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National and local standards in history are evolving from standards on history content to standards on critical thinking and analyzing historical documents. The purpose of this research was to determine the effects of professional development received by K-12 teachers on infusing historical thinking skills into their history instruction. Changes in teacher use and application as well as impacts on students’ self-efficacy were examined.

Forty-eight (48) teachers from a mid-western public school district participated in an accredited masters of historical studies degree program at a mid-western liberal arts university. The two and one-half years masters degree program infused historical thinking skills and pedagogy into the program of studies for all teacher participants. Over the course of the program, data were collected from teachers at three points in time measuring changes in competence of their knowledge, use, and student use of historical thinking skills, as well as their ability to apply historical thinking skills to their own learning. On measures of competence and skill application, findings indicate that teachers’ skills and competence improved significantly ($p < .05$). On a measure of student self-efficacy, findings indicate that students of participating teachers improved significantly ($p < .05$).
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

What is the primary purpose of public education in the United States? According to Horace Mann (1849), considered the inventor of the American common school (Harvey, 2011), schools can be developed that will preserve and sustain a democratic society. In his Twelfth Annual Report to the Secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Education (1849), he states “…may all the children of the Commonwealth receive instruction in the great essentials of political knowledge, -- [sic] in those elementary ideas without which they will never be able to investigate more recondite and debatable questions;--thus, will the only practicable method be adopted for discovering new truths, and for discarding;--instead of perpetuating,--old errors…” (paragraph 29).

American educational philosopher John Dewey stated that the teacher’s “… task is rather to keep alive the sacred spark of wonder and to fan the flame that already glows. His problem is to protect the spirit of inquiry, to keep it from becoming blasé from overexcitement, wooden from routine, fossilized through dogmatic instruction, or dissipated by random exercise upon trivial things” (1910, p. 34).

Now, 165 years after Horace Mann wrote his report and over 100 years after Dewey identified how we gain knowledge, where are we with achieving the goal of providing all students the knowledge they need to be successful citizens?
In 1999, modified in 2001, federal legislation was passed requiring all public school students to be proficient in math, literacy (reading and writing), and science as determined by assessments developed by the states. The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) (2001) required the use of assessments that would identify schools as making adequate yearly progress, or not, based on a goal of 100% of all students identified as proficient by the year 2014.

In surveys administered by the American College Testing (ACT) during the 2005-2006 school year to nearly 13,000 post secondary professors, 65 percent of them reported that what is taught in high school does not prepare students for college, and a major reason they stated for this is the tests students take in high school as required by NCLB. These tests usually measure ninth or tenth grade-level knowledge and skills and students are rarely asked to explain their thinking or apply knowledge to new situations; skills deemed critical for college success (ACT, 2007).

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) has developed “model core teaching standards” in an effort to engage states in dialogue about best teaching practices. In the introduction they stated that students “…want their learning experiences to be relevant and connected to real world problems.” (CCSSO, 2010a, p. 7). Standards five through eight developed by CCSSO speak specifically to teaching students how to think critically and creatively, solve authentic problems through collaboration, use assessment to engage learners and document progress of instruction and learning, use cross-disciplinary skills to support students in meeting learning goals, and use a variety of instructional strategies to build skills to accurately access and apply information. These
are lofty and attainable goals, but as Tony Wagner (2010) points out, “For the most part, teachers have not been trained to teach students how to think (p. xxiv).”

**Common Core and Individual State Standards for History Education**

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) partnered with the National Governors Association (NGA) to develop the Common Core State Standards Initiative with the goal of developing a set of national standards for K-12 education for mathematics and English language arts (2010a). States had the option of participating in development of the standards as well as adoption of the standards. To date, 47 states and the District of Columbia have adopted these standards (CCSSO, 2012). The mission of the Common Core State Standards is found below.

The Common Core State Standards is to provide a consistent, clear understanding of what students are expected to learn, so teachers and parents know what they need to do to help them. The standards are designed to be robust and relevant to the real world, reflecting the knowledge and skills that our young people need for success in college and careers. With American students fully prepared for the future, our communities will be best positioned to compete successfully in the global economy (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2012).

In the Common Core Standards, social studies and history standards (as well as science and technology) are embedded within the English language arts (ELA) 6-12 grade standards. The connection of the social studies standards to the ELA standards, as referenced by the authors, is not to replace the standards in social studies, science, and technology but rather to supplement them. Adding social studies, science, and technology to the ELA standards is to support student literacy skills and understanding necessary for
college and career readiness (CCSSO, 2010). Examples of social studies embedded into the Common Core standards include the following: “cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources; determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary of the source distinct from prior knowledge or opinions; and identify key steps in a text’s description of a process related to history/social studies (e.g. how a bill becomes law, how interest rates are raised or lowered) (retrieved from: http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/RH/6-8, July 11, 2012).”

CCSSO has also partnered with 18 states and multiple professional organizations to support states and their teachers as they develop standards and curriculum in social studies (CCSSO, n.d.). This collaborative, called the Social Studies Assessment, Curriculum, and Instruction (SSACI) program, provides an avenue for discussing social studies standards.

Forty-nine states and the District of Columbia have adopted standards in history, the social sciences, or social studies instruction. Daisy Martin (2011) collected information from all states and territories regarding each state’s adoption of standards in social studies and history and if the standards included historical thinking skills in addition to content. Martin (2011) found that 40 states and the District of Columbia address historical thinking in their standards. Since Martin’s report was published, Nebraska has adopted history standards that include historical thinking skills. The introduction to the Nebraska K-12 History Standards reads: “Students will develop and apply historical knowledge and skills to research, analyze, and understand key concepts
of past, current, and potential issues and events at the local, state, national, and international levels” (Nebraska State Board of Education, 2012, p. 1).

**Statement of Problem**

In the 1960s, it was common for students to take multiple courses in civics and government covering the structure of American government as well as the role of citizens and the issues faced by the public. Today, students typically complete only one semester of American government (Niemi & Smith, 2001). The No Child Left Behind Act has created an academic environment where the goal is proficiency on annual math and reading/literacy assessments. With ever increasing demands placed on schools to raise the bar of student success on these tests, increasingly more classroom time is being spent preparing students for success on assessments used for this accountability purpose (Burroughs, et.al., 2005). Guidry, Cuthrell, O’Connor, and Good (2010) argue that math and reading instruction alone will not provide students the knowledge and skills necessary to become critical thinkers. They go on to state that schools run the risk of disengaging students and of creating greater gaps in achievement among groups of students and frustration among teachers who forgo the art of teaching for drill and practice.

Bandura (1993) explains that teachers’ belief in their abilities to impact student achievement affect how they approach instructional practices. Teachers who believe their students can acquire new skills through practice and constructive feedback will increase classroom achievement. Teachers’ belief in their ability to motivate and promote learning set the stage for the classroom environment they create and the level of academic progress their students achieve. “A major goal of formal education should be to equip
students with the intellectual tools, self-beliefs, and self-regulatory capabilities to educate themselves throughout their lifetime” (p. 136). Based on Bandura’s research (1993), classrooms that emphasize drill and practice are counter-intuitive to the intent of an educational system that hopes to graduate well-informed and critical thinking citizens.

It is becoming evident that change may be pending in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (NCLB, 2002; Rich, 2012), but in the meantime, educators need to think creatively about ways to integrate the social sciences into math and reading instruction, or vice versa, and find ways to develop informed citizens while supporting requirements of increased math and reading proficiency. Students need balance in their education curriculum to maintain engagement and positive efficacy (Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990; Wagner, 2010). Discipline area experts are finding that teachers need to teach history to students that engages them in the debate of history, that teaches skills to foster critical thinking about historical events, and provides students with opportunities to express and dialogue about their interpretations (Guidry et al., 2010; Wagner, 2010; Wineburg & Grossman, 2000).

**Historical Studies Program**

A Master of Historical Studies degree was developed in partnership with a mid-western liberal arts university, the local State Historical Society, and the local K-12 public school system. A steering committee made up of key personnel from each institution met regularly to structure the program to meet the needs of participating teachers. A faculty member from the university history department was assigned to teach the graduate courses. Museum scholars and historians lead workshops and commit resources appropriate to teaching American history with teachers participating in the
graduate level coursework. The Historical Studies program is an articulated course of study resulting in a Master of Historical Studies degree upon completion of all required coursework. The Teaching American History Grant Program funded the program; the cost of tuition, fees, and most expenses incurred by participants in reaching completion of the masters program were paid by the grant (Wanser, 2012).

Based on an interview with the university professor of record, the following information is presented regarding the masters degree program (K. Bower, personal communication, February 23, 2013). The program developed by the steering committee was an intense professional development program for teachers of American history in grades K-12 with programmatic goals of accountability, sustainability, and coherence. The 33-credit-hour graduate program was comprised of five key phases spread over the duration of the two and one-half year program. The first phase involved a workshop titled *Shifting Power on the Plains* (see Appendix A for syllabus), which was conducted at a state park. The purpose of this workshop was to develop collegiality among cohort members through a weeklong retreat experience paired with classroom lectures and history in place experiences, which included visits and tours of places such as Wounded Knee, Fort Laramie, and the Pine Ridge Reservation.

The second phase of the program was to provide the necessary and fundamental content knowledge on American history. A foundation of American history content is necessary to build teachers’ confidence in teaching the content (Lumpe, Czerniak, Haney, & Beltyukova, 2012). Embedded into the content knowledge was a basic understanding of the skills of historical thinking. The historical thinking skills include sourcing, contextualization, corroboration, close reading, and using multiple perspectives. These
skills were directly taught to teachers, modeled, and embedded throughout the courses of *Fundamentals of U.S. History I* and *Fundamentals of U.S. History II* (see Appendix B for syllabi).

The third phase of the historical studies program was for teachers to apply the skills of historical thinking into lesson plans and formative assessments developed under the guidance of the historical studies professor that would be implemented in their classrooms. Teachers developed content and cognitively appropriate lessons and assessments as part of a summer workshop titled *Thinking Like a Historian* (see Appendix C for syllabus).

The fourth phase of the program was to broaden American history content within the process of skills development. These graduate course activities included peer modeling of lesson and assessment implementation within the context of American history content. Teachers developed lesson plans with corresponding assessments and presented them to peers in a structured setting with feedback from both peers and the professor. Teachers were also expected to implement developed and critiqued lesson plans and assessments in their classrooms followed with reflection and adjustments as necessary. These courses included *American Civil Rights Movement* and *Making of the American West* (see Appendix D for syllabi).

The fifth phase of the masters program was to expand on the developed confidence in teachers to broaden historical thinking skills to all learners in the classroom through continued peer modeling, self-reflection, and supportive feedback. These courses include *American Voices* and the culminating project *Capstone Experience* (see Appendix E for syllabi).
Significance of Study

Students who are taught skills and strategies to think critically about learning history will have a greater understanding of historical events and be more engaged in that learning leading to increased confidence in their ability to learn (Bandura, 1993; VanKeer & Verhaeghe, 2005; Wood & Bandura, 1989). Lumpe, Czerniak, Haney, and Beltyukova (2012) found that elementary teachers who participated in long-term professional development showed significantly ($p \leq .001$) more positive beliefs in their teaching self-efficacy as measured by the Context Beliefs About Teaching Science instrument (Lumpe, et al., 2012). According to Wood and Bandura (1989), teacher self-efficacy directly impacts student self-efficacy and achievement.

This study tracked a group of teachers as they progressed through a masters degree program and learned ways to integrate literacy and critical thinking into history instruction. Their learning took place over the course of 30 months in a masters degree program at a mid-western university. Their progress, both in the ability to apply the skills learned and their instructional practice, was monitored.

Students of the eighth grade teachers involved in the study were assessed to determine the impact of their teachers’ learning on their knowledge of history, application of historical thinking skills, and changes in self-efficacy over time as their teachers teach history using an integrated approach.

Purpose of Research

The purpose of this research was to determine the effects of the professional development received by K-12 teachers on infusing historical thinking skills into their
history instruction. Changes in teacher use and application as well as the impacts on students, both academically and efficaciously, were examined.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were identified in an attempt to determine the effectiveness of the historical thinking skills teacher training on the teacher participants and a subset of their U.S. history students:

1. Did participating teachers increase their understanding of historical thinking skills over time?
2. Did participating teachers increase their teaching of historical thinking skills to their students over time?
3. Did participating teachers increase their expectation over time that all of their students will be proficient in the use of historical thinking skills?
4. Were participating teachers able to apply historical thinking skills more accurately over time?
5. When compared to a control group, did students of participating teachers apply historical thinking skills more proficiently from the beginning of the semester to the end?
6. When compared to a control group, did students of participating teachers show an increase in their self-efficacy toward history instruction from the beginning of the semester to the end of the semester?
Hypotheses Tested

The courses developed for the masters degree in a historical studies program at a small liberal arts college were designed to increase teachers’ knowledge about American history and train teachers in the use of historical thinking skills. The intended outcome of the program is that teachers who increase their knowledge about historical events and can apply the skills necessary to think critically will increase their students’ knowledge about historical events, specifically through the use of skills students can apply to think critically about those events.

Based on the goals of the historical studies program, the following research hypotheses were predicted from the planned research:

1. Teachers will increase their understanding of historical thinking skills over time.
2. Teachers will increase their teaching of historical thinking skills over time.
3. Teachers will increase their expectation that all of their students will be proficient in the use of historical thinking skills over time.
4. Teachers will increase their ability to correctly apply historical thinking skills more proficiently over time.
5. Students of teachers will show increased proficiency in application of historical thinking skills over time.
6. Students of teachers will show increased self-efficacy toward learning history over time.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

How can school boards, school districts, school administrators, and teachers try to meet the demands of an aggressive law and still teach students the entire curriculum they have been directed by their state, school board, or administrator to teach? As educators, we know that the effectiveness of a school and the goal of helping to develop productive citizens does not fall on the doorstep of math and literacy achievement, specifically scores on achievement tests for math and literacy. So, the compromise has come in not eliminating those content areas that do not directly support literacy and math, but in finding ways to have an impact on those areas of accountability through science, social studies, and the arts. Based on his research, Tony Wagner (2010) reported that “…work, learning, and citizenship in the twenty-first century demands that we all know how to think – to reason, analyze, weigh evidence, problem-solve – and to communicate effectively. These are no longer skills that only the elites in a society must master; they are essential survival skills for all of us” (p.xxiii). How can teachers provide these skills for students through history instruction that will enable them to become productive citizens?

