

# Learning to Teach Young People How to Think Historically: A Case Study of One Student Teacher's Experience

ROBERT H. MAYER

Twenty years ago, John Goodlad (1984) produced a troubling image of the social studies classroom. The primary activities for students in those classes included "listening, reading textbooks, completing workbooks and worksheets, and taking quizzes" (213). Despite many endeavors over the years to uplift the teaching of history, including the writing of national history standards (National History Standards Project 1996) and a steady stream of research examining history teaching and the history classroom (Carretero and Voss 1994; Leinhardt, Beck, and Stainton 1994; Davis, Yeager, and Foster 2001), there remains a resistance to teaching history in a manner that acknowledges the depth of thinking inherent in the discipline. Barton and Levstik (2003) suggest that classroom activities reminiscent of the Goodlad study are still prevalent in many history classrooms. Why is this?

---

ROBERT H. MAYER is professor of education at Moravian College in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. His e-mail address is merhm02@moravian.edu.

---

An answer is implied in Shulman's (1986, 1987) notion of pedagogical content knowledge. Shulman's phrase alludes to the complex thinking needed to teach any subject and the labyrinthine process of becoming a teacher that such a complexity requires. As Shulman argues, teachers must fathom a content more thoroughly than others because they must transform that knowledge into a pedagogy—a coherent set of classroom strategies. Such a transformation occurs as teachers consider the multiple ways a body of knowledge might be represented in relation to the teacher's knowledge of the students. The field of history serves as a compelling example for illustrating the challenge of coming to terms with a discipline to teach it to others.

The task of learning to teach history is complicated by recent debates in the history field itself over fundamental questions about the discipline (Appleby, Hunt, and Jacob 1994). For instance, to what extent can historians be certain about the knowledge they put forth? And what is the relationship between the present and the past? Does an unbridgeable wall separate the two?

Finally, to what extent can the past be used to inform the present? Teachers are left to wonder how they can be expected to convey a field of study whose practitioners disagree about the field's fundamental nature.

Perhaps the historian's quandaries become the history teacher's opportunities. Seixas (1993) places questions such as those laid out above in the context of what he calls "parallel crises" in that the issues historians face parallel issues confronting classroom teachers. For example, history teachers also need to examine the question of whether history should be taught as inquiry, the extent to which present-day concerns should shape history teaching, and the nature of what should be taught. Through a consideration of each crisis, teachers could indeed elevate their practice. The suggestion to face these questions is, in essence, a call to teach young people how to think historically. This call is supported by the *National Standards for History* (National History Standards Project 1996). The standards argue that students be granted the "opportunity to create historical narratives and arguments of their own" and

be challenged “to enter knowledgeably into the historical record and to bring sound historical perspectives to bear in the analysis of a problem” (59). Standard four requires students to develop “historical research capabilities” (61), including the sophisticated use of primary documents to carry out such research. To engage in the standards, students must learn what a primary document is and how to use such documents within the context of historical forms of thinking.

In this article, I incorporate the following two assumptions that are central to the standards and implied in Seixas’s (1993) “parallel crises”:

1. The teaching of historical thinking needs to lie at the core of history instruction.

2. To study history in this manner, students need to learn how to analyze primary documents.

But given the complex nature of such thinking, as suggested by the questions put forth by Seixas, it is no surprise that many history teachers ignore these debates and become the teachers who generate the activities laid out in the Goodlad (1984) study, while only a few rise to the challenge and become pedagogical models (Bain 2000; Wineburg and Wilson 1988). The process of learning to teach young people how to think historically must be a complicated one. The following discussion of the literature on how one learns to become a history teacher bears this out.

### **Becoming a History Teacher**

The literature on learning to teach history focuses on many different moments within the teacher education program in which learning how to teach historical thinking is a possibility. The research does not point to one aspect of the program as pivotal, suggesting that learning to teach historical thinking must be threaded throughout the program. One thread is the perspective or beliefs about the discipline that a new teacher brings to the program and the dynamic relationship between those beliefs and the evolution of practice

(Goodman and Adler 1985). Wineburg and Wilson (1988) and Gudmundsdottir and Shulman (1987) argue that teachers’ views of history shape the way they teach, either enlarging or limiting their practice, depending on their depth of understanding. Yeager and Davis (1995) noted this phenomenon occurring with the three student teachers in their study. The student teachers did not teach their students how to think historically, in part, because they themselves did not have elaborate views of history or historical methods.

