavior is his suggestion that there are specific "front regions" where character performances are staged and "back stage" regions where the performer learns and rehearses a part. As Goffman notes,

there will be a back region with its tools for shaping the body, and a front region with its fixed props. There will be a team of persons whose activity on stage in conjunction with available props will constitute the scene from which the performed character's self will emerge, and another team, the audience whose interpretive activity will be necessary for this emergence. The self is a product of all of

these arrangements, and in all of its parts bear the mark of this genesis (p.223).

It is backstage, Goffman suggests, that the performer is "given to having fantasies and dreams, some that pleurably unfold a triumphant performance, others full of anxiety and dread that nervously deal with vital discrediting in a public front region" (p. 224). A major component of a performance is the "front" that is employed by an actor to successfully define the situation for those observing and/or participating within the interaction. The actor's "personal front," which includes the management of appearance and manner that are "items that we most intimately identify with that actor and that we naturally expect will follow the performer wherever he goes" (p. 24), is styled and played out within the third feature of "front" which is the "setting" of the performance. Goffman's notion of the setting, of being on stage, appears to be quite broad as he explains "a setting tends to stay put, geographically speaking, so that those who would use a particular setting as a part of their performance cannot begin their act until they have brought themselves to the appropriate place and must terminate their performance when they leave it (1959, p. 22). Within each setting, any physical item such as "furniture, décor, physical layout, and other background items which supply the scenery and stage props" (p. 22) can be utilized and worked with to support the particular performance.

#### Playing with Goffman- Framing my autobiography.

In re-examining my own educational autobiography it is possible to see how Goffman's theatre analogy holds a great deal of potential as a way to unpack not only how I began to construct and seek to accomplish myself in the role of history teacher over time and space but also how the participants within this study began to do the same thing. In examining my own experiences in and out of the classroom as a student of history, it becomes difficult to ignore the importance and power of being an audience member. Being an audience member, as David Buckingham (1993) contends, is not a passive activity, rather it "is something you do, rather than something you are" (p. 13). Although students do not necessarily choose to be sat in a history classroom, once there, they make multiple active decisions/choices that lead to a wide range of activities including,

participating with the teacher, socializing with friends, or even sleeping. Being a member of a history classroom audience was in and of itself an active role within which I began to develop not only an understanding of history and history teaching, but also the role of a good student of history. In subsequently learning to "officially" become a teacher of history through my enrollment at Leeds University, the methods classroom became a backstage area to continue to build on, develop, and rehearse the role of a history teacher. My debut in the character of history teacher came in my teaching practice. It was, to a great extent, viewed as successful by my mentor teachers and university supervisor in the sense that they offered very little direction or changes to alter my performance as I developed lessons for the organized range of students who would find themselves watching me perform twice a week.

In the classroom of my teaching practice, I was not who I was at home or the local pub with my family and friends, yet I felt comfortable in the character of history teacher. Becoming a teacher of history was analogous to learning to perform in the role of a specific character. It was a role that I had observed as a student, and now hoped to take on and develop by appropriating selected characteristics, traits, and approaches. It was not necessarily a new performance because I was mirroring different traits and approaches of teachers I had been long acquainted with; rather, it was a performance founded on what Schechner (1985) contends is the defining trait of any performance, "restored behavior." He states "Performance means never for the first time. It means for the second to the n<sup>th</sup> time... put in personal (actor) terms restored behavior is 'me behaving like I am someone else'... restored behavior is living behavior treated as a film director treats a filmstrip. These strips of behavior can be rearranged or reconstructed; they are independent of the causal system that brought them into existence" (pp. 35-37).

#### Developing pedagogical attachments<sup>1</sup> - Exploring how one approaches the teaching of history

In this context of performance, it is useful to pay particular attention to two continually interweaving components which developed and shaped specific pedagogical attachments that I considered useful and appropriate as I moved into the front stage role

---

<sup>1</sup> The concept of pedagogical attachment is developed from Milligan's (1998) work on the social construction of place attachment that examines the role of the built environment on social life.

of my teaching practice. The first of these, “the interactional past,” can be best represented as experiences and “well remembered events” or “critical incidents” associated with learning and enjoying history as an audience member both in and out of school (Milligan, 1998, p.1-33). The level of meaningfulness of such events and activities, of doing history, laid a foundational understanding of how I believed history could and should be taught as I prepared and rehearsed to move front stage within my methods classes at Leeds University. The second component that encouraged the practice and learning of the skills of history within my role as history teacher can be termed “interactional potential” (Milligan, 1998, p.1-33). This refers to the imagined possibilities, experiences, and outcomes of planning and teaching history in a particular way that are viewed as likely to be successful as one prepares and moves into the front stage role of history teacher within the context of a specific school and classroom setting.

At Leeds, during my teaching practice, there was very little disruption to my attachment to a genre of history teaching that I had experienced as a student, beyond the realization that not all of my students were as ready, willing, and able to do history as I had been. This was not the case, however, as I began to teach in America, for much of the latter half of my autobiography deals with my ongoing attempts to reconcile my actual performances in the character of a knowledgeable, competent history teacher in front of an American audience of students and colleagues with how I remembered my performances as a student teacher in England. In America, it was difficult to perform the character of history teacher as I had envisioned I would have had I remained a teacher in England. In America, the script(s) of the curriculum and textbooks, and the expectations of the audience (students, principals, and mentors) and fellow cast members (social studies department) offered little room for how I wanted to develop my role based on my past experiences associated with learning and teaching history in England. My experiences of developing and taking on the role of history teacher in two different cultures clarifies just how useful a tool Goffman's dramaturgical perspective is to examine the complexity of how students of history begin to construct themselves as history teachers during their teaching practice.

### Moving forward: Shifting one's gaze

In collecting and analyzing data, a recurring theme for all the participants as they began their teaching practice was a concern that they could carry off the role of being a history teacher in front of the students, their supervisors, and cooperating teachers (it is also worth noting that I cannot ignore the impact that my presence as an observer had on their day to day activities and teaching based upon the assumptions and meanings Helen, Jonny, Mike and Amanda imposed on me and my activities as I followed them around). The classroom, in essence, became the setting or stage for their transformation. It was a transformation that required developing a teacher "front" with regard to appearance and manner. In spending time with the participants at school, not only in their classrooms but in the teachers' workroom, the library and the staff room, as well as following them back to their university methods classes, I saw that the character of history teacher remained confined to the front stage setting of the classroom. For example, the following fieldnotes, which include comments made by Jonny, during his internship, explicitly highlight his perception that his role as a history teacher was an interactive performance that mirrored Goffman's discussion of front and back regions and the passageways in between:

I just left the staffroom with Jonny and as usual he seemed in fine form, joking and laughing with Nick and a couple of other student teachers. Today was the first day I noticed the Garfield poster above the front door of the staffroom as you walk in. It reads "Welcome to the Funny Farm." There is also another poster inside with a circle and an arrow that reads, "In case of emergency Bang Head Here." It seems that both Jonny and Nick have taken these posters quite literally and use the staffroom to let their hair down. What was so amazing today, however, was the comment Jonny made as we walked over to class. It was as he was talking me through his transformation into a teacher: "If you look confident and at ease with yourself then no one will mess with you. They sense if you are uneasy, or if you are nervous or if you are unsure of what you are talking about. I mean, there is a teachers walk, isn't there? You know, shoulders back, head up, chin up, looking around, making eye contact, you know that is what I picked up last year. And so as soon as I got to Knottingley I was doing that. If you walk around with your head down, not looking at the kids, they sense you are easy and they will try you out. And going back to Talbert (6<sup>th</sup> form history teacher), that is him. No one messed with him."

His comment about performing in the role of history teacher, the building on previous interactions with his 6<sup>th</sup> form teacher and his own experiences as a special needs assistant in a local school demonstrate the extent to which learning to become a teacher is a process that is preceded and built upon by what States (1996) describes as "an invariant field of twice behaved behavior...[that] is detectable in the world if one had the wit (or artistry) to see it" (p. 23).

The participants' subsequent performances within their classrooms, however, should not as Schechner (1985, 1993) argues, be seen as mere replication of past observed performances. It is much more. As Talburt (1997) contends, the performance of teaching can be viewed as "a representation that is mediated transactionally and constituted by the (mis) recognition of other. It is derived from context, the knowledge of others, and one's understanding of self, subject, and students" (p. 8). A key point is the recognition that learning to teach or, in this case, learning to take on the role of history teacher, is a complex socially constructed process of self-organization and enculturation (Cole and Wertsch, 1996). What is significant is the quality and nature of such culturally situated constructions (Cobb, 1994, pp. 13-20). Within the scope of this comparative study, this means moving through terrain similar to my educational autobiography, examining how both past and present context(s) interact to shape and subsequently re-shape the beginning history teachers "ways of operating" or their "ensemble of procedures" that form the essence of the front stage activity of their teaching (de Certeau, 1984, pp. xi, 43). However, instead of beginning by tracing each participant's understanding of history teaching and their own motivations to teach history prior to their enrollment with their respective preparation programs, we will first meet each beginning history teacher within the front stage setting of their practice school, performing the activity of teaching history.

## Part 6: Portraits of teaching

Each portrait of teaching that follows is designed to serve not only as an introduction to the participants, but as an entry point through which to explore and compare what it means to teach history in England and the USA. The first two portraits detail history lessons taught first by Helen and then Jonny, while the last two portraits recount lessons taught by their American counterparts, Amanda and Mike. In introducing the participants through their activity of teaching, it is important to produce four detailed, impressionistic, and richly layered descriptions of full, “well-remembered” history lessons, rather than short summaries of lessons from the many that I saw (Carter, 1990; Carter and Gonzalez, 1993). Each portrait follows one after another, with little, if any, commentary. Just as one moves through an art gallery or museum, examining specific works or artifacts that are accompanied by brief captions, one should initially experience these portraits in the same way. Each is a distinct entity that forms part of an exhibit on the theme of teaching history. It is only after “viewing” each one that we will begin to unpack and examine the key dimensions of difference between the participants’ pedagogical approaches to the teaching of history.

## Teaching History in England.

### Helen-7K2 alpha<sup>2</sup>- Roman Charioteers and a Day at the Arena.

It was just the day for Organizing Something.  
The House at Pooh Corner

It was a Monday morning in late January, and Helen was just about to begin her fourth week of student teaching. She had just come off a self-proclaimed “crappy week.” Year 10 has been awful,” she lamented. “I get all the shitty groups. I’m pretty much planned up until midweek.” The weekend itself had been spent organizing her plans from the previous week of teaching. She explained that her mentor, Helen B., wants to see her plans, and so she had bought some concertina folders. “Look, I went shopping this weekend so I can put all my stuff together for the first time. I want to show her just how organized I am. The key is to look organized,” she said with a grin as we walked into school. Helen, as usual, was carrying her Sainbury’s plastic shopping bag of graded student exercise books, her briefcase, and two duffel bags. After hanging her coat up in the staff cloakroom and collecting her form’s register, Helen headed upstairs to her form room located along the history and geography corridor. We were early and there were very few students hanging around the halls. Helen headed to the back of the classroom carrying her Sainbury’s bag of graded exercise books. She placed the books in the assigned class tray. Here they would remain until the students came into class. As she opened the tray to put 7K2 alpha’s books in, she shook her head. “Oh, I hate it when they hand in their work after the fact. I marked all this over the weekend. Well, it’s tough. I’m not marking it for the lesson.” She opened the book. “Look, he has not even finished it.” She went on to explain that she was also going to have a word with Rob about one of the students in 7K2 alpha. Rob was the Year 7 form tutor for the form Helen was now teaching and 7K2 alpha was, in fact, his class. She had set them homework last week that involved writing a letter to a friend detailing what they had seen when they went to watch the gladiators at the Arena in Rome. “Most of the letters were pretty good, though a

---

<sup>2</sup> 7K2alpha: Year 7 refers to the year the students are in – Year 7 ages 11-12. K2alpha details the track the students are assigned to. Within each year Helen explained “there is a K band and an S band, it goes K1 Alpha, KI A, K2 alpha, K2 A, K3 and K4 and then it goes S1 alpha, S1 A, S2 alpha, S2 A, S3 and S4 and the K side is brighter than the S side. So S 4 is like phweeww”



couple of them talked about flying to Rome on their holidays.” Her concern was that one boy had been quite explicit about killing a fellow student in his letter. On the advice of her mum, she was going to mention it to Rob. “Maybe Rob could have a word with him.”

I sat at the back of the room as she began to cue up the videos she would be using in class today. She began by finding the beginning of the chariot race in *Ben Hur*, and then the section of an “educational video taped off the telly” that talked about chariot racing and how to use “sources of history.” The day was starting out well: one of the two departmental video players was already in her/Rob’s room, so she did not have to track it down. She also had both videos cued up for second period class. Finding the scene she wanted she joked that this was all pretty easy, since both videos were “used again and again in the same spot” by everyone teaching the Romans. Leaving the video in the video player Helen headed next door to the history workroom. Her first period was free and she would meet 7K2 alpha in period 2.

#### A day at the races that did not go exactly to plan

Year 7K2 alpha came into the classroom as Helen placed the textbooks to be used in class on her desk. She then headed back to the file cabinet to locate the source assessment that would be given to the students at the end of the lesson for homework. During first period she had remembered that she had forgotten to get them, and now she had to wait because the room had a class in it. She pulled out the file and quickly caught Rob as he was wandering out. There were not enough photocopies of the assessment so she asked Rob if he could make some for her. By this point the noise level was getting higher and higher, and a wave of blue-uniformed 11-year-olds carrying big sports bags entered the history classroom.

They sat at their tables facing the front of the class. Each table seated two students. The students were seated in rows; altogether there were four rows of tables with four tables making up each row. Each row was divided down the middle of the room by a large gap that served as the main aisle for the teacher and the students to move to the back of the room. This allowed the teacher to move up the rows of students seated on either side and to get to the file cabinets that stored departmental worksheets and assessments for the history courses taught in that particular room. It also allowed students to get to their seats and to the class tray where their exercise books were stored.

Helen greeted the students as they came in, taking in a couple of exercise books, while asking another student to hand out the textbook.

When they saw the video player, nearly every child had the same question for Helen. Raising their voice over the general chatter, “Miss, Miss, are we watching a video?” echoed through the room.

Helen turned around. “Yes, we are watching two, but anymore of this noise and you won’t be watching any. If you work hard you will watch the videos I just need to write these on the board very quickly.” Helen at this point was busily writing a number of questions on the board.

### *Chariot Racing*

- 1) *How many Chariot racing teams where there?*
- 2) *How were the teams identified?*
- 3) *What could successful charioteers win?*
- 4) *Why was chariot racing so popular?*
- 5) *Copy source C page 58 (drawing of the circus)*

Helen finished the questions on the board, and turned to face the class.

“Right.”

“Oh, Miss, I like your waistcoat!” came the compliment from a couple of girls. Helen was wearing a Winnie-the-Pooh waistcoat, the one she had told me last week all the students talked about when she wore it.

“Thanks. Right. Let’s do the register.” Sitting at her desk, she begins to read off the students’ first names. This prompted either “Yes Miss” if present or “not ‘ere Miss” followed by an explanation from the class of where the person could actually be. The noise level of the class began to rise toward the end of the taking of the register, as fewer children had to listen for their name. Helen closed the register and moved toward the gap at the front of the class.

“SSHHH, please. Right, homework. On the whole there were some very good ones. Eight out of ten or above is very good, and if you have not got eight or nine out of ten, or ten out of ten I should have given you a reason why not.”

The students quickly open their workbooks letting each other know their grades if they did well. As if on cue, one student shouts. “But Miss I have not given my homework in.”

Helen gives a quick staged laugh. “Oh yes. That was the other thing, twelve books were missing when I took them home on Friday. Twelve books- three miraculously turned up this morning, and I have had people telling me all day today saying they had forgotten to hand it in.” Helen continued for the next few minutes explaining the importance of getting in the work, and notifying her if there are any problems with the homework. “Then I know and I can do something about it. Right. Then today we are going to look at this.” She pointed to the title on the board *Chariot racing*. “Chariot racing was a spectator sport. What is a spectator sport?”

One student quickly shouts out an answer while some of the others put their hands up.

“Excellent, can you give me any modern day spectator sports?” What follows is a list of student answers ranging from cricket to American football. After each answer, she repeats the answer, and reminds the students not to shout out. The students quickly shoot their hands in the air, wait for a couple of seconds and then shout out their answer. “So what do all these sports have in common? What do they have in common when they are spectator sports?” Helen calls on students with their hands up to answer the questions. “Good. So was gladiator fighting a spectator sport? Do you remember how many people you could get in the Coliseum? Do you remember? Yes, 45000. Good. So it held about the same amount as Elland Road or about half at Wembley Stadium.”

The reference to the stadium of a local professional football team triggered one student to shout “Oh you mean that rubbish team.”

This in turn started to trigger rival fan responses; Helen, however, talks over the banter. “I don’t know anything about football. All I know is that it held about the same as Elland Road and half of Wembley Stadium. Today we are going to look at another Roman spectator sport; we are going to look at chariot racing. A lot of people watched chariot racing. It was held in a huge stadium far better than anything we have today. It was called the Circus Maximus. What do you think of when you think of the circus?” Hands fly up again. Some, unable to contain the information, fire out answers.

“That is not what this was like. It was a massive track for racing chariots. It was huge.”

“Miss is that it, that picture?” asks a student, pointing to a poster on the wall behind her desk. All the students focus on the picture. The walls of the classroom are full of images, writing, and pictures. The majority is student-based work. On one side of the wall there is a collection of student work dealing with the myth of Rome’s foundation. It is done in the form of a newspaper story and headlines with accompanying drawings. On the other side above more student work there is a large poster that reads “GCSE history at Kettlethorpe Key Stage 3.” Underneath there are three separate drawing in black ink that represent the following themes to be studied: History of Kettlethorpe, Black people in America, and the Making of the UK. The poster of the Circus Maximus stood out from everything else on the wall.

“This one? Oh yes, brilliant,” said Helen almost taken aback that it was there. “That is the Circus Maximus in Rome. Look, the track is like a big oval. What we are going to do today is that we are going to look at a video. You are going to watch a video first and it has actually got a bit about chariot racing and also about gladiators. And I will show you both bits and then you are going to answer the questions on the board. So you will need to make some notes in the back of your books on those questions. You will then answer the questions and I want you to draw the Circus Maximus.”

A murmur spread through the class many of the students started to ask if she meant the one on the wall. “No, no the one in your books. You are going to draw a diagram of the Circus Maximus from the book, so don’t worry. It is simplified in the book. And you are going to watch another video and answer some more questions by taking notes. So now you are just going to take notes in the back of your books on the questions on the board.” Turning to a student at the back of the room she asked, “Would you pull the curtains for me, I’m going to turn it into a cinema.”

It was at this point that students started to ask if they could move to see the video. Those at the back wanted to sit on the desk, while others were now pushing just to see if they could move. The noise level continued to build, Helen made one concession, that those on the back could move to the front, and a cacophony of voices filled the room, asking to be moved or arguing with others who were now in their way.

“There seems to be a lot of fuss about watching a five minute video. Are we settled and ready?” Helen begins the video. As the video played it soon became apparent that this was not the place that Helen had introduced. She stops the video. “It was in the right place and ready to go.” She starts to fast forward to see if she could see the key scenes of the chariot racing. As she fast forwards through the video the class is silent. “Can you put the lights on please? Ok, while I try and find this I would like you to go back to your seats. I will find the video bit to show you, but first go to page 58 and 59 in your textbook and you can answer all the questions on the board in the front of your book. Write out the questions. Page 58-59, all the answers are in there; do this while I am finding the part on the video. Now shh. You should be doing these questions and not watching what I am doing.” As Helen continued to work on finding the video the students began to work. This was not a silent activity, for as they began to answer the questions they chatted with the person next to them.

Helen’s initial plans were thrown off, her goal of having the students watch the video, while taking notes on the questions, discussing their notes and then finally answering the same questions in the front of their exercise book using the textbook were totally thrown. However, because the working on the questions was layered into both the video and the textbook, she was able to direct her students to answer the questions in the textbook without much difficulty. As she worked on the video, Helen kept stopping to monitor the students, “Okay you are on question 2. Can you tell what colours they were identified by? Make sure you put a question mark at the end here.”

One student complained, “Miss, Miss the page does not tell you.”

“Yes it does tell you, it tells you in the second paragraph. It starts with *successful charioteers*, have you got it?” She would then quickly head back to the video, constantly reminding the students of the work they needed to do. “You need to be on more than question two, you know; most people are drawing. There is a little bit too much noise, keep it down. Now remember you also need to put labels on your drawing and tell me what it is. Tell me it is the Circus Maximus. You have to label your diagram. It is not good having a diagram without labels, is it?”

It was at this point that Rob came back into the room he asked Helen for her triplicate book in which her evaluations were written. Helen began to explain what had

happened, Rob nodded and then headed to the back of the classroom. Here he looked at a student's work asking, "What did you do at the start of the lesson? Did you read that together?" He began writing an evaluation in the 'triplicate book.'

After writing on the board: *What does the film get right? What does the film get wrong?* Helen announces to the class, "Right. I have found the part on the video now and you should get ready to make notes." Helen turns on the video, and the class shuffles getting ready to watch. "Just because the video is on does not mean that you can talk."

Helen had previously mentioned that "this educational video was not great but it is all we have got. The presentation is a bit too colloquial."

The video, a taped educational program, is introduced by a fast talking cockney who introduces the Circus Maximus. "It's a place where the lads bring their lovely ladies for a day at the races." The next scene then shows a quick film clip of a chariot race. Suddenly a voice is heard, "that is not history, that is Hollywood."

A computer-generated voice responds, "Good challenge, films are made to tell stories not for historical accuracy. So careful with the film - use evidence." At this stage the video shows a range of different artifacts such as mosaics and then provides a description of the Circus Maximus and reads an advertisement for the day's events. The narrator then comes back and gives a chirpy cockney commentary as the video shows another version of a day at the Circus Maximus based on some of the evidence previously presented.

Helen stops the videos and quickly fires questions to the class. Again, the same routine of students shouting out answers and being cajoled to raise their hands begins. "How many laps- don't shout out- did the chariots do? How long was that in miles? Was it a safe sport?" At one point one student asks if they really had spikes on the chariot wheels? Helen quickly responds, "We are going to look at that in a while." She then continues to ask questions about the size of the Circus Maximus. She compares it to the time she went to Wembley stadium to watch a rugby match. "It was fantastic, jammed in like sardines, you could not go anywhere, so imagine if you were in there with 250,000 people - it must be pretty busy. Now who could go to watch the chariot? Excellent, anybody could. You could be a slave, a foreigner, a rich person. The richer you were,

the nearer you sat to the front. So what type of seats did they sit on at the front?  
Excellent - marble.”

“But Miss, marble’s cold, wouldn’t they get piles?” asked one student.

“I don’t think so, it is quite warm in Rome so they would not have had that problem, and you might have taken a cushion with you as well. Right, you have some good information from the video, and now we are going to look at another video. Some of you raised some issues about what we are going to watch. Who said that about the spikes on the wheels? Well, did you see the spikes in the last section of the video? No you didn’t, did you. How many actual teams did they have in one race? Yes, that’s right, only four. Good.”

Helen then introduces the next video, *Ben Hur*. “I have put a couple of questions on the board. Tell me what the film gets right, and what does it get wrong based on what we have now seen and read. So you need to look at where people are sat, how many teams are racing, how many laps they do. Then we are going to pull it all together and see why some of it is wrong and some of it is right and what is exaggerated. Write your answers in the back of your books.” Helen then shows Charlton Heston racing around the track. As the race ends Helen turns off the video and begins to get the students to identify what they thought the film got historically right and wrong. She lists them on the board as the students shout out the answers. “But does this mean that the video is not good as historical evidence? Is the video useful? What does it tell us? Why do you think it was exaggerated, why spice it up?” The students begin to answer her questions and then Helen shifts the topic to the film *Titanic* that was coming out that weekend in a flurry of publicity.

“You know, I am not sure if the story of Leo and Kate is true. It is Hollywood. They have just spiced it up.” This comment, however, falls on deaf ears as the students begin to discuss their affection for Leonardo di Caprio and their plans to see the film. As the students chat, Helen passes out the source assessment handout that the students will have to complete for homework. Entitled Bloodsports, it is made up of a brief description of the task which reads “look at the source and describe a typical day at the Roman Arena.” Underneath are five sources that have been copied from the textbook they are using on the Romans. These sources include a program of events for a typical

day at the arena, a photograph of a mosaic representing gladiators fighting, a textbook drawing of gladiators fighting, and quotes regarding the popularity of going to the arena and a description of what happened at the arena from the period.

Helen sets up what they will be expected to do. She begins by explaining that they have already done source work by evaluating the video today and now “you are going to look at a different source, written and picture, rather than a video.” Taking each source at a time Helen describes what it is and how it could be used, while differentiating between sources from the period and those that came out of textbooks. “Look at source B. It is a mosaic, who made the mosaic? Yes, excellent, the Romans did - and that is quite a useful source, isn’t it, because you have something from the time, but if you look at source E, did the Romans draw this? No, it is just a drawing from your textbook that shows gladiators fighting. Look at source D.” Helen then reads the source. “Were the games popular? What did people think about in those days? ... Yes bread and the games. Just like you talk about your favourite pop singers, or your favourite football team or skier, two thousand years ago you might have gone to the arena at the weekend to watch the gladiators fight and talk about your favorite gladiators.”

After running through the sources and explaining what they showed, Helen moves on to explain what the class should be able to do with the assessment. “Right, to give you a bit of help I will read you how to get level 4. This assessment covers levels 2-4.”<sup>3</sup> The students listen intently as Helen begins to explain how to get a top grade. Helen then begins to read from a grading guide provided by the department, “To get a level 4 pupils must use all of the sources and select and combine information to answer the question.” The wording mirrors the attainment targets for level 4 within the national curriculum that

---

<sup>3</sup> The levels that Helen describes are national curriculum attainment targets for history that “(d)escribe the types and range of performance which pupils working at a particular level should characteristically demonstrate. In deciding on a pupils level of attainment... teachers should judge which description best fits the pupils performance... By the end of Key Stage 1 (ages 5-7 year group 1-2), the performance of the great majority of pupils should be within the range of levels 1-3, by the end of Key Stage 2 (ages 7-11, year group 3-6) it should be within the range of 2-5 and by the end of Key Stage 3 (ages 11-14 year group 7-9) within the range of 3-7. Level 8 is available for very able students.” (History in the National Curriculum 1995, p.16)



describes the performance of students working with source material where “they are beginning to select and combine information from historical sources. They are beginning to produce structured work, making appropriate use of dates and terms” (History in the National Curriculum, 1995, p. 17).

“So one thing you need to do is describe the events, describe what is happening, the crowd response, people’s attitudes. You have just learned that Seneca in source G was not right impressed but most people were. You can talk about the types of gladiators you learned about last week. Can you remember what they were called? Two of them are in the mosaic... So when you set it out start a new clean page in the front of your book and put the title “Blood Sports” and write the question out. So I know where it is, underline the title. Use the information I have given you, check some of the details that you have written in the notes in the back of your book. Imagine you are there in the crowd, you are there. You are to tell me what is happening what you see and what you hear. Tell me what the atmosphere is like, what you think about. You might be like Seneca and not like it. This is your homework so you need to write it in your planner as well. You could use source A to lay out what you did during the day so you could say at 10 o’clock you went to the arena and the first thing you saw, you could then use source B to say what types of gladiators you saw. So use the program to structure your day. If you have any problems during the week come and see me and I will help and give you some advice.” Helen as this point was talking as quickly as possible the students had started to become restless and the bell was about to go for break time.

As the students leave, Rob heads out, passing her the triplicate book as he leaves. Quickly opening it, Helen reads the evaluation. She did not consider it very good. "Oh I could scream, I’m fed up,” were Helen’s only words as we headed against the tide of students as we walked the wrong way down the one-way corridor to the classroom where she would teach after the break.

#### Jonny- 9Q2- World War I and propaganda

“I love Friday afternoons,” remarks Jonny, as we head down the A1 to Knottingley high school. “No classes, we just hang out, drink tea and then I go play football with the staff. It seems a shame that I have to teach both 9Q2 and 9P3 first. I mean the only nice thing about the morning is 10P1. It is the top set, all girls. It is the

one that Debbie calls ‘the angels.’ I mean 9P3 are just a bunch of shit-heads, though I have a bit more control over them today as I can keep them in for lunch while 9Q2, well, you basically have got to keep them working, you can chivvy them. Yeah, I have 9P2 first.”<sup>4</sup>

“Oh what a lovely War”

For some reason the classroom for Jonny’s first class is locked. As Jonny goes across the hall to get a key, the students begin to gather around the door. All history classes are taught in L Block or the school campus so students of different ages and sizes mix as they move to their classrooms. 9P2 meets at the bottom end of the hall. There is an alcove where desks are placed in the center and around the walls. It is here that students sit if they are sent out of class. One wall above these desks is covered with photographs of students on field trips; the location of the field trip is given as well as the topic which inspired the trip. Across the hall is a bulletin board with a black background; the heading is “World War I.” Upon the background are white typed sheets of paper, some normal A4 size, other sheets are cut in the form of cross. The paper is interspersed with paper poppies. The typed sheets hold the poems and descriptive letters of the World War One poets. It is a very somber read, interrupted by the excited chatter of students as they wait to get into the classroom. The main topic of conversation from this sea of blue-uniformed 13 and 14 year olds was war. Not World War I, which was the topic they were currently studying, but the chances of going to war with Saddam Hussein.

“He’s got enough power to blow up the world my dad said.” One student comments to a group of startled peers.

“Who does?” asks another.

“Saddam Hussein.”

“He never has, it’s all chemical stuff,” are a couple of initial comments as more and more students start to discuss the possibilities of going to war with Iraq on a February Friday morning.

---

<sup>4</sup> In Jonny’s school the students are banded. The High school, just like Helen’s, goes from year 7 age 11 to year 11 age 16. Years 7-9 are studying Key stage 3 history and those who study history in year 10 and 11 have taken history as one of their 2 year GCSE options. Each year is split into 2 separate populations Jonny explained “so, in say year 9 you have got six classes. One side of the school is called P and the other side is called Q. So on the p side there is set 1,2, and 3 and on the other side there is Q1, Q2 and Q3.”

“Sir, do you think we will go to war with Iraq?” one student asks Jonny as he moves through the students to open the door.

“Not sure” comes Jonny’s reply, but it is lost as the class, bar two students who begin to chat with Jonny about what they had heard on the news, moves into the classroom. While the students chat along their row, Jonny comes in with the couple who were still interested in hearing his predictions for what would happen to Saddam Hussein.

“Right. Register.” The noise level of the class drops off as Jonny begins to call out the names of the students. Upon completion, Jonny moves from his desk to stand in front of the thirteen boys and six girls as they sit in rows at their tables. Just as in Helen’s class, each row is made up of four separate tables with each table seating two students. The row itself is broken in two by the gap in the middle of the room. Apart from one boy who sits alone with a girl, all the boys are seated in rows of four on one side of the room, while on the other side of the room two pairs of girls sit together in rows and one girl sits by herself. Jonny begins to discuss what they had done in their previous meeting on Monday.

“Last lesson we were looking at the way people thought about the war at the start. Remember we were looking at those photographs and pictures. Can somebody just put your hand up and give words to describe the way a lot of people felt about the war at the start when it first happened?”

“Happy.”

“Joyful.”

“Excited.”

“Good.” Jonny nods. “Yeah, they were happy that it started, but did they think that the war was going to last four years?”

“No,” comes the class answer.

“Do you think that they thought that thousands and thousands of people were going to die?”

“No.” Again the class answers in unison.

“Okay. People thought the war was going to be over quickly. People thought the war might be fun, it might be an adventure. We looked at those pictures and that advertisement for cigarettes. Remember the soldiers in that. How did they look?.. yes.”

“Healthy,” says the chosen student.

Jonny nods. “Yes, they looked healthy. They looked happy. They looked like they were having a really good time while they were at war. Now today we are going to move on, we are going to look at something called propaganda. Has anybody ever heard the word propaganda before?” The class is silent. “Have you any idea what propaganda means?” Again silence and the shaking of heads. “It is actually something that is quite topical. Somebody on the way in just asked if I thought there was going to be a World War. Now if you go home tonight and you watch the news, you will see that Britain and America are having an argument with Iraq. There is a chance that America and Britain are going to bomb Iraq.”

“Yeah!” is the only response from a couple of students at the front. It was not a loud exclamation to the whole class, but for the row in which they sat. They were, however, the front row.

Pausing for a few seconds, Jonny continues. “Now, I just heard, when I said that, I just heard a couple of people go ‘yes’. People think it might be a good laugh to bomb Iraq. It might be fun. This is exactly how people thought in 1914. Now, you say ‘bomb Iraq.’ Okay, a lot of people think that in Britain at the moment. Other people don’t. Say we started a war with Iraq tomorrow, and it went on for four years and if hundreds of thousands of people started dying and everybody over the age of 18, every man over 18 had to go and fight in the war. Would people be saying ‘yes’?”

“No.” Comes the class answer.

“Exactly, so now we can start to understand a little bit of how people felt in 1914.” Jonny puts his hands on his hips and begins his introduction to the concept of propaganda. “Now propaganda, if you go the dictionary.” He stops, smiles and then moves toward his desk, and holds up a dictionary. “I was going to make you all do this, but I thought no. I will save you time. I will go and look up it in the dictionary myself. Propaganda according to the dictionary is ‘information to assist or damage the cause of a government or movement.’” Jonny then shifts his attention to the students’ discussion of the possibility of war today. “Now, something that I had not thought of until this morning, if you look over the weekend at some of the newspapers, as the crisis in Iraq is likely to get worse. If you look at how newspapers like The Sun, The Star and The

Mirror, and papers like that - tabloid papers - look to see how they talk about Saddam Hussein. It will be a very interesting exercise. You are likely to see them say he is like Adolf Hitler. He is evil, a butcher. That is people using - and that may be true - but that is people using information to damage an opponent. The papers like The Sun, The Star and The Mirror, will try to damage him, they will try to get the people in Britain to think terrible things about him. Now I am not saying that this is right or this is wrong. People are entitled to their opinion on that - either side. But that is what propaganda is. Okay? It is using information and trying to get people to dislike your opponent.” Jonny writes the definition of propaganda that he had just read out on the board. “So put today’s date which is the 6<sup>th</sup>, write class work in your margin, the title is propaganda and copy this sentence.”

While the students begin to copy off the board, Jonny passes out a handout. “Right. I have handed some sheets out on your table. Most people have one each, some of you might have to share one between two.”

The sheet is entitled *The Schlieffen Plan and Belgium Atrocities*. Underneath, a paragraph briefly details the Schlieffen plan and the sequence of events and invasions that led to Britain’s entry into World War I. Next to the paragraph is a map of Europe that highlights the invasion route the Germans took into France. Below this are four newspaper headlines and text labeled Source A, B, C, D. Source A is an extract from a German newspaper, B an extract from a French newspaper, C an extract from a British newspaper, and D from a second French newspaper. The headlines detail the events surrounding the German capture of the Belgian city of Antwerp and the forcing of the town’s clergy to ring the church bells after the town was taken. The paragraph, map, and sources were all taken out of textbooks and then pasted onto one sheet. The second sheet is entitled *Things to do* and includes a number of what Jonny calls ‘tasks’. The first one is made up of four boxes; within the first box is written “*When the fall of Antwerp became known the German bells were rung.*” The second box is empty except for “*The French Newspaper added that..*” The other two boxes are blank. Beneath the boxes are directions, first, for how to complete the empty boxes, and second, to detail the differences in how the story begins in source A and how it ends in source D. This is followed by two specific questions that read: *If you had just read the final story in La*

*Matin* how would you feel? Which side do you think *La Matin* is on?” Underneath this is a final table made up of two columns labeled on one side *Belgium Priests* and on the other side *German soldiers*.

“What we are going to try and do this lesson is get through the exercises. So we are going to have to be quiet. When we start writing it is going to require some hard work.” At this point, Jonny directs the class to spend two minutes reading through the first paragraph to themselves to gain understanding of “what happened at the start of the war.” While the class reads the sheet, Jonny also gives the sheet a cursory look. Quickly finished, he removes his jacket, places it on the chair behind his teacher desk, and then perches himself on the front of the teacher’s desk and waits. As the students complete the reading, and with the majority of faces now looking at him, Jonny directs their attention to the map.

“You should all have read that by now. Now if you look at the map of Europe, France and Germany share a border all along here. France on one side, and Germany on the other. Now in between are three small countries – Belgium, Holland or the Netherlands, and Luxembourg. Now in 1914, we know before the war started people were expecting a war to happen. Now if you were the French and you thought you might get attacked by the Germans where would you put most of your defenses?”

“On the border with Germany.” Comes the answer.

“Right. On the border with Germany is the most likely place they are going to attack isn’t it? Now remember when we talked about alliances, remember that France and Germany were on different sides. Of these countries here- Belgium and Holland were neutral. They were not on anyone’s side. So the French thought if the Germans attacked them they would not attack through here would they? Because these countries are neutral they have nothing to do with it. The French in this sense are expecting a straight fight between themselves and Germany. So they go and put all their defenses and their army along here.” Jonny begins to draw the German-French border on the blackboard and highlights where the French defenses were.

“Now, if you were Germans, do you think you knew where the French defenses were?”

“Yes.” Comes the response.

“Yes, you would have a fairly good idea wouldn’t you? In fact, years before 1914 a German man called Count Von Schlieffen- interesting name isn’t it?- Von Schlieffen came up with an idea that if the Germans were ever going to attack France in a war they would not come straight across this border here. Instead they would go through Belgium. The idea was that because Belgium is a small country and also neutral it would not take them long to get through Belgium and come round to capture the French capital of Paris. This was called the Schlieffen Plan, which is the top of your page there. You have got a map there as well to show you exactly what I have just shown you. Germany would come through Belgium and attack France. Now, two things the Germans had not really prepared for. First was that the Belgians fought really hard. They did not want any part of this war, but they were being attacked, so what are you going to do?

“Fight.”

“Defend your country.” Come the answers from the floor.

“Of course you are going to defend yourself. And the Belgians fought very well, and they held the Germans up for quite some time, which is not what they were expecting. The second thing that happened is that certain countries had agreed that if Belgium ever was attacked, because they were neutral they would defend them. And one of those countries was Britain. So when the Germans attacked Belgium and the Belgians fought back, Britain declared war on Germany. And the Germans found themselves fighting a war which they were not expecting.” Jonny points out that what he had just talked about was what they had previously read. He directs the class to look at the newspaper headlines and stories.

“Now what happened very early on was that stories started coming out about what was going on in Belgium. Stories started to come out that the Germans were doing very terrible things to the Belgians. One of the stories that came out was that there was a town called Antwerp and when the Germans attacked Antwerp they started doing terrible things to Belgian priests there. If you look at the sources underneath, that is what they are talking about.” After introducing each newspaper source Jonny likened the change in each source’s story to how the stories people tell seem to get exaggerated.

“If you saw a car crash, say, which involved a car and a wall, by the time twelve or thirteen people have told the story, it is buses involved, trucks involved, there is all

sorts. The story gets blown up, the story gets out of proportion. This is what happened here. So if we read through source A. All the German newspaper reported was: 'When the fall of Antwerp became known, the church bells were rung.' Now, if we then look at source B, the French newspaper says, 'The Clergy of Antwerp were forced to ring the bells when the town was taken by the Germans.' After each reading of the new source, Jonny checks their understanding of any new terms, repeats what the source had said in his own words, and then finally asks the class what had now been added to that source to make it different from the previous one. As the class progresses through the sources, the interest and focus of the students increases as the Belgian priests were reported to have refused to ring the bells in source C and as a result had been sentenced to hard labour by the Germans, while in source D things just seemed to go from bad to worse. The class was silent as Jonny read the source: "It is confirmed that the barbaric conquerors of Antwerp punished the unfortunate Belgian priests for their heroic refusal to ring the church bells by hanging them as living clappers to the bells with their heads down." While it takes a brief explanation and quick drawing for the students to gain a full understanding of the actual position the Belgian clergy suddenly found themselves in, Jonny has the attention of everyone in the class as he begins to question and discuss with them the tone of source D.

"They also use some words that have been added. You have got barbaric conquerors, who are the barbaric conquerors there? Yes." Jonny points to a student who shoots his hand up.

"The Germans."

"Yes, the Germans. 'The unfortunate Belgians priests.'" Jonny reads again from the source. "That is going to get peoples' sympathy for the Belgian priests isn't it?" A couple of students nod. "So if you turnover on to the next page it says ' things to do.'" Jonny begins to explain to the students what he wants them to complete. This involves copying out the boxes in their exercise books and then for each box/source the students are to write in what had been added to the story. "Don't copy out what the French newspaper said, just put in the little bit that they added. Which was what?"

"That they were forced to ring the bells," a student answers.



“Yes that they - the priests - were forced to. You then can do the same for source C and source D. When you have done that I would like you to look at number 2. ‘What are the main differences between the story which appeared in the German newspaper and the story which eventually appeared in La Matin (source D) at the end?’” Again Jonny reads out the task/question and then explains what they need to do. “So what you can do, if you like, is just draw a line down your page - don’t go all the way down because it not going to take the whole page - and on one side put something like *The start of the story* and on the other side put at the end *the end of the story*. And write down the differences between the two, how it started off in source A and how it finished up in source D.” As he talks, he turns to write down on the black board what he has just said. “Those are the first two tasks for you to do, so off you.”

While the majority of students begin to draw the boxes in the books, chatting along the row as they work, a couple of students ask for help. Jonny does this by explaining individually almost verbatim what he had just told the whole class. The students nod and Jonny moves up and down the classroom. The noise level of the students remains at a low murmur as they chat as they work. It begins to rise as they finish. This has a lot to do with the students now talking not just along the row but across rows. As the noise level grows, and as more and more students finish, Jonny moves to the front of the room.

“Pens down. Neil, that includes you. You will get a chance to finish that off in a second. Let’s look at number three and four.” At this point Jonny once again begins the routine of reading the questions, asking the question directly to the students and then explaining to the students what they would need to do and / or include in their work. “So if you look at question 3 it says ‘If you had just read the final story from La Matin how would you feel about?... The final story is source D so for this question you can ignore source A, B and C. Just look at source D and decide firstly, how you would feel about Belgian priests’”

“I would feel sorry for them,” one student answered.

“Why?” Jonny asks.

“Because they have been hanged like clappers.”

“What else would you think about them?” Jonny continues.

“That they were daft for not doing anything.”

“Well, you might think they were daft for not doing anything. What else might you think?”

“They were brave,” replies a student.

“Yes, somebody had invaded their country and they were making a point. Yes, it was a brave thing to do and they paid the penalty for it, didn’t they? They suffered for it, didn’t they, according to the story. And secondly, how would you feel about the German soldiers?”

“They were nasty.”

“Evil.”

Jonny nods. “Nasty, they were awful, they were evil. Okay, so anything that you can come up with there on how you would feel about German soldiers just if you read source D- not any other source. Then number 4, which side do you think La Matin is on?”

“Belgium.”

“Yes, they are on the Belgian side. They’re on the side of the Belgian priests. Now when you decide this,” Jonny continues, “what I would like you to do , if you look underneath you have Belgium Priests written on one side and Germans on the other. Write this down and then look at the source and see how many words you can pull out that describe, firstly, the Belgian priests. You have gotten unfortunate, they have got heroic- any word that you can find to describe Belgian priests. And then any word you can find describing the German soldiers- they have got words like barbaric and conquerors. Okay? So that is three and four, off you go.”

Again the students begin to work. This time, however, as Jonny walks around the classroom, the students seem more chatty. Again and again as they talk they are reminded to keep on task. The male and female student sitting together are chatting and looking around, when told to get on task they do so for a while and then begin to chat.

“Right, year 9, listen.” Jonny shouts above the growing crescendo. “So far today you have all been doing really well, we have had some good ideas. You have been putting your hands up. You have been following instructions. You have been doing much better. The last five minutes or so some people are starting to have private conversations and not doing their work. I don’t mind a certain level of noise while you

work, but if it gets in the way of your work you will have to work in silence. It is your choice.” Jonny at this point continues to walk about the class stopping and helping individuals or specific rows of students. It seems that many of them are in very different places within the worksheet. Turning to different rows, he explains and illustrates again what they are supposed to be doing.

“We know what happened, but we need to know what kinds of word they used to get their point across, all right, because remember if they are on the side of the Belgians they will try to get people who read their papers to be on their side as well. And they will use certain words and that is what we are looking at.” Turning to another group he addresses another concern. “If you read that story, what would it make you want to do, first, it would make you against the Germans wouldn’t it. So what might you do- especially if you were a young man?”

“It might make you mad you might want to fight them.”

“Yeah, you might want to join up,” agrees Jonny as he moves to another group. As the 45 minute lesson draws to a close, the noise level rises as more and more students complete the work assigned. “Finish the sentence you are working on. Put your pens and pencils down.” Jonny signals to a student to collect up the photocopied worksheets just as he would have done if they had been working with a class set of textbooks. All materials such as textbooks stay within the classroom, stacked in a specific place on top of a row of cabinets along with the textbooks that are used by other history classes that meet in this room. The students’ workbooks were not collected today, for it was homework day. As the student collects the handouts, the noise level increases.

“Year 9,” Jonny shouts. “You should be listening to me. Right. For homework, what I want you to do is to design and draw a poster to get people to join the Army in 1914. Try to get them to join the British Army in 1914. Okay. So if you were going to draw a poster to get people to join the British army, how might you do it?”

“Put ‘your country needs you’”

“The Germans are very bad.” a couple of answers that were audible out of general student chatter.

“Yes. Listen. The first thing you might do is say something like your country needs you or your King needs you. You can get people to be patriotic - do it for your country. What is another reason?” Jonny asks.

“You will be a hero!” another student answers

“Yeah, you will be a hero. You are doing it to be heroic.” Jonny nods

“Doing it for freedom,” adds another student.

“Yes, doing it for freedom. So you might say some of the things the Germans are doing, you might make something up about what the Germans are doing.” Jonny suddenly stops and glares at the male and female sitting together. “You are still muttering. We have had an excellent lesson and it is spoiled in the last five minutes. You should not be packing up yet. I have not said anything about packing up. This should not take this long to outline this task.” He then switches back to the designing of the poster. “Now you might say you’re doing it for King, you’re doing it for country - patriotic reasons. You might say you are doing it for your freedom, you might talk about some of the things you think the Germans are doing. You might use the examples of the priests. What else might you say?”

“Show them what you are made of.”

“Do it for your family.”

“Good, what else?” Jonny asks. It seems he is waiting for a particular answer. The class is silent. “Right, another powerful way to get people to join the army is to think about the way a lot of people lived in 1914.”

“Some were poor. Sir.”

Jonny nods, smiling. “Yes, they were poor. Good. A lot of people lived in slums. And the posters might say things like ‘You get paid well, you get fed well.’ They would not tell you what it was really like at the front would they? Remember the cigarette ad for the Mitchell’s cigarettes in the last lesson. It looked like it was an adventure, it was fun.” Jonny pauses, the bell is just about to go. “Okay there are many different things you could use, the more ways you use to get them to join the army on your poster, the better your poster is. Remember it needs something at the top or on it somewhere to grab people’s attention. Right. This is for Monday. No excuses.” The bell suddenly goes. “Right, pack your things away, put your coats on, and stand behind your chairs.” The

students grab their bags put their books away, grab their coats from off their chairs, and stand behind their chairs, chatting. Jonny waits. "I'm waiting, Year 9." The chatter dies down as the noise outside the classroom picks up as the students from other classes are dismissed and begin to make their ways to their next classes.

"Okay, off you go." The student quickly head out the door as Jonny picks up his jacket and brief case and readies to head across the hall to his next class, 10P1. He smiles as we head out.

"You know, that is the best lesson I have had with them so far. Just because there was no problem with control. I normally have got to keep at them and quite often you have to move people or whatever. And I just, like, keep stopping and telling them, like I did toward the end, just once today. It went well. The fact that there is a silly rumour going around the school that there is going to be a third world war helped. I mean two or three of them asked me when we went in, and I just adlibbed that bit in about propaganda and the situation in the Gulf. And when I was able to say maybe we are going to bomb Iraq, and a couple of them went 'Yeah' and I was like, that is how people felt at the start of 1914. So that sort of worked quite well. They got quite a lot done - most of them - a few of them finished that exercise. Which is good lesson work on propaganda. So I am pleased with that lesson."

### Teaching in America.

One of the key differences in the time spent with the participants during their teaching practice in the US and the UK was that my time with the British participants was greatly constrained. While keeping in touch with Helen and Jonny throughout the year, I only had just over a month from early January to mid February to spend with them in their classrooms during their teaching practice. In America I had the luxury of observing Amanda and Mike through their full teaching practice, which began in mid-February and ended in late April. In England, I spent all the time I had in one of the participant's schools; while in America, my schedule as a student teacher supervisor meant that I could only spend 3 days a week with the participants. I usually spent two days with one, then a day with the other, which resulted in an equivalent amount of observation time. However, in beginning to create portraits of the U.S. participants' teaching, I was initially taken aback at the difficulty I had of finding an "intact" lesson. I had many well-remembered lessons for Amanda and Mike, but I wanted to be able to describe a full lesson in which they 'taught' on a specific topic for the whole period. It was amazing to see that in my time with Amanda and Mike, I actually had very few of these uninterrupted pure history lessons transcribed or detailed in my field notes. As Hargreaves (1994) has contended, a teacher's time in class is not purely her own. It is often stolen from them - colonized by the larger organization of the school system. This was very much the case - especially for the US participants - external factors such as club meetings, field trips, concerts, assemblies, and state tests resulted either in lessons being shortened dramatically, or in half the class missing. This in turn led to the showing of a video or some form of current events discussion. It was not just factors external to their classrooms that were obstacles to seeing them teach history, for every couple of weeks their students would be tested on the work they had covered in class. This required reviewing for the test, taking the multiple choice/ short answer test, and going over the test. My U.S. field notes highlight a great deal of the frustration I felt at the time: "What a week. I've just wasted another day, it seems I am either watching them merely find something to fill class time because half the class was at some meeting or state mandated test or they are busy preparing their students to take another unit test based on last week's lessons. I knew it was going to be a waste of a day when Mike comes up to me in this

morning saying ‘Well you can watch, but no one is going to be here since English is taking them on some trip to see Huck Finn or something.’ And then he ends the class, which turned into a discussion of the shooting in Jonesboro, Arkansas, by announcing to the ones who are there, ‘Remember, you guys have a test on Tuesday so we will go over any questions you have on Monday, so bring all your worksheets.’” Even the participants acknowledged the extent to which external schoolwide events interrupted their teaching of history. As Amanda noted, “it is so frustrating dealing with stuff that is not related to history. The amount of time that’s taken away from the classroom, you know, things like testing and assemblies. And so much of it is announced the morning of or the day before, if you’re lucky, the day before. So just all the unplanned and unperceived things are the things on your time, or what is supposed to be your time.”

Amanda 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history: The Progressive Era: Improvement and Reform 1900-1920

Walking up the ramp into Amanda’s classroom trailer, where she taught one section of 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history and one section of 12<sup>th</sup> grade government, it was possible to feel that spring had finally sprung in the Blue Ridge.<sup>5</sup> It was going to be a gorgeous

---

<sup>5</sup> Amanda’s internship was at a school that had just moved onto what is known as a block schedule or semestering. Block Scheduling seems to be the educational buzzword of the mid 90’s, and is currently attracting a great deal of attention within the educational community in the US. According to Robert L. Canady and Michael Rettig in Block Scheduling: A Catalyst for Change, in 1992-93 five schools in Virginia had adopted a school-wide blocking schedule, however, “fully 33% of the high schools in the state were operating a school-wide block schedule during the 1994-95 school year (p. 18). Canady and Rettig’s work (1995) is very much a key source for administrators and teachers who wish to begin to restructure their schools by jumping on the blocking bandwagon to gain more allocated time in the classroom. Canady and Rettig identified numerous variations of blocking; two key variations are the alternate day and the 4/4 semester plans. Amanda’s assigned school is in the first year of the 4/4 semester plan. The 4/4 semester plan offers students the chance to attend four classes daily in double instructional blocks, completing the course in one semester. For Amanda this means that the two classes she teaches each day are ninety minutes each. She teaches the first two periods of the day and then plans for one period and observes her cooperating teaching teach a US history class the afternoon. During the second semester, students take four new courses again meeting in double instructional blocks. A number of articles on blocking make the point that blocking should lead to improvements in the quality of instruction and the appropriateness of instructions. Extended periods should allow teachers to develop key concepts, increase teacher creativity, and produce time to use a variety of teaching techniques and activities (Huff 1995, Kruse and Kruse 1995, and Canady and Rettig 1995). One concern is that “in reality,... little actually changes with the exception of the time adjustment, and that under this type of schedule we are simply doing the same thing to children as in the traditional block.” In order for block scheduling to be successful and increase student learning, the

April day, which was not a topic that Amanda really wanted to discuss since the school district in which she was carrying out her teaching practice had taken a long weekend to celebrate Easter, while many of her colleagues carrying out their internships in other districts were still on vacation. Amanda was standing at the front of the room with a folder of notes and her American history textbook laying open in front of her. She was busy reading the chapter that she was going to cover today. Flicking back and forth between different sections, she looked up as I walked in. I moved to the back of the room to sit in my chair next to her cooperating teacher's desk. Students started to wander into the classroom, dressed in jeans, T-shirts, and maybe a sweater, carrying cans/cups of pop, candy, egg muffins, and the occasional U.S. history textbook and folder. They made their way to their chairs. Each individual chair comes with its own little desk attached, so there is only one way to slide into the chair. The closer it came to eight o'clock, the noisier the classroom became. At the front of the room Amanda was still looking over her notes and textbook that lay on two of the front desk/chairs. Behind her was the whiteboard, to her right was the TV and VCR, and to her left was a computer and printer. Above the computer was a bulletin board with newspaper clippings dealing with the recent standoff with weapons inspectors in Iraq. The only other bulletin board was in the rear of the room, and took the form of a teacher made time line entitled "Log into history – Progress.Com." Because of the size of the bulletin board the line was broken up into four separate lines parallel to each other. Along the time line were photocopied pictures of the first plane, telegraphs etc. The only student-produced work that was up on the wall was new. Amanda had given them a poster project that involved researching a specific topic from the period 1870-1900. She had just placed these up on the back wall between some maps of the US and a poster of a gorilla that read "My way or no way."

As the class chats away, Amanda takes the register, which involves checking around the room to see who is missing from their seats. Upon completion, she usually asks one of the students at the front to take it, but that routine is interrupted by her cooperating teacher who is heading out the door. "I'll take it, don't forget to get them to

---

restructuring process should include "training teachers to vary their instructional methods during these lengthier classes" ( p. 4, Kruse and Kruse, 1995).



have their progress reports signed.” This is done loud enough for all the students to hear. Amanda nods as she turns to the class.

“Has everybody got one? You guys need to get those signed you need to get those signed and bring them back”

“What?” asks a student.

“Your progress reports,” replies Amanda. From the ensuing noise, it soon becomes apparent that a number of the students no longer have their progress reports. Amanda passes out new progress reports to them, again reminding them that they need to return these forms signed. The progress reports are a result of the midterm exam that they took the previous week. The results had been somewhat disappointing, as Amanda noted, “The mid term exams, oh my God. Well, the grades weren’t great, it was kind of frustrating, but we ended up curving them a little. In history, we had to curve them so the average would be a C or a low C, so we had to curve the history ones 7 points.”

As the students begin to put the progress reports in their pockets, Amanda tells them to open their notebooks “and turn to the notes and discussion section questions – put your textbooks away there is going to be a quick quiz.”

“A what?” asks a student.

“An open notebook quiz,” responds another student.

Walking up to each row she passes out a photocopied handwritten sheet for the students to hand back to the people in their row. The students begin to work in silence, turning the pages of their notebook, then writing, then going back to their notebook while Amanda moves back to her textbook and begins to flip through the chapter. The quiz is entitled ‘Open Notebook Quiz- US History. In parentheses is written ‘(Use notes and section review questions- No Textbooks).’ The quiz is made up of 5 questions: 1) What were three areas of reform proposed in the populist platform? 2) What did farmers stand to gain from inflation? 3) Who was the 1896 Presidential candidate for the Populist/democrats? Who was the Republican candidate? 4) What is Progressivism? 5) List four differences between populism and progressivism.

One student at the back raises his hand, and Amanda, looking up from her textbook notices his hand and moves toward him.

“I don’t know this.”

She looks at the question and then directs him to his notes. The class is quiet as she moves around the back of the class to me, and begins to explain, "I'm giving this pop quiz because for a while some of them weren't taking notes and not doing the work. So I was talking to Mr. Hixon (her cooperating teacher) about that and he thought it was a good idea. You know, just keep them on track." Amanda heads back to the front of room, picking up a dry erase marker she checks the textbook and then begins to write on the white board, 2-31 - the 2 refers the second half of the semester and 31 is the number given to this set of notes - *Answer question #5 p. 408 and #1 p.413*. These questions pertain to the chapter on the progressive era. Just as she finishes, a student comes up to her, hands her the quiz, and then sits back down. Amanda takes the quiz and puts it into her grade book. Over the next few minutes a steady stream of students go through the same motions. "Okay when you have completed the quiz you can start answering the questions in your textbooks." Silently, again, the students who have completed the test pull out their textbooks and begin to work, stopping occasionally to take a drink from their slurpy or a mouthful of candy. The class continues to work in silence with the occasional whisper between rows. Amanda, still at the front, quickly thumbs through the quizzes that have been handed in.

"How many of you are still working on your quiz?"

One student at the back raise his hand.

"Okay take your time, Jeff."

The majority of the class continues to answer the questions that Amanda has just written on the board. Amanda continues to read her notes and the textbook and looks up to see what is happening if there is any noise. One student has nothing on his desk but an egg muffin. Amanda, in the middle of counting the students in class, stops and looks at him. "Kevin, you don't have a book."

"I don't know where it is."

Amanda walks over to him, bends and picks up a textbook off a stack that is against the wall about five feet from the student. She places it on his desk and heads back to the front of the room without saying a word. One student puts up his hand to ask for help and Amanda goes to help. "So what is progressivism?" she asks the student as he stares at his notes. After flipping through his notes and pointing out specific questions

he had answered, she moves to the very back of the class to see how the lone student who is taking the quiz is faring. He has now been working for around 30 minutes. “How’s it going?” The student nods to indicate he has nearly finished.

“Why don’t you guys take another two minutes to try and finish up these questions, she announces to the class.” The lone student walks up to the front to hand in his test. “Okay. It looks as if most of you are done. Let’s start talking about the Progressive era. Yesterday we ended talking about populism and we will do a little bit more about that today.”

“Okay, so what is your definition of Progressivism?”

“To make improvements in the work place.”

“Okay so it is to make improvements, especially in the work area. Most of these reforms will happen between 1900 and 1920. Robbie mentioned reforms in the work area. What are some other areas that had similar changes?” Amanda asks.

“In government,” the same student answers.

“Government, good.” As she spoke Amanda began a routine of writing, exceptionally neatly, the key points she had just mentioned. As she did this the students copied what was written for their notes. These were numbered 2-32.

*The Progressive era*

*Improvement and reform 1900-1920*

*-work area*

*-government*

Upon completing the notes, she turns to the students and asks them questions based on the reading and completion of the textbook questions she had assigned the previous day.

“Where did these ideas comes come from, where did these reforms come from?” The class is silent. “What did we talk about last time?”

“Populists.”

“Good. These reforms were influenced by populists. We also talked about corrupt government in cities and at a local and state level. What did we talk about in government? What did we say were some of the problems with government?” As Amanda asks the question, a train rumbles along the tracks approaching the school; as it

nears the school, the train blasts its horn. This is a regular occurrence, and Amanda and her students do not miss a beat.

