

Beginning Teachers Thinking Historically?
Negotiating the Context of Virginia's High-Stakes Tests

Stephanie Van Hover, David Hicks, and William Irwin

The term historical thinking has become pervasive in research and conversations about history teaching and learning. Historical thinking involves developing students' understandings about the nature of history, to introduce students to the process of historical interpretation, to shift from an emphasis on 'a story well told' (or, the story as told in the textbook), to an emphasis on 'sources well scrutinized.' [Where students] pose questions, collect and analyze sources, struggle with issues of significance, and ultimately build their own historical interpretations.¹

However, before children can engage in historical thinking teachers must presumably possess a deep understanding of historical interpretation and historical inquiry. Yet much of the literature identifies a gap between theory and practice. Moreover, research suggests that a confluence of factors mediate whether and how teachers use historical thinking in the classroom. Teachers' prior educational and life experiences, their perceptions of curriculum, students, and pedagogy, as well their beliefs about the nature of history all affect how they interpret content and implement instruction.²

Complicating matters further, increasing numbers of teachers work in states with history standards and high-stakes tests that pay little attention to authentic historical inquiry. In the Commonwealth of Virginia, beginning teachers (one to four years of experience) are developing their teaching craft within this type of high-stakes environment; these teachers know and have known no other context. Does this context affect their notions of historical thinking and, ultimately, their ability to plan and organize instruction that is designed to teach the doing of history? This article investigates this question by interviewing and observing seven beginning high school history teachers who work in the high-stakes testing environment of Virginia. Before

discussing the methods and presenting the findings, we briefly consider the literature on historical thinking, high-stakes testing, and beginning teachers.³

Historical Thinking, High-Stakes Testing, and Beginning Teachers

Much of the literature on the teaching and learning of history includes intensive and extensive attention to enduring debates over the nature of history, what history should be taught, and how teachers should teach history. Barton and Levstik suggest that calls to engage student in the doing of history as part of the process of learning the skills of the discipline “is the activity most often promoted, defended, and justified by historians and other educators.” Some consensus has emerged about the need to engage students in historical interpretation, but less agreement exists over what that should look like, what the goal of such instruction should be, or even what the nature of historical thinking is. Research clearly demonstrates that children as young as kindergarten-age are capable of engaging in historical interpretation and analysis, and there is some agreement that these are important skills for students to learn.⁴

As noted earlier, in order for students to learn these skills, their teachers must possess these understandings and must be willing to make curricular and instructional decisions that foster students' ability to engage in historical thinking and historical interpretation. This, to a certain extent, reflects the National Research Council's contention that expert history teachers are sensitive to the key issues and practices in the field. Further,

their knowledge of the discipline and beliefs about its structure interact with their teaching strategies. Rather than simply introduce students to sets of facts to be learned, these teachers help people to understand the problematic nature of historical interpretation and analysis and to appreciate the relevance of history for their everyday lives.⁵

Other work describing “best practice” in history instruction includes attention to these elements; that a skilled and knowledgeable teacher helps students pose historical questions,

collect and analyze historical sources in context, work with various forms of evidence to corroborate sources, and identify issues of significance in order to develop their own historical interpretations. Yet as VanSledright observes:

Research in classrooms where history is taught indicates that the primary concern there is with consuming and reproducing events and details found mostly in books, as though interpretive practices, be they engaged in by historians, teachers, or students, simply did not exist...The standard textbooks, combined with lectures delivered by teachers, are considered definitive. Tests measure the results. The obsession appears to be with the products of historical study, not with the practice of doing it.⁶

In Virginia, tests certainly measure results and emphasize recall of factual history content rather than promote historical inquiry. Virginia's accountability system, initially implemented in the mid-1990s, includes three main components: content standards, high-stakes testing, and revised standards of school accreditation. In terms of history teaching and learning, the Virginia History and Social Science Standards of Learning (VSOLs) provide a framework for instruction across the state. The accompanying SOL tests are seventy-item multiple-choice exams that largely emphasize the recall of factual content. Social Studies end-of-course examinations at the high school level include U.S. History, World History I (ancient until 1500), World History II (1500 to the present), and, in some districts, World Geography. U.S. Government is generally taught in the twelfth grade but, to date, does not have an end-of course test. In an attempt to assist teachers to meet the mandated performance expectations inherent within standards-based teaching and test preparation, the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) has created a series of resource guides, including a curriculum framework that provides a breakdown of the essential understandings questions, knowledge, and skills related to each content standard and a "test blueprint" that lists the number of test questions by chronological time period (see Tables 1-4).⁷

The end-of-course fact recall tests are scored on a scale from 0-600. A student must earn a score of 400 or higher in order to pass the test, and 70 percent of students who take the SOL test must pass in order for a school to be considered for accreditation. The VDOE Web site publishes School Performance Report Cards that offer student pass rates, accreditation ratings, comparison of schools and students across the state, and other information about student attendance, teacher training, and school safety. Virginia's standards and accountability mandates reflect what Gerwitz and Ball describe as the "new management discourse in education" which "emphasizes the instrumental purposes of schooling- raising standards and performance measure by examination results, level of attendance and school leaver destination- and is frequently articulated within a lexicon of enterprise, excellence, quality and effectiveness." McNeil's work on the impact of highly centralized school system in Texas in the 1980s and 1990s illustrates the complex and problematic effects of such policies and practices on schools, curriculum, students, and teachers. She asserts that:

The bureaucratic controls designed to operate this system of mass credentialing can easily trivialize course content and undermine the *educational* goals that we have claimed to be the central goals of the institution... What is taught in schools is shaped by the tension between the contradictory goals of educating students and of controlling and processing them.⁸

Table 1: Example of Virginia and U.S. History Standard

<i>History and Social Science Standards of Learning: Virginia and United States History</i>
Civil War and Reconstruction: 1860-1877
VUS.7 – The student will demonstrate knowledge of the Civil War and Reconstruction Era and its importance as a major turning point in American history by
a) Identifying the major events and the roles of key leaders of the Civil War Era, with emphasis on Abraham Lincoln, Ulysses S. Grant, Robert E. Lee, and Frederick Douglass;
b) Analyzing the significance of the Emancipation Proclamation and the principles outlined in Lincoln's Gettysburg Address;
c) Examining the political, economic, and social impact of the war and Reconstruction,

including the adoption of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

Table 2: Sample Questions from End-of Course SOL Tests (1998)