How do teacher education programs help new teachers develop ideas about the discipline before they move those ideas into practice? An important place for learning about the nature of history as a discipline might be in courses on historiography. McDiarmid (1994) describes the changes in thinking about history brought on by such a course. Students left the course understanding that historical study involves interpretation and is not only the memorization of disconnected facts. Despite their new ideas about history, their ideas about teaching history remained static, with a focus on “telling students about events in the past, explaining why events happened, and, occasionally, showing students film documentaries” (179). In a revision of the course (McDiarmid and Vinten-Johansen 2000), McDiarmid and Vinten-Johansen, his colleague from the history department, attempted to reshape the course to make explicit connections between the doing of history and the teaching of history, which resulted in a more sophisticated practice for some of the teachers. The importance of such linkages is supported by Mayer’s (2003) study of three preservice teachers in a historiography class. The students formed new ideas about history, as well as new ideas about teaching history. Although not a specific part of the class, the interviewer’s questions encouraged the students to make connections between their course and their future classrooms. Explicit connection of belief and history seems all the more necessary, given that some research examining the experiences of new teachers (Hartzler-Miller 2001; van Hover and Yeager 2003) suggests that even those with elaborate

views of history do not always bring those beliefs into their practice.

From the teacher education side of a program, instructional methods can be considered in tandem with an exploration of ideas about history. For instance, the social studies methods course might be another venue where new teachers develop their thinking about history and history teaching. Unfortunately, when novice teachers encounter ideas about historical thinking in their methods classes, their impact on both thinking and practice is mixed. Seixas (1998) illustrates how some preservice teachers in a social studies methods course were able to construct lessons using primary documents that captured the “worklike” nature of those documents. That is, their lessons encouraged students to weave back and forth between the documents and the historical context to sustain tension between historical and contemporary views. Preservice teachers in other studies were not as successful at bringing the complexity of history that they had learned into their lessons. Yeager and Wilson (1997) studied the impact of a methods course on helping new teachers understand historical thinking in relation to their practice. Many of the teachers attempted to implement their understanding of historical thinking, although some did it in superficial ways and others did it not at all. Fehn and Koeppen (1998) studied the effect of a methods course that emphasized historical thinking and the use of primary historical documents. Following eleven students from that class into student teaching, the researchers found that all eleven did include primary documents in their instruction, with the extent of use varying from the employment of primary documents to enliven a class to the critical examination of primary documents. Limits to their use occurred because of obstacles identified by the student teachers, including their students’ lack of experience with historical thinking, the need to confront discipline problems, and a push for coverage. As one explanation for the tenaciousness of views about teaching, Skelar (1998) argues that the “apprenticeship of observation,”

that is, the years spent in classrooms prior to entering a teacher education program, is a powerful factor in shaping how new teachers view history teaching.

The literature on learning how to teach history points to important spots in a program in which students might learn how to think about and teach history. It also points to many of the factors that limit new teachers from fully realizing that in practice. We still do not understand why it is that some teachers create a sophisticated practice, whereas others do not. This suggests a need for case studies of new teachers as they weave a practice out of ideas. Such a case study would allow for a close examination of how student teachers take the fruit of their history and education courses and blend them into a pedagogical knowledge of content and a thoughtful practice. In this case study, I examine the experiences of one student teacher, Tamara, to answer the following questions:

- What is the relationship between Tamara's views about history, history teaching, and her classroom practice?
- To what extent does her thinking evolve over the course of the experience? What is the impact of the experience on her thinking?
- To what extent is Tamara able to realize her vision in practice?
- What factors contribute to and what factors constrain Tamara's ability to teach high school students how to think historically?

## Research Procedures

### *Subject and Context for Study*

Tamara was an ideal subject for this study. She had participated in previous research (Mayer 2003) in which I examined the impact of a philosophy and methods of history course on her thinking and the thinking of two other preservice teachers. Tamara satisfied the criteria for the previous study that required that the participants be enrolled in the course during the fall of 2001, be planning to student teach within a year and a half of completing the course, and demonstrate solid aca-

demically performance. From the three original participants, Tamara was chosen for this follow-up study because of the timing of her student-teaching experience and because she articulated a vision of teaching that included a rich understanding of history and a desire to teach forms of historical thinking to her students.

