

**HOW CAN WE TEACH STUDENTS TO READ, WRITE, AND THINK LIKE
HISTORIANS?
ADDRESSING HISTORY STANDARD THREE IN SECONDARY SOCIAL
STUDIES**

by

Elisabeth M. Prueter

An executive position paper submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

Fall 2018

© 2018 Elisabeth M. Prueter
All Rights Reserved

**HOW CAN WE TEACH STUDENTS TO READ, WRITE, AND THINK LIKE
HISTORIANS?
ADDRESSING HISTORY STANDARD THREE IN SECONDARY SOCIAL
STUDIES**

by

Elisabeth M. Prueter

Approved: _____
Chrystalla Mouza, Ed.D.
Director of the School of Education

Approved: _____
Carol Vukelich, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Education and Human Development

Approved: _____
Douglas J. Doren, Ph.D.
Interim Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education

I certify that I have read this education leadership portfolio and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as an education leadership portfolio for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Signed:

Robert L. Hampel, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of executive position paper

I certify that I have read this education leadership portfolio and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as an education leadership portfolio for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Signed:

William Lewis, Ph.D.
Member of executive position paper committee

I certify that I have read this education leadership portfolio and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as an education leadership portfolio for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Signed:

Francis J. O'Malley, Ed.D.
Member of executive position paper committee

I certify that I have read this education leadership portfolio and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as an education leadership portfolio for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Signed:

Preston Shockley, M.A.
Member of executive position paper committee

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to my advisor, Robert L. Hampel, Ph.D., for his guidance and expertise. I would like to thank committee member William Lewis, Ph.D., for his many helpful suggestions. I appreciate the support from committee members Francis J. O'Malley, Ed.D. and Preston Shockley, who have been both friends and colleagues in social studies.

Most of all, I would like to thank my husband John Morgan - my partner in all things. This project would not have been possible without his encouragement, insights, and unfailing support for my research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT	viii

Chapter

1	THE ELUSIVE HISTORY STANDARD THREE.....	1
	The Local Problem Addressed in this Paper	5
	Survey Demographics.....	9
	Interview Methods and Demographics	11
	Goals of the Project	11
	Organization of the Executive Position Paper	12
2	HISTORICAL THINKING AND HISTORICAL LITERACY	14
	Challenges of Effective History Instruction.....	14
	Preparing Pre-Service History Teachers.....	18
	The Teaching American History Grant Program	20
3	UNDERSTANDING HISTORY STANDARD THREE	24
	Data from Surveys.....	28
	Data from Interviews	30
	Data on Professional Development	33
4	TEACHING HISTORY STANDARD THREE	38
	An Exemplary Unit for History Standard Three	38
	Data on Lessons Fully Aligned with History Standard Three	41
	Data on Lessons Not Fully Aligned with History Standard Three.....	43
	Teachers' Evaluations of Lessons.....	46
5	AN EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM RESOURCES.....	52
	The Primacy of Primary Sources.....	52
	Curriculum Resources for History Standard Three.....	56
	Assessing History Standard Three.....	69
6	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	73
	Clarifying the Clarifications Documents	75

Professional Development	77
Conclusion	84
REFERENCES	86
Appendix	
A HISTORY STANDARD THREE	90
B TEACHER SURVEY	91
C TEACHER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	94
D PROFESSOR INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	95
E HISTORICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR.....	96
F UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE IRB LETTER.....	102

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Teaching Assignments of Survey Respondents	10
Table 2	Professional Development Identified by Survey Respondents	35
Table 3	Lessons Selected by Survey Respondents as Aligned to History Standard Three.....	49
Table 4	Resources Used by Delaware Teachers	57
Table 5	SHEG Lessons Listed in DRC as History Standard Three, Grade 8 U.S. History to 1877	62
Table 6	SHEG Lessons Listed in DRC as History Standard Three, Grade 11 U.S. History 1850-1990	63
Table 7	Non-SHEG Lessons Listed in DRC as History Standard Three, Grade 8 U.S. History to 1877	68
Table 8	Non-SHEG Lessons Listed in DRC as History Standard Three, Grade 11 U.S. History 1850-1990	69
Table 9	Assessment Items Listed in the DRC as History Standard Three Grade 8 U.S. History to 1877	70

ABSTRACT

The Delaware social studies standards articulate challenging goals for students. History Standard Three asks students to evaluate competing historical interpretations and determine the factors that lead to differing conclusions. This standard reflects the constructed and contested nature of the discipline of history. Historical interpretation can be difficult to teach and has been unevenly implemented. The goal of this project is to recommend ways to improve the teaching of History Standard Three in Delaware secondary social studies classes. Surveys and interviews revealed misconceptions that teachers have about the standard. A curriculum review suggested a lack of appropriate teaching resources. Recommendations include additions to the standards clarification document, suggestions for professional development, and practical modifications to existing curriculum.

Chapter 1

THE ELUSIVE HISTORY STANDARD THREE

My first real engagement with the Delaware State History Standards began when I was hired as the first Social Studies Specialist for a public school district in New Castle County, Delaware in 2007. My previous roles in education had required little awareness of state requirements. As a high school history teacher in an independent school, I had been free to create my own curriculum. As a supervisor of pre-service social studies at the University of Delaware, my primary concern had been that my college students mastered the standards articulated by the National Council for the Social Studies, which are the basis for program accreditation. Although the pre-service teachers under my supervision completed their student teaching in Delaware schools, they often went on to employment in other states.

As Social Studies Specialist, I wrote and reviewed curriculum and observed social studies teachers at all grade levels. The Delaware State Standards for Social Studies guided every aspect of this work. The creators designed these standards with citizenship in mind; they described the goal of social studies as “preparing young people to become informed and active citizens, who accept their responsibilities, understand their rights, and participate actively in society and government” (Delaware Department of Education, 1995, par. 1). These goals reflect Delaware’s participation in the “standards movement” that followed in the wake of the publication of *A Nation*

at Risk in 1983. Even though the attempt to create national history standards ended in popular controversy and Congressional condemnation in 1995, states moved to define their own goals for student achievement. In Delaware, social studies is composed of four subjects: civics, economics, geography, and history. Each subject consists of four standards. Each of these standards is a skill or concept fundamental to that discipline. In history, these standards are chronology, analysis, and interpretation, with a fourth standard – historical content – the vehicle for teaching the first three skills.

As I delved into the standards for history, I appreciated their focus on historical thinking skills. The creators of the standards avoided laundry lists of names, dates, and events that characterize history standards in some states and instead articulated goals for students' historical understanding. As I spent time in teachers' classrooms observing history lessons, I noticed uneven implementation of the standards among classrooms, especially for the history standards at the secondary level. History teachers typically devoted the most time and attention in the classroom to names, dates, and events (History Standard Four). Most teachers did spend some time considering cause-and-effect relationships (History Standard One) and reading primary documents (History Standard Two). Little time, however, was devoted to the interpretation of history (History Standard Three).

Of the three skills described by the Delaware State Standards, interpretation is the most challenging. It requires that teachers understand how history is created and to recognize patterns and methodologies in historiography. These skills are at the heart of graduate work in history, but those without advanced degrees may not have much

exposure to this aspect of the discipline. My observations in secondary social studies classrooms led me to wonder whether teachers understood History Standard Three and if they were aware that they rarely addressed the standard in their lessons. In 2010, I informally surveyed secondary history teachers about History Standard Three. I asked teachers if they teach History Standard Three and to describe a lesson they use that addresses the standard. Of the 21 respondents, 19 answered yes. Of those who answered yes, more than half described a lesson that addressed History Standard Two, not Standard Three. These responses suggested to me that not all teachers have a thorough or accurate understanding of what the standard requires.

I followed this survey with teacher interviews. I interviewed two secondary social studies teachers about teaching History Standard Three and about their professional development experiences. I selected these two teachers for variation in teaching assignment (middle or high school), teaching experience, and educational background. The first teacher interviewed, Teacher A, was a high school teacher with 19 years of teaching experience and a bachelor's degree in history education. The second teacher, Teacher B, was a middle school teacher with six years of experience and a bachelor's degree in economics. By sampling for variation, I hoped to uncover differences among teachers that might account for differences in teaching History Standard Three.

This preliminary, and admittedly limited, research suggested that History Standard Three was not taught consistently. One reason might be that secondary social studies teachers come to the classroom with a wide range of academic preparation and

experience. Some teachers have been prepared as elementary school teachers, others as historians, and some in another field altogether. Teacher B, for example, had a bachelor's degree in economics and worked in banking before becoming a teacher. At the time of the interviews, only seven of the district's 21 middle school social studies teachers had degrees in history, history education, or secondary social studies education, whereas thirteen of 20 high school teachers did.

The disparate academic preparation of teachers may influence how well they understand historical interpretation. What teachers said about what would help them teach History Standard Three revealed a great deal about how well they understood the standard. Teacher A, for example, reported a need for primary sources related to course topics. Teacher A specified such documents as political cartoons and advertisements. However, History Standard Three requires students to evaluate secondary sources (i.e., historians' accounts of the past). Teacher B's comment that she did not know the historians of a particular period showed that Teacher B understood the standard, even if she did not teach it. Interestingly, Teacher A had a degree in history education; Teacher B did not.

In the interviews, teachers identified lack of resources as a significant obstacle to teaching History Standard Three. Teacher B pointed out (correctly) that the *History Alive!* textbook used in district middle schools does not address historical interpretation. Teachers turn to one another when looking for teaching materials. Teacher A noted that Advanced Placement training was most useful in networking with other teachers and sharing ideas. With regard to professional development,

teachers had little to report. They could not recall more than one or two district workshops that helped them to understand the standards. This information corresponded with the district calendar from recent years. The few professional development days were most often devoted to general pedagogical techniques rather than content-specific workshops. In the 2010-2011 school year, one half-day of in-service was given to social studies, but that time was dedicated to a required presentation from the Delaware Department of Education that was not related specifically to the history standards.

The Local Problem Addressed in this Paper

The focus of this Executive Position Paper is the teaching of History Standard Three in Delaware secondary schools. My experience as a curriculum specialist in one Delaware public school district suggests that History Standard Three is often not taught. In the elementary grades, History Standard Three introduces students to the idea that history is constructed from evidence and that accounts of the same event may differ. At the secondary school level, History Standard Three asks students to consider how historians' perspectives, choice of questions, and use of sources affect interpretations of historical events (Appendix A). When students tackle this standard, they learn that the historical narrative they read in their textbooks is only one interpretation of the past. They discover that history is not memorization of facts, but an on-going debate about what happened in the past and why the past matters to us

now. History Standard Three forces students to evaluate the process of “doing” history and encourages them to be skeptical consumers of information.

Several years after the creation of the state social studies standards, a group of Delaware educators wrote a companion document, “Clarifying the Delaware State Social Standards” to help teachers understand what the standards required and how those standards might be implemented in the classroom. This document provides additional descriptions and examples of History Standard Three and explains that “The foundation of this standard is the understanding that the design of the research influences the conclusion. In addition, the personal background, experiences, bias, and outlook of the historian impact the research strategy. The historical facts do not speak for themselves; a historian makes the facts speak by interpreting the facts” (Delaware Department of Education, 2016, *Understanding the history standards for teachers in grades 9-12*, p.14). The clarifications for History Standard Three detail several examples of how and why historians have arrived at different interpretations of past events, such as the Crusades, the American Revolution, and the dropping of the atomic bomb in 1945. The document provides ample evidence that History Standard Three is crucial to the practice of history; however, there is little to guide teachers in how to teach it.

Since 2013, Delaware public school teachers have also been required to teach the national Common Core Literacy Standards. These standards focus on Math and English Language Arts and include a sub-section for History and Social Studies. The authors note that the literacy standards are “meant to supplement content standards in

those areas [e.g., history], not replace them” (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010, *English Language Arts Standards*, par. 5). Although the Common Core literacy standards in history and social studies are not identical to Delaware’s history standards, some of the underlying principles are similar. For example, at the eleventh and twelfth grade level, students are asked to “evaluate authors’ differing points of view of the same historical event or issue by assessing the authors’ claims, reasoning, and evidence” (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010, *English Language Arts Standards. History/Social Studies. Grade 11-12.6*). This standard might be applied in a History Standard Three lesson to achieve the same instructional outcome.

Significantly, however, the Common Core standards do not specify “authors” to be historians, leaving open the possibility of using primary rather than secondary sources. Indeed, a cursory look at sample lessons provided by Common Core affiliates (e.g., *Achieve the Core* and *Understanding Language*) indicates that primary sources are the basis of most of these lessons. The newer Common Core literacy standards might be used to reinforce Delaware’s History Standard Three, but it should be remembered the Common Core is intended to develop skills in literacy, not historical interpretation.

The creators of the Common Core contend that their standards will help students develop the “critical-thinking, problem-solving, and analytical skills” (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010, *English Language Arts Standards*, par. 2) they need to be successful in college and careers. The authors of the Delaware social studies standards propose that reflective, critical thinking is a key component of responsible citizenship. These are both worthwhile goals. History Standard Three, in

particular, reflects a crucial aspect of the discipline of history. I am interested in uncovering the reasons why teachers might omit this standard from classroom instruction and exploring ways to address this problem.

Research for this Executive Position Paper focuses on three questions related to the teaching of History Standard Three in secondary social studies classrooms: 1) What do teachers understand about History Standard Three? 2) How do teachers attempt to address History Standard Three in their lessons? 3) What professional development and curriculum materials are available to support the teaching of this standard?

In order to answer these questions, I expanded the aforementioned survey and interviews to secondary teachers across the state of Delaware. The survey (Appendix B) and interview questions (Appendix C) helped me to determine if teachers understand History Standard Three and if they try to address the standard in their lessons. The survey and interview questions also helped me to assess the kinds of professional development teachers in various districts receive and the types of resources used in classrooms. Teachers who completed the survey were given an opportunity to provide their contact information if they were willing to answer follow-up questions in a phone interview. Teachers' responses to these interview questions enabled me to probe how teachers came to their understanding of History Standard Three, where they found curriculum resources, and what kinds of professional development they considered most helpful to their teaching of historical interpretation.

The final major source of research was an evaluation of the curriculum resources most frequently mentioned by teachers in the survey and interviews.

Survey Demographics

In the fall of 2017, I was a member of a group of teachers that met to review test items for the new Delaware Social Studies Assessment (DeSSA). I took advantage of this gathering of social studies teachers to distribute paper copies of my research survey. Nine teachers completed this version of the survey. When I reviewed the responses, I discovered that teachers did not always provide enough information to determine if lessons addressed History Standard Three. To address this issue, I added one selected-response question on the survey. This question lists brief descriptions of five lessons from the Delaware Recommended Curriculum for Social Studies (Delaware Department of Education, n.d.) and asks teachers to identify which lessons address History Standard Three. With this addition, I hoped to ascertain what elements teachers deem necessary to include in a lesson about historical interpretation.

In the spring of 2018, I presented my research proposal and survey at the monthly Social Studies Coalition of Delaware meeting. I requested that district representatives encourage social studies teachers to complete the digital survey and sent the survey link to each district. By June 2018, 35 secondary social teachers completed the updated survey, for a total of 44 responses. The first question on the survey asked teachers to describe their teaching assignment. Because teachers have multiple teaching assignments, the total number in the table is greater than 44.

According to the Delaware Recommended Curriculum, History Standard Three is required in Grade 8 U.S. History, Grade 11 U.S. History, and Grade 12 World History. However, districts and schools may decide to address specific standards at other grade levels and in other courses.

Table 1 Teaching Assignments of Survey Respondents

TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	# of Teachers
High School U.S. History (Honors, CP, Special Education)	14
High School World History (Honors, CP, Special Education)	14
Advanced History (AP, International Baccalaureate, Dual Enrollment)	15
High School Geography, Civics, and/or Economics	4
Middle School Social Studies	16

The second question of the survey asks teacher to describe their educational background. I was interested to determine if teachers' understanding of History Standard Three correlated with their academic preparation. Nearly half of the respondents (23 teachers) identified their university degrees as in history or history education. The remaining respondents listed other degrees, including behavioral science, economics, elementary education, geography, psychology, social studies education, and special education.