“Corruption.”

“Good, Okay another origin of progressivism was the growth of the middle class, a middle educated class. As she spoke, she again began to write on the board.

*Origins*

*-Influence of populism*

*-corrupt government---Political machine*

*-growth of middle class.*

This routine of making notes continued throughout this period. Amanda asks questions, and two male students at the front provide the majority of the answers, which she would initially verbally summarize and only then move from the two desks upon which her textbook and folders lay to write on the board.

“Yesterday we talked about progressivism and some of its benefits. Let’s look at the differences between populism and progressivism. What were some of the differences between populists and progressives? The populists had more radical ideas. What were some of these radical ideas, or why were they considered radical?” The class was silent. “You guys should have a lot from the questions you did last night.”

“Farmers wanted to make silver coins.” a student answers.

“Good, what else did you guys come across? Does anybody else want to add to that?” Amanda pauses but there is no response from the class. “Yes, they had some radical ideas about the money supply, and they also wanted electoral reforms. Now, what about progressivism. Do you think they were radical?”

“No.”

“No. How would you describe the progressives?”

“They wanted to make things better”

“Yeah,” Amanda nods, “they wanted to make it better.”

“But they were not as radical,” the student continues.

Again Amanda nods. “So their ideas about change were not considered as extreme. Do you think that is why the populist movement failed?” Again there is silence from the class. “Okay, what were some other changes they wanted?” In response to the

silence Amanda continues, “ You guys have a whole bunch of them done with all the questions you did yesterday or last night.”

“They were poor and they did not have a lot of support,” a student answers referring to previous questions about populists.

Amanda picked up from the students answer, “Okay, many of them were poor, and where did many of them live? What type of area did we describe?”

“Rural.”

“Rural, whereas the progressives were centered in which type of area? Asks Amanda.

“In cities.”

“Yeah, that is kind of what we talked about here, we had that in our notes. But their ideas were not as politically radical or politically extreme as populist ideas were. Okay, these are going to be the main differences. But populism, even though it did fail, it did create the means for progressives to come about and to ultimately succeed. So populism does have an impact, how do you think populism paved the way for progressives?”

Again Amanda is met by silence. “Okay, we are going to talk about the progressives and the progressives are going to make people aware. But what did populists think people were aware of?

“Problems,” one of the two males answers.

“Yeah,” Amanda nods as she picks up her pen to begin summarizing what she has said. “The populists, even though many people didn’t agree with their solutions, the populists made people aware of, more aware of the problems. And the progressives are going to address these problems, they are going to just come up with different solutions. Another thing the populists did, even though it failed, we did this yesterday - it made people aware of the problems that were out there and the progressives are going to take problems and come up with solutions.” Amanda turns to write down the points she has just mentioned. She waits in silence as the students copy the notes. As soon as they finish she cleans the board, and moves on.

“One of the areas you guys mentioned, an important area well known for changes and reform, is that of Government.” Amanda instructs the class to get out the notes they

made from the textbook on the progressive era the day before. She begins to read question four from the textbook, “What were two of the changes progressives demanded in regard to the government? The Government was run by political machines, there was corruption, so what were some of the changes?”

Again, the same two students provide Amanda with answers, however brief. “They wanted to be responsive to people.”

“Good. Okay. So we want more responsive government to people’s demands and an end to bribery.”

Another student with both textbook and his own folder open adds “protect citizens.”

“Okay, protection of citizens,” Amanda repeats and then continues to question students as to the particular types of protection the text referred to. It is only then that one student answers “big business.” Amanda then nods and again takes the pen top off the pen ready to begin writing, this time talking as she begins to write under the heading *Changes of the Progressives*. “Yeah they have regulations for big business, and do you remember we talked about mergers in business? And health and safety is also another area particularly in the workplace.”

Upon completing these notes Amanda continues to question students on the questions they had done the day before. This time the focus was to identify “What group in particular helped come up with some of these ideas and paved the way for progressive change.” Amanda refers the students back to their textbook work that had been assigned after a couple of answers that were not what she expected. “Do you remember the section on muckrakers? Okay, who were the muckrakers?”

“Writers about corruption,” answers a student who, like Amanda, is busy flipping through his textbook.

“Okay. So they were journalists and some were authors. And they exposed the corruption and the negativeness of both big business and corrupt government. So why is that important?”

“Because people did not know about it”

“Yeah, and they published in popular magazines so it would be more accessible, you know, to read about the publishings. What are some examples of publishings of the

muckrakers?” Amanda calls on different students who have not previously participated to give examples of muckrakers. Their answers included Ida Tarbell, Linclon Steffens, Upton Sinclair, and the discussion moves on to Francis Perkins and Robert La Follete. When the students give the individual’s names, Amanda follows up with the question, “Okay, what did she/he do?”

On a number of occasions Amanda receives the answer “I don’t know” from her students. She throws the question over to another class member, while again reminding the class that they were discussing individuals “we looked at from some of the questions you did yesterday. Did you guys have trouble finding those people?” What was interesting was that Amanda’s notes on the white board merely read:

*Who were the Progressives?*

- *Muckrakers*

*–Journalists/authors who exposed corruption of business and government  
-easily accessible to entire public.*

This may have had a lot to do with the fact that the class as a whole is becoming more talkative among themselves and less compliant with the notetaking process. This manifests itself with student moans and groans as Amanda turns to the board to write. As the students finish writing, Amanda continues to move on.

“Okay. Let’s take a look at some of the reforms that were made in city and state government and corruption. We talked about the problems in city government and we talked about political machines. There were two reforms of city government that the progressives worked with. The first one is the city commission. And this is a board of people and they are elected by the voters of the city.” Again Amanda turns and begins to write the notes on the board under the heading of *Reform in City and State Government*. As she begins to write, she continues to go into details on the city commission.

“People get to elect people to this commission - four or five people. And most of these people were not always professional politicians, so they were made up of a variety of occupations, usually middle class occupations.” She suddenly stops writing and draws a line from the points she made on people electing people to the commission to a previous sections of notes on the board. “So this correlates with this bullet here, the government be more responsive to people demands, and then in an attempt to make city

government become more responsive to the needs of the people there was a second reform and that is something called the city manager. The city manager is an individual chosen by the city commission or council to help manage the city. And typically this manger would be an engineer.” Upon completing her notes, Amanda turns to the class, asking the students who are busy copying from the board. “And what do you think the purpose here is? Why would they chose someone who is an engineer to be a city manager? Any thoughts on that?”

“What?” asks the prolific answerer at the front, who, like the rest of the class, is writing up the notes.

“Why would the city commission pick someone who is an engineer to be a city manager?”

“Because he is in charge of roads and buildings.”

Amanda nods. “Yeah, someone who knew something about bridges and building and construction and those types of things. Things that need to be fixed. And again someone who was not necessarily a politician. And this person did not have to necessarily have to be tied to a party.” Again Amanda turns to the board and writes three quick bulleted notes on the city manager. “So these two reforms in cities will help weaken political machines though not completely. The political machines will continue to hang in there but they are weakened some what by these two additions. Right. Let’s take a look at some of the changes in the state government now.” As Amanda flips the pages of her notes and textbook, the students sigh, Amanda begins to discuss and then write down notes explaining what an initiative, a referendum, a recall, and a primary and how each “was another attempt to make government more responsive to the people.”

The class itself has now been going for over an hour, and Amanda starts to wrap up this section of the lesson by quickly, without questions or much detail, providing information on the regulation of business. As Amanda asks, she cleans off one section of the white board and continues to make notes. “There is also some attempt at reform on business. And one idea that is introduced to regulate business is requiring business licenses. Businesses have to apply for them and these licenses can be taken away. You also have the establishment of utility commissions. They were set up to regulate things like electricity and water and these types of things. We will talk more about business.



All right, do you have any questions about this?" The class is silent as they finish taking the notes. Amanda pauses, looks around, and then picks up her grade book.

"All right, for the last 20 minutes of class, this is what I want you guys to do. I am going to break you into groups of four or five and this will go along with reforms in government. You are going to see the addition of four new constitutional amendments. So what I want you do is, I am going to assign each group to work on an amendment. You will do the amendment as a group, write it down, what the amendment did, what its purpose was." Amanda then began to read off students' names placing them into groups and the assigning them either the 16<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup> Amendment. "You can find the amendments in section 3 page 408, sections 3 of chapter 15. And so I want you to write a paragraph or two stating exactly what this amendment did, people who contributed to it. I will write the questions on the board. You have 20 minutes to get this done." The students slowly start to move into groups. Some begin to chat, others sit a little distant from the assigned group, while others begin to open the textbook. As they move Amanda writes the questions on the board, copying them from notes in her folder.

#### Amendments

*State what your amendment is and the year*

*What changes did it make?*

*Who or what did it affect?*

*What was the reason of cause of the amendment?*

The noise level of the class rises immediately as the students are free to move together. The majority of the talk is not on the questions but rather social in nature. In response, Amanda spends the last 15 minutes of class moving between groups – focusing them on the task at hand, constantly moving to different sections of the rooms where the noise level signifies something other than a study of amendments. "The easiest thing for you guys to do is read the amendment and then you will be able to answer the questions...why would they want to do this? Some of this is common sense." As the time begins to slip away, the students begin to close their folders and textbooks. "Okay, put your desks back. If you don't get it done, it can just be your homework to finish for tomorrow. If you are done, I will take it in. Tomorrow we will talk about it. Okay, you

can go.” The students, still chatting, head out of the class. A couple hand Amanda the work they completed in on Amendments as she replaces her US history textbook and folder with a textbook and new folder for her next class, 12<sup>th</sup> grade government, whose students were now entering into the classroom. She then wanders over to me.

“Things seemed to come together pretty well,” I smiled.

“Yeah – yesterday we talked about the populist movement and, you know, their ideas of reform and how they failed, and all of that was like a lead-up to why the progressive movement happened. And I try and stay away from doing all lecture. And I find out that when I assign them to specific groups for the most part they will stay on task. So I figured I had four amendments in this period, you know, and I had 20 kids there today so it worked out perfect. So I thought about it last night. I was like, I will do this at the end and then we will talk about it tomorrow. So I will probably look at them tonight so I can pass them back to them tomorrow so they will have it to refer to.” The class was now full of students as she moved to the front of the class to begin teaching.

Amanda's notes on the board.

2-32

## The Progressive Era

Improvement and reform 1900-1920

- work area
- government

### Origins

- influence of populism
- corrupt government-----political machines
- growth of middle class/educated class

### Differences

Populism

Radical ideas

- money supply
- electoral reform

Failed

Poor rural class

Progressivism

Make gov't work better

- reform within the system
- not drastic change
- work within political mainstream

centered in cities

Urban areas

Middle class/educated people

Paves way for the Progressive movement

Made people more aware of the problems

### Changes of Progressives

1) Government.

- more responsive government to people's demands
- protecting citizens best interests
  - regulation of big business
  - health and safety in the workplace

2) Who were the Progressives?

- Muckrakers
  - journalists/authors who exposed corruption of businesses and gov't
  - easily accessible to entire population

### Reform in City and State Gov't

New forms of City Gov't

- City Commission
    - board of 5 people elected by voters of a city
    - made up of a variety of occup. Not considered professional politicians
  - City Manager
    - individual chosen by city commission
    - engineer familiar with bridges, skyscrapers and construction
    - no political ties
- Weaken political machine in city gov't

Reforms in State Government

- Initiative - gives voters chance to propose bill to state legislator
- for any state gov't to address issues of concern
- Referendum - public vote on a bill
- Recall - allows voters to remove a public official from office
- Primary system - voters who are members can help choose the party candidate

#### Reform in business

-regulating business

- require business licenses
- establishment of utility commission
  - regulate electricity, water, power

Mike –Period 6, 11<sup>th</sup> grade US History: World War II and Propaganda

“It’s Deja vue all over again.”

I arrived later than I would have liked to see Mike. He had already taught his second period class, and because it was going on 11 o’clock I knew he was free and probably in the social studies office. The departmental office was nestled in the corner of the social studies corridor of the school. It was an office regularly frequented by only a few social studies teachers, including the head of the department, Mike’s cooperating teacher, and a geography teacher whose assignment was to teach in both the middle and the high school. The room, though relatively large, had room for only four desks. The rest of the space was taken up by bookshelves and cabinets filled with textbooks, videos, and magazines. For the six other social studies teachers in the department, it was a room in which they rarely spent any length of time. During their free period, Mike knew that they could be found in one of three locations: either in the library, the teachers’ lounge, or their own classrooms. Mike, however, spent the majority of his time in the departmental office; his cooperating teacher had cleared off a table that had previously been hidden under handouts, textbooks, and magazines so Mike could join him in the office. This was where he was now, dressed in a shirt and tie, leaning back in his chair reading a sheet of paper. Mike has the type of frame associated with American football players, and not surprisingly he did play football in high school. He has a deceptively soft voice for his size and always comes off as very calm and confident. His cooperating teacher had commented on his demeanor over a month ago when Mike begin his internship,

“He is one of the best I have had. He is the only one from the very start who was not nervous. He was very comfortable in class.” It was now mid-March and walking down the hall, I saw Mike at his desk in the office.

“Just reading a letter by a student who was attempting to pass it to another student in my last class.” He grinned.

“Any good?” I asked.

“Nope.” Mike crumpled it up and tossed into the garbage bin. “I thought I had all the classes caught up in the same place from last week’s assembly. But there is another assembly and so the time is thrown off again today. So lunch is from 12:45- 1:24 and

then 1:29 to 2:07 is my 6<sup>th</sup> period, so I have only got thirty-five minutes with them and then the same with period 7. Though really, because that is the last period, I have probably got less with them because of the announcements. But it should be pretty good this afternoon. I'm going to do an inductive thinking lesson on the homefront during World War II using these." Mike handed me a stack of paper. On each one was a small black and white poster from World War II. Mike went onto explain that today's lesson had originated out of the graduate methods class at the beginning of the semester. He had planned and taught the lesson in January to the seminar class. The topic of the unit was supposed to correlate with what Mike would begin to teach when he started his internship. "This was the lesson I had to do for Dr. B. I knew I would be teaching World War II. I initially looked for political cartoons with Franklin Roosevelt, but I could not find any. But while I was searching the internet I found these two web sites; the national archives, and this other guy has his own set of war posters and because I wanted to show the kids how political cartoons can influence people's thoughts and emotions, I thought, well, posters can do the same exact thing. It worked well in the seminar. And for this class, the students can see first hand some of the things that were printed because of the war, and that even though in the US you have freedom of speech and thought and just about everything, the government at times will try to influence those rights."

The lesson, though based on the plan Mike had previously written, was not going to mirror exactly what he had done on campus, for he noted, "I changed the definition that I had on there for propaganda, from the one I gave to the seminar class. I got that one out of a regular dictionary. It was a little bit too much. I needed a definition on their level. So I changed it to one that a government textbook had, I was not sure if the definition of propaganda would be in a history book. I know it is not in our textbook. So I decided to use the government book, I actually just picked one off the shelf. Another thing that I am going to change is how the students work. I noticed that in the seminar when I handed out the posters to groups and they start to complete the chart I give them. The first question is *how does the poster make you feel?* Well if they are sitting there talking about it and discussing it they are not just getting their ideas down they are getting everybody else's. So what I am going to do is keep them in rows and give each kid a war

poster and then after looking at that for a minute or so I am going to tell them to write down the first column and spend maybe three or four minutes on that and try to get them so that each kid sees three posters at least. And only then am I thinking of letting them get together, letting the rows get together and talk about the posters that they had and let them see where their differences are. Because I want to point out how the posters are aimed at different groups, like there are some that are aimed at women, there are a couple aimed at African Americans, there are a couple aimed at draft age men to just go down and sign up. There are a couple of them that depict Nazis and Japanese as criminals and basically subhuman. And then I will go from group to group and let them pick out one that they want to share and kind of talk about it. I mentioned what I was planning on doing to John and he is going to come in to watch it.”

“Oh what a(nother) lovely war”

As the students make their way into the room, a question is waiting for them on the board: “*How would you influence your classmates to participate in something you thought was important.*” Mike stands at the door as students, busily chatting away with each other, come in and seat themselves, paying little attention to the question awaiting them. As the majority of the students begin to settle, Mike moves to the front of the room and waits for the noise level to die down.

“Now I want you guys, as you come in, to look at this. I want you guys to look at this question. How would you influence your classmates to participate in something you thought was important, or to do something you felt was important? Come up with ideas in your head or on paper and we are going to talk about it in a minute.” Moving to his desk at the front of the room Mike quickly and silently begins to take attendance. A number of the students continue to chat with each other, while others sit in silence. None, however, are writing down any of their ideas for the question posted by Mike. “Robbie, are you ready to take the test? Who else still needs to take the test?” Mike hands the three students who raise their hands yesterday’s test to take in the library. He then turns to the class. “All right, what are some of the things you guys came up with? Nick, what are some of the ways you would influence?” As the student begins to answer, Mike’s cooperating teacher comes in and heads toward the back of the class.



“I would let them know other people, maybe that they looked up to, were going to do it,” the student answers.

“All right.” Mike nodded. “So peer pressure. Allan, what are some of the ways you would do it?”

“I would tell them that it was important.”

“Okay. Ashley?”

“Pay them,” answers the chosen student. Mike nods.

“Pay them. Anything else?”

“Advertise” comes one answer.

“Show them what it can do for them,” comes another.

Mike nods and points to the writing on the board. It reads *propaganda*.

“All right, does anybody know what I am getting at? What did the American government use during World War II?”

“They wanted you to buy liberty bonds,” comes one answer.

“Yeah. They used propaganda to get people to buy liberty bonds. What is propaganda?” No one answers for a few seconds until one student offers the idea that “it was a way to persuade people.” Mike nods but wants more.

“Yes, a way to persuade people. Any other guesses? Ashley, what do you think propaganda is? Any thoughts?”

“No. Does it make you think in certain way?” she asks.

“To make you think a certain way,” Mike nods. “All right what propaganda is, techniques used to influence views of others about a particular idea in order to advance an idea or a movement. What are some of the examples that the US Government used during World War II?”

“Posters.”

“Posters. Anything else?”

“Commercials,” one student suggests.

“Commercials. They could have, but not necessarily, as many people did not have televisions. But they had advertisements, movies, and newsreels. Remember, I showed the video on the invasion of Italy, and it had a thing about D- Day on it. And John said it was propaganda. And to a point it was. It did not show the other side of the view it only

showed the United States and the Allied point of view. What we are going to do today is look at some,” Mike pauses and then introduces the lesson by drawing the class’s attention to the classroom walls. “You guys have all these war posters from World War I hanging in the classroom. What I thought would be interesting to do is look at some posters from World War II and just see how they affected American thoughts and what was going on in people’s heads when they looked at them. So pass them back and take one. I need these back, so I am not passing them out for you guys to keep.” As Mike began to pass out the material a couple of the students give quick glances at the room’s walls. There are numerous laminated posters on the wall. A number of them, as Mike has just noted to the class are from World War I, designed to encourage the buying of war bonds, or the joining of the Red Cross. These are interspersed with a large American flag, a sheet of paper entitled “*13 things you never knew about the American Revolution,*” and laminated recent newspaper clippings on Vietnam, Amelia Earhardt, and what it was like to fight in the Pacific in World War II. Another poster entitled *Conflict and Compromise- American in World War II- 1941-45* is positioned next to large cut out letters that take over a third of the wall opposite the classroom door; they read “*Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.*” As the students pass the handouts along their rows, Mike continues to explain what the class is going to do.

“All these posters have different thoughts and ideas. I got these off the Internet and you have to realize that these are miniature versions. In real life it would be what you see in the classroom hanging up for the First World War. They are going to convey different images, different ideas, they are going to say different things, and they are going to try to crawl into people’s minds to influence them about something. So what I want you guys to do is, I have passed out this chart on poster propaganda. The first problem says poster number, that is circled and there is a number in red ink. Use this number as your poster number. That way when I look at them I know which poster you are talking about.” Mike details what was on the chart he has just handed out entitled *World War II Poster Propaganda* and how they should go about completing the chart. The class is quiet as Mike continues, “All right, the second thing I want you to do is look at the column that says, ‘At 1<sup>st</sup> glance how does the poster make you feel?’ A lot of these posters are going to play on people’s emotions, they are going to look at them and

think this makes me feel mad or this makes me feel excited or patriotic. So I want you to write down what you feel when you look at it. Then the next column says, “Who was portrayed.” If anyone. Some, like the one Ashley has here, have a person on it. Write down who is in it and maybe what they are doing. The next column says, ‘who is it aimed at influencing the most?’ Think about the different groups in the United States. Who is it aimed at influencing the most? Who does the US Government want to try to reel in with the poster and why? And then the next one says ‘what is encouraged or discouraged?’ Each one has a different idea that it is trying to portray. And then finally is ‘mind games.’ What you need to do here is, if you think that this poster is somehow playing a game on your mind or trying to make you think something or trying to convince you of something in a sneaky way, put down what you think about it. What you are going to do is that I am going to give you about two to three minutes for each poster and then you are going to swap with people in your rows. So I want everybody to get at least an idea of three or four of the posters. Okay? Then we are going to talk about them a little bit afterwards. So go ahead and start filling that out, and I will walk around the room if you guys have any questions or anything.”

Just as Mike finishes he is met with a flurry of questions verifying what they were supposed to do. This leads to a couple of minutes of confusion and noise, as some students begin to work, others begin to chat with each other, and Mike continues to answer specific questions. His answers are directed either to the individual or to the class as a whole.

“Okay, give it to the next person in your row, so they can do the next one. You guys need to be quiet and work on your own, okay? As the class works and chats, Mike constantly moves up and down the rows. While checking on their work, he begins to show students their grade for the World War II test they had taken the day before. A question from a student, or an increase in noise level triggers Mike to make a statement to the whole class. “As you guys are doing it, notice that there really aren’t any right or wrong answers to this, it is how you feel and what you think it means, okay? I mean we could have an all day discussion on one of these posters.” Each one of these announcements gives Mike the floor to organize the students to exchange posters if they have not already done so. “All right, go ahead and trade off if you have not got your

third one yet.” Within a few minutes, Mike brings the class together. The noise level has risen as more and more students complete their three posters.

“All right, did everybody get three posters done? What type of ideas did these posters give?”

“I thought they were really obtuse,” comes one answer, drowned out by another student.

“They made me laugh.”

“They made you laugh?” Mike questions the student and then focuses on the class as a whole. “All right, at first glance how did most of the posters make you feel? Other than laugh.”

“Confused.”

“Confused,” Mike repeats and slowly nods.

“Patriotic.”

Mike nods. “So some made you feel patriotic. All right let’s take this one that Ashley had, she was having trouble with this one. The poster says ‘When you ride alone, you ride with Hitler. Join a car-sharing club today.’ And it shows a picture of a man driving a car and it kind of has a silhouetted image of Adolf Hitler riding in the passenger seat. So what does it mean?”

“Carpool,” responds a student.

“Carpool. Why?” Mike asks.

“You are bad if you don’t.”

“To save gas.” The answers overlap. Mike nods. “Remember, things are going to be rationed on the home front, there are going to be limited supplies in limited quantities so people aren’t going to be able to go out down here to Exxon and just fill up their gas tank whenever they want to, they are going to have gas cards and they can only go get gas or sugar or other foods certain days of the week. The government is going to decide it’s more important for the soldiers to get stuff like that to fight the war. Okay let’s talk about some of the people in it. Who were the people in the posters primarily?”

Individual students in the class offer a range of answers, “Americans.”

“Hitler.”

“Black Americans.”

“Women.” With each answer Mike nods repeats the answer, and waits for another answer. “Anybody else? Jennifer, that one I gave you, who is in the picture?”

“Soldiers.” Jennifer replies. Mike again nods and through either holding up a specific poster or getting a student to hold up a poster, begins to explain why so many posters have women in them. Asking questions that are met with silence, Mike moves the discussion from posters with women onto ones that focus on blacks.

“Why do you think these posters are aimed at women? Why do they have pictures of women in them? Most of the ones that have the women in are going to have catchy slogans. Like this one has Rosie the Riveter. I think this is probably in your textbook, if not most people have probably seen this one at museums or in different types of handouts. It is going to be made by the War Production Coordinating Committee. These are going to be trying to influence people to work in factories and make those tanks, produce as much as you can to help American soldiers. They are going to be aimed at women. Why women?” The class remains silent. “We talked about it yesterday. They are the ones working, remember, women are going to be the majority of Americans left here. We are going to have five million troops go off to war and the women are going to stay here to run the country economically. So they are going to be aimed at women. Laurie, you said Black Americans were in it. Why would they use them? Who has one with a Black American?” A couple of students put their hands up as Mike continues. “All right yes, we talked about this yesterday after the test, why were Black Americans in it?”

The answers two students give have nothing to do with the question Mike asked but are pieces of information related to comments made yesterday.

“They were separated.”

“They weren’t allowed in the marines.”

Mike nods and continues, “Okay, this poster has an American flag, it has an African American and a white man working together on an assembly line, and it says ‘United We Win.’ Why would the government print something like that? Why didn’t President Roosevelt want A. Phillip Randolph marching on Washington?”

“He did not want any problems.”

“Right.” Mike acknowledges the student. “He did not want any people to be sitting there and looking at the differences in skin color and religion to separate and cause a major split in the American public. They wanted people to work together. Before posters like this it might be, well, you may not be able to sit on the front of that bus, you may not be able to sit in that white waiting room, but united we have to win this war, we have to come together to win it. Another one that has a black American, the one Laura has, has a sailor that was a hero at Pearl Harbor. This one has Private Joe Louis, does anybody know who Joe Louis was? He was a boxer. So this is going to play to sports fans, the same thing that you would have today if you saw a poster of Michael Jordan in uniform with a machine gun, same idea. Back then he was a heavy-weight boxing champion of the world. He served in the United States military and he will go off to war.”

“This one says ‘we are going to do our part we have God on our side’ says a student who had just raised his hand.

“Okay,” replies Mike. “That’s another they are going to put things in like ‘We are on God’s side.’ That makes an appeal to religion. Because if you think about it and you are religious and people think that God is on your side, they usually don’t think anybody is going to beat you. I mean we are not going to lose the war because as Americans we have God on our side. What’s that make the Japanese and the Germans look like?”

“Evil.”

“Satan, the Devil. They are going to look like the total enemy and they going to try and set people apart. Tamara, what’s that one you have say?”

Tamara quickly looks at the poster on her desk. “He’s watching you.”

Mike nods “Stacy, who is that watching you?”

“I don’t know.”

“All right, it is a Nazi, that’s the shape of a German Helmet. He’s got eyes, he is watching you. Why would they print something like this?”

“To scare people.”

“To scare people, they will be constantly looking over their shoulder. Does anyone else have anything about ‘He is watching you?’ Most of these should have similar themes running throughout.” One student holds up his poster; Mike peers at it and

directs the class's attention to it. "Okay, here is another one that is kind of similar. It says 'Warning. Our homes are in danger now.' And it has got Adolf Hitler and a Japanese soldier and, I mean, it is hard to see his face, but does it look like a person?"

"No," the class as a whole replies.

"Okay. It looks like a monkey. What they are going to do is make the enemies look a little on the non-human side. They feel that if people were fighting an enemy that didn't have a face or didn't look like you and I, they wouldn't have any problem picking up a gun and shooting them. The other one that I think every row should have something about is it should say something about 'Loose lips sink ships' or 'No talk.'"

"Yeah, I got it."

"All right, Tasha has got 'Loose lips might sink ships.' And Tamara has got one that say 'Wanted for murder. Her talk cost lives.'" Does anybody else have any others like that? Jen read yours.

"'Someone Talked'"

"Look. It has an American soldier drowning? Why would they print these posters?"

"To stop people talking, or telling secrets."

"Okay, yes, to keep people's mouths shut, to not tell war secrets. If you work in a production plant and you are making bullets on a daily basis, or you are making airplanes on a daily basis you know the numbers that are being given. You know how much the United States has in its military, what the US has in its military. If you talk, you could end up with a soldier dying because of it. Another thing that you are going to see off and on, and there should be another poster, is a flag in the background. Yes, Pat has got it. Look, they are going to have flags in the background with stars on them. Does anybody know what these flags are for? What they mean? Yes." Mike points to a student with his hand up.

"Did they use these flags on planes?"

Shaking his head Mike moves to the board and begins to draw a flag on the board similar to the one in the poster the student just held up. "No, good try. These flags are going to be square. The border out here is going to be red. The inside is going to be white and there is going to be a star in the middle. People are going to hang these in their living

room windows. If the star is blue, that means that someone from the house is fighting at war, and you could have a flag with two stars if there were two people fighting in that house. The blue stars mean they are alive, and if they turn gold, it means they have been killed in the war. So this one that says 'Get a Job' has someone with a blue flag in the back, so someone is alive. The one with the dog at the bottom that says 'because somebody talked,' and I know it is hard to tell because the pictures are in black and white, but the star is gold. It means that someone has died, probably the dog's master. What the United States is going to do is play mind games with people and come up with different ways to do it. Some of the things that you will see, there are posters made that shows Hitler and Mussolini walking down the street and it says if you see these people in your neighborhood call the authorities. Now Hitler is not really going to be walking down Main Street in Salem, but it was something enough to scare people and really get them thinking that this could happen, it could happen. And even if it was unrealistic people are going to get scared and do it anyway if they are scared. All right are there any questions about those?" The class is silent. "All right, what I want you guys to do for homework," a moan goes up from the class, and Mike pulls up a world map that has been covering a section of the board for the whole period. Underneath is written "Draw your poster or explain one of the ones given in class." "Yes you've got to do it. You have a choice. On the back of that chart I gave you can draw your own poster, it can be simple stick figures. It could be something with six different colors in it. As you are drawing your posters, please write something across the bottom so I can tell what it is, okay?. Just in case you aren't a great artist, or in case I am a stupid person looking at it and can't tell what it is, write down what it is. It could be real brief. If you don't want to draw your poster and you feel like art just isn't your thing, tell me and I can get you one of these posters and you can just write a paragraph about what that is, what it has done, and what your opinion is about it. Okay? So, Nick." Mike suddenly turns to a student who had started to chat with another student while packing up his work. "What is propaganda?"

"It is something like advertising to try to change someone's view," Nick answers.

"Okay. And what are some of the different types of propaganda the US tried to work with during World War II?" Mike continues to ask questions as the students grow restless.



“Posters.”

“Posters is one,” Mike acknowledges. “Posters is going to be the major one. What other things?”

“Newsreels.”

“Yes, newsreels. If this were the 1940’s and you went out tonight to see *Titanic* or *Man in the Iron Mask*, before the film there is going to be a newsreel. It goes around the world and tells you what is going on. That’s how people got their news, saw their pictures of what was going on. The newsreels are going to have propaganda in them. What else?”

“Radio.”

“Radio. OK. You are going to have radio stories and reporters broadcasting live from Berlin about Hitler.”

The changeover bell, what everyone has been waiting for, suddenly goes. Students quickly jump up and start to head into the hall as Mike makes sure that they do not walk off with his posters, posters that he will be using again with the next class. “Leave those posters on your desk. If you want to do the second option, tell me so I can get you one of the posters.” No one takes Mike up on the offer of the second choice. Mike, it seems, did not expect his offer to be taken as he turns away from the departing students to pull down the maps to once again cover the poster assignment and set up the overhead to repeat the lesson with the students who were already making their way into the room.

#### Stepping outside of the exhibit

Each portrait highlights the potential depth and complexity involved in the teaching and learning of history within these classrooms. It is significant that comparing the portraits reveals that history teaching is conceptualized and performed quite differently by these preservice teachers. The portraits show how the pedagogical approach to teaching history with an emphasis on developing historical understanding through learning the skills of the discipline in Helen’s and Jonny’s lessons stands in direct contrast with Mike’s, and especially Amanda’s history lessons, which emphasize the facts and content coverage. This key dimension of difference between the portraits that stress,

on the one hand, the importance of process and meaning-making, and on the other, the tradition of learning facts, details and content, will be examined in greater detail.

Part 7: Dimensions of difference in the history classroom.

"Everything must be like something, so what is this like?"  
E. M. Forster Abinger Harvest (1936)

As I re-read the portraits of teaching, I am reminded of a comment made by Senator Diane Feinstein during the hearings on the Smithsonian Institution: Management Guidelines for the Future, (1995) that focused on how the past was being interpreted and re-presented in two of their exhibits. The West as America and the planned Enola Gay exhibit prompted Feinstein to think back to her own schooling and her days when she studied history at school:

In the days when I studied history the text ..was essentially a recitation of fact, leaving the reader to draw their own analysis. Now what you see is a writer's interpretation of fact, which is different...Is it really the role [of a museum -or teacher] to interpret history, rather than just simply to put forward historical facts based on the validity of the facts and the historical value.

Such a stance, that stresses the importance of the transmission of historical knowledge, meaning the key facts of and stories about events in a nation's past, has grown from the same soil as arguments that suggest that the content currently taught in American history and social studies classrooms is weak and watered-down knowledge that does not prepare culturally literate citizens (Ravitch, 1987, 1989; Ravitch & Finn, 1987; Hirsch, 1987). This view of history teaching, which stresses the transmission of facts and knowledge, is a genre referred to by David Sylvester (1994) in England as the "Great Tradition," where the "tradition of history teaching was clear cut in both its aims and its methodology. The history teacher's role was didactically active...the body of knowledge... was mainly political history with some social and economic aspects and it was mainly British history with some European history from Julius Caesar to 1914" (Sylvester, 1994, p. 9).

However, what comes out of the portraits of teaching reported in this study is that the teaching of history by these pre-service teachers does not necessarily mirror the history teaching that Feinstein remembers or that Ravitch and Hirsch yearn for. The closest to this genre would be Amanda's lesson with its focus on the presentation of specific facts and details based upon the textbook and teacher-led lecture and notes. The

teaching and learning of history, especially within the English portraits, stand in direct contrast to the "great tradition" of history teaching. Both Helen's and Jonny's lessons are remarkably similar in their emphasis on the teaching and practice of analyzing sources. This does not mean that neither Amanda nor Mike use various sources within their lesson; both use primary sources - the U.S. Constitution and World War II posters downloaded from the internet. It is how these sources are used, not only by these beginning teachers but also by the students, that differentiates Jonny and Helen's portraits of their understandings and goals of teaching history from Amanda's and Mike's.

Dominick La Capra's (1983) work which distinguishes between the "documentary" and "worklike" aspects of a historical text is central to developing an understanding of the differences within the portraits. La Capra contends that the "documentary" aspect of a text merely conveys information, or in other words, presents an account of an event or action. However, the "worklike" aspect of a text recognizes the historical source not as a full account of an event, but as a partial account - a "remainder of the past that forms part of an event or action being investigated and reconstructed in the light of what is already known about the past" (p. 27). How historical texts are used by each of the participants and their students, with regard to the emphasis on the "documentary" or "worklike" aspect, is a crucial dimension of difference, since it represents an adherence to contrasting traditions in the teaching of history. It is this difference, based upon either the learning of the process of doing history and the skills of the historian, or the focus on learning content and specific details on the past, that will be unpacked here. This will involve focusing predominantly on the participants' differing approaches to the teaching of content and concepts and their classroom interactions with students.

It is important to note that these portraits, in and of themselves, are not meant to serve as evidence of the participants' teaching skills or to suggest that one teacher is better than another. In all cases, these portraits should be likened, for want of a better analogy, to 'amateur night,' in the sense that a gap exists between what these student teachers would like to do in the classroom and what they actually do. This is not meant to slight their abilities but rather to recognize that learning to teach is a long process that requires more than good content knowledge.

Research from the Knowledge Growth in Teaching Program at Stanford University in the mid 1980s contends that the idea of knowing the content of history and then being able to reconceptualize the content to teach history is an ongoing process that develops through practical experiences, as Gudmundsdottir (1995) suggests, "learned mostly on the job from trying things out, observing, talking and working with other teachers" (p. 30). The researchers found that the ability to reconceptualize subject matter into a teachable format, which they referred to as Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK), only existed at a superficial level amongst inexperienced teachers (Gudmundsdottir & Shulman, 1987; Shulman, 1987). This low PCK level stood in direct contrast to those teachers viewed as "experienced, excellent teachers," who demonstrated high levels of PCK in their "unique way of understanding the content they teach... These teachers have developed a way of knowing that enables them to function effectively and efficiently in the classroom" (Gudmundsdottir, 1991c, p. 211).

Subsequent research on beginning history and social studies teachers, even those who demonstrated strong historical thinking skills, suggests that their views of teaching and learning are somewhat simplistic in their reliance on unmodified subject matter knowledge as they begin to plan and teach the subject (Gudmundsdottir, 1987a, 1987b, 1990, 1991b; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988; Wilson, 1991; Wineburg, 1991a, 1991b; Yeager & Davis, 1995). The participants within this study have had little chance, if any, to develop the "ways of representing and formulating the subject [to] make it comprehensible to others" (Shulman, 1986, p. 9). Their lack of experience does not detract, however, from the purpose of these portraits to serve as an entry point through which to explore what it means to become a teacher of history in the USA and England.

#### The nature of the content and concepts of the lessons.

The range of material taught in these four portraits - on the nature of entertainment and sport in the Roman Empire, the concept and uses of propaganda in World Wars I and II and the nature of reform in early 20<sup>th</sup> century America - involve abstract ideas and a large amount of contextual knowledge presented by the teacher to the class. What quickly becomes apparent is the potential depth and complexity involved in the teaching and learning of history in all of these classrooms. However, the nature of the content and the concepts taught is quite different between these portraits. The two British

lessons, while presenting different material, mirror each other in their emphasis on the specific historical skill of working with what Donald Steel (1989) terms one of the key “heartland” concepts of history: evidence. While both lessons give time to briefly provide specific facts pertaining to their topics, this merely serves as a context or background for students to develop their 'evidential' skills by working with source materials. For both Helen and Jonny, the activity of teaching history appears to be designed with the goal of fostering and encouraging the development of historical thinking through initially performing and modeling the subjection of particular sources to “an analysis of [their] own purposes, construction, and consequences” (Seixas, 1998, p. 316).

Helen showed a video designed to complement the content and goals of the national history curriculum, that not only provides a narrative of life during Roman times but focuses on using and evaluating sources to learn about events at the Circus Maximus. The students then watched a very different representation of the past in the form of a clip from the film *Ben Hur*. They were asked to compare, contrast, and begin to evaluate the film's interpretation of events based on what they already had learned. These young “apprentice” historians were being guided or directed through the process of evaluating and interpreting individual sources for use as evidence. Toward the end of the lesson, teacher guidance gave way to student practice and participation, which culminated in a source-based written assessment in which the students were expected to demonstrate their ability to organize and work with a variety of sources. It was their turn to take on the role of historian, to imitate how to organize and use sources to produce a written narrative framework.

The essence and structure of the lesson in Jonny's lesson was very similar to Helen's. The lesson itself focused less on analyzing how World War I began and more on how a specific event - the taking of Antwerp by the Germans and the subsequent treatment of Belgian priests - was reported by the press. Each newspaper headline and gobbet (section of primary source) was treated not as an individual account of the event, but as a single specific source that could be used as evidence of propaganda. While he wanted to define propaganda and detail the short term causes and specific events that led directly to the war, his focus was primarily the development of historical skills:

examining bias and active source interpretation. The use of a variety of sources focusing on one event, in conjunction with the assigned tasks, highlights this effort to encourage students to compare and contrast different sources, and thus begin to explore and work with a variety of source based evidence. In both of these lessons, the format seems carefully scripted and choreographed. There is initially a great deal of teacher talk designed to model the process of analyzing sources while clarifying what is actually expected of the students as they begin to complete the assigned tasks. The level of analysis modeled by Jonny and expected of his students was more sophisticated than Helen's introduction to exploring and using sources. As a result, Jonny seemed to focus more on "guided participation" than Helen (Rogoff, 1993). This can be explained by the fact that they were teaching different year groups who were at different stages of their apprenticeship. It is significant to note that in both cases, the focus on developing and practicing historical skills, such as source analysis, was tied directly to the needs and expectations of their respective history departments, whose goals were in turn aligned with the official requirements scripted out within the National Curriculum for History. As Jonny notes,

There are certain things they should have established in Key Stage 3, like the use of evidence and the use of sources, the basics, which you obviously have to keep working on. So at Key Stage 2 and even 3 there is a lot of teaching of the skills of history. This lesson does that; it is a standard departmental exercise. Everyone has done it.

Through a number of structured "tasks" Jonny's students were guided through the process of comparing and contrasting sources. Jonny detailed who had written each source, how it differed from the previous source, and the possible goal of the author in presenting the events in that particular way. The choice of sources and focus of the questions provided little room to expand the details of the military maneuvers that led to the beginning of World War I, except for the contextualizing information presented at the beginning of the lesson. Unlike Helen's source assessment, the assigning of the poster for homework focused on understanding the term "propaganda" rather than modeling the role of historian.

Both Helen's and Jonny's lessons are different from the lessons taught by Mike and Amanda, who focused more on the presentation of specific historical content through

narrative. This is especially true of Amanda's lesson which chronicled over 20 years of change and reform in the United States and focused heavily on transmitting content to the students. From the quick open notebook quiz to the lecture and its accompanying notes, the goal is to provide content matter on the rise and reforms of the Progressive movement. The history textbook, as used by the students and Amanda, serves as the foundation upon which to present the content to the class, including the group work on the Constitution. In essence, the content is a commodity, packaged for transmission first by the textbook, and then "courtesy copied" via Amanda's lecture and notes. Amanda's questioning is designed to check for understanding and to elicit key facts and details of what the students have already covered, which triggers the deploying of more details and content by Amanda.

For Mike, the posters rather than the textbook serve as the means of detailing the impact of the war on the American home front. The posters provide Mike with an excellent opportunity to help students understand the concept of propaganda by seeing examples of propaganda developed by the U.S. during World War II. By examining specific posters the class was able to gather and share evidence of what life was like in the US from 1941-45. However, in contrast to Jonny's lesson with its emphasis on examining the "worklike" nature of the text, Mike's primary focus was to reconstitute and build upon student-based answers about each American poster. This provided a foundational understanding of how the war and mobilization impacted the role of women, affected race relations, shaped the workforce, and influenced supply and demand for household products on the home front. In examining the portraits in this way, it becomes apparent that both the teacher's and the student's roles in knowing and learning history within Jonny's and Helen's lessons are quite different than in Amanda's and Mike's lessons.

#### Student / Teacher interaction within the history classroom

The practice of telling things to children is implicit in subject centered teaching. Yet, perhaps more than that, teachers are conditioned and predisposed to control-side activities. Thus, with predetermined objectives, content, activities, and assessments teachers easily fall into the pattern (or trap) of teacher talks while



children listen, teacher directed activities, and basic teacher domination. (Saxe, 1997, p. 51)

Within all these portraits, the lessons are structured in such a way that there is undoubtedly a great deal of teacher talk, in the form of what Goodlad (1984) terms "frontal teaching," whereby the teacher "lays out the intellectual terrain and predetermines the path students will need to follow" (p. 108). In recent years, the predominance of teacher talk, especially in the history classroom, has been criticized and widely regarded as uninspired classroom practice (Engle, 1990; Goodlad, 1984; Shaver, Davis & Helburn, 1980; Thornton, 1991; and Yeager & Davis, 1995). An interesting contrast to the view that teacher talk in history is a poor form of pedagogy comes from research by Cooper and McIntyre (1996), who constructed a menu of effective methods to aid learning in the history classroom. While such activities as group work, drama, role play, and the use of pictures and other visuals were cited by both teachers and pupils as useful, teacher talk in the form of storytelling by the teacher; reading aloud by both teacher and pupils; oral explanation combined with discussions, questions and answer sessions, or use of the chalkboard; and use of explanatory models based on pupil ideas or generated by the teacher were all reported as being effective.

It is interesting to note that the last four methods, all heavily focusing on teacher talk, were recognized as aids to learning history by teachers and not by students. This support for teacher-dominated lessons may bolster Evans' (1992) assertion that it is the subject of history itself that "inspires didactic forms of teaching in which knowledge is passively accepted by students and stored away for later use" Evans goes on to state that such teacher talk within the history classroom serves as a forum for nothing more than "a great deal of non-critical chronicling in which knowledge is valued for the sake of knowing." What is worse, he suggests, is that the knowledge that is served up for consumption "frequently serve(s) as a subtle means of oppression by emphasizing the stories of dominant elites, glorifying national heroes, minimizing the contributions of persons of color and de-emphasizing or omitting controversial questions." (pp. 313-14). He paints a picture of history classrooms as spaces where lessons themselves are structured to limit student talk and discussion, where the content of history is merely transmitted by the teacher and consumed by the student.

Such a position, however, when examining the student /teacher interaction in the classroom portraits, appears to suggest that Evans' comments are over simplistic. A preponderance of teacher talk in a pre-service teacher's classroom, if nothing else, can be viewed as a direct manifestation of the desire for control and the maintenance of discipline as they begin to perform in the role of history teacher for a less than appreciative audience, rather than a direct result of the structure of the discipline of history. This is evidenced in comments made by Jonny as he detailed his initial goals in moving frontstage.

My goal in the first few weeks [of student teaching] was to feel like I had control of my classes and that I had control in the classroom, and that was like my main target before aiming to achieve anything particularly in the classroom. I did not doubt that I would be able to do it, but obviously I had the fear that, as anybody has in the back of your mind, what if I go in, and I am teaching and they are talking and I tell them to be quiet and they don't? What do I do then?

Nias (1989), and Pendry, Husbands, Arthur and Davison (1998) contend that this fear of losing control is an overriding concern of many beginning teachers. It leads to an initial preoccupation with self as teacher/performer, which in turn allows for very little student/audience - teacher/performer interaction and thus serves as a stumbling block to concerning oneself with student learning (Fuller & Brown, 1975; Calderhead, 1987; Furlong & Maynard, 1995; and Pendry, Husbands, Arthur & Davison, 1998). Teacher talk and the limiting of student dialogue can be seen as a byproduct of concern for the maintenance of a solid initial performance via classroom management. In closely examining the portraits, it also becomes clear that the teacher talk within these portraits, especially with Helen and Jonny and to a lesser extent with Mike, is structured and functions quite differently than Evans' depiction.

Helen's and Jonny's lessons are remarkably similar in their format and presentation of the material to the students. It is almost as if they are following a specific template or cues that structures not only what they say and discuss but also when and how they talk to the class. Following attendance, the beginning of both lessons are dominated by teacher talk and questions that serve not only to control and manage the class but also to briefly introduce the day's topic. While Jonny pointed out that his opening was aided by student interest in current events, both he and Helen began by

questioning students. For Jonny, this was about what they did last lesson, while for Helen, it involved tapping their own experiences and insights in order to relate to and introduce the topic. Both introductions required student participation in the form of answering questions. The next section of both lessons, involved providing students with some initial specific facts and content. For Helen, this would have been the video that described what it was like at the Circus Maximus and the importance of using evidence. Questions to go along with the video were to be answered in note form in the back of the students' workbooks. Once answered, the students were then to answer the same questions, this time based on the notes they had taken and an individual reading of the textbook.

For Jonny, there was a very similar process of providing students with specific background content and information. This involved introducing the concept of propaganda and requiring the students to copy a definition in the front of their workbooks. Which was followed by students individually reading from a handout on the topic in question. The presentation of this content was followed by a recap of the key points. For Helen, this meant asking the students to read out the answers to their questions, while for Jonny it meant detailing in his own words what the student had just read. The expectation from both Jonny and Helen was that the students would only speak when cued to do so. This initial focus on content served as a precursor for both Jonny and Helen to provide the students with material - newspaper goblets, or the film *Ben Hur* to practice using sources and working with evidence in the completion of "tasks" or "exercises." The rest of the lesson could be seen as a workout or drill to help students develop specific historical skills, which required Helen and Jonny to take on the role of coach/ director of the students as they detailed, very specifically, exactly what the students had to do to be successful. This was achieved by first explaining exactly what the source was about and then explaining what to look for as they began to work with the source(s). Before the students were allowed to begin their work, either analyzing *Ben Hur* or their source-based assessment entitled Blood Sports or Belgian Atrocities, their answers were carefully choreographed and rehearsed by Jonny and Helen. This involved not only asking the class for the answers to the questions the students would soon be working on, but also identifying what details and ideas should be used. One tool utilized

by both Jonny and Helen was to phrase questions so as to place the students in a particular role of either the historian looking at the evidence, "What does that tell us?" or as an individual during that period," So you need to describe the events, describe what is happening...Just look at source D. How would you feel about the Belgian Priests?"

It is only then that the students were provided time to begin their exercises under the watchful eye of the teacher. Within these portraits, the student role is clearly defined: when they write, where they write, and what they write is controlled by the teacher. Writing within the lesson is the means by which the students not only document specific content but practice the skills of the historian. Before they are allowed to write in the front of their books, notes are taken in the back, or they have to have demonstrated, by answering teacher-based questions, that they are ready to begin work. Success is measured by how well the students can mimic /ventriloquate the answers previously provided within the teacher-led explanation/discussion. Both English portraits can be viewed as drill fields, where students are shown, and then given room to practice, the habits of a historian.

Within the American portraits, the structure and function of the lesson with regard to teacher-student interaction is quite different from that detailed above. While Mike opened the lesson with a question designed to tap student knowledge that then led to a definition of propaganda, Amanda began by giving an open notebook quiz based on the students' work the day before. Upon completing the quiz, students were directed to begin answering questions in their textbook on the Progressive movement. For the first half of Amanda's lesson, there was very little teacher or student talk beyond detailing what work they needed to do, which carried on from the day before. In Mike's lesson there was little initial teacher talk, other than introducing the concept of propaganda and briefly detailing what the students had to do to complete the chart on World War II posters. In both cases, it is the students who were expected to gather the content and facts from either textbooks or posters.

In both Amanda's and Mike's classes, the facts and details identified by the students form the basis for the next stage of the lesson. For Amanda, her role involved re-presenting the material from the textbook through lecture. This 'second coming' of the material was structured to provide students with an organized set of notes for their files.

The role of the students at this point is twofold. First, they are expected to answer specific teacher-generated questions based on the textbook work they have just done. These questions frame Amanda's packaging of specific content details through the bulleted notes she provides on the board. Second, the students are expected to copy these neatly packaged parcels of content into their own notes. This notetaking forms an important part of the lesson. Each section of notes is numbered by the students and will be checked at the end of the semester. Upon completion of the notes, the cycle begins again: first directing students to use their textbooks to gather content detail, and second re-packaging and transmitting the material by the teacher. It is possible to see this within the last 20 minutes of the lesson as the students, this time in cooperative groups, begin to gather information on the constitutional amendments that occurred during this period so they can be reviewed next class.

Mike's role is quite similar to Amanda's: there is ongoing encouragement for the students to talk and discuss the specific details of what they have covered during their individual student work. The process of having students analyze and discuss the posters in terms of their content, their perceived audience and their message as way to understand the concept of propaganda, and using the posters to document and detail life on the home front during World War II is however quite different. However, the balance between having the students begin to work with historical sources and the need to provide students with specific content begins to waver as the students complete the assigned number of posters in the chart. As Mike encourages the students to discuss their posters, he retreats from using the students' analyses of these posters as evidence of the concept of propaganda, or as a way for them to generate evidence detailing the impact of war on the home front. Instead, he begins to use the students' answers as a basis from which to craft and perform his own narrative of what life was like in America during World War II; there is little explicit encouragement of his students to continue to analyze and interpret the posters. His students become willing audience members as he provides them with a historical narrative. It is only at the very end of the lesson, as the students begin to ready themselves to leave, that Mike shifts from the specific details and content of life on the home front to re-focusing on the concept of propaganda by questioning a student who was all but ready to leave.

Mike's lesson, in terms of its goals, resources, and teacher expectations, appeared set to bridge the gap between Jonny's and Helen's focus on the skills and methods of history and Amanda's focus on historical facts and content. Yet when the time came to move the class in that direction, it seemed Mike 'blinked,' thus showing himself not yet quite ready to break from the 'activity formations' that Evans (1992), Goodlad (1984), and Yeager and Davis (1995) contend form the oft-observed typical doing of the American history classroom. However, the differences between the American and English portraits, and the initial differences between Mike's and Amanda's portraits, do suggest that Evans' contention that history teaching is predisposed to one specific teaching format is an oversimplification of the complexities involved in the process of teaching and learning history.

Tracing the provenance of difference. The danger of simplifying the complex

The very nature of what it means to learn to teach history in America and England appears to be fundamentally different between the classrooms of these pre-service teachers. Does this mean that Jonny and Helen's knowledge and understandings of history and history teaching are so very different from that of Amanda and Mike's? Can the similarities between Jonny's and Helen's portraits be explained by suggesting that they share a similar concept of history and history teaching, while the initial differences between Amanda's and Mike's similarly suggest that they hold different understandings or backgrounds about history and history teaching? Recent research does indicate that history teachers not only hold different conceptions and values of history but also favor different models and stories of teaching history (Evans, 1988, 1989a, b, 1994; Gundmundsdottir, 1989, 1991a,b,c; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988; Goodman & Adler, 1985). But wouldn't this mean that these preservice teachers would be teaching history quite differently from each other? For as Wilson and Wineburg (1988) noted, "the curriculum they were given and the courses they subsequently taught were shaped by what they did and did not know about history" (p. 534). Care must be taken not to explain away the similarities and differences within these portraits by focusing solely on their depth of content knowledge and understanding of the structure of the discipline of history. Such a focus offers too simplistic an explanation of the relationships between the actions of these preservice teachers and the meanings they make as they move from

history majors to history teachers. It limits the ability to see beyond the individual portrait and the specific events in the classroom while failing to recognize, as Lemke (1995) contends, that:

Our meanings shape and are shaped by our social relationships, both as individuals and as members of social groups. These social relationships bind us into communities, cultures and subcultures. The meanings we make define not only our selves, they also define our communities, our age groups, our genders, and our era in history. Even more, they define the relationships between communities, age groups, genders, social classes and subcultures (p 1).

In order to begin to understand these differences identified within the context of their teaching, it is important to explore how the activity of history teaching is negotiated, percolated, and constructed over time and space by these pre-service teachers. It helps to envision the activity of learning to teach history as "analogous to acquiring abilities of finding one's way around in an environment" (Greeno, 1991, p. 197). For many pre-service teachers, the environment in which they believe they learned the most about teaching is the frontstage setting of their field experience within a particular school or classroom in conjunction with the backstage/staffroom interactions with fellow teachers.

As newcomers to this environment, they are helped by their interactions by the many resident actors. It is a perception, however, that is static and ahistorical; it narrows one's understanding of the process of learning to teach. While the student teacher may well situate the majority of their learning to teach in the classrooms of their internship, it becomes apparent in examining the performances within the portraits and analyzing the participants' conversations and narratives that the meanings and practices of these preservice history teachers did not originate or begin within the here and now of their classrooms.

Nespor (1997) contends that such spaces/environments as the school or the classroom "are themselves 'articulations' of intersecting networks beginning and ending far beyond their immediate boundaries" (p. 168). In this sense the classrooms, which serve as the stage for their performances, are merely situations/spaces where networks of relations and understanding generated over time and space intersect and tightly knot

together. The knot of networks of relations and understanding are made up of threads of different strengths and consistencies that are woven into each other; each thread and strand holds the other in place. Unraveling the knot is extremely difficult, if not impossible, but by loosening the knot, one can see how these pre-service teachers' understanding and practice of teaching history are negotiated and constructed within and through the communities and socio-cultural networks within which they have moved and continue to move. This begins with initially focusing on Helen's and Jonny's and then Mike's and Amanda's past experiences and interactions that evolved over time. From the vantage point of the here and now these past experiences can be perceived as shaping not only their conceptions of history and history teaching but also their decisions and motivations to take on the role of history teacher.



Part 8: Developing a biographic conception of history and history teaching. On being an audience member: Exploring actions and interactions

"Histories make men wise; poets witty; the mathematics, subtle; natural philosophy, deep: logic and rhetoric, able to contend."  
Francis Bacon

Constructing oneself as a history teacher in England

For Helen and Jonny, the idea of becoming a history teacher had not been a career path when entering or finishing university. For Helen, it was a career that she knew she did not want, and for Jonny, teaching history in high school was one option, but he believed there were a number of other opportunities out there for him.

From History Student to Prospective History Teacher.

Helen was unwilling to even contemplate the concept of becoming a teacher. This reluctance was due primarily to the fact that both her parents were teachers and Helen found herself privy to the backstage life of being a teacher. Her mother, after going back to school in her early 30s to prepare to be a primary school teacher, became a headmistress and newly trained OFSTED school inspector, while her dad, after a career in the Royal Air Force (RAF) and time spent in banking, became a secondary math and economics teacher. Helen and her brother spent the majority of their primary and high school years in public school, and both were viewed as very capable college-bound students. Throughout those years Helen had made it very clear

that I was never going to go into teaching. I never saw my mother. She is always at school or my dad is always marking or planning lessons. When I was younger I tended to feel quite left out because they spent so much time involved with school. My mum in particular spent so much time in school, and when she came home she was still involved with schoolwork. The teatime discussion would be about school. And I thought "I don't want to live like that." Yeah they get six weeks holiday but they spend four weeks working and the other two abroad on a beach somewhere recovering. And I thought for years that, "This is not for me."

From the age of 14 until her final year in high school, Helen hoped to join the Royal Air Force and serve as a helicopter pilot. After her first selection procedure at 17, she found she was ineligible for flight duty based upon a past history of migraine

headaches. Undeterred, she applied for university sponsorship to become a Royal Air Force intelligence officer, a position she felt well prepared to hold as a result of the courses she had chosen for her A levels, since it involved

Collecting and analyzing photographs... skills that I had picked up in history and geography. That is what I desperately wanted to do. I had even been recommended to do it by my careers officer at school. He said, 'You are the sort of person they are looking for.' No problem. I went back for university sponsorship. I got there and I had this major accident on their premises during one of the physical tests. I had a suspected broken neck but they did not know. I had finished the tests off, and by the time I was supposed to leave, I could not speak. I was really white; I had no sort of sensation in my legs. So I was sat waiting for my transportation and they picked me up on the video camera - just a white thing - they came and spoke to me and I was not even coherent. And then they dealt with the situation, but because it was a serious neck and head injury, I can't join. I was disappointed, and to some extent still am disappointed, that I won't join the air force. I then had to reevaluate what I wanted to do. It was a really tough time. I did my A level wearing a neck brace. I was quite poorly at the time. And nobody actually expected me to pass my A levels.

Helen passed her A levels in history, geography, and general studies, although her final exam grades fell just short of the conditional offer she had received from Cambridge University. Because of the extenuating medical circumstances, her sixth form college sent a letter to both the examining board and Cambridge University informing them of the situation. Cambridge accepted her, and she attended Kings College to read history. It was here that Helen, who jokingly describes herself to be the "feminist type thing in the corner – a Bolshy cow" began to see teaching history as an alternative career choice. A great deal of this came through the fact that her experiences at Cambridge provided her with an understanding of what she did not want to do for a career.

I reevaluated that I don't want a desk job. You know even the Air Force may be nice, you get to see the world, but you are still sat at a desk wearing a uniform, taking orders from people. And in those three years away I learnt that is not what I actually want to do. Cambridge is full of people who want you to conform to their opinions. And I learnt that is not how I operate. I don't mind going along with people, but if I am not happy, I will say so. I did not even know that side of me was there. It was also at this time that I realized I really like history and I realized what I wanted to do.

Her decision to teach, she acknowledges, was greatly influenced by her mother's own initial decision to go back to school to become a teacher after years of being a house wife and her subsequent rapid rise into educational administration. "I mean, I see myself in five years as a department head. That is what I will do." Although her image of the role of teacher was that of a professional, empowered, individual decision maker, which to a great extent was based upon how she viewed both her parents, it soon became apparent to Helen that her peers at Cambridge did not share such an image of the profession. Among her friends who were also reading history, teaching was not an acceptable career choice for Cambridge graduates.