Tamara's seven-week high school student-teaching experience took place within a primarily white suburban school of thirteen hundred in a mid-Atlantic state. The situation was ideal for examining Tamara's history teaching because she taught three eighty-minute blocks of a tenth-grade college prep American history course. The block format was particularly ideal, allowing Tamara the time to experiment with her teaching when she chose. Tamara's cooperating teacher was a veteran teacher with more than twenty-five years of experience. Tamara was supervised weekly by two supervisors from the college's education department.

### *Methods*

Following the suggestions of Stake (2000) for constructing case studies, I based the study on the philosophy of naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln and Guba 1985). Such an approach fit my questions because naturalistic inquiry is carried out in a "natural setting" (Lincoln and Guba, 39) to examine multiple factors holistically within such a setting. I gathered data in three ways: interviews, classroom observation, and the collection of teaching documents. Brief descriptions of each method follow:

- *Interviews.* I carried out five semi-structured interviews (Seidman 1998) with Tamara over the course of the high school student-teaching experience (see Mayer 2004 for interview schedules). One occurred immediately before the experience began. In that interview, Tamara discussed her middle school teaching experience, which she had just completed. She also shared her current view of history and history teaching and described the approach to teaching that she intended to use in her high school experience. I interviewed Tamara in the

field after each observation. At those times, she discussed her lesson in relation to her beliefs about history and history teaching, and she assessed the lesson just taught in relation to those beliefs. A final interview took place a week after the student-teaching experience ended. In that interview, Tamara summarized her views of history and her beliefs about teaching history. In the final four interviews, she identified factors that hindered or helped her teach her students how to think historically. Type-scripts for each interview were made.

- *Nonparticipant Observation of Class.* I observed Tamara teaching three lessons over the course of the experience. She was asked to pick three lessons that reflected her vision of history teaching. I took field notes, which were typed up.

- *Document Study.* I collected and analyzed all artifacts from the three lessons, including lesson plans, documents, and supporting curricular materials. In addition, I collected lesson plans and materials from fifteen other lessons that Tamara taught during that experience. I analyzed the interviews using a method of constant-comparison (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Lincoln and Guba 1985). I triangulated the themes that emerged from interviews with themes that I garnered from close analysis of course documents. I used confirming and disconfirming evidence across sources to assess the quality of all emerging themes.

### **Tamara's Case: Findings and Interpretation**

Tamara's experience suggests an important idea: Teaching is a highly intellectual task that involves a continuous consideration of the content in relation to pedagogy. Tamara used her experience to examine the discipline of history and ideas about history within the context of her practice. Critical readers will notice that Tamara did not always take her thinking about history and history teaching as far as she might have. Such limits are more a reflection of the immensity of the task and missing pieces in Tamara's education than an

indication of Tamara's intellectual propensities or her abilities. What follows is a discussion of how Tamara learned—and did not quite learn—the “management of ideas within classroom discourse” (Shulman 1987, 1) in honing a pedagogical content knowledge in relation to a practice. In discussing the evolution of Tamara's thinking and practice, I also comment on philosophi-

cal issues that historians might discuss and that Tamara ignores. important to learn how to read between the lines of a historical text to discern authorship in the writing. That acknowledgment of authorship then affects subsequent analysis of the work. Second, Tamara used the word “personal” to talk about the nature of historical inquiry. She used the word in two ways, in discussing the stories people told about particular events or times, such as in oral

cal issues that historians might discuss and that Tamara ignores. facing the historians and history educators described by Seixas (1993). By that, I mean that she did not clarify her views on the extent to which historians could make a clear, objective claim about what they “know.” Tamara took this quandary with her into the student-teaching experience.

