

Copyright
by
Caroline Cecelia Sullivan
2007

The Dissertation Committee for Caroline Cecelia Sullivan Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

**ENGAGING WITH SOCIOCONSTRUCTIVIST PEDAGOGY:
FOUR SOCIAL STUDIES PRESERVICE TEACHERS' UNDERSTANDINGS
AND EXPERIENCES IN CONTEMPORARY CLASSROOMS**

Committee:

Cynthia Salinas, Supervisor

Elaine Danielson

Sherry Field

Diane Schallert

Mary Lee Webeck

**ENGAGING WITH SOCIOCONSTRUCTIVIST PEDAGOGY:
FOUR SOCIAL STUDIES PRESERVICE TEACHERS'
UNDERSTANDINGS AND EXPERIENCES IN CONTEMPORARY
CLASSROOMS**

by

Caroline Cecelia Sullivan, B.S.; B.A.; M.Ed.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2007

Dedication

For My Abuelita

Caroline Elizabeth Muirhead Ellwood

Acknowledgements

With deep gratitude I first thank my parents, John and Carol. They instilled in me an enduring respect for education and made possible the many years of my schooling, never raising an eyebrow at the plans for the next degree. My dad (who is probably the only person other than my committee members who will read this dissertation) said that I could stay in school as long as I wanted, and my mom loved me even though I did just that. She has ensured that I could buy peanut butter and dog food (and then some) all this time. They are my most ardent fans and vested supporters—thank you both for your love and support. My brother, John Richard Sullivan, has influenced my thinking about teaching and schools, and life in general, thank you.

Good hair, good shoes, good mojitos—what it takes to get through graduate school. Not really. Not without an advisor like Cinthia (who has all these good things) and who encouraged (almost) every idea of mine and endured every single (of so many) drafts, questions, and mistakes with good humor, compassion, useful suggestions, and stimulating conversation. Moreover, her mentorship and *cariño* has been steadfast, from a well-placed phone call, bottle of wine, or motivating card. Cinthia is a phenomenal teacher. It is a privilege indeed to be her student and (if she takes my phone calls after commencement) future colleague. Providing models of good scholarship, her emphasis on the positive, the multicultural, the critical, and the innovative in our work as teacher

educators is foundational to my research and teaching. I hope to carry forward her example of mentorship with my own students valuing their voices as she valued mine; this is perhaps the only way to honor all she has given me. Mil gracias, Cinthia, for your careful and cheerful guidance into the world of academia.

I extend my thanks to the members of my dissertation committee, Sherry, Elaine, Diane, and Mary Lee. They are an amazing group of women who have mentored my work and membership in the academe. Each has shared their unique visions with me—Sherry’s wisdom, Elaine’s pragmatism, Diane’s precision, and Mary Lee’s expression lend strength to my scholarship now and in the future. Moreover, I sincerely appreciate their support in the job search, writing multiple letters and taking multiple phone calls on my behalf.

My dear friend, Kirsten, has practically earned a doctorate by proxy. With innumerable free phone minutes, she has cheered each and every victory — big and small, talked shop, proofread and stored files, and most importantly shared my laughter and soothed frustrations during these graduate school years. She gets the joy and agony of research, be it to solve a problem or for the perfect pair of shoes or jeans. Without fail, she is a rock and a blessing and I am deeply grateful for our lifelong friendship.

I owe (Dr.!) Shelly many thanks for the champagne, not only for birthdays, but on any given moment that needed celebration. Graduate school calls for many: financial aid deposits, cheesy rice and Grey’s, finishing a draft (or simply a paragraph), buying regalia, party planning, a pedicure—understanding The Egg Plate Incident—whatever gets us through. We have shared these dissertation and job search journeys (amongst others) in every happy and ugly detail. Our friendship was forged over trial and tribulation yet I am grateful, for it created a lifelong friendship. We have many years of good wine ahead of us above and beyond our work as faculty and administration.

To Jane, my fellow grammar vulture, thank you for reminding me to bathe *every* day, and reading my drafts, and taking me to the airport, and loving on my dogs, and bringing me cool plants, and the coffee, and the ride to work when my car was broken, and for breakfast tacos, and proofing my vita, and oh yeah, that book/article/cite I needed, and listening to my stress. Moreover, my friend, thank you for sharing the delights of graduate school with me (yes, there *are* plenty of them!); we created this friendship for support but it has turned out to be not only a professional journey but a personal one as well. I am excited about our pending professorships together! I hereby hand over the title of Head Duck to you...take care of those behind us.

Tom, how fortunate I am to have a colleague such as yourself. I thoroughly enjoy our intellectual and junior high conversations and fully expect them to continue through our days as professors. I have learned much from you in our teaching pursuits together. Thank you. We shall press on against talking monkeys paid in scores of bananas.

Mindy, Robin, and Brenda, thanks much for reaching back and showing me how this is done, answering minute questions and inviting me to happy hours. You are a living brochure on how to get through the program! To my friends Karen, Stacy, Mary—thanks to you for your reality checks, seeing me through this, and buying me lunch and such on more than one occasion!

I must also mention my Great American Canines, Fionn and Ciara. They kept watch and warmth in the late hours, the early hours, and those between. Their abiding and joyful companionship through every assignment, the reading of each book and journal article, crazy job schedules, and hours and hours of writing is proof of the inherent goodness in these two furry and loving creatures.

**ENGAGING WITH SOCIOCONSTRUCTIVIST PEDAGOGY:
FOUR SOCIAL STUDIES PRESERVICE TEACHERS'
UNDERSTANDINGS AND EXPERIENCES IN CONTEMPORARY
CLASSROOMS**

Publication No. _____

Caroline Cecelia Sullivan, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2007

Supervisor: Cynthia S. Salinas

This dissertation, a qualitative case study conducted from an interpretive epistemological stance, focuses on the understanding and implementation of socioconstructivist pedagogy by two middle school and two high school social studies preservice teachers during their apprentice (student) teaching semester. The means by which the participants facilitate socioconstructivist instructional design, and within it, historical thinking, is of primary interest in this study in which the intricate circumstances of diverse classrooms and beginning teachers provide a rich context. The resulting successes and negotiations derived by data analysis include four themes. The first entails the classroom context and resulting logistics of student teaching during the preservice teachers' apprentice teaching semester; the second explores the participants' thinking as they adopt these new pedagogical approaches; the third involves the selection of course materials, navigation of the standardized curriculum as well as efforts with lesson

planning; the fourth and final theme investigates the actual classroom praxis of socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking by the study participants. Findings focus on three areas of interest. First, that epistemological stance plays a significant role in the preservice teachers' adoption and development of socioconstructivist pedagogy; second, the classroom community is essential to the creation of a student-centered learning environment; and finally, that the preservice teachers' partial appropriation of both socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking is an area needing improvement to achieve ultimate success with these pedagogical approaches. Implications indicate that first, preservice teacher education programs should be built upon the examination of foundational epistemology. The second implication has direct impact on the university and practice teaching classroom in that preservice teachers need more opportunities to participate and observe socioconstructivist lessons as exemplary models. The third and final implication demands structural consideration of the comprehensive implementation of socioconstructivist pedagogy.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 Socioconstructivism and Historical Thinking in Schools	2
1.2 Research Questions	6
1.3 Design and Overview of the Study	7
Chapter Two: Review of Literature	8
2.1 Epistemological Foundations of Socioconstructivist Thought	8
2.2 Development of Socioconstructivism	12
2.3 Socioconstructivist Pedagogy	17
2.4 Premises of Historical Thinking	19
2.5 Historical Thinking as a Socioconstructivist Pedagogical Approach	24
Chapter Three: Research Methodology	30
3.1 Research Design	30
Conceptual Framework	32
Table 1: Theoretical Frameworks Used in Study	33
Case Study Design	34
Data Collection	35
Data Analysis	38
3.2 Context of Study	40
University Coursework	41
Research Site Description	42
Biographical Participant Description	45
3.3 Researcher Positionality	47
3.4 Study Timeline and Pilot Research	49
Chapter Four: Results	53
Integrating Themes: Context, Understandings, Curriculum, and Practice ...	58
4.1 Theme One: Establishing and Managing The Classroom Context	59
Multitasking and Management	60

Logistics of Teaching.....	61
Classroom Discipline.....	64
Relationships with Cooperating Teachers	65
4.2 Theme Two: Learning and Adopting New Pedagogical Approaches	70
Participants’ Prior Knowledge.....	71
Epistemological Foundations.....	72
Constructionist Epistemology	73
Positivistic Epistemology.....	75
Epistemology and the TAKS Test	75
Understanding Socioconstructivist Pedagogy.....	77
Conceptualizing Historical Thinking.....	81
4.3 Theme Three: Dividing Allegiances, Negotiating Curriculum.....	95
Standardized Curriculum, Standardized Exams	95
Historical Thinking in Curriculum Standards.....	96
TAKS Testing	98
Instructional Design and Resource Material.....	101
Creation of Lesson Plans	102
Working with Primary Source Documents	105
4.4 Theme Four: Implementation—Creating and Working the Zone Of Proximal Development.....	107
Knowing the Students.....	107
Students as Individuals	108
Students’ Academic Needs	111
Student Engagement	113
Ability to Engage	113
Cooperative Learning.....	116
Prior Knowledge and Relevance.....	118
Scaffolding.....	122
Chapter Five: Study Findings and Implications.....	129
5.1 The Fundamental Role of Epistemology	130
Preservice Teachers’ Epistemological Stance	131

Epistemology and Instructional Design	134
Reinforcement of Epistemology	137
5.2 The Classroom as Community	139
A Social Community.....	140
An Intellectual Community.....	141
Pedagogy, Curriculum, and Management as an Integrated Entity.....	143
5.3 Achieving a Learner-Centered Classroom.....	145
Misnaming Pedagogical Terms.....	145
Partial Appropriation	146
Inadequate Execution.....	148
5.4 Limitations of the Study	149
5.5 Implications Of The Study.....	150
Examining and Developing Individual Epistemological Stance	150
A Call for More Models.....	153
Examining the Details.....	154
Appendices.....	156
Appendix A: Interview Protocols	156
Socioconstructivist Pedagogy	156
Historical Thinking.....	156
Historical Thinking and Socioconstructivist Pedagogy – Professor..	157
Appendix B: Apprentice Syllabus	159
Appendix C: Intern Syllabus.....	170
Appendix D: Socioconstructivist Lesson Design Guidelines	182
Appendix E: Lesson Plan Examples	183
References.....	195
Vita	206

Chapter One: Introduction

Whereas socioconstructivism is not new to academia, it has engendered a fresh perspective on learning and renewed application in schooling in the 21st century (Applefield, Huber, & Moallem, 2000-2001; Henson, 2003; Phillips, 1995; Richardson, 2003; Terhart, 2003). Myriad legitimate forms of constructivism have been found in the current educational literature (Doolittle & Hicks, 2003; Fosnot, 2005a)—as many as 18 variations are described and named by Matthews (2000). Constructivist notions have been extensively explored theoretically and practically in both historical and contemporary contexts. However, given its development as a learning theory and its growing use in classrooms, empirical studies involving constructivism and socioconstructivism have been limited but increasing as the overall constructivist framework gains strength (Fosnot, 2005a; Fosnot & Perry, 2005; Green & Gredler, 2002; Palincsar, 1998; Richardson, 2003). Despite its complexity and variety, (Applefield et al., 2000-2001; Harris & Alexander, 1998; Harris & Graham, 1994; Matthews, 2000; Prawat & Floden, 1994; Richardson, 2003) socioconstructivism continues to be prominent and intriguing as an important learning theory and pedagogical practice in educational settings.

A particular manifestation of socioconstructivist pedagogy may be identified in historical thinking—used in the social studies as a method of teaching history in a rigorous, contextual, and realistic way (Davis, 1998; Seixas, 1993; VanSledright, 2002; VanSledright & Afflerbach, 2000; Wineburg, 2001). Historical thinking is a technique used by professional historians that has been adopted by social studies educators in an effort not only to lend authenticity to learning history, but also to pique interest in

historical events and characters (Davis, 1998; Seixas, 1993; Spoehr & Spoehr, 1994; VanSledright, 2002; Wineburg, 2001). According to Bohan and Davis (1998),

Intriguing history requires the imaginative ability to place oneself back in time, to understand human struggles, actions and consequences, to derive meaning from the stories of persons, places and events, and to make informed judgments on the basis of historical evidence. Conveying such fascinating history to others requires considerable ability, knowledge and effort....Students should be encouraged to imagine many possibilities when thinking of distant times, places, people, and ways of living. (pp. 174 - 175)

Both socioconstructivism and historical thinking have been increasing in esteem, related research, and use in the classroom. Despite the diligent efforts of educators and researchers, the use of these two important frameworks is not yet widespread (Fosnot, 2005a; Fosnot & Perry, 2005; Richardson, 2003; VanSledright, 2002; Wineburg, 2001). Various reasons account for their limited use ranging from the pervasiveness of standardized curriculum and corresponding exams to the difficulty of learning to teach with socioconstructivist principles and techniques of historical thinking (Bohan & Davis, 1998; Grant, 2003; Harris & Alexander, 1998; Mintrop, 2001; Palincsar, 1998; Richardson, 2003; Seixas, 1994, 1998; Smerdon, Burkam, & Lee, 1999).

1.1 SOCIOCONSTRUCTIVISM AND HISTORICAL THINKING IN SCHOOLS

Socioconstructivist lessons have been described in the literature as actively and interactively authentic; properly designed socioconstructivist activities foster critical thinking skills, deep learning (Applefield et al., 2000-2001; Blumenfeld, Soloway, Marx, Krajcik, Guzdial, & Palincsar, 1991; Doolittle & Hicks, 2003; Harris & Alexander, 1998; Harris & Graham, 1994; Henson, 2003; Palincsar, 1998; Phillips, 1995; Richardson, 2003; Terhart, 2003) and affective involvement on the students' part (Applefield et al., 2000-2001; Blumenfeld et al., 1991; Henson, 2003; Shulman, 2000). Students contribute to the learning situation by drawing on previous knowledge, strengths and talents while

improving individual areas of weakness (Applefield et al., 2000-2001; Harris & Graham, 1994; Henson, 2003; Palincsar, 1998; Terhart, 2003).

Historical thinking is meant to prepare students for an active civic life with teachers acting as *knowledge facilitators* rather than *knowledge givers* (Grant, 2003), while requiring students to examine their own contexts as well as those of primary and secondary sources and other historical materials (VanSledright, 2002; Wineburg, 2001).

These elements of socioconstructivism, interactive and rigorous lessons involving students' prior knowledge, culture, and empathy may also be found in historical thinking. According to Doolittle and Hicks (2003),

Traditionally, the search for knowledge within the social studies consisted of the search for “truth”; that is, the acquisition of knowledge that mirrors or corresponds to a singular “reality.” Constructivism, however, employs a more flexible, culturally relativistic, and contemplative perspective, where knowledge is constructed based on personal and social experience. (p. 76)

Doolittle and Hicks advocate the use of socioconstructivism in the social studies with particular focus on the use of technology as a mediating tool to support and foster student learning. Socioconstructivist lessons nurture cooperation with others, both within and outside the classroom community (Moll & González, 2004; Prawat & Floden, 1994; Shulman, 2000). Socioconstructivist practice is democratic and inclusive as it provides for student direction of the curriculum and encourages personal responsibility for learning (Donlevey, 2000; Shapiro, 2000). Palincsar (1998) has asserted that socioconstructivist practice benefits culturally diverse students; the use of prior knowledge and the honoring of cultural backgrounds in the classroom, a shared learning relationship between student and teacher, and the contextual learning of curriculum material lend itself to honoring individual cultural backgrounds. In a similar vein, Wineburg (2001) maintains that historical thinking as useful in both the past and the present in nurturing empathy and tolerance for others, “Coming to know others, whether

they live on the other side of the tracks or the other side of the millennium, requires the education of our sensibilities” (p. 24). Seixas (1994) has concurred, arguing that socioconstructivist practice with regards to history education may “generate a diversity of historical investigations for a diversity of students.”

Preservice teachers negotiate a host of information, ranging from pedagogical practice to campus policy and procedure to classroom management during the apprentice teaching semester. It is expected that they struggle with the amount and complexity of material they manage as they develop into competent teachers. Classroom management often takes place simultaneously with pedagogical practice (Grossman, 1992). Westerman (1991) suggests that beginning teachers have a weak basis in theory of instruction. Often, beginning teachers do not fully access student prior knowledge to optimize learning, either in their lesson construction or actual teaching. Beginning teachers do not have the training or experience to incorporate various elements such as: awareness of students, content knowledge, theoretical knowledge of teaching, student management and disciplinary strategies, and reflection, into their lesson construction (and ultimately teaching) models (Westerman, 1991, p. 301).

As preservice teachers learn about instructional design, socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking are no exception to difficulty. Bohan and Davis (1998), Yeager and Wilson (1997), and Yeager and Davis (1995) have supported teacher preparation for the task of historical thinking while noting a lack of research in the area of learning to think historically and in turn using historical thinking. They have concluded, “As we begin increasingly to teach (and to advocate teaching) with primary historical sources, teacher educators must think far more about what it will take to prepare new teachers for that task” (p. 337). Given the recent development and emergent scope of constructivist pedagogy (Fosnot, 2005a; Richardson, 2003), research literature

investigating its use by preservice teachers has discussed problematic issues dealing with how preservice teachers learn socioconstructivist pedagogy, how they implement it, and how best to instruct them in using socioconstructivist principles (Anderson & Piazza, 1996; Cook, Smagorinsky, Fry, Konopak, & Moore, 2002; Mintrop, 2001; Naylor & Keogh, 1999; Tatto, 1998). Furthermore, the distinct dissonance between university teacher education classrooms and field based classrooms where preservice teachers practice has been documented, and often socioconstructivist lessons are not clearly defined or welcome (Cook et al., 2002; Kaufman, 1996).

As both socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking gain strength and increases in classrooms (in K-12 and post-secondary education), investigating adoption in university coursework for preservice teachers has become a practical matter of curriculum and coursework development. As Bohan and Davis (1998) have emphasized, “Preparation of history teachers to be able to understand and to perform this role [of using historical thinking in the classroom], therefore, is critical” (p. 174). Furthermore, as preservice teachers adopt new teaching and learning concepts, the assessment of the understanding and use of socioconstructivist principles and pedagogy and within them historical thinking during the professional development sequence makes sense from a research and teacher education perspective.

1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions for this dissertation focus on the preservice teacher's understanding and implementation of socioconstructivist principles and within them historical thinking. More specifically:

1. How do preservice teachers understand historical thinking and the socioconstructivist principles that foster it?
2. What are preservice teachers' experiences with historical thinking and socioconstructivist lessons in the classroom?

1.3 DESIGN AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

This dissertation employs qualitative case study research in order to uncover understandings of the research questions previously stated. Four preservice teachers were involved as volunteer participants in this study; two students were apprentice teaching at the high school level, and two were conducting apprentice teaching at the middle school level. The data collected consisted of interviews, observations, and artifacts related to the case. Data was analyzed simultaneously with collection resulting in the following narrative text which describes the preservice teachers' experiences with socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking.

Chapter One provides an introduction and rationale for the use of socioconstructivist pedagogy in classrooms and establishes the accompanying research questions on preservice teacher understanding and use of socioconstructivist principles and historical thinking. Chapters Two and Three describe in detail the conceptual framework for this dissertation as well as details of the research methodology. Chapter Four outlines the themes resulting from the data analysis: *Establishing and Managing the Classroom Context, Learning and Adopting New Pedagogical Approaches, Dividing Allegiances, Negotiating Curriculum, and Creating and Working the Zone of Proximal Development*. Finally, Chapter Five discusses the findings, of the fundamental role of epistemology, the establishment of classroom community, and achieving a learner-centered classroom; and the resulting implications which are directly related to the structure of teacher education programs.

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

The philosophical and educational foundations of socioconstructivism and its development as a pedagogical tool are examined in this study through the technique of historical thinking. Chapter Two provides a review of these foundations and resulting development of socioconstructivist theory. The related contemporary theorizing of socioconstructivism and resulting pedagogical practice is detailed; and finally, this chapter outlines the theoretical parallels connecting socioconstructivism and historical thinking.

2.1 EPISTEMOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIOCONSTRUCTIVIST THOUGHT

Fosnot (2005a) has urged the transition of traditional classrooms into socioconstructivist learning environments—using socioconstructivist principles which are based on the fusion of what is known about how students learn and the nature of knowledge. von Glasersfeld (von Glasersfeld, 2005) has further discussed the existence of knowledge and its relationship to learning,

Too often teaching strategies and procedures seem to spring from the naïve assumption that what we ourselves perceive and infer from our perceptions is there, ready-made, for the students to pick up, if only they had the will to do so. This overlooks the basic point that the way we segment the flow of our experience, and the way we related the pieces we have isolated, is and necessarily remains an essentially subjective matter. Hence, when we intend to stimulate and enhance a student's learning, we cannot afford to forget that knowledge does not exist outside a person's mind. (p. 5)

In order to fully understand socioconstructivist frameworks in an educational sense, the epistemological assumptions of constructionism demands examination. Crotty (2003) has written that constructionism as a paradigm maintains a subjective reality, "...the world and objects in the world are indeterminate. They may be pregnant with potential meaning, but actual meaning emerges only when consciousness engages with them. How,

such thinkers ask, can there be meaning without a mind” (p. 43)? It is as if the world does not actually exist without human interaction; people, in fact, create and impose meaning upon it through their interaction with the world and its objects. Crotty has further illustrated,

...it is the view that all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context. (p. 42)

In the constructionist sense, knowledge is not a collection of information simply there for the asking or the taking; interaction or engagement is essential to generating the knowledge. von Glasersfeld (1987) has explained the critical role that human engagement plays in the development and use of knowledge. The world in which we live, from this vantage point, is always and necessarily the world as we conceptualize it,

“Facts,”...are made by us and our way of experiencing, rather than given by an independently existing objective world. But that does not mean that we can make them as we like. They are viable facts as long as they do not clash with experience, as long as they remain tenable in the sense that they continue to do what we expect them to do. This view of knowledge, clearly, has serious consequences for our conceptualization of teaching and learning. (pp. 5-6)

Further, von Glasersfeld (1987) has emphasized that viable knowledge is key; and in keeping with the constructionist paradigm, there is no correct form of knowledge, the discovery of a single truth is impossible. Rather, if the knowledge that a learner constructs fits within his or her individual experiences, it is considered germane. If a learner’s new knowledge contradicts his or her experience, then new knowledge construction or adjustment is required to obtain a new fit. Following this paradigm, any given piece of knowledge is not necessarily wrong; it is simply what the learner has constructed with available resources and prior knowledge afforded the learner by the environment.

Constructionism is considered to be in a category of its own in the organizational structure of an epistemological typology (as distinct from positivist, critical, and post-modern epistemologies). Therefore, it deeply affects the development of educational thought including theoretical assumptions regarding the nature of knowledge, how students learn, the purpose of schooling, and the design of daily lessons. Fosnot and Perry (2005) have described constructivist goals:

[they are] fundamentally nonpositivist and as such it stands on completely new ground, often in direct opposition to both behaviorism and maturationism. Rather than behaviors or skills as the goals of instruction, cognitive development and deep understanding are the foci; rather than stages being the result of maturation, they are understood as constructions of active learner reorganization. Rather than viewing learning as a linear process, it is understood to be complex and fundamentally nonlinear in nature. (p. 10-11)

The constructionist paradigm and its treatment of knowledge have been utilized by the fields of psychology, educational psychology and philosophy, and education to shape the theory called *sociocultural history*—developed primarily as a learning theory. Vygotsky tapped this mode of thinking and as Karpov (2003) has argued, socioconstructivism is better described in terms of what it is not, as compared to other learning and teaching ideas,

...human mental processes neither are developed in the course of children's independent activity (as constructivist would hold), nor "unfold" as a result of maturation (as nativists would hold), nor are inculcated into children by adults (as behaviorists would hold). The development of mental processes in each period of the child's life is determined by mediation in the context of the specific to the given period relationships between children and their social environment. (p. 139)

Based on the process of deduction, the socioconstructivist paradigm rejects notions from previous conceptions of learning theories. While it carries some features of constructivism, socioconstructivism is a learning theory in its own right and diverges significantly from the concept of constructivism,

...to construct interpretations of ongoing events, actively making sense of language and life, the socioconstructivist perspective also includes the cultural/social/historical milieu into which every person is born and lives. From a socioconstructivist perspective, we attend to the cultural meaning of the situation in which learning is taking place and to the social practices and power differentials that influence teachers and learners in learning situations. (Schallert & Martin, 2003 p. 34)

The emphasis for Schallert and Martin (2003) is on the cultural/social/historical milieu which is described as a critical element of socioconstructivism and forms the all important environment in which learning takes place.

While the terms *constructionism*, *constructivism*, and *socioconstructivism* are related and derived from similar concepts, they have been, at times, used as terms describing the same concept and at other times, used to describe discrete categories. The use of these terms is often dependent upon the context of the research and the author's belief system regarding constructivism. In this dissertation, *constructionism* refers to an interpretive epistemology, while *constructivism* denotes methodologies involving the learner's construction of knowledge without consideration of cultural context or the particular situation in which learning occurs. In this sense, constructivism is more internal and individual.

Doolittle and Hicks (2003) have provided an excellent delineation of radical, social, and cognitive constructivism. Radical constructivism refers specifically to knowledge construction as a strictly internal process; social constructivism (also *socioconstructivism*) emphasizes social interaction as the source for knowledge construction; and cognitive constructivism engenders a positivistic slant (and might be dismissed from any categorization under constructivism by some scholars) that views knowledge as externally existing, then re-structured internally by the learner. Moreover, Doolittle and Hicks caution, "...the concept of 'constructivism' is diverse, with varied

interpretations. This diversity necessitates that the asserting of constructivist claims be made with caution and significant forethought” (p. 81).

The addition of the Vygotskian prefix *socio* to the term constructivism indicates the acknowledgement of cultural and contextual issues in learning situations (as opposed to a strictly internal construction of knowledge referred to by the term constructivism.) It is worth noting that in the majority of literature using both constructivist and socioconstructivist notions, the term constructivism is used as an umbrella term, referring to both constructivist and socioconstructivist notions.

For the purposes of this dissertation, the term *socioconstructivism* is used instead of the more general term constructivism with the intent of taking advantage of its definition previously stated. The specific elements of socioconstructivism, which differentiate it from constructivism, that is, the social and cultural factors present in all learning situations, are key in this study. Throughout the dissertation, various authors’ original use of the various terminologies (constructivism, social constructivism, socioconstructivism, etc.) remains in citations and references to their respective work.

2.2 DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOCONSTRUCTIVISM

Vygotsky’s learning theory—sociocultural history—was originally developed in Russia during revolutionary social upheaval through his work with literature, psychology, and defectology (contemporary special education). Vygotsky’s learning theory was heavily influenced by Marxist thought and may be understood in three parts:

- 1) a reliance on a genetic or developmental method, 2) the claim that higher mental processes in the individual have their origin in social processes, and 3) the claim that mental processes can be understood only if we understand the tools and signs that mediate them. (Wertsch, 1985 pp. 14-15)

Further, Vygotsky’s approach to child development was dual in terms of development: 1) physical—the normal processes of growth and maturation; and 2) cultural—the mastery of

cultural tools, with speech and language as a fundamental tool of mediation in learning situations (van der Veer & Valsiner, 1991). Language as a cultural tool is a central theme in Vygotsky's sociocultural history. It provides the primary means with which two or more persons engage in dialogue and the construction of knowledge follows. Reiber and Carton have described both Vygotsky and his efforts:

[He was] not only a psychologist but a cultural theorist, a scholar deeply committed to understanding not simply Man, conceived as a solo "organism," but Man as an expression of human culture...his educational theory is a theory of cultural transmission as well as a theory of development... [and] for him, the heart of the matter is the interaction between man and his tools, particularly the symbolic tool of language. (Reiber & Carton, 1987 pp. 1-2)

"The heart of the matter" is one of the most widely known concepts that Vygotsky (1978) has offered educators known as the *zone of proximal development (ZPD)* (Chaiklin, 2004), Vygotsky defines zone of proximal development, "the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86). Rather, "...what is in the zone of proximal development today will be the actual development level tomorrow—that is, what a child can do with assistance today she will be able to do by herself tomorrow" (p. 87). Through the concept of zone of proximal development, Vygotsky determined that learning precedes development. This idea demands that students must engage with material that consistently maintains engagement within the zone of proximal development so that development proceeds without lapse. If a student works with learning material that is too simple or too difficult, or the adult or near peer does not mediate the learning activity adequately, then development does not occur and frustration often follows. Fosnot and Perry (2005) have offered further clarity on Vygotsky's zone of proximal development by explaining it as a place where a student's *spontaneous concepts*

work their way up to meet an adult's (or peer's) *scientific concepts* working their way down within this zone of proximal development (p. 23). Logic is imposed and accepted in this dialogic interaction. Spontaneous concepts are learned through cultural practice and scientific concepts are learned through formal instruction according to Smagorinsky, Cook and Johnson (2003). Further, the zone of proximal development is social in nature—in keeping with Vygotsky's theory of sociocultural history,

...an essential feature of learning is that it creates the zone of proximal development; that is, learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers. Once these processes are internalized, they become part of the child's independent developmental achievement. (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 90)

Termed *social situation of development*, the learners experience a contradiction between current abilities, individual interests, and the affordances of the environment. They then engage in learning activities to resolve such contradictions thereby continuing the development of an existing internal function or creating new functions to manage the learning situation (Chaiklin, 2004, p. 47). By using elements of the zone of proximal development, educators have been provided an important tool to assist students at their appropriate learning and developmental levels. The creation of dialogue between a novice and an expert occurs that then leads to an internal dialogue. Vygotsky labels this phenomena *inner speech* which is a component of deep understanding of the material (Reiber & Carton, 1987).

Mediation was also a critical part of Vygotsky's model which contrasted previous theories of acquisition (Kozulin, 2003). The learner must apply psychological tools found in the environment to the process of mediation in order to achieve higher mental development. Such tools, according to Kozulin, were established by Vygotsky as part of formal education (symbolic artifacts such as signs, symbols, texts, formulae, graphic

organizers) but they may also include other human beings or organized learning activities like scaffolding (Cambourne, 1988) or apprenticeship models (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Both the zone of proximal development and mediation made up essential elements of Vygotsky's work. "Paedology, according to him, is primarily interested in the ways in which the hereditary bases of development and actual life-course experiences of the children become integrated" (van der Veer & Valsiner, 1991 p. 312). While Vygotsky was a psychologist, his late work turned to using the sociocultural history construct in a pedagogical sense focusing on language and social interaction in classroom learning situations. Strengthening Vygotsky's knowledge construction were the ideas of philosopher John Dewey whose curricular contributions provide another context in which to consider Vygotskian notions—further clarifying socioconstructivist thought.

Dewey's work was a departure from Vygotsky's in that his background and formal education was in philosophy, not psychology. Dewey's child-centered views were guided by his goal for education, "The process of leading the child from present interests to an intellectual command of the modern world, however, remained for Dewey a controlling purpose, and the critical problem was to construct a curriculum that best facilitated that process" (Kliebard, 1986 p. 63). Dewey heavily emphasized the role of the student in the educational process. The role of the teacher was in the co-construction of knowledge and as guide to the student through a rigorous academic routine that matched both individual inclination and ability.

Dewey's curriculum centered on occupations—natural human activities—within which he taught advanced academic subjects and guided students from concrete subjects to abstract ideas. This place in Dewey's framework may be considered where Vygotsky's spontaneous and scientific concepts would meet. "An experience is educative, Dewey insisted, if it increases the quality of one's interactions with important objects and events

in the immediate environment and lays the groundwork for even more expansive interactions in the future” (Prawat, 2000 p. 806). Dewey’s model consisted of experiential education, wherein students were presented with realistic events or problems in which they were guided through the learning process of materials and subjects needed to solve the problem or understand the event.

If in fact, the situation appealed to their interests and needs, and was not too daunting, all the ingredients for a Deweyan *teachable moment* were present. When a student lacked the cognitive wherewithal to deal with a new, inviting situation, it created a state of disequilibrium. The need to alleviate this discomfort provided the incentive necessary for the *real learning* to occur (Prawat, 2000 p. 806).

This real learning may be likened to Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development. Dewey’s (1897) aim was to develop a rigorous curriculum that would best take advantage of, or frequently create teachable moments. His most pointed writing of his beliefs on education is contained in his piece entitled *My Pedagogic Creed*. Dewey outlined his perspective on education overall—schools, subject matter, methodology, and social progress—as it related to the school. Elements that are characterized today as socioconstructivist are evident in selections from the Creed:

- I believe that the only true education comes through the stimulation of the child’s powers by the demands of the social situations in which he finds himself.
- Education, therefore, must begin with a psychological insight into the child’s capacities, interests, and habits.
- The teacher is not in the school to impose certain ideas or to form certain habits in the child, but is there as a member of the community to select the influences which shall affect the child and to assist him in properly responding to these influences.

- I believe, finally, that education must be conceived as a continuing reconstruction of experience; that the process and goal of education are one and the same thing.
- I believe that the question of method is ultimately reducible to the question of the order of development of the child's powers and interests.
- I believe that education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform. (Dewey, 1897, pp. 77-80)

Contemporary educators continue to benefit from century-old theories developed by Vygotsky, Dewey and others who informed their thinking. As educators continue to research new or improved learning theories and pedagogical practices, the work and ideas of these men is regularly called upon to inform current perspectives on socioconstructivism.

2.3 SOCIOCONSTRUCTIVIST PEDAGOGY

Socioconstructivism may be traced from its grounding roots in philosophy, through various theoretical tenets and conceptions and, ultimately, to practical use in the classroom by teachers and students. Throughout the 20th and 21st centuries, socioconstructivist thought has developed and become accepted as a viable and valuable learning theory—ripe for adaptation to pedagogical principles (Fosnot, 2005a; Richardson, 2003).

Given the long and complex derivation of socioconstructivism as a learning theory, some may be content with leaving it at that—a learning theory. However, satisfied in the establishment of firm psychological and philosophical foundations, scholars have continued to seek translation of socioconstructivist frameworks from learning theory to pedagogical practice. Recently (within the last decade), formal socioconstructivist pedagogical systems and approaches have emerged and are gaining credibility as the

number of empirical studies increase in number and rigor (Richardson, 2003) in support of socioconstructivist practice.

As such, Richardson (2003) has provided a summary of constructivist pedagogical practice that forms the characteristics necessary for the classification of a learning situation as constructivist—or rather socioconstructivist. They included the following:

1. attention to the individual and respect for students' background and developing understandings of and beliefs about elements of the domain (this could also be described as student-centered);
2. facilitation of group dialogue that explores an element of the domain with the purpose of leading to the creation and shared understanding of a topic;
3. planned and often unplanned introduction of formal domain knowledge into the conversation through direct instruction, reference to text, exploration of a Web site, or some other means.
4. provision of opportunities for students to determine, challenge, change or add to existing beliefs and understandings through engagement in tasks that are structured for this purpose; and
5. development of students' metawareness of their own understandings and learning processes. (p. 1626)

These characteristics provide guidelines for the practical use of socioconstructivism in the classroom, both in identifying and developing socioconstructivist learning situations. This is a helpful step towards establishing a strong socioconstructivist pedagogical framework. In addition to Richardson's (2003) work, Fosnot (2005a) has developed a comprehensive definition of socioconstructivism and socioconstructivist teaching as follows:

Based on work in psychology, philosophy, science, and biology, the theory describes knowledge not as truths to be transmitted or discovered, but as emergent, developmental, nonobjective, viable constructed explanations by humans engaged in meaning-making cultural and social communities of discourse. Learning from this perspective is viewed as a self-regulatory process of

struggling with the conflict between existing personal models of reality as a human meaning-making venture with culturally developed tools and symbols, and further negotiating such meaning through cooperative social activity, discourse, and debate in communities of practice. (p. ix)

Fosnot (2005a) has also given insight to the schism between learning theory and pedagogy noting that, in the past, constructivist theory has been misunderstood, misused, and attacked. She maintained that current conceptions reflect better understandings and have paved the way for application as a pedagogical theory (p. x). Her constructivist (or socioconstructivist as implied by the inclusion of community in her definition) view of learning suggests,

an approach to teaching that gives learners the opportunity for concrete, contextually meaningful experience through which they can search for patterns; raise questions; and model, interpret, and defend their strategies and ideas. The classroom in this model is seen as a mini-society, a community of learners engaged in activity, discourse, interpretation, justification, and reflection. (p. ix)

As socioconstructivist pedagogy develops, socioconstructivism becomes easier to identify in classrooms and lessons, in the field as an identifiable practice. One such area is the approach of historical thinking, a methodology used by professional historians that has been adapted for classroom use by the social studies field (Davis, 1998; Grant, 2003; VanSledright, 2002; Wineburg, 2001).