Teaching and Learning History

Barton and Levstik (2010) have argued that it is not so simple to just state that students need to think critically and that teaching students to do so should be an
expectation in history classrooms. How teachers approach historical learning and how they teach history can be very different. These researchers found “numerous studies that show that even when teachers understand the process of constructing historical knowledge, and even when they are familiar with relevant teaching methods, they do not necessarily incorporate those into instruction” (p. 37). The reason for this, they conclude, is that teachers view teaching through multiple perspectives and engaging students in the process of learning conflicts with what they see as their tasks: covering content and controlling student behavior. Barton and Levstik go on to explain that teachers see everything else as extra, and there is little time for extras, and in an era of high stakes testing, covering the content in the textbook is seen as the appropriate way to teach.

Barton and Levstik posit, as did Mann (1849) and Dewey (1910), that “…education for citizenship is the foundation not only of social studies but of schools more generally in this country, and some approaches to history are particularly well-suited to this role” (p. 39).

Starko and Schack (1989) found that teachers were likely not to teach students thinking skills as a strategy for learning, even when they know the strategy is useful for students, unless the teachers themselves felt competent in performing the strategy. They found that with observation, practice, and modeling, teachers became more confident in a task and therefore more likely to teach it to their students.

During the 2007-2008 school year the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) administered the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) to over 1.8 million of the nation’s teachers. Results from the survey indicate that of the more than 60,000 high school teachers of history, just fewer than 64 percent of them majored in history in
college, and of the 15,000 teachers of government and civics, only 6.1 percent of them majored in the subject. Although this is an increase from the reported 53.9 percent in 2000, it is still concerning (NCES, 2008). It begs the question, if good teachers struggle to incorporate historical thinking skills into instruction, how much more difficult is it for a teacher who is less confident about the subject matter? And, what is the effect on the students in those classrooms?

Nystrand, Gamoran, and Carbonaro (1998) found that 90 percent of 106 middle and high school social studies classrooms observed involved no discussion within the instruction whatsoever. For those classrooms where there was discussion, the discussion was limited to an average of 42 seconds in eighth grade classrooms and 31 seconds in ninth grade classrooms. The common preoccupation of having students memorize one fact after another based on reciting history from textbooks may actually retard the development of historical thinking. Memorization fosters the naïve conception that past and history are one and the same (VanSledright, 2010).

Teaching literacy strategies in the history classroom is unlike how it might occur in the science or math classroom, where the primary goal is often to develop rules, theorems, and formulas that can be applied in multiple contexts. Brophy (1996) explains that history is contextual and there are particulars throughout a certain event that make findings difficult to generalize to all populations and time periods. The study of primary sources and other historical documents address issues of personal or group identity, so one aim of historical reading is to read with empathy and to understand that another’s viewpoint is shaped by experience other than one’s own (Timmins, Vernon, & Kinealy, 2005).
Wineburg (1991) has stated that in order to fully understand historical text, the reader must complement empathetic reading with critical analysis. Further, historical reading requires historical thinking strategies of sourcing, corroboration, and contextualizing. Though this may sound similar to reading in an English classroom where the reader may not need to attend to the author’s personal agenda, geographic or political contexts at the time of the writing, corroborating evidence, and so on, the reader must attend to these issues when reading and interpreting historical text. Literacy in the history classroom takes on a unique and important impact on student learning when evaluated through this lens (Wineburg & Grossman, 2000).

**Historical Thinking Skills**

Although there are many ways literacy instruction can support learning in the history classroom, reading for historical accuracy takes on a unique and specific set of pedagogical and learning skills. In a day when information is literally at students’ fingertips via the Internet, it is vital students are able to critically analyze a text (Wagner, 2010; Wineburg & Martin, 2004). Wineburg (2001) argues that thinking historically, like a historian does when analyzing a historical document, for example, is not a skill that comes naturally; one must learn how to do it and practice it in order to do it well. Specific skills can be taught that can help students critically analyze primary and secondary sources. The process by which a historian makes sense of information includes the skills of sourcing, contextualizing, corroboration, close reading, and using multiple perspectives. Wineburg (2001) has defined each of these as follows:
• **Sourcing:** Thinking about a document’s author and its creation. Who created the document? When? For what purpose? For whom? How trustworthy might this source be?

• **Contextualizing:** Situate the document and its events in time and place. What is the historical context of the document? What major events were happening at the time?

• **Corroboration:** Ask questions about important details across multiple sources to determine points of agreement and disagreement. What questions arise after careful reading and interpretation of the document?

• **Close Reading:** A metacognitive view of text that allows the reader to comprehend and think deeply about both the text and the subtext. Those who close read notice phrases they have never seen and find out what the phrase means. What does the text do? What did the author leave out? Is that what really happened?

• **Using Multiple Perspectives:** Interpreting the document from the viewpoint of all involved in the event, whether named or unnamed. Who were the key players in the event? Did the author of the document have something to gain, or lose? Were all viewpoints presented in the document? Whose perspective is missing? Are there documents that share different perspectives?

These skills are not separate from the content, but rather the tools used to learn the content. Students learn about historical events by applying the skills listed above. Within each of the skills are subsets of comprehension strategies that can be applied. These
would include compare and contrast, summarizing, identifying author’s purpose, outlining, and so on. The historical thinking skills can be adapted to meet the cognitive abilities of Kindergarten through twelfth grade learners.

Bruce VanSledright (2010) spent a semester in a fifth grade classroom teaching students historical thinking skills. He found that the goal of teachers must be to close the gap between how novices (students) think about history and how experts think about history. However, he also has argued that teachers themselves need to be taught how to engage in historical thought the way historians do. Similar to Wineburg, VanSledright identified four interrelated and interconnected cognitive acts to thinking historically:

- **Identification**: This involves knowing the source. What type of account is this? What is its appearance? When was it created? What is the grammar?

- **Attribution**: The reader understands that an author created a document for a specific purpose in a particular historical context.

- **Perspective Judgment**: This is when the reader makes sense of the author’s perspective or position.

- **Reliability Assessment**: Judging the reliability of a historical account by comparing it to other accounts from the period: determining the reliability of the author.

When students are informed, educated, thoughtful, critical readers, who appreciate investigative enterprises, know good arguments when they hear them, and who engage their world with a host of strategies for understanding it, they have become skilled historical thinkers (VanSledright, 2010). VanSledright claims that with
proficiency in the application of historical thinking skills, students can be skilled consumers of information, tolerant of different perspectives, skilled at detecting weak claims, and know what it means to build and defend evidenced-based arguments.

**Self-Efficacy**

What are the benefits to teaching students to be skilled historical thinkers, tolerant of different perspectives, who can build evidence-based arguments? VanSledright (2002) has contended that engaging children in historical investigations puts them at the center of their own action, not on the periphery of someone else’s decision-making process. Students learn that they have a hand in the process of making sense of the past, which empowers them to move away from textbook learning. Students learn to analyze primary and secondary source documents by applying skills of historical thinking. These actions further engage students in their own learning. Students make sense of the past and draw their own conclusions, rather than being told how events should be interpreted.

Cognitive research over the past 40 or more years tells us that if students have been successful at a particular skill in the past they probably will believe they will be successful at that task in the future (Bandura, 1993). Self-efficacy is an individual’s judgment about his/her ability to perform a particular activity (Siegle & McCoach, 2007). Bandura (1986) found that students with high self-efficacy are more likely to attempt new tasks and work harder and persist longer when faced with difficulties. Weinstein and Mayer (1986) state that the cognitive strategies of rehearsal, elaboration, and organization have been found to elicit active, positive engagement in learning, resulting in higher levels of achievement. Pintrich and De Groot (1990) identify self-efficacy as a construct
that “…involves students’ beliefs that they are able to perform the task and that they are responsible for their own performance.” (p. 33).

In a study conducted by Prat-Sala and Redford (2010), in which the interrelationships between motivation and self-efficacy were analyzed, results showed that students with high self-efficacy were more likely to adopt a deep approach to studying, while students identified with low self-efficacy were more likely to adopt a surface approach to studying. They state their results demonstrate that not only does motivation influence a student’s study approach, but the student’s belief in her abilities are related to the approaches taken in school work, providing some indication that focusing on self-efficacy beliefs among students may be beneficial to improving study approaches.

Siegle and McCoach (2007) conducted a study to determine if student self-efficacy could be increased if teachers received specific training on the self-efficacy construct and self-efficacy strategies for the classroom. They found that when providing training to teachers, which included a handbook, workshop format instruction, and videos of teachers implementing self-efficacy strategies, increases in efficacy occurred with their students. Further, they found the positive results held for students of varying ability levels and both genders. The researchers also state that feedback presented to students that pointed out improvements over time was a critical piece to increasing students’ self-efficacy.

Bandura (1993) tells us that teachers who have a low sense of *instructional efficacy* (teacher’s belief in their ability to promote learning in students) rely heavily on extrinsic rewards and sanctions to get students to comply. Teachers with high
instructional efficacy support students’ intrinsic interests and academic self-directedness. He goes on to explain that, “…when the complexities of academic demands increase and scholastic deficits become increasingly salient, teachers view their schools as declining in instructional efficacy” (p. 141). The result is lower academic achievement for students.

In a study conducted by Wood and Bandura (1989), managers who believed that ability can be learned had significant effects on workers’ analytic strategies and regarded errors as a natural part of developing decision-making skills. Viewing ability as an acquirable skill resulted in a resilient sense of personal efficacy in employees. The researchers found that managers who view ability as a skill to be developed and practiced had employees who achieved higher attainments. Bandura (1993) links this research to classroom practices; teachers who believe their students can acquire new skills through practice and constructive feedback will increase classroom achievement.

Subsequent research found that teachers who identify student failure as deficits that are uncontrollable or unchangeable, directly and negatively effected student motivation. However, when teachers believed all students were capable of learning and that failures were a natural part of the learning environment, positive self-efficacy was achieved, most especially for students identified with learning disabilities (Fulk, Brigham, & Lohman, 1998; Klassen, & Lynch, 2007).

Lumpe, Czerniak, Haney, and Beltyukova (2012) collected information from teachers participating in an intense professional development intervention. The K-6 grade teachers were all working in school districts in partnership with universities within a state that received federal funding to improve science teaching and learning. The teachers received structured and intense professional development (100 hours annually) on
inquiry-based instruction, science content knowledge, and the district’s curriculum content focus. The researchers collected data on teachers’ efficacy beliefs and matched it with their students’ performance on the state achievement test for science. The results showed significant \((p < .001)\), positive gains in teacher self-efficacy beliefs after one year. The authors report that teacher self-efficacy beliefs and the number of professional development hours in which teachers participated were significant \((p < .001)\) predictors of students’ achievement on the fourth grade state science achievement test.

**Summary**

A free and public education centered on educating a populace with the knowledge and skills to be informed and civically involved citizens, was the hope held by many of the early architects of education in the United States (Dewey, 1910; Mann, 1849). In our current accountability system under the No Child Left Behind Act, educational emphasis has shifted away from history and civics education to those subject areas (primarily math and reading) that directly impact accountability measures (Niemi & Smith, 2001). Students are not being challenged to think critically; they are taught to achieve proficiency on tests (VanSledright, 2010).

Development of pedagogy has begun that infuses critical thinking skills into history instruction, where students become immersed in the history they are learning by critically analyzing primary sources through the skills of sourcing, contextualizing, corroboration, and close reading (Brophy, 1996; Stanford History Education Group, n.d.; VanSledright, 2010; Wineburg, Martin, & Monte-Sano, 2011). These skills have the added benefits of applicability across subjects to other content areas such as math and
reading, as well as potentially increasing student engagement in learning; students become actively involved in the analysis of history, drawing their own conclusions, rather than learning the conclusions drawn by others (VanSledright, 2010; Wineburg, Martin, & Monte-Sano, 2011).

No Child Left Behind has created a climate of drill and practice classrooms that are void of critical thought, where students may not see themselves in the curriculum, and disengage from active learning (Wagner, 2010). The result is lowered self-efficacy for students (Bandura, 1993). A method to boost student self-efficacy could be addressed by providing intense professional development to teachers that can increase their content knowledge and skills of historical thinking in order to teach students to think critically. Through historical documents and the application of critical thinking skills, students of all cultures learn to look at history through a lens other than a textbook. Looking at historical events from the perspective of all affected cultures can further increase self-efficacy (Timmins, Vernon, & Kinealy, 2005; VanSledright, 2002; Wineburg & Grossman, 2000).

By moving away from the textbook reading and rote memorization of facts, dates, and people to exploration of primary documents that encourage students to analyze the text, engage in debate with peers, and draw defensible conclusions, student interest and engagement in studying history will increase (VanSledright, 2010; Wineburg & Martin, 2004). Increases in student engagement can result in higher levels of student self-efficacy; as students find success in learning about history, their engagement increases, as does their belief that they are in control of their own learning (Siegle & McCoach, 2007; Weinstein & Mayer, 1986).
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Background

A large mid-western school district (student population greater than 30,000) signed a memorandum of understanding to partner with the Stanford History Education Group (SHEG). The goals of this partnership included supporting research in the areas of professional development, student instruction, and formative assessment relative to the use of critical thinking skills associated with “thinking like a historian” (Wineburg, 2001). Previous research (Lumpe et al., 2012, Nystrand et al., 1998, and Wood, et al., 1989) indicates that teachers who understand, teach, and model historical thinking skills in their classrooms are more likely to increase critical thinking in their students. Further, students proficient in historical thinking skills often apply these skills in other curriculum areas, such as English and science (Wineburg, 2001). The historical thinking skills are designed with the notion that students can think like historians if they are taught the proper skills. Wineburg (2001) further states that proficient application of historical thinking skills results in more critical and engaged understanding of history than does rote memorization. The historical thinking skills analyzed in this study were (a) sourcing, (b) contextualization, and (c) corroboration.