End-of-Course United States History	End of Course World History I
<p>Which of the following was written specifically to encourage ratification of the Constitution?</p> <p>A. Federalist Papers B. Declaration of Independence C. Articles of Confederation D. <i>Common Sense</i></p>	<p>Which of the following philosophers was the teacher of Alexander the Great?</p> <p>A. Socrates B. Plato C. Agamemnon D. Aristotle</p>

Table 3: Example of The *History and Social Science Standards of Learning Sample Scope and Sequence Guides*

Organizing Topic	Essential Understandings, Knowledge, and Skills	Related SOL	Classroom Assessment Methods	Resources
U.S. Constitution	Explain that during the Constitutional Era, the Americans made two attempts to establish a workable government based on republican principles.	VUS5a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects • Quizzes • Student reports • Unit tests • Writing assignments • Class Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Commonwealth of Knowledge • Audiovisual materials • Center for Civic Education • Library of Congress • Smithsonian Institute • Textbook

Table 4: Excerpt from the *World History and Geography to 1500 A.D. Test Blueprint*

Reporting Category	Number of Items	World History to 1500 A.D. Standards of Learning
Human Origins and Early Civilizations	6	WH1.2b-d WHI.3b-e
Classical Civilizations and the Rise of Religious Traditions	14	WHI.4a-f WHI.5b, d-g WHI.6b, d-k
Postclassical Civilizations	13	WHI.10c-d WHI.11b WHI.12b-d

		WHI.12c-d
--	--	-----------

Within this highly centralized, performance-based context, novice high school history teachers begin their careers in Virginia. Novice teachers contend with a number of challenges as they enter the high school history classroom. These include heavy teaching loads, multiple preparations, the least desirable classes, extracurricular duties, few instructional resources, little collegial support, discipline issues, professional isolation, inadequate salaries, high parent expectations, poor administrative support, unfamiliarity with routines and procedures, and a disconnect between their expectations of teaching and the realities of the classroom. Beginning teachers often struggle with stress, loneliness, isolation, disillusionment, and fatigue; even under the best of conditions, new teachers are a “fragile and valuable resource” that often require “care and support.” And, in Virginia, as in many states, state-mandated SOLs and high-stakes accountability measures only exacerbate the stress and pressure faced by beginning teachers.⁹

As Virginia’s beginning history teachers work through the complex process of learning to teach, they do so within a context that includes content-specific standards and a fact-recall, multiple-choice, end-of-course examination that directly affects school accreditation and students’ opportunities to graduate from high school. Within this context, the learning curve for beginning teachers is enormous as they make instructional decisions and develop as teachers. What, then, influences beginning teachers’ thinking about instruction? How do they conceive of historical thinking as novices within a high-stakes testing context? Research has clearly documented that teaching practices are mediated by teachers’ beliefs and experiences, coursework, and perceptions of curriculum, students, and pedagogy. Research on the effects of high-stakes tests on teachers’ instructional decision making, however, offers mixed results. Gerwin and Visone warn that care needs to be taken in assigning “too much power” to the

impact of high stakes testing. Similarly, Grant argues that his research on high-stakes testing in New York State suggests that while tests do exert some influence on teachers' instructional decision-making, he sees

little direct, deep, and consistent influence of tests on these teachers' classroom practices. The pervading sense that tests drive content, instruction, and the like seems alternately overstated, ill informed, or misplaced. If tests are an influence on practice, and more importantly, if they are intended as a means of changing teachers' practices, then they may be an uncertain lever at best.¹⁰

Within the state of Virginia, it is possible to find, on the one hand, studies that detail how teachers have found ways to creatively design instruction to meet the needs of the state test, and, on the other hand, studies that reveal how the standards of learning have constrained, limited, and narrowed what teachers feel they are capable of doing. Given this "mixed bag of claims" about high-stakes testing, Rex and Nelson call for "thick descriptions of how teachers incorporate test pressures into their thinking and into their daily classroom practices and the relationship, if any, between those two incorporations," and Hicks and Doolittle identify the need for a fuller examination of how "teachers balance the contradictory pressures of preparing students for success on standardized tests while undertaking efforts to teach historical thinking" Thus, this article focuses on the impact of standards and high stakes testing on beginning teachers' understandings of historical thinking.¹¹

While a growing body of research examines different aspects of this reform movement, within Virginia and elsewhere, no research examines beginning teachers' understandings of historical thinking within Virginia's high-stakes testing environment. The high-stakes nature of the fact-recall end-of year history tests raises interesting questions – namely, how do these tests interact with notions of history and historical thinking? The data for this article were originally collected for a study that investigated beginning secondary history teachers' perceptions of the influence of Virginia's standards-based reform on their planning, instruction,

and assessment. An analysis of the interview data, however, revealed additional, and more specific findings regarding teachers' conceptions and understandings of "historical thinking." Thus, this study investigates beginning teachers' conceptualization of historical thinking within a high-stakes testing context. We examined this issue by interviewing and observing seven beginning secondary history teachers.¹²

Research Methods

This study investigates the following question: How do beginning teachers conceptualize historical thinking within a high-stakes testing context? We used a qualitative methodology because this research centered on the sense-making and meaning perspectives of teachers.¹³

Participants and Setting

The participants included seven high school (grades nine-12) beginning (1-4 years of experience) history teachers: three white males (Vincent, Matthew, Fred), two white females (Valerie, Patricia), one Asian American female (Kathleen), and one African American male (Richard). We assigned a pseudonym to each participant (see Table 5). Five of the seven teachers (Vincent, Matthew, Valerie, Patricia, and Fred) graduated from the Masters of Teaching (MT) social studies teacher education program at the local public university. Kathleen graduated from the undergraduate social studies teacher education program of another state university. Richard did not attend a teacher education program and became certified to teach social studies through an alternative licensure program. At the time of data collection, Vincent, Matthew, Claire and Kathleen were in their first year of teaching, Valerie and Patricia were in their second year, Fred in his third year, and Richard in his fourth year.