Interview Methods and Demographics

The surveys were anonymous, but teachers were given the opportunity to provide their email addresses if they were willing to answer follow-up questions in an interview. I was able to arrange phone interviews with nine teachers. Interviews took place in the summer of 2018 and each lasted about 20 minutes. Among the interviewees were five high school teachers, three middle school teachers, and one administrator. They are employed by four different school districts in Delaware. It should be noted that both the survey and interviews were voluntary and therefore might not represent the views and experiences of all teachers across the state. It seems likely that teachers willing to spend time completing a survey are interested in social studies and confident in their views. This bias may be even more pronounced for teachers who offered to spend part of their summer vacation discussing History Standard Three with me on the phone.

I also interviewed two history professors who supervise pre-service teachers in a social studies education program. They shared with me their insights regarding the discipline of history and the challenges of teaching History Standard Three.

Goals of the Project

The overall objective of this EPP is to recommend ways in which to improve the teaching of History Standard Three in Delaware secondary social studies classes. The first step in this process is to identify weaknesses in teachers' understanding of historical interpretation and to suggest ways to clarify the requirements of the

standard. The second step in this goal is to review existing curriculum in order to identify materials that are appropriate for addressing History Standard Three and to provide exemplary modifications or additions that can bring insufficient lessons into alignment. Finally, I draw on the experiences of teachers to suggest professional development that will deepen teachers' understanding of historical interpretation and enhance their skills in providing effective instruction.

Organization of the Executive Position Paper

Chapter 1 introduces readers to History Standard Three and the challenges of addressing it in the secondary social studies classroom. The chapter articulates the key questions that guided the research, identifies the sources and methodology of data collection, and states the goals for this project.

Chapter 2 explores how the work of scholars in the fields of literacy, history, and education helps to explain the challenges of teaching historical interpretation in Delaware social studies classrooms.

Chapter 3 begins with a discussion of the History Standard Three benchmarks and the accompanying clarification documents. It explores some problems with standard-specific terminology and offers working definitions for key terms. The chapter also brings together data from surveys and interviews to explore how teachers understand - and misunderstand - History Standard Three.

Chapter 4 applies data from surveys and interviews to describe common teaching practices and to identify effective instructional strategies for teaching History Standard Three.

Chapter 5 evaluates to what extent available curriculum meets the requirements of History Standard Three.

Chapter 6 draws upon survey and interview responses to recommend professional development and curriculum resources that will best serve the needs of secondary history teachers in Delaware.

Chapter 2

HISTORICAL THINKING AND HISTORICAL LITERACY

Challenges of Effective History Instruction

There are a number of scholarly books and articles that address the issue of what constitutes effective history instruction and how best to foster historical thinking among students. Authors such as Sam Wineburg, Bruce VanSledright, Bruce Lesh, and Jeffery D. Nokes have investigated the gap between how historians practice their craft and how students study history in middle and high schools (Wineburg, 2001; VanSledright, 2002; Lesh, 2011; Nokes, 2013). Lesh observes that “history and social studies are the only disciplines in which students are not taught the tools necessary to understand how knowledge is created” (p. 11). Nokes (2011) argues that while students in science classes test hypotheses in the lab and students in math classes construct proofs, “history students rarely have the opportunity to engage in historical inquiry. Historians produce history and history students consume history, typically with very little thought about how it was produced” (p. 395).

Samuel Wineburg warns that teachers’ reliance on textbooks hides the “metadiscourse” of history: “The textbook speaks in the omniscient third-person. No visible author confronts the reader; instead, a corporate author speaks from a position of transcendence” (p. 13). The way students are often taught history, which relies on

the authority of the teacher and the textbook, obscures the controversies and uncertainties that characterize the writing of history. Because students have little experience with the process of creating historical interpretations, they may develop inaccurate ideas about the discipline. Nokes lists several misconceptions commonly held by secondary students: they view historians as archivists of information, rather than as constructors of historical meaning; they see historical understanding as something that is transmitted, rather than constructed; they fail to recognize the distinction between the past and history, and they fail to appreciate how multiple perspectives shape different versions of history (p. 396).

Students' struggle to understand the nature of history may suffer from a lack of literacy instruction. Although high school teachers expect their students to understand increasingly complex texts across all disciplines, they spend little time developing their students' literacy skills. "Ironically – or, rather, tragically – just as the expectations for reading and writing in content areas grows, the amount and quality of intentional literacy instruction declines and does so in almost direct relation to the increase in cognitive challenges secondary students face" (Bain, 2012, p. 517). Despite the growing importance of informational texts rooted in the Common Core Standards and Smarter Balance assessment, social studies teachers devote only a small percentage of instructional time to the development of reading skills. In a study of 137 social studies and ELA classroom lessons over the course of one academic year, observers found that "students across all social studies classes were observed reading for a total of 410 minutes, or 10.4% of the total observed time" (Swanson, et al., 2016,

p. 213). Only one half of the eleven social studies teachers in the study used comprehension strategies in their classrooms (p. 209). When students do read in the classroom, they are most often assigned passages from the textbook. Remarkably, observers never witnessed students reading narrative text (p. 215). If students are not exposed to the work of historians, it should not be surprising if they do not fully understand the nature of history.

Other scholars have found that this reliance on textbooks persists into undergraduate education. Elizabeth Belanger (2015) found that in a freshman-level history course, students reported being assigned to read textbooks much more often than monographs or articles by historians (p. 39). It seems likely that this pattern of reliance on textbooks over historical narrative is self-reinforcing; teachers who have little experience with sources beyond the textbooks in college may be less likely to use other sources in their own classrooms.

These authors recount classroom experiences and provide recommendations for teachers that address the skills articulated in History Standard Three. As part of the Stanford History Education Group, Sam Wineburg and other educators have created lessons that help students appreciate the interpretative nature of history by asking them to compare textbook accounts with competing historical sources. For example, a “Dark Ages” lesson plan first asks students to analyze three textbook accounts of the European Middle Ages. Guiding questions prompt students to recognize that each textbook excerpt periodizes the “Middle Ages” differently and draws upon different types of evidence. Students then consider a variety of primary sources that

corroborate, refute, or elaborate the textbooks' accounts. Finally, students use all the secondary and primary sources to construct their own evaluation of the Middle Ages (Stanford History Education Group, n.d., *Reading like a historian*).

Bruce Lesh similarly emphasizes the importance of engaging students in the process of creating history. He contends that if students “do not realize that history is debated, and that there are tools historians employ to develop and promulgate their interpretations, they will not be amenable to reconsidering their understanding of history” (p. 34-35). Each chapter of his book, *Why Won't You Just Tell Us the Answer?* is dedicated to an aspect of historical thinking and the lesson he uses to address that skill. In a lesson on Nat Turner, students examine six sources – three primary sources and three accounts by historians – then create their own historical marker for the leader of the slave rebellion. Lesh prompts students to examine what he calls “subtext” of each source: the identity of the author, the intended audience, and the purpose for which the source was created. Lesh admits that although students sometimes struggle to make sense of competing accounts, most are able to appreciate how perspectives and types of evidence influence interpretations.

Much of the scholarship about developing students' historical thinking skills focuses on the difficulties of this goal. Wineburg's work with AP-level high school students demonstrated that even mature and adept students do not naturally apply the critical habits of historians when reading historical texts. Nokes makes some specific, practical suggestions for overcoming common problems that students experience when they are forced to grapple with multiple, complex, and contradictory texts. Nokes

recommends including historical controversies in the classroom, which “not only increases interest, but is likely to confront students’ unsophisticated views of the world. The teacher’s seeming omniscience as content authority is eliminated when he or she introduces a controversial historical interpretation without advocating a side and allows students to develop their own evidence-based interpretations” (p. 393). Nokes also points out that changes in instructional strategies are unlikely to be successful without a concomitant change to student assessment. Nokes recommends assessing student understanding with document-based, open-ended questions.

Preparing Pre-Service History Teachers

Some researchers have directed their focus to the next generation of teachers. Professors of social studies and history education have written about their efforts to help pre-service teachers appreciate the importance of historical thinking skills and construct lessons that facilitate their teaching. Robert Bain (2012) of the University of Michigan emphasizes that history is a discipline based on written texts and educators must teach their students how to interpret the wide variety of historical sources they encounter. With a literacy-expert colleague Elizabeth Moje, Bain developed a series of integrated methods courses that requires pre-service teachers to implement literacy strategies along with content-area instruction. Bain argues that literacy instruction is “inherently connected to studying the past. The responsibility for teaching how to read and write history comes packaged with the responsibility for teaching history” (p. 520). Thomas Fallace (2009), professor of social studies education, co-taught a series

of seminars with history professors. These seminars introduced pre-service teachers to historiographical debates and enabled them to write lessons that incorporated historiography. For example, a pre-service teacher constructed a lesson about the French Revolution that included excerpts from several historical monographs as well as a high school textbook. Students identified the interpretation they found most compelling and explained their choice. Fallace was pleased with the results of these experimental seminars, but he addressed some of the challenges that student teachers faced when they entered the classroom. Pre-service teachers did not find it easy to translate their deeper understanding of historical methods to their high school students. Pre-service teachers felt pressure both to cover a large amount of historical content and to conform to the pedagogical style of their cooperating teachers. On a practical level, one new teacher noted that the resources that he had used in college, such as online academic journals, were no longer available to public school teachers.

Another professor of education, Michael G. Lovorn (2012), noted success with his course that asked pre-service teachers to evaluate the interpretations offered by local historical commemorations. Lovorn also admits that novice teachers face significant hurdles in the classroom, including, “little experience with ‘doing history;’ marginal, if any, support from cooperating teachers; expectations, or even mandates to present material in predictable, traditional manners; and inadequate class time to implement new, often time-consuming, strategies” (p. 570). One of the social studies education professors whom I interviewed noted that pre-service teachers have difficulty integrating the research and analysis skills they learned as college history

students into lessons for secondary pupils (Interviewee 10, personal communication, September 7, 2018).

The Teaching American History Grant Program

Fortunately, even if novice teachers enter the classroom without a strong command of historical interpretation, they may have opportunities to deepen their disciplinary knowledge and pedagogical skills through professional development. One of the most frequently mentioned professional development experiences on the teacher survey was the Teaching American History grant. This federal grant program, funded by Congress from 2001 to 2011, aimed “to raise student achievement by improving teachers' knowledge and understanding of and appreciation of American history” (U.S. Department of Education, 2011, “Programs: Teaching American History,” par. 3). Over the course of 10 years, the U.S. Department of Education awarded grants totaling just over one billion dollars for professional development for teachers in all 50 states, including five grants for Delaware. The Teaching American History grant enrolled roughly 450 Delaware teachers in multi-year professional development programs (teachinghistory.org, n.d., *Teaching American History Grant*).

In its final evaluation of this program, the U.S. Department of Education concluded that one of the strengths of many Teaching American History grant programs was the effort to bring teachers together with professionals involved in historical interpretation and preservation. “Partnerships praised by teachers connected teachers not only with historians but also with local historic sites, history archives, and

primary sources. At some sites, partners engaged teachers in original research. Teachers in turn used this research to create lessons that engaged students in historical thinking” (U.S. Department of Education, 2011, *Grant performance report*, p. x). Another accomplishment of the grant programs was the establishment of networks of teachers and learning communities that supported teachers in their on-going efforts to develop effective history instruction techniques and materials. Teaching American History grants in Delaware had similar positive results. Delaware’s Historical Literacy Project, a 2008-2011 Teaching American History grant, measured increases in student and teacher knowledge of U.S. history through pre- and post-tests. On tests of students of participating teachers, “the project exceeded its objectives for both multiple-choice and open-ended items” (U.S. Department of Education, 2011, *Grant performance report*, p. 6). Participating teachers showed increases in average scores on both multiple choice and open-ended post-test questions, as well as improvement in instructional quality. In fact, “100% of the originally selected teachers... displayed increased use of an average of five of the six observed pedagogical practices” (p.10).

Scholars who have evaluated the effects of the Teaching American History grants have observed that working directly with historians enabled teachers to appreciate how historical interpretations are created and, in some cases, transformed the way teachers view the discipline. Rachel Ragland, assistant professor of education at Lake Forest College, argues that it was necessary to first change participants’ attitudes toward history before attempting to change their instructional practices (Ragland, 2015, p. 610). She noted that only one-third of the 20 middle and high

school teachers who participated in an Illinois Teaching American History grant had majored in history. Moreover, their undergraduate studies in history were based on lectures and textbook reading. “As a consequence of this lack of training in history, most teachers were not familiar with the work of historians and what it means to ‘do history’” (Ragland, 2007, p. 222). Working directly with historians, however, helped teachers to understand the process of research and interpretation that they could then use to enhance history instruction in their own classrooms.

The research of Kevin B. Sheets of SUNY Cortland supports Ragland’s emphasis on teacher-historian partnerships. Sheets (2010) argues that key to the success of Teaching American History grants is a focus on historical interpretation. Historians who worked with teachers must take care to “emphasize a definition of the past as something to be discovered, not memorized” (p. 457). Sheets echoes the sentiment of Nokes and Wineberg that reliance on textbooks and lectures obscures the constructed, contested nature of historical interpretation. Teaching American History grant programs offered teachers that opportunity to see and engage in the processes used by historians. Sheets observed that if historians and teachers “show how they work out a particular historical problem (why they chose to ask *that* question, why they chose to use *that* source, why they chose to pick *that* date and *that* person, etc.), then students will come to appreciate history as a process and not as a package” (p. 458). In his recommendation, Sheets identifies the same factors that affect historical interpretations that are specified in History Standard Three.

While both education scholars and the teachers I surveyed attest to the benefits of Teaching American History grants, the programs did have limitations. One challenge for Teaching American History grants across the country was the uneven implementation in schools and districts. Only a fraction of any district's social studies teachers volunteered to participate. Although participant teachers were encouraged to share what they learned with non-participant colleagues, this transmission was uneven. Moreover, project directors had varying levels of support from school and district administrators. The evaluators of Delaware's Historical Literacy Project noted that some measures were difficult to obtain due to lack of compliance by district teachers. For one cohort of participating teachers, calculations "were rendered meaningless by comparison teachers' failure to take pre- and post-tests" (U.S. Department of Education, 2011, *Grant performance report*, p. 8). A second challenge was difficulty recruiting the individuals most in need of professional development: inexperienced and struggling teachers. It is likely the intensive programs supported by Teaching American History grants were most attractive to teachers who were already enthusiastic and capable history teachers.

Chapter 3

UNDERSTANDING HISTORY STANDARD THREE

My experiences as a district social studies specialist suggested that secondary teachers do not always have a clear understanding of History Standard Three. Reviewing how the standard is written makes it easy to discern how misunderstandings might exist. For grades 6-8, History Standard Three benchmark requires students to “compare different historians’ descriptions of the same societies in order to examine how the choice of questions and use of sources may affect their conclusions” (Delaware Department of Education, n.d., *Social studies standards – history*, p. 4). At the high school level, the History Standard Three benchmark asks students to “compare competing historical narratives, by contrasting different historians' choice of questions, use and choice of sources, perspectives, beliefs, and points of view, in order to demonstrate how these factors contribute to different interpretations” (p. 4). While the middle and high school versions of the standard differ slightly, with added complexity at the higher grades, the two secondary-level benchmarks are similar enough that I will refer to them together as History Standard Three on most occasions in this EPP.

Although the clarifications document claims that “[u]nlike many subjects, history has no particular jargon,” (Delaware Department of Education, 2016, *Understanding the history standards for teachers in grades 9-12*, p. 13) understanding

History Standard Three may be impossible without accurate definitions of its terms. Of particular importance, and where I found the most dissonance among teachers I surveyed, are the meanings of “historian” and “historical narratives.” Nowhere in the standard or clarifications is there a definition of “historian.” The clarifications document for History Standard Three addresses the possible ambiguity of “historical narrative” by stating that “*narrative* is not simply a story; as the standards use the term it is a historian’s written account” (p. 11). This explanation, however, relies on the meaning of “historian,” which remains undefined. The lack of precise definition is important because, as I noted in Chapter 1, teachers frequently use primary sources in their lessons. Teachers who do not appreciate that historical narratives are secondary sources may wrongly conclude that the primary sources they use the classroom, which often offer competing views of an event, address History Standard Three.