The school district was the recipient of four Teaching American History (TAH) grants over the past 10 years. In July 2011, a funded grant received additional funds, which allowed continuation of the TAH grant program until 2013. The TAH funds
awarded to the school district will continue to be used to provide participating teachers a masters degree in historical studies through a mid-western university.

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board granted approval for this study on July 19, 2012. This project was approved as an expedited protocol. The approval letter can be found in Appendix F.

Teacher Participants

*Treatment Group.* The teacher participants were schoolteachers from a mid-western public school system for students in grades K-12, with a student population of approximately 37,000 students. Fifty teachers were recruited to apply for the masters of historical studies degree program at a mid-western university. The program costs (e.g., tuition) were paid through a Teaching American History (TAH) grant awarded to the K-12 public school system where the teachers work. Teachers were selected into the program by the TAH grant program coordinator through an application process. The TAH grant coordinator contacted all elementary, middle, and high schools in the school district to inform teachers of the opportunity to participate in the graduate program.

A cohort of 50 teachers was budgeted for the grant, and was the maximum number of teachers the university could sustain. Interested teachers submitted a brief application to the TAH grant coordinator who selected teachers for participation from the pool of applicants. Of the teachers who submitted applications, primary selection into the program went to school district teachers who taught American history at grades 5, 8, or 11, followed by teachers who may teach American history in the future. Participating teachers were not randomly selected. Teachers agreeing to participate in this study signed an IRB consent form (See Appendix G) at the beginning of the fall semester, 2012. Due
to attrition, 48 teachers completed the grant program as of December, 2012. These teachers did not receive compensation for their participation in this study. The Teaching American History Grant paid their tuition to the mid-western university providing their masters level courses.

Participating teachers represented a broad range of grade levels. Four of the teachers taught high school social studies, nine teachers taught middle school social studies, and 34 taught elementary school. Elementary teachers in the school district do not specialize in one content area. In addition to social studies, elementary teachers may also teach reading, language arts, math, science, and other subjects as assigned by their building administrator.

Control Group. A control group of 18 teachers, most of them eighth grade teachers who had not received the training in the application and instructional use of historical thinking skills, was created as a comparison group. These teachers taught in the same mid-western school district as the participant teachers and taught American history courses. Members of this control group were asked to participate in the data collection measures used in this study as part of the data collection for reporting on the Teaching American History Grant and were a convenient group available for this purpose. The teachers were participating in a district-wide meeting for social studies, in which they were getting paid to attend when the instruments were administered to them. All control group participants signed and returned the Institutional Review Board Informed Consent Forms. Control group participants attended a regularly scheduled staff development workshop for social studies teachers. The instruments administered to the teachers took
place during this workshop time and accounted for approximately half of the time spent in the workshop.

**Student Participants**

The student participants were eighth grade students (n=224) of the eighth grade teachers (n=7) who participated in the Master of Historical Studies degree through the TAH grant program, and a control group of eighth grade students (n=92) of teachers (n=3) who were not participating in the masters degree program. Eighth-grade classrooms were selected because (a) there is curriculum for teaching historical thinking skills in the eighth grade, (b) assessments to measure student proficiency of application of historical thinking skills have been developed and previously used with eighth grade students, (c) American history is the curricular focus at eighth grade, (d) there is a stronger research base for instruction of historical thinking skills with students in grades 6-12 than at the elementary grades, and (e) there are teachers who teach eighth grade and are enrolled in the Master of Historical Studies program (n=7).

Students participating in the study were not a random sample of the students from the classes for the teachers who volunteered to participate in the study. Students were included as participants if they signed an assent to participate form (See Appendix H). Parents of students were informed of the study and advised they could remove their students from the study at any time (See Appendix I). There were 316 eighth grade students who signed assent forms to participate in this study. The student sample represents eight middle school buildings, 10 eighth grade teachers, and 15 eighth grade classrooms. Of the 316 students who signed assent forms, 276 of these students completed both the pre- and post-administrations of the *Your Attitudes Towards Social*
Studies survey, resulting in 203 students in the treatment group and 73 students in the control group.

Demographic breakdowns of the student groups are represented in Table 1. Students within both the treatment and control groups were generally similar in demographic descriptions as the school district as a whole.

**Instruments**

Teachers were expected, as directed by grant requirements, to complete assessments used to track their progress through the program and to collect feedback from them regarding the courses in which they participated. The data were used to report to the U.S. Department of Education on the progress of the TAH grant program and to inform the professor of record and the TAH grant program coordinator of program progress. Upon notification of IRB approval, archival data from the 2011-2012 academic year were collected from teachers signing forms providing their consent to participate.

*Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment.* The Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment (HTSCA) was developed to measure teachers’ understanding of and use of historical thinking skills in their instruction as well as their students’ application of the skills in learning historical content. Teachers were asked to make judgments on their level of knowledge of each historical thinking skill, the percent of time they spent teaching history through the use of each historical thinking skill, and their students’ correct use of each historical thinking skill. The historical thinking skills addressed in the HTSCA include: (a) multiple perspectives, (b) sourcing, (c) contextualization, (d) close reading, and (d) corroboration (Ernst, 2011). A copy of the HTSCA appears in Appendix J.
Table 1

*Percent of Students in Demographic Categories: Percent of Students Within Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Categories</th>
<th>School District (N=36,902)</th>
<th>Treatment Group (n=203)</th>
<th>Control Group (n=73)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified Special Education</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Gifted</td>
<td>18.9ª</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Amer.</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Ethnicities</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These data are reported specifically for eighth grade (n=2,519) during the 2012-13 school year.*
The HTSCA is a newly developed instrument used to measure teachers’ level of self-competence toward understanding and teaching historical thinking skills over time. According to the author (R. Ernst, personal communication, August 3, 2011) the instrument was developed to measure changes in teacher competence with historical thinking skills as teachers progressed through the masters level program. Data collected from the instrument were used to understand how teachers’ competence with historical thinking skills changed with professional development in order to inform future professional development for the school district’s teachers.

Development of the instrument began with definitions of the historical thinking skills (Wineburg, Martin, & Monte-Sano, 2011). The definitions were incorporated into the questions to provide the respondents consistent interpretation of each skill. Responses to the questions were on a 5-point or 6-point scale. Each scale was defined for the respondent, and each set of questions throughout the instrument followed a consistent pattern.

To gather evidence to support the content relevance of the instrument, a professor in the teacher education program of a large mid-western university initially reviewed the instrument and provided feedback. The feedback received from this review included the following recommendations: (a) define each construct (historical thinking skill) for the respondent and (b) add percentage amounts to the Likert responses for the amount of time teachers teach the skill and the amount of time students correctly apply the skill. Next, teachers who were teaching history at the secondary level and familiar with historical thinking skills (n=7) were asked to complete the survey and respond to the following questions: “Were the definitions of each skill accurate and easy to understand? Were the
directions, questions, and response choices clear and easy to understand? Was there anything you think might be important to add to this survey or anything else that you think should be considered?” (R. Ernst, personal communication, August 3, 2011). The author noted that several teachers provided feedback and changes were made to the directions and to the clarity in the definitions of the skills.

The instrument was administered to participating teachers in August, 2011 at the beginning of their program of studies, in December, 2011 at the end of the first semester of their studies, and again in December, 2012 at the conclusion of advanced coursework in historical thinking skills. The HTSCA was also administered to a control group of teachers in December, 2011. Teachers were included as participants if they were enrolled in the Historical Studies masters program and signed and returned a consent form to participate.

The internal consistency coefficient alpha was calculated using the mid-program administration of the instrument (n=62). An overall Cronbach alpha of 0.92 was calculated for the instrument. Additionally, items were clustered by skill and calculations for internal consistency coefficients were computed for each of the item clusters. Reliability indices for indicated item clusters are listed in Table 2.

In a personal communication with the author of the HTSCA, Ernst (2013) indicated the definition of close reading embedded in the three items is too narrowly focused for easy interpretation. He further indicated that the definition would be changed for future iterations of the HTSCA in order to clarify the construct of close reading and its application in the classroom.
Table 2

*Item Cluster Reliability Indices for Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Thinking Skill Item Clusters</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Perspectives</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourcing</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 4-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualization</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 7-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Reading</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 10-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corroboration</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items 13-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stanford History Education Group Assessments. The Stanford History Education Group (SHEG) developed History Assessments of Thinking (HATs) tests to assess “historical knowing” for high school students in American history classrooms (Wineburg, Smith, & Breakstone, 2013). The HATs are aligned with Common Core State Standards (CCSSO, 2012) and through the use of primary sources, engages the test taker in the application of historical thinking skills within the context of a historical event, using a primary source to do so. The HATs measure three aspects of historical knowing: (a) evaluation of evidence, which includes the critical assessment of sourcing, contextualization, and corroboration; (b) historical knowledge, which encompasses the ways of knowing about the past through historical knowledge, significance, periodization, and narrative; and (c) historical argumentation, which requires articulation of historical claims and the use of evidence to support the claims. To support claims validity, each HAT was aligned to a Common Core standard (CCSSO, 2012 and SHEG, 2012) by student test takers who told the authors what they were thinking as they completed the assessments. Through “think-alouds” the authors were able to identify the processes the students applied during the assessment administration (Wineburg, et al., 2013).

On their website (SHEG, 2012), SHEG has identified a rigorous research and development process to support the validity of assessment results. The development of each of the HATs includes identifying the domain of performance through previous literature, selection of a document from the Library of Congress digital archive, construction of an assessment that measures historical knowledge, formulating a prototype of the assessment, identifying student focus groups and administering the
assessments, conducting “think-aloud” interviews where students talked aloud as they completed the assessment, which allowed the researchers to track students’ cognitive processes as they tapped into historical thinking, piloting the assessments with a larger sample, and making final revisions based on development of an interactive scoring rubric (SHEG, 2012).

Each time a set of HATs were administered to the teacher participants a different, though aligned, set of HATS were used. The HATs used for the pretest can be found in Appendix K. No psychometric data were available on the SHEG website; the data presented are from the administration of HATs for this study.

At the time of this study, SHEG had developed scoring guides for only some of the HATs. Each HAT is scored on a 3-point scale. The scoring guide contains response descriptions and exemplars for each performance level. This researcher developed similar scoring guides for HATs that did not yet have SHEG developed scoring guides. The process for developing additional scoring guides was replicated based on information from the SHEG researchers on how scoring guides were developed.

The investigator of this study and a second rater scored each assessment. The second rater was a high school teacher of social studies who had extensive experience in development and application of scoring guides for open-ended items. The second rater did not know the name of the test taker or the sequence of test administration. The TAH grant coordinator served as the third rater. In addition to the first and second raters, the third rater scored the mid- and post-administration of the HATs.

All raters adhered to the following protocol for scoring the HATs. First, each rater examined the questions on the assessment and answered the questions, independently
identifying correct and possible responses. Second, discussion regarding the responses appropriate for each proficiency level (proficient, approaching proficient, not proficient) occurred. The descriptions of responses for each proficiency level were defined and recorded. For the sourcing and contextualization HATs, the rating was on a 3-point scale. The corroboration HATs contained two distinct questions and were scored on a 5-point scale in order to accommodate partially correct and incorrect responses on one or more question. Third, for each set of completed assessments, 10 were randomly selected as sample papers and independently scored by each rater. Fourth, after the sample papers were independently scored, the raters discussed each rating given, and the scoring guide was refined to address any ambiguities in language. From the 10 sample papers, exemplars were selected and recorded in the scoring guide to further support interpretation of the responses to be scored. Finally, each rater independently scored the remainder of the papers. Inter-rater reliability was calculated on exact agreement for the assessments rated on a 3-point scale and adjacent agreement for assessments rated on a 5-point scale. Results of the inter-rater reliability study are presented in Table 3.

*Historical Thinking Skills Assessments (Eighth Grade).* Eighth grade teachers in the participating school district developed the historical thinking skills assessments (HTSAs) that are administered in eighth grade social studies classrooms. The assessments were developed under the guidance of the school district assessment specialist for social studies. A team of trained eighth grade teachers who teach the content being assessed developed the assessment items. The district assessment specialist for social studies trained the teachers on the curriculum standards, alignment, item development, bias and
Table 3

*Inter-Rater Reliability for History Assessments of Thinking (HATs)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Thinking Skill Measured</th>
<th>Title of HATs</th>
<th>Inter-rater reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corroboration</td>
<td>Fredericksburgh (pretest)</td>
<td>0.87&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internment (midtest)</td>
<td>0.90&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperialism (posttest)</td>
<td>0.96&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualization</td>
<td>NAACP (pretest)</td>
<td>0.81&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration (midtest)</td>
<td>0.61&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s Rights (posttest)</td>
<td>0.84&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourcing</td>
<td>Thanksgiving (pretest)</td>
<td>0.81&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayflower Compact (midtest)</td>
<td>0.66&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declaration Signing (posttest)</td>
<td>0.64&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* There were three raters for each set of assessments scored. The number of assessments scored is as follows: 47 pre-tests, 62 mid-tests, and 50 post-tests.

<sup>a</sup> Adjacent agreement on a five-point rubric.

<sup>b</sup> Exact agreement on a three-point rubric.
unfair penalization, and cognitive complexity. The teachers began by developing a table of specifications that outlined the structure and content of the assessment before item development began. The trained teachers worked in pairs or independently to develop items. Other content experts who were not part of the development team reviewed the draft items. Next, the development of the assessment structure and directions to teachers and students on administration of the assessments were completed.

The historical thinking skills assessments (HTSAs) for eighth grade contain short answer and multiple-choice questions designed to measure students’ ability to apply historical thinking skills to the analysis of a primary document, as well as measure students’ understanding of the content taught in the unit of instruction. Items (multiple-choice and short answer) are dichotomously scored and scores from these assessments were reported as percent correct. The HTSAs items were field tested during the 2011-12 school year, and modifications were made to the item pool based on field test data, item statistics for multiple-choice items, teacher feedback, and student feedback. Item statistics included item difficulty (p), item discrimination (d), and item response frequency distributions.