I am not surprised teachers are so demoralized when people are constantly blaming and knocking us. I mean, it starts even before you begin your training. The minute somebody knew that was what I was going to do, it sort of became their place to tell me that teaching is crap. "Don't do it." My own friends knock teaching. I was knocked for leaving Cambridge, wanting to join the teaching profession. Some people assumed it was the only thing I could do with a 2:2 from Cambridge, and I said that's ridiculous.

The decision to apply to Leeds University to do her PGCE in her final year to a great extent was very much a continuation of her stance against the ethos and culture of a setting that she did not like. Helen's decision to become a teacher was a conscious, non-conformist, critical decision that was hers and hers alone, one that had been a challenge to make, and one that would be a challenge to implement. "I did not even tell my parents that I was doing it. This was my decision." It mirrored a previous decision in her final year to not only choose the option of writing a dissertation, which in itself was a rarity, but to focus her research on a topic - the expansion of higher education at Cambridge with the foundation of the first female college - that would not sit well within what she term such a "misogynistic setting."

I think I was the only person out of 120 historians to do a dissertation. They aren't compulsory, so some people can't be bothered. It is a lot of hard work and there is very little support. All it does is replace one paper so I still had to do two papers and a major fifteen thousand-word dissertation as well. I was constantly asked 'Why are you doing that topic? You know you will only ever

get a 2:2 for you final degree mark if you do this.” And I did it and I got a 2:2 but I would not have done anything else.”

Because of the criticism from her peers and her own insights into how the profession of teaching can “control your life,” Helen presents her decision to teach as one that she made very much in isolation. As such, she was taken aback by her mother's comments when she finally informed her that she was going to teach. “You know, it’s really funny, but when I told my mum that I had applied for the PGCE program, she said, ‘I always knew you would be a teacher but I thought you would be an elementary one.’”

For Jonny, the decision to become a history teacher came after he had graduated from university. A number of experiences and opportunities at the University of East Anglia (UEA) placed Jonny on a very different track from wanting to become a high school history teacher. During the final year of his degree, he had a feeling that he did not want to end his relationship with history and politics, but it did not mean that he wanted to teach history.

During my finals when I was revising, I was really enjoying my revision and I thought, ‘this is not normal.’ I enjoyed writing my exams. Actually I enjoyed my A level exams. I enjoyed the adrenaline rush. And I came out of my last exam and I just had this overall feeling that I don’t want it to be over. I don’t want that to be it for history, politics and academic study. There is so much more that I wanted to do. And the weirdest thing was me and this bloke Dennis were having a load of beers and he said. "Do you want to go to the second hand bookshop?" So we finished our pints and we went and bought all these history books that we should have read through the year. He is now teaching history, he did his PGCE at York. But we were overwhelmed with- "We don’t want that to be it." So I thought "Right. Graduate school is what I want to do?"

The idea of graduate school was not a goal decided over a couple of beers. It had initially been suggested by a professor at Georgetown, where Jonny had spent a year as an exchange student. While being deemed a successful student at the UEA, which was demonstrated by the receipt of a five hundred pound scholarship as the “person who was going to America with the top grades,” Jonny was thought an outstanding student at Georgetown. This, he noted, had a great deal to do with the range of courses he chose,

for just as in England, he was allowed to continue to specialize in history and politics courses.

At Georgetown my biggest culture shock was the work. It was more like going back to like school and 6<sup>th</sup> form. The whole 3-hour small group seminars at UAE were completely out of the window. Never saw that again while at Georgetown. We had 60-100 people lecture halls. Very teacher directed. It was “go away read this paper,” you know, that was that. In terms of workload, it was much harder. In terms of the expectations of the subject, it was much easier. Now a lot of English people who went came back and said, the American standard of education is just much lower than ours. But I thought we could do well because we did not have anything that we had to take. Take whatever you want. It was American history courses, American politics, I did some African history. Basically all history and politics that we had already specialized in for two years in England. So basically I would sit at the word processor and bang out an essay, get an A, and I ended up with a 3.9 GPA at the end of it. Which is great - it looks fantastic - 3.9 from Georgetown. But if I had to do theology, the sciences and the stuff the Americans had to do it would probably have been a 2.9.

The high quality of Jonny’s work at Georgetown encouraged one of his professors to suggest that he should consider becoming a member of the species that Bourdieu (1988) termed *Homo academicus*. “And I got talking to this professor and I was doing well in the course, and he said ‘What are you doing when you graduate?’ And he said ‘Why don’t you come back and go to graduate school?’ And that was the first time that anyone had ever mentioned it to me. And he said, ‘You should, you know. You should be over here.’”

Jonny’s ability to work with texts, to select evidence to craft what his professors considered to be superior essays, was a skill that he had learned to master during his A Levels. It was a formula that he had consistently employed from that point on to demonstrate his skills as an historian. It was a formula, however, that appeared to Jonny as one that not everyone could master and perform.

I could just sort of churn out essays and get A’s every time. You know, you can crack the formula, can’t you? You can crack an A level formula- how to write an A level essay. Too many people, when they are doing A level history, don’t understand about making an argument and using evidence. I think there is too much panic and they just write down all they know. It took me a while to discover it,

but I realized that under exam conditions you could write 3- 4 sides. You don't need to write more than that. You can make your argument, select your evidence and with a decent introduction and decent conclusion, you can get an A or a B.

It was a formula that he continued to develop and employ at UEA in both his essay exams and his course work. In his classes he began to view himself as one of the most capable history students. This belief intensified throughout his academic career and came to fruition at UEA and Georgetown. In his first history paper at college he received the highest possible grade: a First. "I was absolutely gobsmacked. Because I remember in the 6<sup>th</sup> form, they said at O Level you obviously are one of the brightest lots in the school, at A level it gets whittled down, and at University you'll be then thrown in to a general pot of the best and the brightest and you will really struggle. And I was expecting to go and really struggle and then I got a first and I was like, 'wow, I'm smart.' This was further established in his final year when he went to see his advisor just prior to graduation about the prospects of going onto graduate school. He found out that he had just missed a first class degree, and he was again encouraged that graduate school would be an excellent option. Taking the next year off, Jonny went back to the States and began to apply for masters programs until he was advised to apply for a Ph.D. in order to receive funding. He found himself having to decide whether to focus on U.S. history or politics. His experiences as an intern in the Senate during his time at Georgetown, and the fact that he used his time to interview Carl Levins, John Glenn and others for his dissertation on the 1984 U.S. primaries encouraged him to focus on politics. He was subsequently offered a fully funded scholarship at Syracuse University to research the rise of the religious right. It was a goal that had taken him two years to achieve, but when he eventually left for the U.S. he started to feel unsure about his future. He made it as far as Washington D.C., and while staying with a friend he started to rethink his plans.

I was not sure if I could face spending five years away from home and my girlfriend with very little money. I was not even sure if I was committed to political science. I kept asking myself "Do I want to be poor for another five years? Do I really want to be a TA? Don't I just want to teach?" And I was thinking, "If you are having second thoughts, and if you are unsure that you want to do it, then you are just going to be miserable." So I started to think, "Well, maybe I can go back to England," and I thought, "Well, I hope I get

a place on a bloody PGCE course after this. Because otherwise I am in trouble."

He never made it to Syracuse. Instead, he bought a ticket home, deciding at that point that he was going to become a teacher. It was a decision that, as with Helen, was not viewed as unusual by his family. Jonny's mother had herself been a history teacher prior to having a family and making the decision to stay at home to look after the children. As Jonny and his siblings grew up, while changing careers to become a vicar, his mother continued to study history at a local university where she recently completed an MA. However, upon returning to England he missed the deadline for 1996-97 admission to the PGCE program to become a history teacher and applied to Leeds for the 1997-98 intake, which gave him a year to wait to get into the program.

So I came back mid-September 1996 and I got a job as a special needs assistant (SNA) in a high school in Leeds. Carl Manor High School- a right shit hole. Absolutely dreadful school, but I thought, "get some experience." It was cynical initially, I thought that I could go to the PGCE interview saying "I'm an SNA" and they would be impressed. So I went to the PGCE interview and said "I am a special needs assistant at Carl Manor High." And the interviewer was like, "I'm impressed." So I got my place at Leeds.

#### Exploring vocabularies of motive and commitment. Why teach history?

Both Helen and Jonny came from families who were or had been teachers, but neither family envisioned them as history teachers. Helen's mother expected her to work with primary school children, while Jonny's mother thought that he would be primarily a PE teacher, "My mum actually said, 'It is so funny we always thought that you would end up being a games teacher.' She was kind of joking, but I was sports mad. Still am, you know."

For Helen, becoming a primary school teacher was not an option she could envision herself undertaking, even though she had spent a great deal of time visiting and helping out in her mothers' primary school. The role of primary school teacher was not one she considered herself qualified to take on.

I did spend time in a primary school. I did like it, but it was not really what I enjoyed, inasmuch as I could not specialize, and I did not feel confident enough to handle the amount of National Curriculum subjects that primary teachers have to handle. They

have to do all the National Curriculum subjects - maths, English, design and technology, science, information technology, music, history, geography, and then PE and a lot more. I think doing a specialist degree focuses you in more. I am a trained historian and I am trained in how to use historical techniques. Even teaching other subjects is very difficult. It is definitely difficult to get away from my training and how I view things and how my mind set works.

Seeing and representing herself as a trained historian of knowing how to do history was vital for Helen if she was going to be able to teach children. Her continued specialization and conditioning into the social practices, patterns of discourse, and activity formations of history throughout her A Levels and her experiences at Cambridge allowed Helen to represent herself as ready to begin the activity of teaching history primarily because she defined herself as a practiced historian. In this sense, the strategic importance Helen gives to being a historian, which is a product of her past experiences studying history at school and home, while not determining how successful she will teach history, suggests that she has developed certain enduring, yet transposable qualities, dispositions and habits of thought and action that represent her readiness and ability to prepare and develop her role as a history teacher. (Bourdieu, 1977, 1988, 1990) As Helen suggested, “I think going into archives, researching, reading, looking, and knowing how to get into them, knowing how to write something that is a good piece of work, good history, at the end is all very helpful for being a history teacher.”

The importance of being trained in a specific discipline before feeling able to teach a subject carried over into her concern about just how successful she would be during her teaching internship when it came to teaching a weekly geography class (Shulman, 1987). Helen had taken geography successfully at A level, but choose not to study it at university because she disliked physical geography and very few universities offered courses focusing on human geography. At Leeds, however, she was eligible to choose geography as a second teaching method because of her A level. As she began to teach, Helen noted that in contrast to history, she found her performance as a geography teacher somewhat lacking; it was harder for her to explain geographical concepts than historical concepts. She lacked the structuring dispositions of a trained practicing



geographer that would have allowed her to be more successful in the role of geography teacher. As Helen pointed out,

I am teaching Geography. I am teaching plate tectonic volcanoes. It is very science based, very hard to comprehend and then explain. I find it terribly difficult explaining what is happening. I mean, when you are talking about things like convection currents and the mantle, how do you simplify that down to something that an 11-year-old can understand? And I don't have the ability in my training to do that – to pick examples to illustrate my point.

This had a great deal to do with her lack of previous experiences through which she could develop and embody a geographic eye that she could have revisited and brought forth in the development of her role as competent, knowledgeable teacher.

After deciding not to do a Ph.D. and making the decision to teach in high school, Jonny saw himself primarily as a historian who was going to be a history teacher. This had much to do with his own academic background. Like Helen, Jonny saw himself as a trained historian; he also saw himself as an academic who had the ability to study for a Ph.D. in either history or politics. Even though he was now within the PGCE program, to teach in a university setting was something that he still hoped to do. “To be honest, I think that is what I will end up doing, if the chance arises in the future.” Becoming a high school history teacher did not bar him from this goal, for as he noted, of one of his mentors at UEA, “This guy Roger Thompson, who became my next sort of big influence, was just the best academic I had ever known. He was absolutely superb. He worked you. He was old. He did not have his doctorate, he was Mr. Thompson. He taught at Eton and then became a top school historian in his field. He had ended up writing a book on American history and basically got into academics through this.” Throughout his academic career from 6<sup>th</sup> form on, Jonny aligned himself with history teachers who he considered to be brilliant teachers. This began with his observations of and interactions with his 6<sup>th</sup> form history teacher, who had a powerful influence on him. “He was an absolutely superb teacher. Really old fashioned, wore a cape, terrified kids, he ruled the classroom with a rod of iron. Shouted, smacked desks, but just a love of history. A really superb communicator, just brought it completely to life.” At university in both England and America Jonny continued to choose courses based on who taught them.

The academics that I really admired and respected at university were the ones who could teach, like this guy Roger Thompson and Richard Profit. There were also a couple of guys in America who were absolutely superb. There was this guy, David Johnson, an African history specialist. He was a Rasta from Jamaica, always talked Bob Marley and Cricket. And I will never forget this. He was talking about South Africa and he said. 'It is like in the words of Bob Marley.' And then he started singing "Redemption Song." He got to the chorus and he went like this (gestures) and he expected us all to join in the chorus. He was a brilliant teacher. I thought he was fantastic. He was just a natural performer. I think really good teachers like him and Bob Unwin perform you know. And he knows he is performing and he is brilliant at it. John Tarbert at school was the same. He wore a cape. It's an act. This guy David Johnson, he was a real showman. But he knew his subject superbly well, he loved his subject, he was a good communicator, and he was a good actor. And that is another thing about good teachers they have to love their subject. You can't go and teach history and just say 'this, this, and this happened.' You have to communicate your enthusiasm to the kids. That's how I got addicted to history.

For Jonny becoming a teacher of history originated from the same experiences that encouraged him to do a Ph.D. In both cases, Jonny saw himself as deeply influenced by a lineage of male academics and history teachers who were not only exceptionally knowledgeable in their specialized field but shared an ability to demonstrate their love of the material via their performances in front of a class. His choice of history over politics, a reversal of his decision for his Ph.D., was grounded in the realities of the English school system. For politics, like economics and sociology, are courses not required in schools. They are neither a core part of the National Curriculum nor provided as an option in many schools; rather, they are generally offered rather as areas to specialize in at A level. As a result, social science methods at Leeds University is not offered as a first method choice. Jonny had his decision made for him: his first method was history. He did not pick social science as his second method, though; instead, he went back to his first love: sport. "I figured that I could probably teach social science anyway based on my degree. I could have done it as a second method, but there is no real point in this country. So I picked games (PE) just because as a kid I always fancied being a games

teacher. I still play cricket and football and stuff and I just thought, 'Well a year of doing that and hopefully some in school, would not be a bad thing to have.'

While Helen's decision to teach was an isolated individual decision, that was questioned by her peers, the situation was very different for Jonny. The decision to become a teacher tied him into two very distinct "imagined communities" of teachers. The first, formed over time and space, was comprised of history teachers who had served as his role models and mentors. The second existed within the here and now, formed through networks of friends he had grown up with and gone to college with, who within a very recent period of time had all made the same decision as Jonny- to become teachers. "It's funny, because until 18 months ago, I did not know anyone in teaching. And then my mate Steve did his training last year at Leeds. Then his twin brother Graham is now training at Leeds and we all had effectively grown up together, went to university, we all came back sort of hung out together, done different things, and then one day we were all like, "I know we will be teachers." And my brother is also now going to do his PGCE at Durham."

### Conceptions of history

A key feature of Helen's and Jonny's vocabularies regarding motive and readiness to teach history as they began the PGCE course manifested itself through their representation of themselves as historians. Being successful at history from O level/GCSE at 16, specializing through A level and reading history at university, are seen by both as evidence that they consider themselves to be highly qualified to become history teachers. Their belief that they have developed the habits and skills of a specific community, is evidenced and objectified through the academic qualifications they gained as they moved through the formal stages of their apprenticeship. Such qualifications serve as what Bourdieu (1986) terms "certificate[s] of cultural competence which confers on [them] a conventional, constant, legally guaranteed value" (p. 248). As such a great deal of their conception of history is framed by the skills and abilities they have gained to do history as they moved within and through the formal disciplinary networks that constitute the discipline of history. As Jonny notes, knowing a great deal of content was not the specific focus of how he was taught history. "I 'm good at history. But I still don't know my Kings and Queens. Now my mum knows them but she was taught history

like that. I wasn't and that is not how it is really taught today." Knowing specific subject matter for the classroom was not a major concern, for it was something that they felt they could do quickly and easily based on the level of their training. As a result, Helen felt quite comfortable and qualified to teach history. Learning new content in order to teach was something that was not difficult to do because she was a historian. "There are lots of skills encompassed in history - analysis, criticism, writing - and the more you do it, the better you get at it. So by degree level, which supposedly is the highest level you can get, I can apply it even onto subjects or periods that I do not know anything about. I can apply my skills and teach it." Both Jonny and Helen see themselves as having a historical eye, through which they are able to identify, gather, and analyze facts and details that can then be used to as evidence within their papers. It is a skill developed and learned at school that will be "mobilized" as they begin to prepare to teach the prescribed content of history according to the National Curriculum. (Nespor, 1994).

#### Moving on up the formal stages of history at school

For both Helen and Jonny becoming a skilled historians was a process that required them to successfully negotiate the hierarchically structured stages of history as demarcated by the school curriculum. Each specific stage was marked by the courses they took at GCSE/O level, A level, and degree level. Whether they were eligible to move up to a new stage was determined by how they fared in the final exams at the end of each course. Moving through the stages in order to attain a greater level of ability in history was not without a degree of drudgery. As Jonny noted, "I know that I could not have got my love of history and I could not have done what I've done with history, and hopefully will do with history, if I hadn't been and gone through the motions and legwork of years seven, eight, and nine." As they passed through each stage, the focus and depth of the study increased, while the number of students studying history decreased. While both successfully followed the Schools Council History Project through to the age of sixteen, their differing reactions to various sections of the course begin to highlight differing perspectives as to what it means to know and learn history. For Helen, the section of the School Council Project that focused on local history struck a very personal chord with her. History was something she could see and feel:

Wakefield Girl's High School is on this Georgian square. And I remember going around the school looking at it because it is all symmetrical, but all the buildings are different. They built the shell and they put the rooms and floors in as you wanted them. And I remember doing that as a class, we went and looked at that, and there is this beautiful church in the center of the square and you can see where the railings used to go before they were taken out and melted down during the war. The teacher pointed these things out to us and you are like, "wow," you get that sort of recognition. The penny dropped, that this happened, and happened for a reason, and I am here looking at it, and it is still here and you wonder, "Why is it still here?" And it was the same thing when I was even younger. We went to this Tudor mansion just down the road at Clark Hall, and you go off and you put your little Tudor dress on. And you see the beautiful drawing room for guests and there is a scabby kitchen for the servants. And it is just a day to handle things. You know this house has seen a lot of history itself. And even today I bore my friends to death with walking around town, saying, "Oh look at that really old building, let's go and have a look at this. Look you can just see the original writing and you can tell what it is." So I bore them to death with practical hands-on history, even looking at the letter box type thing. But history is very integral; it is all around us everywhere. It is school buildings, where people live, and I think it becomes very personal and practical.

The same experience for Jonny, however, was far less enjoyable.

We did the local history thing and I did not particularly enjoy that. You know, going around town, looking at the medieval trade triangle and all that stuff. It never did anything for me, to be honest. I know it is necessary. I know it is the legwork that you have to do. But then I loved the American West at O level. I thought it was superb. It did not touch me personally but I never felt that it had to. I'm really into the broad picture and the questions, like when we looked at Bismarck's Foreign policy at A level - that was absolutely superb. I like the great questions and the great mans side of history. I do find the personalities and characters in history fascinating. I mean there was this guy with this plan and this incredible ability and some incredibly complex issues. I like the complex, big, broad question. I don't like the tiny minutiae.

Helen's conception of history and what she enjoys about studying history has much to do with the personal connections she can make with the past. History is something that she feels and sees all around her. There are themes/eras that she enjoys

and focuses on and others that she personally feels no connection to, which can be seen in her description of herself as "genderist and modern historian," her dislike of the industrial revolution, "God, it is so dull," and her subsequent decision to research and write a dissertation on the expansion of higher education with the foundation of the first female colleges at Cambridge.

Such a personal connection to history however carries less import for Jonny. Rather the studying and doing of history, while a personally enriching experience for him, is less practical in nature and much more tinged with an aesthetic and ornate air. As he notes:

I believe in history for history's sake... just for the sake of pub quizzes [laughs]. I don't beat the drum that we have to learn all our history, but you don't feel whole without it. It just adds depth; it makes you a more interesting and whole person. It feeds into a whole understanding. It is like when you adopt a kid who wants to go and find out where they came from, their natural parents. It is about wanting to know why.

Having an interest and enthusiasm for certain aspects of history becomes the motivating force for wanting to study history, but that in itself is not enough to carry someone through the stages/levels of history. As Helen notes, "History's beyond dates and facts. That is the lowest level. Anybody can learn dates and facts, but not everybody can be a historian. Implicit in being a historian is having the enjoyment and the interest and being able to develop the skills that are involved. It is like being a scientist - knowing the periodic table does not make you a chemist. It is how you apply what you know and your interest level that makes you do it."

This combination of motivation and ability became an issue for Jonny during his A Levels when he was questioned by his teachers as to why he was doing so well in his British history course but not in the European course. "You know, the teachers could not understand it. They said, 'You obviously have the skill. You can write well so what's the problem?' And the problem was, and it has always been a problem, if I am not interested in a subject then I just can't motivate myself to do it." In order to continue with the apprenticeship, Jonny had to stay the course, at a time when the very nature of the process of becoming a historian was itself changing. Just as it seemed that the depth and focus of the history courses increased as they moved on and through their A Level

courses, less time was given to teaching history through "guided participation," in which their teachers provided opportunities to practice the skills and habits involved in the doing of history. Instead, the approach to the teaching and learning of history shifted to one of "participatory appropriation," whereby Helen and Jonny were pushed to begin to take on and successfully perform more of the role of historian (Rogoff, 1990, 1993). For Helen, this actual shift came with her move to Cambridge University, where it was much more of a shock to the system than it was for Jonny, who found himself refreshed and motivated to perform as a historian at UEA. While Jonny found himself enjoying the freedom to write long essays and debate in seminars, Helen was forced into a transition she was not quite ready for.

At A level it was pretty much teacher directed. It had to be because we had to get through the syllabus. But then you get to degree level and it is like 'there is the book list, there is the question, off you go!' And it is daunting going from teacher directed, with quite a bit of research and writing where the teacher will help you, to being cut adrift at a degree level with the comments, "You should know how to do this by now." So for the first term, and even the first year you are floundering all the way. But by the final year I did a dissertation. To get to that level you have to go through these trials and tribulations I suppose.

#### Becoming a historian. Learning the rules to play the game

From the GCSE/O level onwards, showing oneself to be a good historian had a great deal to do with how well one could write essays and analyze and use evidence in course work, as well as the final exam. As Helen notes, "This is an integral part of history at any level. I did written course work for my GCSE's, I did course work and research for my A level, and I have done it for my degree. So at every level of formal history I have done it. You just can't avoid it, because history is that kind of subject."

For both Helen and Jonny, the skills of working with evidence and crafting arguments culminated at university in writing numerous course papers, final written exams, and a dissertation. Success in each of these stages was determined by how quickly they could master the required formula for writing a good essay. History became a wordy language game that required them to read specific texts in order to begin the crafting and creating of arguments for papers and seminar debates. Doing history from A

Level onwards was not about finding the correct answer but crafting and playing with different positions and arguments. As Helen contends,

With history, there aren't any right or wrongs a lot of the time. It is not just black and white, right or wrong. There was a lot of visual evidence, lots of OHP's (overhead projections) and propaganda and things like that. My European history course at A Level was on the dictatorship of Europe, Mussolini to Stalin. I remember the first essay I ever did for it. It was about the Treaty of Versailles and he split us [the class] half and half. Half of us had to write it with sympathy for the allies and half of us had to write it with sympathy for the Germans and he marked it and we had a class discussion. I was on the German side and it was really interesting to try and write something. It was these sorts of techniques that I picked up.

For Jonny, doing history at UAE also meant playing with different arguments as he wrote papers "out of all the chaos of the evidence collected." He was expected to take on the role of historian. Success was measured by how well he, like any other historian, could play the game; from the beginning, he achieved it.

I really got into the New Deal in a big way at UAE. I'm quite a big fan of FDR. I had this long essay to write in my first year, a 5000 word essay. The biggest thing I had ever written by a mile. I still remember the title: 'The New Deal was an economic failure but a political success. Discuss.' And there was this guy on the same course and for two days I would run down the corridor to him saying, "I've got this new idea- it was a political failure but an economic success." I kept changing my mind. You know I was really sort of taking on the question and not going for a straight yes or no answer. I remember arguing that it was a short term political success for FDR and long term neither a success or failure, but sort of revolutionary while it was a short term economic failure and long term economic success. I used a lot of historians and discussed some historiography as well as what different writers were saying and all the different arguments they made. And I got a first for it. That summer I started getting into Marxist ideas and history and when I came back, I had this course on Jacksonian democracy which was taught by a Marxist historian. And I wrote one essay with a Marxist slant for him and then I became very conscious - I can't believe I did this - I became very conscious that I was toeing the line. And then, deliberately, in my second essay I took completely the opposite view just for the sheer hell of it. I did well in the paper but he wrote on it "for all intents and purposes, I don't agree with a single word you have written, but you have argued it well." So in tutorial I said to



him. "You know, I don't believe a single word I wrote either." But he did not have a sense of humor so he just sort of said "Oh. Yes."

Jonny found the formula for writing and debating good history papers, but Helen did not. This, she contends, was not because she did not have the formula she needed to be a good historian, but because she had the wrong formula for the majority of her male tutors at Cambridge. The formula at Cambridge was very different from the one she had been accustomed to during her A levels. At Cambridge, she felt that to be deemed a successful historian, one had to succumb to a formula that was patterned along antiquated gendered lines.

There is a lot of controversy at the moment at Cambridge that men are taught to write one line history - this is my idea, this is what I think - with very little evidence or very one sided evidence at the most. That is how men are taught. But women, on the other hand, write, "Well this could have happened because of so, and so, and so, and so, but also this could have happened because of this, this, and this." Very different style. The female supervisors [tutors] I had seemed much more appreciative of that and the male supervisors, my whole entire degree time, hated how I wrote. In the Oxbridge system of supervision there were two of us and the supervisor. One of us would have to read our essay out and then the other would go through picking on points raised and asking more in depth questions. With my first supervisor, my colleagues' papers-he was male- were always fantastic and mine were always crap and it was very disheartening being permanently told that what I was writing was rubbish. Just because there was too much waffle. But it was not waffle; it was evidence. And then I would give my essay to somebody else to look at and they would say, "What is wrong with this? Why has he just picked on this sort of style?" Mine and my colleague's essays often contained the same information and the same ideas but he was given much more credit for it than I did... The only essay he actually liked of mine was the one on Thatcher, where I stuck my neck out on the block and went for it. The question was basically saying she was a bad PM and basically she was a man in a skirt. This was the whole gist of the argument, so I argued that she had to be pushy because she was in a male environment and she provided a role model for other women. This was the only essay that he appreciated for anything. I just decided this was the final essay that I was doing for him so I just went and tried the tactic of writing down the line and this tactic worked. But I don't like this sort of history. I think it is very sort of dogmatic. But that is how they want it.

In trying to develop a fuller understanding of Helen's and Jonny's conceptions of history, it becomes clear that what it means to know and learn history is framed against a backdrop of their formal apprenticeship with the school system. For both of them, history is not something that everyone has the ability or motivation to do. While content knowledge is important within the study of history, to be deemed successful at history, one needs to develop the skills and the process to analyze sources and use evidence to present and write about the past. History is very much an activity that one does. To do it well, one needs to be initially guided and taught the fundamentals before moving forward to practice the doing of history.

#### Choosing to do history. Being chosen to do history

The trajectory of Helen and Jonny's apprenticeship to become historians appears to have evolved as they demonstrated their abilities within the history classroom from a very young age. At fourteen and sixteen, they had to pick their 'options,' or courses they were to take for the next two years. At each stage, their choice of disciplines narrowed, as did the actual period of history studied. At A level, for example, the syllabi focused on very specific eras of European and British history.

By the time they entered university, there was very little doubt what they would major in. They did, however, have the choice of what period of history in which to specialize. At Cambridge, Helen chose to focus her studies on modern British history, while at the UEA, Jonny chose to read American history and politics. As Jonny notes, it seemed that the path toward choosing to specialize in history was an ongoing process that seemed "self-selecting." Picking the option of history for O Levels was not a difficult choice for him.

It was things that I liked. You obviously had your compulsory subjects like maths, English, one science, and French, but the others you could choose. And basically there were certain things I did not want to do, like geography, because I could not get my head around it, and I was just absolutely woeful at everything scientific. I took the minimum options there because I was totally unscientific. But history and German, I was good at them. I was just more ready.

This feeling of self-selecting subjects in which one had an aptitude was shared by Helen. While history was a valid choice that had evolved over time for her, she notes

that an it was not necessarily a discipline that should be taken by everyone: "I think there has got to be diversity and interest. If we were all interested in history it would be really, really dull, and you know, I am really bored in sciences."

It is important to note that for both participants, their choices and decisions to study and practice history were tied to how successful they were in passing the exams and being viewed by their teachers as ones to be encouraged to continue their apprenticeship. For Jonny, it was Mr. Tarbert, his 6<sup>th</sup> form European history teacher, who saw and encouraged Jonny's potential to continue the apprenticeship.

He got on really well with you if you were trying your best at all times with your work and with people who were good at history like me and my brother. And when I went into 6<sup>th</sup> form, I got in his form group. He was my main contact in school. And I got on really well with him as a person as well. We shared a similar sense of humour, and I knew I was good at history and he knew I was good at history. And Tarbert was keen on students going to Oxford and Cambridge and that year I was the one who he wanted to go to Oxbridge. And so there was pressure there. I was doing extra subjects and special papers and getting ready for the Oxbridge Exam. My brother had been expected to do it; he had been the history golden boy in his year. He had backed out of it, and Tarbert went absolutely up the wall and would not speak to him for about two months. I was then faced with the same dilemma because I wanted to go and do American history and politics and not do modern history. I remember telling him. I was absolutely panicking and I went up to him, told him, and he said. "That's fine, I know what you want to do and that is fine."

Helen's decision to leave Wakefield Girls School and study A Levels at a 6<sup>th</sup> form college was motivated by a concern that if she did not move schools, her options for university would be limited by the fact that she was constantly compared to her elder brother.

I would never have gone to Cambridge if I had stayed at the girl's school. I was not regarded as good enough. My brother is at the boy's school and he is very, very clever, and I was constantly compared to him even though he was at the boy's school. It was always, "Helen you are crap compared to him. You are never going to be as good as your brother." I would have never gone to Cambridge if I had been there. I was not the right caliber. They just did not think I could.

At each new stage of the formal apprenticeship, both Jonny and Helen had to prove their ‘worthiness’ and motivation to continue. A great deal of their understanding of what it means for them to see themselves as historians, and to know history, however, goes beyond the boundaries of the classrooms in which they have served their apprenticeships. What soon becomes apparent in listening to Jonny and Helen, is that while they frame a great deal of their understanding of history against the backdrop of their formal schooling, their conceptions of what it means to know, learn, and teach history are the products of a multitude of accumulated interactions and activities contextualized within and through time and space (Newman, 1991a, b; Rosaldo, 1989). For Helen, knowing and learning history is a process of personal immersion, of a sense of relevance in identifying and tying the past to her sense of self. This can be seen through her ongoing interest in local history and surrounding museums that she visited with her family and continues to frequent.

My dad is quite interested in history. And we often have quite interesting discussions. I live in quite an interesting area of Wakefield. It has a good history behind it. Wakefield is a very small city, and there are a lot of very expensive Georgian houses. It developed as a merchant town. The history is still there, it is all around me, and I see that all the time. I have lived in Wakefield since I was 4, about 17 years, so it is a long time. I am an active historian; I spend my weekends visiting exhibits and museums. I went to the Anne Frank Exhibit a couple of weeks ago, and I often just pop into Wakefield Museum just because it’s open. If we go anywhere to do with history I will bore anyone telling them about it. At Christmas I went on holiday to Egypt, and I got immersed in Egyptology, which until then had never interested me. I was like, “Look at this, Dad,” and I came back and bored him with my pictures. An incredibly different type of history.

Her dissertation at Cambridge was not only a very personal and practical application of her skills as an historian but was also framed by her feminist principles, which grew out of and were encouraged by experiences within her own family as her mother went back to school.

I have always been encouraged to do what I wanted and how I wanted. And my dad has been sort of completely altered from

expecting my mum to cook, and clean, and iron, and wash. He now has to do those things. My brother was made to stand and iron, and this is where the whole gender thing comes from really. I have a great deal of admiration for women who have broken the mould. To some extent, in modern times we are still trying; there is still a lot of inequality. My dissertation was on the expansion of the higher education in Cambridge with the foundation of the female colleges. It is about women who were just ordinary everyday women, which is what makes them extraordinary. They are not anybody special or influential, but they helped create a whole tide of change. And you think, "Well, what did the women think? Did they stick two fingers up at the men? Did they just not care?" It is really original and I'm very proud of it. The dissertation is about my past, and to me that is a very personal thing. I am very interested in why I am where I am, and why I have been allowed to do what I have realized. Women at Cambridge is a very new phenomena. Kings did not let women in until 1974. The attitudes of that all-male environment still persist. And repercussions are still there. That to me is very personal. It is a very personal appreciation of my past, just like having an appreciation of Britain is because of what happened in the past.

As mentioned previously, however, Jonny does not require in essence a sense of personal connectivity to know and learn history. His conception of history focuses more on the exercise of being able to appreciate, craft, and perform interesting, persuasive, and critical arguments. "I like the idea that history does not have to be too applied. I think a lot of people try to apply history to modern day society and give history too much of a practical application. I like the idea that history is about interpretation. You have facts, but the facts are there to be interpreted and used by you." It is a conception of history that was not only mutually supported and supplemented through his formal school apprenticeship, but was tightly woven into his experiences at home and through his own personal textual mediation of a range of media from newspaper to the news and films. This complex network of relations and activity formations over time and space shaped and reinforced persistent habits and dispositions of speaking and acting that allowed Jonny to perform as an able student and historian. The very structure of his family home, with its study and rooms lined with rows of books, served as a space to support the activity of learning and knowing history. "You should see my bedroom - history and politics books everywhere. A lot of these in the living room and the study are my mum's from her university days when she did history. It has been this way since I can

remember.” It was within such a space that events such as the elections, the Falklands war, and the miners’ strike were read about, watched on the television, and discussed.

We were a very book-oriented and politics-oriented family. I can remember the 1979 election quite clearly. I was eight years old. Not many eight year olds can do that. And at the 1983 election, when I was twelve, I cried myself to sleep that night because Labour had lost. It was that kind of background; things like that mattered. We always talked about issues together as a family. We used to watch the news together and talk together a lot. And possibly because there was only one parent, we were sort of companions to my mum in the same way she was to us. So I think we were fairly adult in that sort of way. We were still quite young but we really spent time considering the questions and considering important issues or debates. Like the Falkland war in 1982. I was young, but there was so much patriotic bullshit around it. It was offensive. And I remember my mum was a big influence. She never bought into the whole thing; she saw what it was - a put up job to win an election. No one knew where it was! For me there was kind of a dual thing going on. On the one hand you had this great excitement, you were a ten year-old kid, it was a war you were fighting and winning. On the other hand, there was a feeling, a sense, that something was up, that it was not all that it seemed. Again, I was too young to understand why, but sort of coming from my mum, there was an idea that everything was not what it seemed. Even at that age, I was very anti-Conservative, and as a result I also remember being deeply affected by the miners strike. I was thirteen, a bit more politically conscious, and very pro-miners. The thing that really got me was the day that they came back after it was all over and they way they marched into the South Yorkshire coalfields and the South Wales coalfields and they went back en masse on the same day. I’ll never forget the pictures with those images of the banners of the bands and the miners marching behind with the communities out supporting them. I remember sitting there with tears in my eyes. It was incredible, a "Well, yes, you have beaten us, but you will never crush our spirit" sort of statement. And it still applies now. That is why when people talk about the spirit of Thatcherism and her triumph, to me it never did.

Interpreting and discussing such events formed a very important aspect of who Jonny was and how he wanted to be seen by others. He became actively involved in the Labour movement, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, and the anti-Apartheid movement. “Me and my brother got more and more Bolshy as time went on. We were sort of trying to outdo each other with what we were into, and in sixth form I became

quite the little red in school.” They were activities that Jonny loved; developing arguments and interpreting major events and stories in certain ways were something that he had done all his life. Such a disposition served him well during his formal apprenticeship for history and politics at 6<sup>th</sup> form. University was an arena in which he could perform, show off his skills, and look for the

chance to postulate and be opinionated ... At UAE, we had three hour seminars, which was a superb form of teaching that really appealed to me. Because you did your reading, you went in and you did your presentation for an hour, and then you had two hours of really solid discussion. You could get to the bottom of things. There was never a sense when you were going down a particular train of thought that you were constrained by time, and for a bullshit artist like me, it was heaven. And Roger Thompson in his seminars just loved it if you cracked or made a decent historical reference – like, for example, about Alexander Hamilton. One time we had a debate about who was more important, Hamilton or Jefferson, and I was on Jefferson’s side. And because Hamilton was born out of wedlock, you see, I just kept referring to him as “that bastard,” which Roger absolutely loved. So you were playing to the audience.

#### From apprentice to teacher

Learning history and knowing history for both Jonny and Helen was very much a social practice; it was a skill and ability to be developed, practiced, and performed. While Jonny and Helen may have enjoyed and studied history for relatively different reasons, for both of them the discipline of history and the activity of being an historian is *something that one does*. Becoming a teacher of history was a transition. No longer were they apprentices or audience members, it was now time to learn how to perform as history teachers, to take on their own apprentices chosen from the audience and teach them the tools and language of their trade. The goal of history teaching for both of them was, as Helen put it, “To pass on what I know. Maybe this is arrogant and naïve, but I would like to pass on some of what I know, and if I could just enthuse one person like I have been enthused in my career, then it makes it worthwhile. If somebody comes out feeling like I do and says, ‘Miss, that lesson is really good, I really enjoyed that history lesson’ then that is worthwhile. That is my job done.” Encouraging the student audience to become excited about history was very important for Helen. Such a goal was set in light of her own experiences at Cambridge, where she felt that her specific interests as a

genderist were frowned on. "I think history needs all the help it can get. So I think that excitement and interest has to be there. And I also think if they aren't interested and they aren't excited then they won't make good historians." Engaging students in debates on issues of controversy and issues in which they have a particular interest formed an important feature of her image of self as teacher.

I suppose being a feminist, I have a natural interest in gender issues, which throughout my time at university I developed probably to my detriment. But I think that students should be able to learn about what it is they are interested in. People should not be restrained. So I need to go to a school where I can develop this. And I think as a history teacher I should encourage people's own ideas and thought, and I don't think they should be restricted by what I consider to be history. I think it is good if they say sometimes, "But I don't agree with that." To encourage excitement and interest is important. And if a pupil has a certain interest or excitement then they should be encouraged to take that up. I don't know whether you can do that in a class but you can certainly point them in the right direction if that is what they want. This is easier as the teaching of history gets more advanced and you move higher up the scale, because the higher you go the more independent you become.

It is interesting to note that even from this early stage, Helen shows an awareness that how she will teach history is grounded within the context of her school and the ability of the students she will teach. Based on her own experiences as a student, who from the age of fourteen began to make choices about what she wanted to study, there is a recognition that the studying of history is not something everybody is willing or able to do. She realizes that her main goal as a history teacher, to encourage and build on students' interests, may be difficult to achieve with younger students, especially those who are required to take history prior to choosing history as an option. Teaching history at this level, she felt, would be a very different role than teaching history to those who have either demonstrated an interest or ability in history and have chosen history as an option for their GCSEs.

At this stage you have to be assertive as a teacher to be able to get your ideas across and to get across to thirty children what you want them to do. I think some of them will be historians, but I can't encourage them all to be. Some of them a) won't have the ability, b) don't have the interest. And I would rather encourage those who do



rather than those who don't. If you don't enjoy it then what is the point. You just sit there through your GCSE's thinking 'Why the hell am I here?' At Key Stage 3 year 9 they will drop it anyway. Those who choose it see the relevancy, they make it relevant, they make it have a purpose. They begin to get some idea of how it affects our society today. And beyond that, it means continuing to teach both basic literary skill and historical skills. And you can encourage them to do different things with different skills."

Helen's initial idealized goal of teaching history to apprentice students who wanted to become historians was shared by Jonny, who longed to perform in front of a class the way he remembered and re-presented his favourite history teachers as doing. "In terms of teaching history, I am realistic, but I would love to think I'd be like Robin Williams in Dead Poets Society- enthusing them with a love. But I know that is a going to be a different kind of thing. It is not going to be that academic great classrooms and great issues type of thing." His idealized goals, he notes, had been tempered by his experiences as a special needs assistant the previous year. While this time had been somewhat "soul destroying," he felt it had prepared him for the real world of schooling by allowing him to rehearse for his future role as a history teacher in front of a less than welcoming audience. Carl Manor provided Jonny with the opportunity to "develop a very thick skin, which you had to do if you were every going to get used to the kids having paddies [shouting matches] with you and treating you with disrespect because they know you are an SNA and not a proper teacher. So I don't expect teaching practice to be as hard in terms of getting respect from the kids and controlling the class as it was all last year."

Based on his experiences at Carl Manor, being successful at teaching history was grounded in how well he could manage the classroom rather than the different ability levels of the students within. "Me as a history teacher? Well, first you have got to have discipline. I think a young teacher or student teacher has to be a disciplinarian. I am quite concerned with that because otherwise it will be chaos." It was only from that point that he felt he would be able to perform and encourage his students to not only develop an interest in history but also develop and apply the skills of history.

So one of the things I would love to be able to do, and I think it is being realistic, is to get them to question accepted truths. To get

them to say, 'Is that right?' Thought, reflection, and debate. That is what I would love to do on a regular basis. Get them to think about something, get them to consider something, really reflect on it and think about it, and question or debate them within the class. That is basically what I would love to be able to do.

For both Helen and Jonny, their chance to teach history in the way they imagined history should and could be taught would come as they began their PGCE in late September 1997. Within the first week of the program Jonny and Helen were assigned to one of the School of Education's partner schools where they would spend the year. Both schools were in the Wakefield area, but that was the only initial comparison they could make.

Helen was very pleased with her assignment. "Oh, it's a very good school. Its reputation precedes it. It has a peculiar catchment area. There is a large council estate close by, and then we have some travelers, but the majority of the kids come from Sandal, which is very nice, so there is a bit of a mix. It has very good results. It is second in the league table in Wakefield." Jonny, however, was less excited. He had heard of his school, which was on the other side of Wakefield from where he lived. When he went to look at the school, he was even less thrilled with where he would practice teaching history:

It is at the far end of West Yorkshire. Old mining community, fairly tough school. The thing was that I had in my mind, because of working at Carl Manor last year, that nowhere that they send me is going to be that bad. I know every school has its own set of problems, but I hoped they would send me to Harrogate or somewhere like that, and then I would be well in for the year. But Knottingley High School. I came to look at it when I found out I was going to be here. It was the worst night - it was raining. So I came along the main roads then drove around and you go through this fairly desolate looking council estate. I came around the corner, and the school looked really scruffy, and I just thought "Oh my God. What is this going to be like?"

Constructing oneself as a history teacher in America

"Studies serve for delight, for ornament, and for ability."  
Francis Bacon

For Mike and Amanda, the idea of becoming a history teacher developed at different stages of their academic careers. While Mike had considered becoming a social studies/history teacher since his final year of high school, it was a more recent decision for Amanda, one that she began to contemplate only after she had graduated with her combined B.A. in history and political science.

From history student to prospective history teacher

It was during the 11<sup>th</sup> grade that Mike first considered "teaching and going into social studies." This, he notes, was the result of the two history classes he was taking. "I was taking two courses at the same time in the same thing. And I would almost say that the 20<sup>th</sup> century American History class was almost a support class for AP (Advanced Placement) history. It was the first year that I really had fun learning. I always enjoyed school, but it was actually fun to go class. It was something I looked forward to." These classes not only broke with the ritualistic way Mike had been taught history as he moved through secondary school, but encouraged a further interest in history and teaching. Until 11<sup>th</sup> grade,

All the history classes I had had were straight lecture. And Mr. B.'s class (AP History) I don't want to say they weren't lecture because they were, but the way he did it was different. He would sit there and he would kind of recline in his chair and tell stories. And basically he was a storyteller and it helped us get through. I really enjoyed his class and the way he taught it. You had to prepare yourself for the exam; he wasn't going to tell you what to do. He would show you how to do it, and he would give you samples, though he was a hard grader. But it was very easy to take notes in his class because he was a storyteller. So you would write down the notes and he would kind of write the important terms on the board so you would be ready for the quizzes on Friday. And when it came to writing down or explaining to yourself what it was, you just remembered the story, and you knew what it was about, and I thought, "This is not such a bad job at all."

AP History also re-introduced Mike to the types of projects he remembered enjoying in elementary social studies classes. “The projects I always enjoyed from when I was a little kid. And now we had a project and it was identifying quotes in history. And you would have to go and find out who said them, what year he said it, and what it was in reference to, and then any interesting fact that you could find out about it. And he had us go off to the library and look it up and type it out.” The projects and research also formed a major part of his elective history course, which was made up predominately of those taking the AP History class, though the focus and pressure on weekly tests and passing the final exam was not as evident.

Mrs. Marks never got after us. In fact, when I see her when I sub, she always tells me that was one of the best classes she had because it was fun to teach. It was fun to be a part of. We did all the learning and we got our work done. Also, the second week we were in it one of the major TV affiliates had done this story about how American textbooks were incompetent. And the book they picked for history was the book we had. So Mrs. Marks was like, "Just use it as an outside reference we are not going to use it." And so she taught the class by decade and whenever we got to a decade there was a film strip that we would watch and then we would spend 4-5 week on a decade. And that class I liked because all the American history classes I have ever had they got to World War II if you are lucky and that's it. It is over but this class started around 1900 and we got past World War II no problem. We got into Vietnam and I had never learned anything about Vietnam before.

For Mike it was the time spent on each decade and the type of work that was expected that made this course so different from the history lessons in the past. “She made us go out and do things like projects. We had to do projects on the 50’s and 60’s and we had like ten different topics to pick from and then we could present the work anyway we liked. It was a kind of fun project and it was that year that I started thinking about teaching.” At this stage, the decision over what subject to teach was not a difficult one to make. “I knew I was always interested in history and political science. I think it was because I was good at them. I mean I’ve always got decent grades in them and I always thought it was more interesting than the other things.” He credits a great deal of his ability to gain good grades in social studies to his elementary years spent in a private Catholic school. While “social studies was mostly textbook reading and worksheets, we

were also taught how to write. I remember having to diagram sentences for homework all the time. I knew how to write. I knew how to take notes. So in 9<sup>th</sup> grade when I got to Garfield I would say that 30% of it was pretty much a waste of time.”

In moving from a private elementary Catholic school to the local high school, Mike had to adjust to the increased size and makeup of the school body. “I came from an 8<sup>th</sup> grade class of 46 total and then I get to Garfield, which has an enrollment of over 2,800 students from every nationality and socioeconomic background you could imagine.” He also had to adjust to the amount of work that was required of him. “The attitude changed when I went from private to public. At Garfield, the teachers had four or five times the number of students than the teachers at my old school and they didn’t have time to check your work, call parents and that type of stuff. You were pretty much on your own.” Because of the intensive workload up through 8<sup>th</sup> grade, Mike found the majority of high school relatively easy. “For the most part I was a decent student all the way through. I think the lowest grades I ever got were C’s and they were in math.”

A career in teaching was only one option for Mike. His primary goal was to join the Navy, and enter the Naval Academy at Annapolis and major in history. For Mike, history/social studies was not only a subject he enjoyed and was good at; it also tied in with his extracurricular activities. Throughout high school, he participated in the Model United Nations club in local and national competitions. His grades, as well as his extracurricular activities, which included playing on the football team, attending Boy’s State, and attaining the rank of Eagle Scout, led him to believe that he had a very good chance of acceptance to the Naval Academy.

I don’t know what it was about wanting to be in the Navy. None of my family had a military background, but I thought it would be a nice job. I went up to the school and it was awesome; all the people I talked to were great. And then I noticed what the Naval Academy’s curriculum was. You had the option of either a major in Engineering or minor in Engineering. I could major in history like I wanted to do but I had to have a minor in mechanical or civil engineering. And not being mechanically minded, I didn’t want to do that. Then I thought about it and asked myself “Why do I want to be in the military? I mean, get ordered around, be told what to do – forget it.” And so I started to look at other places.

Virginia Tech was suggested by his AP history teacher, who had graduated from there with a history degree. "I came down in my senior year and fell in love with the campus, and my mother did too." Once Mike had made the decision to major in history at Virginia Tech, he considered himself to be locked into a path toward becoming a history/social studies teacher. "I decided that I really enjoy this stuff. If I major in history, the first outlook I had was the only thing you can do with a history major is probably teach anyway. So I knew I wanted to major in history and I started looking at teaching as one of the only roads to go." As a history major, Mike could not see himself going into any other career than teaching.

At that time the history majors that I was with, with the exception of a couple of people, most of them didn't want to teach. But I don't know what they were going to do with a history degree. I looked around but I felt history was something that I wanted to be associated with after college. The history majors that I know that graduated from here and got jobs are insurance salesmen. That's not using your degree. So I figured, being a teacher would use my degree, and on top of that I found after my sophomore year working as a director for a summer program that my church runs that I enjoyed working with the high school age kids. So that semester I went over to meet with Dr. B (the program advisor for social studies education).

Amanda met with the social studies advisor to discuss the possibility of teaching came after she graduated with her B.A. in history and political science. It was a decision her parents did not expect, and it did not fit with their goal for her to go into law or business.

My Dad was surprised. He really never expected me to go on and become a teacher. He was really surprised that I was thinking about it. I guess he always imagined me wanting to do something, well, as he said, "more ambitious." Not that he doesn't consider it ambitious, but more prestigious. So he was surprised, but I think he was pleasantly surprised. He did say, "You know teaching is more difficult than it used to be?" He had been in the field for 35 years and he said, "A lot has changed, and its more difficult than it used to be." He feels that it is not as much fun to teach as it used to be, although he doesn't have any regrets about his career. He says, "Administrators don't back teachers' ways to do it and just the frustration of all the crap." He said it was not as enjoyable as it was the first 20 years he taught compared to the last 10-15 years. "But if

you are dedicated, and it is really something you want to do you can still enjoy it." So then I went to meet Dr. B.

Another key factor that played into her family's reaction was that Amanda was an exceptional student, who seemed headed for a career that would eclipse both her mother's position as a nursing administrator and her father's position as a teacher. Nicknamed "brain child" in middle school, Amanda and her parents decided that she should go to a private college preparatory school located in their community just outside of New York City. Middle school, as Amanda notes, "was a frustrating age. I just could not wait for it to be over. I could not wait to get to high school. I was at an awkward stage, and I don't think, boys thought I was pretty or anything, so I was just kind of a nerd." Going to the Harvey School would provide her with a fresh start, and it was not unusual for students to move from her middle school to the private school. While the Harvey school generally served as a traditional college prep school to a relatively elite upper class group within the community, "what happened at the public school was that you had a lot of, working class people or kids who weren't traditionally going to college. And by 8<sup>th</sup> grade it was typical for a lot of brighter students or more ambitious students to leave for private school. So it was a trend. So me and maybe 25 of my peers went to private school."

The move to private school brought Amanda into a school system designed to place their clientele on a college-bound path and in doing so open the way to well-paid careers. The school offered more than she could have received if she had stayed within the public school setting. "They offered a lot of Honors and AP courses, which my parents thought were important, and my parents thought the curriculum wouldn't have been challenging enough if I had stayed. They [the local high school] did not have a big enough music or art program, which was the kind of stuff I was interested in. I liked the individual attention, and everybody was there because everybody wanted to go to college."

Amanda successfully completed five Advanced Placement classes in American and European History, English, Calculus, and Biology, which provided her, in conjunction with a series of art classes, eighteen semester hours that she could transfer into college. When Amanda left for Virginia Tech, a university that was, even with out-of-state tuition, "\$10,000 cheaper than the other two schools," her major was undecided.

I don't think when I graduated high school I really even thought about teaching. I really did not know what I wanted to do. When I graduated I had these ideas of having a big career, making lots of money and those sort of meaningless things. I knew I liked a lot of different areas and subjects. I liked history, art, politics, I had four hours of art when I graduated high school and I started to take art as a minor at Tech. But I could not imagine doing art as a career. Most artists are starving artists and so it just did not seem practical to me. Math was also one of my good subjects, and my college advisor encouraged me to maybe go into business, but that did not interest me as much as maybe history or science or art history. Math just was not an area in which I could really express myself. I wanted to be able to write and do a lot of reading.

Because she had brought in so many transfer credits due to her AP courses, she felt she had time to take courses she thought she would enjoy. Eventually, she accumulated a preponderance of history, political science, and international relations classes; within 3 years Amanda had gained enough credit hours in these classes for a double major in history and politics. As a result, her senior year was spent "goofing around taking electives. It became kind of a joke. I really did not need to be there. I could have graduated the year before." Although finishing her degree quickly, the courses she took were neither well-planned nor well-designed to set her on a specific career path. Rather, they merely congealed to form a large enough mass of credit hours to warrant a degree, while at the same time keeping open possible pathways toward law school or work in government.

I was thinking about law school just because I had a lot of people tell me that might be something I would be interested in. I also thought about working for the government, the State Department or something. I don't know. My mind was open; I didn't have a clear idea to where I was going. I just knew what I liked to do and what I liked to study. That kind of guided my choices of classes and my eventual degrees in college. When I finally graduated, I was really kind of in a state of confusion because I didn't know what I was going to do.

After spending the summer and next fall in Blacksburg Amanda began to consider the possibility of becoming a teacher. This idea found its roots in her exploration of what avenues she did not want to pursue as a career and the identification of what she actually enjoyed doing and hoped to continue. It was a process mediated by the experiences of



her father as a teacher and different friends who had gone on to law school or moved into the teacher preparation program.

I really did not feel that there were a whole lot of things out there that were really tailored for me. I had decided to put the law school idea aside because my friends in law school told me how boring it was and how tedious. I couldn't see myself spending three years in school in a library studying. I started to think, "Does the world really need another lawyer?" I want to have a meaningful career. I want to do something that is at least going to help other people or have a positive impact on people. And that was a big thing, the idea of personal satisfaction. Because I am not going to do something I don't like. So I started thinking about what I really like to do. And I knew I liked history. I enjoyed it in college, and I thought, "Well, I could continue to do this stuff." And it suddenly dawned on me that teaching would be a great way to integrate that. I knew my dad enjoyed teaching, and I thought, "This is a real possibility."

#### Exploring vocabularies of motive and commitment. Why teach?

Neither Mike's or Amanda's motivation and commitment to teach is purely framed against the backdrop of their degree. While attaining this "certificate of competence" in a discipline is a prerequisite to enter the teaching program, their knowledge and ability within the subject was not represented, as it was with Jonny and Helen, as a key feature upon which their motives and ability to teach history was founded. For all participants, an enjoyment of the study of history and a sense of wanting to be formally affiliated with history was very important as they explored their career options. However, what becomes noticeable for Mike and Amanda is that it is the notion of teaching rather than the teaching of history that percolates through their narratives as they explore the origins of wanting to become a teacher. As can be seen above, Amanda was deeply influenced in her career choice by what she thought she would enjoy doing. While it is widely recognized that individuals change occupations a number of times during their working lives (Bolles, 1994), Amanda seemed determined to find a lifelong career. In assessing her choices after graduation, a major factor was that she wanted a career that she considered, in her own words, "noble. One of the big things is that I feel really kind of discouraged by the values we place on people, about what is important in life. And in my whole life, I guess because I was a good student, people were trying to push me into careers where there is big money." To be a teacher was a very satisfying

and “definitely noble” career. “I love the idea of studying different cultures and different people and I feel that is a positive aspect that I can bring into the classroom. I just think it is something exciting for me. I love to study, I love to talk about it, so I think I can have a lot of fun teaching. I think I can do more than just lecture or pages out of a textbook.”

The concept of being in front of an audience as a feature of teaching others was in and of itself not new to Amanda. College and working in summer camps offered her experiences through which she could demonstrate her willingness and ability to teach. Teaching was not necessarily something confined to a school classroom and done by teachers; she herself had had a great deal of experience with “the actual act of teaching. Though not necessarily in social studies.” As she notes, “It probably started a long time ago just because I have always been the type of person who likes the sharing of information or ideas or, in some cases, just telling or explaining to people.” Teaching friends to juggle in 5th grade, teaching calligraphy, drawing, watercolor and acrylic paint at a ‘multi-arts’ camps in the summers, serving as a residential advisor within her dorm and as membership chair of her sorority provided her with a number of opportunities to be a teacher. She was told she was good at.

I kind of realized I could speak well in front of people and that it did come naturally. In my senior year I was on the Homecoming Court and I got to go around and talk to organizations of almost a hundred people. I did this for two weeks. By the end of it, it just came so naturally I didn’t have cards or anything. I would just get there and give a speech. And a lot of people came up to me and they were like, “God, you are such a good public speaker. I wish I had that skill.” And I did not even realize it, you know? It was just something I can do well.

In Mike's case, teaching at his church’s summer camp and then substitute teaching at his high school during breaks from Virginia Tech were formative experiences that motivated him to make the decision to become a history/social studies teacher. While he did feel that the major he had chosen had placed him on a path to teaching, the decision to teach was not set in stone until midway through his degree.

I was not sure if I would like it. But I guess I made the decision that I really did want to teach the summer after my sophomore year. That was when I was a summer program director for a program my church runs. It was called the summer friendship program. And I

had a ball. It was stressful but it's fun being with the kids and teaching them. We had to come up with activities and write them down. It was almost like a lesson plan. And that was when I pretty much decided I wanted to be a teacher. Running that program pretty much grasped me into teaching wholeheartedly.

Both Mike and Amanda had developed an image of teaching and of themselves as teachers prior to entering into their social studies education program. Their motives and commitment to teaching were evidenced by their own stories of themselves as teachers. Amanda had been an art teacher, and Mike had organized and supervised sports games and also substituted as a classroom teacher. Having a degree in history or political science was the bridge that would allow them to continue to teach a subject that they not only enjoyed but demonstrated success in through the earning of their degree. For Mike and Amanda, the idea and image of themselves as teachers and of teaching was not new. The difference was *what and where* they would be teaching. It is thus important to gain an understanding of both Mike's and Amanda's conceptions of the subject matter that they were now going to learn to teach.

#### Conceptions of history

As with Jonny and Helen, it helps to understand Mike's and Amanda's conceptions of history by focusing on how they represent what it means to gain the knowledge of history. While all participants moved along trajectories that saw them attain a history degree, for Mike and Amanda, the process of attaining a history degree did not serve as the defining point from which they identified themselves as historians. The concept of being specialists and highly trained historians, who through their deep understanding of the structures of the discipline, had the tools to teach history was not the way Mike or Amanda represented themselves with reference to their evolving image of self as teacher. As Amanda notes,

I don't consider myself an expert, not by any means, just because I have a degree. I feel like I have been exposed to different perspectives. I have gotten a lot out of it, and for the most part I enjoyed it. I think it is the courses I took at Tech and the professors I had that pushed me into wanting to teach it. That is positive but actually just saying, "Yeah, I have a history degree." Big deal, who cares. I don't think that is a big deal. I don't feel that makes me an expert. You forget knowledge, you forget facts. Ideas stay with you

but you know a lot of this stuff is easy to forget. I don't study the stuff every day. I don't write about it every day. I am probably not up to date on a lot of my knowledge. So I don't consider myself an expert.