These teachers taught at three different high schools—Jefferson, Piedmont, and Blue Ridge—within two school districts located in central Virginia. Piedmont High School (Fred and

Richard) and Blue Ridge High School (Valerie and Patricia) are located in rural areas in a fairly affluent county. Both schools are fully accredited by the state. Jefferson High School (Vincent,

Table 5: Participants

High School	Pseudonym	Demographics	Years Teaching	Classes Taught	Educational Background
Jefferson	Vincent	White Male	>1	World History II World Geography	BA: History MT: Social Studies Education
Jefferson	Matthew	White Male	>1	World History 1 World Geography	BA: History MT: Social Studies Education
Jefferson	Claire	White Female	1	World History II	BA: History MT: Social Studies Education
Jefferson	Kathleen	Asian American Female	>1	World History II	BA: Social Studies and Secondary Education
Piedmont	Valerie	White Female	1 1/2	American History	BA: History MT: Social Studies Education
Piedmont	Patricia	White Female	1 1/2	World History 1 AP Psychology	BA: History MT: Social Studies Education
BlueRidge	Fred	White Male	3	World History 1 Newspaper	BA: Politics MT: Social Studies Education
BlueRidge	Richard	African American Male	4	World History 1	BA: History

					Alternative Licensure
--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------

Matthew, Kathleen) is in a city district; at the time of this study, Jefferson High School was labeled by the state as “provisionally accredited/needs improvement.” All three high schools employ a tracking system; students are grouped by achievement level.

Data Sources and Analysis

Data sources included interviews, observations, e-mail communications, and classroom documents. The interview data served as the primary data source for this study—we were interested in what “historical thinking” means to beginning teachers and how they make sense of this notion within a high-stakes testing environment. We conducted a semi-structured interview with each teacher. Questions guiding the interviews focused on a number of topics including instructional planning, classroom instruction, assessment techniques, definitions/conceptions of history and historical thinking, experiences as beginning teachers, and perceptions of the SOLs and SOL tests. Interviews lasted approximately two hours and were audio-taped and transcribed. As an additional data source, participants were observed for one unit of instruction, which varied from two to five class periods. Field notes were later transcribed and annotated. We also collected classroom materials including assessments, hand-outs, graphic organizers, and note outlines. The first author had served as advisor and professor to two of the beginning teachers (Vincent and Matthew); therefore, in attempt to encourage more candid responses from these two participants, a doctoral student with no previous relationship with the teachers conducted the interviews and the observations.

Data analysis included the following: systematic content analysis of the interview and observation transcripts, looking for similarities, differences, patterns, themes, disconfirming evidence, and general categories of responses; development of tables for categorization of

responses as well as a research memorandum detailing analysis of data; coding of interview and observation transcripts by hand, line by line; and, finally, generation of an outline of the major themes and issues emerging from the data. The researchers triangulated the data by searching through the observations, interviews, and documents to confirm or disconfirm these themes and patterns.

Interesting issues emerged from data analysis. The seven beginning teachers possessed mixed feelings toward Virginia's standards and high-stakes assessment and did not cite the SOLs or SOL tests as an enormous influence on their instruction. Rather, they appeared to interpret the major influence of the SOL in terms of time available to cover certain topics. All seven beginning teachers elucidated rich and interesting conceptions of history and historical thinking. Yet, when asked to talk about their aims/purposes for their classes, their conceptions of "effective" history teaching, and to describe their instructional methods, the beginning teachers' did not include much attention to historical thinking. Observations and interviews revealed that the ways in which these beginning teachers thought about *teaching* historical thinking skills were clearly mediated by a confluence of factors including challenges encountered as beginning teachers, lack of content knowledge, and perceptions of the Virginia SOLs and end-of-year tests. In following sections, we explore these findings by first exploring the participants' perceptions of the high-stakes testing context in Virginia and then by examining their notions of historical thinking.

Beginning Teachers and the Context of Virginia

Perceptions of the standards and high-stakes tests varied among the seven beginning teachers. Many of the teachers viewed the SOL *standards* as a valuable curricular guide but disagreed with the high-stakes nature of the end-of-year SOL *tests*. Fred, for example, stated that:

In some ways, SOLS are considered a good thing, or good for teachers because they tell you what to teach. I think a lot of new teachers don't know what's important so it's good, someone is telling me what is important... The SOLs have improved education because when you hold teachers accountable and kids accountable I think things tend to get better.

At the same time, Fred expressed concern about the negative effects of the high-stakes test by saying, "I don't like the punitive aspects of the SOLs, about the kids not graduating. I think there will be a huge drop-out rate, starting soon." Similarly, Patricia cited both positive and negative effects of the reform. She stated that the standards provided her with a structure, with "the basics of what I need to teach and knowing that my students will be assessed at the end of the year on what I've taught them" but, at the same time, she noted that the tests "try to cover so much and teach breadth and not depth, lots of little details."

While perceptions of the SOLs and the SOL tests ranged from appreciation to ambivalence to cynicism, all of the teachers expressed concern about SOL-imposed time pressures – specifically, the rush to cover "everything" before the SOL tests in May. Additionally, the teachers noted that this time crunch precluded them from covering topics in depth. Rapid coverage of topics and a focus on breadth of content comprised a central component of their teaching lives. Patricia described the frantic pace of her teaching:

The biggest influence of the SOLs is the pressure to cover everything.... I've had to cover stuff in a day. We do Africa, the Americas, and I do Japan in about 20 minutes. Because literally, last year I didn't do it all. It's not something they have to have a lot of knowledge about, and it wasn't a player in early history. The way it works out – I'll probably spend three class periods on civilizations in Africa and Americas after Egypt. And it's eight or nine civilizations – like Ghana and Mali and Aztecs and Incas and Mayans. It's crazy. It's my least favorite thing to teach because it's always so rushed and the nature of how much stuff has to be covered around the world from the beginning

of time to 1500. The decision [to spend so little time on this topic] is based on SOL [tests]. The number of questions, it's so random. You have to know this one little thing about Ghana, and one little thing about Mali, and that the Mayans created the calendar and the Aztecs did this, and it's so choppy.

Richard echoed this sentiment, commenting that "if there are only two questions on Africa and Asia, I can't spend much time on that, which ties my hands... time is crazy, the hurricane [Isabel] took up time and then snow... and this year I feel like I'm more and more behind and trying to catch up." Valerie reflected that, "given my time [limitations] I find it's really hard to go in depth given the amount that they are required to know." Fred summed up the time frustrations of most teachers:

All teachers feel [time pressures]. I compensate by trying to stay ahead and to keep us moving... you do feel the pressure all the time of those tests, particularly when it comes down to you, and you haven't covered 200 years of material. [That's why you observed] the Enlightenment in a day. That's all they're getting. Then we're done.

Interestingly, the teachers who taught at least a year and had experienced the SOL tests emphasized the "time issue" more than the teachers in their first months of teaching. While all teachers everywhere struggle with managing time, the seven beginning teachers perceived the time pressures imposed by the SOL tests as extreme. When asked to reflect about the influence of the SOLs and SOL tests on their teaching practice, responses again varied, yet the majority of participants described the SOLs as yet another layer of challenges to be dealt with during their first years of teaching. Anxiety about day-to-day survival as a beginning teacher seemed to trump concern over the state-mandated tests. Concerns, anxiety, and apprehension about behavior management, respect from colleagues, dealing with diverse learners, learning the content, time to grade, block scheduling, multiple preparations, pressure from the school culture and other day-to-day survival issues emerged as significant issues in many of these teachers' lives.