If item difficulty indices were less than 0.20 the item was considered too difficult and was removed from the item pool. Items with low discrimination (d < 0.20) also were considered to be problematic. Percent correct and item discrimination values were compared to item frequency values for clarification. If items were relatively easy (p values greater than 0.8) discrimination values could be lower. Cronbach’s alpha of 0.80 or higher was the target for items clustered for a specific assessment. Based on the method of assessment development described above, the authors of the HTSAs believed
the assessments can be used to adequately measure students’ performance of the content of the unit of study being measured, thereby contributing to the claim that the instrument contained appropriate content (Kane, 2006 & R. McEntarffer, personal communication, January 11, 2012).

For this study, student performance on the historical thinking skills assessments was collected from classroom teachers at the beginning of the 2012-13 academic year and again at the end of the first semester. Copies of assessments were collected and student scores were entered into a database.

*Your Attitudes Towards Social Studies Survey*. The *Your Attitudes Toward Social Studies* (YATSS) survey is a modification of a sub-set of items from the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) (Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990).

As described by Pintrich and DeGroot, the full MSLQ contains 56 items on student motivation, cognitive strategy use, metacognitive strategy use, and management of effort, designed to be used with seventh-grade students in science and English classrooms. Three distinct motivational factors are measured in the questionnaire: (a) self-efficacy, (b) intrinsic value, and (c) test anxiety. According to Pintrich and DeGroot, students respond to items using a 7-point Likert scale with 1=Not at All True of Me to 7=Very True of Me. The authors have reported a coefficient alpha for the administration of the survey of 0.89 for the self-efficacy sub-scale of items with 173 seventh-grade students from eight science and seven English classrooms.

The self-efficacy sub-scale consists of nine (n=9) items regarding perceived competence and confidence in performance class work. These nine items make up the *Your Attitudes Toward Social Studies* survey. To provide evidence of validity for the
interpretation of the scores, the authors used factor analysis to guide the scale construction; items were removed from the instrument if they lacked correlation or a stable factor structure.

For this study, modifications were made to the nine items on the self-efficacy portion of the original instrument. The changes were designed to make the items more general to performance in the social studies classroom and to narrow the Likert scale from 7 points to 5. Table 4 shows changes made to the items. A copy of the modified student survey can be found in Appendix L.

A similarly modified version of the Pintrich and DeGroot instrument was used in previous research (Wanser-Eckhout, 2003). The self-efficacy items were used in high school English classrooms as a pre- and post-measure of changes in student attitudes over the course of a semester. The reliability (Cronbach’s coefficient alpha) for that modified version was reported as 0.93. For the purpose of this study, the survey was administered to student participants at the beginning of the semester and again at the end of the semester. The Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for this study’s administration of the revised survey was 0.89.

A factor analysis was conducted on the YATSS survey. The factor pattern from principal axis factoring for the combined student sample of 276 is presented in Table 5. Scree plot, which applies criteria based on the magnitude of the eigenvalues, indicated that one factor should be extracted, and none of the factors cross load. The items presented in the factor pattern show high loadings on their designated factor, which supports the assertion of the authors of the YATSS that the nine items measure a single construct.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Item</th>
<th>Modified Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Compared with other students in this class I expect to do well.</td>
<td>1. Compared with other students at school, I expect to do well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I’m certain I can understand the ideas taught in this course.</td>
<td>2. I’m certain I can understand the ideas taught to me in social studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I expect to do very well in this class.</td>
<td>3. I expect to do very well in social studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compared with others in this class, I think I’m a good student.</td>
<td>4. Compared with other students in this class, I think I’m a good student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am sure I can do an excellent job on the problems and tasks assigned for this class.</td>
<td>5. I am sure I can do an excellent job on the problems and tasks assigned to me in social studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I think I will receive a good grade in this class.</td>
<td>6. I think I will receive good grades in social studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My study skills are excellent compared with others in this class.</td>
<td>7. My study skills are excellent compared with other students in this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Compared with other students in this class I think I know a great deal about the subject.</td>
<td>8. Compared with other students at school, I think I know a lot about social studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I know that I will be able to learn the material for this class.</td>
<td>9. I know I will be able to learn the material taught to me in social studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

*Factor Pattern Matrix, YATSS Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Compared with other students at school, I expect to do well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I’m certain I can understand the ideas taught to me in social studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I expect to do very well in social studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compared with other students in this class, I think I’m a good student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am sure I can do an excellent job on the problems and tasks assigned to me in social studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I think I will receive good grades in social studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My study skills are excellent compared with other students in this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Compared with other students at school, I think I know a lot about social studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I know I will be able to learn the material taught to me in social studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Design

The 33 credit hours of coursework in which the teachers participated were determined by a tenured professor with a Ph.D. in history and an undergraduate degree in history education who was the professor of record at the university granting the graduate credit. Additionally, the public school district in which the teachers are employed entered into a partnership with the Stanford History Education Group (SHEG) (Wineburg, Smith, & Breakstone, 2013).

Historical thinking skills are taught within the courses throughout the first 18 months of the graduate program. The purpose of embedding the skills into courses is to provide teachers with repeated exposure and practice with applying the skills to their own learning, and transition teachers to developing lesson plans and assessments to use in their classrooms.

On the first day of the course Fundamentals of US History I, teachers completed the Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment (HTSCA) and three Stanford History Education Group History Assessments of Thinking (HATs) to collect baseline data. The three HATs were designed to measure the historical thinking skills of sourcing, contextualization, and corroboration. Both assessments required approximately an hour for the teachers to complete.

Three different HATs were administered to the teacher participants again in December, 2011. These HATs were different from the first set but also designed to measure the historical thinking skills of sourcing, contextualization, and corroboration. This administration was used as the mid-test. A third, and last set of HATs, were administered to teacher participants in June, 2012. Three different HATs also measuring
the historical thinking skills of sourcing, contextualization, and corroboration were administered as a post-test. A control group of teachers completed the HATs in December, 2011. The HTSCA was administered in December, 2011 to both participant and control groups and again in December, 2012 to the participant group. The delay in administration of the post-HTSCA (when compared to the post-HATs) was to allow teachers time to infuse historical thinking skills instruction during the first semester of the 2012-13 school year following an intensive workshop in June, 2012: Thinking Like a Historian.

Students were administered the Your Attitudes Towards Social Studies survey on or around September 1, 2012 (pre-test) and completed it again on or around December 12, 2012 (post-test). The eighth grade historical thinking skills assessments (HTSA) were collected from teachers on or around September 15 (pre-test) and on or around December 12, 2012 (post-test). Table 6 shows the timeline for data collection.
Table 6

*Timeline for Data Collection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2011</td>
<td>Beginning of Program</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>End of Semester 1</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td>Summer Institute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td>End of Semester 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td>Beginning of Semester</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td>End of Semester</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment  
2-Historical Assessment of Thinking Skills  
3-Your Attitudes About Social Studies  
4-Historical Thinking Skills Assessments
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

In this chapter, findings from the analyses of the collected data are presented. Data are organized by research question and supported with tables or figures where appropriate. Explanations and descriptions of analyses and findings then are used to supplement the results.

Analyses

Data from the Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment (HTSCA) and the Your Attitudes Towards Social Studies (YATSS) surveys were recorded as numerical codes for analysis. The Likert-type scales contained options for the respondents to circle, identifying the answers that best fit their responses to the question at that time. During data entry, the selected responses were changed from words to numbers. The most negatively worded response received a score of 1 and the most positively worded response received a score of 5 or 6 accordingly. None of the items required re-coding, that is, none of the questions or item stems were negatively worded.

A table was developed (see Table 7) that links the study hypotheses with the tool used to collect data and the analyses used to respond to each hypothesis. Repeated-measures and mixed-method ANOVAs were selected as the best methods for examining the within-subjects and between-groups effects and were used to analyze the data for this study.
Table 7

**Data Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Results and Scores</th>
<th>Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers will increase their understanding of historical thinking skills over time.</td>
<td>Survey: Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment (HTSCA)</td>
<td>Individual Score</td>
<td>Cronbach's coefficient alpha, repeated-measures ANOVA, pairwise comparisons. Analyses addressed validity, reliability, and significant differences in marginal means. Analysis of significance looked at within group (pre-, mid-, post-) differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers will increase their teaching of historical thinking skills over time.</td>
<td>Assessment of Content and Skills: History Assessments of Thinking (HATs)</td>
<td>Group Results and Scores</td>
<td>Analyses addressed validity, reliability, and significant differences in marginal means. Analysis of significance looked at within group (pre-, mid-, post-) differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers will increase their expectation that all of their students will be proficient in the use of historical thinking skills over time.</td>
<td>Assessment of Content and Skills: eighth Grade Historical Thinking Skills Assessments (HTSA)</td>
<td>Individual Score</td>
<td>Inter-rater reliability indices (three-point rating scale) based on double scoring of each response collected, repeated-measures ANOVA, and pairwise comparisons. Analyses addressed validity, reliability, and significant differences in marginal means. Analysis of significance looked at within group (pre-, mid-, post-) differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers will increase their ability to correctly apply historical thinking skills more proficiently over time.</td>
<td>Assessment of Content and Skills: eighth Grade Historical Thinking Skills Assessments (HTSA)</td>
<td>Group Mean Score</td>
<td>Inter-rater reliability indices (three-point rubrics), ANOVA (for differences in means over time), effect sizes (differences in marginal means and standard deviations over time).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students of teachers will show increased proficiency in application of historical thinking skills over time.</td>
<td>Assessment of Content and Skills: eighth Grade Historical Thinking Skills Assessments (HTSA)</td>
<td>Individual Score</td>
<td>Inter-rater reliability indices (three-point rating scale) based on double scoring of each response collected, repeated-measures ANOVA, and pairwise comparisons. Analysis of significance looked at within group (pre-, mid-, post-) differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students of teachers will show increased self-efficacy toward learning history over time.</td>
<td>Survey: Your Attitudes Toward Social Studies (YATSS)</td>
<td>Individual Score</td>
<td>Cronbach's coefficient alpha, factor analysis, mixed-model ANOVA, and pairwise comparisons. Analyses addressed validity, reliability, and significant differences in marginal means. Analysis of significance looked at within group (pre-, post-) and between group (control, treatment) differences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Significance Selected

The level of significance selected for this study was 0.05, and was applied to all analyses conducted on the instruments. A Tukey post-hoc procedure was used to examine pairwise mean comparisons when main effects were found to be significant. For all repeated-measures analyses, the Huynh-Feldt adjustments exceeded a threshold of 0.75.

Research Questions 1 - 3

Research Questions 1 - 3 all involve data collected from the Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment (HTSCA) and are as follows:

1. *Do participating teachers increase their understanding of historical thinking skills over time?*

2. *Do participating teachers increase their teaching of historical thinking skills to their students over time?*

3. *Do participating teachers increase their expectation over time that all of their students will be proficient in the use of historical thinking skills?*

Thirty-one (n=31) teachers completed all three administrations of the instrument. The HTSCA clusters items based on historical thinking skills, and the research questions are structured around the application of the skills. Means were found for each cluster of items on each administration of the HTSCA for teachers who completed all three administrations. Repeated-measure ANOVAs were used to determine if there was a change in the means for the HTSCA item clusters across the pre-, mid-, and post-administrations of the instrument. Adjustment for multiple comparisons was applied post-hoc, with an alpha of \( p \leq .05 \) selected for all statistical comparisons.
Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment

Multiple Perspectives Items. For items 1 - 3, teachers were asked to identify their level of knowledge, how often they teach, and how often their students apply the historical thinking skill of applying multiple perspectives. Marginal means and pairwise comparisons over the three administrations appear in Table 8. A significant difference was found among the means for the teachers on multiple perspectives over time, F(2,60) = 35.03, p < .05, $\eta^2 = 0.539$. See Table 9 for the ANOVA summary. The abbreviated items and their corresponding means and standard deviations for each administration appear in Table 10.

The results of this study indicated there were significant changes in teachers’ knowledge and use of multiple perspectives across the three administration periods. All three pairwise differences were significant and the means steadily increased from the pre- to post-administrations.
Table 8

*Marginal Means and Pairwise Comparisons for Multiple Perspectives Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Point</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.58&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1.05&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.46&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> p < .05
Table 9

*ANOVA Summary for Multiple Perspectives Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Times</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>35.03&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>53.25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89.25</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> p < .05
Table 10

*Item Means and Standard Deviations for Multiple Perspectives Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of multiple perspectives</td>
<td>2.90 (0.75)</td>
<td>3.71 (0.46)</td>
<td>4.03 (0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching multiple perspectives</td>
<td>3.16 (1.34)</td>
<td>3.55 (1.26)</td>
<td>4.19 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students using multiple perspectives</td>
<td>2.74 (1.34)</td>
<td>3.29 (1.10)</td>
<td>3.94 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sourcing Items. For items 4 - 6, teachers were asked to identify their level of knowledge, how often they teach, and how often their students apply the historical thinking skill of sourcing. Marginal means and pairwise comparisons over the three administrations appear in Table 11. A significant difference was found among the means for the teachers on sourcing over time, \( F(2,60) = 54.00, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.643 \). See Table 12 for the ANOVA summary. The abbreviated items and their corresponding means and standard deviations for each administration appear in Table 13.

The results of this study indicated there were significant changes in teachers’ knowledge and use of sourcing across the three administration periods. All three pairwise differences were significant and the means steadily increased from the pre- to post-administrations.
Table 11

*Marginal Means and Pairwise Comparisons for Sourcing Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Point</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-1.13&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> p < .05
Table 12

ANOVA Summary for Sourcing Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Times</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>54.00a</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>74.67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152.45</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a p < .05*
Table 13

*Means and Standard Deviations for Sourcing Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of sourcing</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching sourcing</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.40)</td>
<td>(1.52)</td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students using sourcing</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
<td>(1.49)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contextualization Items. For items 7 - 9, teachers were asked to identify their level of knowledge, how often they teach, and how often their students apply the historical thinking skill of contextualization. Marginal means and pairwise comparisons over the three administrations appear in Table 14. A significant difference was found among the means for the teachers on contextualization over time, F(2,60) = 60.00, p < .05, η² = 0.667. See Table 15 for the ANOVA summary. The abbreviated items and their corresponding means and standard deviations for each administration appear in Table 16.