This sense of being exposed to history rather than seeing oneself as a history specialist was mirrored by Mike who notes that upon entering Virginia Tech, "I liked history but it didn't necessarily have to be history [that I would major in]. I had considered political science, I had considered geography. And in the end I minored in political science and I think I am three credits shy of a minor in geography." For both Mike and Amanda, learning and knowing history within the formal setting of school and university had very little to do with becoming historians in the making. Rather, the study of history seems designed to develop students' understanding and knowledge of people, places, and events from the past.

#### History for the development of knowledgeable citizens.

The concept of becoming knowledgeable about the past was not lost on Helen and Jonny; it was a very important function of studying history and learning to be a historian. What is different for Mike and Amanda, however, is that the notion of being knowledgeable is tied to a concept not mentioned by Jonny or Helen: citizenship. For both Mike and Amanda, citizenship embodies not only the very personal nature of history, described by Helen, but also the notion of knowing history and specific content just for the sake of knowing, as mentioned by Jonny. As Mike notes,

If I had to say what was important in history, what influences me as a person, the first thing is citizenship. By citizenship, I mean understanding the factors, the people and events, and even the laws that play into what is America, what constructed America. Even if that means looking at things like the Chinese Exclusion Act that were really racist. And it is really important to look at things like that and the different groups that came over and when they came over to the United States. Yes, certain dates are important, like 1776, 1941, and 1929. These are definitely dates that you do have to know. Now I would even throw in 1989-90 with the Cold War, but that is not the important part of history. To me if you are learning about the Declaration of Independence, it is more about learning who Thomas Jefferson was, figuring out where he came from, that he was in the planter class, that he owned slaves. Knowing where he was coming from and what he saw and knowing that he was a British

citizen. Knowing that stuff and why it happened is more important than knowing just what happened.

In this sense, being knowledgeable about the past includes balancing not only important dates and events but also the development and range of interpretations. For Mike, the combination serves as a reference point from which to gain a greater appreciation of events and issues in the here and now via the contexts of the past. Demonstrating knowledge about the past was part of everyday life.

Like lately with stuff on Tech's campus about Lee Hall being named after a member of the KKK. Friends of mine, look at me and they are like, "You are not surprised about this?" But I am not surprised at all because if you crawled into a person's body when this school was around in 1890, you were in an all-white, male military institution in the south. To me there was nothing else. If you weren't in the KKK it would have been unusual. That is an important part of being a knowledgeable person or citizen. Knowing what's going on and what influences history and being able to associate with people's ideas in the past is important.

This ability to understand different points of view from the past in conjunction with specific events and people that influence history also forms an important foundation for Amanda's conception of history. Just as with Mike, knowing or learning about history is important in developing a greater understanding of herself as an individual in the present.

People today, especially our generation, are really trying to get in touch with our own personal identity, where they come from, what influences them, where did these ideas that are being taught originate from. Why do we live in a society that is still largely segregated and our institutions are like this. I think studying history will supply answers to these questions. I think it allows us to discover why we are the way we are, where we came from, what we can do and why we have assumptions about people.

Also similar to Mike, history for Amanda was about learning more than one story of the past, about detailing rather than just learning

what is right with our country. The purpose of history is not to glorify anybody or anything. I think for the most part history doesn't include or leaves out too much of maybe the darker sides that have happened, or we tend to glaze over it and justify it in the end. So I think there is too much glorification, especially in U.S. history and

not enough criticism. The key is to help produce citizens who are neither apathetic or cynical. I think one of the important aspects or goals of history should be to create critical thinkers who can see that problems can be solved in more than one way, that can debate and talk about ideas-why things happened, why you think things happened. There is a lot of room for lots of opinions and lots of interpretation. Bring in other perspectives of people like women, blacks, and even children and groups that aren't talked about. That is another reason why I like studying about different peoples and different cultures besides America. Yeah, history can be empowering. That is why I like history because I like being able to learn about different things, to argue, or disagree with people at times, or see things differently. It makes it more fun. I think all that develops critical thinking.

What becomes apparent in both Amanda's and Mike's descriptions of what it means to know history is that just as with Helen's and Jonny's, it is mostly framed against the backdrop of the formal history classroom. History is a subject that is described primarily in terms of something that is studied and learned. However, learning history in school for Mike and Amanda in terms of what Lemke (1995) calls the "activity formations" or typical doings of the history classroom forms a very different "action genre" of history teaching than that previously represented by Helen and Jonny (pp. 31-32). For Amanda and Mike, history is studied and learned in order to develop knowledgeable, critically thinking citizens, while for Helen and Jonny the continued study of history, after the age of fourteen, goes beyond developing knowledgeable, critically thinkers toward taking on the role of practicing historians.

#### Learning history in America

The discipline of history as part of the social studies curriculum in the US is a mandated series of courses that must be passed in order to graduate high school. History is not an option that one can avoid; however students, such as Mike and Amanda do have the option, to take Advanced Placement classes in history in either American or European History. These courses are a year long and college credit can be gained, dependent on exam success. While Amanda chose to take both American and European history at AP level, Mike chose American AP History and also had room to take an elective history class entitled the 20<sup>th</sup> century American History. In both cases, taking AP history represented a significant watershed in their career as history students. For Amanda, the

courses in AP History were marked by a change in the speed with which the material was covered and the increased reading and writing that was required.

It was still all lecture, but we didn't really use a text book. It was all supplemental reading. I liked that aspect of it, we just had handouts of Xerox sheets and a list of books that we had to go check out of the library, and we had to do these fifteen page book reviews due every month. The classes were small and mostly male. In fact in one of them I was the only female. It was really intense. The teacher moved fast, I remember my hand used to be so sore from taking notes in that class. He had really high expectations but we learned a lot. We did a lot of writing in that class and had pop quizzes, but we could use our notes. He used actual multiple choice questions from the AP exam on them, but he also had essays along with them.

Mike also remembered the pace and increased focus on writing of AP American history. While lecture, or as Mike terms it “storytelling” was the main staple of the class for covering content, his teacher also placed an emphasis on research and group work. Initially, this was to orient the students to the chronology of factual events or key people. “He was the first one to introduce me to group work, in which you were required to do this amount of work period and if you didn’t you didn’t get the grade. One project was a time line, where he gave us probably 100 events in American History and we had to find out the approximate date.” Though research papers were not necessarily unusual within history classes prior to AP History, what did stand out was how research was approached. Research was not just about accessing specific content material; the content of history was not a given in their textbooks.

Like Mr. Bunn said when we began the project, "When it comes to Jamestown, three different books are going to have three different dates so put down where you found it." Then we also had the document based project that is on the AP exam, which was interesting because it was the first time I can ever remember using primary sources for researching anything. He brought in things like paintings, newspaper articles, things that high school students would never think of using. I mean in the past if you had to do a paper you'd go to the encyclopedia, pull it out and you copy whatever is under this section and that is your homework. Working with primary sources gave me the skill of actually doing history, instead of just reading it in a textbook. It made it more interesting.

Previous to AP history, the closest Mike had come to this type of understanding as to the nature of research and the fragility of knowledge came via a 6<sup>th</sup> grade project. It was a social studies project that went well beyond the confines of the classroom. Mike had to do research the Philippines.

I had to go out and find the stuff, and I did more work than any other kid because when it came to government when I was doing the project the Philippine government was constantly changing. The embassy sent me something and when it got to the government portion, the font was changed. And then just as I was getting ready to turn in the government part of my project, I remember it was in my book bag, and I went to bed that night. In the morning my mom came in and woke me up and said, "Michael there is something on the news that you are going to be very interested in seeing." Well, it had taken me weeks to find out who Mrs. Aquino's cabinet was, and the news said they had all been fired at midnight that night because they were planning a coup against her. My paper had all the names of the cabinet who were now fired. I looked at my mom and I was like, "That screws up everything I did." And she was like, "No, it doesn't. What you did is history now and all you have to do is explain it to Mrs. Christy when you hand it in." And my mom gave me a post it note to write down the current situation. Mrs. Christy thought it was really cool, and it was just fun to be a part of. This is the research that I always thought was fun.

For Amanda the increased expectations of individual reading, writing and discussion in both AP History and English was something that was layered within the very fabric of her life at home and the types of extracurricular activities she had long been involved with at school.

I have always loved to read and write. I remember probably in middle school I kept my own journal, like kind of a diary, just because I liked to write. I would just write about random things like poetry and articles for the school magazine. And I have always liked to read. And I think having lots of books at home-my dad has thousands of history books, especially German history books, at home- is like the motivation was there. I would always see my Dad was reading the New York Times, and my mom was always reading a novel. We are the type of family that would debate and discuss topics that would then be talked about in class. In 5<sup>th</sup> grade when Mondale and Reagan ran for President, I can remember having lots of debates and talks around the table with my dad.



AP history became the course in which Amanda could individually challenge and immerse herself with little interruption. For Amanda, becoming a successful and knowledgeable student of history was a very individual process. “I can remember in middle school, when the teacher would say ‘Okay, we are going to work in groups,’ I would just roll my eyes and be like ‘Oh God.’ But in high school, and especially in AP History, I was happy to do all my work by myself. Because I knew I could do it, I could get it done without the stupid kids in the group taking advantage of me.”

AP History was different from Mike and Amanda’s previous history courses because of the amount of writing required. Both saw writing as an important skill in being successful in AP History, a course that both believed made them better writers. Previously for them, success in high school history was based on doing well on the unit test. The ability to remember dates and events for a test was the trait of a knowledgeable student, for as Amanda notes,

I have always had a really good memory. I tend to remember things easily, things for the test like dates, people, events. So that part of history always came easily. But to be successful in AP you had to actually write. Writing about it, thinking about it, discussing it requires more thought. It takes more effort. But that is the part I probably enjoyed more. In fact taking [AP] history and English made me a better academic writer, more analytic. He [the teacher] was more interested in what you were saying and how you organized it. Being able to write a good thesis statement, being able to support it.

Mike shares this view of AP history, which mirrors the template or formula for writing history papers previously described by Jonny and Helen. As Mike notes, “I learned that it didn’t matter what your answer was when writing a paper as long as you could support your evidence for it and that type of stuff. Mr. Bunn said from the beginning, ‘If you make a statement you had better support it with at least three reasons why you think that.’ And I think that is something that has carried me through college.”

#### Taking the grand tour of history. The importance of being exposed

What is significant, however, is that for Mike and Amanda there was little chance beyond the AP courses to continue to develop and practice the skills of writing and doing history. AP history served as a respite from what Mike called ‘textbook history,’ which he had predominantly experienced at school and would continue to experience in his first

years at Virginia Tech. “All it was was lecture, read the textbook, and then take the multiple choice test.” It was a genre of history teaching designed to provide students with a steady diet of easily digestible fact-based teacher-centered instruction that has long been associated with the social studies. (Goodlad, 1984; Haladyna & Shaughnessy 1985, Yeager & Davis, 1995). It was a genre that Amanda remembers hardly inspiring: “You know it was just dry. It was basically lecture, and the textbook. For homework, we would have to answer the questions at the end of the chapter and there was not a whole lot of discussion or cooperative learning or different teaching activities.” Covering as much historical ground as possible, and then trying to remember as much as possible were the expectations for Mike and Amanda. In the case of U.S. history, as Mike notes, it was ground that, during the high school career, was covered again and again.

So by the time I got to college and I had a history of Virginia class – we actually jumped over Jamestown. It was mentioned in five minutes, because, like Dr. W. said, "Everybody has this Jamestown disease they just keep teaching it." We only touched a little bit on pre Civil War and that was to look at the migration patterns in the state and how the counties originally formed. But then we even skipped over the Civil War and went to what was called reconstruction in all the other southern states but was called readjustment in Virginia. Though I had last had Virginia history in 4<sup>th</sup> grade, I had taken U.S. history four times before college... And during that time it was only in Mrs. Marks' course [20<sup>th</sup> Century American History] out of all the American history classes I have ever had, that went beyond World War II. All the others get to World War II and that is it, it's over.

This “grand tour” of the past for both Mike and Amanda, designed for the creation of knowledgeable and worldly-wise students of history, continued at Tech. The course requirements to major in history show that the history degree is structured around the completion of a minimum number of courses that cover the history of specific regions. "I know that we had to have six hours in American History, six hours in European and six hours in other history." While students could take courses based on particular areas of interest, which was US history for Mike and European for Amanda, the chance to specialize in a specific period of history was limited by the structure of the degree. As Mike notes, "well I liked to take classes that just sparked my interest a little bit. I took the class on the late Roman Empire because it sounded interesting and I also

needed a Western History, [and] they considered it a Western History class." This focus on breadth over depth, in conjunction with the goal of developing knowledgeable worldly-wise students, was supported by a pedagogy of teaching by telling, in the form of lecture-based teaching. It was a teaching style that Mike and Amanda recognized from their history and social studies classes in high school.

Kupferberg (1996) observes that the preponderance of this form of pedagogy within institutions of higher education is grounded within the predominant educational culture of the lecture hall, where the lecturer/teacher is knowledge-bearer and authority figure. As he notes, "Teaching in a university context is more often than not a researcher performing than it is a teacher teaching in the narrow sense of the word... What is important are the objective signs of professional recognition and biographical career building. The pedagogical dimension or element of teaching in the sense of being able to communicate effectively with students in a learning context means relatively little" (p. 227-229). The lecture hall itself is not a neutral space; its very structure defines the ritualistic interaction process between the teacher/researcher, who moves from "backstage" or his office, to a "frontstage" performance in the lecture hall, and the audience of students seated around and in front (Goffman 1959). The lecture hall is designed to allow the teacher to impart his/her knowledge to a ready, willing, and able audience "[w]ithin a space where arguably the problems of motivated learning and the need to enforce some kind of discipline are virtually absent. [Where] the self motivation of those present can be taken for granted and any disturbances are frowned upon and hastily concluded due to an unstated ethos of silence and respect for the speaker" (Kupferberg, 1996, p. 230). The role of the lecturer as defined by the expectations of performance is that of "knower" or "teller" of the tale. For as Amanda explains,

In college, I guess because you are dealing with people who are motivated or should be, the professors can get away with lecturing all the time. Like Dr. S., all he ever did was lecture. He would show slides, and he would draw us into his lectures with discussions and questions, but it was pretty much the same every day. I guess because his knowledge was so great, his experience too, he could get away with it and still be great.

For Mike and Amanda, the discipline of history as taught throughout their college career was confined to the lecture hall. For the first two years the courses taken were

filled with 50-80 students. Such history classes were open to everyone at Tech because they were viewed as introductory classes. As Mike notes, “I don’t really remember much about them other than they were early in the morning and there really wasn’t much work to them. The professors were all lecture, and you had to read from the book and then here is a multiple choice test on an opscan form and that was it. That is all we ever did.” It was an experience shared and sometimes enjoyed by Amanda, who chose courses because they were personally interesting and academically challenging. One such course was a year long survey of the History of Western Art, which blended with her own interests in art. “It was hard because there was a ton of stuff to memorize, I mean memorization up the ass whether it was states, names of artists, and their work. Tons and tons of content and it all came out of the text. But it was interesting stuff, just the way the professor talked about art, pointing out things that just as an observer I might never have picked up, even with my own interest in art. So it was a course I personally enjoyed.” In this sense the “frontstage” performance of professors based on their knowledge, enthusiasm, and ability to tell the story of history were perceived as important ingredients of a good history professor in action in front of an audience. As Mike notes,

The two Civil War classes I had-anyone would be amazed and awestruck by Dr. R’s lectures. So the man didn’t want to be confronted by students and I don’t think that he was probably the best teacher in the world outside the classroom. In the classroom he was awesome in the way he lectured, it was more of a story the way he told it and it made you seem like you were right on the battlefield in Chancellorsville when Stonewall Jackson’s Brigade came up the road. He just made it like you were there. You would just sit there and you would be so amazed at what was going on that you would forget to take notes. But the way he told the story, when you saw it on the test, you were going to remember it.

For Amanda both frontstage performances and backstage discussions encouraged a longstanding goal of travelling to Europe not only to see what she had read about and seen in class slides but to also visit the country her grandparents had emigrated from.

From a very young age I was always reading and hearing about, and I would see pictures of, Germany and other places in Europe and I had to go see that. Especially things like the castles and the architecture, you don't see over here. I wanted to go see those and

walk through them. And that's the neat part about travelling and seeing things, especially ancient things. You read about all this stuff and to actually see it and experience it really brings it to life.

The grand tour of history as presented to her throughout her education took on an added dimension as she embarked upon her own mini-grand tour of Europe in the summer of her first year of college.

#### Taking a break from the past. Opening ones eyes and doing a little history

As Mike and Amanda continued to take history courses in their second, third and fourth years, the format of the courses changed very little from merely being told about history. For both of them, however, certain courses did break from the ritualized interaction of the lecture hall. One required course was historical methods, which as Mike pointed out, involved more than reading and preparing for the history test.

I think the most interesting class that I probably have had in college in history was historical methods. He doesn't just sit there and do lectures, he teaches you how to do history. I think it was more fun than textbook history. He had us do initial exercises with primary sources, secondary sources and that type of thing, which we went through real quick. But then he taught us how to use census information and what he did was one of the neatest activities. He told us we had to look at where they had moved or where they were born and trace where they had migrated from and come up with reasons why they may have moved. It was just interesting to be able to actually use the census and see how it worked and that type of stuff. I never imagined that you could really get that much information on families. Another thing he had us do was go to the cemetery in Blacksburg and look up people's names and find out what year the immigrants from Italy started arriving. So that class was kind of neat, to actually do history.

These experiences and ideas within the historical methods class flowed into another course taught by the same professor, which Mike found personally relevant and interesting since it focused on the social history of Virginia. Though he grew up in Virginia, he soon realized that his past exposure to Virginia history had been filtered not only through the scope of the school curriculum but by the area of Virginia in which he grew up.

Living in Northern Virginia has its drawbacks when it comes to Virginia history because the majority of Northern Virginians aren't from Virginia and they probably don't even know that Richmond

exists. So the course kind of opened my eyes to the rest of the state. I had never heard of Governor Harry Byrd, I come to find out he was quite a political machine in his day and age. I had no clue about this man. I had been on the Harry Byrd highway but I didn't even know who he was. Or such things like the resentment between the western counties and the north and eastern counties which still goes on today. I was kind of surprised that it went all the way back to the colonial days when the British monarchy was in charge.

The final paper had to focus on either higher education or race relations. Mike chose to research the first women at Virginia Tech. "It kind of got my interest because it was also the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of women at Tech I had read a couple of articles about it and I just thought it was interesting. So I went over and played in special collection and got all the old university archives out. It was a really cool experience."

For Amanda the historical methods class, though taught by a different professor, also served as a break from previous history classes.

It was fairly small, probably twenty people, but only fifteen showed up regularly. We talked a lot and we had to look at all these primary sources and we kind of looked at things a little more critically. Most of the other history classes tended to be a lot of lecture, a lot of memorizing. But she wasn't interested in how much you could memorize. She wanted you to be able to see through these different ideas and pull out the big picture.

For Amanda this type of experience came again in an honors class that focused on Women in the Renaissance and again in a graduate level history class she took during her Masters program. As she notes of the former,

I did that in my junior year and I was really proud of that. I did this big term paper and considered a lot of new ideas and perspectives, especially about women's roles and how they have been portrayed. The whole idea of looking at history through gender analysis or gender perspective, because previously I felt at college they didn't really think about it that way, is something that is really important to me now. It just opened my eyes to those kinds of perspectives. And the amount of sources I used - I really did a lot of research for an undergraduate. And then last year my graduate seminar in Recent American History really focused on looking at history through gender, class, and race analysis, and it just made me see the perspectives of so many different groups. And that really had not been done before - showing that history is just a bunch of perspectives, and that the key to really getting to the truth is

embracing many different perspectives of many different people and groups.

Mike's and Amanda's narratives of what it means to know and learn history are not in and of themselves defined by negotiating specific levels or stages of history as it was for Jonny and Helen. Rather, they learned about history by being provided with or exposed to stories and details about the past that were required to be remembered for a test. Learning history involved knowing about the past by gaining a broad base of content knowledge. However, within this sea of content knowledge, there existed islands/courses that stressed and allowed for the doing of history. Such courses, though quite different, blended with the more typical ways of learning history and allowed Mike and Amanda to emphasize the importance of the interpretative nature of history. While one could argue that an unexamined tension existed between how they had long been taught history and their developing understanding of how to do and interpret history, the conferring of their history degrees served as notice that both were ready, willing, and able to become teachers of history in the American school system.

From knowledgeable critically thinking citizens to teacher

Mike's and Amanda's initial goal in teaching history mirrored Helen's and Jonny's in that they hoped to encourage their students to develop an interest in the subject matter. In Amanda's case this meant that she wanted her students to "develop some appreciation for the subject matter or maybe even spark some interest in it." Like Jonny, she hoped to stimulate "critical thinking, discussion, and I hope I can get kids who are real quiet and encourage them to be able to speak and talk about their ideas and reactions to things." Amanda felt she needed the goal of encouraging students within the history/social studies classroom. "I think a positive attitude and portraying that to students, showing them that you believe they can do this, is really very important. Because I believe a lot of teachers do come off as negative and don't even realize it." The image portrayed by the teacher in front of and toward students was also intrinsic to Mike's understanding of his role as teacher. How he acted with students, however, was not seen solely as a way to encourage them to appreciate history and social studies; it was part and parcel of "being a role model to students" if he was to teach "the hidden curriculum of citizenship." This meant that students needed

Number one, to see where they have come from. It does not matter what country you live in, but they need to see what type of background your country has had and see what has influenced people in history. And this is important because this can help teach them what's expected of them in society. Like teaching them that the right to vote really should not just be a right in their minds, it should be a duty. So I need to model stuff like this, even if it is just a story about having jury duty or a little bit about an election something like that. It is important for students to know what's expected of them in society and know why that's expected of them. I mean from history they can find out what and why that is. I think that is very important.

Such images of teacher as encourager and teacher as role model were set against a need to make teaching history relevant and interactive in the classroom. Amanda felt strongly about the importance of relevance. "Relevance is so important, especially from arguments with my black friends. They get frustrated studying American History like Revolutionary History. Because they don't care about a bunch of white guys, especially people who enslaved their ancestors. I think that's a big issue, especially when quite a few students I know have the attitude of 'Who cares about the past?'" It was a concern that Amanda hoped to redress through the material she would bring into her class and by the very structure of her classroom itself. This meant teaching the type of history she had enjoyed at school in the form of focusing on different cultures and encouraging classroom discussion:

I don't know. I think I can find interest in something, whether it is by bringing out cultural aspects of history or by looking at different people. I think I can find something interesting for everybody, it is also important that I have lots of interaction, a lot of discussion. I realize I might not get too many of them but I would like classes where everybody gets in a circle and you get everybody involved and the teacher doesn't have to stand in front of the room. I would like to walk around a lot and try to address each student individually in one way or another and pull everybody into the class by using lots of different media, like images, pictures and supplemental reading to create different forms of stimulation because, you know, kids get bored hearing you talk or just reading something out of the book. They like to see things.

Mike had not thought much about relevance prior to beginning his teaching practice. History had always been interesting and relevant to him through the connections that he made in a class. These connections, however, which played into



developing a high level of interest, were not necessarily confined within the four walls of the classroom.

History needs to be relevant. Someone who is 65 years old may not think some things are as important as someone that's 15. And relevance to the individual plays a part. It was something that I have never really looked at before but when I really think about it, it influenced me as a history major. Like the American Civil War was something that I got interested in as a young kid and I think it was because growing up in Virginia there is so many Civil War battlefields around. And at the same time, my interest in the 1940's, 50's, and 60's came not just from the projects I did with Mrs. Marks but from listening to my grandparents who got me interested in it.

For Mike helping students see the relevancy of history involved finding ways for his students to enjoy class; he felt this would come through using "different styles of teaching to make the class more fun and interesting." These styles, he suggested, could range from being a storyteller like his 11<sup>th</sup> grade teacher (which he considered to be very different from lecturing) to having "activities like class discussions and trying to get the class involved and learn from actually doing something." His ability to do both well, especially that of performing as a storyteller of history, he suggested, would take time to evolve. "I think that this type of teaching is more enjoyable as a learner. It was for me, but you really have to be a creative mind. I think it is something that you have to try to develop." The idea performing as a teacher who could not only tell a story but get the class involved, was a key trait that he hoped to flesh out and make an inherent part of the frontstage activity of his teaching. It would, however, require practice and time to craft such front stage performances like those he had seen as an audience member interacting with and watching his teachers. He felt he had witnessed it with one of his history professors at Tech.

Yeah, in one class, Dr. E was telling us about the dropping of the atom bomb. He broke the class up into two groups, and one had to be military advisors for the dropping of the bomb and the other had to be military advisors that were against the war. Dr. E played the role of the President, and we basically had to go through the textbook and our notes and come up with opinions and reasons for our side. And I think I could do something like that if I had a class on dropping the atomic bomb, have one group be anti-bomb and one group pro-bomb. He had not been teaching long. He is a younger professor and I really enjoyed this class. I had three classes with him

over three different semesters and this was the last class I had with him. It was like I slowly saw the evolution of his teaching styles.

For both Mike and Amanda the chance to teach interesting, fun, interactive history and to encourage their students to become knowledgeable, worldly-wise citizens would come in the spring semester of 1998 as they began their ten-week student internship. Their internships were in two very different high schools in the local area.

Mike's placement at Salem High School was he considered ideal for him. Salem High School is in a small, relatively affluent, and predominantly white school district. Mike had hoped to be placed there since the makeup and size of the school mirrored the type of school he would eventually like to teach in:

I kind of requested it. I had hinted to Dr. B at Salem or Northside. I had done that for kind of one reason. The high school I went to, as I said previously, was rather large and very culturally diverse, and I wanted to experience a different type of atmosphere. I did not want to go to Roanoke City because that's what I had done in high school and I knew what to expect. The horror stories don't really bother me because in my own community we have schools like that and it is the same. But I do hope to eventually go back to Northern Virginia area to teach, so I did not want to go to a place like Auburn or Shawsville that was really rural with only ten kids. That just was not realistic for where I was going to teach. But a place like Salem or Blacksburg or Northside is about the average size of school for Virginia with the exception of the mega schools like mine. And I was kind of curious what it would be like to be in one of these small-town schools.

While Mike was very pleased and relieved with his placement, Amanda's reaction to her placement was a touch more apprehensive. She was placed in the small rural school district of Shawsville. While it was also very different from the high school she had attended, it was not the type of school where she imagined carrying out her teaching internship. Her initial hope initially was to be placed in more of a more diverse city school similar to those she had read about.

Taking Dr. G's social foundations class where we read a case study of kids in an urban black school and looked at how the system was failing them and forcing them to drop out, was important for me. I grew up having a good positive educational experience and I can see that I am fortunate compared to a lot of people and I felt like I needed to teach in this [urban school] type of environment. And I was kind of jealous of the ones that did get those placements because

I viewed it as a challenge that would be good for me. But I got Shawsville. I did not know anything about Shawsville except that it was a small school, a predominantly white school, and I knew it was poor. And then the other student teacher who was there told me "Well, the first day of hunting season is like a holiday where half the school doesn't show up." And I know it is a stereotype but I thought, "These kids are just going to look at me like I am some kind of freak." I probably don't look like them, I come from a completely different background I spent half my life making fun of these types of people, and I just thought "God this is going to be different."

### Acknowledging the importance of past experiences

A great deal has been written since the work of Lortie (1975) to support the position that learning to teach is a formative process that begins well in advance of the professional teaching experience (Bullough, 1988, 1995; Powell, 1992; Bullough, Knowles & Crow, 1991, Ball & Goodson 1985). Experiences and memories of being a student in high school and college, of specific teacher role models, of "how their own teachers approached topics" (Grossman, 1991, p. 10), in conjunction with family, books and media, and life experiences, have been shown to be influential in developing teachers' conceptions of teaching and teaching specific subject matter (Evans, 1994; Powell, 1992; Grossman, 1991; Calderhead & Robson, 1991; Wilson & Wineburg; 1988; Britzman, 1986; Adler & Goodman, 1983).

Distinct traces of each participant's own disciplinary backgrounds within their own formal schooling, of how they came to learn and know history, are evident within all the portraits of teaching (Wilson; 1991; Gudmundsdottir, 1990, 1987). While their formal school experiences are powerful influences on how Jonny, Helen, Mike, and Amanda explain their motivation and readiness to take on the role of history teacher, as well as their understanding of history and subsequent goals for the classroom, one cannot ignore the external factors ranging from family experiences to actual geographic location that are woven into their understanding of and interest in history and history teaching. Studying history at school and university, especially for Helen and Jonny, is represented as providing them with a particular way to view the world and their place in it. Representing themselves as university educated historians, as a feminist in Helen's case and politically active in Jonny's case, form key building blocks upon which they construct themselves as

ready to take on the role of history teacher. Such experiences have shaped, for Helen and Jonny an initial understanding of the nature of history teaching that is different from that of Mike and Amanda. The very structure of Jonny and Helen's preparation to become a historian, which they now see as vital to the development of their character of history teacher, is founded on an assumption that the study of history within the formal setting of the school is not for everyone. From the age of 14, history was not a subject taken by all students; after Key Stage 3 history does not form part of the core curriculum. It is an option to be chosen for further study when students follow a GCSE syllabus. Success at GCSE level determines who will choose to specialize in or be diverted away from the study of history at A level. Success in the A level exams determines who will be eligible to go on to read history at university. The experiences of studying history via the Schools Council History Project, focusing more on the developing the skills of the discipline, successfully completing two year courses in order to continue studying history, and being among an ever-shrinking group of students studying history contrast greatly with the experiences of Amanda and Mike. For both Mike and Amanda history was less focused on the structure of the discipline and the learning of the skills of an historian in favor of providing an overview and exposure to details of the past through survey courses that began very early in their high school career and continued onto college. Mike's and Amanda's formal history classes in both high school and college were much more focused on *what we know and how much we know about the past* rather than *how we come to know and understand the past in the context of the present*. Access to history courses in high school and college, in comparison to Helen and Jonny, was far less restrictive which in turn helps to understand the link made by Amanda and Mike between the study of history and the focus on developing citizens.

For Amanda and Mike the study of history was not only different with regard to how history was taught but also in their perception of how attaining a degree in history served as evidence of their ability to teach history. In contrast to Helen or Jonny, neither Mike nor Amanda presented themselves as capable and ready to take on the role of history teacher because they saw themselves as trained historians. Mike's and Amanda's motivation and readiness to teach were not solely tied to their desire to continue to work with the discipline they had specialized in for so long. Becoming a teacher was the first

decision; becoming history/social studies teachers was the second. The holding of a history degree, as such, demonstrated that Amanda and Mike had taken, been exposed to, and become knowledgeable about the history of many different areas of the world. The disciplines of history, geography, and government in Mike's case, and of history and government in Amanda's, became the subject(s) that they would be eligible for licensure to teach because these were the subjects in which they had built up the most credit hours while at Virginia Tech.

Such differences in the participants' personal understandings of the discipline of history and historical thinking go a long way toward building an understanding of the dimensions of difference within the portraits of teaching in terms of the lesson format, the content and concepts taught, and expectations and interactions that developed between the participants as teacher and their students (Yeager & Davis, 1995; Downey & Levstik, 1991; Wilson & Wineburg, 1989, 1993). The importance of focusing on the "worklike" aspect of source texts, as Helen explained, "to evaluate the source, to suggest why the source had been produced and for who it had been produced" as a way to build knowledge about the past is a format that Helen and Jonny had long been acquainted with and practiced. Analyzing historical sources to use as distinct pieces of evidence to discuss and write about the past in each of their portraits mirrors their own descriptions of how they remembered learning to do history and how they imagined they would teach history.

Similarly, the process of learning history as detailed by Mike and Amanda-being provided with a story of past events-can be seen within the format and structure of their portraits. Even Mike's use of primary sources seems not only designed to provide his students with an example of propaganda but to be an avenue through which to document and convey information and stories about life in World War II. While primary sources were used, how they were used reflects a different understanding of the goals of teaching the subject of history from that of Helen and Jonny. However powerful past experiences are in framing conceptions of the discipline of history and history teaching, stopping here assumes that content knowledge is the sole organizing principle through which the activity of learning to plan and teach history is accomplished.

Moving beyond past experiences and the knowing of history in the process of becoming a teacher

"There is always an easy solution to every human problem- neat plausible and wrong."  
H. L. Mencken

Elbaz (1983) has shown that knowledge of the subject matter is only one category of what she conceived as “practical knowledge” that informs the front stage practice of teaching. Since the mid 1980’s the Knowledge Growth in Teaching Program at Stanford University has spawned a cottage industry of researchers who have used the concept of Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) to show that the process of learning to teach can not be understood solely by a teacher’s perspective or understanding of the content (Powell, 1997, 1994; Grant 1996; Aubrey 1996, Hsiao-Lin Tuan et.al., 1995). The research at Stanford identified in the teachers’ knowledge base seven sources of knowledge that are drawn upon in the process of teaching, of which PCK is seen as most important.

Content Knowledge is the teacher’s knowledge and understanding of what they teach. The most important part of the knowledge base is Pedagogical Content Knowledge. This body of knowledge is a special amalgam of pedagogy and content and makes teachers different from scholars in the field. General pedagogical knowledge is the teacher’s knowledge of and skill in the use of teaching methods and other pedagogical strategies that are not subject specific. Teachers have knowledge of learners that include student characteristics, theories of learning and motivation. Knowledge of context is an important source for teachers to draw on in teaching. An important influence on teaching is Knowledge of pedagogical aims, goals and purposes. And finally there is Curricular Knowledge which includes teachers knowledge of curricular material to teach particular topics and ideas. (Gudmundsdottir, 1987 a pp. 3-4)

Recent work by Cochran, DeRutier, and King (1993) proposed certain modifications to the concept of PCK in order for it to be compatible with a more constructivist view of teaching and learning. Calling their model Pedagogical Content Knowing (PCKg) they contend that the activity of teaching requires teachers to draw

upon and develop “an integrated understanding of four components: pedagogy, subject matter content, student characteristics, and the environmental context of learning” in the process of teaching (p. 266). They go on to note that while PCKg development is a continual process, the four component understandings will not necessarily develop and integrate evenly as the preservice teacher negotiates his/her way through their preparation experience. “For example, the initial hours that a preservice teacher spends observing in the classrooms should foster the development of their understanding of school context more than their ...development of subject matter understanding and understanding of students” (p. 268).

Such research supports the assertion that the very activity of teaching history as detailed within the portraits of teaching is a highly complex affair that is neither solely a product of the participants’ own disciplinary socialization nor purely contained or visible within the frontstage classroom performances of each participant. Rather, learning how to take on the role of history teacher and begin teaching is an actively learned process in time that emerges and is negotiated through an individual’s continual participation within and through a complex landscape of networks and communities of practice. In recognizing the active presence of past experiences and well-remembered events associated with learning and enjoying history, the previous chapter offers only a partial set of experiences and scripts from which Helen, Jonny, Mike, and Amanda could begin to prepare for their frontstage performances in the role of history teacher in the classrooms of their internship. In order to continue to trace and compare the provenance of the participants’ meanings and actions as they construct themselves as history teachers it is important to recognize that context(s) - within and through time and space – matter(s). In moving toward a fuller understanding of how these participants continue to approach and negotiate their role as history teachers, attention needs to be paid to examining the extent to which their experiences and understandings of history and history teaching that have developed over time are mediated within the context(s) of their methods class and teaching internship. Within the confines of this study this means examining how each participant’s contextual understanding of their a) respective official history curriculum, b) cooperating teacher’s expectations and c) students abilities

interacted with their biographic conception of history and history teaching to influence their teaching.



Part 9 : Constructing oneself as a history teacher: Backstage: From scripts, rehearsals, settings and stage directions to front stage performances with an audience

The Center for Research on Context of Secondary School Teaching at Stanford University has shown that the process of learning to teach is neither uncontentious nor indistinct. This research has highlighted a number of contexts which affect teachers' perspectives about their work, their colleagues, their students and their own ability to teach. As Hargreaves (1996) notes, "what one knows about teaching, and what one believes is possible and desirable in one's teaching, all vary according to the context in which teaching is done. These contexts of teaching shape not only what teachers can do but also the knowledge and experience that guide their teaching" (p. 15). In addition to the context of the school, other embedded and interrelated contexts include, "community and parent contexts, state and district contexts, higher education, professional settings such as subject matter organizations and networks, high school departments and finally, classrooms, including students' and teachers' beliefs and backgrounds" (Grossman and Stodolsky, 1994, p. 182). Even, while in what are very familiar settings of the university classroom and subsequently the high school history classroom entering into a teacher preparation program as part of the process of learning to teach history itself becomes a point of entry through which preservice teachers quickly find themselves participating

as members of many [new and] different communities and cultures which may exist in harmony with one another or may clash and cause tension. [As student teachers they will find] themselves situated among a number of cultures: the academic community, the education community, cooperating teachers and other local school colleagues... Often these sources... as well as other pressures such as prescribed curricular and state mandated achievement tests provided them with conflicting views of English, of teaching, and of schooling (Fox, 1992, p. 10).

A key goal of student teachers is to fulfill the expectations of such communities/audiences, including their supervisors, mentors, methods tutors, and ultimately the students within their classrooms, and to demonstrate what they know and are able to do within their classroom (PCKg) in order to pass their teaching internship. The activity of teaching for a preservice teacher can thus be viewed as an attempt to negotiate a competent and knowledgeable performance that is informed by and designed

to fulfill a multiple array of needs and expectations. Within this performance, however, there is no one script or set of stage directions provided to develop the character of history teacher. To continue to unravel how the role of history teacher and the activity of history teaching is shaped and accomplished, attention needs to be given to how the participants' own biographic understandings of history and history teaching are either reshaped, transformed, or reinforced within the context(s) of their teaching practice. Within the scope of this study, this means focusing on how each of these preservice teachers explain their planning and delivery of instruction in light of what they perceive to be the contextual expectations and obligations that surface as they move between their methods classroom and their teaching internship. In maintaining and developing the metaphor of performance particular attention will be given to examining the extent to which the official history curriculum in England and Virginia are represented and serve as an organizing script that, under the direction of both university and assigned school mentors, influences their preparation for their frontstage performances in the classroom setting. This means following Helen, Jonny and then Mike and Amanda through three distinct phases of their journey to the other side of the desk. The first stage locates them within the backstage setting of their respective methods classroom at Leeds University and Virginia Tech. The second stage follows each participant as they move into their internship setting to meet their cooperating teachers and classes. While the final stage comes full circle, in terms of how the participant were initially introduced within this study, by focusing on the actual teaching within the frontstage setting of their classroom.

Backstage preparations at Leeds: Locating the methods course and internship within the preparation program.

As described earlier the design of the PGCE program at Leeds University immediately placed Jonny and Helen within a number of different communities and cultures beyond the university setting. During the first semester the history methods course met every Tuesday from 9:15 to 4:00p.m., while the second method course met for Helen on Mondays and for Jonny on Fridays. The timetable at Leeds also required them to attend Educational and Professional studies (EPS) lectures each Monday morning. In conjunction with the time spent at Leeds in the first term, all preservice teachers were immediately placed within partner schools in the local area. For Helen this

was Kettlethorpe High School, while Jonny went to Knottingley High School. It was within the partner schools that Jonny and Helen initially spent two days a week in what was called the serial school experience. Upon completion of the first term they returned to their respective partner schools to begin their teaching internship in their second term. The immediacy of both Jonny and Helen's placement within their partner school at the beginning of their first term is a result of recent reforms in England and Wales to change the structure and content of teacher education (Burton, 1998; Young, 1998). Burton (1998) notes, that since 1992, "the proportion of time student teachers in England and Wales spend in schools during their teacher education courses has increased substantially (p. 129). This trend toward school-based teacher education with the development of partner schools has not gone without its critics, who question the position that "a) the experience of an individual school could be an adequate model for a future teacher, and b) that student teachers could gain all the necessary knowledge to become a competent teacher from the experiences of trying to teach and watch others" (Young, 1998, p. 57).

Within the serial school experience both Jonny and Helen were part of a cohort of student teachers from various specialist subject areas in the first term, this group of student teachers was required to spend Wednesdays and Thursdays in their respective partner schools. Within the school, the cohort was assigned a link tutor, who was responsible for ensuring coherency between work done in the partner school and in the university. They were also placed with a teacher tutor/mentor from the respective academic department of their main method. During the serial school experience, Wednesday mornings were set aside as times to make links with specific topic addressed in the EPS lectures at the university while orientating the student teachers to specific school-based issues that would be useful when they began their teaching practice. Although they were designed to complement each other, Helen and Jonny argued that the structure of these classes did not work in practice. They considered the information and material provided within the serial school experience to be generally useful, practical, knowledge but both Helen and Jonny questioned, as research has shown many preservice teachers do, the value and relevance of material presented in the formal university setting. (Zeichner, 1984; Zeichner & Tabachnick 1981; Zeichner & Grant, 1981). Preparing to take on the role of history teacher with all its nuances and expectations was, Helen

contended, not something that could be directed successfully from the distance of the EPS lectures at the university. Rather, the specific cues and directions required in developing the role of history teacher could only be gleaned from the insights and stories of those practicing within the specific partner schools.

Kettlethorpe were very good. They tended to follow up the EPS lectures on Wednesday with school talks, lectures, and tours. The head of year came in and spoke about the role of head of year, the head of departments came in, and we had people come in and talk about Special Educational Needs (SEN) policy to us and we had to do IEP's. We had a whole day on abuse and if a child discloses information and how do you deal with that as a teacher... it was much more hands on in school. Where EPS lectures [at Leeds] were all theory, they were non-active non-participatory. It was compulsory to go. We had to sign in. People would come in, sign in, and go to sleep. Basically we were lectured to for two and a half hours in the morning about things like behaviour, gender and class, and the structure of the secondary system. I don't know one person who thought it was useful. But at school, it becomes more involved and important with the anecdotal stories that teachers tell you. It was much more, "This is what we do. This is how to deal with it." Like the whole thing with classroom management is much better in school. It comes from a practicing teacher, rather than a lecturer who had not been in a classroom for 15 years. Because what do they know about discipline problems that we have today?

A similar theme was echoed by Jonny, who felt the school-based EPS offered him insights into the types of policies that he would need to know as he began to teach in his school.

A lot of what we did in school was really useful. Because you were covering similar things like special needs procedures, classroom management. We would talk about it Wednesday morning and then observe in the afternoon. We would go to classes and we would have a list of things that we were looking for. For example on classroom management we would have to look at how they [the teachers] managed them coming in and how they managed them coming out, how they managed transitions within the lessons, and other sorts of stuff. That was far more useful than Monday morning in the lecture theatre because you could actually see. The problem is not so much that you're having time wasted as that some people on the academic side of things are giving a totally false impression of how schools work. You are told you have to do certain things and jump through certain hoops but in reality even the best and most experienced teachers aren't able to do what we are being told is

expected of us. Luckily for me, the staff I work most closely with at Knottingley are realists and have made it quite clear that if I ignore half of what I'm told about discipline and special needs and use my common sense then I'll be Okay.

Immediate immersion into the setting-a practical and experiential approach to developing the role of teacher

Spending time within the school from the very beginning of the PGCE course reinforced both Helen's and Jonny's own initial goals and conceptions of themselves as teachers of history, even though Kettlethorpe and Knottingley appeared to cater to very different student audiences in terms of what McLaughlin and Talbert (1992) describe as the "objective reality of student factors. Factors such as language, culture, racial background, parents economic and educational resources and other family circumstances, (such as) academic ability and background" ( p. 2).

Kettlethorpe High school, as Helen noted, "just has a reputation of being a good school. Parents are encouraged to come in if there is a problem. We are the second in the Wakefield league table. We are second to Kings School in Pontefract. And we are only about a percent behind them. So the competition is there." Teaching at Kettlethorpe carried with it an understanding that exam results were important for parents, for the department, and for the school. The organization of students into particular streams was designed Helen suggested as part of a process through which the school could place students on particular trajectories toward exam success. With such an organizational structure, there appeared to be ample room to begin the training of young historians.

The year 7 exams in English, maths, and science are all part of the statutory testing brought in by the National Curriculum. They get them all leveled by year 7 but some may move or get changed at Christmas and then Easter. It is called the thumb test-anybody who sticks out like a sore thumb for either being really good or bad gets moved. It is about getting all the high ability students together and getting them to get the best results on their GCSE's. It is all to do with the league tables, it is all linked up to league tabling and saying whose school is better than the other.

While Kettlethorpe's exam successes were proudly and colorfully displayed in the front foyer of the school, at Knottingley the exam results were displayed on a much less

conspicuous bulletin board in the corner of the staff room. In driving to the school and around the community it served, Jonny had immediately come to some very definite opinions as to the type of school and students with whom he would be working. He found himself, however, within a school and department that, he felt, sought to explicitly create and maintain a positive perception of its students with regard to "such critical dimensions as assumptions about academic abilities and interests and possible futures, and quality as a learner" (McLaughlin & Talbert 1992, p. 2). It was a perception that resonated with Jonny's view that by learning historical skills such as interpreting and evaluating sources students, even if not destined to become historians, would have the tools and wherewithal to begin to question accepted truths, just as Jonny remembered doing in high school.

They got a new head (principal) about two-and-a-half years ago, and he is kind of turning the place around. He is really trying to raise standards, in the sense of league tables, but he talked about the sense of the school as a haven in the community. It is a place where the kids can come and be safe. I definitely sense that attitude in the kind of ethos running through the school. I know the history department is trying to do some of that anyway, though I have been kind of tarnished by a conversation along these lines that I had with the head of history today. So, particularly somewhere like Knottingley, what I want more than anything is to get them to think for themselves more. I think a lot of kids are like this anyway, but certainly at Knottingley it is a cultural thing. There are loads of problems with literacy. There is no history of educational achievement in the community at all. It is really insular. So that is kind of a cultural thing militating against education, but more than anything else, militating against thinking for yourself and questioning. It is really important that they don't just accept everything and think that what they are told must be right. You know, they must question things. And history is the only subject in the curriculum to get them to really question to say, "Is that right?" and not just get one answer. So it would be great if I could achieve the type of thing where they are not just saying to me "What is the answer?" You know, you set them a task and they are like "What is the answer to this?" and you are like, "Well, look at it and think about it. And then you need to give me a reason, and if it is a good reason it will be marked right, because it is not what I think, it is what you think." I know they struggle with that because it is not simple, not straightforward, not black and white, so that is the kind of thing to strive towards.

Whether the goal was to develop either apprentice historians who could successfully negotiate their GCSE exams, or individuals who could evaluate and question various ideas and agendas in the world of work, on the surface, little tension existed between such aspirations and perceptions and Helen's and Jonny's own conceptions and experiences of the nature of history and history teaching.

As the EPS lectures at the university and their partner schools were designed to work together to create an understanding of the nature of schooling and teaching, a parallel design existed between the history methods classes at Leeds and the time allocated with their mentors within their respective history departments on Thursdays. It soon became clear that within both these spheres of influence a key organizing principle/script, through which they were expected to undertake the frontstage activity of teaching history, was tied to the National Curriculum for History.

Backstage: The methods classroom- Learning the importance of the official script of the National Curriculum for History in England

From the very first history methods course in the PGCE program at Leeds it was made clear that what it meant to be a history teacher and what was required in the teaching of history within a classroom was explicitly tied to the National Curriculum for history. Since history was only required in the National Curriculum through Key Stage 3 (14 years old), Dr. Unwin warned the history methods group that they would more than likely be assigned another subject to teach when they gained employment: "Gone are the days when you will just teach history." Highlighting a key section of his lecture booklet he noted that, "Since 1996 entries for history at GCSE have declined in many schools. This has implications for history departments, funding, and staffing" (Partnership in history education, 1997-98, p. 18). This meant that their choice of second methods subject was very important. It was an issue that he addressed again in the second term when he brought in a flyer and press release from the Historical Association entitled "Campaign For History." The flyer mirrored Dr. Unwin's concerns expressed four months before:

In practice, history is only really firmly settled in schools at Key stage (11-14 years), and even there its share of the time table is often cut to make room for other subjects. Crucially in many primary schools, where history can develop both the children's ability to

think and their ability to read and write, the time devoted to it is steadily cut... The situation at GCSE is also alarming. Options systems in school can discourage, or even prevent, pupils from taking history at GCSE, in order to make room in the timetable for new vocational courses. This squeeze on the humanities in schools is having a particularly unfortunate side effect: it means that lower attaining pupils are increasingly being denied a chance to study history (The Campaign for History, Historical Association, 13 Jan 1998, p. 1).

Dr. Unwin pointed out that while this was an ongoing issue that should be “watched closely,” what was more important for those in their initial teacher training (ITT) was that they develop a knowledge and understanding of the National Curriculum for history. Demonstrating a knowledge of the national curriculum was a vital part of the Leeds University and Secondary Schools Partnership (LUSSP) Teaching Competence Profile. The profile, when fully completed at the end of the course, provided evidence that the preservice teacher had met the entry competencies for newly qualified teacher status as detailed by the Department of Education in circular 9/92. The nature and structure of the profile was provided to the history cohort at the beginning of their training. During their first history methods lecture, Dr. Unwin directed everyone’s attention to competencies detailed within the School of Education History Methods Handbook 1997-98. The first competency, entitled the Knowledge Base, highlighted the priority that a knowledge of the National Curriculum for history was given with the preparation program. The booklet detailed that the Knowledge Base

is judged by the extent to which they demonstrate secure knowledge, concepts and skills in history at a standard equivalent to degree level to enable them to teach it confidently and accurately in Key stage 3 (ages 11-14) and where appropriate, Key stage 4 and post-16;

A detailed knowledge and understanding of the history national curriculum Programmes of Study for Key Stage 3 and, where applicable, Key Stage 4, and familiarity with relevant Key Stage 4 and post-16 examination syllabuses and courses, including vocational courses;

Where relevant, an understanding of progression from the Key Stage 2 Programme of Study;



The ability to cope securely with subject related questions which pupils raise (Unwin & Foster, p.7).

The message was clear: successful preservice teachers would be those who knew and utilized the National Curriculum for History in their teaching practice.

#### The National Curriculum for History as official script

The National Curriculum for History (Appendix I) is a document that at first glance is quite overpowering in its structure and expectations for both teachers and students. It is a document that not only prescribes the content to be covered but also addresses the specific understandings, skills, and attainment levels students should develop and reach as they move through their schooling. Introduced in 1991, and revised in 1995 by the Dearing Committee, in its current form it is a document that seeks a balance between the tradition of history teaching, that stresses the importance of transmitting an understanding of national traditions and culture via the teaching of historical content, and the competing tradition grounded in the work of the Schools Council History Project emphasizing the teaching of historical skills and concepts (Crawford, 1995; Pendry, Husbands, Arthur & Davison, 1998). Neither Helen nor Jonny had taken it in its current form in terms of scope and sequence in high school. To become teachers of history in England, both Helen and Jonny were required to work within the framework of assumptions and expectations laid out and defined by the National Curriculum. Jonny commented that learning the details of the National Curriculum as a requirement of becoming a successful teacher was

mind blowing at the time. Bob [Dr. Unwin] kept going on and on talking about the five key elements of the curriculum like chronology, interpretation of history, and all that. I probably can't remember them now and you have to do a profile to prove national curriculum awareness... At first I was like hell, how am I going to cover this? How am I going to prove that I am doing it? I still feel like that but certain things are starting to fall into place.

Helen was less shocked by the document having had exposure to it since both her parents were educators and "there are national curriculum documents all over our house." Before the start of the course, she had already purchased her own copy of the National Curriculum for history.

I have my curriculum document. I bought it from Waterstones in Leeds. It has got Key Stages 1 to 3 and part of my assessment is that I have an awareness of the Key Stages including 1 and 2-which is primary school but having a mum who is a primary school teacher does help. The assessment is all part of my profile. It is a way of assessing me. There are sections that cover certain things. It is provided by the university and Helen [mentor] does it in conjunction with Glen [head of the history department] in conjunction with the deputy head [the school coordinator]. There are things like subject knowledge, demonstration and awareness of the National Curriculum. Like knowing that the early years is nursery age, Key Stage 1 is years 1 and 2, ages 5-7; Key Stage 2 is up to the age of 10 or 11; Key Stage 3 is year groups 7, 8, and 9, ages 11-14; and Key Stage 4 is for those who pick it as an option for GCSE in years 10-11, ages 14-16. Then you also have the attainment targets, which deal with the students' level of performance in history and also the five Key elements which we have to use in our planning, teaching and assessment. So there is quite a bit there really. And then the profile also includes evidence of cross curricula links, professionalism, a relationship with the pupils, the wider professional role, and team work and integration of the department.

While the importance of developing and practicing the skills of history were stressed just as they had been during their own school years, there was an increased focus on content coverage in learning the National Curriculum, including courses that neither Helen nor Jonny had studied in high school or college. However, both suggested that the process of learning the content to be taught within their assigned classes was a short-term concern that, based upon their training, could be overcome quickly as they prepared for their role. In Jonny's case, this meant following the advice of the history methods tutor, Dr. Unwin.

I was not too concerned about knowing the material. I went on a bit of a mission at the beginning of the year doing a lot of reading about the history of Britain since it was not my specialty. Most of what I am teaching I have not done in school I did the Schools Council History stuff, but I had not done Medieval Realms and the Making of the UK. So I was like, "I don't know this shit." But I just seemed to be able to pick it up. I went and got all the school textbooks and I got Bob's textbook on The Making of the UK. And like Bob [Dr. Unwin] said, "You don't have to go and read great tome of history books." But I did not want to get caught out, because you don't want to let the kids down and my history teachers seemed so good they seemed to know the subject. I feel like an obligation to be like that.

And I don't find it hard to do that all. I can read loads of stuff and then I can pick up a line or themes that I want to follow through. It is just the way my mind works.

Helen took a similar approach to learning the course content that the National Curriculum required.

I had to learn about it because I was told to teach it. Basically, I am a modern historian and everything I am teaching, I am learning as I go along from the textbooks and my own university books and the department's schemes of work... But, you know, I also have infinitely more knowledge than they [the students] do. That is not being arrogant that is just knowing that in a lesson you do know more than they do even if I haven't studied the period. I have the skills to pick up things fast because I am trained to.

While learning the content was in and of itself not seen as problematic, Jonny did question how much time could practically be given to developing the skills he considered important in light of the increased focus on content coverage. Such an increase in the amount of material to be covered, he suggested, was a conscious ideological attempt to change the face of history and history teaching from what he remembered and understood them to be.

And I don't know whether it is the same for every subject, but the pace that they force you to go through the National Curriculum militates against thinking for yourself. It seems like there is so much to do. The National Curriculum was so politically orientated and politically biased by a group of people who were anti history-anti thinking for yourself-there is a danger that it leads you toward Kings and Queens and dates. And I am suspicious enough to think that is a conscious effort. I am quite sure it is. I hope that within all this I can get away with a certain amount of trade off. Because I think you still have to put emphasis and spend more time on areas that you want to, especially at years 7, 8, and 9, as long as your paper work shows that you are jumping through the right hoops. I suspect that a lot of school find a way of getting around it by trading off and saying we will spend more time on this and skirt over that a bit. But at first glance it seems so very controlled.

## Backstage: Direction and rehearsal –Learning how to teach history via the National Curriculum

While providing students with an understanding of the importance of the National Curriculum, another key goal of the history methods class, as detailed within the introductory lecture notes, was to provide preservice teachers with "planning exercises and assignments designed to focus on the knowledge, concepts and skills in history" (Unwin & Foster p. 1). This process, Dr. Unwin noted, was analogous to offering them a "buffet of teaching methods, resources, and ideas from which they could pick and choose what they liked." This statement was mirrored within the history method booklet, which, in describing the partnership between the history methods course and the history departments, noted that,

Each Tuesday during Term 1 there will be a University based programme of tutorials/workshops of Method-based activities covering Key Stage planning for coherence; schemes of work; lesson planning; teaching and learning strategies; and the use of role play. Particular attention is drawn to the following: History Trainee Presentations/Micro-teaching, Points to Consider for Presentation, (and) Bringing History to Life. The history partnership intends that trainees have the opportunity to develop some of the skills and strategies needed to 'bring history to life'. The purpose of using these and other teaching strategies is to encourage observation and to foster a questioning in pupils. Concepts which can be developed are: similarity and difference; then and now; continuity and change; cause and effect; source and evidence (p. 13).

After being presented with the specifics of the National Curriculum and then the "buffet" of teaching ideas, the history methods cohort was expected to carry out two micro-teaching lessons. Helen likened the process to being in "guinea pig classes where, you know, we spent a lot of time in teaching scenarios. Like, 'You are a Year 9 class doing the plague. This is your task, you are to cover Key Elements so and so. How would you go about it?' And then we ended up becoming the guinea pigs experimenting." Jonny felt these methods classes were designed to

Remind you first that there are certain topics and things that are best presented in certain ways, and that you have to be aware of the Key Elements that you are covering. And second, the idea of getting everyone involved. Bob is really big into things like envelopes and getting kids involved- giving kids an envelope is a memorable

experience, and you can have stuff in them. Things like cause cards, picture cards, and stuff like that. Like with cause cards the kids have got different types of causes to an event-economic, political, and social causes and then they have to resort them and prioritize them. It is a good way of getting them involved, but you can do it quickly, especially if you are talking to kids about prioritizing causes or looking at different types of causes, which is a very hard thing to do as a whole group. But if they have got these little slips in front of them that they can move around you can get them all to do that at once. And I can see that I could do some of this stuff when I teach... Some of the ideas that Bob did I am going to try and use. He gave us a picture from the Bayeaux tapestry, when Harold is at William's Court and he is making the oath on the relics. And he got everyone [in the class] to re-enact it. You know if you give a kid a picture they are going to be like "So what?" But to re-enact it and show that one of the witnesses in the picture has got a sword at his throat and another is kind of looking away. You can then start talking and looking at the significance of it. You can actually get somewhere with the kids, begin to interpret. So stuff like that was really really good. And they can associate with what you have done, with that stunt or whatever.

Such mediated representation of history teaching, or "stunts" as Jonny called them, served as the foundation upon which the cohort was expected to develop and rehearse the role of history teacher as framed by the National Curriculum within the relative safety of the backstage setting of the methods classroom. Helen suggested that the mini- lessons allowed everyone to begin to take on the role of teacher in manner and appearance while working with specific teacher props in front of an audience.

We had to do presentations. They were quite interesting in seeing the different approaches people had. And then we had to do a report that included our lesson plan, the worksheets, details on classroom management and links to the National Curriculum.... We were given free reign to do what we liked and people tried all sorts of different things. The first ones were just like getting up and getting used to using the chalk board and the overhead. Because it came across that a lot of people could not write on the board and we did some worksheets with task on the OHP and it was interesting to see how different people tackled things. I picked up some ideas and thoughts. And it was also good because at times you would watch one, and you would just think, "This is really dull and boring" because all they did was just speak to you, they did not involve you. Or the information was at too high a level for the year it was supposed to be targeted to.

Similarly Jonny felt such episodes provided him with the opportunity to not only rehearse his lines for his future front stage performances within the history classrooms at Knottingley, but also watch and build upon the performances of his peers. While such dress rehearsals went well and thus served as a confidence builder for his debut performance, he was left to wonder just how practical and successful such rehearsed lessons would be in front of a real-life audience of high school students.

It started off with everybody being a little conservative in how they were doing it, but by the end, it was just like lesson spectaculars. Everyone was outdoing everyone else. I did my second one, and I just brought in so many props it was hilarious. I'm not sure I could even practically do this in the classroom. I did a role-play that involved every member of the group. I would love to be able to do this kind of thing in school. But it was fun, and you only have a limited amount of ideas yourself and other people do things with music and video or cause cards and you think "that is a good idea. Yeah, I could use that or I couldn't do that." And the whole thing kind of teaches you about projecting yourself in the classroom, about acting - you know you can be somebody you are not in the classroom. For me, it kind of fostered a readiness to teach.