### Goals and Activities from the Middle School Experience

Tamara took her views about history and history teaching into her middle school experience and tested them. Through that examination, her ideas about the discipline and her teaching grew. Tamara described her goals while teaching in the middle school and some of the activities she employed as follows:

When I first got there, I heard a lot of, “Why do we have to study ancient Greece? It's so far back there, why do we even care?” So I think my main goal was to, one, make learning fun, and two, relate it to even ancient Greece, relate it to something that's real for them. Something that they're actually living today . . . we did the simulation where in Greece only male Greek citizens over eighteen were allowed to vote. So I segregated all the girls and then I divided the guys in half and gave them each a card saying [that one was] a foreigner, a slave, or a male Greek citizen over eighteen. (3/18/03)

Tamara then went on to assign a project, allowing only the four “free men over eighteen” to decide the topic for everyone. That angered the other students but established the point that Greek democracy was more exclusionary than modern American democracy. Tamara hoped to make the learning “fun” and “real” by simulating democracy in ancient Greece through this more contemporary experience. She also related the Persian War and the Peloponnesian War to the war in Iraq, which was brewing at the time of these lessons. By trying to make her class “fun,” Tamara waded into another historian/history educator “crisis” (Seixas 1993), the debate over the extent to which the present can be used to inform the past. In carrying out the simulation and connecting the Peloponnesian War to the Iraq war, Tamara took for grant-

## The preservice teacher had specific views about how one should teach history. She argued for the use of primary documents and basic forms of historical analysis. She also recognized the need for knowledge of the facts of history.

cal issues that historians might discuss and that Tamara ignores.

One other issue needs to be addressed before I begin a discussion of Tamara's case. As VanSledright (2004) has correctly pointed out, the notion of historical thinking is used loosely and in a variety of ways by researchers, educators, and others. In my analysis of data, I have worked inductively, allowing Tamara's view of historical thinking to grow, as much as possible, from her responses.

### Impact of a Philosophy and Methods of History Course

The narrative for Tamara's student teaching begins with her earlier experience in History 328, the philosophy and methods of history course described in a previous study (Mayer 2003). Students in History 328 closely examine the writing of historians—those from ancient times (Herodotus) to the twentieth century (E. H. Carr)—to understand how history is constructed and the philosophy guiding that construction. The three preservice teachers within that study changed the way they viewed history and, to varying extents, the way they viewed history teaching.

Tamara left History 328 with what were for her some new ideas about history. First, Tamara argued that it is

histories, and when referring to the slant that interpreters of history, specifically filmmakers, might include in their telling. She went on to assert that a given historian is either “trying to be truthful” or “putting forth his own opinion.” Truthful historians approach their tasks systematically by examining two different accounts for consistency across those accounts. Tamara also developed some views about how one should teach history. She argued for the use of primary documents and the inclusion of some basic forms of historical analysis. The outcome of such analysis would be that “students think on their own and form their own opinions” (interview on 10/10/01). Before this process of historical inquiry could begin, Tamara stated: “I'll have to teach the facts like what the textbook says . . . just so they will have a background knowledge of history or the event we are talking about for the specific chapter” (10/10/01). Overall, Tamara wanted the experience of learning history to be fun for her students.

To some extent, Tamara seemed stuck in the middle of an argument that also confronts the community of historians. In sketching out a method of historical inquiry used by “truthful” historians and making repeated reference to historical “facts,” Tamara skirted the objectivity question, one of the “parallel crises”

ed one's ability to link past and present. In addition, she presumed that the contemporary "real" is the same as the ancient "real." One has to wonder how Tamara's careful consideration of such concerns from the historian's world would affect her pedagogy.

Next, I move to Tamara's high school experience and a consideration of the extent to which Tamara was able to realize her ideas about history and history teaching.

### Using Primary Documents, Activities, and Lectures

I was curious about the extent to which Tamara employed the use of primary documents in her student teaching. Tamara's espoused belief, the importance of using primary documents in the history classroom, was clearly mirrored in her practice during the high school student-teaching experience. The three lessons that I observed revolved around the use of primary documents, including the use of a diary entry from a World War I soldier in lesson one (class notes from 3/31/03), a discussion of class and race through a comparison of *The Great Gatsby* by F. Scott Fitzgerald and the poem *The Weary Blues* by Langston Hughes in the second lesson (class notes from 4/16/03), and a comparison of campaign speeches by Herbert Hoover and Franklin Delano Roosevelt (class notes from 4/28/03). In the fifteen other lesson plans that I analyzed, Tamara consistently used primary documents. For example, throughout the teaching experience, she used political cartoons and other contemporary art, such as music by Louis Armstrong. Other documents she employed included *The Jungle* by Upton Sinclair, the Zimmermann telegram, actual testimony from the Sacco and Vanzetti trial, pictures of child labor, and pictures depicting the Great Depression. Beyond the use of primary documents, Tamara's plans included many activities and only a few lectures. Like pre-service teachers in the Fehn and Koepen (1998) study, Tamara was ready to use primary documents.