All of the teachers described their first year as overwhelming. Kathleen, in the midst of her first year, stated that, "I just want to make it through the year." Similarly, Valerie, a second-year teacher noted

My first two years of teaching have definitely been a roller coaster. I have to admit I've definitely questioned if I want to be a teacher... Sometimes I feel like it's my calling, and sometimes I'm like, well, maybe not.... I know that I love my students, I love history, and I have a passion for the subject.... [My greatest success] the past year and a half is surviving. I spent some afternoons crying... but for now, I think [teaching] is where I want to be.

Content emerged as a major issue for the beginning teachers. For example, Patricia observed that, in her first year, "When I first began teaching, I was teaching three subjects that I did not know... so for me, [the major challenge] was content." She recalled that, when meeting with a teacher to collaboratively plan a unit, "he'd ask, so how many days are you spending on each of these groups of people? And I looked at the list and I didn't even know when those [civilizations] were, chronologically, or what they did." Matthew, still in his first few months of teaching, said that "I have no content background in this area; well I've taken one class in college. I was prepared, but how can you ever really be prepared, starting out from scratch. It's a lot of work." The state tests did enter into teachers' discussions of challenges they faced as beginning teachers, but as one more issue on a long list of concerns. Within this context of SOLs and day-to-day survival, how do these seven beginning teachers conceptualize "historical thinking"?

"Putting Together a Puzzle:" Conceptions of Historical Thinking

Definitions of history and historical thinking varied among the seven teachers, but all included attention to notions of perspective, decision-making, and the "skills" of history. Vincent, for example, emphasized historical decision-making and analysis by defining historical thinking

as “looking at people and decisions and questioning those decisions, figuring out why those decisions were made, and in the scheme of things, how they impact our society today.” Fred focused on the skills of history, describing his conceptualization of historical thinking as “the skills associated with history – analyzing, synthesizing information.” Matthew’s definition also included attention to analysis and interpretation, as well as notions of credibility. He stated that, “historical thinking means you are not looking for a right or wrong answer... you are trying to analyze [an issue] from both sides and try to discover the credibility of it and [investigate] what is exactly going on; you can use it to form an opinion or an interpretation.” Kathleen talked about perspective-taking, describing historical thinking as “thinking with perspective on the past and not just thinking about today.... Thinking about things with perspective on the past.”

Patricia referred to historical thinking a “buzz word running around” which she defined as:

In my class, I want students to think historically, to look at something and to question it and see it from a bunch of different points of view. That you’re putting together a puzzle together, and you’re going on best guesses and looking at bias and not taking things at face value and the cause-effect relationship for a lot of what we learn... It’s hard to define. Thinking about things not on one level – here’s what was going on economically, socially, politically. Not just one-dimensional.

Richard said that he hadn’t heard of the term “historical thinking,” but defined history as “people’s interpretations of the past, not something that is clear cut... you’re going to have people who disagree and things that don’t line up.”

Thus, the seven beginning teachers, when asked to define/discuss history and historical thinking, described notions congruent with the extant literature. They addressed the fluid, interpretive, contested nature of history as well as the role of perspective, reasoning, and analyzing evidence in the “doing” of history. Yet, when asked to talk about their objectives for their class—what students would leave their class with—and their conceptions of effective

teaching, the beginning teachers included little explicit attention to the notion of historical thinking.

“I want them to like history”: To be an Effective Teacher

When directly asked to discuss history and historical thinking, the beginning teachers offered definitions congruent with the current literature. Interestingly, however, when asked to talk about their objectives for students (their aims/purposes of their class) and their conceptions of what constituted best practice or effective history teaching, the beginning teachers did not employ the term historical thinking, nor did they address the interpretive nature of history. In fact, the teachers' conceptions of effective history teaching included very little attention to disciplinary concerns, and rather, appeared to reflect typical concerns of beginning teachers. Discussion focused on being positive or enthusiastic, being organized, being liked and/or respected, developing rapport with students, and connecting history to their students' lives. The teachers did not seem to view a deep knowledge of the content or of the discipline of history as extremely important –the idea of being a history specialist who possesses a deep understanding of the structures of the discipline did not enter their conversations of effective teaching. The participants, however, when discussing their aims/purposes for their classes, did *indirectly* allude to certain aspects of historical thinking (empathy, perspective, analysis), but focused mainly on affective issues (empathy, respect, love), specific skills (reading skills, critical thinking skills), and measurable outcomes (to know factual content, to pass the end-of-year tests). The following excerpts offer a representative sample of the participants' responses.

Effective teaching, for Vincent, was, in his words “attitudinal.” He described an effective teacher as

[Someone with a] positive attitude, someone who doesn't take everything too seriously or too personally. You'd destroy yourself if you did. Recognize limitations. Deal with failure every now and then. Deal with doubt and frustration and hold up successes and

celebrate them... I think it's attitudinal, that's where it starts. You also have to have a base of knowledge in the content but, by and large, you'll always know more than the kids you are teaching. Maintain that, maintain your focus, and approach your job with joy and not fear and trepidation.

When students left his class, Vincent wanted them to understand the importance of an education. He stated that:

My purpose is, I suppose, the reason I got into this job and my purpose for the year is just to demonstrate to the kids that there is a reason for being here, and there is something that is worthy of their time. I think a lot of these kids don't realize that teachers are their bridge to a better life.

Yet, Vincent did include attention to disciplinary issues, specifically notions of "otherness" and empathy. Differentiating by achievement level, he stated,

for the [general level] kids, I want them to leave with an appreciation of otherness... and to recognize that there is a need to show respect and dignity for others, even if those others do not believe the same things they believe or share the same customs or language or style of dress or entertainment. For the [honors] kids, I want them to appreciate people that became before us; we're the only reason they exist today because we're here to keep them alive through our discussions. Similarly, they're the only reason we exist. This moral connection between people of the past and people of today.

Fred described effective teaching in terms of presence and rapport. He said, "I think you need to have a presence up there. You have to command authority. A rapport with kids, being able to relate to all of your kids.... [and that] you need to know your material in the sense that you really know it and can explain it in layman's terms." Fred wanted his students to leave his class as better readers with an appreciation for history. He stated:

[I want to teach my students] to become better readers and to make sense of the information and of course to gather the content information that's pertinent to the SOL tests and is, well I think, is pertinent to cultural literacy.... as well as to develop an appreciation for history and to recognize higher-level thinking.