When seeking guidance to understand the requirements of the Delaware state standards, teachers look to the clarifications documents. The clarification essay for History Standard Three raises important issues surrounding historical interpretation: historians select and emphasize different pieces of evidence in their analyses, and historians are influenced in their analyses by their own personal background and perspectives, as well as the attitudes and assumptions common to the era in which they write. The complexity of this standard is reflected in the rather complicated text of the clarification essay. The essay addresses aspects of this standard by posing questions, e.g., “Where is this historian coming from?” “What was the climate of opinion?” and “It is great fun to rewrite history for a different ending, but can we be sure?” (p.13). In

fact, the four-page explication of History Standard Three poses 31 questions, all without definitive answers. These questions are provocative and suggest ways in which teachers might guide their students to interrogate texts, but they do not provide a model for how these factors can be addressed in order to satisfy the requirements of the standard.

The examples included in the clarifications essay to illustrate why interpretations differ may actually cloud the standard. For example, in an explanation of how the “zeitgeist” of an era may or may not influence perspective, the essay offers the example of the Spanish American War: “A wealthy capitalist of the late nineteenth century would reasonably be expected to enthusiastically support the drive for markets and raw materials associated with the acquisition of colonies, such as the Philippines after the Spanish American War. Andrew Carnegie opposed it” (p.11). In the context of History Standard Three, this example is misleading, since Andrew Carnegie was not a historian and his opposition to the war was expressed in primary source documents.

It is fitting that understanding a standard about historical interpretation requires an act of interpretation. In order to evaluate both how teachers understand History Standard Three and the curriculum material intended to address it, we must have working definitions of “historian” and “historical narrative,” in addition to the guidelines articulated in the Enduring Understandings in the clarifications document:

- What is written by a historian depends upon that historian's personal background and methods, the questions asked about the sources, and the sources used to find the answers to those questions.
- Historians select important events from the past they consider worthy of being taught to the next generation. That selection process, deciding what to emphasize, and the questions that historians ask of the documents and other evidence contributes significantly to the conclusions drawn.
- History is what the historian says it is. Different historians collect, use, and emphasize sources in ways that result in differing interpretations as they describe, compare, and interpret historical phenomena. Disagreement between historians about the causes and effects of historical events may result from these differences (p.10).

This EPP will use a definition of “historian” drawn from the American Historical Association (2018). According to the AHA, historians belong to a distinct professional community that is “collectively engaged in investigating and interpreting the past as a matter of disciplined learned practice” (par. 5). Historians contribute to our understanding of the past by analyzing “primary documents in light of the ever-expanding body of secondary literature that places those documents in a larger context... By ‘secondary literature,’ we typically mean all subsequent interpretations of those former times based on the evidence contained in primary documents” (par. 9). The latter half of this quote from the AHA is key to distinguishing interpretations

written by historians from accounts created by contemporaneous commentators. Historians do not simply offer original analyses of primary sources; they also draw upon the work of other historians and explain how their conclusions relate to the existing body of scholarship on that topic. Therefore, the “historians’ accounts” and “historical narratives” at the heart of History Standard Three must be secondary sources, created well after the event under consideration and utilizing a variety of corroborating evidence. The two historians with whom I spoke about this standard confirmed that this standard requires students to evaluate secondary sources.

Data from Surveys

Question number three on the teacher survey provides the 6-8 and 9-12 History Standard Three benchmarks, then asks respondents to explain in their own words what the standard requires of students. In my analysis of the survey, I categorized responses to this question as reflecting a “strong” or “weak” explanation of History Standard Three. I considered responses “strong” if teachers used the words “historian(s),” or “secondary source(s)” in their explanations. Use of these words suggest that teachers appreciate that the standard requires students to use texts created by historians as the basis of analysis. Strong responses also indicate that students will consider the reasons why one historian might arrive at different conclusions than another. “Weak” responses did not make clear that students evaluate secondary sources or the reasons why they differ. For example, a “strong” response stated that “Standard three is asking students to compare the work of historians and their historical research. Students are to

look at a variety of historians' work and then look for the evidence that might explain why historians would have contrasting perspectives on the same historical topic" (Respondent, survey, 2018). This response clearly indicates that students should investigate secondary sources and consider the factors that might lead to differing conclusions. In contrast, one "weak" response stated that History Standard Three asks students to "look at a single event and understand how and why two different individuals could explain it differently based on their own personal beliefs and experiences" (Respondent, survey, 2018). It is not clear from this response whether "two different individuals" refer to eyewitnesses or historians. It should be noted that a "weak" response does not necessarily indicate a misunderstanding of the standard. The categorization simply means that the respondent did not submit a response that revealed recognition of the key elements of History Standard Three. The most common characteristic among "weak" definitions was the lack of distinction between primary and secondary sources. Teachers' understanding of History Standard Three becomes clearer when they describe a lesson that addresses the standard. The EPP will turn to lesson evaluation in Chapter Four.

Twenty-eight out of 44 respondents submitted "strong" explanations, while 16 respondents submitted "weak" explanations. There seems to be a relationship between explanations of History Standard Three and the educational backgrounds reported on the surveys. Of the 28 teachers who submitted "strong" explanations, 61% (17 teachers) listed "history" or "history education" as their college degree. In contrast, only 38% of those with "weak" explanations (6 teachers) had degrees in history or

history education. Forty-four percent of those with “weak” explanations had degrees listed under “other” on the survey (such as Psychology, Administration of Justice, or Elementary Education) compared to only 21% of those with “strong” explanations. This information reflects the fact that secondary social studies teachers have a variety of academic backgrounds and suggests that this variation may affect how well teachers understand specific standards.

Data from Interviews

Interviews enabled me to ask teachers about their interpretation of History Standard Three and discuss how they came to their understanding. All nine teachers who agreed to phone interviews had submitted “strong” explanations of History Standard Three. I began interviews by asking teachers to rate themselves on their familiarity with the Delaware state History Standards on a scale from 1 (not at all familiar) to 5 (thoroughly familiar). Not surprisingly, the majority of interviewees (6) gave themselves a 4.5 or 5 rating. These respondents credited their knowledgeability to experience as a department chair, professional development, and assessment writing.

Despite their strong explanations of History Standard Three, three teachers rated their familiarity with the state history standards as a 3 or 3.5. One teacher, who has ten years of social studies classroom experience, reflected that “I still had a lot to learn” and that mastering the standards was “a continual process of understanding” (Interviewee 2, personal communication, July 6, 2018). Another teacher described a

career teaching civics, and so was less familiar with the history standards (Interviewee 6, personal communication, July 9, 2018).

Objectives of this EPP include identifying misunderstandings about History Standard Three and suggesting ways in which these misunderstandings can be corrected. The survey and interviews raise the question of why some teachers have a sophisticated conception of historical interpretation when others do not. I was keenly interested in the means by which knowledgeable teachers acquired their understanding. I wanted to know about teachers' formal university education before they entered the classroom: Do teachers think that their undergraduate education prepared them to teach History Standard Three? Those teachers who identified their degrees as social studies education or history education reported that while they felt generally well prepared to teach social studies, they did not recall specific instruction in historical interpretation. Two of those interviewees noted that their undergraduate social studies methods courses focused on the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) standards rather than the Delaware state standards. The two social studies education professors I interviewed for this project confirmed that their university's program accreditation is based on the NCSS requirements and their observations of student teachers focused on those standards.

The ten NCSS thematic interdisciplinary standards provide the basis for social studies teacher education program accreditation at U.S. colleges and universities. Teacher education programs must demonstrate that prospective secondary social studies teachers "possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions associated with

the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the disciplines that make up the social studies”: history, geography, civics and government, economics, psychology, sociology, and anthropology (National Council for the Social Studies, 2004, p.13). Teacher education programs must also ensure that that new teachers are “able to create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for learners” (p.13). Thematic Standard Two: Time, Continuity, and Change includes key ideas from the discipline of history that resemble Delaware’s History Standard Three. This standard states that teachers should be able to “assist learners to understand that historical knowledge and the concept of time are socially influenced constructions that lead historians to be selective in the questions they seek to answer and the evidence they use” (p. 22). This requirement focuses on how historians create interpretations of the past; however, this sentence is only one of six bullet-points that make up the standard. It is possible that pre-service teachers could demonstrate a general mastery of history instruction without specifically addressing this concept in a lesson plan. Interview responses suggest even teachers who completed a social studies teacher education program do not necessarily bring this particular understanding with them into the classroom.

Only the two teachers with degrees in *history* gave strong affirmative responses to the question of learning about historical interpretation in undergraduate education. One teacher stated that undergraduate study of history “100%” facilitated teaching History Standard Three: “I understand history and the work of historians” (Interviewee 1, personal communication, July 6, 2018). The second teacher reported

that understanding of historical interpretation began “first and foremost” with his undergraduate study of history. This teacher added that History Standard Three is “part of the process of history. By studying history, I knew how to ask the right questions” (Interviewee 7, personal communication, July 11, 2018).

Data on Professional Development

While teachers entered their profession with varying degrees of confidence regarding History Standard Three, the interviews made clear that their understanding of historical interpretation and how to address it in the classroom evolved over time. One teacher reported that attempts to teach History Standard Three were “stumbling at first” (Interviewee 2, personal communication, July 6, 2018). Another teacher stated that “I learned [History Standard Three] along the way,” not when she started teaching. The teacher added that understanding the standard “took a while,” but now concludes that History Standard Two focuses on the document, while History Standard Three focuses on the historian (Interviewee 5, personal communication, July 9, 2018). A third teacher stated that although in the classroom for 14 years, it has been only in the last five years that “I have gotten a handle” on teaching History Standard Three (Interviewee 9, personal communication, July 16, 2018). These sentiments were echoed by another ten-year veteran teacher who felt that his/her own understanding of historical interpretation had improved in the last four to five years (Interviewee 6, personal communication, July 9, 2018).

The disparate nature of teachers' collegiate preparation indicates that it would be unwise to assume that secondary social studies teachers have an extensive background in historical thinking and processes. As the examination of the Delaware state history standards and clarifications documents suggest, it would also be unwise to presume that these curriculum requirements "speak for themselves." Teachers are likely to need professional development to attain a sophisticated understanding of historical interpretation and how to address it in their classrooms.

I was struck by comments in interviews that revealed that teachers came to their understanding of History Standard Three gradually, after years in the classroom. Several mentioned the importance of professional development experiences in developing their conception of historical interpretation and how to teach it. Yet, less than half of the survey respondents reported having participated in professional development that helped them to teach history. The following table lists the types of history-related professional development that teachers reported.

Table 2 Professional Development Identified by Survey Respondents

Description of Professional Development	Number of Teachers who identified this PD
Teaching American History Grant	7
Workshops provided by the University of Delaware's PDCE	4
District-sponsored professional development	3
Advanced Placement training from the College Board	2
Unit training provided by the Social Studies Coalition of Delaware	1

I was not surprised that the most frequently mentioned professional development was a Teaching American History grant program. As discussed above, hundreds of Delaware teachers participated in these grants. The quality of these programs generally garnered positive reviews from both scholars and participants. Additionally, six out of the seven teachers who identified the grant program submitted “strong” explanations of History Standard Three on the survey. Interviews gave me the opportunity to ask grant-participant teachers what they thought was most valuable about the Teaching American History programs as regards their understanding of History Standard Three. The five teachers brought up three elements repeatedly: the modeling of effective lesson strategies, the focus on state standards, and the sharing of a variety of resources, such as books, primary sources, and videos. One teacher stated that “my ‘ah-ha’ moments about the standards came from Fran [O’Malley, project director]” (Interviewee 1, personal communication, July 6, 2018). Another teacher explained that the program gave teachers an opportunity to work together on

curriculum and forced them to “build lessons from the standard, not vice-versa” (Interviewee 5, personal communication, July 9, 2018). Among the many resources that grant participants received, Kyle Ward’s (2006) compilation and analysis of history textbook excerpts, *History in the Making*, was identified by name (Interviewee 1, personal communication, July 6, 2018).

What was a bit surprising about teachers’ comments was the relative low priority they gave to working directly with historians. The scholars discussed in Chapter Two emphasized the importance of historians explaining their methods transparently; of “pulling back the curtain” on how historical interpretations are constructed. For the teachers with whom I spoke, however, historians were the last aspect of the Teaching American History grant that they mentioned, if they referred to historians at all. This suggests that teachers find the modeling of lessons and the explicit elucidation of the standards more helpful than listening to historians discuss their work. It is also possible that teachers did not see a direct connection between the historians’ presentations and their own classroom instruction.

The second most frequently mentioned professional development were standards-based workshops provided by the Professional Development Center for Educators at the University of Delaware. In interviews, three teachers from the same district emphasized the value of working together to write and peer review common assessments for all of the standards, including History Standard Three. Two teachers noted that professional development for AP history courses helped them to understand historical interpretation. Lastly, one teacher described a Social Studies Coalition of

Delaware workshop on one unit, Interpreting the Past – the Case of the “Bloody Massacre,” that specifically addressed History Standard Three. What is most remarkable about this feedback, however, is that over half of respondents reported no professional development experience for history at all. Given that interviewees described entering the profession without a strong grasp of historical interpretation and learning about it along the way, it is clear that relevant professional development is key to addressing this standard effectively.

Chapter 4

TEACHING HISTORY STANDARD THREE

In Chapter Three, I offered an interpretation of History Standard Three and evaluated teacher explanations. In Chapter Four, I turn to how this standard can be effectively addressed in the classroom. Like Tolstoy's happy families, all History Standard Three lessons should have some common characteristics. I previously noted that any accurate understanding of History Standard Three must include the examination of accounts created by historians, i.e., secondary sources. Historians' accounts are based on both primary source evidence and other historical interpretations. Historians' accounts are created long enough after the event to provide context, analyze causes and effects, and evaluate significance. Classroom lessons that address History Standard Three must therefore ask students to examine secondary source accounts of historical events and consider the factors (e.g., questions, evidence, and perspectives) that result in differing interpretations.

An Exemplary Unit for History Standard Three

On the teacher survey and in interviews, multiple teachers cited a specific unit as an example of good History Standard Three curriculum. I agree that this unit, which was created by Francis J. O'Malley, is an excellent example of historical interpretation and I will use its components as models for how to address each part of History Standard Three. "Interpreting the Past – the case of the "Bloody Massacre" (O'Malley,

n.d.) is an instructional unit that guides students through one of the turning points of American colonial history – the Boston Massacre. The unit includes three lessons, each with multiple learning activities and formative assessments.

In Lesson One, students build their background knowledge by creating a timeline of key events that led to the violence in Boston and considering the relative responsibility of colonists and British soldiers in escalating tensions. Lesson One also has students write questions about the definition of “massacre,” introducing them to the idea that different questions will lead to different answers. Lesson One concludes by asking students to use one source, “The Statement of the Case,” to draw maps of the massacre scene. When students compare their varied depictions of the scene, they begin to appreciate that even one source can yield competing interpretations.

The focus of Lesson Two is a mock trial of Captain Preston and the other soldiers involved in the incident. Students role play the parts of lawyers, witnesses, and jury members. Students consider the evidence in a courtroom setting and draw their own conclusions about the guilt or innocence of the soldiers.

In Lesson Three, students compare the witness testimony from the mock trial to the Henry Pelham/Paul Revere engraving that commemorated the massacre. The last activity of the lesson asks students to read four textbook accounts of the Boston Massacre written between 1855 and 1936. These short excerpts, which together occupy fewer than two pages, show distinct and competing interpretations of the “bloody massacre.” Students create a timeline that charts the continuities and changes among these historical accounts. Students consider how the interpretations may have

been affected by the types of evidence the historians used and the questions that they asked. Finally, students research the time period in which each textbook was created and hypothesize how a historian may be influenced by contemporaneous events.