### Reasons for Using Primary Documents: The Personal and More

In one lesson, Tamara had her students read and examine a diary entry from a World War I soldier. Here are Tamara's comments about that entry.

He talked about how he finally got to take a shower and finally . . . the beds he made, with the blankets, and how it was all wet all the time. It just gives a personal account of not only the fighting but what the soldiers had to go through every day and how he can call people by their names. (3/31/03)

Tamara hoped that by using such a source, history would become a personal experience for her students.

She brought this idea of history as personal from her experience in History 328 (Mayer 2003). What appears to be new is her wedding of the personal to a goal of making history real for her students. She argued that the personal nature of primary documents and artifacts "made it real for them because they could actually see something from that time" (4/28/03). The personal nature of such primary documents contrasts with the assigned classroom text. In describing the diary of the World War I soldier, she stated: "It gives a personal account that wasn't just in textbooks. 'Here's the weapon. This is how it shoots. This is what happens, because of the weapon.' . . . It was someone who actually was there" (3/31/03).

Tamara connected the idea about examining the personal nature of documents to views on how students should read text. She wanted her students to go beyond comprehension of the primary documents and other historical writing. From the start of the experience, Tamara talked about the need to read text "deeply" to ascertain the author's "own opinion" or to read primary documents "between the lines" to find out the sort of person the author was. History students, like historians, need to understand that all text is authored text, and that critical readers learn how writers' positions influence their writing. Such deep reading, another idea from History 328, allows students to recover the personal and gain a sense of the real.

Again, Tamara did not question some important assumptions that historians might consider. They might ask what is the "real" that Tamara looked for her students to recover, just as they might question the ability of contemporary people to encounter the "real" from an earlier time. Tamara's remarks also suggested an issue with historical methodology. That is, even if there was a "real" that we could capture, it could not be found by examining only one account. If Tamara had examined all these issues, doing so might have had an important impact on her practice.

### Making Connections and the Nature of History

What views about the nature of history did Tamara bring into the student-teaching experience? How did those views develop over the course of the experience? Tamara described history as a tale told from multiple perspectives, leading to an uncertainty in the historian's final construction. That suggested a change from earlier thinking, when Tamara did not speak as readily about the tenuous nature of historical knowledge (Mayer 2003). Here are her thoughts between the middle school and high school experience:

No two stories are exactly the same. There can be some parts that are the same, and those parts maybe you could take away with "yeah, it happened." Those things happened, but the authors are gonna always see something with two different sets of eyes. They'll always find no two stories are the same. And I think that thinking historically is just acknowledging that fact and maybe walking away with a better understanding of two points of view or coming away with maybe their own opinion about what happened. . . . I don't think you can ever be 100 percent certain. (3/18/03)

The statement contains contradictory positions on the issue of objectivity in history. A historian can find out what happened in the past by discerning the similarities in different stories. On the other hand, because of the "two points of view," a historian can never be "100 percent certain." Yet, a historian can examine the multiple perspectives, "coming

away with maybe their own opinion about what happened.” How does a historian do this? Tamara did not say. What is the relationship between those things historians know happened and their opinions? Tamara’s answer was not clear, but she seemed to be working out an important idea about history.

Through her use of the word “fact,” Tamara implied that there is a presumption that we can know some things in history. As Tamara made primary documents a regular part of her teaching, she encountered a role for using those facts in the study of history. The role comes through Tamara’s phrase “making connections.” Tamara wanted her students to use the facts that they gained from textbooks as background knowledge for understanding primary documents; that is, she wanted her students to make connections between the facts and the documents. In addition, the students’ prior knowledge became background knowledge with which to view primary documents. Such connecting created a context for making sense of the documents themselves. That idea came through strongest in her discussion of a lesson she taught using witness testimony from the Sacco and Vanzetti trial. She wanted students to examine the testimony and then “put it in historical context.”