Backstage: Preparations at Virginia Tech: Differences in the timing and location of the teaching internship within the preparation program

In contrast to Helen and Jonny, who found themselves placed with the internship school setting from the beginning of their program, and who, upon completing their internship, would spend a final term not only back within the university classroom but within another school for four weeks, Mike's and Amanda's placement within their internship schools served as the capstone of their program. The timing of their teaching experience within the last ten weeks of their program exemplifies a common teacher preparation model in America in which secondary preservice teachers enroll in university based education courses that expose them to a wide array of educational theories and policies prior to their teaching internship. It is only upon completing these course that they then undertake their teaching internship (Zeichner, 1993).

The graduate social studies program at Virginia Tech is a 39 credit hour program that is generally completed with three semesters. Upon completion of the program the students receive a Masters in Curriculum and Instruction and are eligible for a Virginia State teaching license in History and Social Science grades 6-12 (ages 11-18). Each student builds a program of study that includes courses to be taken in educational foundations, educational research, and curriculum. Each semester-long course is designated as a three credit hour course, and the maximum number of credit hours that can be taken per semester is fifteen. The academic courses are generally taken during the first two semesters of the program (Spring and/or Summer sessions and then in the fall) with the nine credit hour internship taken in the following spring semester. While a great deal more time is spent within the university classroom at Virginia Tech than Leeds, the equivalent at Leeds of the educational foundations and research courses comes in the form of the series of EPS lectures. Another key requirement, similar to the History Methods classes at Leeds, are the two Social Studies Methods courses at Virginia Tech. Social Studies Methods I is taught in the fall semester, and is described in the syllabus as a course that

combines five weeks of class work with a ten week field experience. This course will introduce prospective teachers of social studies to the fundamental concepts and strategies of curriculum and

instruction at the middle and high school levels. The course content will include an overview of social studies teaching, lesson and unit planning, skills development, reading and writing in the social studies content area, the use of textbooks and supplementary instructional materials and a basic introduction to a variety of teaching, classroom management and assessment strategies. A major goal of this course is to provide student aides with a firm foundation for continuing professional development (Syllabus EDCI 5784 Teaching in the secondary School 1 (student aides) Fall 1997, p. 1)

The aide experience for all social studies preservice teachers at Tech, while similar to the serial school experience at Leeds in time spent within a school prior to the teaching internship, is located within a middle school, where, each pre-service teacher is assigned to serve as an aide to a social studies teacher. Unlike Leeds, the school within which they conduct the aide experience is not the same school within which the internship is completed in the next (Spring) semester.

Social Studies Methods II is then taken in the spring semester prior to the teaching internship. It is a course designed to follow on from Social Studies I:

This combination of courses comprises the second specialized methods block for prospective social studies teaches. It includes a five week formal class component, a ten week student teaching internship, seminars and special meetings.

These course build on the earlier social studies methods course, the social foundations courses and the educational psychology course. Prospective teachers will have the opportunity to develop their repertoire of teaching skills by observing, designing and implementing micro teaching lessons. Attention will be given to the organization and delivery of instruction, evaluation techniques, student motivation and class management. Student teachers will have the chance to develop their skills in lesson and unit planning as they design units to be used during their student teaching experience. Student teachers will participate in videotaped micro-teaching experiences which will be critically evaluated by their peers and instructors (p. 1).



Backstage the methods classroom: Differing priorities in direction and rehearsal-  
Learning how to and how not to teach.

The methods course, as the syllabi indicated, was designed to provide students with specific pedagogical methods and approaches through which to teach history/social science within their future classrooms. As in the methods course at Leeds, because the focus was very much on how to teach, time was given to practice and develop various approaches within the university classroom. As Mike and Amanada began to look at various approaches to teaching history and social science an explicit goal of the methods course was to avoid the overuse of methods such as lecture and discussion. As Mike notes

I think one of the major things from our class - the methods class - was to stay away from the traditional lecture and stuff. Dr. B talked about unlearning what we know about social studies teaching and falling into lecture discussion mode since that was how we were taught.... So we did stuff with cooperative learning and then I had to use the inductive model of teaching and the one where you get the kids to ask questions and you can only do like yes and no examples, concept attainment. The others had to do lessons on models like the JP model (jurisprudential model), games and simulations and the inquiry model. And it was good because, like [with] the inductive model that I had to do, I had never seen that one used before, not that I can think of.

This approach within the methods class, designed to encourage preservice teachers to question and move away from the methods of how they had been taught social studies, mirrored what Cochran-Smith (1991) describes as the “critical dissonance” model that has emerged over the last fifteen years within teacher education programs. It was a model designed to “help student teachers develop stronger, more critical perspectives...and call into question the social and political implications of standard policy and practice” (p. 107). Such an approach did not necessarily disrupt or sway Amanda and Mike from the pedagogical attachment to the methods of teaching that they remembered from their own experiences of social studies in high school and college. Instead, Amanda and Mike viewed the various teaching approaches modeled and suggested as additional manipulable props that were available for use within their upcoming role of history teacher, should they choose to use them. As Mike pointed out,

the format and structure of the methods course introduced him not only to the expectations of the program but to a range of potential approaches to teaching history. Mike's previously detailed portrait of teaching was a lesson that he developed for one his micro-teaching assignments in the methods course that he then used at Salem. Mike was, however, not always comfortable with the format and structure of all the approaches detailed within the university classroom. Mike's perception of the potential use of such models within his teaching was evaluated against a range of criteria, including anticipating the extent to which the approach involved students and the ease with which it fit into the content being taught, as well as such factors as class size and the estimated length of class time that would be taken up.

But I liked it [the inductive model] because it got you thinking, like when Dr. B passed the things around. She did not tell us what they were or anything like that. We sat and had to figure out what it was. So I liked that because it was more hands on, and you got to actually see the stuff in front of you, so I thought that was kind of neat to do. I would never have done that. But you know, I did not like the other one I did, the concept attainment. I did not like. But I could see how it could be a good introductory unit with younger kids. I think role play can be good at times. Like Heather had one where she had three groups she divided our class into three groups. We each got index cards, and one had to deal with the home front, one dealt with the Holocaust, and the other dealt with the war in Europe. The home front people had to pretend that they were having a conversation around the dinner table. The Holocaust victims were assigned their names and ages, they had to talk about what the Holocaust was to them. And then the last scene was set – it was two privates and a sergeant and they were on a landing craft at Normandy. And they had to talk about what was going to happen and their fears and things they had seen in England while they were there. So that was kind of a neat example. So I thought about doing something like that. The only difficulty is having 20-25 kids in the class, and you would have to give them time to sit around and think up the skit so it could take a lot of time. But I think that if I were teaching a year-long course and I had time I would plan it in, I would do something like that.

As Mike prepared to enter the teaching internship, he recognized some of the expectations of the methods instructor and was open to working with and building upon some of the ideas and approaches presented within his teaching practice. Similarly,

Amanda viewed the methods course as a way to consciously develop her approach to the role of history teacher.

different ways to teach and different ways to incorporate writing and reading beyond the textbook are important to know. Because without taking that class you don't think about stuff like that or you are not conscious of what you need to do. It is useful to have new exposure to it. Before that, I guess I wasn't really conscious about some of the approaches like cooperative learning. I hated that stuff when I was a student, - not in high school because we didn't have it, but in middle school I would be like, "Oh God why do we have to do this?" But in having talked about it, I feel like we got a lot of good ideas from each other. And that's good because I think we learn a lot from just each other. Because of that I have a better sense of how to use it now.

#### Backstage: Learning the official script- The Virginia Standards of Learning for History and Social Science

While a great deal of time was given to how history/social studies could be taught, it was not the only focus of the methods course. Just as in England, the methods course also introduced Mike and Amanda to what was represented to them as the official script for history and social science. While the National Curriculum for History served as the official script for history teachers in England, the new Virginia Standards of Learning for History and Social Science (1995) laid out what was to be taught by history and social science teachers in Virginia. As with the English National Curriculum for History, the content and shape of the new Standards of Learning (SOLs) for elementary and secondary school history and social science had been hotly debated. This debate, as Fore (1995, 1998) has detailed, raged between "two communities with fundamentally different conceptions of the nature of knowledge and the purposes of social studies: on one side were the state's conservative Republican Governor and his political appointees to the State Board of Education, and on the other was the professional social studies community, comprising of college educators, curriculum supervisor and some classroom teachers" (Fore, 1998, p. 559).

By the time Mike and Amanda began their teaching internship in their final semester, both were very aware of the origins and nature of the SOLs. In the methods class, both were provided with a copy of the SOLs for use within the planning of lessons

and units as well as copies of editorials that highlighted the war of words raging over the new SOLs. That the SOLs were established, and that 1997-98 was to be the first year that State tests in English, math, history and social science, and science were to be given was stressed to Amanda by her methods instructor as she began her teaching internship. "She was really hung up on the SOL's. She was like, 'These kids have tests in April, you have to get through this stuff in your class.'" At the university level, there was an understanding that the SOLs formed an important script that should be known and used within their planning and teaching.

In contrast to Helen and Jonny, Mike and Amanda did not view the focus on content within the SOLs especially in their teaching assignments of 11<sup>th</sup> Grade US history as radically different from the US history courses they had taken in 11<sup>th</sup> grade. Amanda suggested that in stressing the content of US history over anything else, the new 11<sup>th</sup> grade curriculum was "pretty typical 11<sup>th</sup> grade history." The continued focus on content coverage, however, did lead her, just as Jonny had done, to question whether it would be possible to plan and teach such historical skills as noted in 11.17. The need to focus on getting through the content, she pointed out, was further exacerbated by the introduction of new state-wide objective tests that were linked to the standards that would be given at the end of April.

I think that I will try to bring in the idea of interpretation, of getting into people's points of view, and developing critical thinking in history but it is going to be hard. I mean one reason it's hard is because of the way the standards are written, and all this emphasis on, you know, you have to get these kids to pass these tests. And from what I understand these tests are pretty much multiple choice, maybe true-false type questions. I would hope that the SOLs won't be that restricting. But they are written in such a way that it is clear that they want you to teach content courses that will get your students to pass exams. That is their goal. It makes it hard to think about developing critical thinking skills when you are stuck with this goal, whether you like it or not.

Mike shared a similar concern. Although he was very aware of the discussions around the standards, he still wondered just how much the 11<sup>th</sup> grade course he was going to teach at Salem had really changed since his days in high school.

I have heard a lot of talk about the SOLs. I have gotten them, I have looked at them, and I know that they are now having the SOL test, and I know that everyone is interested in seeing what is on the test. I have heard some of the teachers that we had in our education classes complain about the SOLs. But personally, I don't know whether to complain about them or not. Like 11<sup>th</sup> grade has always been US history, and you should know basic facts to have a full understanding, to be able to come up with opinions or ideas, you should know the basics or bare minimum facts. The only real difference is that now the State says, " You have to know the basic facts on our test."

Within both methods courses in American and England, Helen, Jonny, Mike and Amanda were provided not only with the official script for their upcoming role within their internship classrooms, but with general stage directions to help them prepare to develop and rehearse for their role as history teachers. Such an approach to how one begins to experience the process of learning to teach is reminiscent of de Certeau's (1984) discussion of how an individual can experience a city from the top of the skyscraper. From such a vantage point it is possible to see the forms, structures and routes into and through the city, the methods courses offered what appeared to be the structures and routes into the activity of teaching history within their future classrooms. However, as de Certeau suggests, at street level, the crowds, junctions, detours, and ongoing conversations are no longer merely viewed from above. Instead, they are now experienced, and are required to be negotiated as they develop in time. For Helen, Jonny, Mike, and Amanda, moving to street level is their move into the schools and classrooms of their teaching practice. It is within such spaces that their prior understandings of history and history teaching, gleaned from the vantage points of well-remembered events as history students and more recent experiences within their methods classes, are mediated and shaped within and through the context(s) of their internships.

Backstage in the School: Learning and developing the role of history teacher in England.

Translating the National Curriculum for History within the Setting of the School

The importance of knowing and applying the National Curriculum in History was not confined to the history methods classroom. It was made very clear during the first term within their respective history departments that what one taught was institutionalized inspecific traditions, practices and policies developed to fulfill the requirements set within the National Curriculum for History. In their initial serial school experience, both Helen and Jonny were expected to map out the departmental terrain within which they would be expected to take on the role of history teachers. What soon became apparent, however, was that a great deal of what Helen and Jonny would be expected to do in their history classrooms was choreographed not by their individual mentor but by the department as a whole. In fact, lesson topics and available resources that could be used to fulfill the requirements of the National Curriculum were already outlined within specific departmental guidelines known as "Schemes of Work." During their serial school experience, Helen and Jonny were provided with the schemes of work that correlated with the year group and Study Units they would subsequently teach. As Jonny remembered, "Debbie gave me schemes of work fairly early on. Yeah so I was fairly clear about what would be taught when."

The schemes of work served as a form of clinical/pedagogical governance in regard to how the National Curriculum would be taught within the history departments of their respective schools. The development and implementation of these schemes of work was not, however, designed solely to help teachers meet the requirements of the National Curriculum, they also functioned as evidence for Her Majesties Inspectorate (HMI) that the department was working within the Guidelines of the National Curriculum. Kettlethorpe and Knottingley had recently undergone Office of Standards for Education (OFSTED) inspections within which they had to present evidence of their ability to successfully teach the history National Curriculum. The schemes of work, Jonny noted were developed in response to the inspection.

The department has a scheme of work for each study unit to be covered. You have the topic subject you are teaching, and it will say these key elements are relevant here. They created them last year for OFSTED. So basically everyone is always pretty much in the same

place and going in the same direction. So I have an idea of approximate timing and I can make sure that I am covering everything and going at the appropriate pace.

The schemes of work for each study unit prescribed not only the content of each lesson but also provided a list of school-based resources that could be used within the lessons, as well as the points at which departmental assessments of students were to be given by those teaching the particular study unit. It was a process, Helen contends that, was very detailed and organized

Hmm, how do you explain a scheme of work? Well, each years' [Grades] work is planned out as a series of lessons by the school. It is part of the National Curriculum requirements, and OFSTED inspectors look for schemes of work. So basically I am prescribed what I teach the children every lesson. It actually goes lesson to lesson. The department devises it, and basically the scheme tells us what we need to know, and the resources that are available for us to use. So like if I am going to plan a lesson and I am stuck, I could use the scheme of work to see what they say, what they have, and if you look on the scheme of work it will tell you the book and the page to use.

The schemes of work, as such, served to translate the National Curriculum in regards to what should be taught, when it should be taught, as well as when and what history skill should be assessed. Each scheme of work made available to Helen and Jonny served as extra stage directions to direct them to the types of props, resources, and materials that could be used in their upcoming classroom performances.

#### The role and expectations that come with being a member of the cast

At Knottingley and Kettlethorpe, the resources and materials were carefully stored and monitored since worksheets and textbooks were designated for use by the whole department rather than a specific teacher. Within both departments, the faculty did not teach one specific year or level of history. No teacher was solely responsible for teaching one particular year group or study unit. Instead the timetables of each teacher incorporated history classes from different years and different bands of students. This was possible because students do not have history classes everyday; for example, at Knottingley school students were taught history twice a week, while at Kettlethorpe, because classes were an hour and fifteen minutes (twice as long as at Knottingley,)

students at Key Stage 3 met once a week while those who chose history as an option at Key Stage 4 met twice a week. As a result each member of the history department was assigned to teach history not only to different year groups but to different bands of students within particular year groups. In joining the department it was made clear that this would be the same for both Helen and Jonny when they began their teaching practice. This did not mean, however that they would just take over the class schedule of their assigned mentor. Instead both Helen and Jonny's timetables consisted of classes taken from the timetables of each teacher in the history department, who in turn became responsible to advise, observe, and report back to the mentor on how well the department's new cast member was performing. As a result of this type of supervision and direction, Jonny, for example, was assigned to teach history to specific sets/bands of students in years 7, 8, 9 and 10, twice a week. His daily timetable, just like the other members of the department, had him meeting different classes each day. On Monday he would teach a top set year 10, a bottom set year 9, and a bottom set year 7, while the next day he would have a top set year 7 and a bottom set year 8. By the end of the week he would have met each of these groups twice. " I do six history classes, so I teach 12 lessons of history, and I then have three PE, so I have 15 classes out of 25 per week. And I have a set 2 and a set 4 year 7 and I teach them Medieval realms twice a week. I also have a set 2 and 3 for year 9, and then I have a top set year 10."

Since no teacher was assigned only one particular year or study unit to teach the availability of resources and materials were carefully coordinated. In both departments, it was made clear that resources, including worksheets and assessment activities, were to be used and shared by all faculty assigned to teach specific year groups. While worksheets were there if needed, departmental assessments, as detailed in the portraits of teaching, were required to be used at set times within the course of a study unit. As preservice teachers working within their respective departments, these materials were made available to Jonny and Helen. As Jonny noted,

The department does not leave me alone. They are very supportive. They say, 'If you need anything, there are worksheets here that you can look through on this this and this, there are lessons that have been done if you want to do something like that. We don't expect you to do something entirely original every lesson.' But they also recognize that I need to do my own planning.



The situation was the same for Helen, who was shown where such student-based assessments as the one detailed in her portrait of teaching and other materials/worksheets were stored in file cabinets. At Kettlethorpe, each teacher was responsible for maintaining the materials, worksheets, and handouts for specific year groups and study units within the National Curriculum.

This file cabinet here is for Romans, and Rob is in charge of this one and a couple of others. Yes, and I think Greg does 'Medicine through time.' And I looked through the material last week and pulled out loads from the file cabinet. I think they are good because they can be used in different ways. I am going to be teaching 'Medicine through time' and there is some stuff on different types of doctors which I don't know anything about, so some of it is useful for me even if I don't even use the full worksheet in class. I find it handy to be able to go in and piltch [sifted] through it and find stuff.

Worksheets and assessments were not the only available resources and props to be carefully organized for the history lesson. A range of history textbooks were stored within individual classrooms and the history departments' store cupboard. Students at both Knottingley and Kettlethorpe were not assigned a set textbook for the year, as the National Curriculum mandates the study of different historical periods and themes. As a result, textbooks are developed and published that cater such individual study unit - such as Romans, Medieval Realms, the Making of the United Kingdom - that form part of the National Curriculum. In both schools this led to a system in which class sets of textbooks for specific study units and year levels are stored within history classrooms to be made available for classroom use. Within each classroom there is often more than just one set of textbooks for a single study unit . Often these are textbooks from different publishers, and while covering the same general content detailed within the National Curriculum, offer different sources and/or reading levels that are viewed as more appropriate for different ability levels of students. As Jonny suggests, "You see they use this book Past and Present a lot. This I would say is the main one for Medieval Realms, and then they also have Contrast and Connections which is from the School History Project [publishers]. I think it is excellent, it has excellent source material and tasks but it is quite a high level for a set 2. So it is only used occasionally."

The goal of locating and working with different textbooks in preparing lessons for different classes was something that was encouraged and reinforced by the history methods tutor in a campus seminar during the first month of their student teaching.

During the seminar, Dr. Unwin made it clear that in taking on the role of a history teacher, a key expectation of their respective departments was that any products or ideas that were developed by the preservice teacher should be shared with fellow teachers in the department. “The department will look at how you are developing material and adding to their stock. What Liz [the second history methods tutor] and I find when we go to some departments is that what they want to know is how you are going to supplement and compliment their own materials.” Helen pointed out that this was indeed true at Kettlethorpe, since a number of her ideas, worksheets, and overheads were regularly appropriated by other teachers and quickly found their way into the general product fund to be used by those teaching the same topic. Helen initially found the process somewhat disconcerting since there was little acknowledgement given to the originator of the product.

As a trainee I am supposed to do all sorts of interesting exciting things and then try them out. I have seen worksheets that I have produced and things have been taught in other classes in the way I taught them when being observed. It seems that this is just the way it is done. If people see something and it worked they use it. Like the OHP [overhead projection] of the gladiators. Helen B came into the room last week when I was teaching year 10 and I saw she had a photocopy of the OHP I had done. And I said “Have you got that idea from Chris?” Because I had given Chris my spare, and he had said it was a really good idea. And now Helen came in, having seen it and was now using it. But she never said, “We are going to use your idea” or “It is really good.” She just had it in her hand, and I was like “Oh, pinching my ideas, are you?” And she just looked at me. I tend to just generally give in now.”

Dr. Unwin went on to suggest that the process of working with various textbooks to develop material for the history lessons was an expectation of all good history teachers, encouraged not only by each partner school but by OFSTED inspectors. Although the National Curriculum bound the teacher to specific content, Unwin pointed out that there were room and resources available through which to flesh out the role of history teacher as they moved into the frontstage setting of the classroom.

It is useful to look at 2-3 different texts to create or take short passages about an event. Yes, a few of the old books at Key Stage 3 were overcrowded and way above the students head, so be selective. There needs to be an emphasis on the use of language skill with the children. Also are you using the pictures as well as the sources in the textbook? For example the well known pictures of Elizabeth I at different stages in her reign. What are the similarities and differences? This is the most general concept that can be used that takes you into cause and effect, continuity and change. Use these books, have a look at the back of the stock cupboard while you're having lunch. Search for old books even the Peter Moss History Alive series with its cartoons and simple graphics. They are a way in, but don't end there, or you have not brought it far enough. Remember at Key Stage 3, interpretation is important. What you are then doing there is what HMI inspectors are encouraging- using various textbook.

#### Backstage: Fleshing out the role. Extra stage direction and the importance of stage scenery

While the schemes of work served notice as to the content that was to be taught, additional directions, in conjunction with the 'stage scenery' within the history departments gave Jonny and Helen more information about how to approach and flesh out their roles as history teachers. Within both departments, the importance of teaching the skills and concepts of history as they covered the content prescribed within the schemes of work was, just as in the methods course, constantly pushed. While their own experiences in high school history classes had stressed the development of such skills, and it was something that they believed to be an integral aspect to the activity of teaching, recent OFSTED inspections within their respective departments suggested that this aspect of history teaching required greater emphasis. At Knottingley the result of such comments was the departments' continued emphasis that "stuff like using sources and source analysis and interpretation was something that needed to be worked on." This Jonny felt, led to the constant ritual of being reminded by his mentor to document within lesson plans when and where he had focused on specific Key Elements that stressed the skills of history.

She would say, "Everything is going well. We want you to continue thinking about what skills they are using in the class, and what skills you are trying to develop. So basically don't think solely about the content of what you are teaching but how you are teaching it and

what you are trying to develop.” So they would always stress the importance of things like analyzing sources, and interpretations looking at bias and stuff like that.

Helen was also informed of the importance of paying more attention to developing these skills within her assigned classes. It was something she agreed with based on her own memories of learning history. She even felt that within the department there should be an even greater focus on developing source analysis prior to what she saw as the push to develop such skills in year 9.

There are certain things they need to do, things like source analysis. I got it at school. And I was talking to a group on Friday who did not even know what a primary and secondary source was or the difference between them. Which at this stage, in year 7, is fairly criminal. Because how can you then present something to them and say “Is this piece of information from the time or has it come from now?” when they don’t understand the concept. Even their [year 7] textbooks are very source based, but then people don’t always use sources. So what is the point of having source textbooks that aren’t used? I mean some people just ask questions related to the text but like I will relate some to the text and some to the sources. In year 7 I think they need to start to understand source reliability because when you get to year 9 and people are saying “You need to start looking at source reliability,” I think it is too late. By year 7 they should have at least a real understanding of primary and secondary sources and that you can have different interpretations. By the time they are 13 they believe everything you give them. I know when they get to GCSE, they have to know certain stuff like dates, places, and events, but they do also have to be able to apply the skill. Because like in a lot of syllabuses you can’t get top marks by just giving names, dates and places, you have seen the National Curriculum you have got to have analysis skill with it. And you have to help them develop this early on.

Specific examples of how to begin to encourage such audience participation were not only found in the textbooks and worksheets organized and stored in each classroom; the walls of the classrooms and hallways of both departments also provided Helen and Jonny with insights into the type of work that had been and was expected of history students. At Kettlethorpe and Knottingley the walls of student based work not only marked off this area of the school as history department territory, but also served as an archive of the activities that had been done by past and present students in history. Within

both setting examples of student based work such as posters showing transportation changes in 19<sup>th</sup> century England, newspaper articles detailing the founding of Rome, story boards marking the events of 1066, and diary extracts and accounts of the Gunpowder plot, could be found along walls of classrooms and hallways. Such aesthetics based upon the activity of teaching the doing of history were deemed important; not only did the displays provide parents, and OFSTED inspectors with a taste of the type of work students were expected to do in the history department, but they also advertised to students what a fun and interesting option history would be at GCSE level. It was a form of advertising that was not lost on Helen as she began to consider how to approach the activity of teaching history to the students of Kettlethorpe.

It was very noticed when I first came in. It is a very obvious thing about the department. And I think it is really good. It works. I think the visual is carried from the textbooks we use on to the displays on the walls. It has taken it a step further and you know they [the department] are all about getting kids interested and making them interested. And If that has to be visual then so be it. But if you look you realize that it is never just draw a picture, there is always some task that they have to do, like it is a poster showing something, or part of a letter or newspaper article. There is always some writing involved. It makes history interesting and stimulating particularly for low ability children who may find a lot of writing or reading difficult. It is easier for them to use and revise from it and this type of work is just a more creative way for them to apply the skills and ideas that they have covered in a lesson to something else other than a plain old boring essay. They tend to get more out of it, particularly if it is like a newspaper. They have to think of a good title, a really good headline. Or they can do a letter, which is really an essay but they have to be more creative and write it in the first person. Then they don't find it as difficult but it is still as valid as writing an essay.

Such types of written work, Jonny suggested, were “nice tactics” to encourage and teach students to develop the writing skills that were vital to their success at GCSE or A levels. The displays offered him insights into the type of work expected by the department and introduced him to ideas that he could use in his lessons.

At this level (Key Stage 3) you don't see the sort of old style formal essays I used to do. They are expected to do different types of writing. Year 8 here had this assessed piece of work where – it was on the Interregnum- and it is like you have got a friend in France

who left during the Civil War and you have to write and say what has happened in the last 10 years and what do you think of it. Which is basically what, say, ten years ago would have been: "Describe or discuss critically what happened in the Interregnum." Basically they were writing that essay but they didn't realise they were writing an essay. They were stressed to organize each idea into paragraphs and have an introduction and a conclusion. So they were getting them to write essays, but the kids don't realize they are writing essays [laughs] which is a really good tactic. It is great. It encourages empathy and organizing their thoughts and they are still getting extended writing out of them. And then like the formal essay can come later, at 15 or 16.

In beginning to teach, the importance of attending to the settings and specific cues and prompts continued to play a major role in controlling the cadence and delivery of lessons and specific activities throughout their study units. Although it soon became apparent that not all teachers were in the same place with regard to the schemes of work, as a member of a cast of teachers presenting very similar scripts to different groups of students, it was important to monitor and stay with the tempo and movement of fellow teachers in order to synchronize the timing of classroom-based assessments and activities. Developing and controlling the pace of their performances in relation to the other cast members could be done on a very subtle level, for as Jonny illustrated,

No one has sort of said that "you will follow the schemes of work or you will be shot." But you need to know where everyone is and when we are supposed to finish the unit. You just sort of tend to talk informally with teachers who are teaching it. Or sometimes you will go in and something is written on the board so you will see that and think, "Alright they are there so that is good" Like the time I went into Debbie's room and they were doing the Norman Conquest and I was like "Good! That is what we are doing so that is alright. I'm keeping up with everybody."

At Kettlethorpe, synchronizing or aligning the content of her teaching with those who were teaching the same study unit was at times, Helen suggested, facilitated by the structure of the building itself.

There are no baffles in the ceiling of the new part. They forgot to put them in. So noise travels and it comes from anywhere. So you can hear what others are doing. On Wednesday morning I had a lively group who was doing team work discussion and I could hear Ben Hur coming through the wall, and as my group got louder the video

got louder. Competition got quite hot in there [laughs] and I thought "Oh Glen is only a lesson ahead of me with the Romans."

### Making the role their own. Preparing to go Frontstage - Re-working with the script(s)

Before being able to teach history within their respective departments both Helen and Jonny were required to learn and fit in with the needs and requirements of the department as the department itself continued to come to terms with the requirements of the National Curriculum and the OFSTED inspectors. Both were provided with teaching scripts and stage directions in the form of schemes of work, departmental lesson plan templates, school textbooks, and departmental profiles, as well as the displays of students works that laid out the "official" expectations for their performance in the role of teaching history. Coming to terms with these expectations created a degree of anxiety for Jonny:

all the resources and planning and Key Elements that are expected is a bit daunting. At first glance it seems so very controlled. Like you even have history department lesson planning sheets and you have to put down the unit the lesson is on, and then circle the National Curriculum Key Elements that are being addressed within this lesson as well as provide an overview of how the lesson fits into the actual scheme or work.

He suggested, however, that in contrast to the stories he had heard from others who had gone through their student teaching he hit his stride quickly.

I was thinking all along, "It will be alright," which is kind of how I am. I do feel nervous like everyone else but you do hear stories about people on the course who say that teacher training is so hard, that you are up all hours. But I don't feel I have yet to pull an all-nighter or get up early in the morning to prepare for class. I do plan religiously. When you first start, the idea of going into each class is kind of a big deal. And you are really conscious about having everything set out and ready and being really prepared, and it is because you are very self conscious and you are making a real big effort about everything. But I keep it in perspective. You have got to realize that you cannot pull off lesson spectaculars every lesson. You don't need to reinvent the wheel. You don't need to do original work for every lesson. There is plenty of stuff that other people will share with you and help you, which are perfectly valid and good learning experiences. That is the whole idea, to draw on other people.

Jonny did not perceive beginning to teach as necessarily an isolated individual activity. Not only was he provided with an outline of each study unit via the schemes of work, but he saw the experience as an opportunity to appropriate tried and tested slices of action that made up the activity of teaching within the department. Just how successful he was at developing lessons, he suggested, was still down to his own ability to confidently take on the role of history teacher. This meant initially working with the scripts in order to plan and coherently organize history lessons into a framework that blended specific content information with “tasks” designed to allow his pupils to practice the skills of history. He suggested that planning such lessons was a skill he had already developed since it was analogous to writing history papers. The formula for writing history essays was directly transferable to the planning of lessons. However, just as with essay writing the habits of mind required to be successful at planning history lessons were not shared by all his peers.

I think a lot of people are just trying to cram too much in. I mean you can over-plan. It is like when people are writing essays at A level and at university and then they put too much in. You don't have to prove everything you know, and it is the same with teaching. You cannot possibly teach them everything that happened in Medieval times. But you can teach them to analyze sources, to make arguments through that. You don't have to teach them who every person was, what every day was. A lot of the time my lessons just fall into place. All it involves is me thinking “How am I going to do teach this, where is it I want to go.” And in my mind I can see . Sometimes I will be having a shower and I will think “Yeah, that is right,” and I will scribble something down when I get to my room. That is how I came up with the idea about discussing bias with year 7. It only came to me last night.

In Helen's case, however, coming to terms with the expectations and requirements of taking on the role of history teacher was an overwhelming experience.

When I first started I felt really overwhelmed. Helen B. gave me all these textbooks and stuff on the first day. And I had to carry all these textbooks and 3 schemes of work home with me on the bus. And I was walking through town and it was pissing it down with rain. I had my best suit on. I could not put my umbrella up. I was getting soaked and I was bordering on tears. I was like, "All this



stuff. What am I going to do with it all? Where the hell do I start?"  
And Helen B. said, "Well read the schemes of work.

A great deal of this anxiety, Helen suggested, had as much to do with meeting the perceived needs and expectations of her mentor and the department as with surviving the experience. Planning became a balancing act that she thought was "initially bloody hard work" since she perceived it as "constantly somebody being at you. I know at the moment I can't come to school having not got the day's lessons prepared and do it off the top of my head a) because I don't have the experience and b) I would never get away with it with Helen B." As a result her plans and files that she seemed to constantly carry with her were not just in preparation for her performance in the classroom but also organized and colourfully prepared for the expected inspection of her mentor/director. As she explained a great deal of thought and organization had gone into preparing to appear ready to move frontstage.

I made the format up from examples of different plans I have seen at Leeds and at the school. So I pretty much created my own design, but it has everything that they will need to see. Like I have a section that put the lesson in relation to future lessons. I have a time section for the tasks. I write the textbook I use in green, and the things I am going to write on the board in red. So I can see them quite quickly. And I also have the key elements that all relate to the National Curriculum at Key Stage 3 and you see I then write them down and they can act as an overview of what elements I have covered over a period of time. So I can show which ones I have concentrated most on and which ones I still need to cover.

Although planning, Helen argued, was a necessary evil, it was a process that, like Jonny, she felt comfortable with due to her experience as a history student who spent a great deal of time writing papers. "Sometimes planning is hard. I have to write some notes to myself to know about the content, what is happening. But it is not as difficult as writing a paper. It is like getting ready to deliver a paper but nowhere near as detailed. And once I have the basic content I like using the idea of a multi-task approach to do things in the lesson." Helen contended that this involved recognizing that the activity of teaching history required the teacher to create lessons that encouraged not only learning the content of history but having students develop and practice the skills of the historian. Teaching history was founded upon the understanding that students

need practice to complete tasks, lots of things need to happen in a class to keep the stimulation going. They need to feel as though they are doing things, progressing and being stimulated so you need to build in various tasks like maybe discussion, then looking at documents or evidence, then assessing the evidence. I mean they need to be challenged at what ever the level they are.

Backstage in the schools: Learning the Role; Receiving Teaching Assignments in America. Translating the Virginia Standards of Learning for History within the school

In contrast to Jonny and Helen, Mike and Amanda's teaching assignments were less diverse in terms of who and what they would be teaching. At Salem, Mike was placed with Coach H. the 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history teacher. Here he was assigned to what he described as three of Mr. H's "mixed ability" 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history classes. Faced with teaching 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history everyday was initially somewhat disconcerting in terms of the amount of material he would have to cover. He initially wished for a less content - focused teaching assignment within the social studies curriculum. This concern began to abate with the reading of the students' US history textbook and internet searches that focused on gathering specific details and content on the historical period he would begin his internship teaching. As a result of this process Mike quickly realized that the material he was expected to cover mirrored the same content he remembered from his high school

I would not have said this last semester, or when we kind of requested what we felt strongest at, but I think I would have been most comfortable with US Government (12th grade). When I got my US history [assignment] I thought, "Man, I have not taken a real US history class for a while," and I think my content knowledge at first was very shaky, which I thought I would be. But getting out their textbook and looking to see what it said gave me the age appropriateness of what goes on. I began to feel more comfortable after I read through the stuff and then I went and looked up on the internet some things [I would be teaching] like D-day information. I also found a page that talked about US military actions in the Pacific Ocean that summed it up in a two page thing and was quick and to the point. I am not going to read it to them but it gave me a good background. And in doing this it turns out really that I have learned a lot of this stuff before. It's just these little things that activate your memory and you read it and go, "Oh yeah, I remember that." So I think that helped out quite a bit.

Amanda's placement was also with one cooperating teacher within the social studies department at Shawsville. Mr. I, however, taught both 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history and 12<sup>th</sup> grade government, due to the small size of the high school department, which had only one other teacher who taught 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade social studies. Her teaching assignment of one US history class and one Government class was also not what she had hoped for during her internship. While pleased with the Government class, she felt that

teaching a US history survey course would be inherently dull since the format focused on economic and political history. This stood in direct contrast to how she had learned, enjoyed, and experienced European history, which she believed, held more potential for stimulating interesting classes than 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history.

I really wanted to teach World History. So I was kind of bummed. I mean it is working out Okay. In Government I am having a ball. It is fun because so much of it is spontaneous and talking about current events, and there is so much stuff you can do with Government. It is not like you have to sit there and follow a textbook like in US history. You know to me American history is just not that interesting until you get to the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Our history is short and at times pretty dull, at least I think it is. Probably some people would kill me for saying that but that's how I have always felt about it. It is not that I don't know it. I have had a lot of different background and exposure, so the content is not a problem I have just always felt that way about it. It is not until you get to the 20<sup>th</sup> century that, to me, it starts to get more interesting. In high school I loved AP European history over AP American history. I mean I just felt AP European was the best class. I loved that stuff. Because it's culturally more colorful, you have your political aspect, your economic aspect but you also have the Renaissance and there is always a cultural movement within each era you know. You can always, it seems, look at the music, or the art and the architecture. And I like to see history in other ways like cultural and social than just political and economic.

In both cases, their understanding of what would be taught within their classes, while initially outlined by the SOLs at Virginia Tech and accessed through the schools' American history textbooks, was woven into the fabric of what they remembered having learned within their own US history classrooms. This understanding of the format and structure of the content they were to teach changed little during their initial visits to their respective schools. Upon meeting their cooperating teachers, few details or expectations suggested that the content or format of what they were to teach would be any different from how they had learned history from high school. While debate had raged over the content and form of the SOLs, neither Mike's nor Amanda's cooperating teachers represented the SOLs and the new tests as greatly impacting how they would teach the content of their courses. Mike noted that his cooperating teacher appeared unconcerned with the new state test for 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history or with the specifics of the new standards

for 11<sup>th</sup> grade. In observing his cooperating teacher's classroom he was quite sure that, even in light of the new curriculum and the accompanying state test, very little had actually changed in terms of what and how US history was taught. This was illustrated by the fact that in the first six weeks of his internship he did not hear anything from his cooperating teacher about the SOLs.

I hadn't even heard John [Coach H.] mention the standards of learning until we had the in-service day. And I just kind of thought that was interesting. I know that they are having the SOL tests in, I want to say, the middle of April. And I know I have heard other teachers mention that they are very interested in seeing what is on those tests. But I think John is pretty much teaching now just as he has taught before, and he just says "this is where I am at." I think it is his philosophy that they are here, they are for real, we are going to have to live with them and there is nothing that you can do about it. But if you teach well, teach this stuff that is in the book, teach the important things, then that is really what is going to be on the SOL [test]. I don't think the state would get super picky about little tiny things. So I don't think he is really worried about them.

This attitude, Mike noted, stood in direct contrast to what he had heard from a fellow preservice history teacher who was teaching in one of the local city schools, "for the most part the social studies department at Salem are not concerned. They are just curious to see what it is going to be like. But like Thad, he's in Roanoke City, would tell us that they are constantly practicing and having pop quizzes at the beginning of every class to kind of review for the SOLs and that is all they talk about." Mike implied that the difference in attitude had a great deal to do with Salem's reputation in relation to surrounding districts.

It is just a good school, it's quite an affluent school. Your first impression means a lot, and the first day I walked in the door, I saw kids sitting there being quiet, doing work in a study hall in the cafeteria, and the lobby was fairly bright with all those windows, and it looked like a place that you would want to be. I mean if you think about it, you have got to assume that, like Coach H. says, "If they are taught well they will do well anyway."

Amanda suggested that Mr. I's apparent lack of concern about the SOL tests was born, however, more out of a sense of resignation since he already expected very poor overall exam results. Amanda had been told this had much to do with the new 4x4 block

schedule that the school had just recently adopted. The school day was now made up of four classes that each lasted an hour and a half. In meeting twice as long as those on a traditional schedule, a course that would have been taught over one academic year (two semesters) now was completed in half the time. At the end of the first semester, those students who had completed 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history now moved on to take another four new courses for the next semester while a new group of students began 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history. This was viewed as problematic, especially since the 11<sup>th</sup> grade test was scheduled for late April. The problem was that half of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade had completed the course by late January and would not take US history again while the students now taking the course in the spring, had only begun in February and would not complete it until late May, but would be tested on the course in April. Through her discussions with her cooperating teacher, Amanda was left with the impression that because of this situation, he was

not really worried about the SOLs and the test. Because the thing is they are getting screwed with the SOLs here because of when they are being tested on them. It is at the end of April or beginning of May or something like that. But because they are on the block schedule, we will probably be just getting to World War II by then. I mean there is so much material we are not going to cover that they are probably not going to have a chance to do all that well. So when I first got there he gave me an updated copy of them and he was like "Don't become really obsessed with them. Don't become a slave to them." He suggested using them as a guideline but when I was talking about whether I should try to skip some chapters if there was nothing on the SOLs about things like mining or the frontier, he said "screw the SOLs, this is important stuff, the kids enjoy learning it, you can't totally cater to these stupid tests." If you think about the position they are in, how do you take the SOLs when you are not even like two thirds through the material for the whole year? I mean I was floored when I heard about it. I was just like, "what are they doing in Richmond? Smoking crack?" I mean there are a lot of schools in Virginia that are on a block schedule, so its going to be a problem in other places besides here.

At both Salem and Shawsville, the official curriculum in the format of the SOLs was not represented by Amanda's and Mike's cooperating teachers as a controlling script that would effect what and how American history would be taught. In both their internships, minimal emphasis was placed on following and/or evidencing their use of the

official curriculum in their planning and teaching. This was based upon an assumption that for all intents and purposes there appeared to be very little difference between the content that had traditionally been taught in 11<sup>th</sup> grade and the period events and details that formed the new content standards for US History. Until the teachers and students experienced the new state test, it appeared, that all the teachers could do was wait to see if the test questions either fitted or broke with their understanding of what should be taught in the history classroom.

Backstage: Fleshing out the role. With little specific stage directions-Developing ones own traditional show

In contrast to the experiences of Helen and Jonny, any expectations of what and when Mike and Amanda would teach specific material were determined at a much more decentralized level within their respective departments. In fact, both social studies departments played little role, if any, in organizing or documenting what any teacher should cover. Such curricular decisions were left to the discretion of the teacher assigned to the specific course. This situation was exacerbated at Shawsville because the social studies department had only two teachers who were both responsible for teaching two of the four high school social studies courses. As a result, Amanda pointed out, there seemed to be very little need to even meet to discuss content issues or concerns that they shared.

So you have Mr. I. and Mr. B.. Mr. B. had all the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade classes and Mr. I had the 11<sup>th</sup> grade and 12<sup>th</sup> grade and they get along great. But basically, from what they told me the meetings they have as a department, were very informal, the two of them would talk in the faculty room or even in the hallways and then be like "We'll call that the meeting."

Even within the much larger social studies department at Salem, which included teachers who taught the same courses from the same assigned US history textbook, each teacher functioned as an individual curricula decision-making unit in terms of how they managed the content and format of their classes. This loosely coupled organizational structure within the department itself can be evidenced by examining when, where, and how the teachers within the department interacted with one another 'backstage.' In coming to Salem, Mike noted that he felt very comfortable with his placement as a

member of the social studies department. "The teachers have reacted fine to me. I don't know many outside of social studies. But the people up there seem very welcoming, they even gave me a desk in the social studies office and basically told me everything in this office was mine." The act of finding a space for Mike within the office brought Mike into the center of the department. It was within this space that he found himself based with the chair of the department, his cooperating teacher, and a geography teacher who did not have her own room since "she doesn't really have a classroom. She's here half of the day and then she teaches at the middle school." It was within this backstage space he noted that:

We talk about all sorts of stuff. David [social studies teacher in the class next to the office] would always come by at the end of the day and ask how it had gone. And Terri [department head] gave me advice in looking for a position and getting hired and things like that. And Lee [geography] would give me advice on dealing with students or what she called the "barbarian students" that she had in her classes this year. Coach H. gave me the best advice about the content and materials that I was teaching.

However, it was rare for all the above-mentioned teachers to be in the office together. It was even rarer to see this space frequented by any other members of the department than those mentioned above, for as Mike noted, "I don't think, since I have been here, that (all of) the department has been together in one place. Most stay in their rooms or hang out in different places like the lounge or the library." As a result, in contrast to the experiences of Helen and Jonny, who participated in regular departmental meetings and in Jonny's case the morning break with the history department, Mike and Amanda's internships were primarily defined and negotiated through their assignment to a specific subject and grade-based cooperating teacher.

Taking on the role of history teacher for Mike and Amanda was more analogous to being an understudy to their specific cooperating teachers than new members of a department who have to negotiate a specific role as part of an established cast. A key assumption that comes with the role of understudy rather than cast member, is that the actual role has already been defined, developed, and fleshed out by the established actor, the history teacher. When the understudy goes frontstage, there is a prior understanding of what is expected in the performance. For all intents and purposes, the expectation is



that what the audience sees should mirror the timing, delivery, and format of the experienced actor as observed, studied, and understood by the understudy. Mike's approach to the planning and teaching of history at Salem was informed more by coming to terms with the philosophy and expectations of his cooperating teacher than those of the department or the SOLs. It was through his initial observations of and meeting with his cooperating teacher that he was provided with very practical insights and general advice and direction as to how to successfully begin to prepare for and think about the upcoming role as history teacher at Salem.

He said, when I first met him “Okay, you can start at World War II, and you have to get through it and then just keep on moving through the Cold War until you leave.” John [Coach H] told me not to worry too much about time. He said, “Cover it, cover it well,” and he said “If you don’t really know it, don’t spend that much time on it. Give the basic facts that you know and don’t try to elaborate too much.” And then he said “spend more time on the things you do know.” I was initially a little unsure how to teach it [World War II], so I talked to him and saw how he had taught World War I when I first observed him so I had an idea - war wise - what he thought was important and then I looked through the textbook, in fact I looked at three textbooks. I took a couple from the shelf there [pointing to shelf in department office] and used them to take notes and outline it. When I first started, he reminded me of one thing that I have been trying to keep in my mind all the time, which is that most kids are not like you and I or people in our program. We are the exceptions. We are the ones that like history and like social studies. He said, “For most of these kids, they hate it.” And he went on about how you have to make it fun, make it interesting to them. And something struck me. I mean you have to have the citizenship education type things in it but where is the kid that isn’t going to go to college or something like that really going to use social studies after high school? They really aren’t. They aren’t going to have to know it, or use it or anything like that. So he said, “Make it fun , make it interesting, make it something they can relate to and just go for it.” At first I was not sure what to think. When I came home, I sat there and I thought about it. I was the exception in high school; everybody else hated it. So when I thought about it, I was like, “He's right.”

In her initial meetings with Mr. I. Amanda was also provided with his resources and expectations as to how to accomplish the teaching of history. As with Mike, the

importance of knowing and covering the content was stressed as the key to a successful internship. This was to be achieved by using the textbook(s) for the course.

We just talked a lot about how we are going to get through the year and what things are important to focus on as far as the schedule. He set a goal, "If you can get here through to World War II this is great. But don't stress over it, you know." And the first day I came in to observe he introduced me to the class right away and said I would be taking over in a week or two, and he handed me a teacher's edition of the textbook. One was the new textbook that they will use next year and the other is the book they have now. And he said, "These are the textbooks we are using, you will probably want to start looking at them now. Any resources you want to use, anything in this classroom is yours." And we talked a lot. He is really easy to talk to and we both think alike.

Through observing and talking to Mr. I. Amanda realized that they both shared a common understanding of what it meant to teach history.

I think our philosophies are similar in terms of our ideas about history, and how it should be taught. We were talking about the Civil War and I was like "Well, I think the years 1850 to 1861 are more relevant than the actual war years," and he totally agreed with me on that. In the first few weeks we would talk a lot at the end of the day about what should be taught and stuff like that. And we both like 20<sup>th</sup> century American history a lot more than like late 19<sup>th</sup> century. So we just have similar ideas about how to teach history or how to see it, or what periods or things are important.

In light of what both considered to be important topics or periods to focus on within the course Amanda was well suited to her upcoming role in Mr. I.'s class. Just as with Mike, after some initial parameters regarding coverage of content were set by the cooperating teachers, the focus shifted to sharing their own conceptions of the types of students/audience members Amanda would face as she moved frontstage in the role of history teacher at Shawsville. What was deemed important to know in preparing the preservice teachers was not tied solely to what to teach but also to insights into who they would be teaching the content to. For Mike, the focus of the discussion on students revolved around encouraging him to make social studies interesting. Mr. I.'s comments to Amanda were designed to prepare her more not for what she could do for her audience but what her audience could possibly do to her.

When I came in to first meet with him we were just talking about the upcoming week and what it would be like and he said to me, "I just want you to know. In this community, you get a lot of middle ground kids. The majority of the kids who come in here are not motivated they tend to pull the kids that are in the middle down these kids are not used to seeing young female role models and for the most part, for a lot of them they don't exist. Most of these kids come from broken homes where their mothers have been left, they are working two to three jobs to support themselves, and many are not educated. So for these kids to see a young single woman who is not married getting a Masters degree is rare."

It was only after she began to teach, she noted, that Mr. I. acknowledged his initial concern as to how well she would be able to manage the audience/students as she took on the role of history teacher.

He said he was impressed with my classroom management. He said that in the past he has had students who haven't been able to manage a classroom. So I guess that was his big worry right from the start. Because with his last female student teacher, the kids made her cry. That's how bad the classroom management was. She evidently had no backbone I guess. I don't know if he thought that I wouldn't be able to manage it, or he thought that could have been a problem, but it has not been.

For Mike and Amanda, just as with Jonny and Helen, the process of planning lessons began with the textbooks that were provided them at the school. This is not necessarily that unusual since decades of research has shown that social studies teachers depend heavily on textbooks in their teaching (Schug, Western & Enochs 1997; Beck & McKeown, 1991; Cuban, 1991; Shaver Davis. Jr. & Helburn , 1979). This, Schug, Western and Enochs (1997) suggest, is because

teachers believe that textbooks provide them with instructional benefits. Teachers report that textbooks are an important tool for organizing class activities. They report that the additional materials that accompany textbooks - testbanks, worksheets, maps and posters - are important sources of satisfaction to them...In other words...teachers use textbooks because they choose to use them- not because they are pressured to by others (p.100).

In the case of Mike and Amanda, it is problematic to argue that they chose to use the textbook, for this implies that they perceived other options from which to (re)learn the content and then organize and package the material for transmission within the classroom. Choice, however, did play a role in the resources they utilized to supplement the text. Like Helen and Jonny, in their initial (re)learning and planning of the material, both Mike and Amanda primarily chose to use other versions of US history textbooks that were available from their department. As Amanda noted,

I have two textbooks I am using. One is the old one the kids have, the other one was ordered with the teachers edition, but only the teachers edition came in and the other stuff did not come in so they are not using that this year. They will use it next year but it has good stuff in it. And then I use stuff from some of my own books. I have a couple of series on American History that is useful to pull information from.

While also using extra US history textbooks he had found in the departmental office, Mike was concerned that it was inappropriate to introduce material that was not detailed within the students' assigned textbook. "I don't want to deviate too far from the book because I know that they have the book and if they study for a test I don't want everything that I have given them to be not in that book." In this sense the textbook itself became the organizing principle behind the learning and ordering of the content and what would then be tested.

While Helen and Jonny stressed and detailed the importance of teaching the skills of the historian, (which was how they had learned and understood history against a backdrop of specific periods), Mike's and Amanda's understanding of what should be the focus within a history classroom, as demonstrated through their actions, was an increased emphasis on the coverage of historical content. To organize the content of each lesson, both Mike and Amanda began to take outline notes from the textbook. As Mike noted, "For the most part, I used the book as an outline and then every once in a while I would go in and see where Coach H.'s class was. I used that kind of as a guide on 'am I going fast enough or too fast?'" It was a process that required a minimal glance at the SOLs "to see what it said for World War II....but I really did not use them that much because I saw that Coach H. was not really using them. I knew what was in them anyway." The SOLs

for World War II , he suggested, provided him with very general topic headlines that told him, "Okay, they need to see this... the debates in Europe and the US prior to the war, the impact of mobilization at home and abroad, major battles, military turning points, key strategic decisions, the Holocaust, and the reshaping of the US role after the war and world affairs." These items from the SOLs served as script prompts that, in preparing for his frontstage performance, sent him back to work on his lines beginning with key sections of the textbook:

I took what I thought were the major stories when I went through the textbook and I would sit down and then I would gain the facts of it, then make an outline. I always did the notes first every time I made a lesson. And then I would go back and think what do I want the kids to learn. Then I would make my objectives and then I would decide what could I do with them [the kids]. I would sit there and think," Well is this going to be easiest with lecture? Or is this going to be easiest with something else?"

The experience of gathering and collecting the specific details to fit under these headings created very little dissonance for Mike as he began to prepare for his role as history teacher. In high school, he had taken a 20<sup>th</sup> century history course that had, he remembered, spent a great deal of time focusing on the impact of World War II at home and abroad. His college transcript details a number courses that focused on the Civil War, World War II, and the Holocaust. This exposure to what he considered and remembered as meaningful history courses, details of which were now represented within the textbooks that formed an important resource in his lesson preparation, reinforced his existing understanding of what should be taught in a US history class. Planning history was about providing students with an understanding of what had happened in the past. "[the goal] is to give them an idea of what's happened in the past even if it is just the basic ideas. You don't always need to go in and elaborate too much. I mean give them the bare facts and then try to relate it and spark some interest like Coach H. said." Mike noted that deciding what events to pay attention to and elaborate on was a decision that, while set against the backdrop of what was officially and traditionally recognized as important, was left to the discretion of the individual teacher as curricular gatekeeper within his own classroom.

For the most part, if you are going to teach World War II, these are the things that you are going to hit anyway. Like the Holocaust, I mean that is something that you just have to teach. It is something that still I think a lot of people can't fathom the idea that it happened, but I mean we are even finding out now it's still happening in places like Yugoslavia. The Atom bomb is the other thing that I will spend a day on. Maybe looking at a video that goes through the pros and cons. Yeah, the SOLs have to be taught, but after that I think you get into decisions based on your own values and opinions on what you think made major impacts or was a major topic in American history. And I think calling what's important is a major value judgement on a teachers part.

Amanda shared the position that within a history course there are specific events that need to be detailed. As she took notes from the textbooks and identified the content that she felt should be detailed, she began to see the SOLs as a rather simplistic guide.

The SOLs are serving as a guide, but they have no mention about the Indians, about the cattle industry, about mining, about migration westward nothing. I mean they say absolutely nothing about it. And you know there is all this content in these chapters that isn't in the SOLs but it's considered traditionally important American history. And I still think that stuff is important and interesting.

As with Mike, Amanda's process of discerning what details should be presented within a lesson began with the routine of harvesting notes from the textbooks that she would then organize in preparation for presenting history to her classes. It was not necessarily a difficult endeavor. "I guess notetaking has always been one of my really good skills. Whenever I do take notes myself, I tend to be able to not write everything down but be able to summarize and organize things well." What Amanda did find difficult, however, was breaking away from the routine of gathering content to thinking about how she would organize the material into teachable/consumable chunks for her audience.

It gets hard because sometimes when I am writing my notes I look at this stuff and it's so easy. You go through the textbook and then you just get caught up in the content and forget what you really want to be teaching. At least I find sometimes I do that. And I know I need to be more aware of it, and be like, "Wait what is the big picture here? What is the theme? What are we talking about here?" Like the other day I was doing notes on all this stuff that was leading up to the Civil War and I was like, "Wait, what's the theme here?"

Okay, it's resistance and protest" So then I thought "Well how am I going to communicate that or section them out instead of just listing all these things on the board? Because if you just do that they are going to forget it anyway."

Amanda suggested that, while time consuming, this initial emphasis on note taking in planning was vital not only as a way to organize and manage the content material that was to be taught, but in order to carry off the appearance and manner of a knowledgeable and competent history teacher.

It took me a long time to prepare for lessons, because I think I tried to overdo it and I would end up getting up at 4:00 in the morning to work on lesson plans. I would either be on the internet looking for stuff to use or going back and reading chapters and making sure I knew the material. I was killing myself. I was spending 5 to 6 hours a night working on writing notes and getting ready for class. I guess cause at first it was just, I didn't know how comfortable I would be in front of the class. So I had tons of notes. Then after a while in actually just getting up there and talking about stuff, I realized I don't need half the notes I was writing. Like a lot of it was just getting comfortable with the whole environment, with what I was doing and after about two to three weeks of anxiety and stress I learned I know this material, or at least half the stuff I was writing down. And I just needed to write little things like dates here and there.

This focus on determining, gathering, and pulling the content together as a primary part of lesson planning resulted in developing plans that were very heavily orientated to telling the tale of the past. The pace of teaching on a block schedule, she suggested, served as a stumbling block to breaking free from what seemed to be a perpetual state of notetaking and organizing of the content for transmission as she tried to make sense of the material herself before going frontstage.

Sometimes I wish I had more time to plan. Because 19<sup>th</sup> century American history, especially the latter half, is not my forte to begin with and I just don't have a whole lot of time, ideas or resources for it. But then sometimes you come up with these great ideas but you need to find time to find the sources that you want to use and things like that. And then you find that you just don't have the time to make really great lessons plans and you end up doing something half assed instead.

However, teaching history on the block was not without certain benefits. Amanda suggested that the increase in the amount of content that could chronologically be covered in telling of the tale of American history did allow her to foster an ability to present history differently. Teaching on the block schedule made it possible to identify and develop themes that could be connected with periods and events that had previously been studied or would be studied in the next few days. Making such connections in a history class on a traditional schedule would have been difficult since the material and events that could be linked could so easily be forgotten by students or glossed over by teachers because they had been taught weeks or months earlier, rather than days or weeks, which was the case when on the block schedule.

I feel like we are moving really fast. Literally two weeks ago we were having a test on like the constitutional period and we are already up to the Civil War. It is kind of cool in a way, even though it is a lot of work to keep up with the pace because you can kind of link the big concepts to others. Like the idea of compromise. A couple of weeks ago compromise was a big theme in the constitutional convention and now we are talking about the causes of the Civil War as a failure of compromise. So I like that. But you know you still have to move fast, and I am not sure if that is a negative impact on how much the kids are going to learn or not. It is hard to say.



Frontstage in England: Taking the stage at Knottingley and Kettlethorpe. Exploring the reality of the classroom

As history students, both Helen and Jonny had successfully negotiated what they identified as very distinct levels of history. However, in taking on the role of teacher, it soon became clear that the activity of history teaching was much more complex than either had initially assumed based on their own experiences as good students of history who successfully moved through the different levels of history and their initial assumption of who they would be teaching as they moved frontstage. The actual activity of teaching history at Knottingley and Kettlethorpe required them both to teach specific sets of students within each year group who, while following the same schemes of work, were organized and represented as having very different academic abilities. As a result the factor of who in conjunction with what they would be teaching quickly became an issue as they moved frontstage.

Script Difficulties and Audience Reactions

During her first term at Kettlethorpe, Helen found herself beginning to teach some of her future assignments. These early experiences in front of her audiences not only opened her eyes to who she would be teaching but left her immediately questioning her own ability to teach high school history

Everyone told me what such a nice school Kettlethorpe was. But I have got some awful classes. I have students who can't read or write, who have behaviour problems. I mean 8S4 are literally the illiterate group. How do you tailor your lessons to that? ... and last term I was put into a full lesson with that year 10 group and it was horrendous. They were awful. Helen [B] was helping interview next years candidates at Leeds, so there was no one into support me and they ate me alive. She came back near the end of it and gave me this debrief and I was like "I really don't need this." I was up verging on tears at the end of it because it was so horrendous. They were being awful. They were being horrible, their behaviour had been shocking - nothing had gone right - and I just didn't need somebody at the end of the day telling me what I knew anyway. So I came close to jacking it in. I just felt I could not teach.

Research has noted that issues of survival and fitting in are phases that many individual student teachers experience as they begin the process of learning to teach. (Fuller & Brown, 1975; Calderhead, 1987; and Furlong & Maynard, 1995) For both

Helen and Jonny, developing and maintaining a frontstage image of self as history teacher led to constant concerns about how successful they would be when faced with an audience of students. This was exacerbated by the fact that neither of their timetables were filled with classes/audiences of little clones of themselves who were ready, willing and able apprentice historians. The closest example to such a class was a top year 10 group taught by Jonny. Referred to as “the angels,” Jonny felt sure of their abilities and needs as well as what was expected of him as their teacher.