There are many elements that make this unit an outstanding classroom resource; however, I will focus only on those that relate to History Standard Three. The conclusion of Lesson Three clearly addresses all aspects of the benchmark for grades 6-8: students read multiple historical narratives, in this case from textbooks, and consider the reasons why they differ. By this point in the unit, students are well prepared to evaluate the factors that contribute to differing interpretations. Students have practiced asking varied questions about a topic. They have examined primary source evidence and have constructed their own interpretations about the events of the massacre. By following the process of historical investigation for themselves, they are ready to critically examine the work of historians. Although the unit specifically targets History Standard Three, lesson activities engage students with the construction of chronologies and the identification of causes and effects (History Standard One) and asks students to consider the perspectives and relative credibility of historical sources (History Standard Two). The integration of the history standards reflects the reality that the work of historians requires all of these skills.

On the survey, I asked teachers if they addressed History Standard Three in their classrooms. The next question asked teachers to describe a lesson they use for teaching History Standard Three. I categorized lesson descriptions as having a “strong” connection to the standard or a “weak” connection to the standard. The key

elements I looked for in a “strong” lesson are: 1) historians’ interpretations that establish contrasting conclusions about the same historical event, and 2) questions that guide students to consider the reasons why interpretations differ. All 44 respondents in the survey answered “Yes” to the question: Do you teach History Standard Three? Teachers’ descriptions of their lessons, however, reveal variation in what teachers deem necessary to address the standard.

Data on Lessons Fully Aligned with History Standard Three

Thirty-seven teachers wrote a description of a lesson they use to address History Standard Three. I considered 13 of these lessons to include the key elements necessary to meet the requirements of the standard. Because I based these judgments only on what teachers had written, it is possible that a lesson includes much more than the teacher chose to describe. In cases where the respondent referred to a specific lesson in the DRC, I could confirm the lesson elements on my own. One example that demonstrates a clear alignment to History Standard Three describes

a lesson on how the analysis of Andrew Jackson’s life and presidency has changed over the past several decades. Previously he was viewed in heroic terms for his role as a general and champion of poorer citizens and now he is viewed much more critically in particular for his treatment of Native Americans. The lesson is about his pending removal from the \$20 bill (Respondent, survey, 2018).

Although this lesson description does not use the words “historians’ interpretations,” we can infer from the use of analyses “over the past several decades” that students are examining sources created well after Jackson’s presidential tenure. The respondent suggests reasons why interpretations have changed from “heroic” to more negative over time. A second example with strong alignment to the standard refers to “[t]he Pocahontas lesson plan from [DRC] Colonization. It looks at different ways John Smith wrote about when Pocahontas “saved” his life. Then, it looks at the variety of ways historians have interpreted the event” (Respondent, survey, 2018). This description clearly raises the Essential Question for the benchmark: Why might historians disagree about the same historical event? Because this lesson plan is available online, I can verify that secondary accounts written by twentieth-century historians about this seventeenth-century event are provided, and questions encourage students to consider why the interpretations differ. I was not surprised to find that 92% (12) of these closely aligned lesson descriptions were submitted by teachers who had written “strong” explanations of History Standard Three.

Some teachers gave me a much more detailed explanation of the lessons that they use to address historical interpretation. One teacher talked me through each step of a Reconstruction lesson that Francis J. O’Malley had presented at a Teaching American History workshop. The teacher described how students analyze either a primary document set that reflects the achievements of freedmen after the Civil War or a primary document set that emphasizes the limitations of reform in the same era. Students draw conclusions based on just one document set, then compare their

arguments with classmates who saw only the opposing set. The activity “shows how using different evidence will yield different interpretations” (Interviewee 1, personal communication, July 6, 2018). Students then compare their interpretations with those of historians. The teacher who cited the Pocahontas lesson described analyzing historians’ interpretations “like a puzzle for students: What are historians saying about what John Smith said?” (Interviewee 2, personal communication, July 6, 2018). The teacher added that this type of lesson “will help students deal with today’s ‘fake news’” (Interviewee 2, personal communication, July 6, 2018).

Data on Lessons Not Fully Aligned with History Standard Three

Eleven survey respondents submitted lesson descriptions that did not align with History Standard Three. These descriptions included enough detail for me to assess the types of sources and activities used in the lesson. In every case, these lessons rely on the analysis of primary sources alone. There is no mention of bringing accounts written by historians into the activity. One respondent wrote that “Students are given sources relating to the Battles of Lexington and Concord. One source describes the British version of event. The other describes the Minutemen’s version of events. The students must try to determine which side fired ‘The shots heard round the world,’” (Respondent, survey, 2018). Another teacher described “a lesson on the success or failure of Reconstruction from the perspectives of a southern plantation owner, freed slave, northern businessman” (Respondent, survey, 2018). In these two examples, as with the other nine non-aligned lessons, teachers ask students to analyze primary

sources that offer competing views of a historical event. This type of activity will demonstrate to students that different perspectives will yield different conclusions. In these descriptions, however, students do not consider how historians may have used these sources to construct interpretations, which is key to addressing History Standard Three. I want to emphasize that while these lessons may not meet the requirement of the benchmark, they may nevertheless be valuable learning experiences. Asking students to carefully examine primary source documents and draw their own conclusions based on evidence is a worthwhile endeavor that fulfills other history and Common Core standards, even if they are not aligned to History Standard Three.

Discussion with teachers about their lessons in interviews revealed how teachers think about the requirements of History Standard Three. One teacher discussed using the “Bloody Massacre” unit with middle school students:

Students look at many different primary sources: Paul Revere’s engraving, political cartoons, written sources from trial. I ask students how looking at certain sources, rather than others, will affect interpretations. There is an optional section at the end asks students to read competing historical interpretations. Not always time for this part (Interviewee 6, personal communication, July 9, 2018).

In another interview, a teacher described making use of sources from *The DBQ Project’s* “What Caused the Salem Witch Trial Hysteria in 1692?” The teacher gives one document from the collection to different students and asks students to draw a conclusion about the causes of the witch hysteria from only that one source. When

they compare their conclusions, “students see that different sources lead to different interpretations” (Interviewee 9, personal communication, July 16, 2018). When I asked directly about using historians’ accounts, the teacher confirmed that none were used as part of the lesson. Both of these interviews suggested that these teachers appreciate the value of students “doing history” by examining primary sources directly. These teachers also recognize that exposing students to different pieces of evidence will demonstrate the role that sources have in constructing historical interpretations. A student who reads only a sermon from Cotton Mather will draw a different conclusion from a student who analyzes a court deposition. When students act as historians, they learn how to answer the Essential Question of the History Standard Three benchmark: Why might historians disagree about the same historical event? In these two examples, students are exploring one key factor – the use of sources – in the construction of historical interpretations. Both of these teachers provide challenging and effective history learning activities for their students. However, they are both omitting an essential element of the standard: the “historians’ descriptions.” It is telling that the teacher in Interview 6 referred to the analysis of historical interpretations – the key activity that fulfills History Standard Three – as “optional.” [The analysis of historians’ accounts in this unit is not optional. However, there is an optional extension of the unit that asks students to apply their historical thinking skills to the Kent State Massacre.] These comments suggest that some teachers may consider the analysis of primary sources as sufficient for meeting

History Standard Three, and even deem the examination of historians' accounts as an inessential "extra."

Approximately half of the survey respondents (6) who provided lesson descriptions that did not clearly align to History Standard Three had written "strong" explanations of the standard earlier in the survey. This data further supports the theory that teachers appreciate the role of questions, evidence, and perspective in the construction of historical interpretations, but perhaps think that students can address these factors through the analysis of primary rather than secondary sources.

The remaining thirteen lesson descriptions did not provide enough information to determine if they addressed History Standard Three. For example, these submissions included descriptions such as "Trail of Tears," "Investigation of the Battle of Lexington and Concord," and "Appeasement." Unfortunately, these teachers did not volunteer for interviews, so I could not ask them to describe their lessons in more detail.

Teachers' Evaluations of Lessons

When I collected my first small batch of paper surveys in the Fall of 2017, I realized that these brief lesson descriptions would not always provide enough information to evaluate how teachers address History Standard Three. To address this issue, I added a multiple-choice section question on the more widely disseminated electronic survey in the Spring of 2018. Instead of asking teachers to provide lesson overviews that I could evaluate, I offered teachers lesson overviews that they could

evaluate. I was eager to see if there was consensus among teachers regarding what a good History Standard Three lesson looks like.

The five lessons that I selected for survey question eight are part of the Delaware Recommended Curriculum for eighth-grade U.S. History to 1877 and eleventh-grade U.S. History 1850-1990. In the Delaware Recommended Curriculum, lessons and units are listed alongside the benchmark(s) they address. All five of these lessons are presented as aligned with History Standard Three. However, according to the criteria described above, only two of these lessons actually align with the standard. Both Lesson One, Declaration of Independence, and Lesson Five, Social Security, are taken from the Stanford History Education Group's (SHEG) *Reading Like a Historian* website. Declaration of Independence asks students to consider if our Founding Fathers were motivated by selfish or ideological motives when they created the Declaration of Independence. Students analyze the competing interpretations of historians Bernard Bailyn and Howard Zinn by comparing excerpts from both authors to the text of the Declaration of Independence. Lesson Five, Social Security, asks students to analyze competing interpretations by historians Carl Degler and Bart Bernstein on the results of President Roosevelt's New Deal reform. Students use primary source evidence to evaluate the strength of each historian's argument. Both of these lessons are aligned to History Standard Three because they require students to compare historians' interpretations and consider how their use of evidence affected their conclusions. In both lessons, the secondary sources were created by professional historians years after the event under consideration.

Lessons Two, Three, and Four ask students to analyze primary source documents. Lesson Two, Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass (Cannaday, 2016) comes from *Achieve the Core* website, which provides lesson plans aligned to Common Core Standards Lesson Three, John Brown, and Lesson Four, Pullman Strike, are both part of the SHEG curriculum. These three lessons are engaging and challenging lessons that require students to apply critical thinking and writing skills. Students use the processes of historians to draw their own conclusions from primary sources. None of these three lessons, however, include secondary sources. They cannot be considered in alignment with the History Standard Three without historians' interpretations.

Teachers were asked which of these lessons address History Standard Three. Teachers were able to select multiple lessons. The following table shows the number and percentage of respondents who chose each lesson as an example of History Standard Three.

Table 3 Lessons Selected by Survey Respondents as Aligned to History Standard Three

Descriptions of Lessons from the Delaware Recommended Curriculum	Number (%) of teachers who selected lesson as aligned to History Standard Three
Lesson 1: Students examine the interpretations of two historians regarding the motives of the Founders in writing the Declaration of Independence. Students then analyze the grievances listed in the Declaration and decide which historian most accurately describes the motives of the Founders.	18 (51%)
Lesson 2: Students engage in a close reading of excerpts from Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass. Students then write a paragraph using their understanding of word choice and emotions expressed in the text to present their opinions about what Douglass was trying to explain to his readers.	1 (3%)
Lesson 3: Students examine three primary sources: John Brown's speech, Frederick Douglass's account of his last meeting with Brown, and a letter from Maria Child to Brown in prison. Students use these sources to determine if John Brown was a 'misguided fanatic.'	15 (43%)
Lesson 4: Students examine contemporary accounts from two Chicago newspapers of the 1894 Pullman Strike. By closely reading these excerpts, students determine which newspaper supported the workers and which supported Pullman.	11 (31%)
Lesson 5: Students read two historians' evaluations of FDR's New Deal programs. Students analyze three primary source accounts of the New Deal. Students determine which historical interpretation is best supported by the documents.	22 (63%)

Results from this question show that respondents most frequently selected lessons one and five as aligned to History Standard Three. Twenty-two out of 35 respondents on the electronic survey selected Lesson Five and 18 out of 35 respondents selected Lesson One, the two lessons that I determined to address History

Standard Three. It is encouraging that over half of respondents identified the key elements of a History Standard Three lesson. However, 15 respondents selected Lesson Three and 11 respondents selected Lesson Four, neither of which include secondary sources in their descriptions. Four respondents selected neither Lesson One nor Lesson Five. These results suggest that teachers are far from unanimous in their conception of what a lesson at the level of mastery for History Standard Three looks like. If the requirements of History Standard Three were clear and widely understood, we would expect teachers to agree on the lesson elements necessary to address them.

Although respondents did not explain their choices for this question, there is a discernible pattern that corresponds with comments teachers provided in other parts of the survey and in interviews. Lesson Two, which was selected by only one teacher as aligned with History Standard Three, describes an activity based on only one source: an excerpt from *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*. It seems that this option was almost entirely discounted by respondents, perhaps because its reliance on only one source clearly could not offer “competing historical narratives.” The multiple primary sources in Lessons Three and Four do seem to offer various perspectives and accounts of historical events. The fact that some teachers selected these lessons as examples of History Standard Three reflects a common misconception that primary sources can serve the purpose of secondary sources for this standard. This misconception is evident in the lesson plans with “weak” connections to the standard from the survey, where respondents described asking students to analyze primary sources and draw their own conclusions about a historical event. We can also observe

this misconception in Interviews 6 and 9, when teachers described using primary source documents in order that “students see that different sources lead to different interpretations” (Interviewee 9, personal communication, July 16, 2018). Indeed, my initial interest in researching History Standard Three was piqued years ago when Teacher A told me that what was needed to teach the standard was more primary sources.

The Delaware Department of Education incorrectly identifies some lessons without historical interpretations as meeting History Standard Three. Having students engaged in the analysis of primary sources engages students in active learning, helps to build their content literacy, and involves them in the process of “doing history.” Without the subsequent examination of secondary sources, however, these lessons fall short of the learning objectives articulated in History Standard Three.

Chapter 5

AN EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM RESOURCES

The Primacy of Primary Sources

A misconception about History Standard Three emerged in previous chapters in discussions related to how teachers understand the standard (Chapter 3) and how they address it in their classrooms (Chapter 4). In both surveys and interviews, some teachers' comments revealed that they think that primary sources can be used in place of historians' accounts to provide competing interpretations of the past. Teachers' enthusiasm for using primary sources is easy to understand. In the literature discussed in Chapter 2, scholars often addressed the issues of pedagogical content knowledge and historical thinking skills as related to analyzing primary sources.

In her aforementioned examination of the long-term effects of the Teaching American History grant, Rachel Ragland (2015) studied teachers' use of twelve instructional strategies. Only one of these strategies included using historical interpretations in the classroom. In Ragland's estimation, the TAH program was most successful in helping teachers to incorporate primary sources into their history instruction. "The most often used strategies were those that are aligned most directly with the core instructional practices of 'doing history' that research indicates is the most effective type of history pedagogy... The students themselves were doing the analysis of the primary documents..." (p. 629). When it comes to engaging students

in the work of historians, the evaluation of secondary sources is subordinate to the analysis of primary sources.

Professional development workshops, history websites, archives, and curriculum resources also highlight the use of primary sources in the classroom. Organizations with teacher outreach programs tout the benefits of placing primary sources at the center of history lessons. For example, the Library of Congress provides grants to schools and universities to support the development of curriculum based on the archive's primary source collections. Its teachers' webpage declares that "examining primary sources gives students a powerful sense of history and the complexity of the past. Helping students analyze primary sources can also guide them toward higher-order thinking and better critical thinking and analysis skills" (Library of Congress, n.d., *Using primary sources*, par. 2). In the past four years, The Teaching with Primary Sources Partners Program awarded the University of Delaware two grants to support teacher-created curriculum using Library of Congress documents: Teaching Civics with Primary Sources and Teaching Information Literacy through Primary Sources. Delaware teachers in both grants attended workshops that helped them to develop lesson plans based on primary sources from the Library of Congress archives.