Matthew said that an effective teacher has "patience, enthusiasm, knowledge, [is] willing to work with kids, [and is] willing to work long hours. He added that, "a good teacher is someone who connects with the students, makes them like them, does enjoyable stuff that they will remember."

Matthew said that he would like his students to leave his class with "the writing skills and reading skills and comprehension skills to succeed at the next level." Similarly, Patricia noted that good teachers were "able to relate to the students," understand students, and know who was struggling. She added that

Obviously, knowing the content. You don't have to be an expert in it. You can be a good teacher and teach, be thrown a new subject and adapt it and teach it. I would like to be interesting, where you gain this interest, along with that is respect from the kids. Enthusiasm.

In terms of her aims and objectives, Patricia did mention particular historical thinking skills, emphasizing her desire to teach students the skills of forming and supporting opinions and/or argument. She said:

I want [the students] to have an idea and back it up. Make an opinion on something and back it up... I want them to be able to think and have you know, have a question in front of them, have their own idea of what the answer is and then be able to back it up with good, concrete facts or reasons. I think that skill is a lifelong skill that they can take with them throughout whatever they do, reading the paper or deciding on a job or defending themselves in some kind of argument. ... My aim? I want them not to hate the class. I want them to feel connected to something.

Valerie's description of "effective teaching" emphasized organization, and she commented that "content knowledge is key, but you might know a subject really well, but how to relate it to students, that's a whole other thing to itself." Valerie wanted her students to leave her class liking history, with better reading and writing skills, and content knowledge. She stated:

I want them to leave with, ideally, liking history. But not everyone does. And that's part of the challenge. I want students in here to do well who don't necessarily come in liking the content area, and reading and writing better. I hope that they remember the content years down the road... My purpose as a teacher is to teach them the skills and the knowledge and love of history.

Finally, Richard said an effective teacher "knows what they are talking about, care [about] what they are talking about, and care about kids." In his discussion of aims/objectives, he did address historical thinking skills, stating that he hoped his students would learn cause and effect relationships, the themes of history, and how to analyze primary sources. He said:

I think this class – it's background knowledge – it's the type of information that educated people know and if you want to be an educated person in society you need to know this information. But at the same time, I realize that ten years from now they will not remember every date or fact... having the background knowledge of how the world works or the history of the world, and seeing thematically different types of causes and effect relationships. Being able to analyze sources, and different skills I know that they'll need in later history classes. They are not crazy about primary sources.

The teachers' conceptions of effective history teaching, however, did not include much attention to disciplinary concerns, and rather, appeared to reflect typical concerns of beginning teachers – desire to be liked and respected, rapport with students, fostering a love of history. The teachers' expressed aims and purposes did include some implicit reference to historical thinking skills—reading skills, critical thinking skills, analysis of sources – but also focused on affective issues and reflected concerns about students liking history and passing the test.

Variety and Engagement: Classroom Practice

When asked to talk about their typical methods of instruction, none of the teachers explicitly described approaches that taught historical thinking skills or fostered historical inquiry—in other words, they did not use the *language* of historical thinking. Rather, these beginning teachers emphasized the *variety of engaging* instructional approaches they used, instructional approaches designed to interest their students in the study of history and to connect history to students' lives. All of the teachers did stress the importance of teaching critical thinking skills and utilizing a variety of resources (including primary sources) in their classrooms. They described critical thinking as a set of discrete skills -- analysis, forming arguments, defending arguments – but did not explicitly connect these skills to historical thinking, to working with historical sources and historical evidence. Observations revealed that several of the beginning teachers did ask students to analyze sources and construct historical arguments. When asked to talk about these instructional decisions, however, teachers talked about student engagement and interest, and in the higher-order thinking skills being developed. The following four interview excerpts highlight the beginning teachers' descriptions of their instruction, specifically the participant's emphasis on the use of diverse and engaging instructional approaches.

When asked to describe his instruction, Vincent mentioned that he tried to teach critical thinking skills through a focus on the key issues of history. He noted that, in his classroom, “we do a lot of activities, a lot of group work, lot of cooperative work, some independent work,” and that he tried to get

as much out of [my] kids as [I] can with the resources available to [me]... [I use] textbooks, primary sources, videos, guest speakers, food, music... and [focus on] diversifying those resources so the kids don't see the same thing every day.

Matthew also portrayed his teaching as a mix of practices:

I use quite a bit of group work. I use lots of jigsaw type stuff. In [the] applied [level class] they do basic reading comprehension in their book; then we'll talk about it and see what they know. For [the] honors [class], mostly group work and discussion. Very little lecture. [Every day] in [both] classes, we do a do-now at the beginning, we discuss it, some type of group work, some guided practice. Honors, the do-now is more in depth and then we'll do some kind of activity and a [reading quiz].

Similarly, Patricia described her instructional approaches as a mixture of approaches:

I have them do a lot of reading and questions and thinking about something... With block periods you cannot do a content lecture for 90 minutes, especially with ninth graders. It just does not work. I do use a lot of lecture and guided discussion, but for a small percentage of each class. I try to give them information that's not in the textbook... I use PowerPoint, I do group work, jigsaw, graffiti. I do interactive stories and drama, I have them act a lot. Read alouds. We have story time sometimes... I use a lot of manipulatives.

Valerie stated that she used "very little direct instruction" and used a great deal of group work, jigsaws, graphic organizers, debates, presentations, and other interactive approaches. The other three beginning teachers described their instruction in ways congruent to the interview excerpts above. In other words, all of the participants emphasized the variety of different instructional approaches that they regularly used in their instruction and most of the participants mentioned critical thinking.

Observations, although limited in number and scope, did match the teachers' descriptions of their instruction. In Patricia's World History I class, for example, in a 90-minute lesson that introduced students to the upcoming unit on Greece, Patricia organized her students into groups of Greek city-states. She played a song and students had to guess how this piece of music related to the unit. She quizzed students on their nightly reading assignment, engaged them in an interactive read aloud about pre-Greek civilization, lectured on Greece, and showed

pictures from a trip she took to Greece. She then provided an overview of the next few lessons, exuding enthusiasm and excitement for the topic. On the board, she had written an agenda, objectives for the day, and “responses” to her interactive read aloud. Patricia’s teaching appeared to reflect her explanation that block scheduling required multiple activities, her desire to cover content not presented in the textbook, and her wish to encourage students to think beyond the content in the textbook.