2.4 PREMISES OF HISTORICAL THINKING

Historical thinking provides opportunity to practice socioconstructivist pedagogy. Like socioconstructivism, historical thinking has increased in use and visibility in the past decade (Spoehr & Spoehr, 1994; VanSledright, 2004; Wineburg, 2001). Wineburg (2001) has called for engagement in historical thinking in a global sense,

...we are all called on to engage in historical thinking—called on to see human motive in the texts we read; called on to mine truth from the quicksand of innuendo, half-truth, and falsehood that seeks to engulf us each day; called on to brave the fact that certainty, at least in understanding the social world, remains

elusive and beyond our grasp....school history possesses great potential for teaching students to think and reason in sophisticated ways. (p. 83)

The National Standards for History (National Council for History Standards, 1996), and Texas state curriculum guides (Texas Education Agency, 1998) have supported Wineburg's position as necessary elements of learning in history classrooms, ranging from Kindergarten through 12th grade,

The study of history...rests on knowledge of facts, dates, names, places, events, and ideas. In addition, true historical understanding requires students to engage in historical thinking: to raise questions and to marshal solid evidence in support of their answers; to go beyond the facts presented in their textbooks and examine the historical record for themselves; to consult documents, journals, diaries, artifacts, historic sites, works of art, quantitative data, and other evidence from the past, and to do so imaginatively—taking into account the historical context in which these records were created and comparing the multiple points of view of those on the scene at the time. (National Council for History Standards, 1996)

Summarized by Davis (1998), the standards for historical thinking, "...intend that students learn to derive warranted, substantive, historical knowledge and that they learn to communicate it in appropriate historical formats." History is no longer a simple chronological accrual of facts and data punctuated by a few events told in narrative style. It has become a field of study where the historical narrative is created by students and teachers and becomes a constructed and contested territory.

As with socioconstructivism, historical thinking has been subject to multiple definitions and uses in scholarly literature. Spoehr and Spoehr (1994) have defined historical thinking using the process of deduction, "thinking historically, in other words, does not call for accumulation, but discrimination and informed judgment" (p. 71). VanSledright (2004) has pointed out that some say "the term [historical thinking] means different things to different people" (p. 230); but has defined it himself as *sourcework* or the investigation and assessment of historical data. This sourcework involves cognitive acts during the examination of primary sources that include the processes of:

- identification,
- attribution,
- judging perspective, and,
- reliability assessment,
- which are practiced by professional historians in the daily course of their work.

VanSledright (2002) has claimed that students as young as seven years old can successfully accomplish historical thinking and, with teacher assistance, high school students' work may be as sophisticated as that of professional historians (p. 230-231).

Seixas (1993) has similarly analyzed students' historical thinking using the following categories:

- historical significance—the ability to select events of importance using factual knowledge and criteria;
- historical epistemology—the ability to “refine, revise, and add to their picture of history, either through new evidence or through reliance on historical authorities” (p. 303);
- historical agency, or, understanding the choices made under particular constraints by those in the past and the consequences thereof;
- historical empathy—the understanding that historical contexts are much different from their own and engaging in historical thinking without being hampered by presentism; and,
- moral judgment, making judgments about past events ranging from individual issues to judgments of historical progress and decline.

Further, Seixas has argued that historical thinking is an ongoing learning process that is influenced greatly by knowledge generated by familial experiences and maintained by family stories; it may be considered in socioconstructivist terms as prior knowledge.

An additional and important benefit of the use of historical thinking is the expansion of traditional historical topics to a more diverse and inclusive body of

knowledge. “In understanding history as a thought process first [historical thinking] and as a body of data second, historians have expanded the domain of inquiry beyond the boundaries of elite culture and those with power” (Staley, 2002, p. 73). VanSledright and Afflerbach (2000) and Wineburg (2001) have found the use of historical thinking a powerful tool to interrupt the celebratory historical metanarrative with which most preservice teachers are familiar. Furthermore, historical thinking may facilitate the consideration of other viewpoints in order to present a more diverse and accurate account of historical events, as well as to develop a sense of empathy,

...prospective teachers as readers will develop the sort of critical reading acumen that exemplifies the way historians, for example, read and understand the past. This in turn, will nurture receptivity to multiple points of view and help produce empathy and tolerance, dispositions that later, proponents hope, will be translated into the classroom teaching practices of these prospective teachers. (VanSledright & Afflerbach, 2000, p. 438)

In this way, teacher educators have sought to reinforce multicultural notions in the social studies classrooms by fostering these skills in preservice teachers.

An essential connection between socioconstructivist theory and historical thinking is in the use of document-based questions (DBQ's) as a scaffold and mediator used to support student development of higher order thinking. Document-based questions, as described by VanSledright (2002), have been used on the Advanced Placement (AP) exam for many years as an assessment tool; they are also an excellent classroom pedagogical tool when used as an organized learning activity. Document-based questions act as mediation tools in Vygotskian terms. Emphasizing the specialized nature of appropriating psychological tools—or engaging in mediation via language Kozulin (2003) has asserted,

content material often reproduces empirical realities with which students become acquainted in everyday life, psychological tools can be acquired only in the course of special learning activities....This learning paradigm presupposes (a) a deliberate, rather than spontaneous character of the learning process; (b) systemic

acquisition of symbolic tools, because they themselves are systematically organized; (c) emphasis on the generalized nature of symbolic tools and their application. (p. 25)

While document-based questions may differ in topic based upon the types of accompanying primary source material—they are specifically designed to prompt students' critical thinking and investigation of original documents, photographs, etc. VanSledright (2002), in his study of fifth graders and historical thinking analyzed their use of primary source material using the following framework:

- Global reading strategies: Level 1: Vocalization Type: Comprehension Monitoring Strategies (CMS)
 - Checking/pointing out details
 - Rereading portions of document/image
 - Questioning the document/image
 - Summarizing about a document passage or image depiction
 - Predicting/inferring about a document/author purpose
 - Checking fit with understanding or lack thereof
- Global reading strategies: Level 2: Vocalization Type: Intratextual Evaluations (IAE)
 - Judging who characters are and actions in text/image
 - Assessing text language/image depiction effectively
 - Judging whether the text/image makes sense
 - Questioning/evaluating the author/artist/title/caption (e.g. style, syntax, color)
- History-specific reading strategies: Level 3: Vocalization Type: Event Knowledge Accretion (EKA)
 - Checking where source(s) come(s) from, identifying the nature of a source(s) relative to other sources

- Corroborating/checking details against those gleaned from other accounts/images, using account to add to knowledge of event, checking fit of details from one document/image to another
- Building an initial interpretation from accreted knowledge
- History-specific reading strategies: Level 4: Vocalization Type: Critical Intertextual Evaluations (CIEE)
 - Judging validity and reliability of source vis-à-vis other sources
 - Assessing and judging the subtext against other subtexts
 - Assessing actions/intentions of the historical agents with respect to other accounts
 - Testing and refining the interpretation (p. 164)

VanSledright's (2002) work provided a format for analysis of the use of document-based questions in the classroom and created a detailed structure for the use of this mediation tool.

Supported by affirming views of historical thinking by scholars and educators, efforts to transform traditional history classrooms via historical thinking are ever increasing. Systematic difficulties such as standardized testing, the belief that students—particularly younger students—cannot engage in this complex academic endeavor, the growing number of poorly funded and staffed diverse urban schools, and the continued debate over subject matter and its breadth and depth continue to challenge teacher educators in instilling historical thinking in the repertoire of preservice teachers (VanSledright, 2002, p.14, 22).

2.5 HISTORICAL THINKING AS A SOCIOCONSTRUCTIVIST PEDAGOGICAL APPROACH

Vygotsky's original interest was in exploring the “integration of development and experience” (Chaiklin, 2004) as he placed emphasis on the social and cultural context in

which knowledge construction takes place. It is precisely within this situation that historical thinking is revealed as a socioconstructivist concept. “The important question to be asked is not whether the cognizing individual or the culture should be given priority in an analysis of learning, but instead, ‘What is the interplay between them?’” (Fosnot & Perry, 2005, p. 28). The use of socioconstructivism in the social studies, “...changes the nature of the social studies from one of a search for truth, to one of a search for perspective” (Doolittle & Hicks, 2003, p. 77).

VanSledright (2002) has written of *a pragmatist’s epistemological stance* (p. 144). This phrase refers to the concept of interpreting the past and VanSledright has contested that,

a pragmatist’s epistemology acknowledges this tension, the unbridgeable divide that separates a reality back then from our interpretations of it now....This requires us to see history as a set of stories we construct and tell—and continually re-construct and retell—about who we were and how they define who we see ourselves as now. They are the tales that then enable us to project who we might be tomorrow. (p. 144-145)

One of the primary purposes of socioconstructivist pedagogical principles is to provide a learning environment in which students learn transferable knowledge—that is, knowledge that may be applied to multiple experiences in a holistic and long-term sense. Both procedural and conceptual knowledge—known in Vygotskian terms as scientific knowledge—are worthwhile goals for student learning, otherwise, students acquire a large amount of random information as well as useless procedures. Karpov has written (2003, p. 68-69), “rote skills are meaningless and nontransferable, and pure verbal knowledge is inert” (p. 70). He argues for this combination of procedural and conceptual knowledge to promote, “a high level of mastery, broad transfer, and intentional use by students” (p. 69). The term *theoretical learning* characterizes this purposeful endeavor (which is guided by teachers or more knowledgeable peers) to provide students with meaningful education.

This is in contrast to empirical learning, characterized by students' unsuccessful learning attempts often resulting in incorrect notions, wrong answers, and development of spontaneous concepts (Karpov, 2003, p. 70-71).

In examining socioconstructivist learning theory, experiential education, and its related pedagogical principles, and historical thinking, multiple parallels may be drawn between them. These parallels are drawn in such a close manner that historical thinking may be labeled a socioconstructivist pedagogical approach both in purpose and in practice. The overarching purpose in each of the concepts lies in the holistic nature of learning and transferability of knowledge used to develop students as well-rounded individuals and active citizens. Sociocultural history seeks to develop students' thought processes so that they may function at high levels in society; likewise, experiential education calls for curriculum that prepares students for success and future responsibilities. Socioconstructivist pedagogy provides rigorous and relevant learning experiences so that students learn transferable knowledge and skills. Finally, historical thinking, in a broad sense, seeks to develop critical thinking skills and emphasizes applicability of these skills to other topics and subject areas beyond the arena of history.

Similar practices include use of the zone of proximal development, use of teachable moments, and developmentally appropriate material, with a teacher or peer as facilitators. Mediation plays a significant role in learning as well as an emphasis on contextuality. In each area, the linking of experience and formal instruction is evident as well as the focus on student individuality and her/his position within the group. The social or situational context and a student's prior knowledge are important elements in each construct. Learning centers on relevant material, informal and formal knowledge. Finally, each theoretical base or pedagogy acknowledges and benefits from the concept of knowledge as a constructed and contested entity.

A learner's prior knowledge is a critical element of socioconstructivism and is a powerful factor in student learning—either as a help or a hindrance—to the extension and building of knowledge. Seixas (1994) and Wineburg (2001) both have asserted the importance of prior knowledge with historical thinking, particularly with regards to preservice teachers. By explicitly assessing their own and their students' preconceptions of historical topics, preservice teachers gain deeper understanding of how to proceed with appropriate lessons. "Learning is not merely an encounter with new information, for new information is often no match for deeply held beliefs" (Wineburg, 2001, p. 153). As the four elements are drawn together, their underlying principles and functions are complementary, "History teaching is a co-investigation in which the teacher and students shape and reshape their interpretations about the past" (Drake & Brown, 2003, p. 471).

This chapter has discussed a selection of major elements of socioconstructivist thought as related to education today. Socioconstructivist principles are currently championed by many education professionals; they believe in its learner-centered orientation and its ability to elicit meaningful learning. Moreover, socioconstructivism, with its emphasis on knowledge construction, is considered to foster democratic learning situations where individuality and culture are honored as context. At the same time that present-day educators support socioconstructivist approaches and their development, it is important to remember that socioconstructivism has been well-established as a theoretical construct and learning theory by scholars and philosophers. The true origins of socioconstructivism lie in constructionist epistemology and the philosophy of knowledge built upon the assumption that all knowledge is constructed via engagement with the human mind. Through an examination and review of constructivist theory and pedagogy, Richardson (2003) has provided clarity to the current state of constructivist pedagogy in schools as well as a five-point list of constructivist characteristics, commensurate with

Fosnot and Perry's (2005) conception of socioconstructivist pedagogy to utilize in classrooms.

A specific manifestation of socioconstructivist pedagogy has been identified in the approach of historical thinking, defined as a manner of contextualizing and thoughtfully examining historical events and characters through primary source material with multiple lenses. Historical thinking, originally created and used by professional historians, is a powerful tool in the social studies classroom with which students may develop critical thinking skills and diverse views of historical events by using primary source material. Both Seixas (1993) and VanSledright (2004) have provided detailed outlines to assist teachers in using and teaching elements of historical thinking to students, these outlines include the use of primary source material and document-based questions. Doolittle and Hicks (2003) have emphasized that historical studies should not seek truth but rather perspective—an outlook that places historical thinking in alignment with socioconstructivist practice. Further, the pragmatist's epistemological stance (VanSledright, 2002) has emphasized the construction and re-construction of historical knowledge to define who we are as individuals and who we will be in the future. Connections between socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking may also be found in the purpose of knowledge and learning. Both constructs emphasized popular and theoretical knowledge as well as the need for learning to be relevant, engaging, and to prepare students to be active participants in their communities.

Socioconstructivism presents itself as a powerful and complex learning theory that is useful as a foundation for developing pedagogical practice, such as historical thinking, by educators. The multiple benefits of pursuing socioconstructivist principles in the classroom, such as improved student learning of academic material and social interaction, embracing culture and diversity, and authentic assessment outweigh

drawbacks that have yet to be fully resolved as in the design of a cohesive pedagogical framework utilizing socioconstructivism. The examination of historical thinking, an established pedagogical practice, and socioconstructivist principles, an established learning theory, may prove to be one manner of highlighting and understanding the continuum between theory and practice enacted in classrooms by preservice teachers as they begin their professional careers as educators.

Chapter Three: Research Methodology

A natural fit emerges in case study for an investigation exploring the nature of socioconstructivism to be conducted from within the interpretive/constructivist paradigm. According to Merriam, (1998) “Qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meanings people have constructed, that is, how they make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world” (p. 6). This dissertation seeks greater understanding of preservice teachers’ use and conception of and their experiences with socioconstructivist principles via the practice of historical thinking in the classroom. The process of investigating uses of historical thinking and subsequent understanding of socioconstructivist principles by preservice teachers was best accomplished as an interpretive task utilizing case study methodology and its related techniques as the research framework. Further, mindful attention was directed towards the rigor and trustworthiness of the research design, its implementation, and the processes thereof.

The following chapter details the methods and process of the study discussing design and conceptual framework, research methodology, data collection and analysis, context of the study and its participants (including researcher positionality), and limitations of the study. It concludes with the study timeline and brief description of related pilot research conducted prior to this study.

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The interpretive nature of this dissertation was grounded in the field of qualitative research and, as defined by Denzin and Lincoln, (2005) characterized qualitative research as,

[qualitative research is] a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible.

These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. (p. 3)

The hope was that by making visible the realm of preservice teachers' efforts to implement historical thinking as a socioconstructivist pedagogical approach, their understandings, or misunderstandings, of socioconstructivism would become apparent. Qualitative research seeks "answers to questions that stress how social experience is created and given meaning" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 10).

Most importantly, qualitative research offers the opportunity to explore the directions that the participants and their experiences took as well as to gain deeper understanding through natural interaction. "Being open to any possibility can lead to serendipitous discoveries" (Merriam, 1998, p. 121). Further, as Stake (1995) has pointed out, qualitative researchers, "...are trying to remain open to the nuances of increasing complexity" (p. 21) thus affording the opportunity to optimize the concept of *progressive focusing* (Huberman & Miles, 1983; Stake, 1994). As data and themes emerged throughout the course of the study, the "organizing concepts change[d] somewhat as the study moves[ed] along" (Stake, 1995, p. 133).

The design of this study was meant to provide guidance in accomplishing the following characteristics of quality qualitative research as outlined by Garman (1994):

- verity (intellectual authenticity)
- integrity (structural soundness)
- rigor (depth of intellect)
- utility (professional usefulness)
- vitality (meaningfulness)

- aesthetics (enrichment)
- ethics (consideration of dignity and privacy of participants)
- verisimilitude (sufficient detail to warrant transferability) (p. 4)

As the research progressed, attention turned and returned to these elements to maintain steady progress in attempt to avoid the traps of tangents, irrelevance, data mismanagement or disorganization, shallow interpretation, bias, and weak analysis.

Conceptual Framework

Four major educational theories or constructs made up the framework for this study, 1) Vygotsky's sociocultural history (Chaiklin, 2004; Karpov, 2003; Reiber & Carton, 1987; van der Veer & Valsiner, 1991; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1985); 2) Dewey's progressive education (Dewey, 1897; Dewey, 1998); 3) constructivist pedagogy (Fosnot & Perry, 2005; Richardson, 2003); and 4) historical thinking (Davis, 1998; Seixas, 1993; VanSledright, 2002; Wineburg, 2001).

These four elements combine learning theory, curriculum theory and pedagogical tools and approaches. The design of this study included the conceptual framework intertwined in such a way as to be interdependent; at times one particular framework is primary, and at other times, a different framework takes the forefront, which may be labeled *montage*,

In montage, several different images are juxtaposed to or superimposed on one another to create a picture. In a sense, montage is like *pentimento*, in which something that has been painted out of a picture (an image the painter "repented" or denied) becomes visible again, creating something new. What is new is what had been obscured by a previous image. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 4)

While laying out the conceptual framework in a linear fashion eases explanation, these lines simplify the theories such that they lose their complex and interconnected meaning in the simplicity of the drawing. The research methodology detailed in the forthcoming

section was designed to investigate closely the relationships between and among these elements as preservice teachers began their work as full time classroom teachers.

Table 1: Theoretical Frameworks Used in Study

<p>Historical Thinking (Seixas, 1993; VanSledright, 2002)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document-based questions, DBQ's • Emphasize student individualism • Epistemological positionality • Historical events in context • Incorporates popular and academic knowledge • Peer collaboration • Primary / secondary sourcework • Use of prior knowledge 		<p>Socioconstructivist Pedagogy (Fosnot, 2005a; Richardson, 2003)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge and maximize • Formal and informal knowledge • Importance of discourse communities • Metawareness of learning process • Peer collaboration • Scaffolding • Student prior knowledge • students' culture • Subjective truth
<p>Experiential Education (Dewey, 1897; Dewey, 1998)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop experiences into organized knowledge • Teachable moments • Teacher as guide • Use demands of social environment to stimulate learning • Use psychological insight to garner student interest & ability 		<p>Sociocultural History (Vygotsky, 1978)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contextuality, use of cultural tools • Develop theoretical knowledge via spontaneous & scientific concepts • Mediation via language, teachers, peers • Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

Case Study Design

This dissertation employed qualitative case study research as defined by Merriam (1998), “A qualitative case study is an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a bounded phenomenon” (p. xiii); and Yin (2003) who has provided more specific boundaries for case study. It is an empirical inquiry that,

investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident;

deals with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points: and as one result relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion; and as another result, benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis. (p. 13-14)

This case study was bounded by several contexts, the preservice teachers themselves and their experiences as students and beginning teachers, their teaching assignment, campus, and fieldwork, and their work on the university campus. The study was situated within these interrelated contexts. Through qualitative research techniques, the relationships and resulting interactions between these contexts, socioconstructivist principles, and historical thinking by preservice teachers were uncovered. These experiences facilitated or hindered the understanding of socioconstructivism and historical thinking by the preservice teachers and gave it meaning. These contexts provided multiple boundaries for this study.

More specifically than general case study, this dissertation may be considered multiple-case study (Yin, 2003) or a collective case study (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995) as there were four preservice teachers participating in the research. Stake (1995) has noted that a case study is,

Singular, but it has subsections (e.g. production, marketing, sales departments), groups (e.g. students, teachers, parents), occasions (e.g. workdays, holidays, days

near holidays), a concatenation of domains—many so complex that at best they can only be sampled. Holistic case study calls for the examination of these complexities.” (p. 239).

The case study was written in narrative form and was primarily concerned with providing the reader with insight and understanding of the unique case or situation, and according to Stake (1995), “Qualitative research tries to establish an empathetic understanding for the reader, through description, sometimes thick description, conveying to the reader what the experience itself would convey” (p. 39). The outcome of a rich narrative text describing the experience of the preservice teachers with socioconstructivism and historical thinking was dependent upon organized, flexible, and careful data collection.

Data Collection

Data collection occurred during the fall of 2005. All data gathered from participant resources was collected with explicit permission from the participants and in full compliance with Institutional Review Board (IRB) guidelines and school district research study requirements and approvals.

In accordance with qualitative research tradition (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003), multiple data sources were collected. Data used in this dissertation was organized into four sets: the primary set was made up of interview data, which comprised approximately three one-hour digitally recorded audio semi-structured interviews. This interview data was triangulated by the following: 1) participant artifacts (lesson plans, classroom materials, personal reflection papers, weekly written reflections, and student work), observations, and field notes (a minimum of five, one-hour field-based observations); 2) professor interviews, syllabi, audio-taped class sessions, and university coursework materials; and 3) other resources including copies of district and state lesson design guidelines (Texas Essential Skills and Knowledge (TEKS), Instructional Planning Guides (IPG's)), and national curriculum standards.

The use of interviews and observations are commonplace in qualitative case study research and have been well-documented in scholarly literature (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Fontana & Frey, 1994; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1994, 1995; Yin, 2003). They are one manner of obtaining an insider, or emic, perspective regarding the issues being studied. The interaction between researcher and participant through the interview is, “the establishment of human-to-human relation with the respondent and the desire to understand rather than to explain” (Fontana & Frey, 1994, p. 366). Interviews with the participants were semi-structured; providing for consistent investigation of particular topics with the participant and basic introductory questions, but also afforded flexibility to engage in natural conversation that provided deeper insight,

This makes the interview more honest, morally sound, and reliable, because it treats the respondent as an equal, allows him or her to express personal feelings, and therefore presents a more “realistic” picture than can be uncovered using traditional interview methods. (Fontana & Frey, 1994, p. 371)

Moreover, Merriam (1998), has noted that highly structured interviews do not afford a true participant perspective, they simply, “get reactions to the investigator’s preconceived notions of the world” (p. 74). Also emphasized by Fontana and Frey (1994) has been the observation and notation of body language and verification of shared meanings during the interview. It is important that the researcher and participant fully understand each other and the particulars of the conversation. These two elements contribute to the richness and integrity of the exchange.

Approximately four hour-long interviews, conducted on four separate occasions per participant (for a total of 16-18 hours of interview data), were audio taped and transcribed using digital media and provided to the participants for review and member checking. Member checking is considered an important method for verifying and validating information observed and/or transcribed by the researcher (Merriam, 1998;

Mertens, 1998; Stake, 1995) and is meant as a critique of the data. Member checking also provides material for further investigation and triangulation, “They [the participants] also help triangulate the researcher’s observations and interpretations....The actor [participant] is asked to review the material for accuracy and palatability” (Stake, 1995, p. 115). When research participants review interview transcripts, observation notes or narrative text they often provide corroboration and feedback (Stake, 1995). Each research participant was given the opportunity to review data materials and provide further response to the research questions. Handwritten notes were taken during the interviews for the purposes of extending questions and to function as the researcher’s personal notes for further investigation. Some interviews were conducted on the university campus but accommodations were made for participants’ schedules and some interviews were conducted on their school sites or elsewhere after-hours.

Similar to interviews, observations must be conducted carefully with strict consideration for the research participants, as observations represent a “firsthand encounter with the phenomena of interest” (Merriam, 1998, p. 94). The role of the observer in this study was as an *observer-as-participant*, wherein the researcher had a peripheral membership in the group/context being observed (Adler & Adler, 1994). No formal, intentional interaction between the researcher, the participant, and students took place, but the observer was a friendly, knowledgeable outsider. The observer selected the least obtrusive location in the classroom from which to operate and took notes on the actions of the preservice teacher, their interactions with students, lesson implementation, and other related contextual elements/events quietly on a laptop computer. Adler and Adler (1994) have noted that,

One of the hallmarks of observation has traditionally been its noninterventionism. Observers neither manipulate nor stimulate their subjects....Qualitative observation is fundamentally naturalistic in essence: it occurs in the natural

context of occurrence, among the actors who would naturally be participating in the interaction, and follows the natural stream of everyday life. (p. 378)

The observational techniques employed provided further insight to the preservice teachers' use of historical thinking in the classroom with students as well as about their notions of socioconstructivism.

Artifact collection is a less intrusive method of collecting data and provided detail and evidence of corroboration or contradiction when compared to other collected data (Merriam, 1998), but Yin (2003) has cautioned that while gleaning material from artifacts, researchers must recall that these artifacts were designed for purposes other than research and, therefore, these sources should be used judiciously.

The interview protocols (see Appendix A), observations, and artifact collection were designed to investigate further the central research questions as well as issues raised by the literature review, and further facilitated data analysis.

Data Analysis

Qualitative case study research amasses volumes of raw data; therefore, it was essential to maintain the data in an organized and timely fashion (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Huberman & Miles, 1983; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1994, 1995; Yin, 2003). More importantly, preliminary data analysis must be conducted immediately post-collection or better yet, "the right way to analyze data in a qualitative study is to do it simultaneously with data collection" (Merriam, 1998, p. 162). Stake has emphasized (1994) that data is continuously interpreted since qualitative research is inherently reflective, "in being ever reflective, the researcher is committed to pondering the impressions, deliberating recollections and records....data [is] sometimes precoded but continuously interpreted, on first sighting and again and again" (p. 242).

More specifically, Huberman and Miles (1983), have outlined a detailed procedure for data gathering and analysis—aiding the simultaneous nature of the work:

- coding (organizing and theming data)
- policing (detecting bias and preventing tangents)
- dictating field notes (as opposed to verbatim recordings)
- connoisseurship (researcher knowledge of issues and context of the site)
- progressive focusing and funneling (winnowing data and investigative technique as study progresses)
- interim site summaries (narrative reviews of research progress)
- memoing (formal noting and sharing of emerging issues), and,
- outlining (standardized writing formats)

While these procedures were used in a large, multi-site study by Huberman and Miles, research for this dissertation utilized a similar format, making necessary changes to accomplish a similar task for a smaller study with a single researcher. This particular data collection/analysis substituted transcribed interviews and written field notes (either typed on a laptop computer or handwritten in a notebook) for the dictated field notes; and it combined the elements of summaries, memos, and outlines into a reflective research journal kept by the principal investigator. These procedures attempted to organize the data as it was collected; such procedures demarcated a fine line between data collection and analysis, thus easing the task of simultaneous collection and analysis.

After reviewing all the data sources, the materials (interview transcripts and follow-up notes, observation notes, and physical artifacts) were manually coded and preliminary meaning generated was from the interviews, observation field notes, and participant artifacts. As delineated by Miles and Huberman (1984), the data analysis

proceeded from noting patterns and themes to arriving at comparisons and contrasts to determining conceptual explanations of the case study.

Triangulation of the multiple data sources was built into data collection and analysis for the purpose of achieving trustworthiness. “Triangulation has been generally considered a process of using multiple perceptions to clarify meaning, verifying the repeatability of an observation or interpretation...triangulation serves also to clarify meaning by identifying different ways the phenomenon is being seen” (Stake, 1994, p. 241). The following four tenets of high quality analysis have been described by Yin (2003). The analysis must:

- attend to all the evidence
- address all major rival interpretations
- address the most significant aspect of the case study, and,
- utilize the researcher’s prior expert knowledge. (p. 137)

These four elements were considered and built into the research study design and were used to guide the data analysis and ensure its quality.

3.2 CONTEXT OF STUDY

This study was situated at a large flagship university in the Southwest portion of the United States. The resident secondary teacher professional development sequence (PDS) required special area coursework, in this instance, social studies. Fieldwork was essential as a significant program focus; preservice teachers divided their upper level coursework between field practice and university-based classes over two semesters. In the first semester of coursework, preservice teachers, known as interns, conducted 40 hours of classroom observations and eight full-length lessons. During the second semester, the apprenticeship, the preservice teachers, called apprentices, were present on school sites full time for sixteen weeks. They were expected to teach a full complement

of courses and take on typical teacher responsibilities such as grading, attending faculty meetings, preparing material preparation, etc. In both semesters, the preservice teachers were matched with practicing professionals, called cooperating teachers, who served as mentors and guides, based on the preservice teachers' preferred certification and grade level.

University Coursework

The university environment, faculty, and facilitators (those who function as teaching assistants and field work supervisors), both in coursework and in programmatic design supported socioconstructivist principles; thus these pedagogic principles required of the preservice teachers were modeled and experienced as part of the advanced social studies coursework during the apprentice teaching semester (see Appendix A).

Teachers often draw upon their previous work as students and their deeply held notions of how teachers undertake teaching tasks when they develop their own teacher repertoire (Britzman, 2003; Lortie, 1975/2002). As novices with little experience with socioconstructivist pedagogy (as learners or teachers), these pedagogical approaches were essentially new concepts for them both as learners and teachers. Eva María Gómez, the course professor, noted a common thread of inexperience in her students' prior knowledge with regards to student-centered teaching,

Well, definitely, many us become social studies teachers because of the way we were taught; it is very attractive. There's a good chance that the way most of us were taught was through a teacher-centered monolithic telling of history or lecture-based recitation models. I think that those models are very deeply burned into our understandings of why we want to become a classroom teacher. (M. Gómez, Interview, March 27, 2006)

Regardless of the teacher-centered and deeply held previous knowledge of teachers and teaching, Dr. Gómez maintained her stance in providing students with alternative notions

of teaching and viewed it as an opportunity to instigate change in teacher education and ultimately, the schools,

We represent the future of education. We represent tomorrow, and in doing that you have to ask, “What have we learned about human learning?” and “What have we learned about classroom teachers?” As a society we evolve; it’s what keeps us invigorated as teacher educators and for that reason I look to the ideal rather than the real. By situating myself in the ideal I hope to prepare a generation of teachers who are pushing the envelope and always questioning what we did yesterday, to foster progress in education. The young people who come to our schools are not static, they never have been, and they never will be. Neither is our understanding of knowledge; it’s a continuously growing body of work...we represent in many ways the possibilities in schools for our students and teachers. (M. Gómez, Interview, March 27, 2006)

It was with this optimism and support described above from Dr. Gómez and the university facilitators that the apprentice teachers were sent into the field to work with these new and sophisticated ideas. These efforts in the field were bolstered by strong support of socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking in their university coursework. They were encouraged to try new lessons, find new resources and to share that knowledge with their classmates, cooperating teachers, and colleagues on their campuses.

Research Site Description

The sites where fieldwork was conducted were located in an urban school district within a central Texas city. The campus student bodies where the preservice teachers were placed were composed of a majority of Latina/o and African American students, with small White and Asian student populations. A large number of students on these campuses participated in the free/reduced lunch program, and overall, the campuses were characterized by a large percentage of students characterized as living at or below the low socioeconomic status (SES) category. Each school in this dissertation is identified by a pseudonym.

Two of the research participants were assigned to cooperating teachers at Pasmoso Middle School in the southern part of town. This school was constructed in 1998 and was home to 1,251 students in the 2003-04 school year. The student population that same year was categorically described as 12.9% African American, 62.4% Hispanic, 22.6% White, .2% Native American, 1.9% Asian American/Pacific Islander. Furthermore, 59.3% of students were classified as economically disadvantaged and 11.4% of the students were classified as having Limited English Proficiency (LEP). The school was rated academically acceptable during for the 2003-04 school year by the Texas Education Agency (Texas Education Agency, 2005). Educational initiatives such as Institute for Learning, Strategies for Success, Harry Wong professional development materials, Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS), TEKS for Leaders, alternative assessments, interdisciplinary units, computer integrated instruction, PRIDE—an Advisory Program, peer mediation, Peer Assistance Leadership Program (PALS), Junior Achievement, and various student clubs were housed at Pasmoso MS (City Independent School District, 2005).

The third research participant was assigned to a cooperating teacher at Winston Churchill High School, also in the southern part of town. This school was constructed in 1968 and was home to 1,964 students in the 2003-04 school year. The student population that same year was categorically described as 9.1% African American, 53.3% Hispanic, 36% White, .3% Native American, 1.4% Asian American/Pacific Islander. Furthermore, 40.8% of students were classified as economically disadvantaged and 8% of the students were classified as having Limited English Proficiency (LEP). The graduation rate for the Class of 2003 was 84.2%. The school was rated academically acceptable during the 2003-04 school year by the Texas Education Agency (Texas Education Agency, 2005). Educational initiatives included automotive, cosmetology, and health care academy, and

culinary arts courses were offered at Churchill HS. Additionally, dual high school/college enrollment, journalism, honors coursework, gifted and talented and Advanced Placement (AP) courses, and Parents as Teachers programs were housed at Churchill HS (City Independent School District, 2005).

The fourth and final research participant was assigned to a cooperating teacher at Mark Twain High School, also in the southern part of town. This school was constructed in 1953 and was home to 1,619 students in the 2003-04 school year. The student population that same year was categorically described as 9.8% African American, 81.1% Hispanic, 8.3% White, .1% Native American, .7% Asian American/Pacific Islander. Furthermore, 74.7% of students were classified as economically disadvantaged and 23.1% of the students were classified as having Limited English Proficiency (LEP). The graduation rate for the Class of 2003 was 84.2%—the same as at Churchill HS. The school was rated academically acceptable during for the 2003-04 school year by the State Education Agency (Texas Education Agency, 2005). Educational initiatives included the communications academy, a multimedia, telecommunications, and teleproduction program. Additionally, freshman transition courses, vertical teaming, a State Education Agency Mentor School were housed at Mark Twain HS (City Independent School District, 2005).

Expectations were that each of these unique sites and the students attending these schools would bring unique properties and challenges to the research study. The research data, analysis, and presentation reflect these aspects of the dissertation and, in particular, highlight the interaction of these contexts with the implementation of use of socioconstructivist principles and historical thinking by the preservice teachers.

Biographical Participant Description

Four participants, all enrolled in the advanced undergraduate social studies methods course, voluntarily agreed to participate. Each of these four students had participated in the previously conducted pilot study and indicated interest in continuing as a primary participant for this dissertation study.