Why were Sacco and Vanzetti not getting a fair trial? Because of the xenophobic ideas that were going on in America and they were afraid of immigrants and here’s an example to back up your statement with . . . the National Origins Act where they limited the number of immigrants from Eastern Europe. And they would connect it to what they were learning and they would connect it to what was going on in America and they would also give examples to back up their opinions and ideas. (5/9/03)

In the Sacco and Vanzetti example, Tamara had her students make connections between facts and the documents in order to interpret events. Students could then go on to form their own opinions.

### **Description of One Lesson**

Tamara’s ideas about historical thinking grew in coherence as her experience in the field went on and are reflected in

one lesson she taught toward the end of the experience, when she had her students compare a 1932 campaign speech by Herbert Hoover to one given by Franklin Roosevelt. Tamara began the lesson by helping students recall what they already knew about the Great Depression. When she asked, “What was it like?” the students talked about people sleeping in the streets, people begging food, soup kitchens, and more. From there, students considered whether it was appropriate to blame President Hoover for the Depression. They then read each document. After the reading, Tamara asked these questions about the Hoover speech: “What do you notice? Is there a bias? Is it one-sided?” Students talked about how the document was biased in that Hoover was trying to present himself as a candidate. Tamara encouraged students to share information about Hoover’s actions, such as his support of the Agricultural Marketing Act, so they could examine the speech within a broader context and better appreciate Hoover’s slant on the Depression. A parallel analysis was then completed on Roosevelt’s speech (class notes from 4/28/03). Students saw two tellings of the same events and used their analysis of the disparate versions to make sense of the Great Depression. Further, they came to understand the identity of the authors and the context in which they themselves shaped the message.

With this lesson, Tamara demonstrated that she was able to come into student teaching and work with many of the ideas about history that she brought from History 328. From the start, the ideas of multiple perspectives and authored text were elements in her lessons. The later lesson on Hoover and Roosevelt contained these elements but then went on to include a discussion of how context was needed to reconcile different tellings. Such inclusion speaks to growth over the course of Tamara’s experience. Despite this growth, Tamara allowed other questions about history to remain unexplored. When one considers the explored and unexplored ideas, the extent to which Tamara was able to bring ideas about history into her practice suggests the depth

of her growth, the complicated nature of teaching young people how to think historically, and the path she might tread during her first years of teaching history.

So far, this discussion has focused on the interrelationship between Tamara’s beliefs and practices. To conclude, I consider the contextual factors discussed in other studies of novice teachers, which also affected Tamara.

### **Obstacles and Supports**

Tamara confronted many of the same issues that were mentioned in other studies of students attempting to teach historical thinking. First, Tamara found the students’ limited experience with primary documents to be the biggest problem she faced. Her fears were realized when she found that students had difficulty reading and analyzing primary documents. Because of that, she felt that her initial experience using the documents was like “pulling teeth” (4/16/03). In addition to confronting this lack of experience, Tamara felt resistance from the students because they wanted information conveyed directly and did not want to go through a process of analysis. She reported, “They always want the easy answer” (4/16/03). Tamara was also concerned about the students’ general lack of interest in history. Another obstacle she discussed involved herself: Tamara acknowledged her own limitations in grasping the documents when she stated, “You as a teacher have to have the kind of knowledge in history of historical context and of primary sources and how to analyze them, because how are you going to teach the students how to?” (4/28/03). Tamara also mentioned restricted time to teach given subjects as a constraint. Interestingly, before the experience began, Tamara felt her greatest obstacle would be finding appropriate documents. Through the resources of her cooperating teacher and her own searching, this concern was not a significant obstacle.

Tamara also discussed factors that supported her inclusion of primary documents and historical thinking. Most important was her cooperating teacher.

His use of primary documents gave the students an initial exposure on which she could build and was also tacit support for Tamara's style of teaching. Moreover, Tamara's cooperating teacher gave her the freedom to try new things.

Although Tamara confronted issues that were similar to novices in other studies, the issues were factors that she acknowledged and with which she contended. They did not stop her from carrying out her teaching agenda. Perhaps Tamara's success suggests the importance of acknowledging elements that might hamper the teaching of historical thinking and confronting them as problems that need to be resolved, especially in instances that involve the students' and the teacher's own understandings. Such a confrontation is part of transforming content knowledge into content pedagogical knowledge.