The results of this study indicated there were significant changes in teachers’ knowledge and use of contextualization across the three administration periods. All three pairwise differences were significant and the means steadily increased from the pre- to post-administrations.
Table 14

*Marginal Means and Pairwise Comparisons for Contextualization Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Point</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.90&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-0.36&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> *p < .05*
Table 15

ANOVA Summary for Contextualization Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Times</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>60.00&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within treatments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>62.28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80.85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> p < .05
Table 16

*Means and Standard Deviations for Contextualization Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of contextualization</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching contextualization</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(1.51)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students using contextualization</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.11)</td>
<td>(1.37)</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Close Reading Items. For items 10 - 12, teachers were asked to identify their level of knowledge, how often they teach, and how often their students apply the historical thinking skill of close reading. Marginal means and pairwise comparisons over the three administrations appear in Table 17. A significant difference was found among the means for the teachers on close reading over time, \( F(2,60) = 71.19, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.711 \). See Table 18 for the ANOVA summary. The abbreviated items and their corresponding means and standard deviations for each administration appear in Table 19.

The results of this study indicated there were significant changes in teachers’ knowledge and use of close reading across the three administration periods. All three pairwise differences were significant and the means steadily increased from the pre- to post-administrations.
Table 17

*Marginal Means and Pairwise Comparisons for Close Reading Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Point</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-1.67(^{a})</td>
<td>-2.32(^{a})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.66(^{a})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) \(p < .05\)
Table 18

*ANOVA Summary for Close Reading Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Times</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>71.19(^a)</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>41.41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76.45</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) \(p < .05\)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of close reading</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching close reading</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.11)</td>
<td>(1.33)</td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students using close reading</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Corroboration Items.** For items 13 - 15, teachers were asked to identify their level of knowledge, how often they teach, and how often their students apply the historical thinking skill of corroboration. Marginal means and pairwise comparisons over the three administrations appear in Table 20. A significant difference was found among the means for the teachers on corroboration over time, \( F(2,60) = 67.85, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.693 \). See Table 21 for the ANOVA summary. The abbreviated items and their corresponding means and standard deviations for each administration appear in Table 22.

The results of this study indicated there were significant changes in teachers’ knowledge and use of corroboration across the three administration periods. All three pairwise differences were significant and the means steadily increased from the pre- to post-administrations.
Table 20

*Marginal Means and Pairwise Comparisons for Corroboration Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Point</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-1.07&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1.66&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.59&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> p < .05
Table 21

ANOVA Summary for Corroboration Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Times</td>
<td>43.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>67.85&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>38.07</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101.04</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> p < .05
Table 22

*Means and Standard Deviations for Corroboration Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of corroboration</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching corroboration</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
<td>(1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students using corroboration</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
<td>(1.22)</td>
<td>(0.99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 4

Research Question 4 reflects data collected from the History Assessments of Thinking (HATs) and was as follows:

4. Are participating teachers able to apply historical thinking skills more accurately over time?

Thirty-five (n=35) teachers completed the pre-, mid-, and post-administration of the instruments. Assessments were clustered for this analysis by the skills corroboration, contextualization, and sourcing. Scores on these assessments range from the lowest score of one to the highest score of three. Repeated-measure ANOVAs were used to compare scores on each assessment between the pre-, mid-, and post-administrations for the teachers participating in the study. The results of the repeated-measures are presented by skill over the pre-, mid-, and post-administrations.

History Assessments of Thinking

Corroboration Assessments. Corroboration assessments were administered to participating teachers at three points during the course of this study. The corroboration assessments presented a historical document and supplemental documents. The test taker was asked to determine if the supplemental documents supported the position of the author in the initial document. This assessment was used to measure teachers’ ability to apply the historical thinking skill of corroboration. Marginal means and pairwise comparisons from each administration appear in Table 23. A significant difference was
found among the means in teachers’ ability to apply the skill of corroboration over time, 
F(2,68) = 5.33, p < .05, \( \eta^2 = 0.136 \). See Table 24 for the ANOVA summary.

The results of this study indicated there were significant changes in teachers’ ability to apply the skill of corroboration across the three testing periods.
Table 23

*Marginal Means and Pairwise Comparisons for Corroboration Assessments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Point</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.33&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.40&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> p < .05
Table 24

ANOVA Summary for Corroboration Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Times</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>5.33&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>20.31</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.22</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> p < .05
Contextualization Assessments. Contextualization assessments were administered to participating teachers at three points during the course of this study. The contextualization assessments presented the test taker with two historical documents. The test taker was asked to determine which of the documents occurred first in history. This assessment was used to measure teachers’ ability to apply the historical thinking skill of contextualization. Marginal means and pairwise comparisons from each administration appear in Table 25. A significant difference was found among the means in teachers’ ability to apply the skill of contextualization over time, $F(2,68) = 31.37, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.480$. See Table 26 for the ANOVA summary.

The results of this study indicated there were significant changes in teachers’ ability to apply the skill of contextualization across the three testing periods. The mean scores declined from the pre-administration to the mid-administration. From the mid-administration to the post-administration the mean improved significantly.
Table 25

*Marginal Means and Pairwise Comparisons for Contextualization Assessments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Point</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.74&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.94&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> *p* < .05
Table 26

*ANOVA Summary for Contextualization Assessments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Times</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>31.37&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.97</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> *p < .05*
Sourcing Assessments. Sourcing assessments were administered to participating teachers at three points during the course of this study. The sourcing assessments presented a historical document in the form of a painting to the test taker. The test taker was asked to determine if the painting was an accurate description of the historical event for which it was portraying. This assessment was used to measure teachers’ ability to apply the historical thinking skill of sourcing. Marginal means and pairwise comparisons from each administration appear in Table 27. A significant difference was found among the means in teachers’ ability to apply the skill of sourcing over time, $F(2,68) = 20.50, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.376$. See Table 28 for the ANOVA summary.

The results of this study indicated there were significant changes in teachers’ ability to apply the skill of sourcing across the three testing periods.

Based on the results of the repeated-measures ANOVAs for the HATs, the null hypothesis can be rejected for Research Question 4.
Table 27

*Marginal Means and Pairwise Comparisons for Sourcing Assessments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Point</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-0.74&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.97&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> *p < .05*
Table 28

*ANOVA Summary for Sourcing Assessments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Times</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>20.50a</td>
<td>0.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>29.94</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52.17</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a p < .05*
Research Question 5

Research Question 5 reflects data collected from the eighth grade historical thinking skills assessments and was as follows:

5. Do students of participating teachers apply historical thinking skills more proficiently from the beginning of the semester to the end?

Historical Thinking Skills Assessments for Eighth Grade

Student scores on these assessments were gathered from the teachers participating in this study (n=10). The assessments were not administered by this researcher but rather by the teacher and submitted to this researcher upon request. Despite repeated requests, only 72% (n=241) of the students in the study have scores for the eighth grade assessment 8.1.2. This represents 55% of the middle school buildings in the district. Of the 241 student scores received, 42% of those scores come from one building. None of the assessment scores received for this study came from the control group of students.

Fifty-seven percent of the students in the study have scores submitted for this study from the eighth grade assessment 8.1.3. The resulting pool of student assessment data was not representative of either the sample of students participating in this study or the students of the school district in which this study was conducted.

The lack of a representative sample of student assessment data does not allow for calculations of assessment validity, reliability, or statistical significance. Therefore, it was decided by this researcher to report no results related to Research Question 5.
Research Question 6

Research Question 6 reflects data collected from the Your Attitudes Towards Social Studies Survey (YATSS) and is as follows:

6. Do students of participating teachers show an increase in their self-efficacy toward history instruction from the beginning to the end of the semester?

Two hundred seventy-six students completed the pre- and post-administration of the instrument. Of those students, 203 were in the treatment group and 73 were in the control group. Students responded to nine statements with a five-point Likert-type scale. Responses ranged from “Not at All True of Me” to “Very True of Me.” Mixed-model ANOVA was used to compare mean scores on the survey between the pre- and post-administrations for student participating in the study. The results of the mixed-model ANOVA are presented for the pre- and post-administrations.

Your Attitudes Towards Social Studies Survey

A 2 (Group) x 2 (Time) mixed factorial ANOVA was used to analyze impacts of classroom instruction students received from their social studies teacher on applying historical thinking skills when learning about history. The two levels for the group factor were treatment and control subjects; the two levels of the repeated measure were pre-test and post-test. Marginal means and standard deviations appear in Table 29. The results of this study indicated there was a significant group x time interaction, \( F(1, 274) = 5.78, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.021 \). The ANOVA summary is displayed in Table 30.
Table 29

*Marginal Means and Standard Deviations for YATSS Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30

2 x 2 ANOVA Summary for YATSS Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>6471.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6471.59</td>
<td>11099.45</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>159.76</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Time Interaction</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>38.02</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6671.92</td>
<td>552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Marginal means have been plotted and the interaction effect is displayed in Figure 1. To further explain the significant findings in the mixed factorial ANOVA, two separate repeated measures ANOVA analyses were conducted. For the treatment group a significant mean difference was found between the pre- and post-administrations of the YATSS survey, $F(1, 202) = 36.36, p < .05$. There was no difference found between the pre- and post-administration means for the control group, $F(1, 72) = 0.35, p < .05$. Means for each group appear in Table 31. Based on the results of the mixed method ANOVAs for the YATSS survey, the null hypothesis can be rejected for Research Question 6.
Figure 1

*Interaction Graph of Estimated Marginal Means for YATSS Survey*
Table 31

*Means and Standard Deviations for Treatment and Control Groups for YATSS Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre YATSS</th>
<th>Post YATSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (n=203)</td>
<td>3.76 (0.59)</td>
<td>3.98 (0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n=73)</td>
<td>3.86 (0.55)</td>
<td>3.90 (0.64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

A group of 50 teachers began a program of studies to earn a Masters of Historical Studies degree. In addition to the content of American history that was taught to the teachers, the application and pedagogy of historical thinking skills was embedded into the program of studies for the teachers. Forty-eight teachers completed the program and participated in this study. The purpose of this research was to determine the effects of the professional development received by K-12 teachers on infusing historical thinking skills into their history instruction. Changes in teacher use and application as well as the impacts on a subset of their students, both academically and efficaciously, were examined.

*Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment.* Results from the Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment (HTSCA) revealed statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) in the mean scores for the 31 K-12 grade teachers who took the pre-, mid-, and post-HTSCA. Between the pre- and post-test administrations, teachers in this study completed approximately 21 credit hours of coursework. The courses in which the teachers participated included content on American history, instruction in and guided practice with historical thinking skills, and development and implementation of classroom lessons that had their students applying the skills of historical thinking. Teachers indicated, through the HTSCA, that over the period of this study they improved their knowledge of historical thinking skills, increased the amount of time they spent teaching historical thinking skills, and increased the percent of time their students
correctly used historical thinking skills in the classroom. The historical thinking skills measured on the HTSCA are (a) multiple perspectives, (b) sourcing, (c) contextualization, (d) close reading, and (e) corroboration. Results of this study were significant for all historical thinking skills measured.

_Historical Assessments of Thinking Skills._ The Historical Assessments of Thinking (HATs) were used to measure teachers’ ability to apply historical thinking skills over the course of their program of studies. Thirty-five (n=35) participating teachers completed the pre-, mid-, and post-administration of the HATs. Each set of HATs administered contained a question on sourcing, corroboration, and contextualization. Linking studies have not been conducted by the authors of the assessments (SHEG, 2012), however the structure and format of the assessments are repetitive by skill, meaning the same questions are asked of the test-taker, but the historical content differs.

Results of repeated-measure ANOVAs on the three administrations of the HATs generally showed statistically significant mean differences between the pre- and post-scores of the HATs for participating teachers. However, a pairwise comparison revealed that for the contextualization HAT, there were no significant differences between the pre- and post-administration for participating teachers. This result could be due to the historical content within which the skill was embedded. If the teacher lacked background knowledge on the topic (e.g. Japanese Internment Act on the “Internment” HAT), the teacher’s response would lack historical relevance and his answer would not be scored high, or could be incorrect altogether. For the contextualization HATs especially, knowledge of the historical content addressed in the assessment could confound the test taker’s ability to correctly answer the question. The mid-assessment covered the Chinese
Immigration Act, a historical event that is not as well known to teachers as the Civil Rights Movement (pre-assessment) and the Women’s Rights Movement (post-assessment).

A control group of teachers (n=18) also took the mid-administration of HATs. Differences between mean scores for the treatment and control groups on this administration were statistically significant ($p \leq .05$) for the sourcing assessment. There were not statistically significant differences in scores between the treatment and control groups on the contextualization and corroboration assessments. At the time of the mid-administration of HATs, teachers in the treatment group had completed 6-9 credit hours in their program of studies. The control group was comprised of eighth grade teachers who teach social studies. Based on the HAT scores at the mid-administration point, teachers in the treatment group outperformed the control group teachers on the sourcing assessment only. Had it been available, post-assessment data could have provided more evidence on the impact of the professional development on teachers’ ability to apply historical thinking skills.

*Your Attitudes Towards Social Studies Survey.* Eighth grade students comprised the student sample participating in this study. These students were selected for two central reasons: (a) eighth grade curriculum in the school district focuses solely on American history and (b) there was a concentration of eighth grade teachers in the Masters of Historical Studies program (n=7). Two hundred seventy-six (n=276) students completed both the pre- and post-administrations of the Your Attitudes Towards Social Studies survey. Results of a mixed-method ANOVA revealed a significant interaction effect. Students in the treatment group showed greater gains in self-efficacy over the
course of a semester of social studies instruction applying historical thinking skills than did students in the control group. Students in the control group received a more traditional method of learning history that did not include the use and application of historical thinking skills.

Historical thinking skills assessments were developed for eighth grade American history courses. The assessments attempt to measure a student’s ability to apply historical thinking skills within the context of American history. As part of the American history curriculum, eighth grade teachers administer these assessments at the conclusion of each unit of study. A plan was developed to collect student scores from these assessments for this study, however an insufficient number of assessments were submitted to this researcher for analysis and the results were not included in this study.

**Implications of Study**

Nationally, state history standards are moving more and more toward infusion of historical thinking skills in addition to content (Martin, 2011). Teachers who have not had professional development in specific pedagogical skills, such as application of historical thinking skills, are more likely to teach the way they were taught, even when presented with compelling evidence that a specific pedagogy would benefit their students (Starko & Schack, 1989). Added to that, when the stakes become high for teachers to improve student achievement, teachers are more likely to fall back to the textbook and lecture methods of teaching rather than a more constructivist approach to student learning (Barton & Levstik, 2010).