The students, all identified by pseudonyms, were purposefully selected based on their performance in university coursework, predicted success in a regular classroom as preservice teachers, and willingness to participate in the research. Purposeful sampling in case study research provided the researcher with the opportunity to select and learn from the most promising participants, “Purposeful sampling is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (Merriam, 1998, p. 61). For the purposes of this dissertation, the term *preservice teacher* describes those within approximately one year of graduation from the professional development sequence, and *cooperating teacher* refers to the teacher in whose classroom they are teaching during the apprentice semester; these teachers, too, are identified by pseudonym.

The first participant, Selena Favin, was Caucasian and 22 years old, and worked at the middle-school level. Her anticipated teacher certification was Composite Social Studies Texas Middle School Teaching Certificate and she graduated in December 2005 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in History and Government. Her future educational plans included a master’s degree. She attended high school in a suburb north of Dallas, Texas; her coursework included Pre-Advanced Placement and Advanced Placement (AP) classes and one honors college history class (taken by accident, she said, but claimed it was the best history class she has ever taken). She was exposed to historical thinking during her AP coursework, though it was not entitled historical thinking. She was a quiet and

thoughtful student. Her lessons were creative and interesting and she invested a great deal of time in them. She was assigned to Carole Cagney at Pasmoso MS.

The second participant, Joshua Henson, was also a middle school preservice teacher. He was 21 years old and Caucasian and attended a magnet high school for the arts in Montgomery, Alabama. At that time, he was enrolled in AP History coursework which included some work in historical thinking. Joshua graduated in December 2005 with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in History and a Composite Social Studies Texas Middle School Teaching Certificate. He was quick to smile and his first moments with his students showed that he enjoyed his work immensely. He was assigned to Paula Waite at Pasmoso MS.

The third participant, Bridget Keller, was a secondary preservice high school teacher. She was friendly and intelligent and spoke with care. She was a post-baccalaureate student and had slightly more life experience than some of her colleagues. She had already obtained Bachelor of Arts Degrees in Ancient History, Classical Civilization, and History. Her teaching certification was a Secondary History Texas Teaching Certificate. She was 25 years old and Caucasian; she attended high school in both Missouri and Texas and was caught between the two different states' curriculum requirements and managed to finish high school in regular history courses. She used historical thinking only during her various student teaching experiences. Assigned to Twain HS, her cooperating teacher was Kristen Kaelem.

The fourth and final participant, Ignacio Longoria, was a secondary preservice high school teacher. His path through college was non-traditional as he completed an associate's degree at a two-year institution and worked in chemical technology prior to entering the university to complete a philosophy degree in December 2005, thus he was slightly older than the average student at age 30—but he did not appear older than the

others. His teaching certification was a Secondary Composite Social Studies Texas Teaching Certificate. He was approachable and easy-going and was extremely creative in the classroom. Ignacio was assigned to Churchill High School with Cara Sampson as his cooperating teacher.

As members of the pilot study, conducted in the spring of 2005, each preservice teacher learned about socioconstructivist lesson design and historical thinking via class discussion, activities, and practice. Using guidelines from Smith and Ragan (1999), the preservice teachers learned an accordion style of planning and teaching, a small group/whole group teaching approach. They were provided with clear guidelines and feedback for their written lesson plans (see Appendix B). Their lessons were refined both as a group process in class as well as via practice in the field while working with their university facilitators. The socioconstructivist principles were introduced over four class periods (equaling four weeks) and historical thinking was a primary element throughout the coursework though it was punctuated by lessons with History Alive! and a special historical technology project in which students examined an event or person(s) of importance to a minority community. These historian projects made up part of the pilot study data.

3.3 RESEARCHER POSITIONALITY

“All researchers have great privilege and obligation: the privilege to pay attention and the obligation to make conclusions drawn from those choices meaningful to colleagues and clients” (Stake, 1995, p. 49). Beyond Stake’s assertion of paying attention and drawing conclusions, such privilege and obligation extends to the researcher disclosing positionality and conducting the research in an ethical manner.

I approached this dissertation study with previous experience as a teacher in both middle and high school for eight years, a graduate student in curriculum studies and a

university facilitator and teaching assistant for 5 years. My interest in conducting this dissertation was instigated by my own struggles as a young teacher in connecting theory to practice and in implementing effective and interesting classroom lessons; it also serves the purpose of partly fulfilling the requirements for a doctorate in philosophy.

A significant consideration was that of conflict of interest between the researcher, the participants, and their respective scholarly obligations. Two of the participants of this study were under my supervision during their Intern teaching semester in the spring of 2005 while in the field and for five classroom seminars co-taught with a second facilitator. All four were in the field under my supervision in the fall of 2005 as well as in seminar, also co-taught with a colleague. The data collected and findings of the study in no way affected the students' evaluations for grades or course completion—all completed the class successfully. Neither professor assigning grades to the students had access to research data or results prior to course completion and grade submission.

This concept of socioconstructivist principles and historical thinking has developed via several iterations of the project in four semesters of classroom and pilot studies. With each variation, the research has taken on and lost constructs, theories, and participants, and has been refined as results emerged. As each version has improved, my own research skills have improved and I have cultivated and nurtured the intuitions and abilities important to qualitative research such as descriptive writing, interviewing, keen observation, note taking, transcription, and data organization and ultimately, the analysis and synthesis of results.

In contemplating my role as researcher, Stake's (1995) conception of case researcher as interpreter is most fitting. According to Stake,

the case researcher recognizes and substantiates new meanings. Whoever is a researcher has recognized a problem, puzzlement, and studies it, hoping to

connect it better with known things. Finding new connections, the researcher finds ways to make them comprehensible to others. (p. 97)

It is my hope that I was able to conceive new connections between socioconstructivism, experiential education, socioconstructivist pedagogy, and historical thinking. If successful, more students will better be able to apply learning theory to teaching situations—to extend that learning theory beyond a single application. Thus they should be able to coherently explain and design their teaching strategies in accordance with how students learn best.

Given the interdependent nature of the work conducted by the researcher and participants, indeed, both the researcher and the preservice teachers represented the university to the community; ethical research was a necessity on professional and moral grounds. Therefore, it was critical that the researcher conducted the study with the utmost consideration for research ethics by respecting the participants, the research process, and the outside community involved.

3.4 STUDY TIMELINE AND PILOT RESEARCH

The study began in the fall of 2005, as soon as IRB consent was obtained. Interviews, observations, and artifact collection took place during this semester as well as the preliminary organization and analysis of data. In the spring of 2006, the bulk of transcription and data analysis occurred and the writing began, continuing with editing and revising throughout the summer and fall of 2006. Final review and the defense took place in the spring of 2007.

This study originated in a very different form as a class project in a course entitled *Secondary Education Curriculum* in the spring of 2004 as an investigation into preservice teachers' design and use of lesson plans. The second iteration of this study expanded the use of instructional design and brought in socioconstructivist principles; but the resulting

literature review was disappointing—it seemed that very little research had been done with regard to instructional design by teachers. In contrast, the literature investigating socioconstructivism was overwhelming. Thus, a conceptual paper on constructivism was prepared to fulfill the Section B requirement of the qualifying exams in the spring of 2005. (Developed from this paper was the subtle, yet important, differentiation between constructivism and socioconstructivism.)

Several papers have been presented at various conferences with data from this dissertation study including the American Association for Teaching and Curriculum (AATC), College and University Faculty Assembly (CUFA)/National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), and presented at the 2007 American Educational Research Association (AERA) annual meeting in Chicago. The papers presented to AATC in 2005 were entitled, *Learner-centered lesson design and preservice teachers: Understanding and implementation in the conflicting context of accountability* and *Engaging with historical thinking and socioconstructivism: Experiences of two preservice social studies teachers*. The two papers presented at CUFA were also developed from this data, *Teaching historical thinking: Preservice teachers confess their struggle* and *Historical thinking and positionality: Two Latina/o teachers challenging and reshaping the social studies curriculum* in 2005 and 2006, respectively. The papers presented at AERA 2007 were entitled: *Modeling the model: The use of classroom talk in teaching socioconstructivist pedagogy in a university setting*; *Sociocultural positionality: Preservice teachers' readiness to engage with socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking*, and *Preservice teachers as "rethinkers": How reflective practice reinforces the development of culturally responsive educators*.

Currently, I have developed two articles for publication as further extensions of the data. The first was co-authored with Cinthia Salinas and entitled, *Latina/o preservice teachers' positionality: Challenging the construction of the official school knowledge through historical thinking* examines the positionality of teachers of color as they implemented historical thinking in their apprentice teaching classrooms and how their individual positionality, influenced by factors of race, class, and gender, affected and enhanced their teaching. These negotiations made by the participants, partially informed by their positions as Latina/o teachers, created particular opportunities to engage with historical thinking in their social studies classes and were the focus of this study. This paper was submitted to *The Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy* in December 2006 and has been accepted for publication. The second paper entails discourse analysis of classroom dialogue to uncover the mechanics of how one professor used talk to create an efficacious learning environment to both support and teach socioconstructivist pedagogy. The focus on student engagement with socioconstructivist pedagogy was a primary factor used to promote success in the classroom by forming a collaborative learning team. This paper is currently in progress.

A great deal of productive work and thought has resulted from this investigation over the past several semesters. As the study has been refined and tangents explored, conceptions of constructivism have been clarified and expanded. Research and organizational skills have been markedly improved in the process as well. The result is, in part, this dissertation, a few additional pieces of work as well as a long list of future research ideas.

Through the use of rigorous qualitative case study research, the purpose of the study was to uncover the processes and features of preservice social studies teachers' understanding and implementation of socioconstructivism and historical thinking in the classroom—further, what was the meaning of these constructs for the preservice teachers? The procedure and operational details of the study are presented and justified in this chapter. Additionally, guidelines for maintaining quality research and analysis were provided. Ultimately, Stake's (1995) assertion that, "The function of research is not necessarily to map and conquer the world but to sophisticate the beholding of it" (p. 43) was the goal of this dissertation, to illuminate and understand the preservice teachers' successes, hesitations, and struggles with socioconstructivist pedagogy.

Chapter Four: Results

Socioconstructivist pedagogy, derived from Vygotsky's (1978, 1986) sociocultural history and Dewey's experiential education (1897, 1998) is a rigorous, student-centered teaching approach that frames the major theoretical grounding of this qualitative study. Richardson's (2003) framework transfers socioconstructivist learning theory into specific pedagogical principles for classroom implementation. This framework includes: student-centered learning, facilitation of group dialogue, planned and unplanned introduction of domain knowledge, opportunities to change or extend existing knowledge, and the development of students' metacognition (p. 1626). Socioconstructivist classroom environments are learning communities that emphasize student engagement and ownership in the content material and encourage reflection upon the individual learning processes' of students.

Historical thinking has been an important approach to teaching social studies and is central to the participants' methods classes. The preservice teachers were required to submit lessons employing historical thinking as well as to utilize this method in their practice teaching classrooms. As an instance of socioconstructivist pedagogy, historical thinking is an authentic and investigative approach to teaching and learning history which has become a key component in social studies education (Seixas, 1993; VanSledright, 2002; Wineburg, 2001). How to think historically, VanSledright (2002) has maintained, extends beyond a list of dates and people and instead demands that learners sift through evidence, make judgments, construct explanations, and build historical arguments. Abandoning the traditional banking model of teaching that involves memorization of facts—names and dates (Freire, 2003)—many social studies educators have consistently

challenged their students through the extensive use of primary source material and related document-based questions.

The preservice teachers enrolled in the methods and advanced methods social studies coursework were taught to write socioconstructivist lesson plans and were expected to teach using the approach. Additionally, their field assessments for the final two semesters of student teaching promoted the principles of learner-centered teaching similar to those designed by Richardson (2003). As an important construct in the teaching and learning of history, historical thinking was central to the coursework of the participating apprentice teachers (see Appendices A and B), they were required to design multiple lessons involving historical thinking and submit them for a portion of their course grade, they experienced historical thinking as students themselves while they created their web-based *Students as Historians* primary source document project (see Appendix B). Additionally, they were required to include lessons involving historical thinking in their regular lesson plans.

Each of the four voluntary participants in this study had radically different experiences in their apprentice teaching classrooms. This was, of course, due to the individual nature of their fieldwork assignments, variations in campuses and student bodies, course assignments (i.e. 10th grade world history versus 8th grade U.S. history) and cooperating teachers. However, each apprentice teacher was a unique person and approached teaching and the classroom in a variety of ways.

As a band member with longer hair, Ignacio Longoria consistently presented an extremely friendly face to his pre-AP World History 10th grade students. He was often dressed in a tie, dress shirt and slacks, and (clean) sneakers while he taught. Ignacio was considered a “hip” teacher and he was well-respected by his students. He was a non-traditional student and had significantly more life experience than his colleagues. He was

30 years old, having already completed an Associate's degree in chemical technology and spent a few years in the workforce. He returned to school to complete a bachelor's degree in philosophy and enrolled in the university teacher education program in hopes of finding a steady career. As it turned out, he very much enjoyed his teaching experiences and followed the program to its end—apprentice teaching. He was from a small town in South Texas; as a Latino, he was also very interested in historical and current political issues involving this community. As demonstrated in the data included in this chapter, Ignacio tended towards a more critical rendition of historical thinking. He spent a great deal of time in seeking primary source documents in which they would be interested, for example, he created an entire lesson beginning with Roman graffiti to specifically pique the interest of one disengaged student who was a street artist. He was skilled at connecting art, music, and elements of popular culture into his history lessons as well as incorporating impressive tactics with technology. Moreover, he gave much thought to his role and goals as a social studies teacher and often research interviews easily became complex conversations about epistemology, pedagogy, and critical curriculum (see lesson plan example, Appendix E).

Bridget Keller was a slight, blonde young woman who cared deeply about history having already completed a bachelor's degree in Ancient History and Classical Civilization and had continued school as a post baccalaureate student enrolled in the teacher education program. She and her 10th grade World History students eyed each other with some skepticism and it took time for them to grow comfortable with one another. Bridget did not always display confidence and she was cool towards the students, not smiling easily. At one point, her cooperating teacher intervened in a missing work situation with a student and encouraged her to be more compassionate towards students who were experiencing difficulties. Nevertheless, Bridget cared about her

students and the subject material and tried in her own hesitant way, to make connections and establish relationships with them. Towards the end of the apprentice teaching semester, more laughter and learning could be seen in the classroom. She was the daughter of a clergyman and attended high school in two states, Missouri and Texas. She had also traveled throughout Europe, at least once on a backpacking trip through Greece, Turkey, and Rome and she was eager to share those experiences with her inner-city students. Her approach to teaching was relatively traditional, she preferred lecture-style lessons punctuated with pictures, photographs, or maps. Many of her early lessons included her writing notes on the chalkboard for the students to copy as she talked through the topic although later she used more PowerPoint slides to accomplish the same task. In her interview conversations, she often expressed frustration with the level of engagement she was able to elicit from her students and confusion as to the implementation and purpose of socioconstructivist pedagogy (see lesson plan example, Appendix E).

While a very quiet student in class at the university, Selena Favin lit up in front of her 8th grade U.S. History students. She was young, finishing her bachelor's degree in History and Government and graduating. She aspired to be an attorney and wanted to teach for a few years prior to applying to law school. Fortunately, Selena was taller than most of her 8th grade students, her fashionable hair style and dress hardly distinguished her as the teacher. Her students liked her and eagerly anticipated her creative lessons. They came by the room during lunch or after school to finish an assignment or just visit, pressing her for details about her plans for Winter Break or details about her boyfriend. Selena was from North Texas and attended a typical suburban (majority White) high school. She wanted her students to see value in becoming active, participatory citizens and to appreciate their democratic society, even at their tender middle school age, she

discussed this often in interviews. Her lessons utilized primary source documents, often photos, and simulations, which the students loved (see lesson plan example, Appendix E).

Joshua Henson was an attractive young man and many of his 8th grade U.S. History female students fawned over the new student teacher. Overall, his students liked him and enjoyed his lessons. Joshua smiled quickly and listened to them attentively, patiently waiting for their thoughts and ideas to unfold, coaxing them when necessary. He was studious and thoughtful and cared deeply about his students' understandings of history and finding relevance in the class. He was completing a bachelor's degree in History and hoped to be the type of teacher he had experienced in his arts magnet high school in Alabama. His father was a psychology professor and Joshua recalled in-depth dinner table conversations about learning and the human mind. He was interested in his students' enjoyment of his class while at the same time he had high expectations for their maturity and behavior, which were usually met. Joshua wanted his students to be independent investigators of history and to see themselves as part of the historical narrative. His lessons included a great deal of cooperative learning and outside materials with students producing multiple projects, such as writing letters and human-size timelines (see lesson plan example, Appendix E).

The research questions for this project were designed in two parts which may be generally conceived as relating to coursework and fieldwork though ultimately there were overlapping characteristics. The first question, "How do preservice teachers understand historical thinking and the socioconstructivist principles that foster it?"; was closely related to university coursework and the themes which focused on understandings and curriculum standards. The second question, "What are preservice teachers' experiences with historical thinking and socioconstructivist lessons in the classroom?" focused on the fieldwork component and was centered upon the themes of classroom context and

implementation. With guidance from the previously outlined research questions four primary themes surrounding socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking emerged. These themes and related sub-themes are introduced in the next section and further discussed in following sections of Chapter Four.

INTEGRATING THEMES: CONTEXT, UNDERSTANDINGS, CURRICULUM, AND PRACTICE

Through the use of qualitative data analysis outlined by Miles and Huberman (1983, 1984, 1994), four themes were uncovered and developed. As the multiple data sources (transcribed audio interviews, field notes and journals, lesson plans, reflective writings, formal reflections, and other class assignments and realia produced in the classroom) were read, re-read, and categorized, words, phrases, and ideas were repeated, such as pressure to prepare students for the TAKS exams. The volumes of data were organized first by preservice teacher, then by type, such as interview transcript or observation notes for the readings such that the themes emerged both within and across the participants. Ultimately, the entire quantity of data was reduced to a long list of topics commonly found within the whole of the data; these topics were then combined and developed into cohesive themes with appropriate data examples for support and illustration.

These four themes highlight many of the academic and logistical complexities of preservice teaching experienced by the participants. These themes involve: issues of classroom management, developing their teacher repertoire, curriculum, and pedagogy, creating optimum learning environments, developing relationships with students and accommodating cultural differences, enacting rigorous practice in the classroom. As these challenges were confronted and resolved by preservice teachers they continued to

develop and refine their belief systems about teaching and learning as well as the resulting classroom practice.

The first theme, entitled *Establishing and Managing the Classroom Context*, entails the environment in which the preservice teachers conducted their work with socioconstructivist pedagogies; and discusses in detail the multitasking and management logistics of teaching, classroom discipline, and relationships with the cooperating teachers. The second theme, *Learning and Adopting New Pedagogical Approaches*, explores the participants' prior knowledge, their epistemological foundations, and understanding socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking (Seixas, 1993; VanSledright, 2002) as they embraced and practiced these new teaching methods. The third theme *Divided Allegiances, Negotiating Curriculum*, involves the selection of the course materials in the process of navigating the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) as well as efforts with instructional design and finding resources with which to teach historical thinking. The fourth and final theme *Creating and Working the Zone of Proximal Development* examines the student/teacher relationships and investigates the ability to engage students in the praxis of socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking.

4.1 THEME ONE: ESTABLISHING AND MANAGING THE CLASSROOM CONTEXT

As emergent professionals, adjustments to being on middle or high school campuses full time for days of teaching, working with students, lesson planning, performing administrative chores, dealing with paperwork, and attending meetings were made in rather rapid succession for the participants in this study. “New teachers have two jobs—they have to teach and they have to learn to teach” (Feiman-Nemser, 2001, p. 1026) has written, aptly describing the complicated nature of their task. These preservice teachers were involved in countless daily decisions that shaped their interactions with

students, the classroom environment, and their teaching repertoire which demanded their attention; while at the same time they were focusing on the details of socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking (Seixas, 1993; VanSledright, 2002). A secondary, yet important, component of the classroom context was the cooperating teachers and their support, or lack thereof, of the preservice teachers' efforts. As the semester progressed, the data showed that the participants were assigned to cooperating teachers whose support ranged from tacit approval to direct disapproval of their work with socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking. The first three sub-themes of *Establishing and Managing the Classroom Context*, all deal with *Multitasking and Management* and explore how participants focused attention and resolution on the classroom logistics and behavior management of learning to teach and their work with their cooperating teachers which details the relationships established between the preservice teachers and their assigned mentors.

Multitasking and Management

The classroom environment is complex and preservice teachers must become familiar with the rhythm of their campus, their classroom, and their curriculum. Early in the semester, the preservice teachers worked through a series of challenges typical of beginning teachers in managing students and the classroom. These challenges have been faced by all teachers, inexperienced and experienced alike. Many of these issues (such as grading papers, shifting lesson plans to accommodate last minute interruptions, organizing technology) were administrative in nature and declined in number and strength as the apprentices resolved organizational and logistical teaching details. Such details were interwoven with socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking throughout the semester and materialize (as concomitant issues) within all of the themes though they are detailed here as an illustrative example and acknowledgement of the

preservice teachers' classroom context as it affected the participants' efforts with socioconstructivist pedagogy.

Grossman (1992) has asserted, "For better or worse, classroom management and instruction are eternally married. How teachers manage classrooms enables or constrains the possibilities of teaching, classroom discourse, and student learning. How teachers manage classrooms must depend on their ultimate goals for students" (p. 174). She believes that these issues are in fact, integrated and each is dependent upon the other, "teacher education must help prospective teachers see the interdependence of management and educational goals" (p. 175). The classroom setting, in addition to administrative work, included working with student behaviors via classroom management techniques and were related to the preparation of lessons. While multitasking and management issues certainly required precious time and energy, they did not preclude the preservice teachers' contemplation of sociocultural pedagogical structures or curricular dilemmas.

Logistics of Teaching

General preparations for teaching classes required a significant investment of time and energy and adjusting to the realities of school life. Furthermore, the preservice teachers dealt with organizational details such as managing makeup/late work, grading papers, and keeping up with faculty/departmental meetings. The decisions that these preservice teachers made with regard to organizational details affected the overall classroom environment thus promoting or diminishing efficacious teaching.

These sometimes overwhelming tasks, particularly early in the semester, took a toll as the preservice teachers lost sleep, worried about potential problems and designed workarounds to difficulties specific to their campus and individual situations. The following interview and journal data discussing essential teaching tasks and working with

their cooperating teachers provides a sampling of the wide-range of issues encountered in these preservice teachers' new classrooms which demanded immediate resolutions.

Ignacio suffered as he learned to manage his own time, in an October reflection he wrote,

Well, this past week was a roller coaster ride to say the least. For most of it I was lost and falling behind. Having to do a complete chapter for the first time and having all five of my cooperating teacher's classes almost became too much. I was spending inordinate amounts of time preparing lessons, grading papers (I picked up WAY too many things for a grade my first week), and trying to meet my teacher's very high expectations. And rather than catching up, I seemed only to fall behind even more. I was staying up way past 2 a.m. preparing for the next day while my teacher expected me to have lessons plans for the next week already drafted. It was a definite low point for me. And it wasn't that I was goofing off either. It would be one thing if I had been playing video games all night and not getting ahead, but that wasn't the case. I worked on lesson plans and grading from 8 p.m. to 2 a.m. and I was still getting nowhere. (I. Longoria, written reflection, October 9, 2005)

Based on interview data, reflections, and formal and informal evaluations, Ignacio was indeed working hard and fulfilling his responsibilities, he earned high scores and praise from his cooperating teacher and facilitator. Still, like many other preservice teachers, he devoted extra hours towards classroom preparation in addition to his coursework at the university. Ignacio was not the only exhausted one; Bridget wrote early in the semester, "Well, I find it very difficult to get up every morning at 7:15 a.m. because I am not used to this schedule" (B. Keller, written reflection, September 11, 2005).

As the participants adjusted to the schedules of long days and nights, other issues also demanded their attentions. Joshua discussed computer equipment failure in an interview, (despite the fact that his campus has only been open since 1998 and was fully equipped), "There were some times when I was frustrated, 'Oh, it would be really great if I had a projector that worked that didn't shut off halfway through the day,' but it's all about perspective and how you handle problems" (J. Henson, interview, March 6, 2006).

Given the emphasis on technology in their teacher education program (see Appendices A and B) and the students' dependency on their laptops (partly a result of the required participation in the university's laptop initiative), failing or missing computer equipment was a frustration. While he had a relaxed attitude about the computer problem, in an interview, Joshua talked about the numerous and varied tasks he faced, both during class time and after hours, and the lack of reflection and/or time to stay organized, or to engage in reflection on a socioconstructivist classroom,

Even though I had a pretty good understanding of what teaching is like, I did get to see firsthand the things I didn't see the first four semesters. There's just some things that fall through the cracks: you don't know about faculty meetings, you don't know about in-service, or you don't get the feel of what it's like to be in classes from 7 until 7, or 9 (laugh) depending on the day. There's really no way to miss all this if you're student teaching. Before, you had the whole day or hour or whatever it is beforehand to prepare, to think about while you're driving and then you know you just do it and you're done and so you have the time to reflect. Whereas, now, you don't have all that time to organize and sort through.... (J. Henson, interview, March 6, 2006)

Joshua's comments summarize the preservice teachers' experiences, which culminated in an overwhelming feeling of needing to tackle a long list of menial tasks in addition to the deliberation of curricular and pedagogical issues such as implementing socioconstructivist principles or historical thinking. Ignacio lamented, "It's just, you just want to eat lunch at some point, you know" (I. Longoria, interview, November 29, 2005). This was a universal feeling throughout the semester with all of the participants and was common given the new tasks they were undertaking for the semester. They were interested in dealing with the logistics of teaching as this would ease the daily task list and simultaneously, they were devising lessons using learner-centered methods and searching for primary source documents to create lessons using historical thinking.

Classroom Discipline

Furthermore, classroom management entailed behavior management as a new and somewhat unfamiliar stressor. The participants found themselves in the role of authority figure and decision maker with regards to behavior for the first time. As socioconstructivism calls for facilitation of group dialogue, one of the main points of contention for them was how to keep students on task while engaging in rigorous cooperative learning. Each of the preservice teachers dealt with learning how to focus students' attention on the lesson as well as facilitate positive classroom relationships between their students. Joshua described this delicate balance,

Well, start with grading papers, behavior management, trying to be three places at once in the classroom; trying to take roll and trying to make sure kids are staying on task when they are in groups, and trying to prepare the lesson for the day all at the same time. With behavior management there's a lot of dynamics in between individual people and classes and teachers and students and teachers that you have to look at with each situation and try to figure out the best ways to play it. It's all thrown in the pot mumbo jumbo of trying to organize the lesson and keep all the students on task and do everything else and so it's just (sigh)... (J. Henson, interview, March 6, 2006)

Joshua's experiences with behavior management were typical for preservice teachers and his experiences were typical of all the participants. Through their coursework and conversations with their facilitator, the four were also working to implement theories of classroom management as they might be integrated with the learner-centered classroom, which added another layer to their experience in the classroom.

In describing these classroom management situations, only representative experiences have been recounted in this first theme. They are, perhaps, based on more mundane issues which arose in a recursive manner throughout this study but, as Grossman (1992) has written, pedagogy, curriculum, and management are naturally and necessarily layered together and each issue affects the other. These notions of classroom

management must be resolved with the intention of affecting the academic environment in the classroom and is an essential part of teaching in a student-centered environment.

Relationships with Cooperating Teachers

The third sub-theme dealt with cooperating teachers and was an important factor in the classroom context, though it was present, of course, only during the practice teaching semesters. When the attitude towards socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking of the campus teachers was positive or even neutral, the apprentice teachers felt more able to try these new methods, but when socioconstructivism or historical thinking were viewed negatively by their cooperating teacher, the task became daunting. The relationships between the mentor teacher and preservice teacher were critical and the following sub-theme examines the role the cooperating teachers played during the apprentice teaching semester.

While the cooperating teachers were not the focus of this study, they did play a role in these preservice teachers' work with socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking adding to the complexity of the environment in which they were conducting their apprentice teaching. These cooperating teachers exhibited a range of supportiveness and positive attitudes towards their apprentice teachers using historical thinking or student-centered learning in their lessons. Three types of support are described in the next section, the first type of cooperating teacher was supportive; the second group of teachers is described as nonchalant, and the third type of cooperating teacher is best described as interfering, one who harbored negative attitudes towards socioconstructivism.

The school district provided professional development in historical thinking for the social studies faculty. One of the cooperating teachers was even a district leader in the social studies area in providing support and training in historical thinking. The staff development occurred during the apprentice teaching semester and the preservice

teachers were invited. The training was tied to the district's initiative with the Institute for Learning at the University of Pittsburgh, *Disciplinary Lesson: Reading the Constitution Backward and Forward in Time* but few to none of the cooperating teachers actually attended the session. Moreover, they did not practice these approaches with regularity in their classrooms. This meant that their apprentice teachers had no model for teaching with this approach other than their university coursework experience. Speaking in terms of Vygotsky's work, the *experienced other* for these apprentices were either the university facilitator or course professor, neither of whom worked with them in the field with the daily classroom work as their cooperating teachers did. Ignacio spoke of this very issue,

She's never said, "Don't go there, don't go there." We don't discuss, "OK, we need to make them think historically or we have to make 'em think of the larger context." She is a little more about, "we need to get certain things done," but she's very open about as far as about how I wanna teach. When I saw her teach it seemed to be that when she was teaching it seemed to be so much more wanting them to be engaged and wanting them to answer questions and to have a grasp of the material but didn't ask a lot of like challenging questions as far as...none of the...like...why are there no Mexicans in here? Or try to get stuff that's not necessarily in the book. (I. Longoria, interview, November 29, 2005)

While Ms. Sampson did not actively advocate historical thinking or socioconstructivist pedagogy, her teaching and mentoring style was the most conducive to Ignacio's development of his efforts with these teaching pedagogies. Her course was a pre-AP (Advanced Placement) World History course and the students were accustomed to using primary source documents and document-based questions as a regular part of their curriculum. As a cooperating teacher, Ms. Sampson was attentive, worked with Ignacio to adjust lessons immediately, and allowed him the opportunity to try new ideas.

Other cooperating teachers' efforts with the participants ranged from indifference to tacit support to directly banning historical thinking lessons. Joshua's cooperating teacher was a district leader in designing the previously mentioned professional

development series for social studies teachers on historical thinking, yet she never had a single conversation with him about it (J. Henson, interview, October 20, 2005). She approved his lesson plans and made suggestions, but did not specifically ask him to include historical thinking in his curriculum for the students, though she did not discourage him when he did write lessons using the approach.

On the same campus, the most arduous cooperating teacher relationship forged by any of the preservice teachers was in Selena's classroom. This was, unfortunately, a persistent and compromising issue throughout her apprentice teaching. Bullough and Draper (2004), Witmer (2005) and Zeichner (2002b) all have written of the necessity of a positive influence by the mentor teacher during the student teaching semester. Differences of opinion happened frequently with both student-centered lessons and lessons involving primary source documents between Selena and her cooperating teacher, Ms. Cagney. Furthermore, it seemed that historical thinking was a large part of this problem between them. Selena wanted to use the approach and Ms. Cagney called it "gaming" and insisted her 8th grade students "couldn't handle" the advanced thinking. Selena conducted a lesson about British tax laws imposed upon the colonies in the pre-revolutionary era using primary resources and document-based questions from a local civics education center. In an effort to establish relevance for her students by making connections with their own experiences, she related the discussion with Ms. Cagney about how she compared a good law to school rules,

I got ragged on by my cooperating teacher today for telling the kids that if there's ever an issue that you have, with school rules, there's steps you can take. If you have a good alternative that nothing is completely unchangeable, everyone has that ability to change what they don't like. She said, "They're not [the students] mature enough to handle it. Don't tell them that they can change things with the school. There are some kids you can have that conversation with but a lot of kids you can't." (S. Favin, interview, October 21, 2005)

The effects of this negative experience were far reaching and in Selena's case fractured her developing belief system about teaching and hindered her growing repertoire of socioconstructivist pedagogical practice. She was very frustrated by the end of the semester,

I don't know anything anymore. I haven't really figured it out. I'm trying to take what Ms. Cagney's giving me in a positive way because that's all I've had for this whole semester and it's making it to the point where I've almost have forgotten some of the things that (laugh) I'm supposed to be doing while I'm here. You know, those constructivist-style lessons here each lesson is taught by the children and they are put in a situation where they're...able to look at history and learn it for themselves where the teacher can be a guide, not necessarily the one that's the source of all information. (S. Favin, interview, November 29, 2005)

Unfortunately, despite the support of her facilitator and course instructor, the field office supervisor and other university resources, Selena and her cooperating teacher continued a difficult relationship. This made a significant and negative impact on all facets of Selena's teaching experience which Zeichner (2002a) has maintained as detrimental to a student teacher's development into a strong professional educator. Ultimately, Selena expressed deep confusion about her work as a teacher and sincere disappointment at what she saw as the "loss of an entire semester of practice" (S. Favin, interview, November 22, 2005).

The majority of the participants were placed in classrooms that were conducive to their learning and practice of socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking. While none of the cooperating teachers used or emphasized the student-centered model and historical thinking extensively as an important element of the social studies, neither did they prevent the apprentice teachers from practicing these teaching approaches. The notable exception was Selena, who was challenged such that she was deeply confused about student-centered and teacher-centered learning and ultimately questioned her

choice of career based on the lack of success she encountered during her apprentice teaching semester.

Theme One: Establishing and Managing the Classroom Context is an important, yet common, theme that emerges in many studies with preservice teachers as the focus. The participants devoted a great deal of time and energy to working out classroom logistics such as their own time management, preparing for class in writing lessons and gathering materials, grading papers and dealing with makeup work, and attending all of the various mandatory departmental and campus meetings. Furthermore, they were also practicing their role as the leader in the classroom and learning about how to deal with the behavioral and disciplinary issues of their students as they arose throughout the semester. The third contributor to the classroom environment was that of their relationship with their cooperating teachers. Most participants found this partnership collegial and supportive; unfortunately, one participant did not and this cooperating teacher relationship created significant difficulty during the apprentice teaching semester.

The multitasking and management aspects of Theme One interacted with the other three themes. As Grossman (1992) wrote, these logistics are an intricate part of learning to teach, not to be divorced from socioconstructivist curricular and pedagogical issues. Each participant did indeed give thoughtful attention to the theoretical and practical issues embedded within socioconstructivist practice and historical thinking in the classroom. Discussing this particular theme first is a reminder of the intricacies of the fieldwork setting and its sometimes overwhelming effects on preservice teachers. It is also an acknowledgement of this common thread throughout studies of preservice and beginning teachers.

The next three themes provide further detail regarding the specific experiences of the participants in terms of their developing understandings of socioconstructivist

pedagogy and historical thinking. *Theme One: Establishing and Maintaining the Classroom Context* was indeed a setting for the following themes. *Theme Two: Adopting New Pedagogical Strategies* provides insight to the participants' prior knowledge, epistemological foundations, understandings and conceptualizations of socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking both in the university coursework and as they begin to implement it in the field. *Theme Three: Divided Allegiances, Negotiating Curriculum* discusses the negotiations of curricular standards and the resulting selection of curriculum components in relation to the instructional design of socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking in the classrooms. *Theme Four: Creating and Working the Zone of Proximal Development* details the actual implementation of socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking during the fieldwork semester via the preservice teachers' efforts.