They are absolutely excellent. They can achieve loads. Debbie has said, "Go in there and do more challenging things, try things out with them." They are very much sort of go in, sit down, listen, and get on with it. I mean it is really a very different challenge say than teaching year 7 set 4. Like 10 set 1 first off opted to take history, second there is no serious classroom management problems though they can be a bit chatty. But you want everyone in there to get at least a C at GCSE. So you are really trying to get them to stretch themselves. I mean they are sponges they will sit back and they will take the stuff in and they will do the work - regurgitate the story for you quite easily - and they are hard working. But I have to get them to go beyond that. I have got to get them to think in thematic terms and make links and connections.

He was, however less sure of how to approach and meet the needs of his other assigned classes. While they were also grouped by ability, their reactions, behaviour, and quality of work on a day to day basis seemed to constantly be in a state of flux. Even after six weeks of teaching or twelve actual lessons with each assigned class Jonny mentioned that the task of teaching the same material at a level appropriate to different bands of students was difficult.

I am still trying to suss [fathom] out some of the groups. My main concern is learning what level to pitch work at. I've got copies of the schemes of work so I know what I will be teaching and I am developing ideas of how to teach but it is quite hard to figure just at what level to pitch the work at. I mean there are lots of kids out there who are not going to get nine A's at GCSE. But if they are under you at school you have to kind of challenge them or push them.

Helen showed a similar concern, observing that especially within the 11-16 year age group, the situation was exacerbated by the fact that if the level of work for these

specific bands of students was not “just right,” discipline and management problems could and would arise. It was only in moving into her frontstage role as history teacher that, for the first time, she suggested that her training as a historian, while providing her with specific skills and habits of mind to plan and prepare to teach history, was not in itself enough to survive in the frontstage setting of the classroom at Kettlethorpe.

I am a trained historian but this [teaching] is very different. Standing up in front of them and talking to them on their own level because they don't have adult vocabulary is difficult. They don't have adult concepts of the world. And being confident to stand up in front of a group of thirty-four back-chatting cheeky kids who think they know it all is so difficult. I mean I am sure I was like that too. I don't think children change but I think your perceptions change when you have to deal with them. This is so very different from teaching in a 6<sup>th</sup> form. When you do your A levels you choose subjects you like so you are more likely to get kids who like history as opposed to finding it dull. You can then be less teacher-orientated because they already have the natural sort of leaning to history and they have already done things like their GCSE so they already have higher level skills. But lower down the school my role is to develop skills they will need later if that is what they choose. But it is really tough because the actual ability level of the group is vital. If you miss their level you can have no end of problems because they will create trouble because they don't understand and for the high ability groups you need to hit a level above them to stretch them.

This concern with planning and presenting lessons at the “right level” in order to maintain a well managed class was exacerbated by the fact that all students at Key Stage 3, irrelevant of stream, were expected to learn not only the content but practice the skills of history as detailed within the National Curriculum, displayed all around the history department, and previously experienced by Helen and Jonny as students themselves. Teaching history was more than telling the tale of the past; in each lesson students were expected to work with the content to practice the doing of history. This required, Jonny suggested, “creating within each lesson realistic challenges with targets that are achievable.” The problem, however, was determining what was a realistic challenge for a group of students who were organized along ability levels. For Jonny this required finding and developing

effective ways of doing things like preparing the worksheets and things. Like you know there're different ways of presenting. Like in table forms, diagram form. And I remember when I was at school if the teacher came in and said "read through these two pages and answer these questions." [groans] what a complete turn off. So you know you need to vary your tasks. So I will make activity sheets, often the language is different for different ability levels, and then I would have task 1, 2, and 3. So when it is time you can use your task sheet with the textbook. Or if I think the stuff that the textbook is providing is way too high for a class, I will have sources on a sheet. I will write a textbook style passage with some information and source stuff and then some exercises at the end. I do it like that because otherwise it just looks lazy if you just say answer the questions out of the book and it looks like you can't be bothered.

Appearing frontstage as a confident knowledgeable teacher, Jonny suggested, was vital if any teaching of history was to be done. Classroom control over his practicing historians throughout his internship was of utmost importance as he began. With practical stage direction from his mentor as he prepared to tread the boards frontstage, Jonny felt that he had managed to quickly and convincingly construct himself as teacher of history for the majority of his classes.

Well, my goal for the first two weeks was to feel like I had control of my classes and that I had control in the classroom, that was my main target before aiming to achieve anything particular things in terms of teaching. And I have been able to do that a lot quicker than expected. I felt I had got control pretty much straight off. The first class I did by myself was Year 8, a top set. There are 33 of them in there. Initially I aimed really low in the first lesson. Because I just wanted to establish control. I did what a lot of people at university will tell you not to do. I wrote two definitions on the board and told them to copy it down. We were stating the restoration of the monarchy so I had restoration and interregnum. And then I got them to copy that; "Off you go," and that got their heads down and got them working. I got the idea from my mentor who said, "You know all the stuff they tell you about going in explaining your rules and introducing yourself. Don't do that straight off. Just go in and find something where they can get their heads down." It was purely a control mechanism and not something I would do regular, but it was just a first meeting. So then the first couple of weeks we just did fairly basic textbook stuff, look at sources, discussion led by me, and then complete a task. But then last Wednesday, I tried this thing where we started on the Great Fire of London. We had watched a video and I wanted to get into causes and consequences and

prioritizing and so I gave them envelopes with cards in and I got them to sort out which were causes and which were consequences. And then we sorted the causes as long and short term. They wrote them down and we got to prioritizing them like in a triangular formation with most important at the top. And then we did the same with the consequences. It was the first sort of adventurous lesson because it wasn't textbook based. There wasn't much teacher led discussion. It was really stopping them and then bringing them back together, discussing and then starting them off again. It is the kind of thing that I thought I would do later on in the term. It was probably the best lesson I have done actually. Really enjoyed it, they got through all the target work.

With a similar approach to the teaching of history, Helen constantly created source-based worksheets for her students to use. "I did one on Hippocrates, on the four humors and clinical observation it was all in the textbook but in different places. So I did a spider diagram on A4 [paper] using the computer and stuck a picture of Hippocrates in the middle and then a diagram of the four humors and then some questions on it." Developing such material, she suggested, was in itself an important part of her role/performance as history teacher; it was a form of complexity reduction whereby the steps to acquiring specific understandings and skills were crafted into more manageable consumable chunks for her apprentice historians.

I don't like making handouts, it is very time consuming. But I think it is important to make things interesting. I think giving them handouts rather than the textbooks sometimes gives them more encouragement to work on things because they are not over-faced with an eighty page textbook. Instead they have just got a sheet or a couple of sheets to work with.

Helen, like Jonny, saw an important aspect of her teaching as being able to manage and control her apprentice historians. Her initial experiences, especially with year 10, had sapped her confidence in her ability to teach, which made it take longer to feel comfortable in her front stage performance, which she approached very differently from her mentor and the rest of the department.

I've been told I am far too polite and well spoken with the students and this was all to do with this initial confidence things, but you know that I am getting more confidence and I am developing as a teacher. I am not a strict disciplinarian in the same way Helen B. is.

I hated being strict with them but I had to be and they responded to that. So I would describe myself as more stern than a disciplinarian but I feel they were as attentive to me through speaking to them as adults and being serious as they were to Glen. Actually they were probably more responsive and receptive because I did not bawl them out. And when I started I deliberately did not stand at the front. I walked around and ask them questions. Because if you stand at the front they don't always feel involved. And if they are sat at the back they think they can mooch about and don't really have to listen. So I started to walk round, between the desks like a preying shark. You could see them all going "oh no" as I would ask them questions and pick on them as I went round. It is a great way of me hearing what is going on, because I have some cheeky pupils. And if you walk around and I pick up on what they are saying I tend to say things like "Have you got a problem? Is there a problem." And then it settles them down. It is a way of keeping them disciplined. And I would tend to stand at the back and talk to them. It changes their attention, it changes their focus so they don't get bored and they don't know what you are going to do next. And they are sort of aware of you all time because you are in there and you are amongst the pupils and you are with them. And I think it really helped me because I think they tend to think you are there, and you are with them and you are encouraging them along and pushing them that bit further and they know they can't just sit there and be quiet and have nothing to say to me for an hour and a quarter which is not going to happen. They have to get involved and they have to say something.

#### Seeking a consistency within and between performances

Finding the right level for each of the classes they were teaching did, however, remain an ongoing process of experimental/experiential performances in which successes were mixed with frustrations. At no point did either Helen or Jonny question or reconsider their understanding of the nature of history or history teaching. A script and stage directions needed to be followed with the goal being not only to teach historical content but also to guide students through the practice of doing history. Their approaches to working with their audience(s), however, were initially quite different, though their outcomes of their lessons (as shown in their portraits) mirrored each other. For Helen, learning the level at which to approach each different audience involved pushing all her classes until she met resistance:

Like even with low ability groups I tend to give them hard tasks. I like to be able to judge for myself because I don't think you can truly

know what level somebody is at until you have set them work yourself and got it wrong. Like last week I set 8S 4 a task that was difficult and they seemed to enjoy it. It was different. And we looked at scenarios to assess whether Charles I was popular or unpopular. And they were quite good at it and they got it toward the end when they understood what they were doing. I agreed with them that it was a hard task but I don't see why, just because they are supposedly a low ability group, they can't do the task.

Even within one day, however, such an approach to this genre of teaching history would leave her singing the praises of one class while desperately frustrated with the ability and behaviour of another.

The horrible year 10, the way they act it shows that they are not a GCSE group. They are not capable of taking even GCSE. Instead they do a local authority unit of accreditation and they end up with a certificate saying they have done some of the GCSE course. And they have to meet certain criteria which are a lot lower than GCSE, often involving drawing tables, maps and basic understanding of things like change, and cause and effect. And a lot of them don't even meet the targets for the level of that unit. I mean another reason why they are low attainers is that they are never in school so what do you do? Everything has got to be simple otherwise they are just confounded, and if you make it too complicated they don't respond. So I have tried to do things with them and they have gone abysmally wrong. And they can be little shits to put it completely unpolitely. Just being in the room with them you can gauge very quickly their mood. And their mood can swing very violently. You know they can be as nice as pie one minute and they can be swearing at you and telling you to "F off" the next. And history just goes out of the window. You cannot do anything beyond a very basic level. That is why we are spending all this time doing the posters that compare medicine in Europe in the dark ages and in the Arab empire on Thursday and the Chinese empire next Monday. With a higher ability group we would have written about it but with this lot they are not right keen on discussion. A lot of what we do with them is just key stage 2 operating level they have not really matured beyond primary level in what they can do. Like you certainly could not do the Ben Hur exercise with them - they would really struggle.

In contrast, Jonny was more tentative in the type of tasks he initially set.

Well, I went in with this year 8 group set 1 actually, and I was a bit concerned because there are a lot of them and they are quite chatty-kind of noisy. And I aimed the lesson quite low. I thought it is better

to do that at least they can then do the work. And when I then looked at the work at the end and went through it I was really disappointed. They were really weak. maybe it was just that it was so low, maybe they need challenging more. I don't know. I'm kind of at a bit of a loss to explain it at the moment. I am just trying to see how it goes.

Jonny's performances became an ongoing battle of finding ways to encourage his students to do and practice history. This was much more difficult with students who had been placed in lower ability groupings. There were occasions, however, when Jonny saw such students begin the process of thinking historically:

Like in that year 9 set 3 yesterday. that is a nightmare group Wendy teaches them and she calls them the "hell group." It is generally regarded as the hardest group in the school. They are so academically weak. Which is not the problem, well, it is the problem, but you also have some right idiots in there. So in terms of what you can actually teach them, I don't honestly know because I have tried active discussion types of approaches which they can cope with for five to ten minutes before it degenerates into shouting out or shouting at each other. But then I suspect if you go for the "heads down and write that down approach" you are boring them. So I don't really know where the line is with them. Generally it is not a very fulfilling experience but then, like yesterday, we were looking at World War I and exploring different reactions to the war over time and this kid looked at this photograph and basically analyzed it. He did not know that was what he was doing but he worked out what it was, thought the thing through and he said "Have they just found out that war has started and they are happy about it?" Now that was like a set one answer.



Frontstage in America: Taking the stage at Salem and Shawsville. Exploring the reality of the classroom

As students of history and subsequently beginning teachers of history, Mike, Amanda, Helen and Jonny shared the view that the study of history had allowed them not only to become knowledgeable about certain periods of history, but to develop skills for critical thinking. For Helen and Jonny the concept of critical thinking was defined as learning to think historically by developing an understanding of what Schwab (1978) terms the substantive and syntactical structures of the discipline. While both acknowledged that not all of their students could or would even want to become historians, Helen and Jonny continued to approach their performance as history teachers from the standpoint that learning history was intricately tied to developing and practicing the skills of an historian. Such a stance stands in contrast to the perspectives and plans held by Mike and Amanda who as students of history experienced and now as beginning history teachers stressed the importance of providing students with a foundation of knowledge about America's past that would later serve as a stepping stone toward encouraging "critical thinking." Amanda viewed the history class at Shawsville as such a stepping stone: "They need a foundation because it gives them more to be able to either criticize or support. So you need a foundation and that is what I am doing here."

Script Difficulties and Audience Reactions

Amanda felt comfortable within the role of teaching history as a subject that requires, above all else, the transmission of content to students. As she continued to plan and develop her lessons she constantly sought to improve her performance as the teller of the tale in front of her audience. The initial key, she suggested, was to appear knowledgeable and comfortable with the lines/script that she developed from the SOLs and her textbook.

You know I look over my notes a lot as I teach, just because I then tend to remember them better and be like "Oh, I don't want to forget to say that or talk about this you know." But I am trying to get in the habit of not so much memorizing but at least remembering each big point that I am going to cover because I am afraid that if the kids see me look at my notes too much they are going to think I don't know myself.

Performing the role of knowledgeable and competent history teacher successfully she suggested was mediated and constituted within and through her interactions with the class. Because her audience was very different from the audiences she had been a member of, it was not easy for Amanda to develop and maintain the balance, on the one hand, as the knowledgeable teller of the tale who could move the student through the content of history, and, on the other as an encourager of student-based activities and "critical thinking."

It is a general ed. class so half of them are not motivated to begin with. Because general ed. does not mean just the general kids it means the middle kids and then a whole bunch at the bottom. There are probably a handful of those kids you could stick into a higher level class and they would be able to keep up, but for the most part they just don't, can't, or don't want to. They don't have any opinions. I mean they don't think. They do what they are told, they are so passive it drives me nuts. I would be hesitant to try something like the JP model in this class because most of them are not going to get involved in it. It is so different from when I was in high school we had classes and we used to debate and argue and I don't see any of that here. They are so passive. I haven't had one female student in the classes that I teach who are really good critical thinkers who question, who have opinions about things, and that is frustrating for me as a female. So I can't teach how I was taught history as I would lose these kids. My AP class was always lecture every day. There were no overheads, almost like a college professor. He talked a mile a minute, we never had worksheets, he would drill us with questions and you had better have known them. He was a great teacher but that type of teaching style only works with a certain type of kids- highly motivated ambitious kids. And these kids would not get anything out of it.

Amanda's perception of her students' capabilities and attitudes, set against a backdrop of her own high school experiences as well as the expectation of the SOLs, left her with very limited options for how she could approach the teaching of history other than by providing her audience with the information that she had compiled in her notes. Her own experiences as a student of history and her own views as to why and how history should be taught left her at ease with what had so long appeared to her to be a necessary if somewhat routine, feature that constituted the role of history teacher. "I am pretty comfortable with standing in front of everyone, whether it's going over questions

and trying to get them to engage in discussion or you know lecturing I am pretty comfortable giving them notes, though I sometimes feel like I have gotten into too much of a routine with it. " The activity of teaching history in this sense for Amanda was and continued to be grounded upon a view of teaching that was focused upon the telling the tale of the past. She found, however, that her attachment to the pedagogy of telling, could not be maintained on a block schedule, in the context of teaching students who had been represented to her as lacking in motivation and ability. Without some form of positive audience feedback and involvement any sense of efficacy that enacting the pedagogy of telling provided, she pointed out, was easily eroded. "If I stand up there and talk the full time it is going to be dull for them." Suggestions and help for such concern came via her cooperating teacher after he had sat in on her first series of performances.

He was really good at the beginning. I did not even think he was observing me. He was just sat at his desk; I thought he was grading. He said that he thought I was doing well, but one thing he suggested was giving them material on the chapter and having them do section questions first before the lecture. Because if I just stood up there and wrote stuff and talked to them I would have no idea if they are keeping up, or if they are understanding what I am saying you know. I mean they could be writing this down and not have a clue what it means. Because like a lot of time when I would start a lecture on stuff they hadn't read anything yet or hadn't looked at anything about it and they had no clue what the lecture is about. So his suggestion was to give them a worksheet before they do notes or you can have them read the chapter and answer questions. Because if you give them some background they will get more out of the lecture. And you see we can do that on the block and he (cooperating teacher) kind of clued me in. He was like, " If you give them reading, give them a kind of guideline. But I have to tell you a lot of these kids don't do homework. They have jobs after school, so giving them class work like that is a good thing. And they will generally do it in class if you give them credit for it and you know that gives them some other exposure besides listening to lecture." And that has worked really well. So they have to look at the material first and they then have at least some idea or some background as to what they are writing down in their notes. And if I am lecturing or going over the questions, I will say "OKay open your textbooks" to the section so that they have their book to refer to as well. And so if I then ask them questions and get the interactiveness, I think, hopefully, it makes it a little more interesting.

It was a format that Amanda saw as having potential. As a result, locating worksheets from the accompanying teacher resource box became a part of her overall planning. The worksheets in a sense served as "flotation device" providing background or supporting knowledge to buoy the audiences' heads above the rising tide of content. " I try to pick worksheets that will either be used as a lead in to a lecture so they have something besides just our text to fall back on or to refer to what has been talked about that day." Such worksheets bridged the gap between how she remembered learning history - in classes made up of students who had developed the habits and abilities to take notes, provide correct answers to teacher based questions, while appearing interested in the teacher talk - and teaching students whom she perceived quite differently. The worksheets also provided Amanda with access to various primary sources that were so important in the activity of teaching history.

I am always giving them quotes or paragraphs you know. I give them stuff from John Jay, from Washington. Like I mean if its just things like two to three sentence quotes during the lecture to just to give them things to think about. And I did a lot of stuff with looking at the Amendments to the Constitution and primary source worksheets like Washington's Farewell Address when we talked about political parties. So I try to use primary sources a lot. Because it is interesting to hear what these people actually said and wrote and observed rather than reading it out of a textbook that somebody like me could have written

Incorporating such ideas as beginning each lesson with students completing their assigned worksheets and or textbook questions was an approach she had little experience with or had anticipated. While she felt such ideas were successful, the time taken up with independent student textbook or worksheet work remained the most uncomfortable part of her daily performance as history teacher throughout her internship. She suggested this had a great deal to do with the fact that in her own experiences as a student of history the whole lesson had been filled with her teacher's presenting and discussing history. In her performances as history teacher, large sections of teaching time were now missing as she stood silently waiting to present the details and content that she had previously (re) learned and had organized in the notebook that lay on the desk in front of her. It was during such periods that she was left to battle and rationalize whether she was really

teaching history as she had remembered it being taught to her and subsequently envisioned it from the backstage regions of methods classroom.

I wonder if I am not doing my job especially when I give them all these worksheet. Because I am not doing anything. I mean it's easier in my mind because I don't have to get up and talk and write stuff down. And I do think that if all I did was get up there and talk in a lecture a) it would be boring and b) I mean I think people learn better when they have different types of teaching going on. And I know that when I lecture too long or when I am up in front of the class too many days in a row doing that I can see the frustration on their faces . And when I give worksheets I mean like today for the most part they stay on task and they do them so it is effective in the way that the main idea is written down in their notes but its just strange waiting for them in order to move on.

In moving frontstage within the role of history teacher Mike similarly found the attachment to telling the tale of the past to be very strong. In looking over his own unit plans for his initial two weeks of teaching he realized that in spite of trying to incorporate the approaches and ideas modeled and practiced within the methods classes, the majority of each lesson was based upon presenting/transmitting content. "I think when I first made them [unit plans] primarily I went through looking to put in creative cooperative type activities, but they all ended up basically in my anticipatory set and in the conclusion. And I found myself with a lot of lecturing in the middle." It was a form of instruction that Mike remembered with less enthusiasm than the projects or story telling of some of his history teachers. "I mean I could sit through a lecture and it would be just fine, but I would rather get involved in it and do something and learn from actually doing it." In spite of such oft-expressed statements, a very real tension existed between how he envisioned the activity of teaching history within his classroom and the sense of efficacy that teaching by telling provided when faced with the content laden textbooks and curriculum. As a result, enacting the pedagogy of telling appeared, more often than not, as the only viable method for teaching and performing his role as a knowledgeable history teacher.

After doing that [lecturing] for a day or two it gets super boring and I mean if I am going to get bored I think the kids probably will be too. So I have to go back and rework what I have done and think of different ways to present the material, but sometimes there is nothing

in my mind. The best way to do it is just come straight out, lecture, give them the information, and have them spit it back out to you.

The tension that Mike felt over his pedagogical attachment to lecturing as he moved through the first weeks of his teaching practice was exacerbated by several intertwining factors. The first was his perception that providing the details of history through lecture was in and of itself a weaker version of the teaching of history than what he termed "the storytelling" performances he had seen and enjoyed in high school and university. In both cases, teaching history remained primarily the telling of history to an audience, but the ability to story the events of the past "made it more interesting for them than just sitting there with you feeding them the facts and giving them slot notes." Storytelling was much more audience friendly; it was designed to appeal to and enrapture the audience just as Mike had been enraptured by the knowledgeable and powerful performances of certain teachers. The problem for Mike, however, was that he felt that such an accomplished level of teaching/performance designed to engage his audience was something that he could at this stage only aspire to develop.

Storytelling, I find is hard. If I could come up with a story or actually sit down and think, "Okay how would this work?" Or think up a story and compare it to like doing something on organized labor and just say talk about a man that works in a factory in Salem I think it would be just fine. But for me to come up with those things I think it's going to take me a little while to get the content. To get I guess comfortable with the content, to be able to elaborate and go into that type of stuff.

A second factor that folded into and upon his initial hopes to not succumb to "feeding them the facts" grew out of his observations of his students' reactions to his performances. Upon completing the first couple of weeks of his internship Mike returned to a campus seminar meeting exceptionally excited about a lesson in which he had developed a role play that not only detailed what happened but allowed all the students to act out and see the events in Europe that led to the outbreak of World War II in Europe. He felt it had gone very well. He had not only broken away from direct instruction, something stressed in the methods class, but all his students had participated in the lesson and they "really liked it." He informed the seminar that instead of just telling

the students about the build up to World War II he had provided them all with a script on individual index cards, which, when put together detailed the beginning of the war:

I took my seating chart and made a map of Europe from my class with the G's Germany, P's Poland A's Austria and the Soviet Union here. And when they came in they had these [index cards] on their desks. And it would have the nations flag on it and specific details. Like with Austria I put down that their language was German and that Czechoslovakia was a democracy with few defenses. I put what type of defenses Poland had, who its allies were. Every kid was a country. I did it kind of in a lecture format, and as I went through I would give them the different events on another index card and it would detail what actually happened. And the kids would say it instead of me and they were in chronological order, even things like the different treaties like the Nazi Soviet Non Aggression Pact. And the kids were doing more of the lecture than I actually was. I would go and reinforce it and add some information to it. It was really a good way to show how the tide of Nazism swept over Europe.

His interjections and insights as each student presented their section of material provided him with room to then "add in stories." In looking back over his internship Mike evidenced this lesson alongside a class debate on the dropping of the Atomic bomb, his inductive lesson plan on propaganda, and a lesson based upon a talk show format as the high points to his teaching internship. "I think one of my successes has been that I have been able to get stuff across to them. I think they enjoyed and know what I have taught. I mean I could probably give them a test today of the stuff I did with them on World War II and they would probably still remember it."

However, developing lessons that received very positive reactions from students while maintaining his cadence as he planned and moved chronologically through World War II and onto the Cold War was, he suggested, exceptionally difficult. Between the well-remembered lessons described above, Mike noted that though he constantly struggled to find ways to

make things a little more interesting and fun if I can. I have been trying not to fall back on lecture but I don't know with a war. I think that it [lecture] is the most straightforward approach. But I am going to also show some videos next week so that the kids can see pictures and equate what I have been teaching them.

Though he noted that the lecture style format was something that the students were accustomed to, since that was how his cooperating teacher taught, he remained uncomfortable with his performance in the role of history teacher if he "fell back on lecture" on a regular basis. In light of his cooperating teachers comments about how little students liked social studies, Mike struggled to find ways to share his knowledge with his audience in such a way as to elicit some recognition of approval of or interest in the content of his performance. Yet as he continued to teach his unit on World War II he could physically see his audiences interest wane, just as he remembered as a student his had on occasion:

I could tell the kids were starting to feel that World War II was dragging on, and for me it was too. It was just the looks on their faces I could tell and then I also had kids sleeping. At times it was getting on my nerves that they are not paying attention. But at the same time I realized I had done the same thing in some of my classes. So I know that I am guilty of it too, because you're tired and stuff is boring.

This push to cover the content was further exacerbated by the pre-existing assessment structure for the course. Students were regularly tested on the content that had been previously presented. It was a routine that of history that Mike was quite familiar with based upon his own experiences as a student; he readily fell into it as he began to teach.

Basically I use the same format as John's tests, the multiple choice, fill in the blanks and the short answer essay type things. I think I like that test style. And John seems to have this down and if you look at his grade book it looks like he's giving one every Friday, once a week. He told me his philosophy was to have a short test that was a little more detailed. Because the kids would be able to do it better than a long test with a lot of information at the end of some big unit. And I think he is right. I always had problems. I hated classes in college that had a mid-term and a final. I just didn't like that. Whereas the other classes, if you had a test every two weeks or so it kept you on the ball and it made sure you kept reading and kept doing your work. I mean you knew what a teacher was going to give you usually. But I think keeping it in the same format gets the kids used to it. They know what types of things you might ask them. The key is to set tests at a logical stopping point.



Because the students in the class were evaluated primarily upon their content knowledge of history it became very difficult for Mike to avoid "falling back on lecture" and telling the tale of history in order to pass on the subject content that the students would subsequently be tested. The push to lecture and deliver the content of the textbook increased as Mike continued to teach his students. While he still sought to introduce specific lessons and ideas from the methods class, his ongoing experiences with his sixth period class, which he described as a "real mixed group" left him seeking to maintain a sense of efficacy within his role a teacher of history as he continued his internship. Mike suggested this involved a distinct shift in how he approached the planning of his classes and how he viewed his classes of mixed ability students. "For the most part I could plan things so that whatever I planned for 2<sup>nd</sup> period I could do with 7<sup>th</sup> period very easily. But then I found myself looking at 6<sup>th</sup> period and what would work for them. And so basically 2<sup>nd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> period got stuck with what ever I did with - well, I would have not done anything differently anyway - but I caught myself planning for 6<sup>th</sup> period not 2<sup>nd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>." Planning for this mixed ability group based upon their wide ranging behaviour patterns, test results, and the upcoming SOL test pushed Mike to focus on giving them the facts and details that he felt they needed to know in order to be successful in 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history.

At the beginning I would just look at the kids and assume that they knew what I was talking about and go through it real quick. But you can often tell from the looks on their faces they weren't understanding and they would ask questions about "Well why did that happen?" or you can tell they didn't have a clue when it came to the test. So now I take it as though I am teaching it to kindergartners who know absolutely nothing. I wonder if that is not fair on some of them but its like when you were learning how to write a paper on something and the teacher said pretend your reader knows nothing about the subject. That's actually the approach I have changed over to.

It was an approach based upon the notion that teaching/telling causes learning, where a defined body of knowledge is organized, managed, and formed into consumable chunks by the teacher in order to be consumed by the students. Over a unit of work this was made palatable by the more student-based lessons that he developed. Similarly, within an individual lesson he sought to avoid fifty minute lectures in order to satisfy the

tension he felt over just seeing himself as a conduit of information. Throughout his internship this meant consistently trying to make history interesting for his students for he contended that

lecture would not work with them [his students] not well anyway, and number one I did not like giving them. The classes were fifty minutes long. So you figure you have the first five minutes to catch them the last five minutes to keep them. So you have forty minutes and I didn't like giving forty minute lectures. They couldn't survive. So what I found myself doing was that I would try to give them a little bit of time. Like I would start with a lecture. I would look at my notes and I would give them the facts, write it on the board give them their slot notes or whatever I was doing that day. I would give them a couple of notes and stuff and then I would try to get them to talk about it. And that way they were getting a lecture but we were having a class discussion, so it wasn't keeping them in that same frame of mind. So I would change up and like sometimes I would pull in a video as well.

Abrupt endings: Recognizing where idealism and reality clash

Time present and time past  
Are both perhaps present in time future  
And time future contained in time past.  
T.S. Eliot

Wilson and Gudmundsdottir (1987) have shown that identifying the boundaries of a case study is far from a simple task. They contend that the process of case generation proceeds through four main stages: "1) identifying key events and experiences for each informant; 2) interpreting the meaning of the identified instances; 3) identifying themes that related key instances within the case; and 4) identifying a structure that related one case to another " (p. 46). My goal in developing these four contrasting case studies has been to adhere to the process that Wilson and Gudmundsdottir identify. However, there needs to be a point of exit-some ending that brings the main threads of this comparative story together. Crafting a final impression of these beginning teachers, who had allowed me into their classrooms, was a difficult step. This is made worse by that fact as Becker (1998) notes that

[s]ometimes... we look for the kind of nice, neat story we like to think, when we are feeling scientific, can be told about the world...If

we tell such a story, we need only cite some facts and everyone will believe it: we will believe it ourselves and be relieved that we have after all found some order in the world. We have a neat story or image. Unfortunately, it is one easily punctured by inconvenient facts (p. 19).

The case studies end, as they began, focusing on the activity of teaching history in the classroom. However, to end with the participants facing and exploring the realities of the classroom does not produce a clean or tight ending. The case studies do not allow for a triumphant finish with the participants portrayed in a "heroic light" as very good beginning teachers (though all were deemed as such by their cooperating teachers and university supervisors).

What the endings do highlight are the concerns and issues continually discussed by these beginning teachers upon leaving the safety of such backstage spaces as the methods classroom and moving into the front stage setting of the classroom in the role of history teacher. To close the case studies here is awkward and uncomfortable simply because the participant's stories come to an end, within this study, where idealism and reality clash. The participants are left, on the one hand, to come to terms with the demands of their own conceptions of history teaching as well as those of their methods instructor, and, on the other hand, with the everyday reality of teaching. It is important as a teacher educator, however, to acknowledge this disconnect between the idealism of teaching and reforming the history classroom and the reality of preparing future history teachers to work within an education system that has undergone no unified systematic reform. This study begins to illuminate and unravel the interactional processes that weave together and give rise to tensions experienced by the participants as they began to negotiate the reality of the classroom. It is only by initially focusing on the interactive forces and the complexities of learning to become a teacher of history that we can move forward to explore the implications of this study, use the cases to inform future practice, and "evoke images of the possible" by examining such epistemological questions as What is History? What do we want to achieve in the classroom? and How could history be taught to achieve such goals? (Shulman, 1983, p. 495).

### Interactional processes in the social construction of a history teacher.

The process of becoming a teacher for Helen, Jonny, Mike, and Amanda did not begin as they entered into their teacher preparation programs; rather, their paths evolved over time, and were shaped and managed by their actions and interactions with others. Learning to teach is a process that extends beyond distinct teacher preparation programs. Rather, it is mediated transactionally and constituted within and through time by the expectations and recognition of others. This study helps to inform our understanding of the socially constructed process of becoming a teacher. It examines two continually interweaving components: the “interactional past and interactional potential” (Milligan, 1998) that together influence how preservice history teachers approach the teaching of history with the context(s) of their internships.

### Shared goals - Differing conception

To a great extent, Jonny, Helen, Mike and Amanda shared very similar goals and hopes for themselves and their students as they entered into their internship. The importance of appearing to be a knowledgeable and confident teacher of history was vital, as was their goal of making history accessible and relevant while encouraging their students to become knowledgeable critical thinkers. Such idealized goals, for all the participants, mirrored their representations of their experiences as students of history. History was a subject they had enjoyed, had been successful in at school, and now wanted to teach. While the participants shared such goals, the case studies reveal that Helen and Jonny held quite contrasting conceptions of history and history teaching from Mike and Amanda, their American counterparts.

### The creation of an “interactional past”

Jonny's and Helen's biographic conceptions of history and history teaching are based upon their experiences learning the methods of the historian and the skills of the discipline in the context of the Schools Council History Project and the English educational system. Learning history at school emphasized primarily the development of historical skills, including the analysis and evaluation of historical texts, and a focus on such concepts as change, empathy, and cause and effect in the concept of history as a body of knowledge. The nature of the school's curriculum and examination structure, however, served to limit the number of students who were willing and/or able to continue

the study of history. By the time Jonny and Helen graduated from university, both represented themselves as trained historians, master craftsmen who now had the ability to find and take on apprentices of their own to teach them the skills and abilities they had learned. In contrast, both Mike's and Amanda's conceptions of history teaching throughout their formal education was influenced in style and content by the tradition where the role of history teacher was to actively present a body of content knowledge to her/his students. Within such a tradition, emphasis was given to the importance of covering/transmitting an understanding of the story of a nation's traditions and cultures. The place of history within the school and college curriculum as a result, for Mike and Amanda, was less exclusive in nature than in England. Even though both US participants demonstrated an ability to take AP history, which placed them with students who were also viewed as academically able, history was a core subject that was taken by all students.

These contrasting conceptions of history and history teaching held by the participants became meaningful to them specifically because of the significance of their past experiences learning history, which then became associated with their understanding of the role of history teacher and the activity of teaching history. Such experiences of how history was taught and learned by Mike, Amanda, Helen and Jonny created an interactional past (history of experiences), which continually served as a filter through which their expectations (the interactional potential) of what they perceived as possible within the contexts of their teaching internship classroom were shaped.

#### “Interactional potential”

Within the context of the methods course at Leeds and internships in their respective partner schools, the emphasis on developing the skills of the historian mirrored Helen's and Jonny's conceptions of how history should be taught in school. In Helen's and Jonny's classes, the departmentally approved approach to the teaching of history became the basis of their everyday pedagogical performance with those students who were organized into the higher ability bands. However, the success of these lessons was tempered by teaching assignments in which both participants constantly struggled with how they should teach history when faced with students who had been placed into lower ability groups. In both cases, knowing history and seeing themselves as trained

historians did little to prepare Helen and Jonny for teaching history to students who seemed to struggle with not only the conceptual and linguistic difficulties, but also the boredom of source analysis as they were encouraged to practice the skills of the historian. Such classes left both Helen and Jonny struggling and frustrated in their teaching. The way they had come to understand history teaching through their own educational experiences did not prepare them for the reality of such classes. A mismatch existed between their own assumptions about students and the realities of the students' abilities and interests in regard to the learning of history. Within the confines of their teaching internships, little room was given or appeared to exist for Jonny and Helen to rethink their implicit assumptions of how to teach history to those students who knew they would not continue with the study of history after the age of either fourteen or sixteen. Instead, the activity of teaching history became an ongoing effort to make it through the lesson while still seeking to encourage and look for those magical moments when their students showed flashes of the skills and analysis that they deemed important in the process of learning to be a historian.

The methods course at Virginia Tech sought by design to offer a range of alternative approaches to the teaching of history and social studies beyond what was represented as the typical "teaching by telling" approach. The different models of teaching that were presented and then practiced in the methods classroom were seen by Mike to hold a degree of potential for future use within his teaching. This had much to do with his belief that he was not yet able to craft the type of historical narratives that enthralled him as a student of history, and offered an alternative to "falling back on just lecture." As a result, Mike developed and introduced lessons based on what he had prepared or seen presented in the micro teaching episodes in the methods class, lessons that he believed would be well received by his audience. As Mike's case illustrates, these approaches were not substitutes to the pedagogy of telling the tale of the past, but mirrored some of the well-remembered projects he had participated in as a student. These served to pique his interest as his teachers provided him with details and content of the story of the past.

Amanda's attachment to the pedagogy of telling the tale of the past remained strong throughout her internship. It was only as she neared the end of her internship that

she made any mention of the models of teaching from the methods course. This came as a result of a meeting with her supervisor who encouraged her, Amanda said, to "just try more interesting lesson plans and, you know, maybe try to use some of the models of some of the innovative stuff we did." Both Amanda and Mike suggested that it was difficult to go above and beyond detailing and covering the events of the past when faced with seventeen-year-old students who they viewed as neither caring nor having the ability to do history. Just as with their English counterparts, the activity of teaching history for Mike and Amanda became a process of searching out and cherishing those magical moments when their students evidenced flashes of interest and involvement in the material and content that Mike and Amanda had collected, organized, and presented to them within the front stage setting of their history classroom.

#### Continuity and constraint

The context(s) of the internship classrooms, including the curriculum, the resources available, the requirements of the department and cooperating teacher, the physical layout of the classroom, including wall displays, and their perceptions of students, can be seen to shape the participants' perceptions of what was and was not possible within their daily pedagogical performances. What these case studies show, however, is that while the context(s) of the school may serve to shape and /or constrain what the participants deemed possible, the context(s) of the school was not the determining factor for how the participants approached the teaching of history. What is clear from these cases is that the participants remained attached to specific approaches of teaching history that they had experienced as willing and able students of history. The continuity between how the participants were taught and how they had come to understand history, and their subsequent use of the same approaches within the internship classrooms, reveals how their understanding of what was possible within the reality of the history classroom was deeply influenced by their own backlog of experiences-the interactional past.

The accumulation of such experiences associated with learning history can be viewed primarily as a process of enculturation into the networks and practices of history teaching that formed a genealogical lens through which the participants came to an understanding of their role as history teacher. The move to the other side of the desk, for

all participants, was akin to “entering upon a stage” which they did not design, and upon which they subsequently found themselves playing out a daily series of pedagogical performances that were not wholly of their own making (MacIntyre, 1984, p. 213). The limitation of their own experiences as products of the educational system to which they now returned in the role of teacher, however, proved to be problematic for the participants when faced with the responsibility of teaching history to a wide range of students. Both Helen and Jonny remained frustrated and rather helpless when trying to organize learning experiences that supported and fostered the teaching of historical skills and concepts. While they held clear ideas of what they wanted to teach, they lacked the exposure to and an awareness of a range of instructional methods and approaches that Mike and Amanda experienced. Methods and approaches, including various cooperative learning techniques, concept attainment, inquiry, and inductive models of teaching that would have added an extra dimension to their daily pedagogical performances. Mike’s and Amanda’s sense of frustration and helplessness did not arise from a limited awareness of how to approach the teaching of history, but from their perception of the nature and goal of teaching history within the high school setting. The case studies reveal that their perception of history teaching is one that encouraged the teacher to be a giver of information, the “teller of the tale of the past.”

The challenge for teacher educators in both England and the US is to focus on the disconnect between 1) the goals of the methods classes, 2) the idealized images of preservice teachers, 3) the concerns and problems faced by students and teachers within the history classroom, and 4) the differences in expectations between supervisors and cooperating teachers. This means moving within and through various networks of relations to unpack our existing assumptions of what history is and begin to develop communities of active learners who are supported and encouraged to explore such questions as: “What do we want to achieve in the history classroom?” and “How can we go about achieving these goals?”

If no effort is made to rethink and bridge the gap between the work and research carried out generally by teacher educators, ensconced within colleges and schools of education, to connect it to instructional issues and research agendas of teachers within the history classroom, the future for history teachers, teacher educators, and history students



appears bleak and, at best, static. In American, this means that the public's understanding of the nature of history will continue to be reduced to the lowest common denominator in the form of a watered-down, "non-critical chronicling" of the past that comes via lecture notes, worksheets, lists of dates, and objective based tests. In England, this means that history will remain an inaccessible and difficult subject that will continue to struggle to attract students, who are either discouraged by difficult source work, or see easier choices at the age of fourteen. In schools and colleges of education, this means that it will continue to be difficult for teacher educators "to refute the persistent and pervasive beliefs that teacher education coursework is, at best, irrelevant" (Grossman, 1990, p. 146). This in turn leads to the argument that there is little need for teacher education institutions, since everything one needs to know about teaching history, one learned and will continue to learn in school as a student and then teacher of history.

## Part 10: Implications, Recommendations and Images of the Possible

“There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so.”  
Shakespeare.  
Hamlet.

Everyone- parents, students, legislators, fellow teachers, academics, and preservice teachers-has memories and expectations of what it was and/or is like to learn history, from elementary school through high school (and for many through college). However limited or mistaken these experiences and memories are, they lead to public/political expectations and images of what history and history teaching is or should be within an educational system. It is within and against these varying levels of public expectations of history and history teaching that teacher educators are faced with the challenge of taking students of history and preparing them to become thoughtful, reflective, and theoretically aware history teachers. This comparative study of four preservice history teachers, in examining the complexity of this process within two very different educational systems, shows that it is a mistake to assume first, that teacher education begins as preservice teachers enter their respective teacher preparation programs; and second, that a common understanding of the role and activity of being a history teacher exists. The study itself only begins to explore the process of learning to teach history. More could have been learned if the sample size of preservice teachers had been larger, more could be learned by following the participants on into their first years of teaching history. For our own purposes, we are constrained by the limits of this study, but all studies have such limits.

This study has its antecedents in my own experiences and reflections of being a student and teacher of history in England and America. It is a study that holds implications for my own research agenda and practice as a teacher educator of history and social studies teachers in America. This does not mean, however, that the implications and recommendations I make here will be of little benefit to history teachers and professors, teacher educators, and policy makers who are concerned with the nature of history teaching. My goal here is to identify key implications and questions through which to develop recommendations and ideas that are salient to my own practice as a

student of history, a teacher of history, and a teacher educator of future teachers of history.

The education of a teacher- when does it begin and when does it end?

While Helen, Jonny, Mike, and Amanda grappled with such questions as "What do I want to achieve?" and "How do I want to achieve it?" as they organized and planned their lessons, it is important not to ignore the influence that their interactional past had on their teaching. The study informs our understanding of the highly influential role played by particular high school and college history teachers as de facto teacher educators. Such insights suggest that further attention should be paid to what is learned by prospective teachers with regard to their understanding of pedagogical practices associated with history teaching prior to entering a teacher preparation program. This study was designed to shed light on these matters, but there is a need to continue to ask such questions as, How does a teacher's family, gender, age, ethnicity, educational background, national origin, political affiliation, religion, friendships, shape their conceptions of history and vocabularies of motive and readiness to teach history? Is it possible to map over time and space the networks of relations and communities of practice within college departments and school departments that constitute beginning teachers' conceptions of history teaching? How do conceptions of history and images of history teaching develop and change through high school, college, and into teacher education programs? How do preservice teachers interpret the expectation of their preparation courses, in light of their own prior assumptions pertaining to history and history teaching before and after the internship experience? How do preservice teachers talk about history and their teaching of history as they move through their preparation program and begin to teach?

Although discipline knowledge was crucial for how these participants approached the teaching of history within their internships, the study shows that for Jonny, Helen, Mike, and Amanda, their knowledge of the content and memories of learning history did not provide them with the experiences and understandings necessary for teaching the range of students they encountered. Although much can be learned by preservice teachers from the field experience, in my limited time with Helen, Jonny, Mike, and Amanda, there seemed to be little room, support, or time for them to identify or develop new conceptions or images of how to teach history once faced with the reality of the

classroom. While such terms as critical thinking and historical thinking were appropriated and freely used by the participants to discuss their goals for the classroom, the activity of working with students affected the participants' initial assumptions of what was really achievable with regard to critical thinking and historical thinking with diverse groups of students (interactional potential) within their history classrooms. The instructional solutions developed in response to the participants' struggle to teach the range of students, for the most part remained limited to creating simpler versions of the same pedagogical approaches they had experienced or seen taught within other history classrooms. For example, in teaching the skills of history, attending to student differences for Jonny and Helen was focused primarily on simplifying the language of worksheets as a way for their students to understand what they were expected to do as they practiced developing the skills of history. The assumption within such an approach is that all students have the ability to learn history and think historically, and the only stumbling block is their language skills. Similarly, in teaching the content of the past, both Amanda and Mike repackaged the pedagogy of telling the tale of the past as they experienced it into what they represented as simpler and more accessible presentation of the content.

What becomes apparent is that research by teacher educators has an important role to play in expanding our knowledge of how historical understanding develops in children. The Chata Research Project on Teaching History (Ashby, Lee, & Dickinson, 1997) in England, in response to such concerns faced within the reality of the classroom, has begun to focus on children's developing understanding of historical evidence and explanation. Such research, however, should not be confined purely to university-based projects as the one mentioned above. The notion of teacher as researcher needs to be pushed and encouraged within initial teacher preparation programs. This study highlights not only the value of having teachers explore and reflect upon well-remembered events that have shaped their understanding of history and their subsequent decision to become a teacher of history, but also contends that teachers, including preservice teachers, should be supported in their individual and collaborative research and studies within the school context. Reflecting on their own private exploration of self in conjunction with more public studies within the school context is an important avenue through which to address

and prepare preservice teachers for the reality of the history classroom. Of particular benefit for preservice teachers, based on the findings of this study, would be action research projects that arise from working with and tutoring students who struggle with history. In order to develop and apply appropriate teaching strategies preservice teachers could begin to ask questions and develop an understanding of, 1) how children learn history, 2) how children know by themselves how to discern what is historically significant from what is not, and 3) what it is that children "do" and understand when they are learning history. By becoming reflective researchers themselves, preservice teachers will have the opportunity to examine the biases and beliefs that children bring with them to the history classroom. Providing such experiences where preservice teachers have the chance to tutor various students while collaborating with peers, cooperating teachers, and teacher educators to develop teaching strategies beginning teachers will hopefully have experiences that will allow them to identify new and more powerful possibilities for the classroom. This study suggests that complementary research by teacher educators should also ask such questions as "How do preservice history teachers come to understand such concepts as critical thinking, and historical thinking as well as citizenship? In which communities of practice did these terms become introduced and meaningful to the participants? How do they use these terms in different contexts and communities of practice? How does their understanding of such concepts influence classroom practice?"

Asking such questions becomes important if teacher educators are to provide pedagogical experiences and images of what is possible that enable beginning teachers to prepare for the reality of the history classroom. Offering up pedagogical images of the possible itself, however, cannot mean simply telling teachers how they should teach history. Instead, it means looking for answers to such questions as what kinds of history courses, what kinds of teacher education resources and activities, and what kind of classroom resources and activities will best allow preservice teachers to first, meet the challenges and frustrations highlighted within this study, as the participants moved front stage; and second, offer positive examples to show that the role of history teacher can and should evolve into more than a "teller of the tale of the past"

A key issue for teacher educators is to consider how the notion of “teacher as researcher” should be structured into the university and internship experience. If a goal of teacher education is to develop reflective practitioners, it is important to ask whether it would be beneficial to bring preservice teachers back into the college setting after the completion of the internship (beyond the occasional seminar and exit interview) to evaluate and reflect on their growth and attitudes with regard to the activity of teaching history, as Helen suggested to “question and challenge our lecturers now that we have some experiences,” as well as be questioned and challenged by their lecturers. The return to the university setting, if not immediately but after the first year of teaching, has the potential to help both teacher educators and teachers maintain a connection as the teachers continue to negotiate the reality of the classroom. The opportunity can then be taken for collaborations with teachers as they continue to develop their own practical knowledge of teaching within the everyday reality of the classroom, and for developing and connecting their experiences with systematic bodies of knowledge and theory. Such collaborations can help prepare beginning teachers “for seeing the promotion of lifelong learning as being at the center of their future role as teacher,” while providing them with resources and support to conceptualize “how to change their practice in response to new contextual demands” (Young, 1998, p. 60).

#### Limitations and possibilities within the history classroom

It has been suggested (Ellington 1998) that little can actually be done to improve the standard of history teaching within American schools, “that young people will continue to be more ignorant than their counterparts in other developed countries in history and other academic subjects unless widespread systematic reform of public education occurs” (p. 444). While there is a great deal of truth to this perspective, it is important to think how reform occurs. It is ill-advised to ignore the political power and influence of grassroots activist movements to gradually educate and sway public perceptions and opinions (Castells, 1997). Much can be learned through conducting further research that examines the historical development, the successes and failures of such magnificent adventures in curriculum reform as the Schools Council History Project in England, and the New Social Studies movement in the US. The Schools Council History Project grew out of a university project in the North of England in the 1970's.

And even within the current and very political document that organizes how history is taught in England, one cannot ignore the impact the project has had on publishers, teachers, teacher educators, and the activity of teaching history in the classroom. Developing organizational histories of such projects, examining the material and resources produced, which in the case of the Schools Council History Project, are still popular today, can inform our understanding of how to think and advocate for change within history classrooms today.

This study shows that if history in our schools is to become more than merely the telling of the tale of the past, it will not be accomplished by teacher educators alone. At the very least, change must begin with not only teacher educators (who teach future teachers what it means to do history) but also history professors and history teachers from elementary to high school (who teach history, and in doing so model the teaching of history to future teachers). In short, this means beginning to find and form powerful communities of practice that can provide the space, time, freedom, and support through which to explore the limitations and possibilities that exist with our current understandings of what is possible within the history classroom. During the 1950's and 60's in America the New Social Studies movement brought the above mentioned groups together to revise the history curriculum (Nelson & Drake, 1994; Fenton, 1991). One lasting product of the New Social Studies was the AP program in history. This serves as evidence that 1) the calls for communities of practice and collaboration is not new and 2) that collaboration between teachers, teacher educators, and historians is possible. It is also possible to learn from the events of past as to why the collaboration ended, for as Whittemore (1993) points out:

Eventually the money flow stopped, university faculty were getting too little credit for their outreach efforts, schools found the new programs too expensive and too unconventional. Like the New Math and the New Science, the New Social Studies faded away” (p. 385).

The reward system for all involved in the New Social Studies movement became a barrier, just as finances, and such issues of research agendas, tenure and time will continue to serve as stumbling blocks to collaboration today. As Michael Sovern, argued in his 1993 Commencement Address at Columbia University, collaboration with faculty

may not be easy since the incentives for them to come out of their ivory towers are not readily apparent. Since it is the “great researcher, not the great teacher, who is likely to receive tenure, salary increases, and job offers” (Quoted in Whitemore, 1993, p.387). However, while there is no evident Sputnik to kickstart calls for collaboration and communities of practice, the proliferation of interactive technologies in education - from elementary schools to institutions of higher education - offers tremendous possibilities through which teacher educators can begin to break down the barriers between the above - named groups in order to facilitate projects that connect teachers, historians, preservice teachers, and students. Given the push toward technology standards within education as a whole, and the resources and funding that are available, it is not only desirable but also feasible for teacher educators and their students to create and develop, in collaboration with historians and history teachers, on-line projects that encourage and provide materials for the doing of history.

The English case studies reveal the potential that subject-based school departments have for forming the nucleus of vital communities/partnerships of active researchers/learners and teacher educators in the goal of working to address the challenges and concerns that are so easily blamed on the nature of the subject of history. Teacher educators can facilitate this community by developing closer collaborative partnerships with schools and departments, to work together to collect, organize, develop, and share materials and resources that address the needs of both institutions, while encouraging and representing "best practices" within the history classroom. It is within such grassroots communities of practice that it may be possible for teachers to move beyond the confines of their own biographic conceptions of history and history teaching and begin together to

reflect on education as a whole, ends and means: to reflect on action, and to test those reflections...(to) reason and reflect about their own teaching, but then also share those ideas with others so that teachers don't become locked into their own individual boxes, learning about teaching alone, simply because they are teaching alone. (Shulman, 1995)

This study forms part of my own personal and professional reflections on what I believe history should become within the history classroom. In heeding Shulman's



words, it seems appropriate to end this study where I began: to share my own evolving thoughts on the limits, possibilities, purposes, and goal of teaching and learning history, while offering a final and brief parting vignette from the field as an image of the possible for the history classroom.

#### Taking notice - Identifying limitations

The range of what we think and do  
is limited by what we fail to notice  
And because we fail to notice  
that we fail to notice  
there is little we can do  
to change until we notice how failing to notice  
shapes our thoughts and deed  
R .D. Laing

The way we think about the purposes and goals of learning history will color our reading of the four participants' case studies, just as my own experiences in England and the US led me to believe that history teaching is conceptualized and performed differently by teachers in England and America. This research in no way proves that this is the case; the participants I chose are not generalizable to, or representative of, English and American history teachers as a whole. The study does, however, detail the influences of two competing traditions of history teaching, traditions that have a strong active presence within the official history curriculum of England and the Commonwealth of Virginia, on the daily pedagogical performances of these four preservice history teachers.

While some may agree with the "great traditions" approach to teaching history that served as an organizing principle for how Amanda and Mike understood and approached the teaching of history, others will just as enthusiastically support the approach that informed Helen's and Jonny's understanding of history and history teaching. What is less debatable is the extent to which neither tradition is wholly unproblematic.

#### Limitations of the "great tradition"

It is difficult to deny that acquiring knowledge about the past is an important reason for studying history. Mike and Amanda emphasized the importance of knowing about the past as part of the process of providing students with access to knowledge necessary for the development of competent, active citizenship. What appeared to be

important for Mike and Amanda was the chronological chronicling/survey of American history in order to provide students with an understanding of the nation's traditions and culture.

Such a tradition of history teaching in conception and structure, with its emphasis on broad survey coverage and mastery of facts, implicitly stresses such notions as objectivity, reality, and truth within the study of history. The danger with such an approach is that history is unwittingly reduced to a unitary, fixed, neatly packaged, simplistic, context-free and natural story that emphasizes "myths over interpretation and consensus over controversy" (Levstik, 1997, p. 48). If, as James Wertsch (1998) cynically muses, the goal of history teaching is merely to put forward the historically significant facts of the past "one could argue that the schools have done their jobs quite well: they have equipped students with one, and only one, cultural tool [the "quest for freedom" narrative storyline] to employ in representing the past of their nation state" (p. 166). Wertsch is not alone in his concern with the apparent lack of time and effort given within a heavily content-focused history curriculum to develop historical understanding through exploring different perspectives on the nature of culture and historical knowledge (Epstein, 1997; Levstik, 1997; Wills & Mehan, 1996). To ignore the range of perspective limits our ability to understand and learn from a nation's past; a past that, Shklar (1991) contends, "from the nation's beginning as an independent republic...was torn by glaring inconsistencies between [Americans'] professional principles of citizenship and their deep-seated desire to exclude certain groups permanently from the privileges of membership. These tensions constitute the real history of its citizens" (p. 14-15).

What becomes problematic in watching Amanda and Mike, as I have watched other beginning teachers as well as myself, tell the story of *the* history of America, is that students are given little, if any, acknowledgement of how and why the details that make up the perspective were chosen for the class. In reality, there is simply too much history for any one student to learn. Consequently some selective decision-making is necessary—initially on the part of the curriculum developers, text book authors and teachers—regarding historical significance before the story is presented and documented to the class as the content that will be on the test (Van Sledright 1997). The final outcome is that the nature of history appears to exist as a stockpile of knowledge with the sole purpose of

studying the past being the pursuit of tacit knowledge. History, as a result, merely leads to a "rudely stamp'd" understanding of the past, in which the past

Itself suffers harm: whole segments of it are forgotten, despised, and flow away in an uninterrupted colorless flood, and only individual embellished facts rise out of it like islands: the few personalities who are visible at all have something strange and unnatural about them, like the golden hip which the pupils of Pythagoras supposed they saw on their master (Neitzche, 1983, p71).

The question that remains is how such an approach to the teaching of history, in which the past is decontextualized, reified, and neatly package for both transmission and administrative control, promotes the goal of citizenship that is so espoused by Mike and Amanda as well as national and state standards for history and social studies. It seems foolish to suggest that correctly answering the multiple choice questions found on Mike's and Amanda's teacher-made tests and on the 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history Virginia state test is a good indication that students know history. For as Peter Lee (1991) contends, it is quite

absurd... to say that schoolchildren know any history if they have no understanding of how historical knowledge is attained, its relationship to evidence, and the way in which historians arbitrate between competing or contradictory claims... Without an understanding of what makes and account historical, there is nothing to distinguish such an ability from the ability to recite sagas, legends, myths or poems (pp. 48-49).

It is even more absurd to then equate the learning of history in this form with the development of the skills and attitudes consistent with the goal of active, enlightened citizenship.

#### The limitations of teaching historical skill and concepts

The competing tradition of history teaching that played a major influence in shaping not only Jonny's and Helen's but my own understanding of history and history teaching is not without its own share of problems. As can be seen from the case studies the expectations of the National Curriculum, while focusing on the learning of historical content, also stresses the need to develop historical skills. In both Helen's and Jonny's departments there was an increased focus on developing teaching materials that emphasized source analysis. However, if school history's main focus becomes primarily concerned with 1) source analysis and 2) developing an understanding of primary

sources, there is a danger that history will remain an exclusive and inaccessible discipline for many students. Shemilt's research in the 1980's highlighted the problem faced by many students who struggled with the expectations of the Schools Council History Project, for "in practice, many adolescents required to use primary sources are given the means to answer questions they have not yet learned to ask" (Shemilt, 1987, p. 43).

The case studies within this research, reveal that much of the frustration experienced by Helen and Jonny originated in classes of students organized into low ability streams. Although Helen and Jonny taught a range of students who were organized into different ability groups, the goals and structure of the lessons differed little from group to group. Both had a great deal of experience and understanding with the problems and nature of historical knowledge and interpretation within their own education, both Helen and Jonny struggled with the challenge of making their tasks pedagogically appropriate for many of their students. In many of their classes, students found historical sources conceptually and linguistically difficult. As Pendry, Husbands, Arthur, & Davison (1998) suggest "a preoccupation with primary historical evidence underplays the importance of narrative structures, which provide the framework within which questions are posed and answers developed" (p. 147).

Peter Sexias' (1998) work has detailed a range of difficulties faced by preservice teachers faced with the task of learning how to use primary sources within a history lesson. The issues faced by his participants mirror the concerns discussed above. For example, Sexias notes that one participant fell into the trap where he "did not use the historical source historically. The use of a historical source to try to promote certain attitudes in the present, directly and without due attention to historicizing the source, risks presentist misreading which, in the end, subverts the moral purpose of doing history" (p. 335). His participants also faced the difficult challenge of trying to make their exercises pedagogically appropriate for their students. The difficulties experienced by his participants, Sexias notes, highlight the complexity of such a task in which "the construction of a good exercise demands attention to specific key passages, difficult phrases, and archaic conventions. It also demands careful attention to the framing of questions, so that the sequence leads students smoothly through an analysis of the text towards new learning" (p. 335). Such work suggests that if greater attention is to be

given to developing children's historical understanding, then teacher educators will be required to think far more about what it will take to prepare beginning history teachers to use primary sources within the teaching of history.

### Teaching history: Concern and conflict in America

The focus on using primary sources and spending time developing the skills of the historian has led to concerns about what will actually be taught and not taught in the history classroom in both England and America. In England there appears to be an uneasy truce established by the Dearing Committee over what will be taught in the history National Curriculum over the next couple of years (Crawford, 1995). In America, individuals such as E.D. Hirsch (1987), William Bennett (1992) and Lynne Cheney (1994) have become well known advocates for a common core of knowledge for all students. Within such a framework for cultural (historical) literacy, there appears to be little room for assuming that historical understanding is more than learning the core set of ideas and facts that make up the story of the past. Suggestions for introducing and working with primary sources appears to lead to such questions as, "Who makes the choices of what primary sources are to be used, and whose perspectives are being represented or ignored within the texts in the history classroom? To what extent will such encounters with historical sources and accounts impact our understanding or view of the past?" Such questions have left many to worry that if history teaching focuses on examining sources and varying perspectives to explore historical events, the school subject of history will become a meaningless discipline where enduring assumptions about what we know as the past are questioned and eroded.