The Stanford History Education Group (SHEG) provides almost half (49%) of the history lessons in the grade 8 DRC and over half (70%) of the history lessons in the grade 11 DRC. SHEG is a popular resource among Delaware teachers (survey). The SHEG website for lesson plans (*Reading Like a Historian*) and assessments

(*Beyond the Bubble*) both focus on the use of primary sources. In fact, SHEG is a member of the Library of Congress Teaching with Primary Sources Educational Consortium. SHEG authors make claims about the importance of primary sources similar to those of the Library of Congress: “This curriculum teaches students how to investigate historical questions by employing reading strategies such as sourcing, contextualizing, corroborating, and close reading. Instead of memorizing historical facts, students evaluate the trustworthiness of multiple perspectives on historical issues and learn to make historical claims backed by documentary evidence” (Stanford History Education Group, n.d., *Reading Like a Historian*, par. 2). The *Reading Like a Historian* website, like the Library of Congress, provides teachers and students with graphic organizers and guiding questions for analyzing primary sources. The message to educators is clear: Primary sources are fundamental to challenging, worthwhile history lessons.

The Library of Congress and SHEG are just two of the many primary document-based resources available to teachers on the Internet. When teachers look online for history lesson materials - as survey responses indicate they frequently do – they can find a wide variety of document collections, analysis guides, and lesson plans all based on primary sources. A search for primary source history lesson plans yields page after page of links to scholarly sites, including PBS, the National Archives, the Smithsonian, the Gilder-Lehrman Institute of American History, museums, presidential libraries, and universities. Teachers can easily access curated primary source collections and lesson plans that promise to “motivate students and pique their

curiosity about history” (National Archives, n.d., *Document Analysis with Students*, par. 2).

In contrast, a search for secondary source history lesson plans generates far fewer results. Most sites that address secondary sources do so only in activities that teach students how to differentiate secondary sources from primary sources. Other than the *Reading Like a Historian* site, which includes some lessons that compare competing historical accounts, I could find only one website that offered lesson ideas that explicitly call for secondary sources. Teachinghistory.org (n.d.), a site funded by the U.S. Department of Education, was created by the Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media “to help K-12 history teachers access resources and materials to improve U.S. history education in the classroom” (*About the Author*). In a section titled Questioning Textbook Authority, the site lists several lesson plans that use primary sources to challenge or corroborate textbook accounts of historical events. Perhaps not surprisingly, the authors of these activities are the scholars cited earlier in this paper: Robert Bain, Kyle Ward, and Sam Wineburg. In each case, the secondary sources under examination were textbooks rather than excerpts from historical monographs. The ready availability of primary source collections and widespread promotion of their use at least partly explains why primary source analysis eclipses the evaluation of historians’ accounts in history lessons.

Curriculum Resources for History Standard Three

An important factor to consider in the teaching of History Standard Three is the curriculum resources that are available for and used by Delaware teachers. Currently, the state of Delaware requires three years of social studies for high school graduation. At the secondary level, the Delaware Recommended Curriculum lists the following courses that address specific benchmarks:

- **6th Grade Global Studies:** Civics 1a; Economics 3a; Geography 1a; Geography 2a; Geography 3a; Geography 4a; History 1a.
- **7th Grade Contemporary Issues:** Civics 2a; Civics 3a; Civics 4a; Geography 2a; Geography 3a; Geography 4b; History 2a.
- **8th Grade U.S. to 1877:** Civics 1b; Civics 2b; Civics 3b; Economics 1a; 2a; History 1a; History 2a; History 2b; History 3a.
- **9th Grade Civics and Geography:** Civics 1a; Civics 3a; Civics 2b; Civics 3a; Civics 4a; Geography 1a; Geography 1b; Geography 2a; Geography 3a; Geography 3b; Geography 4a; Geography 4b.
- **10th Grade Economics:** Economics 1a; Economics 2a; Economics 3a; Economics 4a; Economics 4b
- **11th Grade U.S. History 1850-1990:** Civics 2a; Civics 2b; Economics 1a; Economics 2a; Geography 1a; Geography 3a; History 1a; History 2a; History 2b; History 3a

At the secondary level, History Standard Three is specifically targeted in the grade 8 and grade 11 U.S. history courses. A high-school level world history course is suggested as a twelfth-grade elective. The Delaware Department of Education website

provides full year-long syllabi for both eighth-grade and eleventh-grade U.S. History. However, there are no guiding documents for a world history course at this time. For this reason, although History Standard Three is a skills-based objective applicable to all types of history content, I am focusing my curriculum review on the two secondary-level U.S. History courses.

The survey asked teachers where they found the resources to teach History Standard Three. The following table lists the most frequently cited sources.

Table 4 Resources Used by Delaware Teachers

Resource	Number of teachers who identified this source
Self-created materials	19
SHEG	14
<i>DBQ Project</i>	10
Delaware Recommended Curriculum	8
District or School Curriculum	7
College Board	2

It is telling that the most frequently mentioned resource for History Standard Three are materials that teachers create themselves. Developing teaching materials is time-consuming and difficult work. History Standard Three poses its own particular challenges. This standard asks students to compare competing interpretations of historical events. This means that students must have access to the works of multiple

historians. While a vast array of primary documents – often abridged for easier reading and accompanied by explanatory notes – is freely available on the Internet, most secondary sources are protected by copyright and often limited to book form. Moreover, secondary sources are often long, dense, scholarly works that do not lend themselves to classroom lessons with adolescents.

In interviews, teachers explained how they created some of the lessons to address History Standard Three. One teacher described using letters from the “Vietnam Mailbag” at the Delaware Public Archives. “I focused on the questions: Was the war a worthy cause?” (Interviewee 1, personal communication, July 6, 2018). This teacher asked students what a historian who looked at only one type of letter might conclude, in contrast to a historian who only examined another type. The teacher observed that using a hypothetical “Historian A” and “Historian B” in this activity “gets around the problem of finding actual interpretations. The most difficult part is finding and editing historians’ interpretations. It is difficult to find competing interpretations that can be compared, and they must be edited for student use” (Interviewee 1, personal communication, July 6, 2018). Another teacher used excerpts from Kyle Ward’s *History in the Making* with students (Interviewee 7, personal communication, July 11, 2018). The teacher appreciated that Ward’s book provides the sources, so that teachers “don’t have to hunt them down. This cuts out a step for the teacher” (Interviewee 7, personal communication, July 11, 2018). One teacher applied History Standard Three in an economics course by finding accounts by historians who argued that Standard Oil was, or was not, a monopoly (Interviewee 8,

personal communication, July 11, 2018). A fourth teacher found historians' accounts of the causes of the fall of the Roman Empire. This teacher admitted that a challenge to meeting the requirements of History Standard Three was that it is "hard to find the sources that historians used" (Interviewee 3, personal communication, July 10, 2018). As I discussed in Chapter 4, other lesson descriptions indicated that teachers had created activities that did not align with the standard.

The second most frequently mentioned resource for teachers is SHEG. In the past five years, the Delaware Department of Education replaced existing history teaching units for the two secondary U.S. History courses with lessons from the *Reading Like a Historian* program. There are 73 lessons for U.S. History, which are split between eighth grade (U.S. History to the Civil War) and eleventh grade (U.S. History since Reconstruction).

The adoption of the *Reading Like a Historian* curriculum has been positive for several reasons. The curriculum is offered free online, so all materials are easily accessible to teachers. Each lesson focuses on historical thinking skills rather than the memorization of names and dates. Every lesson includes primary sources that have been abridged for student use and guiding questions that encourage analytical thinking. Lessons frequently include graphic organizers and vocabulary guides, as well as short PowerPoint presentations that introduce the lesson and provide necessary background knowledge. Each lesson is self-contained and requires only one or two class periods. The *Reading Like a Historian* materials are user-friendly for both teachers and students. The curriculum is based on historical thinking skills that align

with the Common Core. There is even an accompanying site, *Beyond the Bubble* (Stanford History Education Group, n.d.), which provides short-answer assessments with grading rubrics.

The Delaware Department of Education's endorsement of the *Reading Like a Historian* curriculum has many clear benefits, but it does not solve the History Standard Three problem. As noted above, the state only recommends this curriculum; it cannot require teachers to use it in the classroom. The bigger issue, however, is that some lessons in the *Reading Like a Historian* do not address historical interpretation. On the Delaware Recommended Curriculum syllabi for the middle school and high school U.S. History courses, lessons from the *Reading Like a Historian* curriculum are correlated with the Delaware State History Standards. I examined each of the SHEG lessons listed in the DRC as aligned to History Standard Three and applied the same criteria that I used to evaluate teachers' lesson plans in Chapter 4. Lessons that address History Standard Three must ask students to examine secondary source accounts of historical events and consider the factors (e.g., questions, evidence, and perspectives) that result in differing interpretations.

Most SHEG lessons follow one of four formats: 1) students examine a collection of primary sources to answer a historical question, 2) students use primary sources to evaluate competing historical interpretations, 3) students use primary sources to challenge a textbook explanation of a historical event, an instructional strategy called Opening Up the Textbook (OUT), or 4) students collect evidence from both primary and secondary sources to defend one side of a historical debate in a

Structured Academic Controversy (SAC). The first lesson format does not include any historians' accounts and therefore does not address History Standard Three. The second lesson format asks students to compare different historians' accounts and use primary sources to evaluate their relative strengths. These lessons are excellent examples of History Standard Three. The last two lesson formats are more difficult to categorize. Opening Up the Textbook lessons address only one textbook account, not multiple competing interpretations. However, students use primary sources to consider how that interpretation was constructed and evaluate its accuracy. Students are asked to view the textbook explanation as an interpretation, rather than a statement of fact, and offer alternatives to this interpretation. Therefore, I consider OUT lessons as aligned with History Standard Three. In contrast, the Structured Academic Controversy lessons include historians' accounts as simply sources of evidence for one side of a debate. Students are not asked to consider the secondary sources as constructed interpretations or evaluate how historians came to their conclusions. For these reasons, the SAC lessons should not be considered fully aligned examples of History Standard Three.

Table 5 shows that for the Grade 8 U.S. History course, six of the 11 SHEG lessons in the DRC labeled as History Standard Three do address the standard. Table 6 shows that for the Grade 11 U.S. History course, seven of the 19 SHEG lessons in the DRC labeled as History Standard Three do address the standard.

Table 5 SHEG Lessons Listed in DRC as History Standard Three,
Grade 8 U.S. History to 1877

Lesson Title	Fully Aligned with H3?	Comments
Pocahontas	YES	Compares historians' accounts to primary sources.
Mapping the New World	NO	Uses primary sources only
Salem Witch Trials	NO	Uses primary sources only
Battle of Lexington	NO	Uses primary sources only
Declaration of Independence	YES	Compares historians' accounts to primary sources.
Shay's Rebellion	YES	Challenges textbook account with primary sources
Slavery in the Constitution	YES	Compares historians' accounts to primary sources.
Hamilton v. Jefferson	YES	Challenges textbook account with primary sources
Louisiana Purchase	NO	Uses primary sources only
Lewis and Clark SAC	NO	Secondary source not used as interpretation
Emancipation Proclamation	NO	Uses primary sources only

Table 6 SHEG Lessons Listed in DRC as History Standard Three,
Grade 11 U.S. History 1850-1990

Lesson Title	Fully Aligned with H3?	Comments
John Brown	NO	Uses primary sources only
Emancipation Proclamation	NO	Uses primary sources only
Abraham Lincoln SAC	NO	Uses primary sources only
Sharecropping	YES	Challenges textbook account with primary sources
Reconstruction SAC	NO	Uses primary sources only
Chinese Immigration and Exclusion	NO	Uses primary sources only
Homestead Strike	NO	Uses primary sources only
Pullman Strike	NO	Uses primary sources only
Albert Parsons SAC	NO	Secondary source not used as interpretation
Mexican Labor in the 1920s	NO	Uses primary sources only
Settlement House Movement SAC	NO	Secondary source not used as interpretation
Social Security	YES	Compares historians' accounts to primary sources
New Deal SAC	NO	Secondary source not used as interpretation
Japanese Internment	YES	Analyzes one secondary source
Atomic Bomb	YES	Analyzes multiple historians' accounts
Korean War	YES	Analyzes two textbook accounts
Truman and MacArthur	NO	Uses primary sources only
Women in the 1950s	YES	Compares historians' accounts to primary sources
Great Society	YES	Compares historians' accounts to primary sources

According to the survey data, the third most commonly used resource is *The DBQ Project*. *The DBQ Project* offers collections of primary and secondary source documents that students analyze in order to write an essay that answers one essential question. *The DBQ Project* library includes lesson compilations for American history and world history, as well as civics, economics, geography, and literature. The founders of *The DBQ Project*, Chip Brady and Phil Roden (n.d.), echo the rationales of organizations like the Library of Congress when they state that these DBQ lessons “require students to evaluate primary and secondary sources, to analyze and evaluate their importance and to take a position and defend a point of view... These skills resemble what professional historians do, but perhaps more importantly, they provide the skills of a thoughtful citizenry capable of using factual data to defend ideas” (*The DBQ Project: Authentic Assessment*, par. 2). A regular-length DBQ lesson consists of 14-16 sources (about eight pages total); a “mini-Q” lesson consists of 3-7 documents and includes guiding questions for each source (about five pages). Unlike SHEG lessons, *The DBQ Project* binder must be purchased at rather steep prices. However, *The DBQ Project* resources have been widely disseminated among Delaware teachers through Teaching American History grants, University of Delaware-sponsored workshops, and district purchases.

The lessons in *The DBQ Project* all follow the same format and ask students to practice the same skills in each iteration. A detailed examination of one lesson can be applied to all the lessons in the collection. One teacher (Interviewee 9, personal

communication, July 16, 2018) specifically described using the Salem Witch trials DBQ, so I will use that lesson as my example. “What Caused the Salem Witch Trial Hysteria of 1692?” (Brady & Roden, 2008) is a full-length DBQ that includes a background essay that establishes context, 14 sources, and steps for students to follow in constructing their own answer to the lesson question. The lesson guide instructs students to read each source carefully, then group them into reasons that explain the witch trial hysteria. Students prioritize these reasons in an analytical five-paragraph essay.

Among the twelve documents in this lesson are five interpretations from historians. Much like the SAC lessons from SHEG, however, these secondary sources are not presented as interpretations; they are included to provide information not evident in the primary sources. For example, an excerpt from James West Davidson and Mark Hamilton Lytle’s *After the Fact* suggests that the girls’ hysteria could have been the result of anxiety over the threat of bewitchment (p. 10). An excerpt from Boyer et al.’s *The Enduring Vision* emphasizes the socioeconomic differences between Salem Town and Salem Village (p. 11). Students may use these sources to bolster their own arguments, but they are not asked to consider why these interpretations differ.

The purpose of the including secondary sources becomes even clearer when we read the guiding questions included for each document in the Mini-Qs. A lesson titled “Jamestown: Why Did So Many Colonists Die?” includes an excerpt from Dennis B. Blanton’s “Jamestown’s Environment” that describes the natural site of Jamestown. Guiding questions focus on extracting factual information from the text: “What is

brackish water?” “What twice daily event would cause water levels around Jamestown to rise?” and “What happened to human waste that got dumped into the river?” (Brady & Roden, 2009, p. 6). Although historians’ accounts are included in the document set, they are treated as sources of facts, not interpretations. The inclusion of secondary sources offers the possibility of modifying the lessons to evaluate historical interpretations, which I will propose in the next chapter. However, if teachers use *The DBQ Project* as prescribed in the instructions, the lessons do not fully address History Standard Three.

The next most commonly cited resource in the survey is the Delaware Recommended Curriculum. Lessons in the DRC not from *Reading Like a Historian* are drawn from the following websites: *Historical Scene Investigation (H.S.I.)* at the College of William and Mary; *Achieve the Core* and *Understanding Language: Language, Literacy, and Learning*, two sites that support Common Core Literacy instruction; DocsTeach at the National Archives; and the Delaware Social Studies Education Project. The links for two lessons that were created for Delaware’s Teaching American History Freedom Project grant are no longer active. Finally, the list includes “Interpreting the Past - The Bloody Massacre,” which was described in detail in Chapter 4.