4.2 THEME TWO: LEARNING AND ADOPTING NEW PEDAGOGICAL APPROACHES

The socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking examined in this study presented a hopeful, yet emergent, narrative. The preservice teachers were indeed learning and embracing elements of socioconstructivism and historical thinking, but they were still developing comprehensive understandings of these teaching and learning methods. The participants valued these pedagogical approaches and sought to adopt them; they displayed novice understandings of socioconstructivist pedagogy, and within it notions of historical thinking were developing. The four sub-themes within first discuss the students' level of familiarity and experience with these pedagogical approaches—prior knowledge; the second sub-point explores notions of the participants' individual epistemological foundations; the third sub-point details the particulars of the preservice teachers' understandings of socioconstructivist pedagogy; and the fourth and final sub-

point examines historical thinking and how the learning of this concept became evident in classroom practice.

Participants' Prior Knowledge

Support from the course instructor, university facilitator, and classmates in learning socioconstructivist pedagogy were vital to the participants as this learning and teaching approach was a novel idea. According to interviews, written reflections, syllabi from required education courses, and degree plan requirements, the apprentice teachers' exposure to and practice with socioconstructivist pedagogy began only in the previous semester during their internship. All total, their formal experiences with socioconstructivist pedagogy were limited to two semesters' worth of university methods coursework—one of which was taken concurrently with apprentice teaching. Although they had significant practice writing lesson plans designed to foster a socioconstructivist environment, it had been modeled in their university coursework (see Appendices A and B), and they each reported in interviews that they had observed at least a few socioconstructivist lessons taught by other teachers, their apprentice teaching semester was their first opportunity to consistently engage with socioconstructivist pedagogy.

Moreover, historical thinking, a lens through which socioconstructivist pedagogy may be examined, was also a fairly new concept for each of the participants. The preservice teachers were history majors, yet they were unfamiliar with historical thinking. This exposed an interesting dissonance of university professors who are both historians and instructors. These history professors seemed to keep authentic the tools of their trade—primary source documents and the accompanying analysis meant to construct an historical narrative—but did not use them as teaching and learning tools in their university history classrooms.

As such, these apprentice teachers, indeed were “pushing the envelope” as Dr. Gómez said, and embraced these new and sophisticated pedagogical approaches, with varying effort and success. Despite constraints afforded by their own beliefs and understandings discussed in the next sub-theme on epistemology, these understandings of knowledge as a socially constructed entity were inextricably tied to their views on knowledge construction and stance on their purpose as social studies teachers. What the preservice teachers knew and believed about the construction of knowledge—epistemology—is examined in the next sub-theme.

Epistemological Foundations

The four participants presented a range of thought on the purpose of their role as social studies teachers and in the nature of knowledge. The students were challenged throughout their university coursework to consider and reconsider their beliefs about social studies education. They studied Grant’s (2003) classification of history teachers as knowledge givers or knowledge facilitators and how that conception of teachers and knowledge translates to classroom practice. While there are significant differences between Grant’s study and their work, the teachers in his study were well-established in their classrooms and had few of the same distracters that the preservice teachers encountered. Still, both the teachers in the study and the preservice teachers were contending with a standardized exam.

This guiding framework was used to identify their position on knowledge, its creation or attainment, and its enactment in the classroom; it provided the participants with a descriptive entry point to the type of teacher they might aspire to become. All the preservice teachers classified themselves as knowledge givers in written reflections (September, 2005) but through discussions, observations, and examination of other data associated with their teaching, all but one would be classified as knowledge facilitators

by their course instructor or facilitator. This discrepancy is indicative of their growing understanding of constructivism and its boundaries and of themselves as classroom teachers.

Constructionist Epistemology

The participants' epistemological stance was one gauge of the participants' future efforts with socioconstructivist pedagogy in the classroom. One end of the epistemology continuum was the constructionist paradigm which holds knowledge to be a socially constructed entity and the other was the positivist wherein knowledge is highly organized and disseminated from one entity to another.

Ignacio expressed a deep understanding of the premise of socioconstructivist lessons in the idea that knowledge is constructed by students, not given by teachers. His written lesson plans for his World History course consistently focused on student-centered activities, cooperative learning, and primary source analysis. He contemplated the nature of knowledge throughout the semester in interviews and written journal entries, and reflected in an interview late in the semester,

The more and more I think about it, I really think you get knowledge from your environment. You bring a lot to school really, and so you bring your prejudice, your points of view from your parents, your friends, everything else. I don't know if school really gives you knowledge, but I have really decided it can challenge your knowledge or make you look at it a different way. And so I don't think we, I don't think if it wasn't for me [as their teacher] they wouldn't know anything. They know an awful lot and I think it's just our job to make them think or to reflect on what they know or realize what they know or think differently about what they know. So I'm starting to think that we don't really do much, besides be the Devil's Advocate occasionally, or just make them think about things. It's all connected between things they come in already knowing and then you draw connections with things outside of the classroom. That's where you get the connections. I think the connections between what they already know and something that they have no experience with but they can relate to somehow is what we consider gaining knowledge or being a smart person. When you start seeing the relevance of historical topics to current topics, I think that's when you become a knowledgeable person. (I. Longoria, interview, November 29, 2005)

As such, his views on the purpose of social studies teachers were aligned with his beliefs about knowledge and its use in both socioconstructivism and schools. He wanted students to make connections, to see the relevance between the history classroom and their lives and during one pivotal classroom moment he realized that it was not happening the way he had hoped,

Looking back on my lessons from the previous week I have come to an epiphany concerning lesson plans. It came to me during my second lesson. I was presenting a thoroughly researched and visually impressive PowerPoint on the Hellenistic Culture. They were busy taking notes and there were no behavior problems that I could see. All in all, I thought, most teachers would be very pleased indeed to have attained such a state of class. However as they were busy writing I asked them a question and no one replied. So I waited. Still no answers, just the sound of scribbling. Any one? Any one? Bueller? Bueller? Finally I asked again and someone said “We’re busy writing.” And I thought to myself, “WTF?!? They should be THINKING, not worried about writing!” So that was it, my big epiphany. I talked to my mentor teacher about it afterwards and I realized that I have been fundamentally misunderstanding my role as a teacher. I realized that I had been intent on showing how much I KNEW, not on how much THEY WERE LEARNING. Jesus jumping on a pogo stick! So I have to say, I don’t know what the heck I’m doing now. And that’s good I think. I have no idea how I’m going to do this but I know what I’m trying to do now and that’s a good thing. So I’m terrified. And happy. And to think I’m only three weeks into this thing! ☺ (I. Longoria, written reflection, September 25, 2005)

For Ignacio, this moment was a poignant illustration of theory in practice, and he realized how his instructional design had led students to their particular situation—that of taking notes. This was obviously a learning mode he did not favor, and he recognized himself as a knowledge giver. He wanted to foster interaction with and between his students—to be a knowledge facilitator and their lack of response to his question was pivotal in his realization of his role and their resulting participation in learning. This was indeed an important moment in Ignacio’s progress in becoming a learner-centered teacher.

Positivistic Epistemology

In sharp contrast, Bridget's conception of her place as a teacher in the schools was indicative of the positivistic end of the continuum. She separated content and pedagogy and implied that knowledge was a pre-existing entity that must be delivered to students for their benefit and consumption,

Well, I think there's two reasons why people get into teaching. One, people love history; or two; they want to work with kids. And they meet in the happy medium. Well, I like history. So I tend to be more lecture-oriented simply because...and well, I like kids too! (laughter) I think those people get into it because they want to work with children, they want to teach children. I figure they're a little more constructivist oriented, and I'm on that other side where I've taken a million history classes, I like it and I'm more inclined to go up there and talk about it than I am to let the kids explore it. So that's something I struggle with. (B. Keller, interview, November 21, 2005)

Bridget's thoughts on how knowledge is constructed took a positivistic stance and her role was as purveyor of history. It was obvious that she placed herself in the category of someone who prefers history to children. She was the only one of the four who cited text as the location of knowledge and she consistently struggled with creating and delivering socioconstructivist lessons.

Epistemology and the TAKS Test

Selena, working in an 8th grade classroom responsible to the middle school exit-level TAKS test mentioned on more than one occasion the ever-present pressure of preparing students to pass the test. Her response to this issue was evident of her internal conflict about teaching, social studies and her role in the classroom,

Well, this year it seems like the role [of the social studies teacher] is to get them to pass the TAKS... (laugh). In my own classroom, well, I don't even know, maybe that's the most important thing at the end. But also how to be an effective citizen and connecting these things that happened in the past to how our system is set up today, and how you should behave in certain situations, it's also confusing in a lot of ways in allowing the students to embrace the conflict and then realize

there isn't a single way of thinking of things. But a lot of times, you have to stick to that narrative with TAKS. (S. Flavin, interview, October, 21, 2005)

Selena discussed her role as a social studies teacher with confusion based on the conflation of significant emphasis on the standardized exam, her cooperating teacher's opposition to student-centered teaching (as seen in Theme One), as well as her own developing ideas about her role as teacher and the purpose of social studies as a socioconstructivist opportunity. Shepard (2000) has called for *assessment for learning* which integrates assessment within the constructivist learning culture of the classroom and calls for a broader range of assessment tools which include performance tasks, projects, reflective journals, and other demonstrations of student work. Much like Vygotsky's zone of proximal development, assessment tasks, in Shepard's view, are a means with which to target student needs and scaffold them to the next step. Her framing of assessment is formative and seeks insight to learning; it is not a tool with which to distribute rewards and punishment. Additional perspective on assessment in socioconstructivist environments has been discussed by Palincsar (1998) in terms of *dynamic assessment* wherein students' abilities are predicted based on the student's potential development and makes no attempt to remove sociocultural influences as standardized exams often attempt to do.

The participants were in the process of aligning themselves with varying degrees of learner-centeredness in their classrooms as well as their thoughts on teaching and teachers. As each participant considered the role of knowledge in teaching, they were continuing to develop a belief system surrounding the epistemological focus of their classrooms and teaching which was reflected in their stance on socioconstructivist principles. These ideas are further detailed in the third sub-theme focusing on their

understandings of socioconstructivist pedagogy—a natural extension of the constructionist epistemological stance.

Understanding Socioconstructivist Pedagogy

Each of the four preservice teachers who participated in this study were purposefully selected based on their strong understanding of socioconstructivist pedagogy indicated via written lesson plans, successful grades on course assignments, and observation notes taken by the university facilitator during their internship semester. Their impressive classroom performance provided a range of opportunities to determine their success in the classroom with socioconstructivist lessons. Some had more developed (though still growing) understandings of socioconstructivist pedagogy than others and were more student-centered in determining how they would teach their lessons. Furthermore, each expressed varying experiences with socioconstructivist pedagogy both in terms of models and opportunity to practice.

Through interviews and written reflections, the participants discussed diverse experiences and models with socioconstructivism; overall, these were quite limited. Given these limitations, the preservice teachers could not depend upon prior knowledge or previous experience in order to help them shape their own classrooms as socioconstructivist environments. Furthermore, there was a dearth of models for them to use as examples. They were able to observe only one or two socioconstructivist lessons in the field and were quite dependent upon models from their university coursework to provide assistance in their work.

Joshua talked about his views on socioconstructivism, in a manner defining it for both himself as teacher and his students in his classroom,

Constructivism is, it's the student taking the thinking onto themselves—and as much as I know what my answer would be—the student's answer might be different and that doesn't mean it's wrong or right, but it's the one that they

identified with for whatever reason. It's [socioconstructivism] someone taking the learning on to themselves as in building; and in a way, building it for themselves even though they're not technically, I guess, constructing anything other than a thought, but building it for themselves. (J. Henson, interview, March 6, 2006)

Joshua approached his lesson design without reliance on the history textbook or lecture—taking him away from the teacher-centered, monolithic telling of history discouraged in coursework—as well as recognizing individual student perspectives and responsibilities in the learning process. These habits were encouraged by his university facilitator and course instructor, he continued, “Overall, I use constructivist [methods] because that’s the way I think of teaching.” Despite Joshua’s promising efforts with socioconstructivism, he conceded limited exposure to teaching these lessons in his teacher preparation program, but he noted congruency with his own classroom experiences, which included socioconstructivist elements,

I’ve never seen constructivism; it’s not been modeled for me. And I haven’t done it. Well, it’s been modeled for me with one of my mentor teachers, but she wasn’t explicit. She did it, and I watched, and then I did my lessons with the way I had been taught. Which was not at all [the teacher] saying, “Oh, turn to page so and so and such and such and read.” (J. Henson, interview, November 22, 2005)

As asserted by Lortie (1975/2002) and Britzman (2003) Joshua searched his memory and drew upon past experience to shape himself as a teacher and design his lessons for the classroom. It was noteworthy that his apprenticeship of observation was positive and in his case it facilitated his development; so often the case is that the apprenticeship of observation proves to be an impediment. He attended an alternative arts high school and recalled it as oriented toward student interests and group dialogue and those were the experiences he used to create a similar environment in his own classroom.

Bridget echoed his comments on a lack of models—but she had no previous experience with socioconstructivism to assist her,

Simply, I’ve never been taught that way. My old high school was lecture and worksheets and now...all my history teachers stand up there and deliver their

lectures and you take notes and...I wish I had models, just like an overview of how it should happen. (pause) I mean, I'd even take something written down. That goes back to having constructivist lessons—I want a book with different ideas. Yeah, I think part of it is that I've just never seen it. It's hard for me to imagine how I would do it or how it should go down in the classroom because I'm not certain. And I want to lecture (in a whisper). (B. Keller, interview, November 21, 2005)

In Bridget's case, she confessed a strong desire to lecture and employed a teacher-centered curriculum, which may be attributed to her experiences as a student and positivistic beliefs about knowledge. Classroom observational data revealed Bridget's considerable discomfort with cooperative learning and eliciting feedback or participation from her students. She was truly a teacher-centered instructor heavily dependent upon lecture-style lessons. At the end of the semester, Bridget still found herself struggling, "I find my problem is I can't, I don't have an idea of what I could do other than just lecture" (B. Keller, interview, March 6, 2006). Bridget had a tenuous grasp on socioconstructivist lessons, confirmed by a review of written lesson plans which were primarily lecture-based, writing notes on the board for students, assigning workbook exercises and written exams. Rarely did she use historical thinking (exactly three times) in her teaching of World History throughout the twelve week semester in the field. These were marked differences from her work in the previous semester in both written lesson plans and classroom observations.

While Bridget struggled and Joshua developed labels for the type of teaching and learning he experienced (and hoped to continue); Selena was frustrated by her cooperating teacher who rarely allowed her to use constructivist teaching methods, though she tried to include them as best she could,

I've done a lot, unfortunately, of just straight lecture type style things. I've tried to incorporate it [socioconstructivism] wherever I can. I've done a lot of cartoon type things where I'm having the kids analyze from the VanSledright kind of point of view, that's the way I'm trying to slip it in. And you know sometimes a

warm-up can be spread out and become a larger part of the day, I do a LOT of warm-ups. Yes, I've managed to get a lesson or two where they're analyzing documents but not really... (her voice dropping off). The way I'm expected to teach is very, well, Ms. Cagney says, "That's not teaching." It could be used, but it's only supposed "to support the teaching and the teaching comes from the teacher," so I get to do just basically lecture. When I do constructivist stuff, she said, "OK—that's good, but when are you going to teach them?" She says that the teacher is the "source of information" and I don't know if I agree with that.... (S. Favin, interview, November 29, 2005)

Selena would often begin her lesson with a student-centered activity and draw the lesson out across the class period, but wasn't often able to teach a student-centered lesson as the main portion of the class. Selena encountered significant resistance and virtually no support from her cooperating teacher although she consistently expressed emergent yet positive understandings of socioconstructivism, wrote lesson plans including student-centered activities and made earnest attempts to teach in this way.

However, Selena did manage to reserve two days in her planning calendar to conduct a simulation of an early American tea party. The students brought in cookies and treats; Selena and her cooperating teacher purchased real china teacups at the local thrift store. Most of the students had never tasted hot tea before and wondered at the spectacle of the Boston Tea Party as described to them in class based on this drink that did not taste very good to them. Selena added an element to this lesson plan and had each student create a colonial character based on some primary source material and other information from their text. While the students did not "get into character" during the actual class period of the tea party, their descriptive narratives and accompanying illustrations of their characters were for the most part excellent. Unfortunately beyond this lesson, through written reflections and classroom observations, it became obvious that Selena's cooperating teacher would not have socioconstructivist lessons in her classroom and frequently interrupted or took over Selena's lessons, robbing her of the opportunity to practice. Selena finished the semester feeling insecure about her teaching, her choice of

career, and the new methods that she attempted with her 8th grade students despite a few bright moments of success.

Through their fieldwork, though limited, the participants were beginning to see the connections between theory and practice as well as results of their epistemological stances, individual experiences, and the effects on their teaching practice. Even the limited articulation of socioconstructivist pedagogy provided opportunities for them to refine their thinking and adjust their practice to align with their thinking. Further, they were beginning to see the results they wanted in the classroom and to identify and mitigate obstacles to attaining those results.

Conceptualizing Historical Thinking

The fourth and final sub-theme of *Adopting New Pedagogical Strategies* explores increasing understandings of historical thinking as a specific example in the social studies of a socioconstructivist pedagogical approach. The preservice teachers expressed appreciation of the benefits and strengths of historical thinking in the social studies and generally worked to include it in their lessons. They were enthusiastic about historical thinking throughout their coursework and eagerly shared websites and resources for finding primary source documents. All four of the participants created and submitted impressive *Students as Historians* projects, each student created a web page with primary source documents / photos and accompanying document-based questions (see Appendix B). Dr. Gómez, in an effort to provide a route to interrupting the monolithic telling of history and to create a more holistic curriculum, pointedly used historical thinking in a critical manner (Loewen, 1995; VanSledright & Afflerbach, 2000; Wineburg, 2001). As such, the topic for the web-based project was of the students' choosing within the parameters of selecting a topic/group of people traditionally marginalized in the historical metanarrative.

The preservice teachers' learning experiences with historical thinking were limited to the prior semester of social studies methods coursework and their intern teaching semester (see Appendices A and B) where they engaged in readings and conversation about the topic and learned how to construct lesson plans using historical thinking. Further, they were strongly encouraged to teach these lessons in their intern classrooms (provided it coincided with their cooperating teachers' lesson plans) and as previously mentioned one of the major course assignments involved historical thinking and web-based resources—these assignments were designed to be lessons that could actually be taught in the classroom.

The participants were still developing full understandings of historical thinking. The final section discussed is the participant's work with historical thinking in the classroom. The first sub-point details their almost non-existent prior experiences with historical thinking. The second sub-point focuses on their understandings and definitions of historical thinking as teachers. The third and final sub-point focuses on their efforts in the field with historical thinking.

Hampering their understanding of historical thinking was the preservice teachers' substantial lack of experience with it as students themselves. None of the preservice teachers had participated in historical thinking lessons as students themselves (at elementary, middle, and high school levels) and they cited a few scattered encounters with it at the university level prior to enrollment in the social studies methods courses. As discussed previously in the earlier sub-themes of prior knowledge, epistemology and understandings, teachers often draw upon their previous work as students when they develop their teacher repertoire (Britzman, 2003; Lortie, 1975/2002). Given their very limited experiences as students with historical thinking, it was essentially new to them. As Joshua noted when asked about historical thinking in his schooling, his most vivid

memory was of interactive activities in science class but he also recalled some work in history, still, it was not historical thinking,

I do remember, well, a science class... We did the “DNA Dance” and each person was one of the different components to a DNA strand....I guess in history classes, we had to do debates in my U.S. history class and we had to process it and take a side and then support that side in a discussion with other people in class so we had to support our views whether they were ones we got to choose or whether they were assigned to us. Which I would say is kind of a historical thinking exercise. It wasn't the most common thing, but the school I went to was an arts high school so everyone there was thinking outside of the box and thinking in different ways as opposed to just ‘get them the information’ and move on but there were some classes that were like that. (J. Henson, interview, October 20, 2005)

Joshua was conflating notions of socioconstructivist pedagogy in both his science and history classrooms. While debates are indeed socioconstructivist, they do not comprise historical thinking which requires the use of primary source material. In observations of his classroom, Joshua often focused on asking the students to support their points of view or comments regarding a particular activity or document under examination. By the end of the semester, students were often able to provide justification for their interpretation of a primary source document without his persistent questioning, “Why do you think that?”

Interestingly, Selena, too, spoke of historical thinking as related to work from another subject, “Some of the most interesting experiences weren't actually in history classes, they were in English classes. Reading *The Crucible*, you just actually feel the anger and helplessness of the people that were in that time period and history...” (S. Favin, interview, October 21, 2005). Selena particularly recalled notions of empathy in English class and favored the notion of empathy in history, included in Foster's (1999) analysis. The preservice teachers did not study Foster's work, and this interpretation of historical empathy, while not incorrect, did not coincide with Seixas' (1993) work, with whom they were supposed to be familiar. Selena often encouraged her students to think on how historical figures felt via examining primary source documents. Furthermore, she

asked them to consider how historical actors responded to particular historical situations as in historical agency (Seixas, 1993). Many of her document-based questions, paired with photographs or other original documents, as warm ups, outlined in her lesson plans used this form of analysis.

Lastly, Bridget expressed a complete unawareness of historical thinking until she received a low grade on a history paper at the university,

Well, of course in high school we didn't really deal with primary source documents, didn't even think about any kind of historical thinking, it was just worksheets. Even in my first 2 years of college I don't even have any recollection of even thinking like that, and it wasn't until I got to the university, I had a *History of Greece Up Until the Peloponnesian War* class and I had never really dealt with a lot of primary source documents before or historical accounts. I had to write a paper and so I used one of the sources that the instructor recommended and I think I got a C because I hadn't taken into account when the event actually happened and when he was writing about it. So "How would he have really known if he was writing about it 150 years later?" which is something that I've never been taught to think about, I never even thought to think to think like that....So, I've never actually had like a name for it like *historical thinking* until like Dr. Gómez's class. (B. Keller, interview, October 21, 2005)

It is noteworthy that with her limited conception of historical thinking, Bridget had only encountered the idea of historical thinking on one occasion. In this situation, she was not taught by the history professor the methods of historical thinking, it was expected that she already knew how to consider primary source material in her history studies. She was not formally introduced to the concept until the semester prior to her apprentice teaching semester, a possible impediment to her ability and willingness to implement historical thinking as a teacher.

Likewise, Ignacio recalled little to no work with historical thinking as a young student and he could not attribute his affinity for historical thinking to encounters from his youth,

I don't really remember any specific thing in school where, I'm sure teachers did that, but I don't know if they were explicit about it and I can't remember any

instances. Historical reasoning is an inherent critique of history where you try to make it real, but at the same time you also have to take things at face value about what happened so there is only a little critique thrown in. Maybe I'm mythologizing my youth, but I never really got it from school. I don't remember a teacher bringing it up. They might have and I just might have later on remembered it and I just claimed it for myself later but I can't really remember anything as far as school. (I. Longoria, interview, October 21, 2005)

While Ignacio had little to no memory of practicing historical thinking as a student in public school, his disposition gravitated towards work with historical thinking. Despite the unreliability of memory, these recollections of the absence of historical thinking were significant in that the preservice teachers had little to no prior knowledge of the construct or how to go about teaching with this approach.

While their experience with historical thinking may invoke doubts about the long term impact of centering historical thinking within the social studies methods program these preservice teachers' enthusiastic efforts with historical thinking provided hope that they would continue working with this important social studies concept. Each preservice teacher expressed their belief in the importance of historical thinking and their desire to make it a central piece of their curriculum.

The possession of clear definitions of historical thinking were not a prerequisite for performance, (as is seen with expert teachers who often cannot articulate their expertise (Shulman, 2000)). In this case, with young preservice teachers, it indicated emergent thought processes about historical thinking and teaching. In an unusual take on historical thinking, Joshua discussed it at first in terms of opposites, which was a helpful explanation of his growing understanding for himself. His learning began by acknowledging what historical thinking was not,

I think in finding its opposite. *Historical thinking* would be the actual requiring of students to process their thoughts about history. For example, uhm, what's going on in it, what the whole story is, how it affects them, uhm, versus like lecturing and I guess I kind of call it, *historical hearing* where students hear the history in a

lecture-based system and they could be required to recall that information later and think about it but at the time it's just a lecture. It's just simply hearing it, writing it down, and moving along....What is called *historical thinking* is where you'd be required to think about it to process it for some goal. VanSledright gave the example of how his students made a newspaper, they had to take the knowledge that they learned through the historical thinking and through whatever basis, whatever it was, historical hearing (or it was reading the textbook), they had to take that knowledge and process it and think about it to come to some end result; and possibly connect it to their lives and the process depending on I guess what the assignment was. (J. Henson, interview, October 20, 2005)

He continued to practice historical thinking and continued to meet with success throughout the semester. Joshua perceived his efforts with historical thinking as a process of reciprocal teaching (Palincsar, 1998) wherein the teachers and students co-construct knowledge with the teacher beginning as the more knowledgeable other and gradually transferring that task to the student. The goal in Joshua's lessons was for the students to engage with the material and each other in a more complex manner than simply in the recall of information. During the methods course, the preservice teachers were taught to write rigorous document-based questions for their primary source documents by synthesizing Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956) and Seixas' (1993) principles of historical thinking (historical significance, historical epistemology, historical agency, historical empathy, and moral judgment). Joshua preferred to focus on the higher levels of Bloom's (Bloom et al., 1956) and according to classroom observation field notes, he exhibited a skillful ability to facilitate his students' thinking in class and group discussions using high level questions from the synthesis and evaluative levels of the taxonomy. For example, at the end of the semester, he had designed a gallery walk for his students with the Articles of Confederation. The students were walking up and down the display hallway working on determining which illustration coordinated with which Article on display based on activities from the day before with the primary source documents. Their guide sheet was the first step in their

synthesis; Joshua moved about the groups of students prompting them to tell him more about their thoughts on historical significance, agency, and moral judgment with regard to the article they were viewing and discussing. The students were formulating their own questions and creating narratives about the documents they were studying. This activity was the final result of Joshua's work with historical thinking and was indeed quite successful.

Ignacio gave the most accurate answer when asked about his conceptions of historical thinking,

Um, I would say it's...it's drawing conclusions from resources [primary source documents] or drawing conclusions (pause) about the past from resources. Resources could be... something you heard orally or read or saw or, anything like that sort of thing. So the idea would be that you would take these sources of information and either create a story line or narrative about the past or try to use it to recreate or have some sense of what the past was like based on these information sources. That's what I would consider historical reasoning. (I. Longoria, interview, October 21, 2005)

Although he was still reaching for a full definition, Ignacio's notion of historical thinking directly reflected the students' construction of historical narratives by creating story lines, (Ignacio's version of evidentiary trails used in historical thinking) by analyzing primary source documents and then drawing conclusions (VanSledright, 2002). Based on field notes and lesson plan analysis, his lessons included a wide range of primary source documents and several accompanying constructs of historical thinking as written by Seixas (1993) or VanSledright (2002).

For example, in a lesson about Marco Polo and Kublai Kahn, he required that his students recognize and analyze the multiple historical perspectives present in the lesson material. As he was handing out copies of a journal entry written by Marco Polo about the palace of Kublai Kahn, he told his students that he wanted them to discuss, in pairs, the authenticity of the journal entry and to question Marco Polo's authority on the subject

and his motives for writing the lavish descriptions (I. Longoria, observation, October 26, 2005). Ignacio directed students to an epistemological examination of the primary source and asked them to dissect Marco Polo's purpose in writing the journal piece. The student conversations focused on the author's nationality, rationale for writing the journal piece, potential gains from the journal piece and other writings of the same nature. In this way, the students crafted a holistic picture of the primary source document, its creation, purpose, and meaning to their study of that era.

Of the four participants, Bridget's discussion of historical thinking was the least developed and her resulting work in the classroom with historical thinking was weak, when present,

OK. I think historical thinking is...pause...being able to think about history without necessarily putting your views and the social...well, what's going on today, and making that part of what's in the past and just being able to think about history. I don't know everything about history, obviously, but I mean if you're...if I can talk about something even if I don't know the details because you know, you understand the bigger theme or the bigger idea of that...I don't know, just being able to use documents, and understanding you know who wrote it and why and when and their point of view and what you know their angle was... (B. Keller, interview, October 21, 2005)

Within this discussion, Bridget specifically missed the notion of historical positionality—an important element of examining primary source material. This limited and hesitant description implied a lack of experience and practice with historical thinking and analysis of her written lesson plans showed limited use of historical thinking lessons. Throughout the semester, she planned for only one lesson using a primary source document, a couple of lessons using photos, and there were no examples of prepared document-based questions despite the encouragement of her cooperating teacher, university facilitator and course instructor to include them in her classes.

Selena's conversation about historical thinking, like Bridget's, revealed a need for clarification, she put some thoughts together in an interview,

I guess if I had to describe historical thinking, I would say yeah, putting yourself in that frame of mind because it's so hard to break away from the idea of our culture to think of that culture and then once you realize the differences there's still certain things about humanity that are the same today. So I guess, recognizing the differences in the past and how it's leading up to today as well as realizing how these are also human beings and they have certain similarities to the way we think and respond to things today. Was that the most jumbled, confused response I've ever given...? (S. Favin, interview, October 21, 2005)

Selena was particularly concerned with connecting past actions to present situations and avoiding *presentism* (VanSledright, 2002). She hoped to instill in her students the ability to think in similar veins as the historical actor they studied might, while at the same time emphasizing the commonalities and differences of humanity in the historical era. She was drawn to Seixas' (1993) historical thinking structures of judgment, empathy, and agency. She had a relatively clear conception of historical thinking although she neglected to include the trail of evidence built upon the primary source documents examined.

While each of the previous discussions surrounding the description of historical thinking were emergent, a review of these three participants' lesson plans reveals the consistent inclusion of primary source documents/accompanying document-based questions, and other use of graphics and simulations by Ignacio, Joshua, and Selena whereas previously mentioned, Bridget did not use historical thinking but once.

The participants were anxious to implement their lessons involving historical thinking in their fieldwork. They were encouraged to use the lessons they had created for class assignments in the classroom as they were allowed to choose topics that matched with their field placements. As such, they were able to see the results of their efforts with learning historical thinking through coursework and their written lesson plans.

Ignacio could not see stepping away from the idea of historical thinking, and as further evidence will corroborate, he was the most successful in accomplishing historical thinking in his classroom,

It's fundamental; it's the basis of all the social studies, really. For example, let's say you want to talk about the present—you can't even begin to talk about it without placing it in some sort of context...the context involves some sort of past actions or some sort of past in general so you can't talk about anything without talking about its historical context on some level. There's no way to get around it for social studies, you have to think about everything historically in some aspect. (I. Longoria, interview, October 21, 2005)

This idea of context was important to him and his lesson plans reflected particular activities and sets of questions for students, he frequently set the context for his students with primary source documents. These segments of his lessons helped create settings for the daily lesson to which students could relate both in terms of prior knowledge, previous lessons, and current events. Also noted in his classroom observations was that he specifically ensured (via group dialogue, or examination of a primary source) that his students had an understanding of context when he introduced new material, reviewed material or was asking students to make connections with the content material. Ignacio favored political cartoons as primary source material and had a growing collection for each era he studied with his classes. They enjoyed the artwork and Ignacio worked their way into the topic using questions and class discussion (though never using pre-written document-based questions). Sometimes he used group simulations, tied to primary source documents, as with the Black Death to give students a visual/physical image to relate to when class discussions began. The students had a very candid idea of how the population was decimated by this disease in the Middle Ages.

Even Bridget, who had the most difficult time in taking on historical thinking as a new belief in her own teaching and learning, believed it as central to the social studies classroom,

I think it should be the primary goal because you know; no child is going to remember every single detail that you think they should. If you can teach them to think in a smart, in an intelligent manner and to think about history like that, then they're gonna be able to apply that in other areas of their life, in other subjects,

and certainly as they continue on in history. (B. Keller, interview, October 21, 2005)

This comment from Bridget was noteworthy as she professed her view of historical thinking as primary, yet in lesson plans, in her teaching, in other remarks, and in journal entries, she exhibited marked efforts to ensure that students remembered particular pieces of historical information and usually privileged the teacher-centered monolithic telling of history. Noted in classroom observations, she favored teaching methods which often included workbook exercises from the TAKS workbook, note taking sessions from either PowerPoint or the chalkboard, and answering questions directly from the textbook as homework assignments which they could often accomplish in the last fifteen minutes of class. She sometimes attempted to ask them questions but rarely gave them sufficient time or opportunity to answer; so she assumed they did not know the answer and move on.

As they progressed through the semester, the importance and understanding of historical thinking grew; Joshua talked about his increasing use of historical thinking in an interview towards the end of the semester,

I incorporate it [historical thinking] into my classroom because I think it's a better way for them to learn. I see historical thinking as the way they're thinking about it, how it relates to them and they're creating their own ideas about it [history]. And they're looking for answers, whereas the non-historical thinking is where you're kind of just told it, and my idea is that's like a textbook. And I haven't used the textbook very much in my class. It's a good source or resource to go and to find information but you can't get so much history into a 200 / 300 page book. I mean, so much happens; you can't fit it all in there. And so, in my mind you have to use other sources regardless. You can't teach everything that happened. Ever. So you can't teach, if you could make a history textbook with everything in it you couldn't teach it (laugh) so the textbook has some places where it's useful, but it's not the thing I use to teach. What I use is primary sources, ideas, quotes, and this is what this person thought, this is what they said. And, "What does that tell us about this situation?", "What does that tell us about what they were thinking?", "How would you feel if you were in that situation?" (J. Henson, interview, November 22, 2005)

The students had all participated in an assignment and conversations centered upon Loewen's (1995) critical textbook analysis, and were acutely aware of the potential inaccuracy of a typical history text and viewed primary source material as an opportunity to introduce more authentic materials with multiple perspectives. The avoidance of the textbook was not uncommon with most of the participants. Not only was it difficult to employ historical thinking by following the traditional text closely, the amount of material in the textbook was simply overwhelming. Theme Three discusses this task of curriculum selection as the text does not employ historical thinking—it was completely based on ancillary or supplemental materials.

Joshua and Ignacio were particularly cognizant of the possibilities of using historical thinking in presenting alternative narratives for students' consideration. Moreover, Ignacio particularly wanted to make history authentic for his students and believed that historical thinking could help in accomplishing this task. His work in taking on historical thinking provoked a great deal of thought on his part about its actual meaning and use,

Yeah, yeah! I like Seixas—the empathy is interesting—the idea to put yourself in their place, like how would it have been if YOU were there? How you react, or what's happening around them is making them act in that way. I find that much more interesting, and I just don't about how to get that across. Then I think you can teach them how to look at it and say “What point of view is this from? What's the perspective? Should we believe it?” That seems a little easier—that's almost easy—to get 'em thinking—to get them in that place in their own mind and getting them to think and what does that mean to you now? (I. Longoria, interview, November 29, 2005)

Like Selena, Ignacio was interested in his students' recognition of their place in history and what it would have been like if they were actually there (Foster, 1999). He continued contemplating what historical thinking and teaching history really meant within the context of his work with students and efforts in the classroom, and the limitations placed on him by the school culture and rules,

The problem is that we had to teach a thing about the paper clip movie [*Paper Clips* (Berlin & Fab, 2004)] and you can collect the paper clips and that equals one Jewish person who died for each clip, but that's not the same. People are "so proud of those kids who thought of that" and they really know what it means now. But no! They are clipping paper clips! It's like you try to give them a semblance of the idea but then you're not really recreating the time. The students are going to have their tennis shoes and they're sitting in a comfortable chair, I mean you're not gonna put thumbscrews on them and start squeezing and say, "tell me what you're thinking about God" you know—so how can you come as close to that [The Holocaust] as possible? (I. Longoria, interview, November 29, 2005)

Ignacio viewed this activity as lacking in rigor, or perhaps lacking in the types of structure laid out by VanSledright (2002) or Seixas (1993) which might provide a more stringent analysis. Like in an earlier discussion with Selena and her memories of *The Crucible* in English class, or the previous comments by Selena and Ignacio about prompting students to empathize with historical actors these were reflective of Foster's work, not Seixas (1993) or VanSledright's (2002). This comment was reminiscent of Ignacio's earlier quest to make history authentic and provide students opportunities to think.