Valerie, in an American history lesson on the abolition movement and the women’s movement, opened class by showing students a chart from the United States patent office, 1800-1860. An engaging and enthusiastic teacher, she asked students to work in pairs to identify some inventions that played prominent roles in economic development during this time period. The students listed the cotton gin, steam engine, and others. Valerie then instructed her class to use the patent chart to create a time line of these inventions. The pairs compared their time lines with a chart of cotton production and drew generalizations and predictions. As a class, the students discussed how the spike in cotton production correlates with the patent of the cotton gin. Valerie then reviewed the time period under discussion, and called the students’ attention to posters of abolitionists hanging on the walls of her classroom. Students, in groups, then visited each poster, read about each abolitionist, filled in a graphic organizer about each abolitionist, and answered the discussion questions: a) Who had the greatest influence on the abolitionist movement? b) Who had the least? c) What generalization can you make about protest? A 7-minute movie excerpt about John Brown and his raid and a PowerPoint lecture on the abolition movement followed this activity. Again, this observation reflected Valerie’s description of her instruction—group work, jigsaws, graphic organizers.

The interviews and observations revealed that when thinking about, talking about, and implementing instruction, the teachers appeared concerned with implementing a variety of instructional approaches in order to engage their students and to fill a block period. Explicit discussions of or references to historical thinking did not appear in their responses, but

references to “critical thinking” did. When asked to describe resources used in the class, teachers did refer to historical sources, but most often as a means to interest or engage their students, to add another element of variety to instruction, or to teach “critical thinking” skills.

Discussion and Implications

Hector: I count examinations, as the enemy of education. Which is not to say that I don't regard education as the enemy of education too...

Irwin: For what it's worth, I sympathise with your feelings about examinations, but they are a fact of life. I'm sure you want them to do well, and the gobbets you have taught them might just tip the balance.

Hector: What did you call them? Gobbets?... Handy little quotes that can be trotted out to make a point...

Irwin: I just thought it would be useful...

Hector: Oh, it would be useful...every answer a Christmas tree hung with the appropriate gobbets. Except that they are learned *by heart*. And it is where they belong and like the other components of the heart not to be defiled by being trotted out to order.

Irwin: So what are they meant to be storing them up for, these boys? Education isn't something for when they're old and grey and sitting by the fire. It is now. The exam is next month.¹⁴

This paper examined the question of how beginning (one-four years of experience) secondary history teachers' conceptualized historical thinking within a high-stakes testing context. Although clearly a small sample, the teachers' discussions about historical thinking raise interesting issues that can add to and enrich the conversation about what it means to teach history in Virginia and beyond—particularly within classrooms, schools, states, and countries where the political and occupational realities of teaching are intricately tied to

quantifiable concepts of performance and productivity within highly centralized educational environments. Such discussions lay at the very heart of what it means to be a teacher of history, not just in Virginia, but also, as the above quote between two teachers from the play *The History Boys* illuminates, across time and space.

The findings indicated that, when asked to talk about history and historical thinking, the seven beginning teachers elucidated rich and interesting conceptions congruent with much of the literature. However, when asked to talk beyond simple definitions – when asked to discuss their objectives for their history class, to describe their conception of best history practice, or to describe their typical instructional approach – historical thinking did not enter teachers' conversations in explicit ways. The participants did talk about critical thinking and readily described teaching approaches and teaching purposes that included attention to critical thinking. They remained mostly silent on the topic of historical thinking and somehow seemed to conceptualize critical thinking and historical thinking as two distinct entities. In the case of these seven beginning history teachers, a confluence of factors appeared to impact their thinking about instruction – factors that trumped their views or notions of historical thinking. One significant influence appeared to be the participants' existence as beginning teachers.

These seven beginning teachers faced a number of challenges, all clearly documented in past research – behavior management concerns, heavy teaching loads, multiple preparations, new contexts. And, although almost all of the teachers held a bachelor's degree in history, issues of content knowledge emerged as a significant challenge. These teachers were faced with teaching unfamiliar content, or a wide range of content they had not encountered since early in their college careers or in high school. As a result, they had to play content “catch-up” in order to keep a few days or weeks ahead of their students. There was little room or time for designing instruction that went beyond covering content that they had learned and repackaged for transmission—albeit in interesting and creative ways—a few hours before. Faced with the stress of having to prepare their students for the rapidly approaching high-stakes

state tests, these beginning teachers did what teachers do: they found survival strategies that got them through the curriculum material and the school day as best they could. And, whether they fully recognized this influence or not, the SOL test appeared to exert a pervasive and tacit influence on how teachers decided to teach. In short, all of these teachers knew that, at the end of the year, their students would face a fact-recall, high-stakes test. And this meant, in the teachers' minds, that, in order to do their jobs properly, they had to cover an enormous amount of content at a rapid pace.

These teachers, based on interviews and observations, were ambitious, enthusiastic, hard-working, caring teachers who worked incredibly hard to connect with their students. They introduced engaging, hands-on activities in their classroom, lectured in interesting ways, and were, generally speaking, good teachers. Yet, these teachers did not appear to systematically engage their students in historical investigation. It could be that, for these teachers, a “conceptual distinction” exists between history as exclusively knowledge-based and history as exclusively skills and process. Or, it could be that these teachers feel confident defining historical thinking but struggle to understand what “doing history” looks like in terms of actual classroom practice, particularly as they negotiate new content and a high-stakes testing environment. Or perhaps, that, within a context that requires rapid coverage of historical content, these beginning teachers perceive historical thinking as an approach incongruent with a high-stakes test that measures recall of facts. Or, overwhelmed with all of the challenges of beginning teaching, it could be that these teachers simply didn't have the time or luxury to think through how to implement instructional practices that foster “historical thinking”—rather, they were too focused on surviving day-to-day.¹⁵

The teachers' objectives for their history classes also should be considered. In most cases, the participants' elucidated objectives for their class that reflected their concerns as beginning teachers (desire to be liked and respected, rapport with students, fostering a love of history) rather focusing on disciplinary issues like historical thinking. Barton and Levstik argue

that research indicates that many teachers view their primary tasks, or objectives, in terms of controlling students' behavior and covering content and, in most cases, teach in ways that accomplish those goals. And, Barton and Levstik assert that,

in order for teachers to present history as an investigative, interpretive undertaking, they must have a purpose that cannot be served by focusing on coverage and control; their goal must be one that can be met only by having students work with primary sources, consider multiple perspectives, and so on.¹⁶

Yet, even teachers with a clearly elucidated purpose struggle within a high-stakes testing context. VanSledright, who sought to teach fifth-grade students how to engage in the “doing of history” elucidates this challenge in the following way:

I worried about how my students would fare on such tests, because I fell short on covering all of the required historical events. I continue to worry about this. I want to imagine that many ambitious history teachers wrestle with these larger dilemmas of practice, these pedagogical and curricular double binds where their convictions about teaching a subject to benefit children's academic and civic development are challenged by educational policies that undermine that development.¹⁷

These issues raise interesting questions for the teaching of history in Virginia, particularly in terms of teacher preparation, induction, and professional development. Perhaps the education of teachers at all levels should focus on how to help teachers make sense of effective practice within a high-stakes testing context and, specifically, how to figure out what historical thinking looks like within this context. The teachers in this study could visualize “critical thinking” and describe questioning techniques and activities that fostered critical thinking; thus, it would seem that education of teachers could help novices understand the congruence between “critical thinking” and “historical thinking” and should assist teachers in figuring out how to teach multiple perspectives and use primary sources in a way that still allows for test preparation and high pass rates on a fact-recall examination. Additionally, education of

teachers could include specific attention to developing educational objectives/goals that focus on disciplinary issues, including historical thinking. Ultimately, however, teachers need to learn strategies to cope with the dissonance of the world of effective history practice, professionally defined, and the context of teaching, politically defined. Otherwise, talented teachers might begin to conceptualize history in a way similar to Mr. Rudge, a student of Mrs Lintott in the play

The History Boys:

Mrs Lintott: Now. How do you define history, Mr. Rudge?

Rudge: Can I speak freely, miss? Without being hit.

Mrs Lintott: I will protect you.

Rudge: How do I define history? It's just one [damn] thing after another.¹⁸ⁱ

NOTES

1. See, for example, Matthew Downey and Linda Levstik, "Teaching and Learning History," in *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning*, ed. James P. Shaver (New York: Macmillan, 1991), 400-10; Gaea Leinhardt, Isabel L. Beck, and Catherine Stainton, eds., *Teaching and Learning in History* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1994); Peter Stearns, Peter Seixas, and Sam Wineburg, eds., *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives* (New York: New York University Press, 2000); Bruce VanSledright, "Confronting History's Interpretive Paradox While Teaching Fifth Graders to Investigate the Past" *American Educational Research Journal* 39 (Winter 2002): 1089-1115; idem, "What Does it Mean to Think Historically...and How do You Teach It?" *Social Education* 68 (April 2004): 230-33; Bruce VanSledright, *In Search of America's Past: Learning to Read History in Elementary School* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2002); Sam Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001); Linda Levstik, "Negotiating the History Landscape," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 24 (Fall 1996): 394.

2. See, for example, David Hicks, "Continuity and Constraint: Case Studies of Becoming a Teacher of History in England and the U.S.A," *International Journal of Social Education* 20 (Spring-Summer 2005): 18-51; Stephanie van Hover and Elizabeth Yeager, "'Making Students' Better People?' A Case Study of a Beginning History Teacher," *International Social Studies Forum* 3 (2003): 219-32; Bruce VanSledright, "Closing the Gap between School and Disciplinary History?: Historian as High School Teacher," in *Advances in Research on Teaching: Teaching and Learning History*, ed. Jere E. Brophy (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1996); Keith C. Barton and Linda S. Levstik, "Why Don't More History Teachers Engage Students in Interpretation?" *Social Education* 67 (October 2003): 358-61; Bruce Fehn and Kim E. Koeppen, "Intensive Document-Based Instruction in a Social Studies Methods Course and Student Teachers' Attitudes and Practice in Subsequent Field Experiences," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 26 (Fall 1998): 461-84; Peter Seixas, "Student Teachers Thinking Historically," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 26 (Summer 1998): 310-41; Elizabeth Yeager and O.L. Davis, Jr., "Between Campus and Classroom: Secondary Student-Teachers' Thinking About Historical Texts," *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 29 (Fall 1995): 1-8; Timothy D. Slekar, "Epistemological Entanglements: Pre-service Elementary School Teachers' Apprenticeship of Observation' and the Teaching of History," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 26 (Fall 1998): 485-507; Ann V. Angell, "Learning to Teach Social Studies: A Case of Belief Restructuring," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 26 (Fall 1998): 509-29; Jesse Goodman and Susan Adler, "Becoming an Elementary Social Studies Teacher: A Study of Perspectives," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 13 (Summer 1985): 1-20; P.L. Grossman, "Overcoming the Apprenticeship of Observation in Teacher Education Coursework," *Teaching & Teacher Education* 7 (1991): 345-57; Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts*.

3. S.G. Grant, *History Lessons: Teaching, Learning, and Testing in U.S. High School Classroom* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003); Linda M. McNeil, *Contradictions of Control: School Structure and Social Knowledge* (New York: Routledge and K. Paul, 1986).

4. See, for example, Stearns, Seixas, and Wineburg, eds., *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History*; VanSledright, *In Search of America's Past*; Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts*; Keith A. Barton and Linda Levstik, *Teaching History for the Common Good* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004), 70, 248; R. Ashby, "Developing a Concept of Historical Evidence: Students' Ideas About Testing Singular Factual Claims," paper presented at the History Educator International Research Network Conference, St. Martin's College, Ambleside, United Kingdom, July 2004); Keith A. Barton, "'Bossed around by the Queen': Elementary Students' Understanding of Individuals and Institutions in History," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 12 (Summer 1997): 290-314; Keith A. Barton and Linda Levstik, "'Back When God Was around and Everything': The Development of Elementary Children's Understanding of Historical Time," *American Educational Research Journal* 33 (Summer 1996): 419-54.

5. John D. Bransford, ed., *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 2000).

6. Cynthia Hartzel-Miller, "Making Sense of 'Best Practice' in Teaching History," *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 29 (Fall 2001): 672-95; David Kobrin, *Beyond the Textbook: Teaching History Using Documents and Primary Sources* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1996); Levstik, "Negotiating the History Landscape," 393-97; Linda Levstik and Keith Barton, *Doing History: Investigating with Children in Elementary and Middle Schools* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001); VanSledright, "Confronting History's Interpretive Paradox While

Teaching Fifth Graders to Investigate the Past," 1089-1115; VanSledright, *In Search of America's Past*, David Gerwin and Jack Zevin, *Teaching U.S. History as Mystery* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2003). See also American Historical Association, *Benchmarks for Professional Development in Teaching History as a Discipline*. (2003) <www.theaha.org/teaching/benchmarks.htm> (June 20, 2002); National Center for History in the Schools, *National Standards for History*. (Los Angeles, 1996); National Council for the Social Studies, *Expectations for Excellence: Curriculum Standards for Social Studies*.