A method of professional development was designed that would provide teachers the necessary content knowledge of American history and support classroom pedagogy to
infuse historical thinking skills while learning the content. This method was modeled to teachers by providing them with opportunities to practice applying historical thinking skills as they learned American history content. Through an accredited Masters of Historical Studies degree program, teachers participated in over 100 contact hours of professional development. The purpose of this research was to determine the effects of the training received by K-12 teachers on infusing historical thinking skills into their own learning as well as into their history instruction. Changes in teacher use and application as well as the impacts on students, were examined.

The Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment (HTSCA) measured changes over time in teachers’ beliefs in their level of knowledge of the skills, the amount of time they taught using the skills, and the amount of time their students correctly used the skills. Items were clustered for analysis by historical thinking skill. All item clusters on the HTSCA revealed significant differences for teachers on the measured indicators between the pre-, mid-, and post-administrations. All three constructs (knowing, teaching, expectation for students) are important for changes in teaching to occur. Applying historical thinking skills to learning history is not something most teachers are taught how to do during in-service professional development training. For elementary teachers especially, these skills were likely missing in their undergraduate training as well. It was important for this school district to provide professional development opportunities that would support history teachers in the transition from textbook teaching to using primary source documents designed to engage students in critical analysis and discussion. For this to occur, teachers needed the historical content and confidence in teaching through the application of historical thinking skills. It was hypothesized that changes in teacher
practice would not occur through a traditional professional development workshop, but rather could occur through direct instruction of historical thinking skills with modeling, guided practice, professional and peer feedback, and classroom application with students. According to findings from the HTSCA, the provided professional development offered through the Masters of Historical Studies Program seems to be changing teachers’ classroom practices as evidenced by the impact on student efficacy in the social studies classroom.

In order to track teachers’ ability to apply the historical thinking skills as they learned historical content, Historical Assessments of Thinking (HATs) were administered to teachers. These HATs measured skills of sourcing, contextualization, and corroboration. The assessments were administered to teachers three times throughout their program of studies. Teachers’ scores improved significantly between the pre-, mid-, and post-administrations. As teachers developed their levels of competence in historical knowledge and thinking skills, they were better able to apply the skills over time. Being able to apply the skills to their own learning of history facilitates the likelihood that teachers will transfer the skills to their students.

**Self-Efficacy**

Bandura (1986) found that students with high self-efficacy are more likely to attempt new tasks and work harder and persist longer when faced with difficulties. Cognitive research over the past 40 or more years tells us that if students have been successful at a particular skill in the past they probably will believe they will be successful at that task in the future (Bandura, 1993).
VanSledright (2010) and Wineburg and Martin (2004) believe that by moving away from the textbook reading and rote memorization of facts, dates, and people to exploration of primary documents that encourage students to analyze the text, engage in debate with peers, and draw defensible conclusions, student interest and engagement in studying history will increase. The findings of the present study show that students of teachers who participated in the professional development program experienced increased self-efficacy in the social studies classroom.

Limitations of Study

One limitation to the study was the difficulty of maintaining a control group throughout. Teachers in the control group tended to be reluctant to participate in the data gathering on their own time, so the participation of the teacher control group provided little comparative data, contributing no meaningful findings to the study. Additionally, teacher and student participants in this study were not randomly selected for participation, nor randomly assigned to treatment or control groups. Caution, therefore, should be used when generalizing the results of this study to other teacher and student groups. Future studies that track teacher knowledge and competence through intense professional development opportunities should be conducted, as well as evaluating the impacts on students.

A second limitation to this study is that the Historical Thinking Skills Competence Assessment (HTSCA) is a new instrument and, as noted in the findings, needs modification to its definition of the close reading skill. However, administration of the instrument in this study generally showed high reliability of the instrument. Additional administrations of the instrument with different groups of teachers will
provide additional reliability information and potentially support confident interpretation of the results.

A third limitation to this study is with the Historical Assessments of Thinking (HATs). The HATs are instruments developed for high school students, and were used in this study with teachers who were learning how to apply the historical thinking skills in their graduate degree program of studies. No equating studies were conducted by the authors of the assessments to ensure the different forms of the instruments measure the same constructs across time. Thus, there is the potential that different constructs are being measured than were intended. As indicated in the findings, pairwise comparisons between the pre- and post-administration of the contextualization assessments were not significantly different, however comparisons of means between the pre- and mid-administration of the contextualization assessments were significantly different. This indicates there may be some other construct, likely history content, that is confounding the historical thinking skill construct of contextualization being measured.

A fourth limitation of the study is the lack of student assessment data available for analysis. Assessment scores could have provided information about the impact of the teachers’ professional development on student application of historical thinking skills and history content achievement.

**Future Research**

Future research tied closely to this study could include tracking teachers’ use of historical thinking skills in their classrooms after they graduate from the historical studies program. Such data could provide information about the degree to which the intervention resulted in long-term changes to teaching practices. Impacts on student achievement in
social studies and other subjects, such as reading and writing, could prove informative. Additionally, measuring the impact of infusing historical thinking skills instruction in classrooms on students as consumers of information would be a positive next step.

As national, state, and local history standards move away from focusing on memorization of content to infusion of critical thinking skills, more research is needed on how that shift manifests in pedagogical changes and ultimately how student learning and efficacy are impacted. Questions that address the quality and quantity of professional development for teachers necessary to elicit systematic and permanent changes in pedagogical practice should be addressed.

A final suggestion for future research is for a qualitative or mixed-methods intervention study that would examine the results of an intense professional development program for teachers and their students such as the one presented in this study. This study should include focus group interviews, examinations of products developed in the professional development program by teachers as well as student products created in classrooms of participating teachers.

**Conclusions**

Despite the identified limitations, this study provides important information on a professional development model for teachers to infuse historical thinking skills in the social studies classroom. The usefulness of this information is strengthened by the increased emphasis of historical thinking skills additions to national and local curricula. The findings in this study indicate that teachers’ confidence in knowing and teaching the skills increased over the course of the program of studies, and teachers’ ability to apply the skills to their own learning of history also increased throughout the program. These
are encouraging findings when considering large-scale, permanent change in instructional pedagogy. Findings also indicate that students’ beliefs in themselves as learners in the social studies classroom changed over the course of this study. Data indicate this may be a result of their teacher’s participation in the Masters of Historical Studies program.

It is important that education leaders do more than mandate a change in curriculum and expect teachers to teach in a different way. Despite evidence that a certain teaching method works best for students, teachers will increase their confidence and likelihood in teaching in a new and different way if they are provided with the appropriate content and background knowledge as well as modeling, guided practice, and helpful feedback to change pedagogical practice effectively and permanently. In turn, the students of these teachers will benefit from instruction that encourages them to explore, analyze, and discuss information, whether historical or current, through a critical lens and further apply that critical thinking to make informed decisions.
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The Great Plains bore witness to dramatic shifts in power during the nineteenth century and played a central role in the emergence of modern America. The rapid expansion of the United States in the decades following independence and the earlier arrival of horses, guns and the European fur trade helped transform the Great Plains into a world of refugees competing for resources and adapting to new realities. In an era characterized by increasingly deadly warfare and rapid societal change, Indian peoples sought to maintain autonomy within an increasingly complex economic system. Some groups, like the Lakota, thrived while others fell victim to aggression or were decimated by periodic waves of disease. The encroachment of migrants and soldiers from the United States in the latter nineteenth century added another variable to an already dynamic situation. The subsequent establishment of the United States’ political control in the region, which forced most Indian groups onto reservations, was not the last power shift but rather the beginning of a new era of colonialism.

Course Objectives

1. Model effective content-based, pedagogical, and methodological approaches to teaching the history of the Great Plains through excellent presentations, discussions, “learning with place” experiences and small group activities that participants can translate directly into school curricula. Focus will be on habits of historical thinking and cultural proficiency.

2. Provide a graduate-level examination of key themes and developments in Great Plains history that promotes both a factual understanding of important events, figures and trends as well as the analytical tools to recognize, analyze and contextualize the recurrent myths that hamper our ability to understand the peoples of the Plains as fully realized historical actors.

3. Familiarize teacher-participants with resources, recent scholarly literature and first-hand experiences that will allow them to most effectively integrate Great Plains history into their classroom.

4. Enable teacher-participants to better draw connections between the past and issues continuing to shape the Great Plains region.

Course Themes  To understand the story of shifting power, we will focus on four broad themes:

1. The role of human migrations in shaping the context and course of power shifts on the plains.

2. Environmental and ecological change as factors both driving and driven by the actions of human inhabitants of the plains.

3. The connectedness of the plains to emerging national, continental and global economies since at least the time of Lewis and Clark.
4. Adaptation and persistence among native inhabitants of the plains amidst changes brought about by U.S. colonialism.

**Required Texts**


**Grading**

Pre-Trip Assignment 10% Attendance/Participation 10% Course Project 80%
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SYLLABUS: HISTORY 501 & 502 FUNDAMENTALS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

TO 1877

History 501
Fundamentals of American History to 1877

Course Rationale
This course serves several purposes. While it is foremost an introduction to the field of American History to 1877, it serves also as a bridge between the goals, methods and expectations of undergraduate and graduate education. The primary focus of the course is content. Through the use of recent scholarship as well as primary sources and other resources, we will explore the ways scholars of American History continue to understand the American past and the burden of our nationhood. In the process we will remain mindful that each of us shares another burden, the responsibility of teaching others about our collective past, and we will endeavor to improve our ability to meet that task in a manner that is accurate, rigorous and meaningful. We also will address those challenges by developing a set of skills we consider important if we are to teach students to think like historians.

Required Texts (in the order we will read them)
Alan Taylor, American Colonies (2001).
Frederick Douglass, Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass (1845).

Course Structure and Objectives
This course will meet once per week in the evening. Our meetings will not conform to any one format, with most sessions involving a mixture of activities, including informal lectures, book discussions, and small and large group activities. By the conclusion of the semester participants will:

• Recognize the major issues, developments and events from this era that continue to shape American life and the persistent conversations that surround them.
• Be able to analyze important historical documents from this era within the context of the time of the creation and for their continued legacy.
• Become familiar with relevant available resources for taking scholarship and primary documents into the classroom.
• Create resources that can enhance classroom instruction and teach students to think like historians.
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Course Requirements
1. Have with you (in either virtual or hard copy form) the “weekly course guide” that will be sent to you via e-mail before 2PM each day the course meets.
2. Attend class and actively participate in all discussions and activities to the best of your ability. This course will succeed only if each participant is responsible for his or her own learning.
3. During most weeks (see “course schedule”) write a response to the assigned reading. These assignments will take various forms (see Appendix A) to fit our objectives for each particular week. The assignments will be submitted by e-mail by 2PM on the day of each applicable course meeting.
4. Write document analyses for the weeks that we read assigned documents in The Cherokee Removal (see Appendix B).
5. Write an analysis of Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass utilizing the document analysis skills we will develop throughout the semester (see Appendix C).
6. With a group of colleagues, develop a teaching module designed to develop skills of historical thinking amongst students at your grade level (see Appendix D).
7. Present your teaching module to your colleagues.

Grading
Grades for this course will be determined based on the following components and their respective weight:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance/Participation</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Responses</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee Removal Responses</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Douglass Response</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Project</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Presentation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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History 502
Fundamentals of American History since 1877

Course Rationale
This course serves several purposes. While it is foremost an introduction to the field of American History since 1877, it serves also as a bridge between the goals, methods and expectations of undergraduate and graduate education. The primary focus of the course is content. Through the use of recent scholarship as well as primary sources and other resources, we will explore the ways scholars of American history continue to understand the American past and the burden of our nationhood. In the process we will remain mindful that each of us shares another burden, the responsibility of teaching others about our collective past, and we will endeavor to improve our ability to meet that task in a manner that is accurate, rigorous and meaningful. We also will address those challenges by continuing to develop a set of skills we consider important if we are to teach students to think like historians.

Required Texts (in the order we will read them)
Anne Moody, Coming of Age in Mississippi (any edition will do)
Timothy Tyson, Blood Done Sign My Name: A True Story (2005)
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Course Structure and Objectives
This course will meet once per week in the evening. Our meetings will not conform to any one format, with most sessions involving a mixture of activities, including informal lectures, book discussions, and small and large group activities. By the conclusion of the semester participants will:

- Recognize the major issues, developments and events from this era that continue to shape American life and the persistent conversations that surround them.
- Analyze important historical documents from this era within the context of the time of the creation and for their continued legacy.
- Determine appropriate historical thinking skills for the appropriate student population and
- Create resources that can enhance classroom instruction and teach students to think like historians.
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Course Requirements
1. Have with you (in either virtual or hard copy form) the weekly course guide that will be sent to you via e-mail before each class meeting.
2. Attend class and actively participate in all discussions and activities to the best of your ability. This course will succeed only if each participant is responsible for his or her own learning.
3. During most weeks (see “course schedule”) write a response to the assigned reading. These assignments will take various forms (see Appendix A) to fit our objectives for each particular week. The assignments will be submitted by upload to blackboard by 2PM on the day of each applicable course meeting. There are two weeks in which the response is a larger assignment. They are February 20 and April 2.
4. With a group of colleagues, develop a teaching module designed to develop skills of historical thinking amongst students at your grade level (see Appendix C).
5. Present your teaching module to your colleagues.

Grading
Grades for this course will be determined based on the following components and their respective weight:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance/Participation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Note-taker</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Responses</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter/Gatherer Assignment</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rauchway Assignment</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Moody Response</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mission Statement”</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Project</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Presentation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Rationale
This course applies the skills of “Thinking Like a Historian” to K-12 classroom curricula. In a workshop-style setting, participants will act as co-researchers with faculty and staff from Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln Public Schools, Nebraska Educational Service Unit 18 and the Stanford History Education Group. Together we will explore current research regarding Historical Thinking and create materials applying this to curricula at each grade level. The result will be completed teaching materials usable throughout the schools and school districts represented.