These reflections, though not entirely cohesive, from the participants indicated that they were indeed taking on notions of historical thinking and contemplating their role as social studies educators and the kind of history teaching and learning they hoped to establish in their classroom. When compared to the framing of historical thinking scholarship, the preservice teachers' efforts moved toward this fuller definition, but did not quite reach a comprehensive definition of historical thinking. VanSledright (2002) has defined historical thinking as sourcework or the investigation and assessment of historical data. The preservice teachers did not yet recognize the full realm of the construct by including notions of the cognitive acts required of historical thinking that include identification, attribution, judging perspective, and reliability assessment. Seixas (1993) has developed categories as follows: historical significance, epistemology,

agency, empathy, and moral judgment. Taken together, the participants' early conceptions of historical thinking acknowledged several of these elements, primarily historical empathy, judging perspective, and attribution, but their ideas were not yet complete. The majority of their work with historical thinking, based on analysis of their lesson plans and observation notes, focused on identification, attribution, and empathy. Still, while each of the four participants experienced historical thinking for the first time in their university coursework, their understandings of historical thinking deepened and their teaching repertoire grew.

As the participants' thinking was traced from epistemological stance through understandings of both socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking it became apparent that despite their limited experience with these new concepts, they were willing to engage with the new theories and most were persistent in developing their understandings. Three of the four were contemplative about these new pedagogies and could be classified as adopting a socioconstructivist stance; Bridget's take on socioconstructivism placed her in a more positivistic realm likened to Grant's (2003) framework of knowledge facilitator and knowledge giver. Each possessed a limited range of individual experience as students and appropriate models of these pedagogies. Yet throughout the semester, the participants displayed wide range of thinking in terms of the social construction of knowledge, notions of student-centered teaching, interference by the TAKS test, and ideas of the principles of historical thinking in the classroom. This thinking provided a foundation for their work in the classroom. They all professed a strong desire to use historical thinking in their social studies classrooms; identifying it as central to history teaching. With the support of their course instructor, Dr. Gómez and their university facilitators, these preservice teachers approached the task of navigating the curriculum and instructional design with new pedagogical strategies and worked to

implement them in their apprentice teaching classrooms—both topics of the next two themes, respectively.

4.3 THEME THREE: DIVIDING ALLEGIANCES, NEGOTIATING CURRICULUM

As the data analysis unfolded about the preservice teachers' experiences in the classroom, it appeared that the act of negotiation became important as they attempted to learn the concepts within socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking for themselves and reconcile it with the standardized curriculum and campus/department requirements. While these curriculum requirements were quite specific, there were still multiple decisions to be made regarding the specifics of how the curriculum was enacted in the classroom. Cornbleth (2002) has written of particular constraints on social studies teaching, one of which is the use of bureaucratic controls such as structured instructional materials and external exams which affect the social studies curriculum. Additionally, Applebee (1996) has used the metaphor of conversation to describe curriculum and maintains that the teacher is the gatekeeper of classroom curriculum. He views teachers' roles as pivotal and believes that their decision-making process is critical to enacting standardized curriculum. As such, in the ensuing sub-themes, the participants first investigated the use of historical thinking in the TEKS and learning about the scope of the TAKS test, and second, worked with creating student-centered lesson plans, adapting primary source documents, and writing accompanying document-based questions for their students.

Standardized Curriculum, Standardized Exams

The overarching concept of a selective curriculum and the non-constructivist TAKS assessment (Shepard, 2000) presented itself as a reality as the apprentice teachers began to make decisions regarding what to teach and how much time they had to teach it.

One important conversation included the necessary curriculum coverage in order to be aligned with departmental goals and requirements, to meet state curriculum standards (Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)) and to prepare for standardized testing (Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)). Additionally, the preservice teachers had the local school district goals in the form of Instructional Planning Guides (IPG's), a detailed matrix of the TEKS placed on a daily calendar meant to assist teachers in teaching all of the required elements of the standard history curriculum.

Often, the pace of covering the curriculum precluded more in-depth lessons using socioconstructivist principles. The facilitation of group dialogue, student-centered lessons, use of materials beyond the textbook, or focusing on students' metawareness of their learning processes was limited in part by the requirements of the standards-driven tests. Historical thinking, largely socioconstructivist, was also restricted by these standards. The examination of primary source documents requires more time than a lecture-based lesson in the manner in which the lesson must be conducted with scaffolding, document-based questions, and allowing students time to create their own narrative derived from historical evidence. The preservice teachers reported pressure to cover the curriculum in terms of delivering a quantity of material to the students so that they would receive the adequate amount of information to be prepared for the TAKS exam.

Historical Thinking in Curriculum Standards

Historical thinking was not an optional activity in social studies classrooms, the National Standards for History (National Council for History Standards, 1996), and Texas state curriculum guides (Texas Education Agency, 1998) required it as an element of learning in history classrooms in varying degrees, from Kindergarten through 12th grade,

The study of history...rests on knowledge of facts, dates, names, places, events, and ideas. In addition, true historical understanding requires students to engage in historical thinking: to raise questions and to marshal solid evidence in support of their answers; to go beyond the facts presented in their textbooks and examine the historical record for themselves; to consult documents, journals, diaries, artifacts, historic sites, works of art, quantitative data, and other evidence from the past, and to do so imaginatively—taking into account the historical context in which these records were created and comparing the multiple points of view of those on the scene at the time. (National Council for History Standards, 1996)

Although historical thinking took its rightful place in these official curriculum documents, it is only one of many demands placed upon students and teachers in the history classroom. Other history curriculum requirements were numerous. For example, the ability to reference traditional events in history, geography mapping skills, economic forces in an historical context, the role of government, citizenship issues, notions of science, culture and technology in history (Texas Education Agency, 1998), presented a wide range of other ideas needing attention.

In an interesting extension of the idea of selective curriculum, Ignacio had concerns about the type of content material he was expected to share with students. He was interested in using historical thinking in a critical manner where he could use primary source materials to present a different narrative of the topics he found in the textbook and other curriculum documents he was required to use. He discussed on multiple occasions his doubt about the school system allowing him to teach in the authentic manner that historical thinking demands, for example,

Well, I want to get them thinking about what it was like, but I worry that I am going to be limited by rules. I can't tell them about the sweaty guy jumping at Anne Boleyn, there's a sweaty hairy guy and, yech. That's what history is, the real stories, so I don't understand sometimes what the administration wants, and the people who want us to teach history to students. And I'm like, "Are we really teaching history?" Or are we teaching them the nice little versions, the nice little stories you want us to tell them and then they [the students] go off on their merry way and never think about them again. Or, do we want them to really know that most of the time, if you don't have money, it's gonna really suck for you...these other things that aren't as heroic as someone who was sent across the water to

prove that the world was round and discovered this huge country and brought civilization to this area. I mean, it's a nice story; do you want some of that? Or do you want to tell about the natives he took back and the smallpox and how you die from smallpox? It's not a really good way to die—it's not it's not just like, bam! you have the smallpox and you fall down. You're going to suffer for long while—so what kind of history do I teach? (I. Longoria, interview, November 29, 2005)

Ignacio was indeed turning a critical eye towards historical thinking and entering into the realms of questioning the typical historical metanarrative, which often glorifies traditional historical stories and presents singular renditions of history. Furthermore, knowing that his students were more engaged by “nitty gritty” history, as he called it, he wondered where to draw the boundaries of appropriateness with his high school students as a teacher and public school employee while being faithful to authentic history.

TAKS Testing

While none of the preservice teachers reported significant pressure to perform for the TAKS test, all of them recognized the responsibility they carried to prepare the students well. Bridget talked often about keeping up, “Number one is time. I came in and Mrs. Kaelem was already behind and so...now I've got to catch up but she doesn't want to cut anything out,” (B. Keller, interview, October 21, 2005). This was a common dilemma for social studies teachers overall and was a challenge for the inexperienced preservice teachers. Joshua worried about spending too much time on one topic, when perhaps he should have moved on to another tested objective,

I don't know, I think I probably spent too much time on the Articles of Confederation overall for what was covered on the [TAKS] test and for what I guess they need to know....The TAKS test, your students have to be able to pass the TAKS test and you have to cover A B C D and E before they're finished with your class so that they're prepared to take the TAKS and just the fact that there's so much history that you have to cover in a year. You're covering all of world history, US history, you have so many things that you need to say in a certain amount of time. (J. Henson, interview, March 6, 2006)

The 8th grade U.S. History course was a tested grade level and many teachers found it necessary to review material from previous years. Although 8th grade was U.S. History, world history concepts were reviewed (and in some schools, the 7th grade Texas History course was altered to favor concepts of U.S. History), thus blurring the boundaries of the curriculum to support student success on the exam. On paper and in discussions, this idea was logical, but when enacted in the classroom over five class periods and 150 students, it became somewhat disordered in terms of content selection.

Selena noted her role in the TAKS exam and its contradictory position to socioconstructivist pedagogy and the social studies,

This year it seems like the role is to get them to pass the TAKS (laugh) I want to teach them how to be an effective citizen and connecting these things that happened in the past to how our system is set up today....But a lot of times you have to stick to that narrative with TAKS.... (S. Favin, interview, October 21, 2005)

Not only did the TAKS narrative interrupt her goals of connecting the past and present, but she also felt it prevented her from setting up experiential lessons, Selena writes further,

I once again must reflect on my lessons this week with a twinge of bitterness at their lack of creativity. I haven't done the constructivist, gritty type lessons that took me weeks to put together. The rush to get through the material is hitting me really hard—I realize the kids have to have learned so much before the TAKS, but that eliminates the potential to really experience the material (S. Favin, written reflection, October 23, 2005)

Covering the curriculum was a prominent theme with all of the apprentice teachers; they were particularly concerned with teaching all of the required content material. Applebee (1996) has discussed the rush to cover content, “too much coverage quickly reduces a course to an exercise in memorization without the opportunity [for students] to take action” (p. 58). Applebee has further asserted that when there is too much material to cover, dialogue becomes monologue and the teacher-centered classroom ensues; he has

claimed that this pressure to cover stems from standardized testing, state legislatures, and local school boards who are often involved in curriculum design.

Working against departmental requirements and timelines, the preservice teachers found it difficult to integrate lessons including historical thinking and to complete the lessons in the amount of time allotted in the calendar. Joshua presented the time dilemma complicated by the TAKS test. The TEKS curriculum called for historical thinking in the classroom, yet those objectives were not necessarily tested. There were a very limited number of primary source documents and document-based questions used as test questions on the TAKS test. It is a quandary for practicing professionals and sets forth new curriculum dilemmas for a beginning professional,

There's so little time as it is and so much needs to be done with your classes that you can't spend three days going over a treaty or a primary source. You have to get it done quicker. One of the drawbacks I noticed as I did primary sources today was with the Treaty of Paris. I knew one of my classes wouldn't be able to look at the entire document and get it processed in the right amount of time; so we looked at little excerpts from the document so those parts were the most important, but they didn't get to find the parts that were most important. They didn't see the document in its entirety, they only saw the little parts that were kind of pointed out to them or highlighted for them. In a way, that's a drawback because they're not seeing it in its full state. They're seeing the parts that are pulled out but at the same time they are getting to actually look at the primary source. If you think about it it's the testing...the TAKS test. How your students have to be able to pass the TAKS test. (J. Henson, interview, October 20, 2005)

Joshua did not feel that he was able to focus an appropriate amount of time and attention on the primary source document so that students would fully understand it; though he did feel that he could give it in the pieces that they needed to meet a TAKS objective. It was a divided allegiance—to privilege the primary source document or the TAKS objective—and they debated which was best for the student in the interest of learning or in the interest of passing the test, both were important. The preservice teachers felt as if they were sacrificing lessons with historical thinking for coverage of historical material or

giving up student-centered activities in order to provide PowerPoint lectures which enabled them to cover large segments of course material within short periods of time.

Working with these state and local curriculum standards was very helpful for these preservice teachers as it provided structure and a framework with which to plan their lessons. As the semester progressed, they became more adept at manipulating and including the standards in their lessons. They also learned to insert the use of primary source documents into their lessons and ways to adjust the use of historical thinking in terms of time and primary source documents; these lessons required an investment of time both in planning and in implementation. The participants learned to pace their instruction such that they covered the required material for the TAKS test, but were also able to fit in various lessons with historical thinking or utilize socioconstructivist principles. Very quickly, though, the apprentice teachers discovered the common curricular dilemmas inherent in these standards and entered into conversations about purposes and methods of education as they made decisions in the best interest of their students given the current constraints of standardized tests in the social studies.

Instructional Design and Resource Material

Given that the apprentice teaching semester was the final semester in the professional development preparation program, the preservice teachers had been writing lesson plans for at least five semesters with guidance from TEKS and other curricular standards outlined in the previous sub-theme. While each university class and cooperating teacher made small changes or suggestions in the formatting and/or requirements of the instructional design, lesson planning was a familiar classroom tool for the preservice teachers and a regular part of their experience. Benz and Newman (1985) have written that beginning teachers, upon graduation from their teacher preparation program, cite the most confidence and comfort in writing and using lesson

plans. As they entered the teaching force though, it seemed that the beginning teachers were not as adept at daily lesson design as they perceived. Still, they continuously improved in writing their lesson plans; the next sub-themes examine the lesson plans as living documents taking time and energy to create, the last-minute adjustments required in pacing and skill in finding appropriate primary source documents, and writing the accompanying document-based questions.

Creation of Lesson Plans

Instructional design and finding resource material was also a learning process for the participants. While they had been writing and using lesson plans for some time in their teacher education coursework, the preservice teachers were adjusting to the formatting and structure of a socioconstructivist lesson plan. Furthermore, researching and collecting primary source material was for most, a monumental task as there was a considerable amount of information available to teachers, particularly via the Internet. Contradictions presented themselves as some discovered “a ridiculous amount” of material (S. Favin, interview, October 21, 2005). In Selena’s case, working with 8th grade U.S. History primarily focused on The American Revolution during her time in the classroom found she had more material and primary source documents than she could process. Others found few primary source materials, as in Bridget’s situation studying early human civilizations. Aside from difficulties in finding primary source materials, one of the most difficult elements of lesson planning was logistical—writing an appropriately detailed lesson plan given their time limitations to prepare lessons, in interviews Bridget discussed this balance,

Well, the lesson plans. I’m unsure a real teacher, for example my cooperating teacher wrote half a paragraph about how they were gonna read chapter 3 today. So I don’t think once I get into an actual classroom that I have to be quite so

[pause], explicit as was required of me in class. (B. Keller, interview, March 6, 2006)

Written lesson plans were an especially personalized document and highly dependent on teacher style, content area, and campus context. Adapting lesson plans to accommodate multiple requirements from their facilitator and course instructor, cooperating teacher, individual campus, and personal style was difficult. Apprentice teachers were required to submit very detailed lesson plans to provide sharp focus on lesson implementation and help them keep up with a swift semester. The actual amount of time that the preservice teachers spent in writing lesson plans was significant, they spent a great deal of time researching the topics, refreshing their knowledge of the topics, creating accompanying activities and support materials (such as PowerPoint slides), and finding primary source documents. Highlighting a more complex issue, pacing proved to be a major adjustment—both in writing and in implementing lessons, Joshua mentioned this struggle,

I noticed a lot of my lessons would go over one period or one day and so it's a little different in that way because you have to manage the time, in my mind, you have to take a break, and then you have to get them into it again the second day. I'm sure there's some way I could have planned all those lessons to fit into one day by which they would have gotten the same amount they would have gotten from two days. (J. Henson, interview, March 6, 2006)

Making these adjustments for student learning took some time and trial and error. As the apprentice teachers improved their ability to gauge student progress and shift activities to include more work time, discussion time, or additional explanation and examples, their original lessons improved. This refinement also helped them in the beginning stages of lesson planning so that they were using their planning time more wisely and not putting significant effort into revising plans.

Selena also spoke of simply knowing how long a particular lesson would take. This was an important skill in navigating curriculum and was nearly impossible for a new

preservice teacher to predict. Unfortunately, in Selena's case, her cooperating teacher was unforgiving,

My greatest weakness in my lessons this week is I spent way too much time on Jamestown—apparently I was supposed to fly through that material, all the students needed to know was that it was founded in 1607. I had the students do several activities on Jamestown: we did a simulation of the joint-stock venture that funded the company and that took an entire day, we did a flow chart over the simulation, we did a T-chart comparing Jamestown to two previous colonies that failed, I also created a worksheet in which the students summarized some of John White's journal about Roanoke and answered two questions over the meaning of the text, plus the students read some of the chapter out loud and wrote out all the vocabulary for the section. My mentor teacher was very angry at my pacing, and I was astounded at her reaction—the entire time I showed her what I was planning to do. (S. Favin, written reflection, September 25, 2005)

This novice mistake illustrated Selena's unfamiliarity with the curriculum, a lack of understanding of the scope and sequence of the course and perhaps an enthusiastic bout of lesson planning. Further discussion in the interview revealed that the effort put forth by the apprentice teacher was an example a unit plan based on a micro-topic, and definitely threw the timing of her lessons off by at least a week or two. One of the most frustrating (and frequent) moments for the preservice teachers was when their lessons did not unfold as planned and they were required to rewrite the plan immediately. Making last minute changes throughout the day, indeed within the class period, was difficult and required sophisticated and quick thinking,

As for the lessons that needed to be altered, I am not sure if it was the class, the lesson, or me that is at fault. The lesson was going well and I felt comfortable, however, my cooperating teacher said I just switched and looked uncomfortable. She said at that point the class kind of shut down. I felt like I was pulling the answers out of the class most of the time. I wasn't sure what else to do. (J. Henson, interview, March 6, 2006)

At these points in their lessons, the preservice teachers often wrote that they wished they could have invoked the bell—seeking a moment, or a conference period to regroup. As

the semester progressed, their ability to refocus the class improved and observational notes showed more immediate strategizing and less forcing of lesson completion.

Working with Primary Source Documents

Lessons with historical thinking centered upon the use of one or more primary source documents. As previously noted, there was usually more than sufficient material via the Internet, ancillary textbook materials and other sources available to the preservice teachers from which to choose. Despite Selena's comment in finding a wealth of primary source documents and others' success in finding materials, Bridget maintained that she had difficulty finding appropriate primary source documents,

It's hard to find stuff that I can use for the kids. I mean you know they've looked at *Hammurabi's Code* in the textbook you know blah blah blah but I mean as far as like finding stuff that's really useful for them. Uhm, I don't know, for me to bring into the classroom and for them to look at (pause) I don't know I just need to get into a time period where there's more stuff and there's different angles for them to look at in different places... (B. Keller, interview, November 21, 2005)

Working with early human civilizations, Bridget felt that she could not find sufficient (and sufficiently interesting) materials for her students to use in their world history studies. As detailed throughout the data, she did not use historical thinking as a regular part of her lesson plans, and according to her research, there simply were not enough writings, artifacts, drawings, etc. of early civilizations that her students could use. The sense in working with primary source documents was that finding and adjusting the actual primary sources and fitting them in to their lessons became a task in itself. Beyond finding time to actually use historical thinking in their classroom schedules, many of the primary source documents had to be reorganized into a printable format or transferred to PowerPoint slides to be viewed digitally.

Creating and adjusting lessons plans entailed significant effort. The preservice teachers were not only adjusting excessively ambitious lesson plans (or in some cases

less than ambitious) during the course of the day; they were also learning to manage lesson writing as a professional task. In fact, at mid-semester, Ignacio was limited by his cooperating teacher and university facilitator to two new lesson plans per week because he was expending so much energy that other tasks, such as grading papers, attending faculty meetings and his own coursework were suffering. The final issue in terms of lesson planning and course materials was the sheer volume, or paucity, of primary source materials available to use in their classrooms. Most of the students were overwhelmed with excellent resources found via curriculum materials on their campuses, university resources, History Alive! materials as well as digitally on the Internet.

Once the preservice teachers had become familiar with the pedagogical strategies they were asked to adopt, they encountered more involved debates in integrating socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking with the social studies standards. The presence of curriculum standards was useful for guidance in lesson planning as well as provoking contemplations on the purpose and methods of pedagogy. Historical thinking and student-centered teaching were certainly included in the written standards, but when the pressure of covering the curriculum for the TAKS test became a reality, the efforts of including everything became a matter of negotiation and compromise. Additionally, writing lesson plans and gathering the necessary materials for class was an important task. The preservice teachers invested a great deal of time in searching for and organizing primary source materials for their lessons in historical thinking. The one exception was Bridget, who struggled to find adequate primary source materials for her students who were studying early human civilizations in World History. The final theme, *Creating and Working the Zone of Proximal Development* investigates how these curriculum decisions manifested and evolved in the apprentice teachers' classrooms with their students.

4.4 THEME FOUR: IMPLEMENTATION—CREATING AND WORKING THE ZONE OF PROXIMAL DEVELOPMENT

Using Vygotsky's (1978) development of the zone of proximal development this fourth and final theme demonstrates the actual implementation of socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking. In the classroom was where the focus of student-centered learning and its benefits became apparent. The primary socioconstructivist pedagogical principles that applied in this theme were those that focus specifically on the zone of proximal development and its implementation. These include attention to the individual student and her/his background, facilitation of group dialogue, and opportunities to challenge existing knowledge (Richardson, 2003). As each participant worked with these concepts, they experienced varying levels of success and multiple perspectives on achieving a learner centered classroom; the following sub-themes discuss student-teacher relationships, student engagement and cooperative learning, and the use of prior knowledge and scaffolding.

Knowing the Students

Knowing students entailed dual forms of information, of knowing ones' students in a personal sense and that of knowing ones' students in an academic sense. This undertaking was a priority for all of the participants. As each of them became familiar with their schools and began to employ best teaching practice, they agreed that knowing one's students well was critical to success. Noddings (2005) and Parker (1998) have written of the essential relationship between students and teachers which precludes learning in the classroom. According to experts like Glasser (Brandt, 1988; Glasser, 1990a, 1990b) and others (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Witmer, 2005) who have written of student-teacher relationships, they are of utmost importance in creating a positive and efficacious classroom environment and are worthy of the necessary additional time they

require. In order to foster a socioconstructivist environment in their classroom, the participants needed to ensure that the students were well able to engage in cooperative learning tasks and were willing to take academic risks in the classroom in the form of small group instruction, performance tasks, and taking on challenging assignments. Palincsar (1998) has written of the necessity of socializing students to the structures and processes inherent to a socioconstructivist classroom and maintains its importance to successful implementation.

Students as Individuals

The preservice teachers first focused efforts on knowing their students' names, interests, and academic strengths and weaknesses as well as the culture of the school, concerns of teenagers and how the demographic makeup of the campus emerged in the classroom. Learning about and adapting to the different personalities that make up a typical classroom, in addition to gender differences, played a role in this endeavor. Palincsar (1998) and Moll and Whitmore (1993) have written of the importance of relational issues between students and teachers as well as Cazden (1993) and Litowitz (1993) who have written of a shared sense of purpose and identity between students and teachers in the socioconstructivist classroom. None of the preservice teachers in this study found themselves placed in school settings very similar to their own schooling experiences. Despite Ignacio's ease with his students, his experiences were dissimilar to his students' and he had much to learn. Ignacio immediately focused on developing relationships with his students and learning about the boundaries involved,

I don't want to get over cocky and think I got this down flat because I don't. I'm more worried about the people who aren't saying anything who aren't doing anything. Honestly, if students are up and running around and I see you're doing something, I can deal with that. I'm worried about the people who are quiet. If you're quiet, you know it's hard for me to think how to approach you 'cause you're quiet and it's very hard to draw that person out. I don't want to make them

uncomfortable I don't want them to be someone they're not, if they're quiet and they're fine that's great; but I worry because those are the ones I don't know about....My least concern was if the students would like me or not. I don't care. I knew they were gonna like me, so I wasn't worried about that at all. But on the flip side, I was worried about them being too friendly and or feeling they could just talk all over me....(I. Longoria, interview, November 29, 2005)

Placed in the classes of a cooperating teacher with a reputation for fostering positive student behavior, Ignacio found himself in the fortunate position of learning about more intricate student-teacher relationships. Eliciting participation from quiet students or learning to draw boundaries for himself with super-friendly students was his focus. The other student teachers found themselves mitigating defiant behavior or cajoling silence during explanations of assignments from their students. These typical classroom issues were not often present in Ignacio's room, though the other participants had the opportunity to learn to work with challenging students.

Joshua, in a different school with younger students, celebrated a seemingly small—yet important—victory with an obstinate student. He wrote in a weekly reflection,

The best moment of my week was getting a student that I commonly have issues with, to cooperate. She moved seats and was sitting between two students talking. I asked her to move back to her seat and she put up a fight. I told her to move back to her seat and she kept up the argument. I told her that I had a problem with her sitting there and that the simplest solution was for her to move back. I then told her that the next solution I would find would be much more difficult for everyone involved and that I would appreciate it if she would just move back to her seat. Later a friend of hers, who also has a problem completing work, asked her to move next to him. She looked at me and asked permission. Knowing that they both never work, I asked, "Will you be quiet if you move?" She said "Yes," Then I asked, "Will he be quiet if you move?" She answered yes again. I said OK. I did have to ask them a few times to be quiet, but not more than I had to ask the rest of the class and they both got quiet when I asked. The best part is that they participated in the lesson the entire period. (J. Henson, written reflection, September 26, 2005)

Noted in classroom observations, it was also noted that Joshua was interested in students' self-monitoring of behavior and worked with them to meet their needs while still

maintaining a rigorous learning environment as in his reflection above. He used his efficacious relationship with the student to easily gain compliance and then immediately return to the lesson. He was not often or significantly interrupted for disciplinary matters. Students generally followed the routines he established for moving in and out of groups, for obtaining supplies for large group posters, and for participating in group conversations and reports. He engendered respect with and amongst his students, had few major discipline disruptions which allowed him to focus on pedagogy and curriculum. While this moment may seem small, these seemingly obscure victories accumulated and contributed to overall feelings of efficacy and success, which bred future successes thus encouraging him to attempt more and more ambitious lessons involving socioconstructivist pedagogy and/or historical thinking. Moreover, this classroom environment allowed him to consistently employ cooperative learning, paired discussions, gallery walks outside in the hallways, group research in the library, and other student-centered activities without severe discipline interruptions.

An important component of working with students was in recognizing and appreciating cultural differences both between students and between teachers and students. Moll and Whitmore's (1993) finding with regards to lack of mutual trust is applicable in the following situation where a cultural mismatch and lack of understanding was a partial culprit in Bridget's situation. Some had more difficulty than others in knowing their students and establishing relationships, and Bridget navigated cultural and gender issues, as illustrated below,

I'm not gonna lie, Twain High made me very nervous. I am not a big Black woman [like her cooperating teacher] and Mrs. Kaelem handled that class so well. It kind of worried me, students would walk up and say, "Are you the sub?" and they'd get this look in their eye, and I'd think "Ohhhh—just go sit down and be good!" (in a whisper). So, I really had trouble dealing with some of the, (long pause and sigh), male tension and the boys. It's just a different culture. After the semester progressed and I got to know the kids a little better it became easier and

you know, once you get to know them you can joke around, it's not so serious anymore and they're not out to get you. (B. Keller, interview, March 6, 2006)

Bridget found herself in a significantly different high school setting than her own schooling and previous student teaching experiences. The gender issues were compounded by cultural differences, but a few incidents of student violence on campus, and at least one in her classroom may have contributed to her wary perspective. Had she entered the classroom with more confidence and less deficit thinking, perhaps her first several weeks might have been more positive. Furthermore, based on classroom observations, Bridget was so focused on getting her students to be quiet and behave that she was reluctant to encourage academic interaction in the form of cooperative learning as it often turned into social hour. Students would delay sitting in groups, prolong obtaining supplies, and socialized with each other the entire time as she made repeated requests for compliance. Her demeanor was not necessarily open and inviting, and though she smiled quickly, she did not often visit with her students between classes. She stayed after school only as required for makeup work sessions—thus missing two common opportunities to become acquainted with her students.

Students' Academic Needs

Most of the preservice teachers created socioconstructivist lessons that would meet their students' academic needs. As will be demonstrated though, in the sub point about prior knowledge, the preservice teachers missed opportunities to refine this skill by not fully accessing student prior knowledge in order to gauge the level at which the students should be working within the zone of proximal development.

Selena was challenged by the significant support that her students required in examining a primary source document. While she had faith in her students' ability to accomplish the task, she was indeed frustrated by the amount of time it took to process a

small segment of the Articles of Confederation. She found that her students were neither socialized (Palincsar, 1998) to the procedures of a socioconstructivist classroom nor accustomed to the elements of examining primary source documents within historical thinking. She described her experience in an interview,

A drawback [to historical thinking] is that it takes a LOT of time and it's really, especially for middle school, it's just very complex because they're not used to seeing that kind of writing at all. So I mean just to, well, I did a journal, and it was, less than a paragraph and we had to read it, reread it, and as a group RE-translate it into their own words, and that's just for a small piece of work. By the time you've done that you've already given them your slant on it anyways and they're not necessarily picking up the slant that they would get on their own. So it's just frustrating for how much time it takes for a primary source document that way. But, it's only because they're not exposed to it if it was more included earlier on in schools it wouldn't be as difficult. (S. Favin, interview, October 21, 2005)

Her belief that her students were capable sustained her efforts and she began to include in her lesson plans mini-lessons on the methods of historical thinking and strategies of scaffolding and historical sourcework (VanSledright, 2002) to help her students read and examine primary source materials together. She remained adamant that students needed exposure and practice to historical thinking from a young age in order to foster the recursive development and sustaining of these skills.

Once the preservice teachers realized the benefits of strong student-teacher relationships and with positive leadership role in the classroom; they were able to use these partnerships with their students in establishing a strong classroom community in which to conduct socioconstructivist lessons. Furthermore, in gaining deeper knowledge of their students' academic strengths and needs, they were better able to tailor their lessons for their individual students. The next sub-theme examines the levels of student engagement that the participants facilitated as well as raises a debate amongst the apprentice teachers about their students' willingness to engage.

Student Engagement

The ultimate goal of any given constructivist lesson was student engagement. Even as they had limited models and support from their cooperating teachers, bringing students along on the historical thinking journey proved to be an arduous task for these preservice teachers. When they managed to negotiate the lesson plans and materials and obtained approval from their cooperating teacher, they found that they had one more major negotiation to orchestrate—convincing the students to work with them. Working within the zone of proximal development, or in a reciprocal teaching situation (Palinscar & Brown, 1984), demands student engagement.

One of the primary reasons that engaging lessons were essential was to promote student participation; yet sometimes even the most engaging lesson seemed uninteresting to students, or presented challenges they were simply unwilling to accept. There were myriad reasons why these student-teacher negotiations became necessary. Simple classroom management issues and establishing themselves as credible teachers were necessary elements, as were teaching students the methods and systems of how to learn with historical thinking. This learning approach was unfamiliar to students and for some, so was cooperative learning, a frequent component of socioconstructivist lessons.

Ability to Engage

A recurring theme from the apprentice teachers was hopeful doubt as they continued to work with socioconstructivist lessons in their classrooms. The preservice teachers needed to convince themselves to trust the students; and convince their students of their potential success and to enjoy this type of learning. The participants were learning how to read their students; how to gauge when there were miscommunications in the classroom, and determine whether they were true misunderstandings, or when the students were simply not interested. Additionally, there was always the possibility of the

students feigning misunderstanding in attempts to avoid working during class. These nuances were important but sometimes elusive and took skill and personal reflection to detect.

Ignacio worried about student reaction and ability to engage as with this example of a lesson on the influence of the Christian church during the Middle Ages,

It might be asking too much from the students. I don't know, I don't know if they're capable of it. I mean at that age...do you have enough life experience to really understand what that means? Yeah, you might, and there's moment's of "OK, I get that." Like today, today's discussion was interesting, they were talking about what does God believe and what does the Church believe? And yes, they do have the experience, and they're grasping at it—but I don't know if it's possible at that age to have a grasp of the whole thing. Even if you immerse somebody totally in, for example as in the Grant book, where there were two teachers and one of them is totally immersed in Civil Rights. Even if you do that and you get some deeper meaning, can the students relate that in context outside of that schoolroom? Can you relate that into like anything else besides just the "bad experience of the school?" So I don't know if it's possible to even get that kind of (pause) historical immersion, like you understand it, you're in it, you understand your part and where you relate to it and everything else in context. (I. Longoria, interview, November 29, 2005)

Despite his doubt, Ignacio persisted in teaching rigorous and interesting lessons to keep students in the zone of proximal development by using appropriate material which perhaps was atypical for a world history teacher. For example, he liked to bring in music clips, online streaming video, pieces of *South Park* and *Monty Python and the Holy Grail* to serve as entry points to particular historical topics.

While Ignacio's doubts centered on students' life experiences, Joshua was concerned about his 8th grade students' ability to actually engage with historical thinking in terms of their willingness to participate,

I don't know that I have that much freedom in that...I don't always feel like my students are capable of doing the things that I would like for them to be able to do [with historical thinking]. Sometimes it's just behavior. Some, I don't really think it's a level on which they can think as much as it's the level on which they are willing to think and the amount of attention that they're willing to give to

something. Sometimes it's difficult to think of something creative for my lessons; it's just that sometimes I feel restricted in what I can do with my students, in what they'd be willing to participate in as opposed to what I'd be allowed to try to give them to do. For example, with my first period, we did the Treaty of Paris, I put them in groups, and I asked them to look at these different articles and analyze them and then present them to the class. They did all right. Then I started out with my fifth period and I asked them to do the same thing. We broke into groups and none of them got started. Even with refocusing and redirection and how to do it and more explanation. It was almost as if they just weren't willing to come to the table and work on it—they just weren't engaged. It might have been the lesson or something else I don't know. So maybe they just weren't engaged, I guess first period was captivated, maybe it's just because it's earlier in the day and they are still asleep but they did it and they worked on it whereas the other classes weren't even I guess capable or willing, I'm not sure which, to sit down and to actually look at it. (J. Henson, interview, October 20, 2005)

As Joshua was getting to know his students, it seemed natural for him to be sorting out what his expectations were for both himself and the students. However, like the other participants, he expressed disappointment in the students' uninformed, or blasé, attitude towards historical thinking and rigor in the classroom overall. He attributed this, in part to their lack of previous experience with it in the hands of former teachers.

Ignacio described a similar experience to Joshua's and contemplated his role in the way the lesson was enacted in the classroom,

I'm having trouble trying to figure out how to get kids to think that way. And I don't know if it's more because I have trouble thinking that way, or is it because I just, I find myself doing all the work that they should be doing. The mass confusion about the assignment led me to think that they don't have the skill yet of reading a couple of paragraphs and getting information from it and then thinking about it in any context, much less, you know, what it means historically. Maybe they didn't want to do it, maybe they weren't trying but it seemed like they read it and they couldn't get anything from it. (I. Longoria, interview, November 29, 2005)

This particular incident to which Ignacio was referring was the subject of an observation and in the follow-up discussion; he reached the conclusion that the students were indeed feigning misunderstanding because they had participated successfully in similar lessons both earlier in the week and in previous weeks during the semester. The students, most of

whom were honor students, had been taught how to read primary source documents and obtain basic information from the text or photograph. Ignacio, as he said, “had been played as the new guy.”

Cooperative Learning

Ignacio and Joshua debated the skills and abilities of their students to enter academic engagement with historical thinking, and it was noteworthy that at the same time they were pondering their role in these semi-successful situations. Others found that cooperative learning was not a standard practice in their cooperating teachers’ classrooms and struggled to implement basic cooperative learning structures in their classrooms.