I examined each of these remaining lessons listed in the DRC as aligned to History Standard Three and applied the same criteria that I used to evaluate the SHEG lessons: Lessons that address History Standard Three must ask students to examine secondary source accounts of historical events and consider the factors (e.g.,

questions, evidence, and perspectives) that result in differing interpretations. The lessons for *H.S.I.* (Swan & Hofer, n.d.) resemble those of *The DBQ Project*. Students analyze a collection of sources in order to answer a historical question. As in *The DBQ Project*, H.S.I. document collections may include historians' accounts, but these accounts are utilized as sources of factual information rather than constructed interpretations. The two resources that address the Common Core Literacy standards focus on the "close reading" of one primary source. The lessons on The Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, the Gettysburg Address (Student Achievement Partners, 2016; Stanford Graduate School of Education, n.d.), and The Gospel of Wealth (Liben & Suarez, 2016) guide students through a careful study of the use of language in foundational American history texts. These lessons do not, however, address historical interpretations of these documents. Table 7 shows that for the Grade 8 U.S. History course, two of the eight accessible non-SHEG lessons in the DRC labeled as History Standard Three do address the standard. Table 8 shows that for the Grade 11 U.S. History course, neither of the two lessons in the DRC labeled as History Standard Three address the standard.

Table 7 Non-SHEG Lessons Listed in DRC as History Standard Three,
Grade 8 U.S. History to 1877

Lesson Title (Publisher)	Fully Aligned with H3?	Comments
Landing of the Pilgrims (Teaching American History Freedom Project)	n/a	Site not accessible
The Starving Time in Jamestown (Historical Scene Investigation)	NO	Secondary sources not used as interpretations
Interpreting the Past – the Case of “The Bloody Massacre” (Social Studies Coalition of Delaware)	YES	Analyzes multiple historians’ accounts
Lexington and Concord (Historical Scene Investigation)	NO	Secondary source not used as interpretation
Motivations for Writing and Ratifying the Federal Constitution (Delaware Social Studies Education Project)	YES	Analyzes multiple historians’ accounts
Hidden in Plain View (Teaching American History Freedom Project)	n/a	Site not accessible
Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass (Achieve the Core)	NO	Uses primary sources only
Persuasion in Context: The Gettysburg Address (Understanding Language: Language, Literacy, and Learning)	NO	Uses primary sources only
The “Gettysburg Address” by Abraham Lincoln (Achieve the Core)	NO	Uses primary sources only
Children of the Civil War (Historical Scene Investigation)	NO	Uses primary sources only

Table 8 Non-SHEG Lessons Listed in DRC as History Standard Three,
Grade 11 U.S. History 1850-1990

Lesson Title (Publisher)	Fully Aligned with H3?	Comments
Effectiveness of the Freedmen's Bureau (National Archives: DocsTeach)	NO	Uses primary sources only
Close Reading: The Gospel of Wealth (Achieve the Core)	NO	Uses primary sources only

The only two examples from tables 7 and 8 that clearly meet the requirements of History Standard Three were both written by Francis J. O'Malley at the University of Delaware. This suggests that lessons created outside of Delaware to meet other objectives are not always a perfect fit with our state's standards. In particular, the Common Core Literacy Standards in History and Social Studies may support good history instruction in Delaware, but it would be a mistake to assume that Common Core lessons fulfill specific state benchmarks.

Assessing History Standard Three

The last two resources indicated by respondents on the survey are materials provided by schools/districts and the AP College Board. When I asked interviewees about these resources, teachers indicated that these two resources were most helpful for assessment items. Four teachers from one school district noted the value of meeting with other teachers to write and review district common assessments. Two

teachers reported adapting the historians' accounts used on short answers on the Advanced Placement U.S. History course to address History Standard Three.

In the Delaware Recommended Curriculum for Grade 8 U.S. History, there are four assessment items listed as assessing History Standard Three. Three of these items are taken from the SHEG assessment website *Beyond the Bubble*. I examined each of the assessment items listed in the DRC and applied the same criteria that I used to evaluate lesson plans earlier in this chapter. Assessment items that address History Standard Three must ask students to examine secondary source accounts of historical events and consider the factors (e.g., questions, evidence, and perspectives) that result in differing interpretations. Table 9 shows that only two of the five assessment items listed as History Standard Three fully align with the standard.

Table 9 Assessment Items Listed in the DRC as History Standard Three
Grade 8 U.S. History to 1877

Assessment Title	Fully Aligned with H3?	Comments
Slave Quarters (Beyond the Bubble)	NO	Uses a primary source only
Historian Disagreement (Social Studies Coalition of Delaware)	YES	Asks why historians' accounts may differ
A Perspective on Slavery (Beyond the Bubble)	NO	Uses a primary source only
Antebellum South (Beyond the Bubble)	NO	Uses a primary source only
Causes of the Civil War (Delaware Social Studies Education Project)	YES	Analyzes multiple historians' accounts

It is evident that assessments written expressly for Delaware state standards are closely aligned with History Standard Three, while those created for other objectives are not. The DRC for Grade 11 U.S. History 1850-1990 lists 33 assessment items, but none are identified by standard. All of these assessment items are from the *Beyond the Bubble* website and ask students to source, corroborate, and contextualize primary sources. These are excellent assessments that require historical thinking skills, but they do not include the examination of historical interpretations and cannot be considered in alignment with History Standard Three. Through the History Standard Three clarifications document, teachers can access a performance task, “Was John D. Rockefeller a Hero or Villain?” This performance task, created by a Delaware social studies teacher, asks students to consider interpretations of Rockefeller’s legacy and the evidence that supports them. This exemplary activity requires a least one full class period and asks students to write a multi-paragraph essay in response to the prompt. At the time of this writing, this performance task is not listed as part of the DRC.

In the Spring of 2019, students in grades 4, 7, and 11 will take the new DeSSA social studies assessment. The new test reflects the adoption of the Common Core State Literacy standards and Smarter Balanced assessment methods. Questions will ask students to consider multiple sources to respond to prompts. At the secondary level, History Standard will be assessed on the Grade 11 test. Because this is a new test that utilizes multiple sources in a way new to Delaware assessment, teachers have few resources to help students practice for this text. There are six practice questions on the DEDOE website, but none of these questions measure History Standard Three. An

initiative from DOE and the Social Studies Coalition has brought together Delaware teachers to write practice assessment items for classroom use. These practice assessment items are not available at the time of this writing, but I am optimistic that these items will be a helpful addition to teacher resources.

Chapter 6

RECOMMENDATIONS

My conversations with teachers suggest that among the social studies standards, History Standard Three poses a significant challenge for instruction. Several teachers pointed to the complexity of critically evaluating multiple historical interpretations. One teacher explained that this standard was more difficult for students than others because it “requires literacy and critical thinking skills and drawing conclusions from many different sources” (Interviewee 3, personal communication, July 10, 2018). This teacher added that the reading level of even the modified documents in SHEG lessons is too challenging for some students (Interviewee 3, personal communication, July 10, 2018). History Standard Three also asks students to go beyond understanding the meaning of a text to consider the perspective and point of view of the author. Students need to take into account how the questions historians ask and the sources they use to answer those questions affect how they construct a narrative about the past. One teacher observed that recognizing that historians ask different questions in their research is challenging for students since “students are rarely given the opportunity to generate questions” (Interviewee 9, personal communication, July 16, 2018). History Standard Three also leads students to appreciate how interpretations about the past change over time. One teacher suggested that this way of thinking is especially difficult for young people because “students do not have a lot a background knowledge. That comes with time. Adults see change over time because they lived through it” (Interviewee 7, personal communication, July 11, 2018).

We should also recognize that History Standard Three may be challenging for teachers of history as well as students. Survey responses show that teachers have a variety of ideas about what History Standard Three requires students to do. There was a notable lack of unanimity when survey respondents were asked to identify lessons that are aligned with the standard. Comments from interviewees indicated that teachers come to understand History Standard Three over time in the profession, and some teachers may not fully appreciate what a fully aligned History Standard Three lesson entails. One interviewee observed that “teachers are entrenched in what they like to teach. History Standard Three is different from what teachers usually do” (Interviewee 3, personal communication, July 10, 2018). Investigating how history is written may be quite different from how history teachers learned history themselves in secondary school. Although two teachers remembered learning about the construction of historical interpretations in high school, others described their own high school history teachers as “stand and deliver” (Interviewee 9, personal communication, July 16, 2018) and “too busy covering content” (Interviewee 7, personal communication, July 11, 2018). One interviewee recalled that an AP teacher’s focus on historians’ interpretations was “very disorienting” (Interviewee 6, personal communication, July 9, 2018).

Research for this EPP uncovered two misconceptions about History Standard Three. The most prevalent is an unclear definition of “historical interpretations” that leads to using primary sources in place of secondary sources. Teachers need to understand that although having their students “do history” by analyzing primary sources and formulating arguments is a worthy endeavor, this kind of activity does not replace reading the work of the historians themselves. A second, more subtle

misconception is the idea that historical interpretation is an advanced supplement to the study of history, rather than an integral element of the discipline. This attitude toward historical interpretation is evident in the comment that describes the evaluation of historians' accounts as "an optional section" to be taught only if there were enough time (Interviewee 6, personal communication, July 9, 2018). Another teacher lamented that recent history textbooks are too focused on interpretation rather than facts. "Students aren't getting a good foundation in history. We need to develop the basis of history itself" (Interviewee 3, personal communication, July 10, 2018). The spiraling nature of Delaware's history standards, however, demonstrate that students are expected to appreciate the constructed nature of history from the earliest grades.

Clarifying the Clarifications Documents

One of the ways we can support teachers in their instruction of historical interpretation is to add information to the clarification document for History Standard Three, especially for the 6-8 and 9-12 benchmarks. In interviews, teachers noted that the clarifications document did not answer all the questions educators have about the standard. Two interviewees from the same school district referred to a recent professional development session where they worked with colleagues to critique teacher-created common assessments. Both teachers referenced the spirited debate among teachers over what the standard requires and the alignment of assessment items. A set of definitions for key terms, such as those provided in the economics clarifications documents, would help teachers understand what History Standard Three requires of students. As an instructive comparison, the clarifications for Economics Standard Three 6-8a include definitions for the key vocabulary terms related to

Economic Systems: traditional economy, command economy, market economy, mixed economy, etc. (Delaware Department of Education, 2016). The clarifications essay also includes a link to a lesson the addresses the benchmark and an assessment item that measures student understanding. The sample assessment describes a satisfactory student response. The clarifications for History Standard Three would be more useful to teachers with the addition of definitions for key vocabulary terms used throughout the essay:

- History
- Historian
- Historical account/historical narrative
- Point of view
- Perspective

I also recommend adding a description of what components are needed in an aligned History Standard Three lesson. The clarification essay for History Standard Three 6-8a benchmark includes neither a lesson link nor an assessment example. The History Standard Three 9-12a benchmark does include a link to the Rockefeller performance task referenced above. It also includes the following much briefer assessment item:

Stephen Ambrose wrote a history of the Allies D-Day invasion of Europe during the Second World War. Unlike other historians, Ambrose interviewed only soldiers in the lower ranks of the military.
--

How might Stephen Ambrose's use of this source and the questions he asked lead to a perspective of the D-Day invasion that differed from other historians? Explain your answer (p. 14).

This question aligns with the benchmark's requirement that students compare competing historical narratives by contrasting different historians' use and choice of sources. Since the assessment does not include any information on the questions that guided Ambrose's research, students will not be able to answer the second aspect of the prompt. Teachers would benefit from a satisfactory student response, as was provided in the Economics clarifications. Once the key vocabulary terms and lesson components have been articulated, the benchmark labels for lessons in the DRC can be re-evaluated.

Professional Development

Responses in the survey and interviews highlighted the necessity for professional development. Interviews indicated that teachers view their understanding of History Standard Three as evolving over years of professional practice, not something they had when they first entered the classroom. The survey also revealed that almost half of respondents had university degrees in disciplines other than history or history education. The variety of teachers' academic backgrounds means that professional development is crucial to establishing a common set of skills and knowledge for teaching history. Yet over half of the respondents reported that they had not experienced any professional development that aided their teaching of History Standard Three.

When I asked teachers on the survey and in interviews what kind of professional development they would find most helpful, comments like "bring back the Teaching American History Grant!" were a familiar refrain. Sadly, there is no indication that Congress will resume funding these grants. However, educators in Delaware can

imitate the aspects of the grant that teachers found most effective, specifically the modeling of exemplary lessons. Survey respondents requested “PD that focuses on examples of how to teach the standards,” “Ready-made activities to use and adapt for the classroom” (Respondent, survey, 2018), “teacher teaching teachers model” (Respondent, survey, 2018), “Guided practice” (Respondent, survey, 2018), “Sample lessons” (Respondent, survey, 2018) and “more examples of how to teach this benchmark” (Respondent, survey, 2018). One respondent noted that “I like to see the actual lessons being taught” (Respondent, survey, 2018). One interviewee agreed that “lesson modeling is key” (Interviewee 1, personal communication, July 6, 2018). Another recommended the professional development structure of the Teaching American History grant workshops: “Morning lecture from a content expert, then a model lesson or activity that can be taken back into the classroom” (Interviewee 6, personal communication, July 9, 2018). Another interviewee advised, “show me a lesson, let me be a student” (Interviewee 7, personal communication, July 11, 2018). Lessons for such active professional development can be drawn from History Standard Three lessons in the existing curriculum. One interviewee highlighted the importance of attending a workshop for the “Bloody Massacre” unit: “The PD helped me learn how to teach the unit’s many components, including the mock trial” (Interviewee 9, personal communication, July 16, 2018). However, the teacher also noted that the “Bloody Massacre” was the only full unit that addresses History Standard Three, and the teacher expressed doubt that students could transfer the skill to other situations (Interviewee 9, personal communication, July 16, 2018).

A second frequent suggestion from the survey and interviews was the development of standards-aligned assessment items. One respondent wrote, “I think

we need to see more examples of how to teach this benchmark and how we should evaluate whether students have mastered it or not” (Respondent, survey, 2018). Four teachers from the same school district spoke positively about their recent experience working together to review common assessments. One asserted that “better common assessments will drive better instruction” (Interviewee 4, personal communication, July 7, 2018). Another teacher expressed a similar idea by explaining that teachers could “reverse engineer” effective lessons from good assessments (Interviewee 1, personal communication, July 6, 2018). One interviewee warned that some assessments that teachers currently use for History Standard Three are too “basic” to measure the standard. This teacher explained that savvy students learn what an acceptable answer is and produce “canned” responses. For example, students know to write that two interpretations might be different because the historians wrote in different time periods. However, “students do not necessarily understand *why* an interpretation written in 1950 might be different from one written in 2004” (Interviewee 5, personal communication, July 9, 2018).

The third type of recommendation that emerged from the surveys and interviews is the need for more teaching materials that address History Standard Three. Teachers noted the difficulty in finding curriculum resources. One respondent observed that “often times competing sources are not readily available. Pro/Con types are, but ‘historian’ accounts are hard to come by” (Respondent, survey, 2018). Another respondent wrote that “it would be lovely to have lots of front end loaded resources with competing narratives arranged in chronological order” (Respondent, survey, 2018). In interviews, teachers remarked on the dearth of History Standard Three lessons. One stated that “it is hard to find complete lessons with everything you need”

(Interviewee 3, personal communication, July 10, 2018). Another emphasized the amount of preparation teaching the standard entails: “There are few instructional materials. Textbooks are written to convey content. [History Standard Three] requires a lot of work by teachers” (Interviewee 4, personal communication, July 7, 2018). My review of the lessons in the DRC indicates that teachers have even fewer curriculum resources than I estimated at the outset of this research.