Required Texts
Much of the research base for this course is found on-line and will be presented in class. However, participants will read:

Sam Wineburg, Daisy Martin and Chauncey Monte-Sano, Reading Like a Historian: Teaching Literacy in Middle and High School History Classrooms (2011).

Course Structure and Objectives
This course will meet from 8AM-4PM during the week of June 4-8, 2012. Group work will be completed subsequently and submitted by July 15, 2012. By the conclusion of the course, participants will demonstrate the ability to:

- Identify and define the separate skills of historical thinking for the appropriate grade level.
- Apply each separate skill to a primary document.
- Create original materials for the classroom teaching students how to think like a historian, as defined by the particular proficiency chart for that grade level.
- Create formative assessments to measure student understanding of each skill.

Course Requirements
1. Attend all class sessions. Participate in all course activities.
2. With a group of colleagues at the same grade level, create a publishable-quality set of classroom materials to be disseminated throughout your school or school district.
3. Work cohesively and equally within a team in meeting the first two requirements.

Grading
Attendance/Participation: 10%
Group Work Grade: 15%
Group Project: 60%
“Flipped” Grading Assignment 15%
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SYLLABI: CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT AND MAKING OF THE AMERICAN WEST

Civil Rights Movement Course Rationale
Welcome! This course examines what has been termed the Civil Rights Movement. The struggle for equality among African Americans and others for the full rights, privileges, legal protections and responsibilities of citizenship played a decisive role in shaping twentieth century America. We will therefore interrogate our topic broadly. While the African American experience is central to our interests, this is not a course in African American History. Instead our focus will be the issue of Civil Rights and its role in shaping American ideas about nation, citizenship, individual versus group rights, the role of government and a host of other factors.

Required Texts

Course Structure and Objectives
This course will meet once per week in the evening. Our meetings will not conform to any one format, but will attempt to model the “Thinking Like a Historian” method. By the conclusion of the semester participants will:
* Provide an answer to the framing question for each course meeting drawing upon evidence from course readings, lectures and other materials.
* Identify major historical issues and controversies in our understanding of the Civil Rights Movement, as evidenced through the course themes we develop throughout the semester.
* Create curricular tools to involve K-12 students in interpreting and understanding the Civil Rights Movement.
* Demonstrate the ability to “Think like Historians” in both understanding the subject matter and teaching others about it.

Course Requirements
1. Near the end of each course meeting, each participant will write a summative assessment response to the framing question for that evening and send it to the instructor via e-mail. Two or three of the most interesting responses will be added to the running notes on blackboard each week.
2. Also near the end of each course meeting, each participant will write an initial response to the framing question for the coming week. This may be sent to the instructor in the same e-mail message as #1.
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3. Each week the members of the seminar will agree upon a written response to the reading for the coming week. These will be graded assignments.

4. The members of the seminar will endeavor to create a “Teaching the Civil Rights Movement with Historical Thinking” website to be launched at the conclusion of the semester. Working alone or with a partner, participants will select a project to be added to this website.

5. For our October 25 meeting, participants will write a one page response corroborating what Douglas Blackmon tells us with the authors we have read during the semester.

Grading
Grades for this course will be determined based on the following components and their respective weight:

- Attendance/Participation 15%
- Weekly Reading Responses 30%
- Weekly Assessment Responses 15%
- Blackmon Paper 5%
- Course Project 35%

Making of the American West Course Rationale
This course examines the Trans-Mississippi American West and how it became something we consider a distinct place. This is a big topic. To make it manageable, we will use the year of 1862 as a touchstone. That year saw major federal initiatives to shape the region, including the Homestead Act, Pacific Railroad Act, Morrill Land Grant Act and the creation of the United States Department of Agriculture. We will examine ideas and contests over what the expanding nation’s west would become, what it actually became and how the stories we associate with it shape American national identity.

Required Texts
Course Readings are posted to blackboard.

Course Structure and Objectives
This course will meet from 8AM-4PM during the week of July 16-20, 2012. By the conclusion of the course, participants will be able to answer the following questions using evidence from primary and secondary sources:

1. What ideological visions animated the creation of an American West?
2. How did diversity and conflict shape the American West?
3. How did national and global economic factors shape the American West?
4. How does the popular image of the American West inform American national identity?

Course Requirements
1. Attend all class sessions. Participate in all course activities.
2. Complete the pre-course assignments to the level outlined in the assignment.
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Complete the post-course project at a publishable quality that can be shared with colleagues in your school or district.

**Grading**
- Attendance/Participation: 15%
- Pre-Class Assignments: 25%
- Course Project: 60%
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American Voices Course Rationale
This course explores the ways we use primary accounts to make claims of historical truth. Together we will read a variety of documents – some considered foundational to the formation of an American national identity – and interrogate the limits and possibilities they hold for teaching American history. We will intend to develop both our own understanding of how to interpret documents and our ability to help students do the same.

Required Reading

Documents and other materials posted to blackboard

Course Structure and Objectives
We will endeavor to make this course a true seminar, with each member teaching and learning from the others. We will:

1. Develop distinct strategies for reading primary documents and using secondary sources to deepen our understanding of them.
2. Trace important themes (or threads) in American history as a means of enabling us to make comparisons between separate primary documents, to use primary documents to criticize secondary sources, and to question whether the themes themselves have explanatory power that warrants their continued use.
3. Develop primary-document based teaching tools that can be shared.
4. Implement primary document based lessons in our classrooms.

Course Requirements
1. Attend class and actively participate in all discussions and activities to the best of your ability. This course will succeed only if each participant is responsible for her or his own learning.
2. Complete “skill-building” assignments during the first three weeks of the course.
3. Participate in small group development and presentation of a primary document based lesson three times during the semester.
4. Create your piece of the “picturing America scrapbook.”
5. Participate in the creation and criticism of our “best practices” documents.
6. Create a primary document based mini-unit from the template we develop.

Grading
- Attendance/Participation 15%
- Skill building mini-assignments 15%
- Group teaching sessions 10%, 15% and 20%, respectively
- Picturing America assignment 10%
- Best Practices documents 5%
- Mini-Unit Project 10%
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Capstone Experience Course Rationale
This course is the culmination of the Master of Arts in Historical Studies degree at Nebraska Wesleyan University. Teachers will rely on knowledge, skills and resources gained from their coursework to demonstrate the ability to utilize relevant secondary literature and primary sources to enhance instruction in history and improve student achievement. Specifically, we will focus on the creation of original curricular materials involving students in actively engaging historical materials and developing skills of interpretation.

Course Objectives
Participants will demonstrate the ability to use secondary scholarship and primary resources to teach history with accuracy and depth of interpretation appropriate to the grade level being instructed. Emphasis will be given to teaching the skills of historical thinking.

Course Requirements
Participants will create an original classroom module of publishable quality. This module will apply the habits of historical thinking to classroom curricula. To be accepted, the module must demonstrate:

1. The capacity to combine scholarly understandings of the material with classroom resources, be they primary documents or other materials, in a manner that can be expected to engage students.
2. A clear expectation that students will develop further habits of historical thinking as part of mastering the material.

Each module will include a full set of materials necessary to teach the material in question. Models of these lessons can be found on the LPS social studies website.

All projects will include:
1. A lesson procedure
2. A full set of documents and other materials used in the lesson
3. A full set of graphic organizers, worksheets and assessment materials used in the lesson.
4. An explanation of the historical background of the project and an annotated bibliography indicating the major books, websites or other resources used to complete the project.

Grading
The grading breakdown for this course is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Proposal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Materials Submitted on Time</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper Submission Format</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Project</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD LETTER OF APPROVAL

July 19, 2012

Teresa Eckhout
Department of Educational Psychology
2042 Peppar Ave Lincoln, NE 68502

Charles Anseorge
Department of Educational Psychology
202 MABL, UNL, 68588-0345

IRB Number: 20120712053EP
Project ID: 12053
Project Title: Critical Thinking Skills in the History Classroom: Impacts on teachers and students

Dear Teresa:

This letter is to officially notify you of the approval of your project by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects. It is the Board's opinion that you have provided adequate safeguards for the rights and welfare of the participants in this study based on the information provided. Your proposal is in compliance with this institution's Federal Wide Assurance 00002258 and the DHHS Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46). Your project was approved as an Exempted protocol, category 5 & 7.

https://isgrant.unl.edu/mgrantview/viewFileMessage.php?ID=150255
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You are authorised to implement this study as of the Date of Final Approval: 07/19/2012. This approval is Valid Until: 07/18/2013.

We wish to remind you that the principal investigator is responsible for reporting to this Board any of the following events within 48 hours of the event:

* Any serious event (including on-site and off-site adverse events, injuries, site effects, deaths, or other problems) which in the opinion of the local investigator was unanticipated, involved risk to subjects or others, and was possibly related to the research procedures;

* Any serious accidental or unintentional change to the IRB-approved protocol that involves risk or has the potential to recur;

* Any publication in the literature, safety monitoring report, interim result or other finding that indicates an unexpected change to the risk/benefit ratio of the research;

* Any breach in confidentiality or compromise in data privacy related to the subject or others; or

* Any complaint of a subject that indicates an unanticipated risk or that cannot be resolved by the research staff.

For projects which continue beyond one year from the starting date, the IRB will request continuing review and update of the research project. Your study will be due for continuing review as indicated above. The investigator must also advise the Board when this study is finished or discontinued by completing the enclosed Protocol Final Report form and returning it to the Institutional Review Board.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB office at 472-6965.

Sincerely,
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD LETTER OF APPROVAL

Julia Torquati, Ph.D.
Chair for the IRB
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TEACHER INFORMED CONSENT FORM

INFORMED CONSENT FORM: TEACHER

Acquiring and Applying Skills of Thinking Like A Historian: The Impacts on Teachers and Students

This is a research project that will document Lincoln Public School teachers' increased knowledge and application of skills of thinking like a historian in the social studies classroom. You are invited to participate in this study because you are a teacher in the Lincoln Public Schools District and a participant in the Teaching American History Grant program.

Participation in this study may not require any additional time on your part. Data collected from your participation in Fundamentals of U.S. History I and II during the 2011-12 school year will be used in this study. You were asked to complete an evaluation of your current teaching practices at the beginning of the 2011-12 school year and again at the end of semester 1. You were asked to participate in an assessment on the application of thinking like a historian skills, which was administered three times during the school year: once at the beginning of the year, mid-way through the year, and at the end of Historical Thinking Skills summer institute.

If you are a teacher of 8th grade social studies, you may be asked to allow for data collection from your students during the fall semester of the 2012-13 school year. These data would include a short survey (pre and post) and collection of historical thinking skills assessments (pre and post).

There are many benefits to participating in this study. Some of the benefits may be increased student self-efficacy and student achievement. Another benefit would be that teachers become more aware of their instructional practices. We will also be making recommendations about future staff development opportunities regarding the instruction of thinking like a historian skills and curriculum and classroom assessment development.

There are no known risks associated with this research. You will be asked to examine your current teaching practices, which may be uncomfortable to you. We will do whatever we can to ensure your privacy and be respectful of your self-examination. Any information obtained during this study that could identify you will be kept strictly confidential. The data will be stored in a locked cabinet in the investigator's office and will only be seen by the investigator during the study. The data will be kept for three years after the study is complete. The information obtained in this study may be published in scientific journals or presented at scientific meetings, but the data will be reported as aggregated data. If direct quotations are used, they will not be attributed to specific individuals.

There is no compensation for participating in this research.

114 Teacher College Rd / P.O. Box 5444 / Lincoln, NE 68505-0444
402-477-1591 / Fax 402-477-6910
TEACHER INFORMED CONSENT FORM

You may ask any questions concerning this research and have those questions answered before agreeing to participate or during the data gathering. Or, you may call the investigators at the numbers listed below. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigators, you may contact the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at (402) 472-6929 or irb@unl.edu or the Nebraska Wesleyan University College Research Review Board at (402) 465-2488 or newebhr@nebrwesleyan.edu. This protocol has been reviewed and approved by the Nebraska Wesleyan – University College Research Review Board (reference # HS TW 01 0612 A).

You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators. University of Nebraska, Nebraska Wesleyan University, or the Lincoln Public Schools District. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you choose to quit the study, you can continue to participate in the Teaching American History Grant coursework without participating in the study.

You are voluntarily making the decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Your signature certifies you have decided to participate, having read and understood the information presented. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

_________________________________________  ______________
Signature of Research Participant  Date

Name of Research Participant

Names and contact information of investigators:
Teresa Waner Eckhout, M.A. Principal Investigator
Office: (402) 436-1791 Email: teckhout1@ps.org

Charles Anseorge, Ph.D. Secondary Investigator
Office: (402) 472-1702 Email: camorge@aml.edu
Appendix H

STUDENT INFORMED ASSENT FORM

Acquiring and Applying Skills of Thinking Like A Historian:
The Impacts on Teachers and Students

Purpose of Research. Your teacher is taking a class at Nebraska Wesleyan University this school year. The class is studying skills on how to think like historians think. We hope that one result if this class is that students’ history learning will improve. We want to know this in order to help schools and teachers do a good job of helping students learn.

Procedures. We are asking for you to volunteer to take part in this study. We will ask you to answer 10 questions about what you think of yourself in school. You will answer the questions at the beginning of the semester and again at the end of the semester. The questions should take you about 10-15 minutes to answer. You are answering the questions twice so we can see if your feelings have changed over the semester. Your name will not be on the questions you answer.

As part of regular instruction, your teacher administers tests of what you’re learning in social studies. We would like to look at these tests after your teacher scores them. We will not share any information with your teacher and we will not have any impact on your grade. We only want to see if your knowledge and skills have changed over the semester.

Risks or Discomforts. There are no known risks or discomforts for you as a participant in this study. No student names will be used. Your answers will be combined with the other students’ answers. All of the answers will be discussed as a group of students.

Benefits. There are many benefits from this study. One benefit is that students may feel more confident about how they are doing in school. Another is that
students may learn more about history. We would like to share that information with other teachers and administrators so we can help schools do the best they can to support students.

Confidentiality. Your name will not be used on any of the information. Your teachers will not see your answer sheets, but we may tell the teachers how their classes feel. No names will be used. All the answer sheets will be kept in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s office. No one other than the researcher will have access to this information. We will destroy all the student answer sheets at the end of the study.