Selena found that her students were unaccustomed to reciprocal teaching (Palinscar & Brown, 1984) or cooperative learning; their routine was teacher-centered and her cooperating teacher meant to sustain that method. She retained her authority with regards to the class material and she did not subscribe to the view that teachers and students could co-construct knowledge in a successful learning situation such as the zone of proximal development. As a result, Selena contended with transitioning her students into this type of classroom environment while her cooperating teacher hovered and interfered. Selena explained a conversation with Ms. Cagney about a lesson she wanted to teach,

Their warm up would be about the Writs of Assistance and then we’d break up what the different roles meant. Mrs. Cagney said, “Well, I heard the whole lesson plan, it sounded to me that if they’re not taking notes that’s gaming, not teaching, they need something solid they will not have gained anything from that it will just have been free time.” And I disagreed, well, if it’s already such a part of their routine that they know what sort of behavior is expected of them during those kinds of activities that would help. And that’s another thing that she’s saying, these kids aren’t to that level yet, they’re not ready to do something like that without running around going crazy. And I disagree. (S. Favin, interview, October 21, 2005)

VanSledright (2002) would concur with Selena's frustrations. His key study on historical thinking was successfully conducted in a fifth grade classroom. His students were resolving complicated and authentic historical questions and creating narrative to describe their interpretations of historical evidence presented in class.

Bridget described struggles with implementing cooperative learning, and for her, the issue was conflated with other classroom matters,

I just, we—some of the... Well—all right—maybe not all of them but most of them can [do group work]. If I could, you know, break them up in the right groups, those who maybe would have a little more trouble could be helped by the ones that call out the answers, and want to have discussions in class. But part of it is over... it's the whole classroom... the aura, first period, they're really quiet and they don't really participate. I don't know if they're sleepy, half of them don't show up. Third period, they could do it—I could break them up into groups no problem but then it's matter of, I feel bad that maybe some are missing out. First period would be missing out on that whole group student-centered thing because I have to lead it; rather than with third, who will actually do it in the groups. Like fifth period, I can't break them up into groups there's just too many kids that are distracted and so unless I'm standing up at the front of the room leading them, they're bouncing off the walls, they're getting up, they're walking around, doing whatever. The other problem is absences. So if I make the activity a grade and half of first period doesn't show up—how am I gonna make that up? I could give it to them on their own, but it will be more difficult for them if they're not with the group and having other input. I just I don't know, I don't know if they get it though. I don't know if they care. I'm not sure that they care about most things (long pause) well, you know, half of them come because their P.O. [parole officer] says that they have to give me that sheet so that I can put that they're present so they don't get in trouble. Others come because their mom's taken away their car keys and won't give them back to them unless they are passing the class. And then there's just that few who are really interested and who are trying to learn and really thinking about it. And it's just hard to have that whole group together and make it interesting enough so that they want to participate. (B. Keller, interview, November 21, 2005)

Bridget was talking through her problems with cooperative learning, having the students successfully engage in group-based lessons was a significant challenge for her. She then launched into a related issue which was that of attendance; and her concerns about how much they cared, or did not care about world history. As she became mired in interrelated

problems and her inability to resolve them, she found it more and more difficult to implement student-centered lessons.

Prior Knowledge and Relevance

One of the keys to both socioconstructivist pedagogy and student engagement was working with prior knowledge. A major premise of Richardson's (2003) framework is to challenge and extend existing knowledge. As such, it was critical that the preservice teachers examine, and teach the students to examine for themselves, the extent, and nature, of their prior knowledge regarding the particular subject they are studying. With this information, the instructor could then adjust the lesson to best meet the needs of the learners. The lesson plan format they were required to use in the methods coursework specifically highlighted the need to access prior knowledge (see Appendix B). This could be done via multiple methods, but it was the first activity of any new lesson.

Ignacio confessed that he did not access prior knowledge well although he was often pleased with what the students brought to the class,

I don't know... (softly, then pause—thinking). I think right now I run on a lot of assumptions. I just assume they know certain things and until they show they don't. Then I think, "Oh, I guess I should have checked that they knew that." (laugh) I haven't gotten really good about checking their prior knowledge. I take what I've shown them as something they should know by this point. If I've gone over that they should know it, they are responsible for it at this point....But, I'm always surprised with what they know and I probably don't give them enough credit. I forget that they, too, have all these experiences and I'm always surprised when they bring something up that I hadn't thought about. It's just weird jumping in halfway [through the semester] and trying to figure out what they know backwards without, I might not be familiar with what they are doing in the grade before, or after, really. I just know whatever grade I'm in, I just know what I'm doing that year, or that semester. I don't really have a grasp of what the whole process is yet. (I. Longoria, interview, October 21, 2005)

Ignacio admitted a limited effort with accessing prior knowledge in addition to unfamiliarity with the scope of the general social studies curriculum. He acknowledged

that his students could make positive contributions to the class and curriculum. He should have taken advantage of the opportunity to place his students more powerfully in the center of his lessons.

Joshua gave his students a great deal of credit, too, but he acknowledged that his students arrived in the classroom with misinformation. “Some of them know a lot, they have a strong understanding and some don’t. And there’s some—misinformation—that we’re responsible for setting straight,” (J. Henson, interview, October 20, 2005). Part of the benefit of examining prior knowledge was understanding any misconceptions that students may bring to the classroom so that the lesson may be adjusted to investigate, and correct, if necessary, those misunderstandings.

In continuing to examine the data, it seemed that as a whole, the group of preservice teachers did not make significant effort to access prior knowledge. Selena, too, made no pointed inquiry of prior knowledge. She discussed an introduction to one of her lessons,

I haven't been doing it that much right now (sheepishly). I've thrown in questions like, “OK, you know we are talking about the pilgrims and the puritans what do you know about the first Thanksgiving?” and “Let’s just start there” and I get blank looks from some of the kids. I’m just thinking, “You’ve gotta be out of, you’ve gotta be kidding me, please, I know you know about the first thanksgiving, you learned about it in elementary school.” I don’t know how much of it is playing dumb and how much of it is something else, so I’ll start at a certain level. I haven’t had too many places where the kids have jumped in and said, “Oh yeah, we already know that, we already know that.” Which is kinda surprising, I just kinda try to pick up what they have already learned by what their comments are in class. (S. Favin, interview, October 20, 2005)

Given the nature of her classes, it was likely that since the students were unaccustomed to interactive lessons, they were reticent or fearful of answering her questions. Nevertheless, reliance on comments offered in class was not an especially helpful or successful way to elicit prior knowledge from students.

Bridget, worried that students did not recall basic historical information, merely confirmed her concerns when she asked them questions about prior knowledge. She discussed her attempts to include questioning techniques throughout her lectures,

I try questioning throughout lectures but it's hard because they don't remember stuff that we had just talked about the day before or the week before. And you're up there and you're like "OK!" Part of it is because I know they memorize a fact for 2 days and then forget it. But, I'm having problems with prior knowledge. I tend to think, OK yesterday, we talked about whatever, and you'd think they'd remember, but they don't. So I try to broaden the questions a little more "Why would this have occurred?" or "Think about what's going on right now," and let's take it back and try to get them a little more involved without having dead silence when you ask a more specific question about something that you think or assume that they should know. (B. Keller, interview, October 21, 2005)

Like her colleagues, Bridget did not take advantage of the students' prior knowledge. Furthermore, she did not seem to understand that prior knowledge was an important part of setting up the lesson and directing the course of study for her learners, which ideally would consist of student-centered activities.

Tied to the notion of prior knowledge was the establishment of relevance (see Appendix B). Relevance is a critical element to honoring the students' background and interests as has been asserted by Richardson (2003). It allows students to invest in the content material and feel ownership in their learning. Relevance was also a challenge to establish as discussed by Bridget in an interview,

Twain High has so many different groups and you know you'd think they'd all like know something in pop culture—and they don't. When we did world religions, we were talking about karma—that new TV show, *My Name is Earl* had just premiered, and the whole first episode is all about Karma. I asked the students if they had seen that show and they just looked at me like I was insane. One kid said, "Yeah, that show's kinda funny," and asked, "Well, what's it about?" He said, "Karma" and finally, I found a connection, "Yes!" And so I tried to get into pop culture, but it's really hard especially since some of their popular culture is just so different. (B. Keller, interview, March 6, 2005)

While establishing relevance did not necessarily have to use elements of pop culture, it was possible for students to make various and interesting connections with pop culture. In this case, Bridget's attempt at relevance via popular culture failed.

Establishing relevance was a crucial component of assessing prior knowledge so that students would be able to work within the zone of proximal development and challenge or extend their existing knowledge (Richardson, 2003) or consider their historical positionality within an historical thinking lesson (VanSledright, 2002). Ignacio, in particular, was especially interested in helping his students find relevance between his history course, current events, and their lives. He wanted to challenge his students but acknowledged the previously discussed matter of knowing his students which engendered the trust needed to teach about tough issues. He explained in an interview,

I'm tempted to tell them to go out and do something when I teach historical issues and current events. I want them to understand there are there are still a lot of injustices and a lot of social problems that are out there and that you should be aware of them. I hate to say DO something about it because I don't always do anything about it, (well, teaching them about it is doing something.) I do worry about lighting a fire and then blowing on it in essence. It's like giving the patients the keys to the asylum. And then what happens? I AM going to teach tough issues but I don't know what's going to happen with my students when I do that. I don't see how you can teach social studies without talking about these major issues. (I. Longoria, interview, November 29, 2005)

He expressed regret that he was not yet teaching during the immigration debates wherein students were joining marches to the capitol building and protesting the legislative debates. He was imagining the creative lessons he could design around that current event while at the same time wondering if the students truly understood the meaning of political protest and whether it would be appropriate for a teacher to lead them in that journey, either physically or academically (I. Longoria, interview, November 29, 2005). Ignacio was exceptionally skilled at using music, videos, and current events to help him establish relevance in his classroom. For example, he used Billy Joel's *We Didn't Start the Fire*

music video, which the students recognized as retro-80's music to illustrate multiple elements of modern American history and asked the students to begin by identifying and then organizing the events into logical categories.

Overall, the importance of accessing prior knowledge seemed to escape the participants. They did not use it fully and although when lesson plans were reviewed, prior knowledge was indeed at least a part of the written lesson. Fosnot (2005a) has described prior knowledge as existing personal models and is the touchstone for learning in a socioconstructivist sense,

Learning from this perspective is viewed as a self-regulatory process of struggling with the conflict between existing personal models of reality as a human meaning-making venture with culturally developed tools and symbols, and further negotiating such meaning through cooperative social activity, discourse, and debate in communities of practice. (p. ix)

Prior knowledge and relevance were the principle tasks in student-centered learning. Although the participants were able to write lesson plans including these elements, they did not manage to fully implement this important element of socioconstructivist pedagogy.

Scaffolding

Furthermore, none of the preservice teachers, either in interviews or via review of their lesson plans used document-based questions as a scaffolding tool often or in an in-depth manner, although they each showed skill in doing so for lessons submitted to their instructor for university coursework. These document-based questions made up an important part of the classroom curriculum as an accompaniment to primary source material, but they were often not a part of the lesson plan and were implemented haphazardly in class. Ignacio described his non-existent efforts with document-based questions and scaffolding,

I've asked a big question before right off the bat and it doesn't work very well – you get a lot of, “Huh” and “What”? So now—especially with pictures “What do you see?” and any answer's acceptable. Then you go higher. I guess I try to go higher, like “Who's in it?” so yeah, I guess I do try to scale...it didn't work out so well the other way. I haven't really used DBQ's to this point, I did a little bit, but I don't really have a lot of DBQ's. I'm starting to think of stuff, I think right now my main thing is that I'm trying to get them to get the skill of being able to read something and extract information from it. So right now I'm concentrating on that one so all I've got is little organizer to get their thoughts on a paper on a primary source. At this point, I haven't really sat and developed a whole bunch of primary source documents and questions based on those documents. Let me think, the way I would develop it [DBQ's/primary source material], I'd look at it and see what interests me about it and then ask questions to bring out, to see if I can pique their interest. Or if I gave them a document I'd point out things that I saw, “Oh, what does this mean?”, “Or how does this relate to what we talked about earlier?” I guess I would do it that way; I haven't really sat down formally and written a whole set of questions over a document.... (I. Longoria, interview, October 21, 2005)

As VanSledright (2002) has written, appropriately designed document-based questions assist students in investigating the primary source materials at hand and ensure that they are asking high level questions about the document and constructing rigorous narratives centered on the piece. Joshua also spoke of his lack of pre-written document-based questions, “I don't know that I actually had document based questions like when I think of document based questions I think of AP tests, and uh, I don't think my questions were anything like that...”(J. Henson, interview, October 20, 2005).

Unfortunately, document-based questions were rarely, if ever, formally used by the preservice teachers when working with primary source material. The lack of document-based questions represented a missed opportunity for students to work in Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (1978) with their apprentice teachers' or peers' assistance.

In a different type of academic challenge that also required the use of scaffolding, Bridget struggled to work with her students who were learning English as a second language. She had just realized that some of her students navigated two types of English,

conversational or social, and academic English, which was decidedly more complex. An important element of knowing one's students in terms of their academic strengths, ESL strategies can and should be employed in the social studies, adding another layer of complexity to the teachers' efforts. Bridget described her realization in an interview,

After going to the ESL seminar, I have had to reevaluate my thinking. I always assumed that because some of my ESL students can talk to me about homework or what is going on in school that they should have no problem doing the homework or understanding the lectures. But at the ESL seminar we spoke about how there are 2 different languages for them. Everyday English allows them to get by speaking to friends or teachers at school or at a work and classroom English (I forget exactly what it is called) but the understanding of English necessary to understand the information that I am giving in a lecture or to analyze a primary source document. I had never thought about it like that before. (B. Keller, interview, November 21, 2005)

The acknowledgement of the issue is significant, yet dealing with it is even more important and Bridget attempted to make her curriculum more accessible to her second language students by selecting appropriate texts, providing support through additional notes, and cooperative learning. Despite her efforts, she missed an important opportunity to scaffold course materials for her second-language students by the use of document-based questions and other mediating tools. This made her course material even more obtuse for her language learners.

Theme Four: Creating and Working the Zone of Proximal Development, focuses on the preservice teachers' efforts with engaging students within the zone of proximal development, the crux of socioconstructivist pedagogy. The classroom was where the culmination of student-centered learning and strategies to create this learning environment should have materialized. The first focus was on knowing one's students and providing for students' individual needs by honoring their unique backgrounds and establishing important student-teacher relationship such that there was a level of trust in the classroom with which to facilitate academic activities. The second sub-point detailed

the preservice teachers' efforts to assess and support via the access of prior knowledge the students' academic needs. This task was virtually unexplored by the preservice teachers. The second focus of Theme Four was based on student engagement wherein the preservice teachers debated the ability and willingness of their students to work with socioconstructivist lessons or complex historical thinking lessons. There were times when the participants agreed that their students needed more practice with the concepts or wondered if their students had sufficient life experiences to grasp historical thinking. At other times, the preservice teachers were convinced that they had been duped by their students. The second sub-point of student engagement dealt with students learning the processes of cooperative learning and the role that classroom management played in this endeavor. The fourth sub-point, prior knowledge and relevance were critical points in the socioconstructivist pedagogy (Richardson, 2003) and historical thinking frameworks (VanSledright, 2002). Prior knowledge provides critical information to the preservice teachers about the academic strengths and weaknesses of their students so that they can appropriately target their lessons, work within the zone of proximal development. The issue of relevance assists the participants with engaging the students, but also provides a link to their individual interests; it helped the preservice teachers center the lessons on their students. The final sub-point, scaffolding was a primary activity conducted within the zone of proximal development. The more knowledgeable other, in this case, the preservice teachers engaged in the co-construction of knowledge with their students building the tasks so that students are simultaneously challenged and successful. Within the realm of historical thinking, document-based questions provide an excellent scaffolding tool available to the participants—unfortunately, they did not take advantage of this tool thus compromising the rigor of their lessons.

The whole of Chapter Four, comprised of four major themes, outlines and details an array of data displaying the wide range of the participants' understandings and experiences with regard to socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking. *Theme One: Establishing and Managing the Classroom Context* was an important, yet common, theme of most studies involving preservice teachers. The participants were often overwhelmed with navigating classroom logistics—time management, preparing for class, grading papers and helping students with makeup work, as well as attending all required departmental and campus meetings. The preservice teachers were also learning their role as classroom leader in dealing with discipline management. The third contributor to the classroom environment was that of the cooperating teacher relationship. The participants generally had positive relationships; unfortunately, one participant did not and this cooperating teacher relationship impeded practice teaching within the classroom. The logistics of classroom management and relationships with cooperating teachers interacted with the other three themes. Grossman (1992) has written that these logistics are intertwined with learning to teach and cannot be separated from socioconstructivist curricular and pedagogical issues.

Theme Two: Learning and Adopting New Pedagogical Approaches provided insight to participants' thinking about the individual epistemological stance and understandings of the preservice teachers' about both socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking. Despite limited experiences with both, the preservice teachers were willing to attempt the new theories and most were persistent in gaining understanding. Three preservice teachers could be characterized as supporting a socioconstructivist stance. One exception was Bridget. She maintained her decidedly positivistic stance throughout the semester. Each preservice teacher expressed a minimal amount of individual experience with these pedagogies. The participants displayed a wide range of

thinking in terms of the social construction of knowledge, notions of student-centered teaching, interference by the TAKS test, and ideas of the principles of historical thinking in the classroom. They all claimed a strong desire to use historical thinking in their social studies classrooms; identifying it as important to history teaching and the social studies.

Theme Three: Divided Allegiances, Negotiating Curriculum described the debates involved in integrating socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking with the social studies standards. The curriculum standards were useful in initial lesson planning as well as instigating debates on the purpose and methods of pedagogy. Historical thinking and student-centered teaching were a part of the standards, but covering the curriculum for the TAKS test was a pressure in the classroom and the preservice teachers engaged in negotiation and compromise in order to use socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking during the practice semester. The preservice teachers invested a great deal of time in searching for and organizing primary source materials for their lessons in historical thinking. Again, Bridget was the exception. She struggled to find adequate primary source materials and to include historical thinking consistently.

Theme Four: Creating and Working the Zone of Proximal Development focused on the zone of proximal development and the details required of the preservice teachers to create and sustain it. The primary task was in knowing the students in a social and academic sense in order to focus the lesson around the student and their individual and academic needs. A secondary but equally important notion in Theme Four was based on student engagement wherein the preservice teachers needed to draw their students into the work of reciprocal teaching. This proved to be an interesting task as the participants encountered varying levels of student experience with cooperative learning and historical thinking; with some finding it necessary to teach this learning procedure to their classes. Prior knowledge is meant to assist in determining students' academic levels so that the

preservice teachers could design their lessons to take advantage of and extend that foundational knowledge. This important element of socioconstructivist pedagogy went virtually unused by the preservice teachers. Relevance, a tool of engagement, also provided a means to include students' individual interests and was used successfully at time, and others, the preservice teachers' efforts at relevance fell flat. When using historical thinking, document-based questions were occasions in which to scaffold student learning. Unfortunately, the preservice teachers did not utilize this tool thus missing an opportunity to engage in the co-construction of knowledge with their students.

Taken together, the data described in Chapter Four provided an emergent picture of the preservice teachers' work with socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking. Their efforts, in most cases, were persistent and emergent in providing a hopeful opportunity for further development with socioconstructivism. The one exception, Bridget, was a contrast to the rest of the participants. She retained her positivist tendencies, refusing to engage further with socioconstructivism. The final chapter, Chapter Five, outlines the findings and implications as a result of this data analysis.

Chapter Five: Study Findings and Implications

Given the data elaborated in Chapter Four, the findings in Chapter Five seek to answer the original research questions, the first is, “How do preservice teachers understand historical thinking and the socioconstructivist principles that foster it?” centering upon university coursework; and the second, “What are preservice teachers’ experiences with historical thinking and socioconstructivist lessons in the classroom?” attending to the fieldwork component. Emergent data from *Theme One: Establishing and Managing the Classroom Context* provides description of the classroom context and the complex nature of classroom management, administrative tasks, and interactions with cooperating teachers; each influencing, as a hindrance or facilitator, the preservice teachers’ apprentice teaching experience with socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking. This first long-term exposure to life in schools reveals surprise and exhaustion and requires new thinking and reflection. Data categorized into *Theme Two* entails the participants’ efforts with adopting new pedagogical stances and reconciling them with not only their epistemology but with their individual experiences as learners. As such, they are developing roles as teachers and practicing with new approaches in the classroom as they begin to understand and explore the principles of socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking. Practicing with these new approaches requires a considerable amount of curriculum negotiation, detailed in *Theme Three: Curriculum Selection*. The selection of curriculum is not only driven by the need to make use of state required standards and departmental planning, but also by considerations of TAKS testing and the desire to create a student-centered classroom environment in which the instructional design entailed socioconstructivist principles play a significant role. *Theme Four: Creating and Working the Zone of Proximal Development* focuses on the

preservice teachers' implementation of socioconstructivist pedagogy and within it, historical thinking. The extent to which they are able to employ socioconstructivist pedagogy is apparent by their ability to establish relationships with their students, use of details such as the ability to engage students, the use of cooperative learning, accessing prior knowledge, establishing relevance, and scaffolding.

As such, the whole of the themes in Chapter Four, the classroom context, the adoption of new pedagogical approaches, the selection of curriculum, and implementation culminate to findings detailed here in Chapter Five. First, the preservice teachers' epistemological stance plays a significant role in the preservice teachers' adoption and development of socioconstructivist pedagogy; how they shape themselves as teachers; and most notably in the ways in which this epistemological stance is reinforced, supporting or negating the adoption of socioconstructivist principles. Second, the presence and use of socioconstructivist models in the classroom is essential to the development of the preservice teachers' knowledge and experience with socioconstructivist pedagogy. Finally, the preservice teachers' partial appropriation of both socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking indicates an area of improvement in order to achieve ultimate success with these pedagogical approaches.

5.1 THE FUNDAMENTAL ROLE OF EPISTEMOLOGY

Epistemology pertains to the study of knowledge and its acquisition. The preservice teacher's epistemological stance is fundamental in setting the learning context for both the apprentice teachers and their students. What a preservice teacher believes about the construction of knowledge can be traced from their epistemological stance throughout their work as a teacher—it becomes a guiding principle. First, this epistemological stance carries through conceptions of their role of the teacher as authoritative or facilitative. Second, it therefore influences their understandings of

pedagogy manifest in instructional design and practice; by virtue of selecting and organizing course material, the teacher supports one particular epistemological stance. Third, their epistemological stance is ultimately reinforced by their own efforts and experiences in the classroom making change difficult.

What the participants believe about how knowledge is acquired indicates the extent to which they may be characterized as a teacher who espouses socioconstructivist theory. The conception of knowledge, as discussed by Crotty (2003), encompasses a range of beliefs. Two epistemological paradigms are identified in this case study, constructionist—that knowledge is a socially constructed and contested entity and positivist—that knowledge is a highly organized, pre-existing entity available for dissemination. Socioconstructivist pedagogy is associated with the constructionist paradigm and the positivistic epistemology is associated with the banking model (Freire, 2003), or the transmission model of teaching.

Preservice Teachers' Epistemological Stance

The preservice teachers' epistemological stance influences their notions of the teacher's role in the social studies classroom. The way in which they conceive knowledge creates inherent assumptions of teaching roles. von Glasersfeld (2005) asserts that “a constructivist orientation can modify a teacher's attitude” (p. 7) and ultimately their use of tools and resources in the classroom to instigate the construction of knowledge on the students' part. Portrayed in the study by Grant (2003) are two teachers classified as knowledge facilitators or knowledge givers creating a descriptive narrative of two types of teaching. These descriptions provide an example of two contrasting types of teaching, one of which is familiar to the students as a traditional lecture-based history teacher; the other teacher in Grant's study embraces a socioconstructivist method of teaching and applies it in her classroom via inquiry-based projects. The preservice teachers are able to

visualize these two types of teaching in a more concrete manner using the teachers in this study as examples of a teacher who is learner-centered and another who holds teacher-centered views. The preservice teachers in this case study, with the exception of one, exhibit the belief that knowledge is a constructed and contested entity; believe it their role to foster learning situations for their students in which they consider multiple versions of history. One participant, Bridget, is a notable exception in displaying a belief of teaching which entails the traditional telling of historical narratives for students to learn. This conception of a teaching role, informed by a constructionist or positivist stance, becomes a guiding principle of the participants' work in the classroom, shaping themselves as teachers and their students as learners.

The manner in which the teacher takes on their role in the classroom, in this case as socioconstructivist or positivist, necessarily shapes their manner of teaching, thus affecting how students learn in their classroom. Shulman (1987) calls attention to the relationship between the teacher's conception of truth—as knowledge—and a student's learning, "The teacher also communicates, whether consciously or not, ideas about the ways in which 'truth' is determined in a field and a set of attitudes and values that markedly influence student understanding," (p. 9). Ideas about truth in the content material are wrapped up in the teacher's epistemological beliefs and are transferred to students via pedagogical method and curriculum selection—sometimes these beliefs reflect the field's standard of truth, and sometimes not. For example, in history, the use of multiple primary source documents is an accepted method of approaching historical authenticity, if not truth. Shulman's notion of how teachers appropriate their beliefs about knowledge is apparent in the participants' lesson plans according to their socioconstructivist or positivist conceptions of knowledge.

The adoption of new pedagogical approaches, as detailed in Theme Two, discusses the participants' previously held notions of knowledge, teachers, and teaching which affects their ability to engage with socioconstructivist pedagogy. They learn this new pedagogical approach through their own epistemological lens and individual experiences in some cases providing further support for socioconstructivism and in another, causing significant cognitive dissonance. The theory that knowledge is a socially constructed entity resonated with most of the participants and those who understand epistemology in this sense are best able to embrace socioconstructivist pedagogy. Moreover, they were more willing and able to persist despite obstacles encountered in the classroom and the standard curriculum and meet the challenges of learning new content and practice. The one participant, again, who stands out, understands in an empirical sense the meaning of constructionist epistemology, but it does not resonate with her individual belief system. She consequently struggled to teach with socioconstructivist approaches. When she meets with resistance via internal (herself) or external sources (her students), she often quickly dismissed socioconstructivist pedagogy and returned to a transmission model of pedagogy which is a better fit in terms of her understanding of and beliefs about knowledge.

These two contrasting epistemologies promote different types of learning environments. Examples of these belief systems become apparent throughout the second theme revealing the participants' efforts with adopting socioconstructivist pedagogy. The preservice teachers' in this case study revealed their efforts must reconcile their constructionist or positivist epistemology and their individual belief systems about knowledge in order to understand and enact socioconstructivist pedagogy.

Epistemology and Instructional Design

The preservice teachers' epistemological beliefs become apparent in the creation of their lesson plans, as some lessons were designed by those with socioconstructivist viewpoints to foster group dialogue with other students and primary source material. The negotiation of the curriculum, discussed in the *Theme Three: Curriculum Selection*, reveals the participants' efforts with instructional design as related to adopting socioconstructivist pedagogy in their classroom instruction. Highlighting how the preservice teachers devised the purposes of their lesson plans and selected the accompanying material provides further focus on their epistemology. Other lessons, designed by the participant who espoused positivistic thinking were created to deliver information and assist students in collecting notes for studying.

On one hand, the concern in the interpretivist paradigm is in the encounter with and in the interaction of subject and object—between the students and course content—and the social context in which these interactions take place—individual classrooms. All members of the classroom are considered members of the learning community—both students and teachers alike. The teacher's role is to provide opportunity for such interactions. As outlined in *Theme Three: Divided Allegiances, Negotiating Curriculum*, those who approach the classroom with this stance consider coursework as necessarily exploring multiple perspectives and versions of historical narrative while also challenging traditional historical metanarratives using primary source documents and other supplemental materials. Lessons are designed to create opportunities for these interactions via group dialogue and with the specific intent of instigating the construction of knowledge in accordance with the interpretivist paradigm. While honoring curriculum standards, their historical content was both multitudinous and contested. Lessons are designed to create opportunities for these interactions as required by Richardson's (2003)

tenet of group dialogue in socioconstructivist pedagogy. The participants' role in the classroom is facilitative and concerned with the students' role and process in the learning of history as an interactive and interpretive act which is relevant to their lives as students and citizens thus fulfilling the tenets of socioconstructivist pedagogy.

On the other hand, as a stark contrast and in keeping with the ontological assumption of an existing, accessible, and highly organized body of knowledge, the positivist epistemology centers upon strict objectivity attained through a predetermined and carefully controlled system used to collect and disseminate knowledge. In this view taken up by Bridget, history is a chronological collection of events and facts used to inform in lecture-based classes. These lessons typify a transmission model of learning where the teacher, or prescribed text, chooses and displays the information for consumption by students which is both collected and learned objectively with little variation or challenge of the traditional metanarrative. The teacher's role is authoritative as purveyor of the predetermined curriculum as delineated in the textbook. Strictly following curriculum standards, the historical content in positivistic classrooms resembles the traditional metanarrative and focuses on the students remembering the whole of historical information.

As discussed in *Theme Three: Divided Allegiances, Negotiating Curriculum*, a secondary, but equally important, pressure influencing instructional design is the divided allegiance between the exigencies of standardized exams and learner-centered classroom environment providing example of the complicated curriculum dilemmas presented to the participants. Grant (2003) has emphasized that these two concepts (standardized exams and learner-centered teaching) are not mutually exclusive though they are frequently touted as such. As the preservice teachers continued their efforts with socioconstructivist pedagogy they conclude that the amount of material that required coverage was not

conducive to student-centered lessons. These lessons require a great deal of time not only in terms of preparation on the preservice teachers' part, but also in terms of time to teach the students how to learn in this setting and providing them time to construct their own knowledge. By the participants' thinking, often the quantity of material in the standards demanded that the preservice teachers conduct a lecture-based lesson.

As the participants implement their lessons, some more and others less student-centered, their strengths and weaknesses of using socioconstructivist pedagogy becomes apparent. As the preservice teachers embrace a learner-centered approach, it is evident not only in the types of lessons they create but also in their use of most of the facets of socioconstructivist pedagogy. They prioritize students by providing choice for them in the materials and products used in the lesson as well as a focus on accessing prior knowledge and making the topic relevant. When using primary source documents, students are asked to create their own narrative by examining authentic historical evidence and create their own considered interpretation. These lessons incorporate cooperative learning in small group, pair work, and triads with roles assigned to each student to foster group dialogue and encourage the Vygotskian (1978) notion of more knowledgeable other helping a novice learner.

The weakest portion of the socioconstructivist pedagogy is in focusing on the element of metawareness of learning strategies and positions. This is perhaps due to the preservice teachers' own novice status in the classroom. They have not yet developed the sophisticated ability to teach content and process simultaneously or interactively. Both Richardson (2003) and Fosnot (2005a) encourage the teaching of metacognition as an element of socioconstructivist pedagogy. This comes through in VanSledright's (2002) notion of the pragmatist's epistemological stance wherein students must examine their own epistemological stance in the process of examining primary source documents.

The participants' instructional designs are intended to create particular types of activities and interactions with the material in the classroom requiring different types of teacher leadership. As they teach, their individual instructional styles emerge shaped by their epistemological focus. Using these conceptions of knowledge and its existence in a positivist stance; or its creation in an interpretivist stance, the preservice teachers designed their classroom lessons according to their epistemological understandings and beliefs.

Reinforcement of Epistemology

The results of their teaching, the level of student engagement and success in the lesson, and their reflection as developing professionals serve as a catalyst to further reinforce their epistemological belief system. The classroom lessons conducted by the three participants who support a constructionist epistemology are relatively successful in their implementation. Student interest and engagement is high and discipline problems are few. Their students perform well on tests, produce creative projects, and contribute thoughtful comments and questions to class discussions. Setbacks with particular lessons, understanding of pedagogical principles, or students' understanding of the content material were met with persistence to continue developing their repertoire with socioconstructivist pedagogical approaches and/or historical thinking by the preservice teachers. The preservice teachers frequently reflected upon their instructional design and implementation of the lesson for solutions to the problems in class.

Conversely, those lessons which could be described as positivistic, while sound by some definitions, did not meet socioconstructivist principles. Student engagement was limited at best and classroom relations are strained and management difficult. Student success on tests is much lower than desirable. When she attempted lessons that could be considered more learner-centered than her typical lessons, Bridget met with typical

problems of lackluster engagement and chaos. These setbacks simply reinforced her original notions of positivistic epistemology and a teacher-centered classroom and further encouraged her circumspect relationship with students. When she employs teacher-centered lessons, students are compliant and fare well enough on assessments.

The reinforcements of epistemological stance certainly help in further developing not only belief systems in knowledge as a socially constructed entity but encouraged the practice of socioconstructivist principles. Unfortunately, in the case of the preservice teacher who struggles to adopt a constructionist epistemology, it only serves to strengthen her belief in a teacher-centered classroom and that knowledge is a pre-existing entity disseminated to others. This limited the development of abilities to sustain a learner-centered classroom because each attempt of these types of lessons and teaching, the preservice teacher is met with failure both on the part of the teacher and that of the students.

As seen in this first finding, the preservice teachers' individual epistemological stance plays a significant role in the degree to which the classroom is learner-centered or teacher-centered. This is reflected in the participants' conception of their roles as social studies teachers as co-constructors of various historical narratives or as an authority on pre-existing subject matter. Furthermore, this stance is evident in the instructional design produced by the preservice teacher gauged by the extent to which their lessons are student-centered or teacher-centered. The most critical notion in the first finding is that these preservice teachers' epistemological groundings are reinforced by their experiences in the classroom. The three participants who agree that knowledge is a socially constructed entity subject to interpretation may be more likely to develop a sophisticated teaching repertoire as a learner-centered teacher as their belief system fuels their persistence and willingness to continue practicing with this pedagogical approach. The

participant who maintains a more positivistic epistemological stance provides a contrast to this belief in the idea of knowledge as an objective, pre-existing entity. This preservice teacher may be less likely to develop as a learner-centered teacher as experiences in the apprentice teaching classroom have simply reinforced original beliefs about knowledge and learning and thus resorts to a transmission model of teaching.

5.2 THE CLASSROOM AS COMMUNITY

In the second finding, the extent to which the classroom is maintained as a positive learning community, in both social and intellectual realms, plays a significant role in the success of socioconstructivist learning principles. Establishing and maintaining the classroom as a positive social and academic space is critical to adopting socioconstructivist pedagogical principles which demand that lessons focus on students' individual and academic needs and the facilitation of group dialogue (Richardson, 2003).

This framework may be considered as encompassing two realms, the student as an individual and student as an academic. The students are honored as individual learners in the classroom with their backgrounds and social needs considered. Further, students' academic needs are prioritized such that lessons are designed to build upon their interests and prior knowledge and to meet students' academic level. As seen in *Theme One: Establishing and Managing the Classroom Context*, in these classrooms, students work together, questions are freely asked and answered, major disruptions are minimal, and the teacher co-constructs knowledge with the students. The preservice teachers prioritize students to establish positive relations in class and foster appropriate student-teacher relationships which align the two, teacher and student, as co-constructors of knowledge. Second, the preservice teachers focus their instructional design on creating a synergetic intellectual climate in which students thrive. The third component is to foster positive classroom management techniques and reduce classroom disciplinary issues. Each of

these three elements is dependent upon the other for success. If one of the pieces is missing or weak, then the system as a whole, positive social environment, synergetic intellectual climate, and classroom management suffers.