My own experience writing History Standard Three lessons corresponds with these sentiments. It is indeed time consuming to review historical literature, select works from historians whose interpretations offer distinct variations from one another, and edit or summarize these works for the reading level of secondary students. My research for a high school teaching unit on the causes of the First World War required several weeks for reading book reviews and skimming the shelves at the University of Delaware’s Morris Library. I settled on the works of five historians to represent the over 20,000 monographs devoted to the outbreak of the Great War. I wanted my high school students to read the words of the historians themselves rather than my own summaries, so I took excerpts from each monograph that totaled one to two pages for each historian (Appendix E). Scaffolded lessons ask students to use primary sources to examine specific events and long-term trends for their own critical assessment of the war guilt clause in the Treaty of Versailles. Once students had built their own background knowledge of pre-war alliances, conflicts, plans, and ambitions, they were well-prepared to evaluate historians’ interpretations. With the help of some guiding questions, my students were able to compare and contrast each historian’s conclusion to the war guilt clause and to the interpretations of other historians. Students could identify that a historian who focused on the military arms buildup before 1914 would

likely find blame with Germany and Great Britain; whereas a historian who focused on the nationalist ambitions of subjugated ethnic groups would place blame on the instability of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Students could even see that Harry Barnes's (1928) *In quest of truth and justice: Debunking the war guilt myth*, which found Russia's imperialist ambitions at the root of the war, was probably influenced by the first Red Scare in the United States. The excerpts I provided were challenging but appropriate for my junior-year world history students. However, teachers of younger students could adapt this lesson by editing the excerpts further or writing their own clearly worded summaries of each interpretation.

A second option for teachers willing to find and create their own materials is to ask students to read multiple-book review essays, which expose students to the practice of historiography. For example, a four-page article in *The Economist* ("Pointing fingers – the Dreyfus affair," 2010) succinctly describes the divergent conclusions of three recent monographs on the Dreyfus Affair. I was pleased that my students could easily discern the three distinct interpretations and speculate on the types of evidence and points of view that influenced each historian.

In addition to guiding teachers to the aligned lessons I identified in Chapter 5, professional development should include guidance in adapting the curriculum materials we do have in order to meet the requirements of History Standard Three. One of the challenges of creating curriculum for this standard is finding historians' accounts and presenting them in a readable form to students. As I discussed in Chapter 5, some lessons in the *Reading Like a Historian* and *The DBQ Project* include short, edited excerpts from secondary sources. These lessons do not always align with History Standard Three because the historical accounts are used as sources of factual

information rather than interpretations. Changing the way these secondary sources are used could bring a lesson into alignment with the standard. For example, one of the SAC lessons from *Reading Like a Historian*, Lewis and Clark, includes one secondary source among its primary documents that students use to answer the question: Were Lewis and Clark respectful towards the Native Americans they met on the journey? The primary documents provided for students to consider are Jefferson’s letter to Meriwether Lewis, a diary entry of Meriwether Lewis, diary entries of William Clark, and Meriwether Lewis’s speech to the Otoe. The collection also includes an excerpt from a TIME magazine article by Margot Roosevelt titled “Tribal Culture Clash” (Document C). This article quotes the president of the Western American Indian Chamber in Denver, notes the use of Indian oral histories in recent historical scholarship, and uses the terms “cultural genocide” and “ethnic cleansing” in reference to western expansion. This is no sanitized textbook entry; the author presents a clear point of view, identifies Native American sources, and even states that she is describing a re-interpretation of past events. Teachers could pull this article from the SAC activity in the lesson, then ask students to evaluate the Roosevelt account as a follow-up exercise. Students should be able to identify how Roosevelt’s use of sources and twenty-first century perspective influence her interpretation.

In a similar fashion, lessons from *The DBQ Project* can be modified to address historical interpretation. The aforementioned Salem Witchcraft lesson includes both primary and secondary sources. As written, this lesson uses historians’ accounts as sources of factual information to answer the question, what caused the Salem witch trial hysteria of 1692? Among the 14 documents are six secondary sources that offer competing interpretations of this late seventeenth-century event. Once students

formulate an answer to the question, teachers can pull these interpretations for students to compare and evaluate. For example, historian Charles W. Upham's 1867 account (Document G) offers a very different view of the "wicked" teenagers than Davidson and Lytle's account (Document H) of girls suffering from convulsive attacks. Students should observe that "Underlying Themes in the Witchcraft of 17th Century New England" (Document E) draws upon marriage records, while *The Enduring Vision* (Document J) relies on economic data from Salem Town and Salem Village. By posing additional questions, teachers can adapt existing materials to align with History Standard Three.

Although it is challenging to find historians' accounts in digital form that are not prohibitively expensive and do not require extensive editing, there are some resources available to teachers. By registering as an Affiliate School, teachers may access the online journal *History Now* published by the Gilder-Lehrman Institute of American History. Each issue of *History Now* contains thematically linked essays by prominent historians. Teachers can augment existing primary source-based lessons with historical interpretations on the topic at hand. For example, Elliott West's essay, "America the Newcomer: Claiming the Louisiana Purchase" could be used in comparison to Roosevelt's account of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Mary Beth Norton's (2009) essay, "The Years of Magical Thinking: Explaining the Salem Witchcraft Crisis" rejects the explanation of behavior driven by parasitic fungus promoted in *The DBQ Project* article "Ergotism: the Satan Loosed in Salem?" (Document N). For schools and districts willing to devote financial support to developing History Standard Three, books such as Kyle Ward's *History in the Making* provide competing interpretations of historical events from textbooks and historical monographs. Of course, teachers can

encourage their students to examine their textbook as one interpretation that can be challenged or corroborated with primary source evidence.

Conclusion

Engaging students in the analysis of primary sources has been a positive trend in history instruction. Asking students to “do history” by examining the raw materials of the past and using evidence to draw their own conclusions sharpens their critical thinking skills, challenges them to see events through different perspectives, and gives them insight into the work of historians. But students will miss an important part of the discipline if they do not also examine the final result of research: Historical narratives that reflect the varying ways historians use primary sources as evidence. By studying competing interpretations, students can learn to appreciate the constructed, contested nature of history itself.

The creators of the Delaware State Social Studies Standards made clear the importance of historical interpretation by designating it one of only three skill-based standards for history. But as my research suggests, significant barriers separate the stated goals of History Standard Three and its implementation in the classroom. In my roles as a district social studies specialist and supervisor of student teachers, I rarely observed secondary students tackling historical interpretations. When I first began thinking about this project, I mentally referred to History Standard Three as “the untaught standard.” Happily, my research has revealed that there are teachers in Delaware who are addressing History Standard Three in their classrooms with creative and effective lessons. However, teachers’ understanding of the standard and its implementation remain uneven. Not all history teachers have an academic background

in history, nor have all teachers had professional development that enhanced their teaching of History Standard Three. Critically examining how history is created may be a radical departure from how teachers studied history themselves. Teachers may be constrained by the few lessons aligned to this standard or discouraged by the difficulty in creating lessons with secondary sources. I hope that my recommendations to augment the History Standard Three clarifications document and to show teachers how to bring appropriate sources and questions into their lessons will improve the teaching of history in Delaware. I also hope that our secondary students will benefit from the challenge of evaluating historical narratives beyond the textbook.

REFERENCES

- American Historical Association. (2018). Statement on the standards of professional conduct. Retrieved from: <https://www.historians.org/jobs-and-professional-development/statements-standards-and-guidelines-of-the-discipline/statement-on-standards-of-professional-conduct#Profession>
- Bain, R. (2012). Using disciplinary literacy to develop coherence in history Teacher education: The clinical rounds project. *The History Teacher*, 45, 513-532.
- Barnes, H. E. (1928). *In quest of truth and justice: De-bunking the war guilt myth*. Chicago, IL: National Historical Society.
- Belanger, E. (2015). Bridging the understanding gap: an approach to teaching first-year students how to ‘do’ history. *The History Teacher*, 49, 35-62.
- Brady, C. and Roden, P. (2008). *Document based questions in American history*. The United States of America: The DBQ Project.
- Brady, C. and Roden, P. (2009). *Mini-Qs in American history. Volume 1: 1607-1877*. The United States of America: The DBQ Project.
- Brady, C. and Roden, P. (n.d.) *The DBQ project: Authentic assessment*. Retrieved from: <https://www.dbqproject.com/about-us/best-practices/authentic-assessment/>
- Cannaday, J. (2016). “Narrative of the life of Frederick Douglass” by Frederick Douglass. *Achieve the Core*. Retrieved from: <https://achievethecore.org/page/32/narrative-of-the-life-of-frederick-douglass-by-frederick-douglass>
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010). *English Language Arts Standards*. (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/>
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010). *English language arts standards: history/social studies, grades 11-12*. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/RH/11-12/>
- Delaware Department of Education. (n.d.). *Delaware recommended curriculum for social studies*. Retrieved from: <https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/2544>

- Delaware Department of Education. (n.d.). *Social studies standards – history*. Retrieved from: <https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/2548>
- Delaware Department of Education. (1995). *Introduction to the 1995 social studies curriculum*. Retrieved from <https://www.doe.k12.de.us/site/handlers/filedownload.ashx?moduleinstanceid=2115&dатаid=6596&FileName=Introductiontothe1995socialstudiescurriculum.pdf>
- Delaware Department of Education. (2016). *Understanding the history standards for teachers in grades 9-12*. Retrieved from <https://www.doe.k12.de.us/Page/2547>
- Fallace, T. (2009). Historiography and teacher education: Reflections on an experimental course. *The History Teacher*, 42, 205-222.
- Lesh, B. (2010). *Why won't you just tell us the answer? Teaching historical thinking in grades 7-12*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Liben, D. and Suarez, C. (2016). "The Gospel of Wealth" by Andrew Carnegie. *Achieve the Core*. Retrieved from: <https://achievethecore.org/page/37/the-gospel-of-wealth-by-andrew-carnegie>
- Library of Congress. (n.d.). *Using primary sources*. Retrieved from: <http://www.loc.gov/teachers/usingprimarysources/>
- Lovorn, M. (2012). Historiography in the methods course: Training preservice teachers to evaluate local historical commemorations. *The History Teacher*, 45, 569-579.
- National Archives. (n.d.). *Document analysis with students*. Retrieved from: <https://www.docsteach.org/resources/document-analysis>
- National Council for the Social Studies. (2004). *Program standards for the initial preparation of social studies teachers*. Retrieved from: https://www.socialstudies.org/sites/default/files/ncss_program_standards-04rev.pdf
- Nokes, J. (2013). *Building students' historical literacies: Learning to read and reason with historical texts and evidence*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Norton, M. B. (2009). The years of magical thinking: Explaining the Salem witchcraft crisis. *History Now*, 20. Retrieved from: <https://www.gilderlehrman.org/history-now/years-magical-thinking-explaining-salem-witchcraft-crisis>

- O'Malley, F. (n.d.). Interpreting the past – the case of the “bloody massacre.” *Delaware Recommended Curriculum*. Retrieved from: <https://www.doe.k12.de.us/>
- Pointing fingers – the Dreyfus affair. (2010, June 10). *The Economist*. Retrieved from <https://www.economist.com/books-and-arts/2010/06/10/pointing-fingers>
- Ragland, R. (2007). Changing secondary teachers' views of teaching American History. *The History Teacher*, 40, 219-246.
- Ragland, R. (2015). Sustaining changes in history teachers' core instructional Practices: Impact of 'Teaching American History' ten years later. *The History Teacher*, 48, 609-640.
- Sheets, K. (2010). Thinking historically, teaching historically: Perspectives on the professional development of teachers from a Teaching American History grant. *The History Teacher*, 43, 455-461.
- Stanford History Education Group. (n.d.). *Beyond the bubble*. Retrieved from <https://sheg.stanford.edu/history-assessments>
- Stanford History Education Group. (n.d.). *Reading like a historian*. Retrieved from <https://sheg.stanford.edu/history-lessons>
- Stanford Graduate School of Education. (n.d.) Persuasion in context: The Gettysburg Address. *Understanding Language: Language, Literacy, and Learning in the Content Areas*. Retrieved from: http://ell.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/ela_pdf/ELA%20Lesson%202.pdf
- Student Achievement Network. (2016). “The Gettysburg Address” by Abraham Lincoln. *Achieve the Core*. Retrieved from: <https://achievethecore.org/page/35/the-gettysburg-address-by-abraham-lincoln>
- Swan, K. and Hofer, M. (n.d.). *Historical scene investigation project*. Retrieved from: <https://hsi.wm.edu>
- Swanson, E., Wanzek, J., McCulley, L., Stillman-Spisak, S., Vaughn, S., Simmons, D., Fogarty, M. & Hairrell, A. (2016). Literacy and text reading in middle and high school social studies and English language arts classrooms. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 32, 199-222.
- Teachinghistory.org. (n.d.). *About the author*. Retrieved from: <https://teachinghistory.org>

- Teachinghistory.org. (n.d.). *Teaching American history (TAH) projects*. Retrieved from <http://teachinghistory.org/tah-grants>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *Grant performance report (ED 524B)*. PR/Award #: U215X100420.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *Programs: Teaching American history*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/teachinghistory/index.html>
- VanSledright, B. (2002). *In search of America's past: Learning to read history in elementary school*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Ward, K. (2006). *History in the making: An absorbing look at how American history has changed in the telling over the last 200 years*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- West, E. (n.d.). America the newcomer: Claiming the Louisiana Purchase. *History Now*. Retrieved from: <https://www.gilderlehrman.org/history-now/america-newcomer-claiming-louisiana-purchase>
- Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Appendix A

HISTORY STANDARD THREE

History Anchor Standard Three: Students will interpret historical data [Interpretation]. Historians collect and analyze both primary and secondary sources in order to describe, compare, and interpret historical phenomena. The same phenomenon or event may be presented from a variety of perspectives by different historians because they choose different questions to guide their inquiries, may have varied access to historical materials, analyze those sources differently, and are led by their own beliefs and points of view to weigh causes in distinct manners. Any comparison or evaluation of competing historical interpretations has to take these factors into account.

K-3a: Students will understand that historical accounts are constructed by drawing logical inferences from artifacts and documents.

4-5a: Students will explain why historical accounts of the same event sometimes differ and will relate this explanation to the evidence presented or the point-of-view of the author.

6-8a: Students will compare different historians' descriptions of the same societies in order to examine how the choice of questions and use of sources may affect their conclusions. Grade 8

9-12a: Students will compare competing historical narratives, by contrasting different historians' choice of questions, use and choice of sources, perspectives, beliefs, and points of view, in order to demonstrate how these factors contribute to different interpretations. Grade 11 and 12

Appendix B

TEACHER SURVEY

1. Please select the history courses you currently teach. If a history course you teach is not listed, please select “other” and write in the course title.

- ☐ High School U.S. History CP/Honors
- ☐ AP History (European, U.S., World)
- ☐ High School World History CP/Honors
- ☐ International Baccalaureate History
- ☐ Other _____

2. Please list your university degree(s) and major(s):

Example: Bachelor of Arts in History Education; Master of Arts in Educational Technology

History Standard Three, 6-8a:

Students will compare different historians’ descriptions of the same societies in order to examine how the choice of questions and use of sources may affect their conclusions.

History Standard Three, 9-12a:

Students will compare competing historical narratives by contrasting different historians’ choice of questions, use and choice of sources, perspectives, beliefs, and points of view, in order to demonstrate how these factors contribute to different interpretations.

3. In your own words, briefly describe what History Standard Three asks students to do and understand.

4. Do you address **History Standard Three** in your teaching?

☐ YES

☐ NO

5. If you answered **YES** to Question 4, please briefly describe a lesson you use that addresses History Standard Three.

6. If you answered **YES** to Question 4, please briefly describe where you found the classroom materials to teach History Standard Three. Select all that apply.

- ☐ Delaware Recommended Curriculum
- ☐ District or school created curriculum
- ☐ Stanford History Education Group
- ☐ The DBQ Project
- ☐ College Board AP lesson materials
- ☐ Your own creation
- ☐ Other: _____

7. If you answered **NO** to Question 4, please briefly explain why you do not address History Standard Three in your teaching.

8. Below are brief descriptions of lessons in the Delaware Recommended Curriculum. Select the lessons that you think address History Standard Three. You may select more than one.

☐ **Lesson 1:** Students examine the interpretations of two historians regarding the motives of the Founders in writing the Declaration of Independence. Students then analyze the grievances listed in the Declaration and decide which historian most accurately describes the motives of the Founders.