Within the "public world" events ranging from the Smithsonian's The West as American exhibit and the Enola Gay "affair" to debates over the existence of the Holocaust and Oliver Stone's JFK and Nixon have sparked debates over the use and abuse of history by revisionists. Even within the academic world, concern has been expressed about the nature of the path taken by professional historians. Walter Arnstein, in a 1995 interview with Roger Adelson, expressed his concern that over the last 25 years the nature of history has shifted. At one time, Arnstein commented, historians

had too much of a sense of certainty...nowadays we have too much of a sense of relativity... I find myself deeply troubled by scholars who seem to have reached the conclusion that writing history is

identical to writing a work of fiction, as if there is no fundamental difference between historical monograph and a novel (Adelson, 1995, pp. 487-489)

Such concerns reflect the comments I heard from a young student when his history class was informed that they would be given material to study for use in a debate. The student could barely contain his excitement as he explained to his friend that he was really good in debates because he could argue with anybody about anything. At this point, it seemed that the ideas of working with historical sources to develop evidence as a way to explore and shape one's understanding of an historical event within the context of the here and now was missing from his understanding of history. What remained for that particular student was a belief that there were no right or wrong answers based upon the collection of evidence, since everything was relative to some perspective.

#### Re-thinking History- Exploring Possibilities

"I hate everything that merely instructs me without augmenting or directly invigorating my activity."

Goethe

Oscar Wilde wrote in The Importance of Being Earnest that "truth is rarely pure and never simple." The same can be said for history. In approaching these two contrasting traditions through an exploration of their limitations, it becomes clear that neither 'choice' appears to offer much promise as a way for history to enhance one's sense of empowerment, identity, or critical thought. The teaching of history, however, does not have to flounder within either tradition. Instead, it is possible to show that a space exists between the Scylla and Charybis of, on the one hand, the dominant authorized chronicle of facts that so many people believe forms the historical truth, and on the other, the so-called subjective revisionist history, which locks us into an inescapable relativism. This space begins with the recognition that having an ability to understand how the discipline of history works-how we come to know the past, how the past is explained, and how historical accounts are produced and justified - is just as basic a goal of history as learning to recognize the significance of past events within a historical and current

context. It is only when these two traditions, are not perceived as inherently exclusive of each other, within a history lesson that the history classroom can become a space in which the opportunity exists for students to actively and critically construct meaning for and of one's self in the here and now. Past events can be unraveled, deconstructed and subsequently reconstructed within the classroom, instead of merely being presented as a totality of facts and details to be remembered for the upcoming test.

If teachers want, as the participants expressed their students, to become critical thinkers in high school these four case studies show the importance of teaching more than just the narrative of history to students. One of the most significant insights from the portraits of teaching is that the eleven-year-olds taught by Helen and the fourteen-year-olds taught by Jonny were expected to do more in terms of writing and the doing of history than the seventeen-year-olds taught by Mike and Amanda. Helen's and Jonny's experiences as history students, in conjunction with their own conceptions of themselves as practicing historians, go a long way toward explaining their ability and willingness to see history as much more than the memorizing of the past. While Helen's and Jonny's case studies also highlight that not all children can or even want to become historians, it is important for teachers, history professors, teacher educators, and policy makers to see the possibilities that do exist within the history classroom when students are challenged to know how history is done, and to know how to do history. If there is to be any movement toward closing the gap that exists "between history as a critical discipline and history as a schoolroom trivia game, with its traditional mind-numbing regurgitation of names and dates" (Cohen, 1998, p. 116), then, within my own practice in America, this means addressing such questions as "What is history?" "Why are we teaching history?" and "What does it mean to know and do history?" with both elementary and secondary preservice teachers. In order to encourage a re-thinking of the nature and goals of history and history teaching within the methods classroom, this begins with presenting my own understanding of history and reasons for studying and teaching history to be debated and

discussed while offering images taken from this study of what this could look like in the history classroom. It is through observing the comments and reactions of students that it will be possible to help them identify the strength of their own biographic conceptions of history and the issues and constraints that they may face and need help with as they move into their internship. While future preservice teachers like Amanda and Mike may not consider themselves historians in the way Jonny and Helen do, if they are to teach history and social science in a way that goes beyond the telling of the tale, the case studies reveal the importance of unpacking and paying close attention to what history is, before showing what this actually can look like in the classroom.

#### What is history for? Why bother?

Though many historians aim to appear as disinterested, objective practitioners of history, there is a growing recognition among practicing historians that history is a personal and passionate construct, the product of a historian's perspective as a story teller/narrator. Wayne Urban & Jennings Waggoner Jr.(1996), in American Education: A History, went so far as to explain their growing theoretical understanding of what history is in the preface of their book:

While striving to be conscientious in our research and adhering to the accepted conventions of scholarship, we recognize that our interpretations at times differ in detail and tone with some other histories of American education...We hold that there is no single interpretation of facts, no single story, to which all need give assent. Every history represents an attempt to "make sense" of the past from the perspective of the present. And for every historian, the way one experiences the present affects to some degree the way one comprehends the past. (p. xx)

Simply put, what the historian studies is the past; however, the past and history are not the same, they are separated by time and space, for the past has occurred. It can only be brought back, by the historian who reads the world as a text and subsequently presents it in the form of a narrative. Historical narrative, in this sense, is not merely a chronicle of facts about the past that is waiting to be written down; the very nature of narrative prevents this. Meanings and idea emerge through the creative and active



process of writing; narratives are authored. Understanding this helps to see history as a field of action, as a social construct, whereby historical meaning comes into being through the tool of language, in the form of narrative.

#### History as a field of action. What historians do, we all can begin to do

One only needs to play with the idea of how historians work to see history as a field of action. Professional historians get up and go to work in departments and institutions that identify themselves with certain beliefs, values, tools of inquiry and ideologies. Historians bring with them certain strengths, weaknesses, values, and perspectives based on their own personal history. They also bring with them, or are hired because of, their research agenda, their own special area of interest and expertise. One does not go into research blindly, and the historian, based on her past readings of other historians and her own research, will have begun to identify areas that 'require' further examination.

To "do history," as Helen and Jonny learned throughout their apprenticeship, requires the historian to actively find the material with which to build a foundation from whence one can enter the 'conversation.' This comes from the work of other historians in books, articles and other leftover primary traces of the past in the form of documents, diaries, notes etc. These are then used by the historian as evidence to build his position. Decisions are made about what is used, how it connects, and how it will further his representation of the past. This understanding of the past however is impacted by the historian's own viewpoints and predilections:

The major changes in historical interpretation do not as the layman often imagines, arise from the discovery of new evidence—the chest full of unsuspected documents. What is most likely to happen is that the historian will find what he is looking for, namely the documents which will explain and illustrate his point of view. But what is he looking for? Surely the truth—for what really happened. It is his job as a scholar to form as exact an idea of past events as he can from the surviving evidence. But the instrument with which he looks at the past is modern. It was made, and shaped, and it operates in the present. It is his own mind. And however much he bends his thoughts toward the past, his own way of thinking, his outlook are the products of the time in which he lives (Wedgwood, 1955, p. 53)

The historian actively sets out to find traces of the past; he is not “passively subject to them” (Mead in Joas, 1985, p. 67). The traces found in the writings of other historians or in primary evidence serve as a “generator of meaning.” The meaning of the sources is not “transmitted” to the historian; rather, he works to imbue them with meaning, and makes choices about the way sources will be represented and given a particular meaning.

### Crafting the historical text

After identifying the traces of the past to be used, the historian begins to craft them into a historical narrative. This is by no means a purely abstract task. Time constraints are a problem, and the marketing concerns of publishers play a role in impacting the writing and the rewriting, as do the historian’s own interests and literary style. Throughout the process of “doing history,” it is not just the ideas and voice of the historian that are re-presented within the text: the words and ideas of the historian are not purely his own, they are intertextual. He uses both the words of past historical texts and those found in original traces of the past that he has read, made meaning from, and now chosen to cite to craft his own historical interpretation. Narrative’s intrinsic properties, “its sequentiality, its factual indifference, and its unique ways of managing departures from the canonical,” along with its inherent dramatic quality make the writing of history a highly imaginative affair (Bruner, 1990 p. 50) To do this, the historian must call on her own creative resources to develop the ideas and themes that will play a role in reconstructing the past. How the narrative is constructed will impact the meaning of the text. The “facts” chosen to be used do not make the story; it is the job of the historian to interpret the material, to utilize it as evidence and to identify and piece together facts, perhaps as they have never been pieced together before. While the historical facts may or may not be in dispute, their arrangement into contiguous series of intermediate points that move forward to present a point of view in the conclusion will offer a different emphasis or perspective from other historians writing on the same period.

History is a way of organizing and explaining the past. It is not a neutral activity, for “to tell a [his]story is inescapably to take a moral stance... for [his]stories carried to completion are explorations in the limits of legitimacy.” (Bruner, 1990. p. 50) Historical narrative/historical discourse is always by someone, for someone, for some purpose. Thus

history is never for itself; it can never be neutral, objective or innocent of meaning. The doing of history, therefore, becomes a dialogue between a multiplicity of perspectives and range of readings as they seek to include, exclude, marginalize, or bring to the forefront various understandings of the past.

What needs to be recognized is that new interpretations form part of an ongoing conversation and dialogue between the text and its readers. The goal for the historian is not to revolutionize our understanding of the past, but to “transcend the limitations of rivals, in a way that would be recognized and acknowledged by adherents to rival views” (Johnson, 1993, p. 242). This does not mean that the text, however well researched, unlocks the golden door of truth and thus offers the authoritative univocal word that demands

we acknowledge it, that we make it our own: [that] binds us quite independent of any power it might have to persuade us internally:.... [that] demands our unconditional allegiance and [that] allows “no play with its borders no gradual and flexible transitions, no spontaneously creative stylizing variants on it. (Wertsch, 1990, p. 78).

Rather, at that moment in time, the text seeks to position itself as the “superior” view; for it offers a powerful current understanding of the past. This position, however, should be seen as merely a privileged position within the historical community. History, in this very real sense, is a “shifting discourse constructed by historians.” No single reading of the past based on the historical facts is guaranteed: “change the gaze, shift the perspective and new readings appear” (Jenkins, 1991, pp. 13-14). Jonny's portrait of teaching, in using the history department's lesson plan made up of English, German, and French newspaper clippings, and Mike's collection of posters, can be seen as a powerful examples of simple resources which have the potential to provide opportunities for students to begin to construct their own historical narratives from very different perspectives.

#### Moving toward a perspectival approach

History, as described above, is an ongoing process; “not only does the past influence the present, but the concerns and issues of the present prompt historians to reform and rephrase questions about the past and to think in new ways about old

problems. History is thus fluid, dynamic, and shifting” (Urban & Waggoner, 1996, p. xx). History is not purely a chronicle of facts, to be learned and memorized for the upcoming test, but a narrative discourse about the past produced by historians. A historian's work can never be seen as neutral. History is an ideological construct. However authoritative a work may appear, it should be viewed as a powerful discourse within a field of action that merely corresponds to someone's or some group's point of view.

Such arguments, however, do not necessarily lead to the conclusion that history is all interpretation, if we can never really know the past, then history is worthless relativism, pure bunk, a pack of tricks that the living play on the dead. Such criticisms fail to understand the dialogic nature of the history text and ignore how historians study the past. Doing history is an ongoing process of interpretation, one that involves a “limited freedom to imagine other values and points of view, and to change one's world in light of possibilities revealed by those alternative viewpoints” (Johnson, 1993, p. 241). History like education “is not an affair of ‘telling’ and being told, but an active and constructive process” (Dewey, 1980, p. 43).

Recognizing one's role within this process as a student of history, while being encouraged to participate, provides the opportunity for not only the development of a knowledge base, but more importantly a critical reflexivity, that will allow one to negotiate and see the underlying ideological presuppositions that framed the reconstruction of the past into a particular historical account. In moving towards an understanding of the perspectival nature of history within the classroom new questions can be framed and asked, questions that go beyond low level factual questions, that when answered, are viewed as proof of one's understanding of history. The text or sources can be ‘unpacked’ and critiqued by such questions as Who is this history for? Who benefits by this reading? Is this account believable? Whose viewpoints are omitted? Is the account backed up by sources? “What would it be like to believe that? or what would I be committing myself to if I believed that?” (Bruner, 1990, p. 26). Such a form of history recognizes how important it is for individuals to begin to make sense of the world for “one's own understanding in itself becomes part of history, part of the story. Each person's view of the past heavily influences his or her view of the present and the future;

it shapes one's conception of what is desirable or undesirable, possible or impossible" (Urban & Waggoner, 1996, pp. xx-xxi).

### The ideal of perspectival history

A perspectival approach to history does not mean succumbing to useless relativism. It does not mean that the teacher will hear every week, "History is just someone's opinion of what is important. My opinion is just as good as anyone else's. I don't think this stuff is important. History is not important." (Barth & Spencer, 1992, pp. 13-14). It does mean that the history classroom will not be a comfortable place for those who want just the facts, swear by *the* textbook and enjoy what Loewen calls the "morality play" of official history. It requires participation and open-mindedness, whereby the individuals are expected and willing to

construct knowledge and values from multiple perspectives without the loss of commitment to ones own values.... It demands that we be conscious of how we come to our knowledge and as conscious as we can be about the values that lead us to our perspectives. It asks we be accountable for how and what we know. But it does not insist that there is only one way of constructing meaning, or one right way (Bruner, 1990, p. 30).

History in the classroom thus becomes a transactional and creative activity that requires the student to be able to frame situations imaginatively, explore previously unseen implications of existing ideas, empathetically explore the experiences and feelings of others, and envision both how various viewpoints are made possible and what the impact may be of supporting or disavowing such ideas. This does not mean that the individual is left alone in wild abandon to shock, scintillate, and turn upside-down our understanding of the past. Within a historically aware population, there should be no fear of revisionism,- for the historian's freedom to reconstruct and present a specific perspective of the past is socially situated. Varying perspectives are there to be opened up to questioning and critical reflection. Individuals and groups hold up the values, principles and fundamental frames to scrutiny. Limitations and prejudices can be identified, differences can be discussed and challenged, agreements can be made-the possibilities are endless. The key to a perspectival approach to history within the classroom is communication for "when communication occurs ...events are subject to

reconsideration and revision; they are re-adapted to meet the requirements of conversation” (Dewey, 1981, p.132). Those who can’t hold their own, “who stubbornly adhere to the old [narrative] without at least broadening it through argumentative engagement,” will slip from the conversation because what they offered did not add to an understanding of history. (Mead in Joas, 1985 p. 134)

A perspectival history requires the classroom to recognize history as a shifting discourse, a language game that is more than capable of ignoring racial, ethnic, gender, and class distinctions and thus rendering certain groups and individuals invisible. It means, however, avoiding the trap of succumbing to a yearly round of "cultural tourism," especially in February and March (Black History Month and Women History Month, respectively, and somewhere along the line you may also have a brief “getaway” with Indigenous Awareness Week)

...When underrepresented groups are treated as "cultural representative" and not as "social" or "historical actors." Cultural tourism also occurs when students are invited to study the cultural attributes of specific groups as static and fixed, rather than establishing the presence of members of cultural groups as social actors in particular historical events in history...When the approaches to including diverse groups in American history situate these groups outside of history, then students' knowledge of these groups becomes that of a tourist - knowledge of an exotic people, an "other," who have not bearing on our lives, or our history" (Wills & Mehan, 1996, p. 6).

The history classroom, as this study reveals, must become a key place where resources are provided and teachers are prepared 1) to think historically, 2) to use models of teaching to create lessons that encourage students to work with sources to develop evidence of past events, 3) to ask probing questions, and 4) to demand supporting material for interpretations and ideas made by their students.

Teaching history can then begin to function as a generator of meaning, as a thinking device that lays open the current “privileged” forms of historical knowledge and shows that possibilities do exist for individuals to make meaning, to become creative individuals, to become more than central processes into which information can be downloaded, and to be capable of making choices that are not limited to such dichotomies as true or false on a multiple choice test, good and bad, but political and

moral choices about what kind of world they want to live in. The choice is not between history as the “truth” or history that is relative, but “between a history that is aware of what it is doing and a history that is not” (Jenkins, 1991, p. 69).

This comparative study suggests that a goal for teacher educators in collaboration with teachers, and history professors should be to provide images from the classroom of what it means to do history with our students. It is these students who will become the future teachers, historians, teacher educators, and policy makers within a citizenry whose own biographic conceptions of history and history teaching will influence what is possible within the history classroom. A great deal can be gained through collecting and sharing images and stories from the field of study to evidence that it is possible to organize learning experiences for the classroom in which students can 1) learn history, 2) learn how history is done, and 3) learn how to construct history on their own. Collecting, developing and sharing such images, I believe, can help overcome the limitations and constraints of our own experiences and provide a foundation upon which to reflect, examine, and move toward thinking about the importance of doing history as opposed to being given history in school. On a personal level examining and carrying out such collaborative work is how I am beginning to understand my role as a teacher educator of future history teachers. This study serves as a marker from which I can begin to focus and position myself as a teacher educator. In reflecting upon what I have written here, while at the same time struggling with the need to bring a sense of closure to this text, I have to acknowledge that I do not have a neat and clean ending. There is no set of simple truths or conclusions as to the nature of teaching and learning to teach history in England or America that I can now espouse. In fact, as a result of my research I seem to be left with more questions than answers. Questions and ideas however do not act as obstacles to new and ongoing conversations and dialogues, and so hopefully this text will serve as a way to begin to re-think what it means to be either a student and/or teacher of history, or (in one way or another) an educator of future history teachers. You, the reader, will have to decide for yourself what this work means to you as a teacher, historian, policy maker, preservice teacher or teacher educator. This process can begin by asking whether you are willing to discuss, dialogue, collaborate and explore the complexities of what history could become in the classroom? If the answer is no, the danger is that school history, as I

have seen it in America, will continue to function as a reductionist tool that strives to perpetuate a dominant story of the past. If the answer is yes, then it needs to be understood that change will come slowly and unevenly. It will have to start with an understanding of what it means to do history. This will mean a major paradigm shift in how history is taught in our schools. A perspectival approach to history will not provide us with universal truths, but it promises much to “anyone who prizes the gift of life, the gift of the mind and the imagination, the gift of beauty and eloquence, and whatever truths about ourselves we can master” (Poznar, 1997, p.327). Before one decides upon the path to be taken it is important to realize that there is nothing as disempowering in a history classroom as first, a teacher to be faced with a class of students, many of whom have their heads down asleep on the desk; and second, a student to be presented with an authoritative history that either disparages, marginalizes or simply makes no connection to their own understanding of ‘their’ past. For as Adrienne Rich puts it, “When someone with the authority of a teacher ...describes the world and you are not in it, there is a moment of psychic disequilibrium, as if you looked into a mirror and saw nothing.” (Cited in Bruner, 1990, p. 32). Perspectival history offers the opportunity for teachers and students to begin to do history. What is needed to encourage the “doing of history” are stories and examples that share ideas and show how history is more than merely the teacher “telling the tale” of the past.



## References

- Adelson, R. (1995). Interview with Walter L. Arnstein. Historian, Fall, 485-499.
- Adler, S. A. (1991). The education of social Studies teachers. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning: A project of the National Council for the Social Studies . N Y: Macmillan.
- Adler, S. A., & Goodman, J. (1983, November). What is social studies? Student teachers perspectives. Paper presented at the National Council For Social Studies CUFA, San Francisco.
- Anderson, L., & Holt- Reynolds, D. (1995). Prospective teachers' beliefs and teacher education pedagogy: Research based on a teacher educator's practical theory. . East Lansing MI .: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.
- Anderson, L. W. (1997 ). The stories teachers tell and what they tell us . Teaching and Teacher Education , 13 (1), 131-136.
- Apple, M. W. (1990). Ideology and curriculum. New York: Routledge.
- Ashby, R., Lee, P., & Dickinson, A. (1997). How children explain the "why" of history: The Chata Research Project on teaching history. Social Education, 61(1), 17-21.
- Atkinson, P., & Delamont, S. (1985). Socialization into teaching: The research which lost its way. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 6, 307-322.
- Aubrey, C. (1996 ). An investigation of teachers' mathematical subject knowledge and the processes of instruction in reception classes. British Educational Research Journal, 22(2), 181-197.
- Ball, D. L. (1993). Moral and intellectual, personal and professional: Restitching practice. In M. Buchmann & R. E. Floden (Eds.), Detachment and concern. Conversations in the philosophy of teaching and teacher education . New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ball, D. L., & McDiarmid, G. W. (1990). The subject matter preparation of teachers. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (pp. 437-449). NY: Macmillan.
- Ball, S. J., & Goodson, I. F. (1985). Understanding teachers: Concepts and contexts. In S. J. Ball & I. F. Goodson (Eds.), Teacher's lives and careers (pp. 1-26). London: Falmer.
- Barham, E. (1996). General control of the curriculum and teacher involvement in curriculum change. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 12(1), 29-36.
- Barr, R. D., Barth, J. L., & Shermis, S. S. (1978 ). Defining the Social Studies. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.
- Barth, J. I., & Spencer, J. M. (1992). The deconstruction of history in the public school classroom. Social Education, 56(1), 13-14.
- Barton, K. C. (1997). History - It can be elementary: An overview of elementary students' understanding of history. Social Education, 61(1), 13-16.
- Barzun, J., & Graff, H. (1992a). The modern researcher. (5th ed.). NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Barzun, J., & Graff, H. F. (1992b). The modern researcher . (5th ed.). NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

- Bateson, G. (1972). Steps to an ecology of mind: A revolutionary approach to man's understanding of himself. New York: Ballantine.
- Baxter, M. G., Ferrell, R. H., & Wiltz, J. E. (1964). The teaching of American history in high schools. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Beck, M. G., & McKeown, M. G. (1991). Social studies texts are hard to understand: Mediating some of the difficulties. Language Arts, 68, 482-90.
- Becker, C. L. (1958). Everyman His Own Historian . American Historical Review , 37, 221-236.
- Becker, H. (1998). Tricks of the trade: How to think about your research while your doing it. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, H. S. (1986). Writing for social scientist: How to start and finish a theses, book, or article. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.
- Berk, L. (1980). Education in lives: Biographic narrative in the study of educational outcomes. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 2 (2), 88-155.
- Berliner, D. C. (1995). Teacher expertise. In A. L.W. (Ed.), International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education . New York: Pergamon.
- Biermann, M. (1997). EDCI 5784 social studies-methods I & II graduate seminar syllabus . Virginia Tech.
- Block, J. H., & Hazelip, K. (1995). Teachers beliefs systems. In A. L.W. (Ed.), International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education . New York: Pergamon.
- Board of Education, C. o. V. (1995). History and Social Science Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools . Richmond: Board of Education.
- Bogdan, R. C., & S.K., B. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bolles, R. N. (1994). The 1994 what color is your parachute? (22 ed.). Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed Press.
- Booth, M. (1993). Students historical thinking and the national history curriculum in England. Theory and Research in Social Education , 21(2), 105-127.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). Outline of a theory of practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), The handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education (pp. 241-258). NY: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). Homo Academicus. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). The logic of practice. Standford, CA: Standford University Press.
- Brady, H. R., & Barth, J. L. (1995). Reclaiming the spirit of the social studies. Social Education, 59(4), 208-210.
- Brickhouse, N. W. (1990). Teachers beliefs about the nature of science and their relationship to classroom practice. Journal of Teacher Education , 41 (3), 53-62.
- Briggs, C. L. (1986). Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Britzman, D. (1986). Cultural myths in the making of a teacher: Biography and social structure in teacher education . Harvard Educational Review, 56 (4), 442-456.

- Britzman, D. P. (1991). Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach. Albany: SUNY.
- Broadfoot, P. (1993). Research on teachers: Towards a comparative methodology. Comparative Education , 36 (2/3), 165-169.
- Brophy, J. (Ed.). (1991). Advances in research on teaching: Teachers' knowledge of subject matter as it relates to their teaching practice. (Vol. 2). Greenwich Conn: JAI Press.
- Bruner, J. (1985). Actual minds, possible worlds. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1990). Acts of meaning. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Buchmann, M., & Floden, R. E. (Eds.). (1993). Detachment and concern. Conversations in the philosophy of teaching and teacher education. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Buckingham, D. (Ed.). (1993). Reading audiences: Young people and the media. NY: Manchester University Press.
- Bullough, R. V. J. (1989). The first year teacher. A case study . New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bullough, R. V. J. (1992). Beginning teacher curriculum decision making, personal teaching metaphors, and teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education , 8(3) , 239-252.
- Bullough, R. V. J., & Gitlin, A. (1995). Becoming a student of teaching: Methodologies for exploring self and school context. New York: Garland.
- Bullough, R. V. J., Knowles, J. G., & Crow, N. A. (1991). Emerging as a teacher . New York: Routledge.
- Burton, D. (1998). The changing role of the university tutor within school-based initial teacher education: issues of role contingency and complementarity within a secondary partnership scheme. Journal of Education for Teaching, 24(2), 129-146.
- Butt, R., Raymond, D., McCue, G., & Yamigishi, L. (1992). Collaborative autobiography and the teacher's voice. In I. F. Goodson (Ed.), Studying Teachers' Lives (pp. 51-98). NY: Teachers College Press.
- Byrnes, R. S. (1997). Interrupting ordinary expectations in the social studies . Journal of Curriculum and Supervision , 12 (2), 135-151.
- Calderhead, J. (1987). Exploring teachers' thinking. London: Cassell.
- Calderhead, J. (1991). The nature and growth of knowledge in student teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education , 7 (5/6), 531-35.
- Calderhead, J., & Robson, M. (1991). Images of teaching: Student teachers' early conceptions of classroom practice. Teaching and Teacher Education, 17(1), 1-8.
- Canady, R. L., & Rettig, M. D. (1995). Block scheduling: A catalyst for change in high schools. Princeton, NJ: Eye on Education.
- Carlsen, W. (1991). Subject matter knowledge and science teaching: A pragmatic perspective In J. Brophy (Ed.) Advances in research on teaching: Teachers' knowledge of subject matter as it relates to their teaching practice. (Vol. 2, ).Greenwich Conn: JAI Press.
- Carr, E. H. (1961). What is history? NY: Vintage.
- Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education . NY: Macmillan.

- Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. Educational Researcher, 22(1), 5-12.
- Carter, K., & Gonzalez, L. (1993). Beginning teachers' knowledge of classroom events. Journal of Teacher Education, 44(3), 223-232.
- Chaiklin, S., & Lave, J. (Eds.). (1996). Understanding practice: Perspectives on activity and context. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Cheney, L. V. (1994, Oct. 20). The end of history. Wall Street Journal, A22.
- Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Clandinin, D. J. (1985). Personal practical knowledge: A study on teachers' classroom images. Curriculum Inquiry , 15, 303-323.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1987). Teachers' personal knowledge: What counts as "personal" in studies of the personal. Journal of Curriculum Studies , 19(5 ), 2-14.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995). Teachers Professional Knowledge Landscapes. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cobb, P. (1994). Where is the mind? Constructivist and sociocultural perspectives on mathematical development. Educational Researcher , 23(7), 13-20.
- Cochran, K. F., DeRuiter, J. A., & King, R. A. (1993). Pedagogical content knowing: An integrative model for teacher preparation. Journal of Teacher Education , 44(4), 263-272.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Reinventing student teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 42(2), 104-118.
- Coffey, A. (1996). The power of accounts: Authority and authorship in ethnography. Qualitative Studies in Education , 9 (1), 61-74.
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). Making sense of qualitative data- Complementary research strategies. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cohen, R. (1996). Moving beyond name games. Social Education, 60(1), 49-54.
- Cohen, R. (1998). Book review: History on trial-Culture wars and the teaching of the past. Social Education, 62(2), 116-118.
- Cole, D. B., & Pressly, T. (1983). Preparation of secondary school history teachers. (Third ed.). Washington DC: American Historical Association, Teaching Division.
- Cole, M., & Werstch, J. W. (1996). Beyond the individual-social antimony in discussions of Piaget and Vygotsky  
[[Http://www.massey.ac.nz/~Alock/virtual/colevyg.htm](http://www.massey.ac.nz/~Alock/virtual/colevyg.htm), .
- Collingwood, R. G. (1946). The idea of history. London: Oxford University Press.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. Educational Researcher , 19(5), 2-13.
- Connelly, M. F., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). Teachers as curriculum planners: narratives of experience . New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cooper, P., & McIntyre, D. (1996). Effective teaching and learning: Students' and teachers' perspectives. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Crawford, K. (1995). A history of the right: The battle for control of national curriculum history 1989-1994. British Journal of Educational Studies , 23(4), 433-456.

- Crease, R. P. (1993). The play of nature: Experimentation as performance. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Cuban, L. (1991). History of teaching in social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp. 197-209). New York: Macmillan.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). The practice of everyday life. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Delamont, S. (1992). Fieldwork in educational settings. Methods, pitfalls and perspectives. Washington, D C : Falmer Press.
- Delamont, S. (1995). Teachers as artist. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education (pp. 6-8). New York: Pergamon.
- Desalvo, L. (1998). Advice to aspiring educational biographers. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 14(4), 54-55.
- Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1980). Democracy and education. (Vol. 9). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1981). Experience and nature. (Vol. 1). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dey, I. (1993). Qualitative analysis: A user friendly guide for social scientists. London: Routledge and Kegan and Paul.
- DfEE. (1994). The National Curriculum: History Statutory Orders . London: HMSO.
- Dickinson, A. K., & Lee, P. J. (Eds.). (1978). History teaching and historical understanding. London: Heineman.
- Dolby, N. (1997). The flow of values in history. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 13(1), 6-15.
- Downey, M., & Levstik, L. (1991). Teaching and learning history. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp. 400-410). New York: Macmillan.
- Downey, M., & Levstik, L. S. (1988). Teaching and learning history: The Research base. Social Education , 52(5), 336-342.
- Doyle, W. (1986). Content representation in teachers' definitions of academic work . Journal of Curriculum Studies, 18(4), 365-379.
- Elbaz, F. (1983). Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge. London: Croom Helm.
- Elbaz-Luwisch, F. (1997). Narrative research: Political issues and implications. Teaching and Teacher Education , 13 (1), 75-83.
- Ellington, L. (1998). Book Review: "History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past". Theory and Research in Social Education, 26(3), 443.
- Emmerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). Writing ethnographic field notes . Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Engle, S. H. (1990). The commission report and citizenship education. Social Education, 54(7), 431-34.
- Epstein, T. L. (1997). Sociocultural approaches to young people's historical understanding. Social Education, 61(1), 28-31.

- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). NY: Macmillan.
- Evans, R. W. (1988). Lessons from history: Teacher and student conceptions of the meaning of history. Theory and Research in Social Education , 16(3), 203-225.
- Evans, R. W. (1989a). Meaning in history: Philosophy and teaching, American Educational Research Association . San Francisco, CA.
- Evans, R. W. (1989b). Teacher conceptions of history . Theory and Research in Social Education , 17 (3), 210-40.
- Evans, R. W. (1992). Misunderstanding social studies: A rejoinder to Whelan. Theory and Research in Social Education, 20(3), 313-317.
- Evans, R. W. (1994). Educational ideologies and the teaching of history . In G. Leinhardt, I. L. Beck, & C. Stainton (Eds.), Teaching and learning in history (pp. 171-207). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Feagin, J., Orum, A., & Sjoberg, G. (1991). A case for the case study . Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. E. (1986). The culture of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching . New York: Macmillan.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Parker, M. B. (1990). Making subject matter part of the conversation in learning to teach. Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (3), 32-43.
- Fenstermacher, G. D. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching , Review of Research in Education (Vol. 20 , pp. 3-55). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- Fenstermacher, G. D., & Soltis, J. (1986). Approaches to Teaching . NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fenton, E. (1991). Reflections on the "New Social Studies". The Social Studies(May/June).
- Firestone, W. A. (1993). Why "Professionalizing" Teaching is Not Enough. Educational Leadership , 50(6), 6-11.
- Fore, L. C. (1995). Case study of curriculum controversy: The Virginia Standards of Learning for History and the Social Sciences. .
- Fore, L. C. (1998). Curriculum control: using discourse and structure to manage educational reform. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 30(5), 559-576.
- Fox, D. L. (1992). The influence of context, community, and culture: Contrasting cases of teacher knowledge development, National Reading Conference . San Antonio, Texas.
- Freedman, S. W. (1994). Exchanging writing, exchanging cultures: Lessons in school reform from the United States and Great Britain. Cambridge: Harvard University Press and National Council of Teachers of English.
- Freedman, S. W. (1995). Crossing the bridge to practice- Rethinking the theories of Vygotsky and Bakhtin . Written Communication , 12 (1), 74-92.
- Fryholm, J. A. (1996). Rethinking supervision: Learning to teach mathematics in community. .
- Fullan, M. G. (1993). Why teachers must become educational change agents. Educational Leadership, 50(6), 12-17.

- Fuller, F. F., & Brown, O. H. (1977). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher education: The seventy fourth year book of the national society for the study of education . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Furlong, J., & Maynard, T. (1995). Mentoring student teachers. London: Routledge.
- Gage, N. L. (1978). The scientific basis of the art of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gagnon, P., & Schools, B. C. o. H. i. (1989). Historical literacy: The case for history in American education . New York: Macmillan.
- Garrison, J. (1995). Deweyan pragmatism and the epistemology of contemporary social constructivism. American Educational Research Journal, 32(4), 716-740.
- Gilroy, P. (1998). New Labour and teacher education in England and Wales: the first 500 days. Journal of Education for Teaching, 24(3), 221-230.
- Giroux, H. A. (1994). Disturbing pleasures: Learning popular culture. NY: Routledge.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine.
- Glatthorn, A. (1995). Teacher development. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education . New York: Pergamon.
- Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. London: Allen Lane/Penguin Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). Ineraction ritual: Essays on face to face behavior. NY: Pantheon Books.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodlad, J. (1990 ). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass .
- Goodman, J., & Adler, S. (1985). Becoming an elementary social studies teacher: A study of perspectives. Theory and Research in Social Education , 13(2), 1-20.
- Goodson, I. F. (1992). Studying teachers' lives. NY.: Teachers College Press.
- Goodson, I. F. (1995). The story so far: Personal and political. Qualitative Studies in Education , 8(1), 89-98.
- Goodson, I. F. (1997). Representing teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education , 13(1), 111-119.
- Gore, J. M., & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). Action research and reflective teaching in preservice teacher education: A case study from the United States. Teaching and Teacher Education, 7(2), 119-136.
- Grant, T. J. (1996). Preservice teacher planning: A study of the journey from learner to teacher in mathematics and social studies, American Education Research Association . New York.
- Greene, M. (1988). The dialectic of freedom. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Greene, M. L., & Campbell, C. (1993). Becoming a teacher: The contribution of teacher education. Edmonton: Alberta Dept. of Education.
- Greeno, J. G. (1991). Number sense as situated knowing in a conceptual domain. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 22, 170-218.
- Grossman, P. L. (1990). The making of a teacher; Teacher knowledge and teacher education. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Grossman, P. L. (1991). What are we talking about anyhow? Subject matter knowledge of secondary English teachers . In J. E. Brophy (Ed.), Advances in Research on Teaching. Vol 2: Teachers' Knowledge of Subject Matter as it Relates to their Teaching Practice (pp. 245-264). Greenwich Conn.: JAI Press.

Grossman, P. L. (1995). Teachers knowledge. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education (pp. 23-37). New York: Pergamon.

Grossman, P. L., & Gundmundsdottir, S. (1987). Teachers and Texts: An expert/novice comparison in English , American Educational Research Association . Washington D.C.

Grossman, P. L., & Stodolsky, S. S. (1994). Considerations of Content and the circumstances of secondary school teaching, Review of Research in Education (Vol. 20 , pp. 179-221). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Grossman, P. L., & Stodolsky, S. S. (1995). Content as context: The role of school subjects in secondary school teaching. Educational Researcher , 24 (8.), 5-11,23.

Grossman, P. L., Wilson, S., & Shulman, L. (1989). Teachers of substance: Subject matter knowledge for teaching. In M. C. . Reynolds (Ed.), Knowledge base for beginning teacher . Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1987a). Pedagogical content knowledge: Teachers ways of knowing, Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association . Washington, DC.

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1987b). Learning to teach social studies: Case studies of Chris and Cathy, Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association . Washington, D.C.

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1990). Values in pedagogical content knowledge. Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (3), 44-52.

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1991a). Ways of seeing are ways of knowing: The pedagogical content knowledge of an expert English teacher. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 23(5), 409-21.

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1991b). The Narrative nature of pedagogical content knowledge, Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association . Chicago, IL.

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1991c). Story-maker, story teller: Narrative structures in curriculum. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 23 (3), 207-18.

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1991d). Narratives and cultural transmission in home and school settings , Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association . Chicago, IL.

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1996). The teller, the tale, and the one being told: The narrative nature of the research interview. Curriculum Inquiry, 26 (3), 293-306.

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1997). Introduction to the theme issue of narrative perspectives on research on teaching and teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 13 (1), 1-3.

Gudmundsdottir, S., & Saabar, N. (1991). Culutral dimensions of the good teacher, International Study Association of Teacher Thinking . Surrey, England.

Gudmundsdottir, S., & Shulman, L. (1987). Pedagogical content knowledge in social studies. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 31(2), 59-70.



Gudmundsdottir, S., & Shulman, L. S. (1989). Pedagogical content Knowledge in social studies. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 31(2), 59-70.

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1995). The narrative nature of pedagogical content knowledge . In H. McEwan & K. Egan (Eds.), Narrative in teaching, learning and research (pp. 24-38). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gudmundsdottir, S., Carey, N., & Wilson, S. (1985). The role of subject- matter knowledge in learning to teach social studies. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University School of Education.

Haigh, R. (1996). A personal reflection on school leadership in England in recent times. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 12 (1), 11-20.

Haladyna, T., & Shaughnessy, J. (1985). Research on student attitude toward social studies. Social Education, 49(Nov.-Dec.), 692-695.

Hallam, R. N. (1972). Thinking and Learning in History. Teaching History , 2, 337-46.

Hammersley, M. (1977). Teacher Perspectives. Milton Keynes, Great Britain: The Open University Press.

Hammersley, M. (1980). Classroom Ethnography. Educational Analysis , 2, 46-75.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995). Ethnography: Principles in practice. (2nd ed.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hargreaves, A. (1981). Contrastive rhetoric and extremist talk: Teachers, hegemony and the educationist context. In L. Barton & S. Walker (Eds.), Schools, teachers, and teaching . Lewes, UK: Falmer.

Hargreaves, A. (1995). Realities of teaching. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education . New York: Pergamon.

Hargreaves, A. (1996). Revisiting voice. Educational Researcher, 25(1), 12-19.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. G. (1992). Understanding teacher development. NY: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, D. H. (1980). The occupational culture of teachers. In P. Woods (Ed.), Teachers Strategies . London: Croom Helm.

Harrington, H. (1994). Teaching and knowing. Journal of Teacher Education, 45(3), 190-197.

Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Toward definition and implementation. Teacher and Teacher Education , 11 (1), 33-49.

Hawley, K. (1995). Learning from peers: The experience of student teachers in school based teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 46(3), 175-183.

Heath, S. B., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1994). Learning for anything everyday. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 26(5), 471-489.

Helsby, G. (1996). Defining and developing professionalism in English secondary schools. Journal of Education for Teaching , 22 (2 ) , 135-148.

Hendry, G. D. (1996). Constructivism and educational practice. Australian Journal of Education , 40 (1), 19-45.

Hermanowicz, J. C. (1998). The presentation of occupational self in science. Qualitative Sociology, 21(2), 129-148.

Hirsch, E. D. (1987). Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

- Hoel, T. L. (1997). Voices from the classroom. Teaching and Teacher Education , 13 (1), 5-16.
- Hollingsworth, S. (1989). Prior beliefs and cognitive change in learning to teach. American Educational Research Journal , 26 (2), 160-189.
- Hollingsworth, S. (1995). Teachers as researchers . In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education . New York: Pergamon.
- Holt, M. (1996). School reform in England: A symposium- A cautionary tale. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision , 12 (1), 4-6.
- Holy, E. (1995). Teachers as professionals. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education . New York: Pergamon.
- Huff, L. A. (1995). Flexible block scheduling: It worked for us! NASSP Bulletin, 1995(May).
- Husbands, C. (1996). What is history? Language, ideas and meaning in learning about the past. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Jalongo, M. R. (1992). Teachers' stories: Our ways of knowing. Educational Leadership , 49(7), 68-73.
- Jenkins, K. (1991). Re-thinking history. London: Routledge.
- Jenness, D. (1990). Making Sense of Social Studies . New York: Macmillan.
- Joas, H. (1985). G.H. Mead: A contemporary re-examination of his thoughts (Raymond Meyer, Trans.). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press.
- Johnson, M. (1993). Moral imagination: Implications of cognitive sciences for ethics. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Johnston, M. (1990). Teachers' backgrounds and beliefs: Influences on learning to teach in the social studies. Theory and Research in Social Education , 28(3), 207-233.
- Kagan, D. (1992). Implications of research on teacher beliefs. Educational Psychologist , 27 (1), 65-90.
- Kelchtermans, G. (1997). A sample card of narratives in education . Teaching and Teacher Education , 13 (1), 125-130.
- Knowles, J. G. (1992). Models for understanding preservice and beginning teacher's biographies: Illustrations from case studies. In I. F. In Goodson (Ed.), Studying teachers' lives. (pp. 99- 152). NY: Teachers College Press.
- Korbrin, D., Abbot, E., & Ellinwood, J. (1993). Learning history by doing history. Educational Leadership , 50 (April), 39-41.
- Kridel, C. (1998). Educational biography: "a grand consuming passion for life". Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 14(4), 52-53.
- Kruse, C. A., & Kruse, G. D. (1995). The master schedule and learning: Improving the quality of education. NASSP Bulletin, 1995(May), 1-8.
- Kupferberg, F. (1996). The reality of teaching: Bringing disorder back into social theory and the sociology of education. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 17(2), 227-247.
- Kvale, S. (1996). Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- LaCapra, D. (1983). Rethinking intellectual history: Texts, contexts, language. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London: Meuthen.

- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press.
- Lanier, J. E., & Little, J. W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook on research on teaching (Vol. 3rd, pp. 527-569). NY: Macmillan.
- Lave, J., & Wegner, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawton, D. (1996). Education "reforms" in England since 1979. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision , 12(1 ), 7-10.
- Lee, P. (1991). Historical knowledge and the national curriculum. In R. Aldrich (Ed.), History in the national curriculum (pp. 39-65). London: Kogan Page.
- Lefebvre, H. (1976). Reflections on the politics of space. Antipode , 8.
- Leinhardt, G. (1994). History a time to be mindful. In G. Leinhardt, I. L. Beck, & C. Stainton (Eds.), Teaching and learning in history (pp. 209-255). Hillsdale, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Leinhardt, G., Beck, I. L., & Stainton, C. (1994). Teaching and learning in history . Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lemke, J. L. (1995). Textual politics: discourse and social dynamics . Bristol PA: Taylor and Francis.
- Lerman, S. (1989). Constructivism, mathematics and mathematics education. Educational Studies in Mathematics , 20, 211-223.
- Levstik, L. S. (1997). "Any history is someone's history": Listening to multiple voices from the past. Social Education, 61(1), 48-51.
- Levstik, L. S., & Barton, K. C. (1997). Doing history-Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools. Mahwah, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Levstik, L. S., & Pappas, C. C. (1992). New directions for studying historical understanding. Theory and Research in Social Education, 20(4), 369-385.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry . Beverly Hills, CA : Sage.
- Little, J. W., & McLaughlin, M. (1993). Cultures and Contexts of Teaching. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Loewan, J. W. (1995). Lies my teacher told me. New York: New Press.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- Louden, W. (1991). Understanding Teaching: Continuity and change in teacher's knowledge. New York: Teachers College Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (1984). After Virtue. (2 ed.). Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Mahlios, M., & Maxson, M. (1995). Capturing preservice teachers' beliefs about schooling, life, and childhood. Journal of Teacher Education , 46(3 ), 192- 200.
- Marble, S. (1997). Narrative visions of schooling. Teaching and Teacher Education , 13 (1), 55-64.
- Marks, R. (1990). Pedagogical content knowledge: From a mathematical case to a modified conception . Journal of Teacher Education , 41(3), 3-11.
- Marland, P. W. (1995). Implicit theories of teaching. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education . New York: Pergamon.

- McCutchen, G. (1981). Elementary School Teachers' Planning for Social Studies and Other Subjects. Theory and Research in Social Education, 9 (1), 45-66.
- McCutcheon, G. (1980). How do Elementary School Teachers Plan? The Nature of Planning and influences on it. . The Elementary School Journal, 81 (1), 4-23.
- McDiarmid, W. (1990). Challenging Prospective teachers' beliefs during early field experience: A quixotic undertaking? . Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (3), 12-20.
- McEwan, H. (1997). The functions of narrative in schooling. Teaching and Teacher Education , 13 (1), 85-92.
- McEwan, H., & Bull, B. (1991). The pedagogic nature of subject matter knowledge. American Educational Research Journal , 28 (2), 316-334.
- McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (1992 ). Social construction of students: Challenges to policy coherence , Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association . San Francisco, CA.
- McNamara, D. (1995). The influence of student teachers' tutors and mentors upon their classroom practice: An exploratory study. Teaching and Teacher Education , 11 (1), 51-61.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, self and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mearns, L., & Sikes, P. (1992). Visiting Lives: Ethics and methodology in life history. In I. F. Goodson (Ed.), Studying teachers' lives (pp. 99-152). NY: Teachers College Press.
- Meltzer, J. (1997). In their own words: Using retrospective narratives to explore the influence of socio-cultural and contextual factors on discourse about identity of self-as-principal. Unpublished Ph.d, VPI, Blacksburg.
- Milligan, M. J. (1998). Interactional past and potential: The social construction of place attachment. Symbolic Interaction, 21(1), 1-33.
- Mitchell, C. (1995). The logic of the analysis of social situations and cases. Sociological Review, 31 (2), 187-211.
- Morine-Deshimer, G., & Leighfield, K. (1995). Student teaching and the field experience. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education . New York: Pergamon.
- Morrill, C., Buller, D. B., Buller, M. K., & Larkey, L. L. (1999). Toward an organizational perspective on identifying and managing formal gatekeepers. Qualitative Sociology, 22(1), 51-71.
- Murphy, S. (1992). Biographies and autobiographies: Creating a tapestry of our lives. Virginia English Bulletin, 42(2), 17-21.
- Nash, G., Crabtree, C., & Dunn, R. E. (1997). History on trial: Culture wars and the teaching of the past. NY: Knopf.
- Nelson, L. R., & Drake, F. D. (1994). Secondary teachers' reactions to the New Social Studies. Theory and Research in Social Education, 22(1), 44-73.
- Nespor, J. (1994). Knowledge in motion. Philadelphia: Falmer.
- Nespor, J. (1997). Tangled up inschool. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Newmann, F. M. (1991b). Promoting higher order thinking in social studies: Overview of a study of sixteen high school departments. Theory and Research in Social Education , 19, 324-340.

- Newmann., F. M. (1991a ). Classroom thoughtfulness and students' higher order thinking: Common indicators and diverse social studies courses. Theory and Research in Social Education , 19, 410-433.
- Nias, J. (1989). Primary teachers talking: A study of teaching as work. New York: Routledge.
- Nietzsche, F. (1983). On the uses and disadvantages of history, Untimely Meditations . Cambridgeshire, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Niles, R. A., Dillard, G., & Hersi, A. (1995). Challenging the odds: Narratives of two African American teachers, Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education .
- Olsen, D. G. (1997). Applications of cognitive principles to teaching and learning, College University Faculty Assembly of the National Council of Social Studies . Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Pagano, J. A. (1991). Moral fictions: The dilemma of theory and practice. In C. Witherall & N. Noddings (Eds.), Stories lives tell: Narrative and dialogue in education (pp. 193-206). NY: Teachers College Press.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research , 62 (3), 307-32.
- Pajares, M. F. (1993). Preservice teacher beliefs: A focus for teacher education. Action in Teacher Education , 15 (2), 45-54.
- Pendry, A., Husbands, C., Arthur, J., & Davison, J. (1998). History teachers in the making: Professional Learning. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Phillips, D. C. (1997). Telling the truth about stories . Teaching and Teacher Education , 13 (1), 101-110.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. Qualitative Studies in Education , 8 N 1, 5-23.
- Pollard, A. (1982). A model of classroom coping strategies. British Journal of Sociology of Education , 3 (1), 19-37.
- Posner, G. J. (1992). Analyzing the curriculum. NY: McGraw Hill.
- Powell, R. R. (1992). The influence of prior experiences on pedagogical constructs of traditional and non traditional preservice teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education , 8 (3), 225-238.
- Powell, R. R. (1994 a). Case studies of second career student teachers . Qualitative Studies in Education, 31 (4), 351-366.
- Powell, R. R. (1994b ). From field science to classroom science: A case study of constrained emergence in a second career science teacher. Journal of Research in Science Education, 31 (3), 273-291.
- Powell, R. R. (1997). Teaching alike: A cross-case analysis of first career and second-career beginning teachers' instructional convergence. Teaching and Teacher Education , 13 (3), 341-356.
- Poznar, W. (1997). Is modern literature unique. The World and I (March), 320-37.
- Quinn, L. F. (1995). Having new eyes: The international experience. Journal of Teacher Education , 46 (1.), 29-34.
- Ragin, C. C., & Becker, H. S. (1992). What is a case? Exploring the foundations of social inquiry. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Ravitch, D. (1987). Tot sociology, or what happened to history in the grade schools. American Scholar, 56(Summer), 343-354.
- Ravitch, D. (1989). The plight of history in American schools. In P. Gagnon & Bradley Commission on History in Schools (Eds.), Historical literacy: The case for history in American education (pp. 51-68). New York: Macmillan.
- Ravitch, D., & Finn, J., C.E. (1987). What do our 17 year-olds know? A report on the first national assessment of history and literature. New York: Harper and Row.
- Reisman, C. K. (1993). Narrative analysis. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.
- Reynolds, A. (1992). What is competent beginning teaching? A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research , 62(1), 1-35.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B. (1993). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided practice, apprenticeship. In A. Alvarez, P. d. Rio, & J. V. Wertsch (Eds.), Perspectives on sociocultural research . New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosaldo, R. (1989). Culture and truth. Boston: Beacon.
- Ross, E. W. (1987). Teacher perspective development. A study of preservice social studies teachers. Theory and Research in Social Education , 5(4), 225-243.
- Ross, E. W. (1997). The struggle for the social studies curriculum. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities (pp. 3-20). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Russell, T., & Johnston, P. (1988). Teachers learning from experiences of teaching analyses based on metaphor and reflection, Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association . New Orleans.
- Saxe, D. W. (1997 ). The unique mission of the social studies . In E. W. Ross (Ed.), The social studies curriculum. Purposes, problem, and possibilities (pp. 39 -59). Albany NY: SUNY Press.
- Schechner, R. (1985). Between theater and anthropology. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press.
- Schechner, R. (1993). The future of ritual: Writings on culture and performance. NY: Routledge.
- Schechner, R., & Appel, W. (Eds.). (1990). By means of performance: Intercultural studies of theatre and ritual. Cambridge: Cambridge Univeristy Press.
- Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.
- Schratz, M., & Walker, R. (1995). Research as social change . New York: Routledge .
- Schug, M. C., Western, R. D., & Enochs, L. G. (1997). Why do social studies teachers use textbooks? The answer may lay in economic theory. Social Education, 61(2), 97-101.
- Schwab, J. J. (1978). Education and the structure of the disciplines. . In I. Westbury & N. J. Wilkof (Eds.), Science, curriculum, and liberal education (pp. 229-272). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Science, D. o. E. a. (1989). Statistics of schools, January 1988. London: Department of Education and Science.

Seixas, P. (1997). Mapping the terrain of historical significance. Social Education, 61(1), 22-27.

Seixas, P. (1998). Student teachers thinking historically. Theory and Research in Social Education, 26(3), 310-241.

Shapiro, M. J. (1997). Violent cartographies. Mapping cultures of war . Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press .

Shaver, J. P. (1991). Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning . New York: Macmillan.

Shaver, J. P., Davis Jr., O. L., & S.M., H. (1979). The status of social studies education: Impressions from three NSF studies. Social Education, 43(2), 150-159.

Shaver, J. P., Davis, O. L., & Helburn, S. W. (1980). An interpretive report on the status of precollege social studies education based on three NSF- funded studies in What are the needs in precollege science, mathematics, and social studies education . Washington D.C: National Science Foundation.

Shemilt, D. (1987). Adolescent ideas about evidence and methodology. In C. Portal (Ed.), The history curriculum for teachers . Lewes: Falmer.

Shimahara, N. K., & Sakai, A. (1995). Learning to teach in two cultures: Japan and the United States. NY: Garfield.

Shklar, R. A. (1991). American citizenship: The quest for inclusion. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Shor, I. (1992). Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shotter, J. (1993 ). Conversational realities. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.

Shulman, L. (1983). Autonomy and obligation: The remote control of teaching. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy . NY: Longman.

Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15 (2), 4-14.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review , 57(1), 1-22.

Shulman, L. (1991). Ways of seeing, ways of knowing: Ways of teaching, ways of learning about teaching. Journal of Curriculum Studies , 23 (5), 393-395.

Shulman, L. (1995). To know it is to psychologize it. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Silverman, D. (1992). Theory elaboration: The heuristics of case analysis. In C. C. . Ragin & H. S. Becker (Eds.), What is a case? Exploring the foundations of social inquiry (pp. 173-202). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Silverman, D. (1993). Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text, and interaction. London: Sage.

Smith, D. (1987). The everyday world as problematic. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Spradley, J. (1979b). Participant observation. NY: Holt, Rhinehart, & Winston.

Spradley, J. P. (1970). You owe yourself a drunk: An ethnography of urban nomads. Boston: Little Brown.

Spradley, J. P. (1979a). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Wilson.

- Stanley, W. B. (1991). Teacher competence for social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp. 249-262). New York: Macmillan.
- States, B. (1996 ). Performance as Metaphor . Theatre Journal , 48(1 ), 1-26.
- Steel, D. (1989). New history. History Resource, 2(3).
- Steiner, K. (1996). Interviews- An introduction to qualitative research interviewing. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.
- Stodolsky, S. S. (1988). The subject matters: Classroom activity in math and social studies . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Strehle, E. L. (1996). Negotiating uncertainty: Making sense of the student teaching experience. .
- Studies, N. C. f. t. S. (1994). Expectations for Excellence-Curriculum Standards for the Social Studies. Washington D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Sylvester, D. (1994 ). Change and continuity in history teaching, 1900 -1993. In H. Bourdillon (Ed.), Teaching history . london: Routledge for the Open University .
- Tabachnick, B. R., Popkewitz, T., & Zeichner, K. M. (1979-80). Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. Interchange , 10(4), 12-29 .
- Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. M. (1984). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives . Journal of Teacher Education , 35(6), 28-36.
- Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. M. (1985). The development of teacher perspectives: Final Report. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Center for Education Research.
- Talbert, S. (1997). Reading self consciously performative pedagogy. Journal of Curriculum Theory, 13(4), 5-12.
- Thompson, A. G. (1984). The relationship of teachers conceptions of mathematics and mathematics teaching to instructional practice. Educational Studies in Mathematics , 15 (2), 105-127.
- Thornton, S. J. (1991). Teacher as curricular-instructional gatekeeper in social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp. 237-48). NY: Macmillan.
- Thornton, S. J. (1994). The social studies near century's end: Reconsidering patterns of curriculum and instruction , Review of Research in Education (Vol. 20, pp. 223-254). Washington, D.C. : American Educational Research Association.
- Thornton, S. J. (1997). First-Hand study: Teaching history for understanding. Social Education, 61(1), 11-12.
- Timmermans, S. (1998). Mutual tuning of multiple trajectories. Symbolic Interaction, 21(4), 425-440.
- Tuan, H.-l., Jeng., B.-Y., Whang., L.-J., & Kaou., R.-C. (1995). A case study of pre service chemistry teacher pedagogical content knowledge development, The annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching . San Francisco.
- Unwin, R., & Foster, E. (1997). Leeds University School of Education: Partnership in history education- history methods handbook . Leeds University: School of Education.
- Urban, W., & J., W. J. (1996). American education: A history. NY: McGraw-Hill.



- US Congress, S. C. o. R. a. A. (1995). Hearings on the Smithsonian Institution: Management guidelines for the future : 104th Congress.
- Van Sledright, B. (1997). Can more be less? The depth-breadth dilemma in teaching American history. Social Education, 61(1), 28-41.
- Van Sledright, B., & Brophy, J. (1992). Storytelling, imagination, and fanciful elaboration in children's historical reconstructions. American Educational Research Association, 30(792-69).
- Vaughan, D. (1992). Theory elaboration: The heuristics of case analysis. In C. C. . Ragin & H. S. . Becker (Eds.), What is a Case? Exploring the foundations of social inquiry (pp. 173-202). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research , 54 (2), 143-178.
- Waterhouse, S. (1991). Person formulation in the process of schooling. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 12(1), 45-60.
- Wedgewood, C. V. (1955, February 10th, 1955). The present in the past. Listener, 53.
- Weigall, D., & M., M. (1982). A-Level Modern History (1815-Present day) . London: Charles Letts and Co. Ltd.
- Weiner, J. (1995). History lesson. The New Republic, 172(4 ), 9-11.
- Wertsch, J. (1990). Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J. (1998). Mind as action. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Whelan, M. (1997). History as the core of social studies education. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities (pp. 21-38). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- White, J. J. (1989). Student teaching as a rite of passage. Anthropology and Education Quarterly , 20 (3), 177-195.
- Whittemore, R. (1993). On renewing school history. Journal of Teacher Education, 44(5), 385-387.
- Wildman, T., Niles, J., Magliaro, S. G., & McLaughlin, R. A. (1989). Teaching and learning to teach: The two roles of beginning teachers. Elementary School Journal , 89(4), 471-493.
- Wiley, K. B., & Race, J. (1977). The status of pre -college science, mathematics, and social science education : 1955-75, Vol. 3: social science education. Boulder, CO.: Social Science Education Consortium.
- Willis, P. (1981). Learning to labor. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Willis, P. (1990). Common culture. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Wills, J., & Mehan, H. (1994). Recognizing diversity within a common historical narrative: the challenge to teaching history and social studies. Multicultural Education, 4(1), 4-11.
- Wilson, S., & Richert, A. (1987). 150 different ways of knowing: Representations of knowledge in teaching. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), Exploring teachers' thinking (pp. 104-24). London: Cassell.
- Wilson, S., & Wineburg, S. S. (1989). Subject matter knowledge in the teaching of history. In J. Brophy (Ed.), Advances in Research on Teaching . Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Wilson, S., & Wineburg, S. S. (1993). Wrinkles in time and place: Using performance assessment to understand the knowledge of history teachers. American Educational Research Journal , 30(4), 729-69.
- Wilson, S. M. (1991). Parades of facts, stories of the past: What do novice history teachers need to know? . In M. Kennedy (Ed.), Teaching Academic Subjects to Diverse Learners (pp. 99-116). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wilson, S. M., & Gudmundsdottir, S. (1987). What is this a case of? Exploring some conceptual issues in case study research. Education and Urban Society , 20 (1), 42-54.
- Wilson, S. M., & Wineburg, S. S. (1988). Peering at history through different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in teaching history. Teachers College Record , 89 (4), 525-539.
- Wineburg, S. S. (1991a). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. Journal of Educational Psychology , 83(1), 73-87.
- Wineburg, S. S. (1991b). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. American Educational Research Journal , 28(3), 495-519.
- Wineburg, S. S., & Wilson, S. (1988). Models of wisdom in the teaching of history. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(1), 50-58.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1990). Writing up qualitative research. Newberry Park, CA.: Sage.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1994). Transferring qualitative data: description, analysis, and interpretation. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Yeager, E. A., & Davis, J. O. L. (1995). Between campus and classroom: Secondary student teachers' thinking about historical text. Journal of Research and Development in Education , 29(1), 1-8.
- Yeager, E. A., & Wilson, E. K. (1997). Teaching historical thinking in the social studies methods course: A case study . The Social Studies , May/June, 121- 26.
- Yin, R. K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.
- Young, M. (1998). Rethinking teacher education for a global future: lessons from the English. Journal of Education for Teaching, 24(1), 51-62.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1984). Individual and institutional influences on the development of teacher perspectives . Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1986). Content and contexts: Neglected elements in studies of student teaching as an occasion for learning to teach. Journal of Education for Teaching, 12 (1), 5-23.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1992). Rethinking the practicum in the professional development school partnership. Journal of Teacher Education, 43 (4), 296-307.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1993). Designing educative practicums for prospective teachers, International Conference on Teacher Education: From Practice to Theory . Tel-Aviv, Israel.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan.