A Social Community

Creating this positive space in which to learn consists of a establishing and maintaining high levels of collegiality amongst the students and between the students and their teacher. In this environment, students are more willing to engage in assignments that require academic risk such as those involving cooperative learning or complex approaches such as historical thinking. Palincsar (1998) has discussed the concept of socialization of students into a socioconstructivist environment, stressing student relationships with one another to facilitate learning and participate in the co-construction of knowledge.

Research of this nature [in socioconstructivist classroom environments] reveals the increased complexity for the teacher who must attend to socializing students into new ways of dealing with peers as intellectual partners, as well as new ways of thinking about subject matter learning. (p. 359)

As such, not only must the participants focus on learning socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking for themselves, but they must also ensure that their students are learning the processes of this pedagogical approach. This concept is demonstrated in *Theme Four: Creating and Working the Zone of Proximal Development* as the preservice teachers attempt to work within the zone of proximal development with their students and engage them in socioconstructivist and historical thinking lessons. In some cases, it is necessary for the preservice teachers to teach or re-teach students ways in which to engage in cooperative learning or use primary source documents. Additionally, Noddings

(2005) has written much on the subject of caring in education and she asserts that the student-teacher relationship is essential,

Good teachers do not reject what students see and feel but, rather, work with what is presently seen and felt to build a stronger position for each student. To do this effectively requires the creation and maintenance of a trusting relationship. (p. 107)

A trusting relationship (or lack thereof) affords the apprentice teachers a wider latitude to challenge students with complex material and advanced activities. The students are sometimes skeptical of challenging assignments; but with positive feedback and modeling the participants are well able to engage them in the lesson.

Moreover, a positive student-teacher relationship makes the classroom an inviting place to learn. Attendance and tardy problems are reduced and students want to actively participate in a classroom where they feel welcomed and valued as learners; and where they expect to be successful. The trusting relationship described by Noddings is essential to success with the challenging academic endeavors planned by the preservice teachers. One cannot exist without the other; a trusting relationship is necessary to engage in rigorous academics and those academic pursuits are fruitless without a trusting student-teacher relationship.

An Intellectual Community

An equally important notion of community is that which emphasizes the reciprocal work (Palinscar & Brown, 1984) of students and teachers within the classroom. The social and intellectual community components are synergetic and necessary for socioconstructivist learning and teaching. As an example of working within the zone of proximal development, Palinscar and Brown (1984) have devised a system which utilizes the elements of the zone of proximal development with struggling reading students. “The reciprocal teaching procedure involves continuous trial and error on the

part of the student, married to continuous adjustment on the part of the teacher to their current competence” (p. 169). Ideally, these interactions take place consistently between the participants and their students within socioconstructivist lessons. Naturally, since the students are required to experience trial and error, (though supported by the teacher or more knowledgeable peer,) persistence is important to their learning. Tied to this notion of is a classroom climate that fosters persistence as well as promotes success. Noddings (2005) also has written that in caring for ideas, another tenet of her framework of caring in schools, students should also be prioritized, “Pedagogy should begin with the purposes, interests, and capacities of students,” (p. 107).

The way in which preservice teachers begin as Noddings describes is in accessing prior knowledge—another element of centering lessons on students’ interests and abilities. Prior knowledge is essential in determining a student’s existent knowledge and current level of ability so that lessons are aimed at the appropriate level and the preservice teachers can set up learning situations—the zone of proximal development—as described by Vygotsky (1978). Students should engage with material so that they consistently remain within the zone of proximal development in order to continue learning.

Relevance is a term used in the social studies methods classes to describe this task of connecting the curriculum to the students’ “purposes, interests, and capacities.” Relevance is conducive to developing a deeper understanding of the rationale for learning the material and provides the students ownership in the lesson. However, relevance is difficult to establish for students with whom the preservice teacher has a limited or tenuous relationship. The preservice teachers spend a considerable amount of time learning about the lives and interests of their students in order to draw upon examples in their lessons to help establish relevancy. As demonstrated in Theme Four, the preservice

teachers have great difficulty in accessing prior knowledge, perhaps not understanding it as a critical element of socioconstructivist pedagogy but merely as an introductory piece to their lessons. The preservice teachers must establish an intellectual environment that makes use of the reciprocal teaching methods as described by Palincsar and Brown (1984). As such, important information gathered by accessing prior knowledge and establishing relevance must be used to engage with students at their academic level and challenge their existing knowledge such that learning occurs.

Pedagogy, Curriculum, and Management as an Integrated Entity

The third and final element of the classroom environment entails the issue of classroom management. If the first two elements, positive social relations and student-teacher trust, and a stimulating intellectual environment are in place, then classroom management as a disciplinary issue is reduced from great disruptions to merely interruptions of classroom activities, usually easily resolved. Teaching is a complex endeavor, and as has been described by Armento (1996) is multifaceted,

Teaching social studies has to do with one's beliefs, content knowledge, and much more. It has to do with one's understanding of children, with understanding the multiple ways they learn; it has to do with the joy and power of learning and with all the ways teachers can integrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions to create learning environments that help children create meaning in their lives. Prospective teachers try to synthesize their knowledge, beliefs, values, and skills as they interact with children during teaching internships and student teaching. (p. 492)

Within this complicated synthesis, the apprentice teachers find multitasking to be overwhelming, the topic of *Theme One: Classroom Context*, yet they eventually learn to successfully manage themselves, their time and all of the additional chores required of them. Despite this sense of overwhelming multitasking, the participants establish and maintain a positive classroom climate which promotes good student behavior, as discussed in both Theme One with regards to classroom discipline and in Theme Four in

terms of knowing students. Only one of the participants had significant problems with student discipline which may be attributed to the weak establishment of the social environment in her classroom.

In addition to Armento's (1996) description of a preservice teacher's tasks, Grossman (1992) has argued that they simultaneously grapple with academic, pedagogical, and management issues. These teachers do not overlook matters of professional development, "these concerns did not prevent them from reflecting deeply on issues related to the content of teaching" (p. 173). Furthermore, she argues against the developmental notion of "establishing control prior to teaching" (p. 174) and challenges preservice teachers to "struggle simultaneously with issues of management, social roles and routines in classrooms, instruction, and learning" (p. 175). Perhaps the focus on classroom environment and academic endeavors frees these participants from discipline issues and allows students to learn the content and process of history while their preservice teachers learn the content and process of pedagogy.

As the preservice teachers move through the semester, the interdependent nature of pedagogy, curriculum, and management becomes more apparent. The selection of pedagogical methods and curriculum material is important to promote the positive classroom climate they establish. By creating engaging and interesting lessons, the preservice teachers support appropriate classroom behavior and reduce discipline problems. As Grossman (1992) has asserted, classroom management issues do not prevent students from engaging with complex pedagogical and curricular issues, indeed this engagement is critical to establishing a classroom in which academic rigor is prioritized.

5.3 ACHIEVING A LEARNER-CENTERED CLASSROOM

One of the primary goals of this study is to examine how preservice teachers in this study achieve a learner-centered classroom using socioconstructivist pedagogy with historical thinking (Seixas, 1993; VanSledright, 2002) as a specific example of a learner-centered pedagogical approach. Success is partially advanced by the participants' success in embracing a socioconstructivist epistemology and establishing a rich classroom context. Given their experiences in the field and in their practice classrooms, by the end of the semester they reach a large measure of that goal, but they still require progress in accomplishing a fully student-centered classroom. Some of this lack of progress may be attributed to the standards and test-based system in which the participants work. Furthermore, some of the participants are placed with more supportive cooperating teachers than others, which affects the ability to implement learner-centered lessons. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this discussion, the focus remains solely on the efforts of the preservice teachers. Three areas in need of improvement for these participants are first, the tendency to misname or mislabel pedagogical terms with reference to socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking indicating a novice understanding of the concept. Second, the practice of only partially appropriating socioconstructivist and historical thinking approaches used in the classroom creates weak lessons thus reducing the rigor of socioconstructivist principles and historical thinking. Third, the inadequate execution of the teacher's role in socioconstructivist lessons compromises the successful implementation of the lesson.

Misnaming Pedagogical Terms

Misnaming pedagogical terms would not be problematic if the participants were making simple mistakes in terminology; but in this case, the preservice teachers' mislabeling is an indicator of emergent and novice understandings of the pedagogical

approaches taught in the social studies methods class. One of the most common mistakes is in defining and labeling historical thinking. When discussing historical thinking in *Theme Two: Learning and Adopting New Pedagogical Approaches*, the participants often view socioconstructivist lessons—such as an historical simulation—as a lesson in historical thinking although no primary source documents are involved. In a similar sense, cooperative learning, while an important component of socioconstructivist pedagogy does not make up the whole of the pedagogical approach. A final example is that of accessing prior knowledge. Many students equate prior knowledge with the lesson warm up or introductory segment. While accessing prior knowledge may occur during these segments of the lesson, simply including those pieces does not ensure suitable access of prior knowledge or the resulting use of the gathered information.

The preservice teachers are not intentionally careless in their use of terms; but by not carefully considering the fundamental definitions of the socioconstructivist pedagogical approaches and frameworks of historical thinking used in the classroom, they consequently miss opportunities to develop their understanding and to create rigorous lessons for students. Weak socioconstructivist lessons are certainly a disservice to students in the classroom but they also provide a limited basis upon which the preservice teachers can build their knowledge and skill with these types of lessons.

Partial Appropriation

In terms of historical thinking in particular, the apprentice teachers focus only on a few of the pieces of the curricular frameworks taught in class. When they work with historical thinking, they almost entirely ignore notions of historical epistemology both as outlined by Seixas (1993) and VanSledright (2002). Further, they rely on VanSledright's (2002) attribution and reliability; and Seixas' (1993) empathy (presentism) and moral judgment. Important pieces such as significance, epistemology, and agency (Seixas,

1993) and identification and judging perspective (VanSledright, 2002), what may be considered the more difficult facets of historical thinking, are overlooked. Moreover, the participants favor using empathy as described by Foster (1999) which comprises a different framework in terms of historical study and is not similar to the framework of historical thinking. The preservice teachers have not studied this type of historical empathy, yet this notion is consistently employed throughout the participants' classes. Foster's (1999) work emphasizes a different sense of understanding human actions in the past than VanSledright (2002) or Seixas (1993). Foster's (1999) work includes examining why people in the past acted as they did, understanding context and chronology and analyzing historical evidence, appreciating consequences of past actions, sensing that the past is different than the present, and displaying sensitivity for the complexity of human achievement. While this work with empathy is legitimate; the problem arises in that his work is not the framework that the preservice teachers know and they are misappropriating the concept of historical thinking and empathy. By not including each piece of historical thinking, the participants reduce the rigor in historical thinking lessons and do not present a holistic picture of historical inquiry to their students.

While selective about the use of historical thinking, the preservice teachers are also selective about the pieces of socioconstructivist pedagogy they choose to utilize, also reducing its rigor and success in the classroom. As seen in *Theme Four: Creating and Working the Zone of Proximal Development*, they do not fully embrace the first three tenets of socioconstructivist pedagogy typical of Richardson (2003), they attempt student centered learning, group dialogue, and to challenge and extend their students' knowledge. The preservice teachers have no problems in introducing knowledge but they falter in eliciting student contributions as a piece of the third tenet. The fifth tenet is almost completely ignored, that of increasing students' metawareness of their own

understandings and learning processes. Perhaps this is due to the novice status of the preservice teachers. Learning to make these strategies explicit for themselves as well as for their students was a part of the apprentice teacher experience.

Inadequate Execution

The third and final manner of the preservice teachers' partially reaching the goal of attaining a student-centered classroom was in the inadequate execution of socioconstructivist lessons. As detailed in *Theme Four: Creating and Working the Zone of Proximal Development*, the apprentice teachers did not exploit the details of either socioconstructivist pedagogy or historical thinking (Seixas, 1993; VanSledright, 2002). First, the preservice teachers gloss over important elements such as accessing prior knowledge, relevance at the beginning of the lesson. Second, they fail to use DBQ's in scaffolding students when examining primary source documents throughout the course of the lessons. The overall effect of the lessons are weakened. The necessity of teaching (or re-teaching) learning strategies and processes to students is a new concept for the preservice teachers and is not prioritized. Furthermore, socioconstructivist pedagogy requires that not only should teachers introduce domain knowledge in a formal manner but also that students contribute to the knowledge base in the classroom. Eliciting and extending student contributions is difficult and one which the preservice teachers attempt with little skill and novice-level content knowledge. It is at the transformation and instruction levels of Shulman's (1987) model of pedagogical reasoning and action where the participants fall short. The expectation is that at that level, knowledge is transformed to a usable format for class and appropriate ways are used to teach students that knowledge. It is possible that the participants do not possess the realm of content knowledge necessary to accomplish this task in an immediate sense in the classroom; this specific shortcoming is only remedied with time and further study. Students do not

receive the rigorous instruction they deserve and the preservice teachers do not take the opportunity to practice conducting these types of lessons and extending the learning for all.

5.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

One of the limitations of this dissertation lies in the fact that the study did not follow the preservice teacher/participants further into their first year of teaching. A lengthier look into their future efforts with of socioconstructivist principles and historical thinking would provide further illumination as to the development of their practice. A second limitation is that of involvement with the principal investigator. It is possible that the in-depth conversations and study of the preservice teachers' practice encouraged a better understanding of socioconstructivism and historical thinking by focusing attention on these elements of their practice, the presence of which may have created a slightly more positive rendition of their work. Furthermore, the principal investigator was also their university facilitator, evaluating them in an official capacity for their university coursework assessment. As the principal investigator/facilitator, I made every effort to fairly assess and guide the four study participants in addition to the other class members. While the data for the dissertation and the course evaluations were conducted separately and there was member-checking involved for each process, the possibility of conflating the two experiences was entirely possible.

A final consideration was that the nature of interpretive inquiry. Given the nature of case study research, the data, by necessity was exposed to interpretation by a single principal investigator. The researcher's voice, interpretive authority, and representation (Chase, 2005) all play a role in the interpretation of data, as is the situation in this case study. While triangulation methods have been employed to maintain the characteristics of qualitative research as has been outlined by Garman (1994): verity, integrity, rigor,

utility, vitality, aesthetics, ethics, and verisimilitude. Despite all efforts made to retain the quality of study, qualitative research is inherently interpretive and therefore subjective to the principal investigator's analytical stance. As such, the principal investigator's analysis and interpretation are inherently privileged in this case study.

5.5 IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The implications of this study involving socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking center upon the realm of teacher education in a programmatic sense. Given the themes and findings previously outlined in Chapters Four and Five, the implications include first, the notion that preservice teachers should be encouraged to engage in considerable reflection regarding their individual epistemological stance on their conceptions of knowledge. The second implication has direct impact on the university and practice teaching classroom in that preservice teachers need more opportunities to participate and observe socioconstructivist lessons. The third and final implication calls for consideration of the details involved in implementing socioconstructivist pedagogy.

Examining and Developing Individual Epistemological Stance

Indeed the data analysis within the themes and findings indicate that the preservice teacher's individual epistemological stance plays a significant role throughout their endeavors with learning and teaching with socioconstructivist pedagogy. This implication calls for first, engagement via reflection to explore the preservice teachers' individual epistemologies as essential in order to determine individual stance regarding epistemology and to further pursue socioconstructivist ideas successfully. Second, the careful introduction of socioconstructivist pedagogy to preservice teachers demands thoughtful examination of the constructionist paradigm, socioconstructivist learning theory, and the pedagogical consequences thereof via targeted reflection. Those

preservice teachers who attempt instructional design and implementation in the socioconstructivist realm while maintaining a positivistic belief system will ultimately undermine their efforts and merely reinforce original positivistic notions. If a teacher education program functions on the premise of socioconstructivist thought, then it is important that the preservice teachers and instructors know their stance so that they will be able to interact with and respond to the course material and each other appropriately. Finally, the previous two recommendations call for intensive consideration of theoretical groundings for classroom practice raising the importunate debate of theory versus practice and their use in the university classroom and field work placements.

As a beginning point in learning socioconstructivism, as a means to investigating and developing a socioconstructivist epistemological stance, the preservice teachers should consistently engage in the practice of reflection as described by Zeichner and Liston (1990) without which preservice teacher growth may not occur. Targeted reflection upon a preservice teachers' epistemological stance will foster further self-analysis in terms of understanding their own belief system with regards to the constructionist paradigm. Clarifying conceptions of knowledge and how students may construct or acquire it will assist in their understandings of the intricacies of theory and praxis as they engage with socioconstructivist pedagogy. This purposeful reflection ultimately promotes professional growth as practitioners of socioconstructivist pedagogy. Zeichner and Liston articulate the belief that, "...learning, for both pupils and teachers, is greater and deeper when teachers are encouraged to exercise their judgment about the content and processes of their work and to give some direction to the shape of schools as educational environments" (p. 236). Given that embracing new paradigms of knowledge conception, learning, and teaching approaches in socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking, it is essential that the preservice teachers have opportunities to take

ownership in their own learning and teaching processes. In further support for engaging in reflection, in work within constructivist teacher education contexts, Fosnot (2005b) calls for recursive reflection to aid in examining and shifting beliefs regarding epistemology. She calls for teacher educators to challenge traditional beliefs about knowledge and provide preservice teachers opportunities to reconstruct and reorganize their thoughts about traditional teaching.

Furthermore, the first introduction of these collective constructivist ideas for the preservice teachers should be as an ontological and epistemological constructionist concept and continued examination as translated to a learning theory. Socioconstructivist pedagogy, as conceived by Richardson (2003) or Fosnot (2005a) should then be examined as the next logical step in the process. This demand places upon the course instructor the burden of designing lessons in which the preservice teachers are able to connect in an explicit manner the constructionist paradigm to socioconstructivist learning theory to socioconstructivist pedagogy.

The close examination of theory in university teacher education programs is often suspect as viewed by field practitioners, likewise, the wielding of practice with little examination of theoretical grounding in the field is criticized by teacher educators. In this case, the findings resulting from data analysis demonstrate that theory and practice are indeed intertwined and one is necessary for the good of the other (Schwab, 1978). It is important to recognize this schism while at the same time mitigating the issue by facilitating the preservice teachers in their understanding of explicit connections and the rationale fueling the investigation of the notion of theory into practice. Cochran-Smith (2005) urges the consideration of the intersection between theory and practice in order to best utilize resources and facilitate learning. Constructivist theory is a recent development in the field of education and has been introduced gradually into classrooms, often found

first in mathematics. Given its status as a relatively new theory, it may be viewed with skepticism by classroom teachers and administrators (Fosnot, 2005a).

This first implication calls for the investigation of a preservice teachers' individual epistemology and carries ramifications for planning course content in the tracing of theory into practice. This examination of theory into practice entails the study of constructionist epistemology, socioconstructivist learning theory, and socioconstructivist pedagogy, the connections between these entities, and their impact on classroom learning. The second point provides a means by which the preservice teachers may examine their individual epistemologies via reflection and further their growth as individual teachers and members of the teaching profession in their efforts to create a socioconstructivist environment for their students. The final consideration in the implication dealing with individual epistemology is that it raises the long standing debate between theory found in teacher education programs and practice implemented in the field. This debate calls for deliberate and considered construction of lessons and material that bridge this divide and provide impetus for the preservice teachers to embrace both theory and practice.

A Call for More Models

In order to best facilitate socioconstructivist pedagogy, preservice teachers need plentiful opportunities to experience and observe models of exemplary socioconstructivist practice. Explicit modeling by teacher educators of this pedagogical approach and the consequent student-teacher interactions is important to the ultimate success of implementing the approach. While the preservice teachers have an empirical understanding of socioconstructivism, and historical thinking, translating that understanding into practice requires more support in terms of participating in these types of lessons as students, as well as observing them. Modeling not only provides

visualization of how this concept works for preservice teachers but also demonstrates support for socioconstructivist pedagogy in the university classroom.

Many preservice teachers are working against the apprenticeship of observation—their prior experiences as documented by Lortie (1975/2002) and Britzman (2003) and have not yet worked in a classroom where the students and teachers engage in this type of reciprocal learning and teaching. Preservice teachers are not likely to see these types of interactions consistently during their classroom observations in the field. This may be attributed to the importance of the standardized curriculum and exams, which tends to center the classroom on the teacher and the curriculum itself. Furthermore, as a new pedagogical theory, there is a dearth of models from which to choose and observe (Fosnot, 2005a).

Examining the Details

Given the tendency of the preservice teachers to adopt and/or utilize portions of the frameworks pertaining to socioconstructivism and historical thinking efforts in the university coursework should focus upon exploiting the details of such frameworks. There are multiple reasons which explain this phenomena, first, the preservice teachers' understandings and practice are emergent as novice teachers, they are not necessarily careless in their work but these emergent understandings are a natural part of the learning process. Second, some of the pieces of socioconstructivist pedagogy are easier to conceptualize and implement than others, for example, working with class simulations is simpler in practice than scaffolding students with increasingly difficult DBQ's surrounding a primary source document. Third, with the preservice teachers' limited use and understanding of prior knowledge and scaffolding, student responses to different pieces of the frameworks are more conducive to implementation than others. At times, the preservice teachers do not obtain all of the information they need to center their

lessons properly on their students; moreover, they do not realize that they are missing information which would make their facilitation of the lesson smoother and more successful. Finally, it is important that the preservice teachers conduct their fieldwork in a supportive setting. Using cooperating teachers who espouse a socioconstructivist stance and are skilled in socioconstructivist pedagogy is best. At the very least, the cooperating teacher should not deny the preservice teacher the opportunity to engage with the approaches they are learning in their teacher education coursework.

Ultimately, the implications of this study focus upon teacher education coursework and both foundational and minute changes would be needed to better support socioconstructivist pedagogy. Close examination, and perhaps the shifting, of the preservice teachers' epistemological stance is essential to their adopting socioconstructivist pedagogy. Further engagement with this learning approach should be conducted via targeted reflection and detailed interaction with the socioconstructivist pedagogy framework (Richardson, 2003). Teacher educators must also be mindful of the ever-present debate of the values of theory and practice and ensure that they are considering the intersection of the two (Cochran-Smith, 2005) as they commence with their work. The second implication calls for a shift in the teacher-student relationship paradigm and encourages a climate in which the co-construction of knowledge is facilitated. This should be central to the classroom environment promoting trust and mutual respect between teachers and students for one another as learners and teachers. The final implication of this study indicates a need to further develop preservice teachers' attention to the detail of the frameworks which they are adopting to facilitate their leadership of the class. It is also most helpful to conduct their field placement in a socioconstructivist pedagogy classroom and campus.

Appendices

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Socioconstructivist Pedagogy

1. Tell me about your understanding of socioconstructivist lessons? What makes a lesson socioconstructivist?
2. What are the primary components of socioconstructivist lesson design?
3. How do you define knowledge? What is the role of knowledge in learning?
4. Tell me about your experience with socioconstructivist lessons in school as a student in high school, college, or previous education (UTeach) coursework?
5. Tell me about the differences between socioconstructivist and non-socioconstructivist lessons. Which type do you prefer as a student? As a teacher? Why?
6. How do your students respond to socioconstructivist lessons? What are the benefits? Drawbacks?
7. What is the importance of culture and individuality in the classroom? How do you account for and utilize them to benefit students?
8. How do socioconstructivist lessons work in diverse classrooms? Do they acknowledge or maximize cultural differences/similarities? In what ways?
9. Tell me your thoughts on lesson planning in general. What similarities or differences do you see between your coursework and fieldwork in terms of use of socioconstructivism and/or historical thinking?
10. What is the purpose of lesson design? How do you connect lesson design and classroom management/environment? Do socioconstructivist lessons alter your classroom management? In what ways?
11. How do you conduct assessments for socioconstructivist lessons?
12. Please define / explain the zone of proximal development.
13. What is the role of peer collaboration/cooperative learning in socioconstructivist lessons?
14. What types of teaching and learning tools do you use with students in social studies classes? How do you define a teaching/learning tool?
15. How do you differentiate popular and academic knowledge? What roles do they play in learning?
16. How do you focus students on their own learning styles / skills? In what ways do you teach them about how they learn and how to take advantage of that?

Historical Thinking

1. Please define / explain historical thinking.
2. What importance do you place on historical thinking in the social studies? Why?
3. What are your prior experiences with historical thinking—in high school, college, or previous education (UTeach) coursework?

4. What benefits and drawbacks do you see in working with primary source documents with your students?
5. How do you go about developing document-based questions (DBQ's) for your students?
6. How do students use document-based questions in your lessons?
7. In what ways do you examine students' prior knowledge in your lessons? And in lessons particularly involving historical thinking?
8. How do you believe that student prior knowledge in social studies topics helps or hinders your lessons? How do you mitigate or maximize those effects?
9. How do you contextualize—place historical events in context—with your students? Is this important? Why or why not?
10. How do historical thinking techniques engage your students? Do you believe your lessons are rigorous and relevant for students? In what ways?
11. What is the role of the teacher in the social studies classroom?
12. Is there practical value in the social studies? What is it? How do you emphasize the practical aspect of social studies with your students?
13. How do you gauge student interest and abilities in social studies topics?
14. Should students be able to direct their own work in the social studies? How would you facilitate that as the teacher?
15. How do you assess student work with historical thinking in social studies?

Historical Thinking and Socioconstructivist Pedagogy – Professor

1. Why choose socioconstructivism and historical thinking as your frame for teaching and learning?
2. Do you believe that in order to use socioconstructivist teaching and historical thinking (effectively) one must adopt an interpretive epistemological stance?
3. How do you explain the gap between University practice and fieldwork that students experience?
4. Do you encourage students to continue on paths of new (or different) curriculum and instruction? How and why do you accomplish this?
5. In what way(s) do you model socioconstructivist practice and historical thinking in your own teaching?
6. Do you believe that the preservice teachers engage in socioconstructivist practice and historical thinking in your classroom as students? Do they have previous experience with these concepts?
7. What is the preservice teacher response to these ideas of socioconstructivist practice and historical thinking in both your class and for their fieldwork?
8. How does the idea of *theory into practice* in relation to socioconstructivist pedagogy and historical thinking translate for students?
9. Do you assess your students' work in socioconstructivist practice and historical thinking in their class assignments? What strengths and weaknesses do you see in these two areas with your preservice teachers?

10. Do you see evidence of preservice teachers' use of socioconstructivist practice and historical thinking in the field? Do you believe their efforts are successful? How do you gauge this assessment of their work?

APPENDIX B: APPRENTICE SYLLABUS

**EDC 350/650S
Unique #: 08420
Secondary School Teaching Practicum: Social Studies
Fall 2005
M 1:00-4:15 Rm. SZB 442**

Instructor: Pat Nickell	Instructor: Cinthia Salinas	University Facilitator: Caroline Sullivan	University Facilitator: Tom Wacker
Email: Pnickell63@msn.com	Email: cssalinas@mail.utexas.edu	Email: ccsullivan@mail.utexas.edu	Email: tom.wacker@gmail.com
Office: 428M	Office: 428G	Hm number: 220-3682; cell 426-4076	Cell: 970-9101
Office number: 232-3902	Office number: 232-3539	Office box in 428	Office box in 428

Congratulations on advancement into the final semester of the University of Texas at Austin, teacher certification professional development sequence, Secondary School Teaching Practicum Social Studies (350S; for a letter grade) AND Secondary School Teaching Practicum Social Studies (650S; pass/fail). As apprentice teachers, the semester represents the culmination of your hard work regarding the development of your pedagogical and content knowledge (PCK).

I. Course goals and objectives

Your work in Advanced Methods in Social Studies (370S) was a significant step towards preparing you for this semester and should be looked upon as foundational knowledge. Students should consider 350S and 650S as two courses that are in absolute and essential tandem with each other during the student teaching semester. The courses are designed to offer the students an enhanced understanding of the social studies and support during the semester long field experience.

Six major foci guide the semester discussions, readings, and assignments including:

Becoming a social studies teacher: The existing and shaping frameworks as they relate to the social studies curricula including Hahn's Expanding Communities of Humans, the NCSS themes, the TEKS, TAKS objectives, and your district/campus scope and sequence documents should guide the unique curricular and pedagogical issues that concern social studies educators. We place an emphasis on historical reasoning (the use of primary

sources—photos, editorial cartoons, participant accounts and other primary documents) and the development of document based questions (see VanSledright), pedagogical and content knowledge (see L. Shulman via VanSledright), historical revisionism (see Loewen), and engaging instructional strategies (in particular those found in the History Alive program).

Constructivist instructional design: The continued development of students as effective classroom teachers through the use of instructional approaches that acknowledge unique social-cultural contexts and student’s understandings as well as student centered instruction (see Brooks; Brooks & Brooks; Ragan & Smith; Richardson) with an emphasis on higher order thinking (i.e. Bloom’s taxonomy (see <http://www.coun.uvic.ca/learn/program/hndouts/bloom.html>)).

Classroom discipline that fits: An exploration of several significant and successful approaches that can be utilized by teachers. These approaches provide future teachers with several choices, a guiding forum for discussion, and an opportunity to reflect upon the best choices teachers can make in classroom settings (see Jones & Jones).

Teaching social studies through and with technology: The continued development of your use of technology in varying settings (whole class, small group, individualized instruction) for the purpose of enhanced communication and classroom management, professional development, instruction, and learning.

Commitment to diversity and culturally responsive teaching: The unrelenting effort to become reflective of our own positionality and approaches to diverse classroom settings by integrating culturally relevant curricula and pedagogy into our understanding of effective teaching. For social studies educators a multicultural paradigm is rooted in an understanding a historical narrative from the scholarship established by revisionist historians like Takaki, Loewen, and Zinn.

Critical issues seminars: An emphasis on those issues that have been carefully woven into our entire program but that demand a broader forum for discussion and exploration. As educators we remain committed to reflective practices that examine linguistic, cultural and academic diversity. Our abilities to examine our own teaching and responsibilities to all children remain a driving force in our continued growth as teacher. (See Required Critical Issues Seminars below).

II. Apprentice teaching expectations

The complex dynamics of apprentice teaching include a professional commitment and responsibility to your teacher education program, the school district/campus/mentor teacher that will act as your host, and the students within your classroom. Apprentice teaching fieldwork begins on August 31 (class meeting on August 30). Apprentice teachers should contact their cooperating teacher prior to their first day of class and make arrangements regarding schedules, course assignments, and appropriate materials. At all times, you should be aware of how you will best represent our university, the profession,

and yourself. Your punctual attendance and appropriate dress (also see the district dress code for teachers), cooperative and polite demeanor, assertive and innovative participation, and regard and patience for the day-to-day challenges of teaching are key to a strong performance and evaluation. Please refer to the Apprentice Teacher Handbook for additional requirements (materials from Apprentice Orientation Meeting and UT Web site).

Your cooperating teacher, university facilitator, and you will decide how quickly you can transition to full teach. Each situation is different and is highly dependent upon the needs of the students in the classroom, the demands of the curriculum, and your readiness (eagerness and preparation) to assume a full class load (even this varies amongst you). We strongly recommend that you begin taking over significant class responsibilities within two weeks of your placements.

III. Fieldwork evaluation

Your university facilitator will coordinate five to seven 650s evaluations documented through anecdotal records.

On average, you should have three anecdotal records completed by September, two completed by October, and 3 completed in November. All evaluations must be completed by December 2.

A debriefing (either face to face or via email) of the evaluation will follow soon afterwards. In order to make the most constructive use of field evaluations, it is important that apprentice teachers engage in reflective practice and dialogue (with their cooperating teacher and university facilitator) and explore ways in which they can improve their teaching.

Your cooperating teacher will be asked to complete three anecdotal records and also share these notes with you in a conference setting. One anecdotal record should be completed in September, October, and November.

You are to post your weekly lesson plans onto Teachnet. Note that lesson planning requirements (format) may differ between your cooperating teacher and your university facilitator/faculty. So long as the constructivist's elements are present, there is no need to duplicate your effort. It is also important to understand that though your teacher may share with you sample lessons—your adaptation of the work that is more tailored to your teaching style is required.

A conference utilizing the midterm formative evaluation completed by you and the university facilitator will be scheduled (see www.edb.utexas.edu/field/supervisorsecs.html). The mid term evaluation must be completed October 10 of your field placement. A copy of your mid term evaluation completed by your university facilitator will be given to you.

Finally, a summative evaluation –completed by the cooperating teacher and university facilitator AND a final formative evaluation—completed by you, cooperating teacher and university facilitator—will be used in your concluding conference. All evaluations and conferences must be completed by December 2. A copy of your mid term evaluation completed by your university facilitator and cooperating teacher will be given to you.

A summary of field evaluations is as follows:

Evaluation tool	University facilitator	Cooperating teacher	Apprentice teacher
Anecdotal records	5-7 throughout the semester. On avg. 3-Sept, 2-Oct, 2-Nov	3-5 throughout the semester. On avg. 1-Sept, 1-Oct, 1-Nov	NA
Mid term Formative	Complete 10/10	NA	Complete 10/10
Final Formative	Complete by 12/2	Complete by 12/2	Complete by 12/2
Summative	Complete by 12/2 Signature required	Complete by 12/2 Signature required	Signature required

Iv. Required critical issues seminars and apprentice teacher opportunities

Date	Topic	Speaker/Time/Location
9/1	FYI: Cooperating Teacher Training	5:15.-8:15; GSB 2.124
9/8	Mandatory Apprentice Teacher Orientation	5:00-6:30; JES A121A
9/20	Critical Issues Seminar: Differentiating Instruction	Guest speaker: Dr. Anne Fuller 5:00-6:30;Thompson Conference Center Room 1.110 (Auditorium) ***BRING A LESSON PLAN to the seminar!
9/26	Positive Behavior Support in the Classroom	Ben Smith 5:00-6:30; Thompson Conf. Ctr. 1.110
10/10	Critical Issues Seminar: School Law Seminar	Chris Elizalde 5:00-6:30; Bass Concert Hall
10/20	Job Search Tools (only need to attend ONE of the Job Search Tools Seminars)	Resumes/Cover Letters/Job Search 5:30-6:30; TBA
10/24	Critical Issues Seminar: ESL in the Secondary Schools	Guest Speaker: Dr. Elaine Horowitz 5-6:30; CBA 4.324
10/26	Job Search Tools	Interviewing Techniques 5:30-6:30; TBA

11/1	Career Day	9:00-4:30; Erwin Center
11/7	Critical Issues Seminar: Diversity	
11/09	Job Search Tools	Resumes/Cover Letters/Job Search 5:30-6:30; TBA
11/17	Job Search Tools	Interviewing 5:30-6:30; TBA

V. Resources and guidelines

As always you should remain aware of the many frameworks and state mandated deadlines and expectations that will affect you.

The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (www.tea.state.tx.us/resources/ssced/resources/webresourcesgeneral.htm) and their alignment with the Texas Assessment of Knowledge of Skills (www.tea.state.tx.us/resources/ssced/resources/webresourcesgeneral.htm) should be a helpful guide you regarding some of your choices this semester. Please visit <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/> for additional information.

Likewise, you are held to the teacher certification standards (frameworks that outline the specific competencies that are aligned with the TEKS) that are include in the TExES Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility and History and/or Social Studies exams that are required for your certification. Please visit <http://www.excet.nesinc.com/index.htm> for additional information.

You should utilize the Education Career Service and Field Experience Office in SZB 294 (<http://www.edb.utexas.edu/field/field-experience.html>) and for certification information in SZB 216 (<http://www.utexas.edu/education/certification/index.html>).

To learn more about the university's substitute policy during your apprentice semester go to <http://www.edb.utexas.edu/field/substitute.html>. I strongly encourage you to apply for a substitute teacher position for the district. You are allowed to assume the responsibility IF you have completed and been approved by the district's process AND if your cooperating teacher AND university facilitator AND 350 faculty member are confident in your ability to independently teach in the classroom. You may NOT substitute on Mondays during our class time.