☐ **Lesson 2:** Students engage in a close reading of excerpts from Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass. Students then write an explanatory paragraph using their understanding of the word choice and emotions expressed in the selection to present their opinions about what Douglass is trying to explain to the audience.

☐ **Lesson 3:** Students examine three primary sources: John Brown's speech, Frederick Douglass's account of his last meeting with Brown, and a letter from Maria Child to Brown in prison. Students use these documents to decide if John Brown was a 'misguided fanatic.'

☐ **Lesson 4:** Students examine contemporary accounts from two Chicago newspapers of the Pullman Strike of 1894. By closely reading these excerpts, students determine which newspaper supported the workers and which supported Pullman.

☐ **Lesson 5:** Students read two historians' evaluations of FDR's New Deal programs. Students analyze three primary source accounts of the New Deal. Students determine which historical interpretation is best supported by the documents.

10. Have you participated in professional development that has helped you teach **History Standard Three**?

_____ YES

_____ NO

11. If you answered **YES**, please briefly describe this professional development experience. Please describe more than one example, if applicable.

12. Who provided the professional development session(s) that helped you teach History Standard Three?

13. Please describe the type of professional development that you think would help you in your teaching of history:

Thank you for helping me to conduct this research! If you are willing to answer some follow-up questions in an interview, please include your name and email address:

Appendix C

TEACHER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How would you rate yourself in being familiar with the state history standards, with 1 being not at all and 5 being thoroughly familiar?
2. (refer back to explanation of standard) How did you come to this understanding of H3?
3. Do you think your undergraduate study of history helped you teach H3?
4. Lesson example: Why do you think this lesson meets H3?

How did you find this lesson?
5. Curriculum materials: Can you describe your process for creating a lesson? Where do you find materials?
6. Have you had Professional Development that has helped you teach History Standard 3? Can you tell me why it was valuable?
7. Do you think H3 is a difficult standard for students? Do you think your students are exposed to H3 in other classes?
8. What kinds of PD or curriculum materials would most help you to teach H3?

Appendix D

PROFESSOR INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What do you think History Standard Three asks secondary students to do?
2. What elements need to be in a lesson that addresses History Standard Three?
3. Do you address this standard in your college-level history courses?
4. Do you address this standard in your social studies methods courses?
5. Have you observed student teachers who have addressed this standard in their lessons? How did they do so?
6. What curriculum materials would you advise student teachers to use to address History Standard Three.

Appendix E

HISTORICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Harry Elmer Barnes, *In Quest of Truth and Justice: De-Bunking the War Guilt Myth*. The Right Wing Individualist Tradition in America series. Chicago: National Historical Society, 1928.

Professor of History at Columbia University, NY.

“The problem of who started the World War has now reached a stage where it can be discussed with assurance, with respect to both the facts and the bearing of these facts upon the peace of the world and the future of Europe... There can be no hope of establishing peace in Europe until the moral and material injustices of the Treaties of Versailles, St. Germain and Trianon are undone and Europe is reconstructed in harmony with justice and decency” (1-2).

“The Causes of Wars in General: By the causes of wars in general we mean those diverse aspects of the European international system in the half century before the War which predisposed Europe to war whenever a crisis of sufficient proportions arose. As characteristic of this state of affairs making for war in times of international tension, one would naturally list such things as the super-patriotic national state, the cult of war, racial and national arrogance, the growth of great armaments, secret diplomacy, the struggle for raw materials and markets, the system of differential and discriminatory tariffs, population pressure, the doctrine of absolute national sovereignty, the conception of national honor, opposition to international organization and arbitration... When we consider such causes of war as the general factors listed above, it must be frankly admitted that all parties involved in the War were about equally guilty” (11).

“Serbia and the Assassination of Franz Ferdinand: The precious war time legend of a ‘poor, innocent little Serbia’ that bravely defied extinction by the brutal and unprovoked Hapsburg bully was dealt a staggering blow as early as 1923 by the revelation that the plot was laid and executed by the chief of the intelligence division of the Serbian general staff, Colonel Dragutin Dimitrievitch... In the last three years the revelations as to Serbian guilt in the Archduke’s assassination have been truly amazing” (40).

“Of one thing we are certain, namely, that Colonel Dimitrievitch, who directed the assassination plot, worked in collusion with Artamanov, the Russian military attaché in Belgrade [capital of Serbia], and also with the knowledge of Hartwig, the Russian minister in Belgrade. These two men were aware of the plot long in advance of the 28th of June 1914. Hence it is obvious that either they did not inform their home government or else the Russians did not attempt to crush the conspiracy... It has been stated from a number of independent Serbian sources that, before he dared to send the assassins to Bosnia, Dimitrievitch secured a Russian promise of protection for Serbia against Austria” (43).

“The Austro-Hungarian Peril... By all odds the chief fact in favor of Austria and the most damaging to the Entente relates to the assurances which Austria gave... that she would not

impair the sovereignty or territorial integrity of Serbia. Russia has based her claim to a right to intervene on behalf of Serbia on the ground that she could not stand by and see Serbia destroyed. As Austria gave full assurance that no destruction of Serbia, either political or territorial, was contemplated, the Russian case for intervention then disappeared” (48).

“The German Attitude in 1914... There is no longer any doubt that, if England had promised her neutrality in the event that Germany respected Belgian neutrality, Germany would have been happy to do so. Nor is there much doubt that, if England had given a sharp preliminary warning that she would intervene in the event of the invasion of Belgium, Germany would have changed her plans” (56).

“ It so happened that in 1914 France and Russia had, as their leading objectives in foreign policy, goals which could only be obtained by war, while Germany was in a position to profit by the maintenance of the status quo” (56-57).

“The Immediate Responsibility of Russia for the World War... It is impossible to read the Russian documents in the period from 1904 to 1914 and doubt that Russia was determined to secure the [Black Sea] Straits at any price. By 1913 it had become apparent that this price would be European war” (57).

“In the early summer of 1914 Russia was menaced by the prospect of an economic and social revolution more serious than that of 1905... Pan-Slavism had been developed as a patriotic antidote to radicalism in Russia and a Pan-Slavic was had been held in reserve as a trump-card to be played in the event of another revolution” (58).

“The French Collusion with Russia... Even before 1910 it was fully understood that the [Black Sea] Straits and Alsace-Lorraine were inseparably coupled as the cornerstone of the [Franco-Russian] Alliance... It is shown that [The French Minister of Foreign Affairs] Delcassé discussed the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine with the Russians on his mission to Russia in 1913, and that when the War broke out France insisted upon adding to this the destruction of the economic power of Germany” (68).

“It was well-known that [French president] Poincaré made his crucial decision for war at a ministerial council on the night of July 29th, when the Russians were told to go ahead with their mobilization plans that meant certain European war. From this time onward, Poincaré’s program consisted in stifling opposition to his plans for war and in formulating deceptions and subterfuges, designed to deceive the world, and particularly the publics of France, England and Italy, as to the real intentions of and policies of France” (71).

Laurence Lafore, *The Long Fuse: An Interpretation of the Origins of World War I*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1965.

Laurence Lafore: American (1917-1985) – Professor of History at Swarthmore College and the University of Iowa.

“The war... grew out of a single international event, which was the conflict between the Habsburg Monarchy and the kingdom of Serbia. Has Austria-Hungary been differently constituted, had Serbia posed a less lethal threat to it, there would have been no Austro-Serbian war in 1914; and if a general war had come later, it would have been fought on different terms and taken different forms. It was the system of alliances and the changing balance of military power in Europe that converted a Balkan dispute into a world war, but it did not cause the particular war that happened to be fought” (17).

“Therefore, it seems plausible to examine the outbreak of war in 1914 with principal focus upon the role that Austria-Hungary and its neighbors played in its background; but there are larger reasons than this for focusing on Southeastern Europe. For a hundred years and more, Europe, the prosperous and stable Europe of the west and the north, has suffered from the complexities of the land and peoples of the east and the southeast, whose difficulties have intruded themselves on Great Powers and have, by magnetic attraction, drawn Great Powers into conflict... In tracing almost any of the circumstances that were most critical in 1914, one is led back to the national conflicts of Central and Southeastern Europe” (17-18).

“The European System of national states required that a line be drawn between international and domestic affairs. In international affairs the sovereign state was deemed to be a unit, speaking with a single voice... The other Powers were constructed upon a foundation of nationality. Austria-Hungary was not. Major threats to the stability of the System came in the end, by 1914, from the magnetic or divisive forces exercised by minorities in national states. Austria-Hungary consisted entirely of minorities” (56).

“For Austria-Hungary, the neat distinction between domestic and foreign could not, in the last analysis, exist. It could not act as a national state; and it was impossible for its neighbors, themselves affected by its peculiar composition, to act toward it as they could toward a national state. It was this situation that brought about the outbreak of the first World War” (57).

“The needs and ambitions had underlaid the tensions of Europe and had shaped the alliance system and the policies of the Powers. But they none of them had led to actions that produced war. They were either negotiable or repressible. The one problem that was neither negotiable nor repressible was that raised by threats to the integrity of Austria-Hungary. The composition of the Habsburg Monarchy made it fatally vulnerable to the activities of the Serbs... It was this problem that caused the war which became the First World War” (268).

John G. Stoessinger, "The Iron Dice: World War I" in *Why Nations Go to War*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.

About the author: Fled Nazi-occupied Austria in 1939. Came to the United States in 1947. BA – Grinnell College, PhD – Harvard.

"A study of the leading personalities of the time and the manner in which they perceived one another may be more fruitful analyses than to postulate such abstractions as alliance systems, militarism, or nationalism" (2).

"The crucial events to be examined on the threshold of war are the German pledge of support to Austria in her policy toward Serbia; Austria's ultimatum to Serbia and the rejection of the Serbian response; Germany's efforts to mediate and to restrain Austria; and the actual outbreak of general war on August 1, precipitated by Germany's declaration of war on Russia and the invasion of Luxembourg and Belgium" (2-3).

Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany "believed that the assassination [of Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand] represented a profound threat to the monarchical principle...

On July 5 he took the fateful step of assuring Austria that she could count on Germany's 'faithful support' even if the punitive action she was planning to take against Serbia would bring her into conflict with Russia. In other words, the Kaiser issued Austria-Hungary a blank check... The incredible fact is that the German Kaiser had not the slightest idea of what the Austrians would do. Impelled by a generous impulse of loyalty to his dead friend, he offered what he thought would be moral support to the aggrieved party. That this guarantee would entail military support never seriously occurred to him or to the German military and governmental apparatus that fully supported his move" (4).

"The Kaiser's decision to support Austria-Hungary under any circumstances demonstrated an extraordinary confusion of personal ethics and political judgment. His friendship with the archduke prompted him to place the fate of his nation in the hands of another power. His view of the Russian czar as a kindred-spirited fellow monarch led him to assume that such a relinquishment of control carried no risk whatever. And his romanticism robbed him of all flexibility in the emerging crisis" (4-5).

"Conrad von Hotzendorff, Austria-Hungary's chief of staff and head of the militarist party in Vienna, believed passionately in the need to preserve his nation's status as a great power. Even before Sarajevo he feared the disintegration of the Habsburg empire from either internal decay or violent overthrow by its enemies. If Austria-Hungary accepted this final insult, then the dual monarchy would indeed become a 'worm-eaten museum piece.' Thus Serbia had to be dealt a punishing blow quickly, before the situation deteriorated even further" (6).

"It now becomes essential to this analysis to consider the actual situation in Russia at the time of Sarajevo... The popular response in Russia to the Austro-Serbian rupture was extremely heated. On July 26 crowds chanting 'Down with Austria' and 'Long live Serbia' marched through the streets of St. Petersburg" (11).

"In conjunction with its declaration of war against Serbia, Austria-Hungary had mobilized eight out of a total of sixteen army corps. By this action Berchtold [Austria-Hungary's foreign

minister] hoped not only to administer a decisive military defeat to Serbia but also to frighten off Russia from intervening. Sazonov [Russia's foreign minister], however, viewed this partial mobilization as directed against Russia and so decided to order a partial mobilization of his own. He hoped that quick Russian action would deter Austria from attacking Serbia in the first place. Thus, both the Austrian and Russian decisions to mobilize a part of their armies were essentially bluffs designed to deter the other side" (11-12).

"As emperors and statesmen on all sides gradually lost control over the deepening crisis, generals and military staffs began to dominate the scene. During the final period before the outbreak of general war, one appalling fact becomes terrifyingly clear: the unrelenting rigidity of military schedules and timetables on all sides. All these had been worked out in minute detail years before, in case war should come. Now that it was imminent, each general was terrified lest his adversary move first and thus capture the initiative. Everywhere, then, military staffs exerted mounting pressure on their chiefs of state to move schedules ahead so as to strike the first blow" (15).

"Finally, one is struck with the overwhelming mediocrity of the personalities involved. The character of each of the leaders, diplomats, or generals was badly flawed by arrogance, stupidity, carelessness, or weakness... As a result of their weakness a generation of Europe's young men was destroyed" (24).

Donald Kagan, *On the Origins of War and the Preservation of Peace*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

Donald Kagan (b. 1932) – American. Professor of History at Yale University.

“At the turn of the twentieth century Germany was the strongest military power in the world. It also had the strongest and most dynamic economy on the Continent. In 1897, without any previous naval tradition, without any new challenge from the sea to require an expensive change in policy, the Germans undertook the construction of a major battle fleet concentrated in the North Sea where it threatened British naval superiority and the only security available to Britain. The British gradually became alarmed as they came to recognize the threat Germany posed” (206).

“Repeated statements by the German Emperor and many other leaders in and outside the government asserted that Germany was aiming at ‘world power,’ that it demanded ‘a place in the sun,’ that ‘no question of world politics must be settled without the consent of the German Emperor” (206).

“Wilhelmine Germany was not just another European nation seeking to maintain its national interest or even to advance it by means tolerable to its neighbors. From the 1890s imperial Germany was a fundamentally dissatisfied power, eager to disrupt the status quo and to achieve its expansive goals, by bullying if possible, by war if necessary” (209).

“No peace keeps itself. After the Franco-Prussian War, Bismarck judged it to be in the interests of Germany to exercise restraint and maintain the peace of Europe. For twenty years under his guidance Germany accepted the major burden of keeping the peace by maintaining a powerful military force and using it to help avoid war. When William II and his ministers abandoned that role and became the chief menace to the status quo and the peace of Europe, the only power capable of taking its place and checking the movement toward war was Great Britain. Reluctantly, slowly, and ultimately inadequately, the British assumed some part of that burden. They undertook just enough responsibility to avoid defeat narrowly but not enough to deter war” (212).

“Suppose, however, that the British had looked at their predicament clearly, honestly, and courageously in the years between 1898 and 1914. Suppose they had faced the fact that only the assurance of a large, well-trained British army that could quickly come to France’s aid in case of attack could make a German victory in the West impossible and obviously so... It would have meant going against an honored and comfortable tradition; it would have been costly and would have strained the British economy at a time when there was great pressure for domestic spending; it would have been at odds with the great libertarian ethic central to the British character – but the result would have been the presence of a standing army and a large trained reserve in 1914. That would have made the Schlieffen Plan or any conceivable German plan of war obviously absurd and certain to fail... [The British] could have spared Britain and Europe more than four terrible years of war, horrendous casualties, and the rapid loss of their place in the world” (214).

Appendix F



RESEARCH OFFICE

210 Hullihen Hall
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19716-1551
Ph: 302/831-2136
Fax: 302/831-2828

DATE: January 25, 2018

TO: Elisabeth Prueter
FROM: University of Delaware IRB

STUDY TITLE: [1178190-1] Teaching Historical Interpretation

SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
DECISION DATE: January 25, 2018

REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption category # (2)

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this research study. The University of Delaware IRB has determined this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal regulations.

We will put a copy of this correspondence on file in our office. Please remember to notify us if you make any substantial changes to the project.

If you have any questions, please contact Nicole Farnese-McFarlane at (302) 831-1119 or nicolefm@udel.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.