7. The Virginia Standards of Learning are among the best in the nation, according to the Virginia Department of Education, American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. The AFT gave Virginia top honors for its standards in all four disciplines and called the standards "exemplary" and "worthy of a close look by other states." According to the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation's *The State of State Standards* report, Virginia received one of the tops six cumulative scores for state standards across all subjects (parents' guide, p. 14).

8. Virginia Department of Education, *Regulations Establishing Standards Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia 8 VAC 20-131-10 et seq.* (Richmond, July 28, 2001). Regulations connecting student achievement on the SOL's end of course exams to high school graduation requirements, and student success on SOL tests to school accreditation, were planned to gradually come into effect. For example, requirements that link a standard diploma in terms of completing standard and verified credits to whether students pass end of course SOL assessments in Math, Science, English, and History and Social Science were gradually put into effect for each ninth grade class from 1998-1999 through to full implementation in 2003-2004. (p regs p. 5). Similarly, regulations connecting school accreditation to their students' passing rates on SOL tests continue to be put into effect:

Schools that meet the pre-accreditation requirements prescribed in 8 VAC 20-131-280.F. shall be assigned one of the following ratings:

1. Earned During Academic Years Ending in 2000 through 2003:
 - a. Fully Accredited
 - b. Provisionally Accredited/Meets State Standards
 - c. Provisionally Accredited/Needs Improvement
 - d. Accredited with Warning (in specified academic area or areas)
 - e. Conditionally Accredited
2. Earned During Academic Years Ending in 2004 and 2005:
 - a. Fully Accredited
 - b. Accredited with Warning (in specified academic area or areas)
 - c. Conditionally Accredited
3. Earned During Academic Years Ending in 2006 and Beyond
 - a. Fully Accredited
 - b. Accredited with Warning in (specified academic area or areas)
 - c. Accreditation Denied
 - d. Conditionally Accredited
 - e. Accreditation Withheld/Improving School Near Accreditation, not to be used after academic year ending in 2009 (pp. 32-33)

Virginia Department of Education, *Every Child Can Succeed... A Parent's Guide to Virginia's Standards of Learning Program*, 15; Sharon Gerwitz and Stephen Ball, "From 'Welfarism' to New 'Managerialism': Shifting Discourses of School Headship in the Education Market Place," *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 21 (December 2000): 256; Linda M. McNeil, "Contradictions of Control. Part 1: Administrators and Teachers," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69 (January 1988): 334.

9. See Robert V. Bullough, *First-Year Teacher: A Case Study*. (New York: Teachers College Press, 1986); Robert V. Bullough, "Planning and the First Year of Teaching," *Journal of Education for Teaching* 13 (1987): 231-50; Linda Darling-Hammond, "Learning to Teach in the 21st Century," *Principal* 78 (1998): 23-25; Sharon Feiman-Nemser, "From Preparation to Practice: Designing a Continuum to Strengthen and Sustain Teaching," *Teachers College Record* 103 (December 2001): 1013-65; Hal A. Lawson, "Beyond the New Conception of Teacher Induction," *Journal of Teacher Education* 43 (May-June 1992): 163-72; Michael S. Rosenberg, Cynthia C. Griffin, Karen L. Kilgore, and Stephanie L. Carpenter, "Beginning Teachers in Special Education: A Model for Providing Individualized Support," *Teacher Education and Special Education* 20 (Fall 1997): 301-21; Hicks, "Continuity and Constraint," 18-51.

10. See Donald L. Duke and B.L. Reck, "The Evolution of Educational Accountability in the Old Dominion" in *Educational Leadership in an Age of Accountability: The Virginia Experience*, eds. Donald L. Duke, Pamela D. Tucker, and Walter F. Heinecke (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 36-68; Stephanie van Hover, "Teaching History in the Old Dominion: The Impact of Virginia's Accountability Reform on Seven Secondary

Beginning Teachers," in *Measuring History: Cases of State-Level Testing Across the United States*, ed. S.G. Grant (Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 2005), 195-221; Stephanie van Hover and Walter F. Heinecke, "The Impact of Accountability Reform on the 'Wise Practice' of Secondary History Teachers: The Virginia Experience," in *Wise Social Studies Teaching in an Age of High-Stakes Testing*, eds. Elizabeth A. Yeager and O.L. Davis, Jr. (Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 2005), 89-116; M. Cochran-Smith and K. Zeichner, "Executive Summary," in *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*, eds. M. Cochran-Smith and K. Zeichner (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005), 1-36; Hicks, "Continuity and Constraint," 18-51; M. Frank Pajares, "Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning up a Messy Construct," *Review of Educational Research* 62 (Fall 1992): 307-32; Grossman, "Overcoming the Apprenticeship of Observation in Teacher Education Coursework," 345-57; David Gerwin and Francesco Visone, "The Freedom to Teach: Contrasting History Teaching in Elective and State-tested Courses," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 34 (Spring 2006): 262; S.G. Grant, "An Uncertain Lever: Exploring the Influence of State Level Testing in New York State on Teaching Social Studies," *Teachers College Record* 103 (June 2001): 421-22.

11. See M Bolt, "Teachers Perspectives on the Standards of Learning School Reform in Virginia" (Ph.D. diss., Virginia Tech University, 2003); M. Grogan, "Positive and Not So Positive Effects of Preparing Students to Pass Standards of Learning Tests in Virginia High School Classrooms" *NASSP Bulletin* 85 (2001): 5-23; Lesley A. Rex and Matthew C. Nelson, "How Teachers' Professional Identities Position High-Stakes Test Preparation in Their Classrooms" *Teachers College Record* 106 (2004): 1293

12. Van Hover, "Teaching History in the Old Dominion," 195-220.

13. Matthew B. Miles and A. M. Huberman, *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1994); Robert E. Stake, *The Art of Case Study Research* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995).

14. Alan Bennett, *The History Boys: A Play* (New York: Faber and Faber, 2004), 48-49.

15. C. Counsell, "Historical Knowledge and Historical skills: A Distracting Dichotomy," in *Issues in History Teaching*, eds. J. Arthur and R. Phillips (London: Routledge, 2000), 54-71.

16. Barton and Levstik, "Why Don't More History Teachers Engage Students in Interpretation?" 358-61.

17. VanSledright, "Confronting History's Interpretive Paradox While Teaching Fifth Graders to Investigate the Past," 1108.

18. Bennett, *The History Boys*, 85.