Opportunity to Ask Questions. You can ask any questions about the study and have those questions answered before agreeing to participate. Please call Teresa Wasner Eckhout at (402) 436-1791 or email at teckhout@ps.org if you have any questions about the study. If you have questions about your right as a research participant, please call the University of Nebras-ka-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at (402) 472-6929 or email at irb@unl.edu.

Freedom to Quit the Study. You are free to decide not to participate in this study any time without hurting your relationship with the researcher. University of Nebraska, Nebraska Wesleyan University, or the Lincoln Public Schools. If you choose not to be a part of the study, your teacher, the school, and the researcher will support your decision and it will not affect your grade in any way.

Right to Receive a Copy of This Form. You will be given a copy of this form to keep.

I volunteer to be in this study.

Signature of Participant ___________________________ Date ___________

Printed Name of Participant ___________________________
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PARENT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

PARENTAL NOTIFICATION FORM

Acquiring and Applying Skills of Thinking Like A Historian:
The Impacts on Teachers and Students

Purpose of Research. Your child’s teacher is taking a graduate class this school year. The class is studying skills on how to think like historians think. We hope that one result if this class is that students’ history learning will improve. We also want to know if this learning improves student confidence in social studies. We want to know this in order to help schools and teachers do a good job of helping students learn.

Procedures. We are informing you of this study and what your child will be asked to do as a participant. The research will look at students’ self-confidence as learners and their change in learning over the course of the fall semester. Your child will be asked to complete a short questionnaire regarding his/her perceptions of themselves in school. The questionnaire will be given to your child at the beginning of the semester and again at the end of the semester in their social studies classroom and will take 10-15 minutes of class time to complete. Assessments already being administered in the classroom will be shared with the researcher. This will not impact your child’s grade in anyway.

Data from this study will be reported as group data only. Individual results will not be shared. The results of this study may be published in scholarly journals or reported at professional conferences.

Risks or Discomforts. There are no known risks or discomforts to your child. We will make sure no student names are used so that individual students cannot be identified.

Benefits. There are many potential benefits from this research study. One benefit is that students may feel more confident about how they are doing in school. Another is that students may learn more about history. If we are able to find that student confidence and knowledge about history does increase, we would like to share that information with other teachers and administrators so we can help schools do the best they can to support students.
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PARENT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

You may ask any questions concerning this research and have those questions answered before agreeing to participate or during the data gathering. Or, you may call the investigators at the numbers listed below. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigators, you may contact the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at (402) 472-6929 or irb@unl.edu or the Nebraska Wesleyan University College Research Review Board at (402) 465-2488 or nwehrbein@nebrwesleyan.edu. This protocol has been reviewed and approved by the Nebraska Wesleyan – University College Research Review Board (reference # HS TW 01 0612 A).

You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators, University of Nebraska, Nebraska Wesleyan University, or the Lincoln Public Schools District. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you choose to quit the study, you can continue to participate in the Teaching American History Grant coursework without participating in the study.

You are voluntarily making the decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Your signature certifies you have decided to participate, having read and understood the information presented. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

__________________________________________________________________________  ________________
Signature of Research Participant                                               Date

______________________________
Printed Name of Research Participant

Names and contact information of investigators:
Teresa Wanser Eckhout, M.A. Principal Investigator
Office: (402) 436-1791 Email: tcekhou@lps.org
Charles Ansorge, Ph.D. Secondary Investigator
Office: (402) 472-1702 Email: cansorge@unl.edu
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HISTORICAL THINKING SKILLS COMPETENCE ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H-TEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One goal of this class is to learn how to teach the skills necessary to read like a historian.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Using **Multiple Perspectives** when teaching social studies includes teaching from more than one point of view when reading about an issue. Teachers ask, “Whose voice is left out?” and “What might someone who disagrees with this author say about this issue?” Where would you put yourself on a continuum measuring your knowledge of **Multiple Perspectives**? |
| I have never heard of using Multiple Perspectives | I have heard of Multiple Perspectives, and know a little about this skill | I have a good idea of what it means to use Multiple Perspectives | I know a lot about using Multiple Perspectives | My understanding of using Multiple Perspectives is at the mastery level |

2. Where would you put yourself on a continuum regarding how often you teach **Multiple Perspectives**? |
| I never teach how to use Multiple Perspectives | I teach using Multiple Perspectives in about 10% of my lessons | I teach using Multiple Perspectives in about 25% of my lessons | I teach using Multiple Perspectives in about 50% of my lessons | I teach using Multiple Perspectives in about 75% of my lessons | I teach using Multiple Perspectives in almost all of my lessons |

3. What percentage of your students correctly use **Multiple Perspectives** when prompted? |
| None of my students correctly use Multiple Perspectives | About 10% of my students correctly use Multiple Perspectives | About 25% of my students correctly use Multiple Perspectives | About 50% of my students correctly use Multiple Perspectives | About 75% of my students correctly use Multiple Perspectives | Almost all of my students correctly use Multiple Perspectives |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H-TEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One goal of this class is to learn how to teach the skills necessary to read like a historian.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Sourcing** is another skill necessary to read like a historian. Students using this skill ask, “Who wrote this?” and “Is this person a credible source?” Sourcing leads to learning whether the information in the document is written from a first-hand perspective or based on hearsay. Where would you put yourself on a continuum measuring your knowledge of **Sourcing**? |
| I have never heard of Sourcing | I have heard of Sourcing, and know a little about this skill | I have a good idea of what it means to Source a document | I know a lot about Sourcing | My understanding of Sourcing is at the mastery level |
### Appendix J (cont.)

**HISTORICAL THINKING SKILLS COMPETENCE ASSESSMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Where would you put yourself on a continuum regarding how often you teach Sourcing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I never teach Sourcing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Where would you put your students on a continuum of their correct use of Sourcing when prompted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None of my students Source correctly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### H-TEA

One goal of this class is to learn how to teach the skills necessary to read like a historian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Contextualization is another skill necessary to read like a historian. Those who Contextualize understand that events must be located in time and place to be properly understood. Where would you put yourself on a continuum measuring your knowledge of Contextualization?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have never heard of Contextualization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Where would you put yourself on a continuum regarding how often you teach Contextualization?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I never teach Contextualization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Where would you put your students on a continuum of their correct use of Contextualization when prompted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None of my students Contextualize correctly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### H-TEA

One goal of this class is to learn how to teach the skills necessary to read like a historian.
10. *Close Reading* is another skill necessary to read like a historian, and often helps "get at" some of the other skills. *Close Reading* includes carefully considering what a document says and thinking deeply about word choice and subtext. Those who *Close Read* notice phrases they have never seen and find out what the phrase means. *Close Readers* also ask, "What did the author leave out?" or "I wonder if that's what really happened?" Where would you put yourself on a continuum measuring your knowledge of *Close Reading*?

- [ ] I have never heard of Close Reading
- [ ] I have heard of Close Reading, and know a little about this skill
- [ ] I have a good idea of what it means to Close Read a document
- [ ] I know a lot about Close Reading
- [ ] My understanding of Close Reading is at the mastery level

11. Where would you put yourself on a continuum regarding how often you teach *Close Reading*?

- [ ] I never teach Close Reading
- [ ] I teach Close Reading in about 10% of my lessons
- [ ] I teach Close Reading in about 25% of my lessons
- [ ] I teach Close Reading in about 50% of my lessons
- [ ] I teach Close Reading in about 75% of my lessons
- [ ] I teach Close Reading in almost every lesson I teach

12. Where would you put your students on a continuum of their correct use of *Close Reading* when prompted?

- [ ] None of my students Close Read correctly
- [ ] About 10% of my students Close Read correctly
- [ ] About 25% of my students Close Read correctly
- [ ] About 50% of my students Close Read correctly
- [ ] About 75% of my students Close Read correctly
- [ ] Almost all of my students Close Read correctly

---

**H-TEA**

One goal of this class is to learn how to teach the skills necessary to read like a historian.

13. *Corroboration* is another important historical thinking habit or skill. Those who *Corroborate* seek answers to questions about important details from multiple sources. *Corroboration* implies dealing with points of agreement and disagreement among sources. Where would you put yourself on a continuum measuring your knowledge of *Corroboration*?

- [ ] I have never heard of Corroboration
- [ ] I have heard of Corroboration, and know a little about this skill
- [ ] I have a good idea of what it means to Corroborate a document
- [ ] I know a lot about Corroboration
- [ ] My understanding of Corroboration is at the mastery level

14. Where would you put yourself on a continuum regarding how often you teach *Corroboration*?

- [ ] I never teach Corroboration
- [ ] I teach Corroboration in about 10% of my lessons
- [ ] I teach Corroboration in about 25% of my lessons
- [ ] I teach Corroboration in about 50% of my lessons
- [ ] I teach Corroboration in about 75% of my lessons
- [ ] I teach Corroboration in almost every lesson I teach
Appendix J (cont.)

HISTORICAL THINKING SKILLS COMPETENCE ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Where would you put your students on a continuum of their correct use of <em>Corroboration</em> when prompted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ None of my students Corroborate correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ About 10% of my students Corroborate correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ About 25% of my students Corroborate correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ About 50% of my students Corroborate correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ About 75% of my students Corroborate correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Almost all of my students Corroborate correctly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Have you read <em>Reading Like a Historian</em> by Wineburg, Martin, &amp; Monte-Sano (2011)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ I have not read this book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ I have started reading this book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ I have read this entire book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H-TEA**

For the reasons mentioned in class, it is important that you type your name here. Your responses will never be identified by your name and will be analyzed by cohort, not individual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. Please type your name here.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H-TEA**

Thank you very much for your time in completing this survey!
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HISTORY ASSESSMENTS OF THINKING

Directions: Use the painting to answer the question below.

Title: "The First Thanksgiving 1621"
By: J.L.G. Ferris
Date Painted: 1932

Question:
The painting, "The First Thanksgiving 1621," helps historians understand the relationship between the Wampanoag Indians and the Puritan settlers in 1621.
Do you agree or disagree?

Briefly support your answer:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

CONTINUE ON BACK
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HISTORY ASSESSMENTS OF THINKING
Appendix K (cont.)

HISTORY ASSESSMENTS OF THINKING

Directions: Use the letter below to answer the questions that follow.

"Well we are trying to get a long the best we can and I tell you that is poor a rough. The troops all seem to be discouraged since the last battle at Fredericksburgh. I tell you that they had best ever take this army back to Alexandria or they will all [desert] and go home. I don't see what our government is doing."

Source: Letter from Joseph F. Green, a soldier in the Union Army, to his friend Julia Reynolds on January 2, 1863.

Question 1: Explain why a historian might think that Joseph F. Green's letter may not reflect the morale of the entire Union Army.

_________________________________________

CONTINUE ON BACK
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HISTORY ASSESSMENTS OF THINKING

Question 2: Three documents are described below. Explain whether a historian could use each document to support Joseph F. Green’s claims about the morale of the Union Army. If a historian could not use the document to support Green’s claims about morale, explain why not.

a. A speech by President Lincoln in 1863 that describes the Union soldiers as brave.

b. An 1863 document from the US government that shows many Union soldiers had recently deserted.

c. An 1861 letter from a Confederate soldier to his mother that describes how two of his friends had deserted.
Appendix K (cont.)

HISTORY ASSESSMENTS OF THINKING

Directions: The following two letters are both from the archives of the National Association for
the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and were written over twenty years apart. Read
the letters and determine which was written first. Then explain your answers using evidence
from the letters and your knowledge of history.

**Letter A: From First Lady of the United States to Walter White, Executive Secretary of the
NAACP**

Before I received your letter today I had been in to the President . . . and he said the
difficulty is that it is unconstitutional apparently for the Federal Government to step in in the
lynching situation . . . The President feels that lynching is a question of education in the
states, rallying good citizens, and creating public opinion so that the localities themselves will
wipe it out. However, if it were done by a Northerner, it will have an antagonistic effect . . . I
am deeply troubled about the whole situation as it seems to be a terrible thing to stand by and
let it continue.

**Letter B: Daisy Bates to Roy Wilkins, Executive Secretary of the NAACP, on conditions of
black children in a previously all-white school**

Conditions are yet pretty rough in the school for the children . . . The treatment of the
children had been getting steadily worse for the last two weeks in the form of kicking,
spitting, and general abuse. As a result of our visit, stronger measures are being taken against
the white students who are guilty of committing these offenses . . . [The President of the
United States] was very much concerned about the crisis . . . Last Friday, the 13th, I was asked
to call Washington and see if we could get FBI men placed in the school.

Letter _______ was likely written first because

[Blank lines for answers]

CONTINUE ON BACK
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HISTORY ASSESSMENTS OF THINKING

Letter _____ was likely written later because ____________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
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YOUR ATTITUDES TOWARD SOCIAL STUDIES SURVEY

Your Attitudes Toward Social Studies

For each item on this survey circle one of the following choices: Not at All True of Me, A Little True of Me, Somewhat True of Me, True of Me, or Very True of Me. Circle the choice that best describes your view of yourself as a student.

1. Compared with other students at school, I expect to do well.
   | Not at All | A little | Somewhat | True | Very True |
   | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me |

2. I’m certain I can understand the ideas taught to me in social studies.
   | Not at All | A little | Somewhat | True | Very True |
   | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me |

3. I expect to do very well in social studies.
   | Not at All | A little | Somewhat | True | Very True |
   | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me |

4. Compared with other students in this class, I think I’m a good student.
   | Not at All | A little | Somewhat | True | Very True |
   | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me |

5. I am sure I can do an excellent job on the problems and tasks assigned to me in social studies.
   | Not at All | A little | Somewhat | True | Very True |
   | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me |

6. I think I will receive good grades in social studies.
   | Not at All | A little | Somewhat | True | Very True |
   | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me |

7. My study skills are excellent compared with other students in this class.
   | Not at All | A little | Somewhat | True | Very True |
   | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me |

8. Compared with other students at school, I think I know a lot about social studies.
   | Not at All | A little | Somewhat | True | Very True |
   | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me |

9. I know I will be able to learn the material taught to me in social studies.
   | Not at All | A little | Somewhat | True | Very True |
   | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me | True of Me |