### **Implications for Practice**

Why is it that teachers with solid backgrounds in history and pedagogy sometimes teach history by means of lectures and worksheets and not as historical inquiry (Hartzler-Miller 2001; van Hover and Yeager 2003)? Factors within the school setting, such as the push for coverage of material and students' limited experience with historical forms of thinking, make the prospect of a complicated practice that much more unlikely. I believe that Tamara's experience, both what she did and did not accomplish, suggests an important idea about how novices become sophisticated history teachers and how they grow throughout their careers. It is simply this: The intellectual exploration of the historical enterprise in relation to pedagogy needs to be a continuous thread throughout the teacher-education program and throughout a teacher's career. This is true even for teachers who possess a rich background in history. Teachers automatically encounter questions about the nature of history within the context of their practice. Those questions can be ignored or considered, but those who choose to grapple with such questions are in a better position to enhance their practice.

To teach historical thinking to young people, new teachers must come into the experience with a rich understanding of history and be ready to continue an examination of that understanding as they develop in their teaching. A frame for such studies is suggested by the parallel crises in the fields of history and history education as delineated by Seixas (1993). Tamara's teaching would be strengthened by encounters with historians and educators who can help her better understand questions growing from these crises, including questions related to objectivity in historical knowing, questions about the relationship between past and present, and concerns over fragmentation in history as a discipline. Such a consideration needs to be more than an intellectual exercise about history. Interwoven throughout her study of both history and pedagogy, the novice teacher must consider what views about history imply about practice. For instance, History 328 introduced Tamara to historical thinking; during the course, she began thinking about implications for practice. That was happenstance, not a set goal of the course. There needs to be ways to make such chance occurrences a regular goal of such courses. The experimental historiography course described by McDiarmid and Vinten-Johansen (2000) might serve as a model. From the teacher-education side, we need to create more models for introducing ideas about history into teacher-education classes, such as those in the methods class described in the Seixas (1998) study. Such a threading of history and pedagogy, whether it be a history course or an education course, is contingent on collaboration between teacher educators and historians.

What elements should be a part of the student teaching experience? Perhaps the most important aspect to begin with is the student teacher, who must be ready to take the risk of trying a strategy that is complicated. Tamara's learning began with her doing. It should be noted that she taught historical thinking with genuine excitement. As her comments about obstacles also suggest, she took the risk without illusions. She was not short-cir-

cuted by the students' lack of experience or desire for clear-cut answers; in fact, she taught with those concerns in mind. In addition to the student teacher's readiness, the cooperating teacher must support the teaching of historical thinking in some way. In this instance, the cooperating teacher's use of primary documents allowed for a supportive environment. The cooperating teacher also offered concrete help in the form of documents. All of this speaks to the need for teacher educators to choose cooperating teachers who at the least support and at the most model best practices. Finally, there is the role of the supervisor. My interviewing, though not an exact parallel to the college supervisor's task, contained a crucial element. Namely, I encouraged Tamara to articulate her beliefs about history and to consider those beliefs in relation to her practice. Such conversation makes the discipline of history part of the explicit agenda for becoming a history teacher. Supervision that explores relationships between history and pedagogy should not stop at the end of student teaching. Overall, for such a program to work, I conclude from this case study that there is a need for continuous collaboration between history and education departments.

Although not necessarily unique, my current situation contains elements of practice that might serve as a model for that collaboration. A member of my college's history department currently participates in the supervision of student teachers with me, a member of the education department. That allows her more readily to bring issues of historiography to the attention of students during student teaching. Likewise, from the education department side of the equation, I continue to involve myself in a dialogue with the history department so that I can help students better examine ideas about history within the approaches that they choose for their practice.

Because this is a case study involving only one student teacher, the above claims must be viewed with some caution. The case study underlines the need to expand this research to include more student teachers and examine my suggestions more deeply. For instance, I

suggest that researchers study the overall nature of programs to see where linkages between content and pedagogy are, and are not, being made and examine the impact of both on preservice teachers. Such an examination might focus on specific sites where these linkages do or might occur, such as during supervision. Last, there is a need to continue case research that studies history teachers in the early years of their career. The nature of historical thinking and the difficulties inherent in learning how to teach historically suggest strongly that it is imperative to view this process developmentally, and the subtle nature of such growth suggests that it should be studied up-close, such as in case studies.