Zeichner, K. M., & Grant, C. (1981). Biography and social structure in the socialization of student teacher: A re-examination of the pupil control ideologies of student teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 7(3), 299-314.

Zeichner, K. M., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education "washed out" by school experience? . Journal of Teacher Education, 32(3), 7-11.

Zeichner, K. M., Tabachnick, B. R., & Densmore, K. (1987). Individual, institutional, and cultural influence on the development to teachers' craft knowledge. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), Exploring teachers'thinking (pp. 21-59). London: Cassell.

Zhixen, S., Jilin, S., & S., G. (1994). Teaching and learning science in American and Chinese high schools: A comparative study. Comparative Education , 10(3), 255-270.

Zukin, S. (1995). The culture of cities. London: Blackwell.

Zumwalt, K. (1989). Beginning professional teachers: The need for curricular vision of teaching. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), Knowledge base for the beginning teacher (pp. 173-184). Oxford: Pergamon.

## Appendix A

### Methodology- Developing a methodological awareness

A research methodology must be sensitive to the (con)textual complexity of individual student teachers' stories. ( Kvale, 1996; Coffey and Atkinson, 1996; Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995; Emmerson, Fretz & Shaw, 1995; Wolcott, 1994; Dey, 1993; Silverman, 1993; Delamont, 1992; Briggs, 1986). Coffey and Atkinson (1996) make it clear that qualitative research methodologies are not predetermined but are crafted in response to the questions posed:

there are many ways of analyzing qualitative data....we do want to counsel against the premature adoption of one or other ...strategy over the exclusion of others... the process of analysis should not be seen as a distinct stage of research: rather, it is a reflexive activity that should inform data collection, writing, further data collection, and so forth (pp. 3-6).

This crafting of the methodology is not and cannot ever be a purely individual act. My research is grounded within previous work undertaken within the Ethnographic Methods for Educational Research Course. The study initially set out to look at how preservice teachers' preconceptions of history change as they enter into their teaching practice. One of the implicit assumptions was a belief that the preservice teachers who did not merely lecture had a "better" philosophy of history. "Better" meaning that they saw history as a critically interpretive endeavor that required using primary evidence and ideas to construct an explanation or understanding of the past. I gathered data through interviewing preservice teacher's concerning their academic experiences and views of history, participating and listening in on listserv conversations about what it means to teach history, observing them in the field, and taking detailed notes about their lessons and our discussions afterwards. Through working with the data it became apparent that many factors impacted their teaching other than just their philosophy of history. In focusing purely on their philosophies of history the study, conducted in the ethnographic methods course, failed to acknowledge the impact of the interactions between the preservice teacher's life experiences and goals, and the impact of the contexts within which they began to teach. This new study will develop a more methodologically aware

approach that focuses on how preservice teachers learn to teach the content of history in two different educational settings.

### The Power of the case study

The question of what we know... cannot be separated from that of how we know: (this) reflect(s) directly on the practice of research itself. (Buckingham, 1993; p. 17).

Case studies offer an exceptionally powerful method of inquiry for researchers who have little control over the real life events they wish to study (Yin, 1984). The value of case study methodology lies in its ability to provide multi perspective explanations of events, to show how complex processes fit together and work overtime, and to produce rich data which enables the researcher to develop strong theoretical insights. Case studies can serve as a point of entry through which the reader can move into the conversation and compare their own understandings and experiences with those within the specific setting of the case study (Feagin, Orum, and Sjoberg, 1991; Bullough, Jr., Knowles and Crow, 1991; Bullough Jr., 1989).

Through a detailed examination of a setting that is bounded by space and time it will be possible to develop grounded theoretical insights to better explain the relationship between individual and contextual factors that influence preservice teachers perspectives toward history and history teaching and their subsequent planning and teaching of history during their student teaching. (Ragin and Becker, 1992; Vaughn, 1992; Wilson and Gudmundsdottir, 1987; Mitchell, 1983).

Four individual case studies will be developed. Two will come from the Post-Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) program at Leeds University and two will come from Masters in Curriculum and Instruction at Virginia Tech. While each individual case (person) initially forms the primary unit of analysis, the possibility of identifying very different patterns of influence resulting from the “cultural, historical and institutional contexts in which” the participants carried out their professional preparation should be increased by having two very different sets of cases (Freeman, 1994, p 243). This should enrich the opportunity for theory generation and expanded explanation originating from cross case analysis of the ways in which a novice teacher’s perspectives toward history and history teaching influence and are influenced by the process of

learning to teach during their professional preparation within a broader conceptualization of teaching and learning (Grossman, 1991).

Case study narratives within educational research have a unique ability to present detailed insights into the “essence of schooling” (Bullough Jr., Knowles and Crow 1991 p.13). While a great deal of my focus is on the reasoning and perspectives of the participants as they go through their teaching practice, a vital ingredient of a case study requires the researcher to contextualize the participants’ experiences, and recognize, what Hammersley (1980) calls, “the typifications of situations and lines of action” that form part of the work related beliefs and knowledge that beginning teachers acquire through their own casual conversation and observation of others. (p. 58). This can be viewed as an important “safeguard” to prevent the presentation within this research of de-contextualized preservice teacher voices.

#### The settings

The settings will include two graduate programs in education, one based in the United Kingdom (UK) at Leeds University and the other based in the United States (U.S.) at Virginia Tech, during the 1997-98 academic year.

#### Leeds University School of Education

Leeds University in the north of England offers the Post Graduate Certificate of Education which is equivalent to 30 US graduate hours in education. Preservice teachers who enter must already hold a minimum of a Bachelors degree (BA) in history. Preservice teachers have also been accepted with undergraduate degrees in such areas as politics, archeology, humanities and art history. The decision to admit non-history majors is left to the discretion of the methods’ tutor. The preparatory course is a 36 week program (3 terms) which is taught jointly between tutors at the university and teachers in partner schools. All preservice teachers enrolled in the secondary (11-18 years of age) level PGCE courses begin the first term (September-December) with what is called a preliminary school experience. This is undertaken in a primary school, normally in the novice’s home area and consists of a structured task orientated program of observation during the last two weeks of September. Upon completion, preservice teachers then register at the university at the beginning of October. They are expected to take two teaching subject courses. The main method subject course would be their major

while their subsidiary study method often would be their minor at undergraduate level. Novices, for example, who take history as their main methods course would take such subsidiary courses as English, Social Science or games. The history main methods course meets every Tuesday in the first term and runs from 9:15 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. This consists of workshops, tutorials and lectures covering the 1) National Curriculum Key Stages and schemes of work; 2) lesson planning in relation to the National Curriculum; 3) teaching and learning strategies; 4) information technology; and 5) student teacher presentations. The subsidiary course meets on either Monday or Friday morning. After meeting with methods tutors, students are assigned to a partner school. The partner school will normally take a number of student teachers from different curriculum subjects. A senior member of the partner school's staff will serve as a primary coordinator for the full group of student within the school. The preservice teachers will be assigned to a teacher tutor/mentor in their main subject area for the whole year.

Throughout the first term, preservice teachers are involved in what is known as the Serial School Experience. They spend two days per week in their assigned school (Wednesdays and Thursdays). Their link tutor is in the school on one of those days. A typical program during the serial school experience would be for the Wednesday morning to be devoted to broad or whole school educational and professional studies, with input from a specialist member of the school staff, followed by a group discussion led by the link tutor. They would then spend the remainder of their time on Wednesdays and Thursdays in subject departments observing lessons and developing teaching skills.

The School of Education also runs a core university course taken by all preservice teachers titled Educational and Professional Studies (EPS). History main method preservice teachers attend the EPS lectures on Monday mornings. The program of EPS lectures is designed to be followed up in the group discussions held at the partner schools on Wednesday mornings.

The entire spring term (January-March-13 weeks) is spent in the partner school teaching a full class schedule, with the exception of two days during which they return to the university for classes in their main teaching subject. Upon completion of the block school experience the preservice teacher spends the third term (April-June) in a negotiated further school experience. The negotiated experience is organized by pairing

up preservice teachers in the same main method group so that each can have experience of teaching in the school where the other one has undertaken the block experience. During this final term student again attend both methods classes and EPS lectures for workshops on different educational topics, advice and preparation for teaching post applications and to complete course assessment portfolios.

#### Virginia Tech- College of Human Resources and Education

Virginia Tech in southwest Virginia offers a Masters in Education: Social Studies. The Masters (MA) Program is designed to prepare social studies teachers at the secondary level. The Social Studies program is open to students who hold a BA in one or a combination of the following: History, Political Science, and/or Geography. The program requires a minimum of 39 semester credit hours and can be completed generally in 18 months. Preservice teachers build a program of study that requires courses to be taken in educational foundations, educational research, the cognate area and within their education and curriculum concentration area. The equivalent at Leeds for the educational foundations and educational research courses comes in the form of the EPS lectures. In the Fall and Spring Semester a key requirement in the program is Teaching in the Secondary School-Social Studies Methods- Part I & II. This comes in the form of a graduate seminar, In the fall semester this seminar includes an aide experience which is equivalent to the serial school experience at Leeds. During the Spring semester Part II of the graduate seminar is followed by the teaching internship which is the equivalent of the block teaching experience at Leeds.

Upon completion of the program preservice teachers receive either a full social studies certification that permits them to be hired to teach History and social science grades 6-12 in Virginia or specific subject certification that permits them to teach only the subjects in which they are certified. The key difference in these certifications is the number of graduate hours they have in their cognates.

#### Participants

Four volunteer preservice teachers; two from the history first methods class at Leeds and two from the social studies methods class at Virginia Tech will be the primary participants for this research. Each participant will be enrolled in their respective teacher education course through the 1997-98 academic year; all participants will have spent time



in the Fall/Christmas semester/term within schools carrying out observations, aiding, and doing a varying amount of classroom teaching. They will conduct their teaching internships during the spring/Easter semester/term.

It is important to note that the primary participants making up the four case studies emerged from a larger group of volunteers. In October 1997, at Leeds University, ten history main method preservice teachers volunteered as participants, while seven social studies preservice teachers volunteered to be participants at Virginia Tech.

The four participants who will form the case studies will emerge based upon their level of participation and willingness to share their experiences throughout the data collection process. The “winnowing out process” will not immediately result in only 4 participants. Those participants who have been assigned history courses, as opposed to geography, economics, and government, will be interviewed and asked to keep journals. The field of participants will be narrowed based on their willingness to, 1) complete the above 2) allow classroom observations of their teaching during their internship.

#### Data Collection

In order to obtain the quantity and quality of information necessary to adequately address the research questions the collection of data, from October 1997-May 1998, will utilize the following four key methods of qualitative research: interviews, audio recordings/transcriptions of events, observations, and document collection (Kvale, 1996; Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995; Emmerson, Fretz and Shaw, 1995; Silverman, 1994; Delamont, 1992). It is important to note that the design of this methodology is fluid and open to change, for as Hammersley and Atkinson make very clear, “Research is a practical activity requiring the exercise of judgment in context; it is not a matter of simply following methodological rules” (p. 23).

The following data collection strategies will be used:

- Interviews with student teachers - formal and informal
- Fieldnotes and audio recordings of classroom lessons
- Fieldnotes of scheduled university based seminars
- Audiotaped/written weekly “journal” by participants
- E-mail discussions
- Participants lesson plans and papers

- Researcher's field note journal

### Interviews

The goal for the interview researcher is to return from the stages of his or her qualitative inquiry with a tale that does justice to the subjects' stories of their lived world and that convey new and valid knowledge and insights to the listeners to and the readers of the tale (Kvale, 1996, p.80)

Because interviews are, as Kvale (1996) notes, "highly suited for studying people's understandings of their meanings in their lived world, describing their experiences and self understanding, and clarifying and elaborating their own perspectives of their lived world," the ethnographic interview will form a major source of data collection (p. 105). While the interview as a method of data collection can be open to the criticism that it is tainted by human bias it is important to note that the notion of an objective reality simply collapses upon itself with the realization that we are, as Shotter (1993) notes; (a) "conversational being for whom language is a reality...(for) we constitute both ourselves and our worlds in our conversational activity" (p.iv). We all exist within a conversational world, what we know about ourselves and our world is based upon conversations and our understanding of conversation is based upon our knowledge of the human world. As such what Kvale (1992) calls the 'Inter View' occurs like any other dialogue in a focused-directional conversational context between two persons conversing about a common theme. The research interview is a conversational technique whereby knowledge is constructed through the interaction of interviewer and interviewee; it provides access to individuals basic experiences of their lived world. (Gudmundsdottir, 1996). What is important to remember is that the construction of knowledge does not end with the interview but continues within the researcher's analysis of all the data that is then reported within the researcher's findings and subsequently read by others.

This study will carry out an initial one-two hour autobiographical interview that looks for accounts, episodes or magical moments that motivated the participants to enter into their respective teacher preparation programs. This will be followed by a series of interviews that explore, 1) the participants' initial experiences within their respective schools and teacher education programs as they prepare for their internships, and 2) the

factors that they perceive have impacted their teaching. The questions and point of entry for the interview will be grounded within the context of the participants' experiences. However in preparation for the entering the field a number of guiding interview questions have been developed. The frame, however, is meant only as a guide for a conversation that sets out to explore who they are and how the participants came to the decision to become history teachers. The following interview frames/protocols mirror those developed by Grossman (1990). (Appendix D)

Classroom/school observations and observations of scheduled university based seminars

The ethos of field work holds that in order to fully understand and appreciate action for the perspective of participants, one must get close to and participate in a wide cross section of their everyday activities (Emmerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995, p.10).

Regular classroom observations and visits with the participant in their respective school will form another vital layer of data. Such observations will serve as an important source for detailing the school context: in terms of the setting, interpersonal dynamic relations, behavior and actions of members of the school, the activities within the setting, and the types of ideas and thoughts that were discussed.

Fieldnotes and audio recordings will capture the specifics of their teaching of history. Participants would be visited/ observed a minimum of two days a week in the schools. The observation will include a brief pre and post lesson interview that will be audiotaped and transcribed. Field notes will made of the regular scheduled methods meetings/seminars that the participants attend. Throughout their student teaching, participants attend regular university-based seminars. Such meetings will provide an opportunity to understand the ways in which the participants talk about and discuss their experiences as beginning teachers in different settings.

Weekly "journal" by participants

During the student teaching experience participants will be asked to keep a journal discussing "critical incidents"/ "well remembered events' of their experiences. The option as to whether this will be an audiotaped, or written journal will be made available to participants. Participants will be encouraged to free write/talk about their daily or weekly events. It is important here to note that no specific format or focus for

these writings will be given. The journals will serve as useful way to look at the variety of issues that are addressed by the participants.

#### E-mail/listserv discussions

The social studies methods class at Virginia Tech participate on a student based class listserv. While questions are placed on the listserv for student response, there is a great deal of student originated dialogue. The participants responses within the context of the listserv provide another important data source that can be layered (triangulated) with other sources of data. (Permission to use student responses from the listserv in research is sought each year)

General e-mail correspondences will also be used as a data source by participants from Leeds and Virginia Tech. This serves as a way to discuss and talk about their experiences. Journal entries will also be sent via e-mail.

#### Lesson plans and papers

Throughout the study examples of lesson plans, copies of handouts, and comments on papers will be kept as another data source. I will also have access to the texts and handouts provided to the participants by their methods tutors. This will serve as an excellent source for gaining insight into the expectations and ideas presented to the participants throughout the year.

#### Researcher journal(s)

Throughout the study three separate journals will be kept. One journal will be for UK field notes, another will be for the American field notes and a third journal will serve as a researchers log/diary/methodology journal. The third journal will serve as a catch-all, where ideas, 'memos', patterns and themes initially find a home as I move back and forth through the data. For as Barzun and Graff note, "Between the first notion of it and the final draft you will probably modify your conception more than once" ( p.15). It is through the third journal that I will be able to see not just where I have been, but ideas for where I should go.

#### Data analysis-At play in the data from the field

We should never collect data without substantial analysis going on simultaneously... It is equally paralyzing to think that the analysis, when tackled, has to be exactly right and must conform precisely to one or other orthodoxy...there is no single right way to analyze data;

equally, it is essential to find ways of using the data to think with...the process of analysis should not be seen as a distinct stage of research: rather, it is a reflexive activity that should inform data collection, writing, further data collection, and so forth. (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996 Pp. 2-6)

Data analysis will be an ongoing process through the data collection process. As the above quote illustrates, while it is important to immerse oneself early in the data, there is more to data analysis than coding and condensing these codes into a simplified story of what it means to become a teacher of history. Immersing oneself in the data, like a dolphin at play in the ocean, requires a sense of balance as one moves down through and around in the sea of data; exploring, coming back, changing one's position and perspective to gain a greater appreciation of what is not just in front of you, but all around you. It is also important, however, to have an ability to know when it is appropriate to come up for air.

The following will detail how the data will be analyzed within this study. The process described will not be as separate and distinct as it appears below.

#### Cooking and writing

Spradley (1979a) in his work details the need for “cooking” data immediately upon completing fieldwork. This means making and reworking detailed notes after interviews and observations. Even before interview transcriptions are underway details of what was said, the context of what was said, and specific thoughts and insights will be written down. Immediately writing down ideas and themes Becker (1986) argues, is a good introduction to “find out how to analyze (the) field materials,” (p.109). These initial “free writes” will work as a guide into the transcriptions and a more systematic study of the data. Patterns and themes will be identified to both support and also contradict and complicate initial assumptions made in early analysis memos.

#### Coding the Data

Coffey and Atkinson (1996) see coding as a way to begin the move towards theorizing about the data. Identifying patterns, themes, regularities, contrasts, paradoxes and irregularities allows for the development of fresh perspectives from the data. It is vital however that once coding has occurred that the researcher needs to move toward thinking with the data, in order to generate meaning, and begin the process of

interpretation (Wolcott, 1994; Delamont, 1992; Coffey and Atkinson, 1996). However in order to generate rich interpretive descriptions it is important to go beyond seeing the data merely in terms of thematic content and recognize that such diachronic data that details the participants journey toward becoming a teacher is a story- a narrative account. Teacher stories are social constructions, that are historically and culturally located within networks of relationships. Narratives, Coffey and Atkinson (1996), suggest “provide information about the perspectives of the individual in relation to the wider social grouping of cultural setting to which that individual belongs” (p.68).

### Narrative analysis

Narrative analysis goes beyond the search for content and helps the researcher move toward what Polkinghorne (1995) terms a synthesis and “coherent developmental account” (p.15). The narrative analysis will begin by opening up the data to such questions as: How is the interviewee’s story organized? How does the story explain how events came about and why they came about? This type of questioning allows the researcher to look at: How the participants tell their stories; how they refer to themselves and others; where they begin and end their stories; and how they talk about the choices and subsequent decisions that were made. (Polkinghorne, 1995; Goodson, 1992; Reismann, 1993; Coffey and Atkinson, 1996).

Narrative analysis, within this research, offers a great deal of room to sensitively examine the story(s) of what it means to emerge as a teacher of history in two very different educational settings. Through attending what has been said and how it has been said, this research will explore the meanings and metaphors that are appropriated and used by student teachers as they enter into the socially shared professional knowledge landscape that teachers inhabit. (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996; Connelly and Clandinin, 1995). This involves going beyond explicit metaphors that can be located within the text, for as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) note “our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (p.3). By exploring language usage it will be possible to identify underlying metaphors that we not only live by, but use to make our world. For as Johnson (1993) suggests, “the way we frame and categorize a given situation will determine how we reason about it, and how we frame it will depend on which metaphorical concepts we are using” (p.2).

Through the use of domain analysis; which involves paying close attention to how “folk terms” and particular sorts of vocabulary are used within specific settings, this study will seek to explore the tacit cultural and craft based knowledge that is part of becoming a teacher of history. (Spradley, 1979; Coffey and Atkinson, 1996). Domain analysis is exceptionally useful if one view teachers or history teachers as a social group bounded by their department who have “persistent habits of speaking and acting... through which it construes its... beliefs, opinions and values” (p. 95).

### Writing

The final step is the writing of the story... the researcher cannot simply compile or aggregate the happenings: they must be drawn together in a systematic whole... The storied production that is the outcome of the research is the retrospective or narrative explanation of the happening that is the topic of the inquiry...The plausibility of the produced story is in its clarification of the uncertainty implied in the research question of why the happening occurred. The explanation needs to satisfy the subjective needs of the reader of the report to understand how the occurrence could have come about (Polkinghorne, 1995, pp. 18-19).

Before the final report is written, it needs to be made clear that the process of moving through levels of writing and rewriting is a vital part of the field work and not purely a final stage in the research process (Spradley, 1970). Throughout the data analysis the writing process will occur in an effort to transform the data into four case studies that explore the social and cultural process of becoming a history teacher (Wolcott, 1994).

### Research issues

Validity does not serve well as a criterion or goal for qualitative research...I can state unequivocally that I find no counsel or direction in questions prompted by a concern for validity. There is no set of circumstances here, no single and “correct” interpretation, nothing scientific to measure that tell us anything important... For every actor in these events there are multiple meanings...I hasten to add, however, that I always try to present issues in concrete terms and complex illustrations guided by Geertz’s maxim that there is no ascent to truth without a corresponding descent to cases. I think it instructive and provocative to examine cases that are open, confounding, and of immediate consequence, rather than to retreat

always to cases where known outcomes make us appear so much wiser in our ability (Wolcott, 1994, pp. 364- 365).

While concurring wholeheartedly with the above statement, it is just as important to argue for research that is ethical, thorough and trustworthy. In moving toward this researchers need to recognize, as Schratz and Walker (1995) do, that qualitative research “is not a technical set of specialist skills but implicit in social action and close to the ways in which we act in everyday life...our inclination is to seek to understand situations as participants see them rather than as theory might suggest and to recognize that once we start to study them we inevitably become part of the situation ourselves, not apart from it” (p. 2). My presence as a researcher within the educational setting will have an unavoidable impact on the participants. It is important here to explore my role within the research and address issues pertaining to such concerns as balance, trustworthiness, and power relations.

It is important to note here that even though the research will occur in two separate and distinct settings such issues as: getting in and getting out, and my own level of involvement and responsibilities at Virginia Tech, make it difficult to maintain a perfect symmetry with regard to data collection between these settings. As such this study will require two separate yet comparable plans for data collection. (Appendix E) In building on the above point it needs to be noted here that the process of “getting in” at Leeds University was designed to meet the expectations and ideas of the history methods tutor and bares no resemblance to the same process of Virginia Tech. Upon meeting with the method tutor in May 1997, the idea was put forward that one way to get volunteers would be to run an hour seminar that not only sold the project but also focused on what was usually discussed in the beginning seminar. As a result of this, I was allocated time to meet with the history methods students and discuss ideas pertaining to the philosophy of history. This was sent to Leeds prior to my arrival for approval. This seminar involved students reading over various statements, (Appendix F) modeled on the work of Barr, Barth and Shermis (1978) and Evans (1994), and rating the statements in relation to their own personal philosophies of history. This was followed with a taped discussion of what people thought of the statements and their own ideas as to what history is. The



Barr, Barth and Shermis statements were used previously with the Virginia Tech students during a seminar at the beginning of the fall semester by the course instructor. It was this impetus, in conjunction, with my perceived expectations of what was desired from the Leeds methods instructor that impacted my design for “getting in.” The process of “getting in” at Virginia Tech felt less artificial due to my position as a graduate assistant.

In seeking to develop a study that is thorough and trustworthy the methodology has been designed to collect rich data that can be layered together throughout the process of analysis. This could be simplistically viewed as providing for both the triangulation of data sources and the theoretical triangulation of data. In terms of the former the variety of data collection methods allows for the checking of inferences from one data source against another. While the data analysis process, with its focus on narrative analysis, and the use of multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to explore patterns and themes found within the data provides for the latter (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995). The researcher’s journal will also serve as an important tool to record and work through issues, concerns and frustrations that otherwise may have led to myopic view of the field.

Like a great deal of qualitative research, this study in focusing on preservice teachers’ “studies down,” this leads to power issues between researcher and participants. While I am a graduate student, like the participants, I also hold an assistantship and it is known that I have taught . This knowledge, probably, carries more of an impact with the participants at Virginia Tech than at Leeds University. This is because I am the Graduate Assistant for the social studies methods professor at Tech. This requires me to serve as the course’s student teaching supervisor during the student teaching. I have also taught the group in a number of meetings. This dual role of supervisor and researcher is an awkward role to fill. In order to overcome this issue, I will not supervise the participants in the case study. This role will be filled by the method instructor instead.

Going native is an issue that should be of great concern to educational researchers who have had experience as teachers, as Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) note “the ethnographer needs to be intellectually poised between familiarity and strangeness... the comfortable sense of being at “home” is a danger signal” (pp. 112-115). Though this will be my third year of supervising student teachers, I have not taught in Virginia, and I do not feel at “home” in any of the schools I have been in. I have always been and merely

remain a visitor from Tech. I would argue that I will be even less at “home” in the UK. It has been eight years since I completed my student teaching at Leeds University. Though the history methods tutors are the same, the introduction of the National Curriculum in England has changed what and how history is taught, while impacting the structure of teacher education in England. I will be entering schools in England just as I will enter the schools in Virginia as a visitor who is studying a student teacher.

## Appendix B

### The National Curriculum for History as official script

The National Curriculum for History is a document that at first glance is quite overpowering in its structure and expectations for both teachers and students. It is a document that not only prescribes the content to be covered but also addresses the specific understandings, skills, and attainment levels students should develop and reach as they move through their schooling. Introduced in 1991, and fiercely debated and revised in 1995, its current form is a document that seeks a balance between the tradition of history teaching that stresses the importance of transmitting an understanding of national traditions and culture via the teaching of historical content, and the competing tradition grounded in the work of the Schools Council History Project that emphasizes the teaching of historical skills and concepts (Crawford, 1995; Pendry, Husbands, Arthur & Davison, 1998). Neither Helen nor Jonny had taken it in its current form in terms of scope and sequence in high school.

The structure of the curriculum offers separate Programmes of Study for Key Stage 1, 2, and 3. These Key Stages are taken by pupils from ages 5 through 14. Key Stage 4, which begins in Year 10-11 (ages 14-16), is not required of all students; rather it is taken as an option in which students who have chosen to study history follow for the next two years a GCSE history syllabus chosen by the school. At each Key Stage the Programme of Study that is to be taught consists of both historical content and Key Elements which set out the historical knowledge, understanding, and skills to be taught as students study history. Each Programme of Study is laid out on a double page spread "to emphasise the inseparability of the historical content from the Key Elements" (School of Education - Partnership in History Education History methods booklet 1997-98, p. 29).

The actual historical content to be taught progresses in depth and breadth across the Key Stages. In going from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2, students focus on changes in their own lives before moving on to study those of people around them and then on to the lives of people in a time beyond living memory. In moving from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 3, students begin to study an increasing range of historical content drawn from the history of Britain, Europe, and the world.

Figure 2 Historical content (English Order)

Key Stage 1 Year Group 1-2 (ages 5-7)	Key Stage 2 Year Group 3-6 (ages 7-11)	Key Stage 3 Year Group 7-9 (ages 11-14)
Areas of Study	Study Units	Study Units
<p>Everyday life, leisure, culture.</p> <p>Changes in their own lives and those of adults around them.</p> <p>Aspects of the way of life of people in the past beyond living memory</p> <p>Lives of different kinds of famous people.</p> <p>Past events of different types.</p>	<p>Romans*, Anglo- Saxons, Vikings.</p> <p>Life in Tudor times.</p> <p>Victorian Britain or Britain since 1930.</p> <p>Ancient Greece.</p> <p>Local History.</p> <p>A past, non present European Society.</p> <p>* At Kettlethorpe the Romans were studied in Key Stage 3 as shown in the portraits of teaching.</p>	<p>Medieval Realms: Britain 1066-1500.</p> <p>The Making of the U.K.: Crowns, parliament, and peoples 1500-1750.</p> <p>Britain 1750-circa 1900</p> <p>The twentieth century world</p> <p>An era or turning point in European History before 1914.</p> <p>A past non-European society</p> <p>*Across the Key stages suggestions are given to where pupils should be provided with the opportunity to study a related topic in depth and /or through a local context.</p>

The knowledge, understanding and skills to be developed at each Key Stage are detailed in the Key Elements. The Key Elements are concerned with the following aspects of students progression in history: chronology, breadth and depth of historical knowledge and understanding, interpretation of history, historical enquiry; and organization and communication. Each of these Key Elements appears in each Key

stage but the focus changes to show progression. The National Curriculum makes clear that the Key Elements should be consistently developed within and through the teaching of historical content. The last section of the document focuses on student attainment targets that "describe the types and ranges of performance which pupils work in at a particular level should characteristically demonstrate." The document goes on to note that by "the end of Key Stage 3 the majority of student work should be within the range of 3-7" At Level 3 this means that :

Pupils show their understanding of chronology by their increasing awareness that the past can be divided into different periods of time and their recognition of some of the similarities and differences between these periods. They demonstrate knowledge of some of the main events, people and changes drawn from the appropriated programme of study. They are beginning to give a few reasons for, and results of, the main events and changes. They identify some of the different ways in which the past is represented. They ask and answer questions about the past by using historical sources (History in the National Curriculum, 1995, p.17).

While at Level 7:

Pupils make links between their outline and detailed factual knowledge and understanding of the history of Britain and other countries drawn from the key stage 3 programme of study,. They use this to analyze relationships between features of a particular period or society, and to analyze reasons for , and results of, events and changes. They explain how and why different historical interpretations have been produced. Pupils are beginning to show independence in following lines of enquiry,, using their knowledge and understanding to identify, evaluate and use sources of information critically. They are beginning to reach substantial conclusions independently. They select, organise and deploy relevant information to produce well structured narratives, descriptions and explanations making appropriate use do dates and terms sources (History in the National Curriculum, 1995, p.18).

## Appendix C

### The Virginia Standards of Learning for History and Social Science

The History and Social Science Standards of Learning is a 23 page document that prescribes the scope and sequence of the content to be taught to students from Kindergarten to Grade 12 (ages 5-18). It draws heavily, Fore (1998) suggests, “on a traditional knowledge base, [that] emphasizes chronologically organized US and European history” (p. 559). The importance of the content and focus on what students need to know is made very explicit within the first page of the standards:

The study of history and the social sciences is vital in a democratic society. All students need to know and understand our national heritage in order to become informed participants in shaping our nation’s future....The History and Social Science Standards of Learning are designed to:

- develop the knowledge and skills of history, geography, civics, and economics that enable students to place the people, ideas, and events that have shaped our state and our nation in perspective.
- enable students to understand the basic values, principles, and operations of American constitutional democracy;
- prepare students for informed and responsible citizenship;
- develop students’ skills in debate, discussion, and writing;
- provide students with a framework for continuing education in history and social science.

The organizational framework, while focusing heavily on history, includes the teaching of Civics, Economics, Geography, and Government at specific grade levels, as well as a list of minimum computer and technology standards that students should “acquire by the end of Grade 5” and Grade 8 (Standards of Learning 1995, p. 9).

Figure 3. Virginia Standards of Learning for History and Social Science

Grade Level	Content
Kindergarten-Grade 3	Introduction to History and Social Sciences
Grade 4	Virginia Studies 1607-Present
Grade 5	United States History to 1877
Grade 6	United States History: 1877 to Present
Grade 7	Civics and Economics
Grade 8	World History to 1000 AD
Grade 9	World History: 1000 AD to Present
Grade 10	World Geography
Grade 11	United States History
Grade 12	United States and Virginia Government

For each grade level a brief paragraph provides an overview of the content to be covered throughout the year. For example, the SOLs for Mike's and Amanda's teaching assignment of 11<sup>th</sup> grade US history begins,

the standards for the eleventh- grade students cover the historical development of American ideas and institutions from the Age of Exploration to the present. While focusing on political and economic history, the standards provide students with a basic knowledge of American culture through a chronological survey of major issues, movements and people and events in United States and Virginia History.

This preamble is followed by a bulleted lists of eighteen major objectives that detail what the student will be able to do and understand as they move through the course. Each section of objectives is clumped around major periods or events in US history that follow one another chronologically. For example, the first objective details that “the student will analyze and explain the contacts between American Indians and European Settlers during the age of discovery,” this is followed by objective number 2, in which “the student will compare the colonization of Virginia with that of other American colonies,” which then moves on to detailing that “the student will analyze and explain

events and ideas of the Revolutionary Period” (pp.19-20). The objectives continue in this format while moving through:

the events and ideas of the Constitutional era ...the events of the Early National Period... the cause and effects of major events of the Civil War and Reconstruction... the impact of Immigration... the causes and effects of the Industrial Revolution... the importance of World War I... Great Depression... the origins and effects of World War II... United States Foreign Policy since World War II... the federal civil rights and voting rights developments since the 1950s... and domestic policy issue in contemporary American society (pp. 20-21).

Within each of these objective blocks, further details are given for what should be addressed or emphasized within the classroom. For example in Standard 11.11, the objective reads,

The student will demonstrate an understanding of the origins and effects of World War II with emphasis on

- the rise and aggression of totalitarian regimes in Germany, Italy, and Japan;
- the role of the Soviet Union;
- appeasement, isolationism, and the war debates in Europe and the United States prior to the outbreak of the war;
- the impact of mobilization for war, at home and abroad;
- major battles, military turning points, and key strategic decisions;
- the Holocaust and its impact; and
- the reshaping of the United State’s role in the world affairs after the War (p. 21).

Within the 11<sup>th</sup> grade SOLs for history, there are 14 such content material objectives that survey specific periods and eras in US history. These are followed by a final four standards, 11.15 to 11-18, which stress the development of specific discipline skills and understandings.

11.17 The student will develop skills for historical analysis, including the ability to

- analyze documents, records, and data (such as artifacts, diaries, letters, photographs, journals, newspapers, historical accounts, etc.);
- evaluate the authenticity, authority and credibility of sources;
- formulate historical questions and defend findings based on inquiry and interpretation;



- develop perspectives of time and place, including the construction of various timelines of events, periods, and personalities in American History; and
- communicate findings orally, in brief analytical essays, and in a comprehensive paper.

The three remaining standards, stress skill development and frame the use of these skills as a way to continue the teaching of the first 14 content objectives.

11.15 The student will explain relationships between geography and the historical development of the United States by using maps, pictures, and computer databases to

- locate and explain the location and expansion of colonies;
- trace the advance of the frontier and the territorial expansion of the United States and explain how it was influenced by the physical environment;
- locate new states as they were added to the Union;
- understand the settlement patterns, migration routes, and cultural influences of various racial, ethnic, and religious groups;
- compare patterns of agricultural and industrial development in different regions as they relate to natural resources, markets, and trade; and
- analyze the political, social, and economic implications of demographic changes in the nation over time.

11.16 The student will interpret the significance of the excerpts from famous speeches and documents in United State History, including “the letter from a Birmingham Jail,” “Speak softly and carry a big stick,...” “The Gettysburg Address,” and “The Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom.”

11.18 The Student will develop skills in discussion, debate, and persuasive writing with respect to enduring issues and determine how divergent viewpoints have been addressed and reconciled. Such issues include

- civil disobedience vs. the rule of law;
- slavery and its impact;
- the relationship of government to the individual in economic planning and social programs;
- freedom of the press vs. the right to a fair trial;
- the tension between majority rule and minority rights;
- problems of intolerance toward racial, ethnic, and religious groups in American society; and
- the evolution of rights, freedoms, and protections through political and social movements.

## Appendix D

### Interview frame

#### Life experiences/ educational autobiography and perspectives on history

- 1) Early family life- Where did you grow up?
- 2) Early schooling when/ why did you develop an interest in history and teaching?
- 3) What do you remember learning about most?
- 4) Background in history – O levels, A levels, Degree?
- 5) Courses- specialization's:
- 6) What do you find difficult/ easy when you study history?
- 7) What were some of your best pieces of work in history at college?
- 8) What does it mean to you to have a degree in history - what do you think it means to be an expert in history?
- 9) What are the major areas that make up the discipline of history? *-Powell (1992) in his work with science teachers and Wilson and Wineburg (1989) used the idea of drawing a concept map. I could do this to help them explore the different areas of history and how they related to each other in order for participants to explain and describe their own "personal construct of history."*

#### Perspectives on history teaching

- 1) Exploration of decisions of why become a teacher- why a history teacher?
- 2) Do you have a preference for what year or students you want to teach?
- 3) Why do we need to teach history?
- 4) What goals do you have for your students?
- 5) What areas issues/ skills/ content do you consider a student should get from your history class? (Concept map)
- 6) What problems do you think students face in learning history?
- 7) What do you think they would find easy to learn?
- 8) How could you help students learn history?
- 9) In your minds eye how do you imagine yourself teaching a class? Describe the subject, the students, and what you and they are doing.

- 10) Describe what you think makes someone a good/ bad teacher of history- Where did you get your examples from?
- 11) Do you have any role models for how you would want to teach?
- 12) What did you learn from your history classes in high school and college?
- 13) Which were your favorite classes? How did they influence your ideas about teaching history?
- 14) What other experiences have influenced how you think about history?
- 15) What concerns do you have about beginning to teach history? Do you see any possible issues that may block you teaching history as you would like?

Before and after a unit /lesson is taught during teaching practice

- 1) Please tell me what you plan to teach?
- 2) Why are you teaching this topic?
- 3) How did you go about planning to teach this topic; what materials and sources are you going to use, why did you choose them?
- 4) What are the weaknesses and strengths of the materials you have?
- 5) In an ideal situation what would you use instead?
- 6) What are your objectives for students?
- 7) What do you think they already know about the topic?
- 8) What areas do you think they will have problems with/ how will you try to help them with these problems?
- 9) How have you organized your lesson- did you have other scenarios to teach this material?
- 10) How long did it take you to plan this; do you feel confident that you have the content knowledge to deal with any student questions?
- 11) How does this lesson fit into your unit?
- 12) What factors influence the why and how of teaching this lesson?

After Class

- 1) How did things go? Tell me about the lesson.
- 2) What went well?
- 3) What did not go as planned? Why?
- 4) How do you think the students did?

- 5) If you had to teach the text again what things would you do differently?
- 6) What would you have to take into consideration?
- 7) How might you change the lesson if you were teaching a stronger/ weaker group of students?

Appendix E

Data collection schedule

<b>U.K.</b>	<b>Month</b>	<b>U.S.</b>
Meet with Dr. Unwin - Discuss possibilities of research at Leeds	01-May-97	
	01-Sep-97	Getting in - GA position IN Social studies methods - Document collection begins - class handouts
	15-Sep-97	Listserv participation begins
Getting in - Request volunteers - 10 - Interview - educational autobiography	01-Oct-97	Request volunteers - 6
- Field Notes begin - Begin observations of lecture seminars - Document collection begins	15-Oct-97	
Participant journals begin - e-mail contact begins	01-Nov-97	
	15-Nov-97	Field Notes begin
	01-Dec-97	- Interview - educational autobiography
	15-Dec-97	
	01-Jan-98	
Audio-taped conversations and recordings of lessons Classroom/school/seminar observations and fieldnotes with case study participants	15-Jan-98	Listserv continues Case study participant journalling begins
	01-Feb-98	
Observations end	15-Feb-98	Audio-taped conversations and recordings of lessor Classroom/school/seminar observations and fieldnotes with
	01-Mar-98	case study participants
	15-Mar-98	
	01-Apr-98	
	15-Apr-98	
Journalling ends Interview #3 repeat via phone/e-mail	01-May-98	Journalling ends Interview #3 Field Notes end Observations End
	15-May-98	

## Appendix F

### Teacher Statements about the Purpose of History in Secondary School

#### Individual rankings of statements

Assign a number from 1- 9 to each statement presented in this handout. Put a “1” next to the letter of the statement that sounds **most like** what you believe, a “9” next to the statement that sounds **least like** what you believe, and rank the other statements accordingly. Please note that statements are not completely distinct nor are they all-inclusive. They are merely designed as an initial way to think about and examine one’s own perspective/ philosophy toward history and history teaching.

- \_\_\_\_\_ A History is an escape. It’s fun. It’s like a gigantic story. What it’s for is to better understand ourselves. History touches everything in our lives...it gives us clues to our identity. I teach by story telling. If a person does not know their background, they are not a whole person. I talk about events and the kids love it because it’s a story, and that’s what history is. The book might mention people and what they did, but I tell them stories about their personal lives and it makes it more interesting for them. It makes it easier for them to remember material and get a sense of time. You don’t try to justify it, you make it interesting.
- \_\_\_\_\_ B Right from the start I make it clear that though there are facts, there are few black and white answers in history... and that your interpretation of them is as valid as mine... and often I’ll ask some question which is interpretive and then read two totally different answers... both answers are valid as long as they’re supported by evidence. History puts things into a larger context. I think by delving deeply into a time period or an issue you develop some analytical skills and some research skills that will serve you in any thing you want to study. We need different historical perspectives on questions. I don’t try to put words in their mouths at the end of it all.. I’d rather leave them questioning. It’s hard for teenagers to accept because they want answers... I want them to test their hypothesis again and again. History broadens the mind. It gives us a common vocabulary so we can communicate.
- \_\_\_\_\_ C The key thing I try to emphasize to the kids is the fact that we’re human beings making decisions and affecting lives. The old adage that history repeats itself really does apply if you take a good look at it. If we can learn from the mistakes of past people and build upon them then we’re going to make a better world. I try to draw parallels; things that happened before then try to apply them to what’s happening now... it’s for learning about how people get to a certain point culturally.. and what you can do

about it once you're there. We have a clear obligation to generate involvement on the part of our students. We have the opportunity to determine our own future- to make a better world.

\_\_\_\_\_ D The primary task of teaching history is crystal clear. Teach the academic courses that will get your students to pass the exams and hopefully on into college. Provide them with the facts of history. If you don't your students will be anxious, their parents will be furious, and you will be superfluous. School is a mobility machine, and the main function of history, like that of every other subject, is to do the conventional academic thing. My goal is to help student move up the social ladder.

\_\_\_\_\_ E The historical process is continual and its all linked together. Using the past, hopefully you can communicate to kids where our species -Homo Sapiens- has gone wrong and continues to go wrong (you know we do not learn from our historical experiences). You look at the cycles of history, you try to communicate the idea that there's a certain predictability.. The example I use is that civilization emanates from a single human being, forms a group, then a tribe, a community, the city-state, the nation and eventually the empire. Empires reach a certain point when they become cumbersome they disintegrate and the cycle starts again. Its is a cyclical cycle, entwined with nature like the life and death cycle of a human, or a tree, or the seasons. History goes through various stages and experiences but they are all quite similar. All humans have thought about similar things and they have addressed the same questions. The historical process will continue.. it's all connected, we don't really have any control over it. What happened in the past and what happens today is part of a greater plan. Knowing this however is important. History as such provides us with a context for understanding our place in the world. The key is to help students develop a knowledge of self and an understanding of each person's unity with humanity.

\_\_\_\_\_ F I think it's important that students have a knowledge of how this country came to be. So many things hinge on the government; people need a good background in our nation's history. Maybe we can learn from our mistakes. I use history as a good way to tell stories and emphasize how things can relate to us today. I look upon history as a survival course. If we don not learn..nothing else will survive. Knowledge is power. Sometimes it's for the sake of knowing. We need a certain body of knowledge to function. The mind, like the body, needs exercise. Knowledge is the mark of an educated person.

\_\_\_\_\_ G We, as a nation, have lost our roots and our identity. What we need from history is for students to learn what has been good about our country. We need more heroes and to learn of great happenings such as the courage of our soldiers in wars and early explorers and pioneers. Students need to

know what is “right” about our country, not how to tear it apart. We need to bring back those moral values and beliefs that made our country great.

\_\_\_\_\_ H Well as I see it, the main task of history is to produce citizens who are neither apathetic nor cynical. That is, who feel that problems can be solved, that wrongs can be righted, and most of all, that they personally can participate and influence the direction of society. The implication for history is that somewhere in the curriculum we have to show them how to participate, convince them that their efforts can really count. This can't be phony. We have to demonstrate, maybe through descriptions of real people and cases, that individuals and organizing can exert power in ways that improve society.

\_\_\_\_\_ I History gives us insights to solve contemporary problems. It helps us understand our world and lets us see how power relationships have worked. It helps us understand the ways people have been oppressed, and lets us see strategies people have used to change the conditions of their lives. I try to provide them with the histories of minorities- and give a voice to the powerless; to women, blacks, and indigenous peoples. History cannot be only about rich white males. Students need to be aware of how specific changes came about, how and why they were resisted, what their long range consequences were, and how people adapted to them. History needs to empower students to be both socially and self aware in this ever changing world.



## Appendix G

### Informed Consent of Participants of Investigative Projects

#### Becoming a Teacher of History - Case Studies of the Journey to the “Other Side of the Desk” by Pre -service History Teachers in the UK and USA.

#### Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

### PURPOSE

This study will seek to explore how preservice teachers brought up in two very different educational/cultural settings- in the United Kingdom and the USA- begin to construct the process of learning to teach history. The purpose of the study is to develop an understanding of the following questions: What factors and experiences impact a preservice teachers decision to teach history and their perspectives on history? To what extent are preservice teachers actions and practices within the classroom impacted by their perspectives and beliefs toward history? If the preservice teacher’s perspectives on history does not connect with their practice what factors do impact their actions? An exploration of such issues is salient for those in teacher education and curriculum development and implementation. The following research questions will act as an initial guide to carrying out this qualitative study:

- 1) What experiences do preservice teachers contend impacted their decision to become a history teacher?
- 2) What perspectives on history and history teaching do preservice teachers bring to their preparatory experience?
- 3) What elements/ experiences seem to shape their development as a history teacher, as they progress through their preparation to teach history?
- 4) What impacts their planning, and delivery of instruction during their teaching practice.

### PROCEDURES

I would like to initially conduct an open ended interview/discussion with you of approximately 90 minutes in length that looks at your own life experiences and “critical incidents” that have impacted your decision to become a history/social studies teacher. Though I will follow an interview frame, follow up questions will also be asked. You will also have the opportunity to address issues not covered in the questions. You should feel free to stop the interview at any point, or refuse to answer any questions.

Following this I would like you to keep some form of journal- either over email, and/or a written or audio taped journal throughout your teaching internship. During your internship I would also like to be able to observe you in class, audio tape your lessons, study your lesson plans and organize follow up 30 minute taped interviews/ discussions twice a week..

All interview/discussions will be audiotaped and transcribed by the interviewer. Unless you request anonymity, the audiotape will be stored with the transcripts. If you request anonymity, the tapes will be erased as soon as it has been transcribed, and I will remove all identifying markers from the transcript.

I would also like to use the listserv discussion that is being generated within our social studies methods class this year as a source of data. Throughout this study every effort will be made by the researcher to maintain confidentiality through the use of codes or pseudonyms. At the end of my analysis I would also like to give you the opportunity to read the analysis and write a response to the analysis and your own comments with regard to your experiences.

## BENEFITS AND RISKS

Since you control the extent of your participation, answering only those questions you wish to answer, discussing only those issues you wish to discuss, the “risk” from participating in this project should be minimal. Generally the benefits of this project will not be to you directly though the discussion may allow you to reflect on your own ideas and practice within your classroom.

## EXTENT OF ANONYMITY

If the people who ultimately read this interview/discussion know which department or field you are training in at Virginia Tech/Leeds University, or the listserv you are participating in your anonymity may be compromised. For that reason, I am asking you to forgo anonymity. That is, I wish to use your name in the transcripts and in whatever publication may result from this work. It is hoped that the open ended, voluntary nature of the interview/discussion will allow you sufficient control over the nature of process to make you comfortable with speaking on record. If you are not comfortable with such an arrangement and you do not wish your name to be included in the transcript or any publication that might result, you can indicate by signing on the appropriate line at the bottom of the page. A pseudonym or code number will then be assigned to you and any identifying information will be deleted or changed in an effort to assure confidentiality. However, you should be aware that despite every effort to preserve it, anonymity may be compromised.

## COMPENSATION

No compensation will be given for your participation in this project.

## FREEDOM TO WITHDRAW

You can refuse to answer any question, and you may withdraw from this research at any time by informing David Hicks at (540)-381 4548 (hicks@vt.edu) or by contacting Dr. Melanie Biermann at (540)231-3743 (biermann@vt.edu). If you are unsure about the nature of this research, or would like to see the full proposal for the project, please contact either of the above individuals.

Your signature below means that you have read this form and agree to its conditions. Please indicate whether or not we may use your proper name on transcripts and fieldnotes. You will be offered a copy of this form.

#### APPROVAL OF RESEARCH

This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, by the College Of Human Resources and Education.

#### PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSIBILITY

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

#### SUBJECT'S PERMISSION

I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent for participation in this project. If I participate, I may withdraw at any time without penalty. I agree to abide by the rules of this project.

\_\_\_\_\_  
I wish to participate and you may use my name in transcripts and publications

Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
I would like to participate, but wish to remain anonymous. Please use pseudonyms in all documents to mask my identity.

Date

Should I have any questions about this research or its conduct, I may contact

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Hicks (540) 381-4548 (Investigator)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Melanie Biermann (540) 231-3743 (Faculty Advisor)

H.T. Hurd 1-5281  
Chair, IRB  
Research Division.

## Curriculum Vitae

### **David Hicks**

1007 Evergreen Way  
Blacksburg, VA 24060  
(540) 552-1199

[hicks@vt.edu](mailto:hicks@vt.edu)

<http://www.chre.vt.edu/admin/socstuds/hicks.html>

<http://www.chre.vt.edu/admin/socstuds/home.html>

## **Education**

---

### Ph.D. Curriculum and Instruction

**Virginia Tech**, Blacksburg, VA, July 1999.

Major: Social Studies Education

Areas of Concentration: Instructional strategies in the social studies, Integrating technology in the social studies, Interdisciplinary curriculum development, Ethnographic research, History of education.

Dissertation: "Constructing oneself as a Teacher of History- Case Studies of the Journey to the "Other Side of the Desk" by Pre-Service Teachers in the UK and the USA."

### M.A. History

**State University of New York College at Cortland**, July 1994.

Areas of Concentration: Modern US History and Modern British History

Research Seminars: "Operation Mongoose and its impact on the Cuban Missile Crisis" and "Luddites in Huddersfield- Rioters or Rebels?"

### Graduate Certificate of Education

**Leeds University**, England. June 1989.

Teaching Methods: History and Social Science

### B.A. (Hons) Social History, Second Class (i)

**Lancaster University**, England. June 1988.

Combined Major: History and Sociology

## **Certifications**

---

Virginia Collegiate Professional License in social studies

New York State certification in social studies (Grade 7-12)

England Qualified Teacher Status -History and Social Science

## Professional Experience

---

**Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University**, Department of Teaching and Learning, College of Human Resources and Education, Blacksburg, VA.

Instructor: Secondary Social Studies Education, 1998- present

- Coordinated and managed the social studies education program including administrative responsibilities, student advising, and applicant screening.
- Coordinated work of Graduate Assistants
- Supervised and evaluated student interns in field experience
- Restructure of program to meet State licensure requirement and NCATE.
- Taught the following courses

EDCI 5784	Graduate Seminar in Education -Teaching Secondary School 1 (Social Studies Methods for Aides)
EDCI 5964	Field Studies in Education
EDCI 5784	Graduate Seminar in Education - Teaching Secondary School II (Social Studies Methods for Student Teachers)
EDCI 5754	Internship in Education (Social Studies)
EDCI 5974	Independent Study- Teacher as Researcher
EDCI 2114	Perspectives in Elementary and Middle School Education
EDCI 5974	Independent Study- Integrating Technology into the Social Studies

Graduate Assistant: Social Studies Education, 1996-1998

- Team taught graduate courses

EDCI 3724/5784	Teaching Secondary School 1 (Social Studies Methods for Aides)
EDCI 5784	Teaching Secondary School II (Social Studies Methods for Student Teachers)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supervised and evaluated student teachers during teaching practice</li><li>• Established and managed social studies listserv</li><li>• Developed student based secondary social studies web page</li></ul>

- Participated in revision of teaching intern handbook for Department of Teaching and Learning
- Participated in writing of NCATE report for social studies

**Radford University**, Educational Studies Department, Radford, VA

Student Teacher Supervisor/Instructor, 1995-1996

- Prepared social studies student teachers for student teaching
- Supervised and evaluated student teachers during teaching practice

**Roanoke Valley History Museum**, Roanoke, VA

Curator/Educator, 1994-1995

- Designed and organized D-Day exhibit “29 let’s Go!”
- Designed and organized homefront exhibit “The War at Home”
- Catalogued and preserved artifacts
- Developed and presented curriculum and courses for educational outreach
- Collected D-Day veterans oral histories
- Organized speakers bureau

**Newfield Middle School**, Newfield, NY

Social Studies Teacher, 1992-1994

- Taught 8th grade American History in middle school
- Taught 9th and 10th Global studies in the high school
- Organized cross curricular activities as part of the 8th grade team that included study skills unit, indigenous awareness unit, black history unit, and archaeological dig unit
- Designed and implemented an alternative assessment end of year project for 8th grade social studies and language arts
- Attended Cornell Middle Level Institute
- Initiated and implemented school participation in Model United Nations conferences
- Middle school year book advisor
- Completed training in and participated in Student Assistance Team

**Oxford Central Schools, Oxford, NY**

Social Studies Teacher, 1990-1992

- Taught 10th grade global studies
- Taught 12th grade economics
- Tutored students in learning center for Regent's Competency Test, Regent's US history and government and global studies
- Senior class advisor
- Soccer coach
- Served as mock trial advisor
- Served as Model United Nations advisor

**Job Corp., Oneonta, NY**

Substitute Teacher, 1989-1990

- Worked with students ages 16-22 enrolled in the GED and Vocational programs
- Taught in all subjects for absent teachers
- Administered class work
- Long term substitute in the health program

## Research and Scholarship

---

### Refereed Publications

Hicks, D., Biermann, M.J., and Ariew, S. (1997) "Small Blue Planet Series: The Real Picture World Atlas, Version 3.0- Technology Review." *School Science and Mathematics* Vol. 97, No.3, pp. 441-443.

Hicks, D., (1995) "Willing Sacrifices- The War at Home" Roanoker, August 1995.

### Scholarship in Progress

Hicks, D., and Zell, S. (in review) "American Education. A History." *Educational Studies*.

Hicks, D. (in preparation) "History as a Field of Action. Doing Perspectival History."

Casey, D., Soares, D., Hicks, D. and Bentley, M. (in preparation) "Using a Field Trip as a Context for Integrating Math, Science, and Social Studies Curriculum with Preservice Secondary Student Teachers."

### Professional Presentations

---

#### International Conferences

Hicks, D., and Biermann, M.J. (July 1997) "Becoming a Real Researcher: Connecting with the Past via a Social Studies / Language Arts Oral History Project." Presented by M.J. Biermann at Connections '97. An International Conference in Studies of Society and Environment. Sydney, Australia.

#### National Conferences

Hicks, D. (Oct. 98) "On the Need for Perspectival History in the Classroom." Presented at the 20<sup>th</sup> Annual JCT Conference, Fourwinds Resort and Marina, Bloomington IN.

O'Quinn, E, and Hicks, D. (Oct 98) "Braving the Stories of Self and Other: Reimagining the Histories of Classroom Dynamics" (Performance). Presented at the 20<sup>th</sup> Annual JCT Conference, Fourwinds Resort and Marina, Bloomington IN.

Hicks, D., O'Quinn, E, and Nesor, J. (March 1998) "Student Discourse about Qualitative Research: Help Us Out Here, Won't you Doc?" (Performance) Presented at the 19th Annual Ethnography in Education Research Forum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.



Hicks, D., Biermann, M.J., and Colley, D. (March 1998) "Using E-Mail to Aid Reflection by Student Teachers" Presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, San Antonio, Texas.

Biermann, M.J., Hicks, D., Manross, M., and Weaver, S. (November 1997) "Encouraging Discourse between Student Teachers via an E-Mail Discussion Group." Presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies. Cincinnati, Ohio.

Hicks, D. (November 1996) "Tapping Community Resources through a Social Studies Language Arts Oral History Project." Presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, DC.

### **State and Regional Conferences**

Bentley, M., Hicks, D., Casey, D., and Soares, D. (April, 99) "Using a Field Trip to Explore Park to Encourage Curriculum Integration with Preservice Teachers." Presented at the Blue Ridge Symposium, Explore Park Roanoke VA.

Biermann, M.J., Hicks, D., Manross, M., and Weaver, S. (February, 1997) "Encouraging Discourse between Student Teachers via an E-Mail Discussion Group." Presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association. Hilton Head, S.C.

Hicks, D. and Colley, D. (March 1996) "Creating a Museum in Your Classroom: On the Homefront." Presented at the 92nd Middle States Regional Conference on the Social Studies. Wilmington, Delaware.

### **Local Presentations and Workshops**

Hicks, D., and Niles, R.A. (Dec. 98) Co-organizers "Virginia Tech and Radford University Symposium on Integrating Technology into the Social Studies." Blacksburg, VA.

Hicks, D., Casey, D., Soares, D., and Lloyd, G., (Nov. 98) "Preservice teacher integration using Explore Park for integrating science, math and social studies SOL's." Presented at the Integration of high school academics and vocational education conference, Blacksburg, Virginia Tech.

Hicks, D. (Nov 98) "Preparing for you Prelims and Prospectus in the Ph.D. program" Discussion participant in Professional Seminar at Virginia Tech.

- Hicks, D. (Oct 97) "Preparing Proposals for Conference Presentations" Discussion participant in Professional Seminar at Virginia Tech.
- Niles, R.A., and Hicks, D. (February 1997) "Using Cooperative Learning on the Block Schedule." Inservice workshop presented at Patrick Henry High School. Roanoke, VA.
- Hicks, D. (January 1997) "Becoming Detectives and Learning about our School-How to begin an Oral History Project." Presented to the elementary students at Bethel Elementary School. Radford, VA.
- Hicks, D. (November 1995) "Living in England." Presented at Pulaski County High School. Dublin, VA.
- Hicks, D. (September 1990) "Comparing the Educational Systems in the US and the UK." Presented at the Lions Club. Oxford, NY.

### **Professional Affiliations**

---

- Eastern Educational Research Association
- Middle States Council for the Social Studies
- National Council for the Social Studies
- Virginia Consortium of Social Studies Specialists and College Educators

### **Honors and Citations**

---

- Phi Alpha Theta Honor Society, SUNY Cortland
- Kappa Delta Pi Honor Society, Virginia Tech
- Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society, Virginia Tech
- Award of Distinction in teaching practice and educational theory, Leeds University
- Upper second class honors degree, Lancaster University

### **Grants/Funding**

- Graduate Student Assembly Travel Fund Recipient (Funding Cycle II 1997/98)
- Graduate Research Development Project Recipient (Funding Cycle II-1997/98)