Tamara's experience is in part a cautionary tale for teachers who wish to teach their students how to think historically. Such teaching demands a complexity in practice that requires experience, deep reflection, and time. Those who have already started down this road know also the excitement of considering the nature of history within the context of their teaching. I believe that I observed this excitement in Tamara's words. The deeper she engaged in thinking about history, the more energized her pedagogy became. For those who are lovers of the historical enterprise, that is undoubtedly no surprise.

*Key words: case study of student-teaching experience, collaboration between history and education departments, primary sources in history class*

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author thanks Keith Barton and Sandy Bardsley for their thoughtful reading of and critical comments about this article.

#### REFERENCES

- Appleby, J., L. Hunt, and M. Jacob. 1994. *Telling the truth about history*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Bain, R. B. 2000. Into the breach: Using research and theory to shape history instruction. In *Knowing, teaching, and learning history*, ed. P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, and S. Wineburg, 331–52. New York: New York University Press.
- Barton, K. C., and L. S. Levstik. 2003. Why don't more history teachers engage students in interpretation? *Social Education* 67 (6): 358–61.
- Carretero, M., and J. F. Voss, eds. 1994. *Cognitive and instructional processes in history and the social sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Davis, O. L. Jr., E. A. Yeager, and S. J. Foster, eds. 2001. *Historical empathy and perspective taking in the social studies*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Fehn, B., and K. E. Koeppen. 1998. Intensive document-based instruction in a social studies methods course and student teachers' attitudes and practice in subsequent field experiences. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 26 (4): 461–84.
- Glaser, B. G., and A. L. Strauss. 1967. *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goodlad, J. I. 1984. *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodman, J., and S. Adler. 1985. Becoming an elementary social studies teacher: A study of perspectives. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 13 (2): 1–20.
- Gudmundsdottir, S., and L. Shulman. 1987. Pedagogical content knowledge in the social studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 31 (2): 59–70.
- Hartzler-Miller, C. 2001. Making sense of "best practice" in teaching history. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 29 (4): 672–95.
- Leinhardt, G., I. Beck, and L. Stainton, eds. 1994. *Teaching and learning in history*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lincoln, Y. S., and E. G. Guba. 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mayer, R. H. 2003. Learning to think historically: The impact of a philosophy and methods of history course on three preservice teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- . 2004. Learning to teach young people how to think historically: A case study of one student teacher's experience. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- McDiarmid, G. W. 1994. Understanding history for teaching: A study of the historical understanding of prospective teachers. In *Cognitive and instructional processes in history and the social sciences*, ed. M. Carretero and J. F. Voss, 159–85. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McDiarmid, G. W., and P. Vinten-Johansen. 2000. A catwalk across the great divide: Redesigning the history teaching methods course. In *Knowing, teaching, and learning history*, ed. P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, and S. Wineburg, 156–77. New York: New York University Press.
- National History Standards Project. 1996. *National standards for history: Basic edition*. Los Angeles: National Center for History in the Schools.
- Seidman, I. 1998. *Interviewing as qualitative research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Seixas, P. 1993. Parallel crises: History and the social studies curriculum in the USA. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 25 (3): 235–50.
- . 1998. Student teachers thinking historically. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 26 (3): 310–41.
- Shulman, L. S. 1986. Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher* 15 (2): 4–14.
- . 1987. Knowledge and teaching: Foundations for the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review* 57 (1): 1–25.
- Skelar, T. D. 1998. Epistemological entanglements: Preservice elementary school teachers' "apprenticeship of observation" and the teaching of history. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 26 (4): 485–507.
- Stake, R. E. 2000. Case studies. In *Handbook of qualitative research*, ed. N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln, 435–54. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- van Hover, S. D., and E. A. Yeager. 2003. Challenges facing beginning history teachers: An exploratory study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- VanSledright, B. A. 2004. What does it mean to think historically and how do you teach it? *Social Education* 68 (3): 230–33.
- Wineburg, S. S., and S. M. Wilson. 1988. Models of wisdom in the teaching of history. *Phi Delta Kappan* 70 (1): 50–58.
- Yeager, E. A., and O. L. Davis. 1995. Between campus and classroom: Secondary student-teachers' thinking about historical text. *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 29 (1): 1–8.
- Yeager, E. A., and E. K. Wilson. 1997. Teaching historical thinking in the social studies methods course: A case study. *The Social Studies* 88 (3): 121–26.

Copyright of Social Studies is the property of Heldref Publications and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.