VI. Reading materials

(*Please note that several of these readings were originally reviewed in 370S)

Banks, J. and McGee Banks, C.A., (1999). Community of Humans, Ch. 1, from Teaching Strategies for the Social Studies, (Chapter 1) Longman, NY. *

- Banks, J. and McGee Banks, C.A., (1999). Community of Humans, Ch. 1, from Teaching Strategies for the Social Studies, (Chapter 16) Longman, NY. *
- Hoge, Field, S. Foster, S. Nickell, P. (2004), Investigations for social studies: Inquiries for middle and high school students based on the ten NCSS standards.
- Jones, V, & Jones, L. (2004). Comprehensive classroom management: Creating communities of support and solving problems. Boston: Pearson.
- Loewen, J., (1995). Lies my teacher told me, New York: Simon & Schuster. *
- Seixas, P. (1993). Historical understanding among adolescents in a multicultural setting. Curriculum Inquiry, 23(2), 301-327.
- Smith, P. & Ragan, T. (1999), Instructional Design, John Wiley & Sons: New York, chapter 7. *
- Grant, S.G. (2003). History lessons: Teaching, learning, and testing in US high school classrooms. Erlbaum: New Jersey.
- VanSledright, B., (2002), In search of America's Past, New York: Teachers College Press. *

Additional articles found on UT Web Page, Access Electronic Reserves, Pull down "Curriculum and Instruction" go to 350S Salinas. Faculty member will provide password.

VII. Assignments

	Assignment	Percentage Grade
350S	Lessons	30
	Technology component of lesson	10
	Writing Assignments	30
	Class Participation/Attendance	30
650S	Classroom Management Presentation	25
	Field Weekly Reflections/Lessons posted for review	25
	Field Based Evaluations and Reflective dialogue	50

350/Technology Project: Demonstrate the teaching of social studies through and with technology during your teaching. 1) Submit an appropriate lesson plan and 2) prepare a short model demonstration presentation (10 min). 3) Include your rationale for technology choice in your presentation.

350/Lesson: You are required to post your weekly lesson plans on Teachnet every Sunday by midnight. Throughout the semester lesson plans must demonstrate a strong understanding of constructivist teaching and learning. Utilize the Smith and Ragan (1999) material including the format handouts and evaluation/assessment comments from your 370S coursework.

In addition: At the end of the semester, you will turn in 3 favorite lesson plans, more fully developed according to the constructivist’s format. One of these lessons must incorporate a creative and relatively complex technology component (something more than a lecture supported by PowerPoint slides!) Randomly, some of you will be asked to present one lesson of these lessons in class on 11/28.

350/Class Participation/Attendance: CP has to do with your “engagement” in class activities, discussions, and instruction. You are expected to be in attendance, of course, but you are also expected to be “attending” fully to what is going on at all times (just as you want YOUR students to do).

350/Writing: From time to time, short writing assignments will be given to capture your thoughts on a particular reading or topic. You may also be called upon to read your paper in class as a discussion starter.

650/Classroom Management Presentation: In a ten-minute PowerPoint presentation, provide your classroom management plan that includes a theoretical/conceptual premise (cite sources/authors/theories) and details of your classroom discipline plan. The presentation should be a synthesis of your readings and field experience that result in a cohesive and comprehensive professional classroom management philosophy. IN addition, you will make a chart outlining the structure of your plan. This final presentation explains your choice/rationale in the development of your own approaches to classroom management. Utilize the Jones and Jones (2004) text.

Structure of CM plan	Theorist	Theory Name	Why	Classroom Practice
Proactive				
	1.			
Reactive				
	1.			
Relationships & Community Establishment				
	1.			

650/Field Weekly Reflections: Please know that your deep and meaningful reflective practice is essential as you enter into the field of education. Every week you should start

with the following: a) Reflect on the creativity/success/effectiveness level of your lessons this week; b) What was the best moment this week? Why? C) What was the most difficult moment this week? How will you work to improve or correct this? d) How can the facilitators provide specific help or direction for you?

In addition, you will be asked to also complete the questions designated in the below table. Responses are to be posted onto Teachnet every Sunday by midnight.

Reflective Field Experience Prompts (post to Teachnet)	Due Sunday...
1. What is your job search plan? What kind of teaching job would you like? Why?	9/11
2. Are you a knowledge giver or facilitator? Give some examples.	9/18
3. Why differentiate instruction? What are the benefits and drawbacks of differentiation? In what ways can lessons be differentiated to meet varying student needs? Where can you find resources to help?	9/25
4. How do you support your students that are second language learners? Where can you find resources/help?	10/9
5. What sorts of legal issues must teachers deal with in the classroom/campus? What are your primary responsibilities / duties to meet those requirements? Again, where can you go for help?	10/16
6. How do you go about designing your assessments and reviews? What do you do if the students aren't successful?	10/23
7. What role does diversity play in the classroom and school community? How can you best take advantage of that to enhance your classroom and your students' learning?	11/13

VIII. Communication

The apprentice semester is a fast paced and complex experience that involves a large support network including your faculty, university facilitator, the Education Career Service and Field Experience Office director and staff, your cooperating teacher, and district administrators. Each educator is committed to excellence and improving your performance. As a result, you are required to communicate in a prompt, positive, and reflective manner via email or in person. Your diligent response to the many demands that will be presented this semester is part of your professional growth and role.

IX. Final considerations

Attendance notes:

We will follow the school district calendar. Attendance is required on your campus and at UT classes, seminars, and critical issues seminars. Missing more than two course events (e.g. classes or seminars), late assignments, or less-than-exemplary class participation will result in the lowering of your 350 grade. Likewise, missing critical issues seminars or seminar will result in the lowering of your 650 grade. Students will be asked to extend

the student teaching semester beyond ending date of May 9 in order to make up any missed field days. Not making up these days may result in the failure of 650.

In the event that you are not able to attend your field work, class, seminar or critical issues seminars, you must notify your mentor teacher, university facilitator, AND course instructor immediately via email AND telephone.

Special note: You are on the verge of becoming a full-fledged social studies teacher. One of the most critical goals of social studies, particularly in these times, is to strengthen sensitivity to and tolerance of differences—gender, age, culture, religion...you know the drill. Any behavior on the part of a budding social studies teacher that does not uphold and/or promote this goal is unprofessional and completely unacceptable.

Individual Performance Plan: In the event that your academic performance in 350S or 650S fieldwork anecdotal/formative evaluations indicate a need for specific goal-oriented improvement, an individual performance plan one will be designed for you and explained during a conference session. You are required to meet with your course instructor and university facilitator every week to mark your progress towards the IPP goals.

Policy on Scholastic Honesty:

Students who violate University rules on scholastic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary penalties, including the possibility of failure in the course and/or dismissal from the University. Since dishonesty harms the individual, all students, and the integrity of the University, policies on scholastic dishonesty will be strictly enforced. You should refer to the Student Judicial Services website at <http://www.utexas.edu/dept/dos/sjs/> to access the official University policies and procedures on scholastic dishonesty as well as further elaboration on what constitutes scholastic dishonesty.

Accommodations for Students:

The University of Texas at Austin provides upon request appropriate academic accommodations for qualified students with disabilities. Please see me the first week of classes if accommodations need to be made. For more information, contact the Office of the Dean of Students at 471-6259, 471-4641 TTY.

Date	350S Topic	Reading/Assignment	650S Topic
8/30			Syllabus orientation: Observations & evaluations
9/1	FYI Cooperating Teacher Training	5:15.-8:15; GSB 2.124	
9/5	Labor Day Holiday		

9/8	Mandatory Apprentice Teacher Orientation	5:00-6:30; A121A	JES	
9/12	The art and craft of teaching in Social Studies: Review of Instructional Design; Unit Writing	SG Grant, Ch 1-2		Jones & Jones Chapter 7
9/19	What you teach v. what gets learned	S.G. Grant, Ch 3-4		Jones & Jones Chapter 8
9/20	Critical Issues Seminar: Differentiating Instruction	Guest speaker: Dr. Anne Fuller 5:00-6:30; UTC		
9/26	Assessing T&L in Social Studies; Discuss TExES (Test dates include 10/1 & 12/10)	S.G. Grant, Ch 5-6		Jones & Jones Chapter 1
9/26	Positive Behavior Support in the Classroom	Ben Smith 5:00-6:30; Thompson Conf. Ctr. 1.110		
10/03	Committed/Ambitious Teaching	Grant Ch 7-8		Jones & Jones Chapter 2
10/10	Contextual Teaching & Learning	Hoge, etc., Intro. and Ch. 8		Jones & Jones Chapter 3
10/10	Critical Issues Seminar: School Law Seminar	Chris Elizalde 5:00-6:30; Bass Concert Hall		
10/17	Teaching Culture/Tolerance	Hoge: Ch. 1&5		Jones & Jones Chapter 4
10/20	Job Search Tools	Resumes/Cover Letters/Job Search 5:30-6:30; TBA		
10/24	Teaching Economics	Hoge, etc.: Ch 7		Jones & Jones Chapter 5
10/24	Critical Issues Seminar: ESL in the Secondary Schools	Guest Speaker: Dr. Elaine Horowitz 5-6:30; CBA 4.324		
10/26	Job Search Tools	Interviewing Techniques 5:30-6:30; TBA		
10/31	Teaching World Geography	Hoge, Ch 3, 9		Jones & Jones Chapter 6
11/1	Career Day	9:00-4:30;	Erwin	

		Center	
11/7	Teaching History	Hoge, Ch. 2; VanSledright	Jones & Jones Chapter 9
11/7	Critical Issues Seminar: Diversity		
11/09	Job Search Tools	Resumes/Cover Letters/Job Search 5:30-6:30; TBA	
11/14	Teaching Government/Citizenship	Hoge, Ch 6, 10	Jones & Jones Chapter 10
11/17	Job Search Tools	Interviewing 5:30-6:30; TBA	
11/21	Reading and writing in the social studies Guest Speaker: Diane Lagrone		Jones & Jones
11/28	Final Presentations and Lesson Plan: Teaching social studies through and with technology	3 favorite lessons DUE (one including advanced technology component)	
12/5	Final Presentations: A classroom management plan that works for you and your students!		

APPENDIX C: INTERN SYLLABUS

EDC 370S Advanced Methods in Social Studies Spring 05 Tue 12:30-3:15; Rm. 536L

Cinthia Salinas
cssalinas@mail.utexas.edu

Kristi Preisman
kapreisman@hotmail.com

Caroline Sullivan
ccsullivan@mail.utexas.edu

Office Hours: Monday 2-4; Tue 9-11

Hm #: (512) 405-0585
Cell: (512) 567-5451
Mailbox: SZB 294

Hm #: 220-3682
Cell: 426-4076
Mailbox: SZB 294

Course Overview

The social studies encompass a wide variety of topic areas including history, sociology, anthropology, economics, geography, and civics or government or political science. Each social science becomes relevant to young members of our democracy as they formulate their understanding and roles in our society. As educators we are responsible for creating classroom environments that provide our students with opportunities to explore complex and dynamic issues concerning the social studies including culture; time, continuity, and change; people, places, and environments; individual development and identity; individuals, groups, and institutions; power, authority, and governance; production, distribution, and consumption; science, technology, and society; global connections; and civic ideals and practices (NCSS Themes, see <http://www.socialstudies.org/standards/2.0.html>). The goal for this semester is to create such a classroom by embracing new ways of knowing and understanding the teaching of the social studies, our pluralistic society, and our roles as educators.

Goals

This course draws from the National Council of Social Studies: "Social Studies is a basic subject of the K-12 curriculum that: (1) derives its goals from the nature of citizenship in a democratic society that is closely linked to other nations and peoples of the world: (2) draws its content primarily from history, the social sciences, and, in some respects, the humanities and science: and (3) is taught in ways that reflect an awareness of the personal, social, and cultural experiences and developmental levels of the learners." (1984)

Objectives ...to develop an understanding of:

the existing and shaping frameworks as they relate to the social studies curricula including Hahn's Expanding Communities of Humans, the NCSS themes, the TEKS, TAKS objectives, and your district/campus scope and sequence documents; the most noted instructional strategies of the social studies including those found in the History Alive program;

the use of primary sources (photos, editorial cartoons, participant accounts and other primary documents) in the process of historical reasoning and the development of document based questions (see VanSledright);

an understanding a historical narrative from the frameworks established by revisionist historians like Takaki, Loewen, and Zinn;

instructional design through the concepts and premises of constructivist's approaches and higher order thinking (i.e. Bloom's taxonomy (see <http://www.coun.uvic.ca/learn/program/hndouts/bloom.html>));

and the teaching of the social studies through and with technology in varying settings (whole class, small group, individualized instruction) to enhance communication, professional development, instruction, and learning.

Course assignments:

Constructivist instructional design: There are unique approaches and understandings that accompany constructivist instructional design. Students will be asked to submit four edited lessons on 4/26 that meet the demands of a well-developed constructivist design. Lessons shall demonstrate the required elements (see Ragan and Smith):

TEKS (only 2-3)	Body: detail steps that show how students are scaffold within the instructional strategy
Learning Objectives (use Banks and Banks AND Bloom's Taxonomy) verb list to demonstrate scaffolding and alignment with TEKS)	Body: sample of prewritten prompts/questions that help scaffold students towards more critical thinking (Bloom)
Introduction: relevance to students lives	Body: model learning in whole class before small group or individual work
Introduction: access to student's prior learning/knowledge	Body: continuous feedback and refocus on lesson learning objectives
Introduction: preview of lesson/day's agenda	Conclusion: Student generated closure
Body: variety of instructional approaches (do NOT rely on lecture)	Variety of assessment approaches

1. One lesson must utilize a current event as the focus of the lesson.
2. Another lesson must utilize the practice of historical reasoning via primary sources.
3. Another lesson must utilize technology.
4. Another lesson must utilize of at least one History Alive instructional strategy.

Lesson Work Sessions

With a special emphasis on particular components of lesson design, during work sessions students will have an opportunity to receive feedback before the final assignment is due 4/26. Four areas of concentration will be discussed: 1) Alignment between TEKS, learning objectives, and assessment tools; 2) Introductory elements; 3) Body elements; and 4) Concluding elements. As we explore each of these components of lesson design, I will ask that you bring with you lesson drafts for us to edit.

Loewen re-analysis and presentation

With a partner students will examine one of Loewen's chapters and gather evidence in support or in opposition to his premise. Presentations should 1) include Loewen's major arguments for that chapter/foci and 2) provide three textbook examples affirming or negating Loewen's conclusions. Presentations should be made via PowerPoint and be no longer than 8 minutes allowing an additional 5 minutes for discussion. Please recognize this as an opportunity to make a persuasive argument and for me to note your ability to construct a SHORT lecture that includes student participation. Due 4/5

Student as Historian

Students (with partner) will select a topic (event, controversy, figure, etc) that celebrates the experience of human diversity (African Americans, Latinas/os/Chicanas/os, Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders, American Indians, Women, non-Christians). The students will develop a series of web pages that provide a collection of primary sources that lead to a historical conclusion. The end goal is to create a narrative through multiple perspectives and to prompt others, through document based questions (DBQ), to engage in historical reasoning. Special emphasis is given to a) your choices of primary sources; b) how you utilize those sources; and c) your ability to scaffold student learning through DBQ's.

Web Preparation

In order to help the student develop the materials needed for the web pages, the assignment will be broken down into four components due 3/29 on a CD (please include your last names and topic on the CD title) including: collection (3) of photos and developed (3 or more) DBQ's, collection of editorial cartoons and/or other primary sources (3) and developed (3 or more) DBQ's, collection of participant accounts (3) and developed (3 or more) DBQ's, and a summary narrative and rationale on the main page that guides the reader through the collection of primary sources.

Please give this narrative a title and note yourselves as the authors. The narrative should refer to your primary sources (i.e. "according to government documents...;" or "as historical photos would indicate...;" or "in analyzing editorial cartoons...;" or "other artifacts from this era indicate...") and your own conclusions. I am interested in HOW you developed your own historical narrative/claims. It should indicate the importance of DBQ's and the rationale of historical reasoning via primary sources.

In collecting and using these artifacts, please ask permission from web sites/archives and cite the source underneath each piece. In addition, underneath each artifact you most probably should give a short/one sentence description/explanation since they are entirely out of context.

Save the jpg/pdf/gif in a consistent and descriptive manner indicating the kind of artifact and its substance (i.e. “photodhuerta.jpg” or “docufwucreed.pdf” or “editorialunion.gif”). All artifacts should be placed in ONE folder entitled “images.” Save the narrative outside the folder.

Your final web site will include four pages (though I recommend that you include an additional web page with related links that you have found useful in your project) and will be presented on the final class day 5/3. Your presentation will be about 12 minutes-with 3 minutes Q&I space. You may engage your colleagues by using the DBQ’s or in any way you feel will help us learn more about your topic and primary sources.

Please provide me with a copy of your presentation on CD (again—with your last name and topic labeled on the CD)—thanks!

Narrative and Main page	FOCUS: Telling a story through photos/DBQ’S
FOCUS: TELLING A STORY THROUGH PARTICIPANTS' VOICE /DBQ’S	FOCUS: TELLING A STORY THROUGH EDITORIAL CARTOONS/OTHER PRIMARY SOURCES/DBQ’S

Teaching the social studies through and with technology

As social studies educators there are many opportunities to broaden the democratic landscape of our classrooms through the use of Internet based curricular resources and instructional strategies. Though these opportunities are not without concern, for our purposes we will focus our attention on developing a critical disposition towards the teaching of the social studies through and with technologies. Our goal should be to wisely examine the use of these resources/teaching strategies as they apply to our abilities to manage and communicate efficiently, teach and design curricula effectively, and assess appropriately. At all times we should be conscious of the decisions we make within the classroom setting (whole class, small group, or individual instruction) and how they enhance our students' learning and performance. The following Technology Teach sessions will be included throughout the semester:

Developing critical consumers of the Internet
Photos as Social Studies Teaching Tools: A truth through primary sources and historical reasoning
Editorial Cartoons as Social Studies Teaching Tools: A truth through primary sources and historical reasoning
Multiple perspectives as a teaching tool: The use of international newspaper sources

Developing Web Pages
Use of Internet Based Simulation Software

Field Work

Student interns will spend 40 hours in the field working with their cooperating teachers (modified for post Baccs to 45 hours in combination with your 303 hour requirements) that includes teaching a minimum of five full class sessions and three mini lessons. In order to meet your requirements you will need to complete 4-6 hours per week during the thirteen week placement window from January 24 to March 25.

Please make sure to carefully document your time in the classroom with the form provided. Your time sheet is Due on 4/27—no exceptions.

Your classroom experiences should enhance your eagerness and ability to assume planning, teaching, and evaluation responsibilities. As always, you should be aware that you represent our university, profession, and yourself. Your punctual attendance and appropriate dress (also see the district dress code for teachers), cooperative and polite demeanor, assertive and innovative participation, and regard and patience for the day-to-day challenges of teaching are key to a strong performance and evaluation.

In the event that your field performance does not meet the required standards, your faculty member and university facilitators will develop an individual performance plan (IPP). It should be noted that you cannot receive a passing grade in the course if you do not satisfactorily complete your fieldwork.

You should gauge your time in the classroom on the basis of your evaluation requirements including a video taped submission/coaching session and two formal evaluations. Your university facilitators and cooperating teacher will utilize anecdotal records in providing you feedback and formative evaluation (see <http://www.edb.utexas.edu/field/cooperatingteacher.html>).

Fieldwork evaluation

Your university facilitator will schedule three 370s evaluations documented through anecdotal records. Please keep in mind the difficulty of scheduling so many evaluations and the need for your full cooperation. Please contact your university supervisor immediately if any difficulties arise with a scheduled evaluation.

On average, you should have one anecdotal record completed by the end of February, March, and April. All evaluations must be completed by April 25.

Via email or hard copy you are required to provide the university facilitator with a copy of your lesson plan at least one day before your evaluation. You may be asked to complete a pre-conference to discuss your lesson and evaluation. Note that lesson planning requirements may differ between your cooperating teacher and your university facilitator/faculty. So long as constructivist elements are present, there is no need to

duplicate your effort. It is important to note that though your teacher may share with you sample lessons—your adaptation of the work that is more tailored to your teaching style is required.

A debriefing (either face to face or via email) of the evaluation will follow soon afterwards. In order to make the most constructive use of field evaluations, it is important that apprentice teachers engage in reflective practice and explore ways in which they can improve their teaching.

Your cooperating teacher will be asked to complete an additional anecdotal record and also share these notes with you in a conference setting. Please help to ensure that your university facilitator receives a copy of this anecdotal record.

At the conclusion of the field experience, you, your cooperating teacher, and your university facilitator should complete a final formative evaluation. Your fieldwork time sheet as well as your formal self-evaluations and cooperating teacher’s formal evaluation are due on 4/25.

A summary of field evaluations is as follows:

Evaluation tool	University facilitator	Cooperating teacher	Apprentice teacher
Anecdotal records	3 throughout the semester. Must complete one in February, one in March & one in April	1 throughout the semester.	NA
Final Formative	Complete by 5/3	Complete by 4/27	Complete by 4/25

Aside from your formal evaluations, you will be asked to complete fieldwork reflections:

Fieldwork Reflections

Throughout the semester you will be asked to share your observations regarding your fieldwork experiences. The following foci will be used as observation and reflections prompts. Please post your reflections on Teachnet.

Reflective Field Experience Prompts (submit to university facilitators via Teachnet)	Date
Are students motivated? How can you tell? What teaching strategies or approaches does the teacher use to motivate students? Are all students participating? What are some of the best motivators for students—how can you activate them?	2/8
What are some of the classroom management techniques used by your cooperating teacher? For example, what routines have been established, how is disruptive student behavior addressed, are behavior expectations posted and how is the room arranged? What other elements contribute to the teacher’s management of student behavior?	2/15

What types of assessments does your cooperating teacher use? Do they vary by assignment or by students? How are these assessments actually handled (graded, given back to students, entered into the grade book)?	2/22
What kinds of questioning techniques are used in the classroom? What levels of Bloom are apparent in your observations of class discussions or teacher question and answer technique?	3/1
In your classroom observations, how do teachers access students' prior knowledge? How do teachers make material relevant to students' interests? Is there a preview of the day's lesson? What kind(s) of introductory activities are used?	3/8
Spring Break	
Discuss at least one instructional strategy from your field observations that is student centered/constructivist. What elements of the lesson tell you that the lesson is, in fact, constructivist? How does this strategy differ from other teachers that you observe? What are the benefits and drawbacks of constructivism in the classroom?	3/22
Some lessons are more complex than others. Some discussions prompt students to be critical. How does the teacher work to scaffold student learning? For example, does the teacher model activity before asking students to work in small groups or as individuals?	4/5
What strategies does the teacher use in reaching closure at the end of the class period? What evidence can you provide that the approach teacher or student centered?	4/12
How is each student's individual learning provided for in the classroom? What is done to assist students with special needs or second language needs?	4/19

Seminar Sessions

Throughout the semester you will have five one-hour seminars with your university facilitators Kristi Preisman and Caroline Sullivan.

Date	Topic/focus
1/25	Evaluation tools& field assignments
1/25	Classroom management reflections: Charles, Ch. 1
2/22	Lesson sharing: Where can I find sample lessons and lesson ideas
3/22	Sample of constructivist demonstrations
4/19	Sample of constructivist demonstrations

Individual Performance Plan

In the event that your academic performance in 350S or fieldwork anecdotal/formative evaluations indicate a need for specific goal-oriented improvement, an individual performance plan will be designed for you and explained during a conference session. You are required to meet with your course instructor and university facilitator every week to mark your progress towards the IPP goals.

Active Participation

I cannot emphasize the need to participate as active citizens in this class. Your voice is an important intellectual exercise and a significant contribution to the overall value of the entire course for you and your colleagues.

Communication

The apprentice semester is a fast paced and complex experience that involves a large support network including your faculty, university facilitator, the Education Career Service and Field Experience Office director and staff, your cooperating teacher, and district administrators. Each educator is committed to excellence and improving your performance. As a result, you are required to communicate in a prompt, positive, and reflective manner via email or in person. Your diligent response to the many demands that will be presented this semester is part of your professional growth and role.

Summary of Assignment	Due Date	Percentage weight
Lesson Work Sessions	See syllabus	NA
Learning social studies through and with technology	On-going	NA
Web Page Preparation Assignment	3/29	NA
Loewen Presentations	4/5	10%
Lessons	4/26	30%
Student as Historian Presentation and Web Page	5/3	30%
Constructivist demonstration for seminar (FIELD)	4/19	10%
Lesson Work Sessions	See syllabus	NA
Learning social studies through and with technology	On-going	NA
Fieldwork Reflections (5)	On-going	20%
Participation	On-going	10%

Readings

Loewen, J., (1995). *Lies my history teacher told me*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

VanSledright, B., (2002). *In search of America's Past*, New York: Teachers College Press.

Additional articles found on UT Web Page, Access Electronic Reserves, Pull down "Curriculum and Instruction" go to Spring 2004, E370S Secondary Social

Studies Advanced Methods (Salinas) (password will be provided by faculty member)

Articles

Banks, J. and McGee Banks, C.A., (1999). Community of Humans, Ch. 1, from Teaching Strategies for the Social Studies, Chapter 16, Longman, NY.

Banks, J. and McGee Banks, C.A., (1999). Geography: Structure, concepts, and strategies, from Teaching Strategies for the Social Studies, P. 402-427, Ch 14). Longman, NY.

Barton, K., (2001), A picture's worth: Analyzing historical photographs in the elementary grades, Social Education, Vol. 65 (5), p. 278-283).

Cogan, J., Grossman, D., & Liu, M., (2000), Citizenship: The Democratic imagination in a global/local context, Social Education, Vol. 64 (1), p. 48-52

Kent, S. (1999). Saints or sinners? The case for an honest portrayal of historical figures. Social Education, 63 (1), 8-12.

Kohl, H. (1994). The politics of children's literature: What's wrong with the Rosa Parks myth? In Rethinking our classrooms: Teaching for equity and justice, (pp. 137-140).

Lopus, J., Morton, J., & Willis, A. (2003). Activity based economics. Social Education, 67 (2), pp. 85-89.

Parker, W. (2001), Classroom discussion: Models for leading seminars and deliberations, Social Education, Vol. 65 (2), p. 111-115

Smith, P. & Ragan, T. (1999), Instructional Design, John Wiley & Sons: New York, chapter 7.

Schug, M., Lopus, J., Morton, J., Reinke, R., Wentworth, D., & Western, R., (2003). Is economics your worst nightmare? Social Education, 67 (2), pp. 73-78.

Wineburg, S., Mosborg, S., & Porat, D., (2001), Empathizing with the many voices of the past: Two teachers help their students connect with United States History, Social Education, Vol 65 (10), p. 55-58.

Optional readings

Dawson, K. & Harris, J. Reaching out: Telecollaboration and social studies, Social Studies and the Young Learner, Vol. (), p. P1-P4.

Flores, R., (2002), Memory, modernity, and the master symbol: Remembering the Alamo, Texas Press: Austin. (Chapter 2).

Nathan, Debbie, (1998), Forget the Alamo, Texas Monthly, Vol. 26 (4), p. 125-128.

Guiding Reference Documents	URL
National Standards (history, geography, economics, government)	www.hist.unt.edu/2nhs.htm www.ncge.org/publications/tutorial/standards/ www.ncee.net/ea/program.php?pid=19
TEKS	www.tea.state.tx.us/resources/ssced/resources/webresourcesgeneral.htm
TAKS Objectives	www.tea.state.tx.us/resources/ssced/resources/webresourcesgeneral.htm
NCSS Themes	www.ncss.org
District Scope and Sequence	

Course Practices

No late assignments will be accepted. All assignments should be spell checked and typed or word-processed.

The learning process includes that you come to class prepared to be an active participant in class discussions and activities.

Punctuality is expected. Three tardies, unless otherwise excused, will be considered an absence.

Attendance

The course instructor will take attendance at every class. You are expected to attend class, be on time, and be well prepared to participate. Regardless of the absence, students are still responsible for work that may be due and for information covered during the absence. Please ask your classmates to gather a set of handouts and review you on missed material. If you will not be in class, call or email me prior to the absence. Any student who misses two or more classes may expect her/his final grade to be lowered one grade.

Policy on Scholastic Honesty

Students who violate University rules on scholastic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary penalties, including the possibility of failure in the course and/or dismissal from the University. Since dishonesty harms the individual, all students, and the integrity of the University, policies on scholastic dishonesty will be strictly enforced. You should refer to the Student Judicial Services website at to access the official University policies and procedures on scholastic dishonesty as well as further elaboration on what constitutes scholastic dishonesty.

Accommodations for Students

The University of Texas at Austin upon request provides appropriate academic accommodations for qualified students with disabilities. Please see me the first week of classes if accommodations need to be made. For more information, contact the Office of the Dean of Students at 471-6259, 471-4641 TTY.

Weekly Schedule

Date	Topic	Readings/Due Dates
1/18	What is Social Studies	TEKS, TAKS, NCSS, National Standards Banks & Banks, ch 1 Tech Teach: Developing wiser consumers
1/25		SEMINAR SESSION (1): Fieldwork evaluations SEMINAR SESSION (2): Classroom Management Reflections (Charles, ch 1) Learning Teach Net
2/1	The dilemma of teaching the social studies: Myths, Herofication, Omission AND Learning to think historically Instructional Design: A constructivist in the making	(Loewen (ch 1) Kent Kohl VanSledright (ch 1) Smith and Ragan
2/8	Teaching American History through historical investigations: Historical reasoning is all that... (DBQ'S writing) Lessons Work Sessions 1) Alignment between TEKS, learning objectives, and assessment	VanSledright (ch 2-4) Smith and Ragan Technology Teach Photos as Social Studies Teaching Tools: A truth through primary sources and historical reasoning (Barton) (for Student as Historian Project too)
2/15	Teaching American History through historical investigations: Historical reasoning is all that... Lessons Work Sessions 2) Introductory process	VanSledright (ch 5-7) Smith and Ragan Technology Teach Editorial Cartoons as Social Studies Teaching Tools: A truth through primary sources and historical reasoning
2/22	Resources from The Holocaust Museum Houston (contact person Christina Vasquez) (www.hmh.org/)	SEMINAR SESSION (3): Lesson sharing: Where can I find sample lessons and lesson ideas
3/1	Teaching Citizenship	Cogan, Grossman, & Liu

	Lessons Work Sessions 3) Body process	Smith and Ragan Technology Teach Internet based simulations:
3/8	Teaching World History Lessons Work Sessions 4) Concluding process	Smith and Ragan Banks & Banks, ch 16 Technology Teach Participant Accounts: Historical reasoning through letters, journals and other first hand artifacts.
Spring Break		
3/22	History Alive: Instructional Strategies for the social studies (video)	SEMINAR SESSION (4): Demonstration of constructivist design
3/29	History Alive: Instructional Strategies for the social studies	All primary sources with DBQ's and narrative due
4/5	A day with Loewen	Student Lead Discussions Emailed PowerPoints DUE
4/12*	Web Development Technology Teach	You must bring with you all primary sources, accompanying DBQ's, and the summary narrative
4/19	Teaching World Geography Teaching Economics	Banks, (ch 14) Teaching strategies for the social studies: Geography-structure... Schug, et. al. & Lopus, et. al. SEMINAR SESSION (5): Demonstration of constructivist design
4/26	Guest Speaker: Law Related Education, Carlen Floyd	Lessons Due (Note: Your fieldwork time sheet as well as you formal self-evaluations and cooperating teacher's formal evaluation are Due on 4/27)
5/3	Student as Historian Presentations	

APPENDIX D: SOCIOCONSTRUCTIVIST LESSON DESIGN GUIDELINES

Socioconstructivist Lesson Design Guidelines

Name: _____

Spring 2005/Fall 2005

Lesson Checklist

Criteria	Lesson 1	Lesson 2	Lesson 3	Lesson 4
TEKS (2-3 and written out)				
Learning Objectives Do you use (use Banks & Banks AND Bloom's Taxonomy) active and specific verb choices that demonstrates scaffolding and alignment with TEKS)?				
Introduction: Do you make the lesson relevant to students' lives?				
Introduction: Do you access student's prior learning/knowledge?				
Introduction: Did you preview of lesson/day's agenda?				
Body: Do you include a variety of instructional approaches?				
Body: Do you provide detailed steps that clearly show how students progress within the instructional strategy/lesson?				
Body: Do you provide samples of prewritten prompts/questions that help scaffold students towards more critical thinking (Bloom)?				
Body: Do you model learning in whole class before small group or individual work?				
Body: Do you provide continuous feedback and refocus on lesson learning objectives?				
Conclusion: Do you provide for student generated closure?				
Are a variety of assessment approaches included?				
Lessons include technology, primary source, current event, and History Alive				

APPENDIX E: LESSON PLAN EXAMPLES

1) **Selena Favin Sample Lesson Plan Apprentice Teaching Semester: Lesson Plans Week of October 31- November 4**

Objectives for the week:

Students will examine the Declaration of Independence, and British Acts that led to the Declaration of Independence. Students will use internet and their textbooks to research elements of an authentic English tea party so as to recreate one in commemoration of the Boston Tea Party, and will begin to look at elements of propaganda that colonists encountered concerning British/colonial relations. Each activity will be done in note and picture form which will be transferred into a “Road to Revolution” timeline.

Monday, Oct. 31

Objectives: Students will examine the Declaration of Independence for clues as to events that led to a break with England.

Warm-Up: What does the expression “it was the last straw” mean? When have you been in a situation like that?

Procedure:

- Warm-Up
- Turn in homework, go over vocab words
- Preview of the next two weeks
- Look at the Declaration of Independence
- Students will fill out Declaration chart, they will reword certain portions of the Declaration of Independence and draw a picture of the meaning.
- Students will be told what portion they will be expected to remember, class will practice together
- Homework: 2nd Vocabulary worksheet

Tuesday, Nov. 1

-Warm-up: Look at the Declaration of Independence, name three grievances they had with the king.

Procedure:

- Warm-up
- Boston Tea Party introduction
- Student reading packets
- Students will fill out a chart of British Acts

Wednesday, Nov 2

Procedure:

- Warm-up

- Finish packet
- Quiz over Acts and Declaration of Independence
- Student research for Boston Tea Party
- sign up for parts for party

Thursday, Nov. 3

Procedure:

- Warm-up
- Research for Tea Party

Friday, Nov. 4

Procedure:

- Warm-up
- Students will examine different political cartoons including the “Boston Massacre” and “Repeal of the Stamp Act” looking for meaning and elements of propaganda.
- On the blackboard teacher will write down elements of propaganda in pictures: symbols, exaggerations, etc.
- In pairs students will create their own propaganda as either a poster or political cartoon about the Boston Tea Party.
- Results will be shared with the class.

2) **Joshua Henson Sample Lesson Plan Apprentice Teaching Semester**
Monday, October 17th

<u>Class:</u> 2 & 4 Road to Revolution Research	1, 5 & 6 French and Indian War
<u>Objectives:</u> Students will research in the library.	Students will view a slide show on the French and Indian War
<u>Activities:</u> Warm-up – In three words or less describe the act, document, person or event you researched on Friday. -Go to library and research.	- WU- On p. 132 there is a map. Look at the map and answer question 1. -Begin slide show on the French and Indian war. Have students take notes on the note-taking guide.
<u>Assessment:</u> Time line criteria due on Tuesday and Wednesday.	Quiz given on a following day.
<u>Modification:</u> Based on individual student need.	Varies depending on individual student needs.
<u>Closure:</u> Explain the following day and how they must do their homework for it to work. HW- Prepare your information so that it can be added to the time line on Tuesday.	Explain how after the war the Treaty of Paris (1763) is set up to resolve issues around the world as well as in America. -Start The Treaty of Paris is needed.

Tuesday

<u>Class:</u> 2 & 4 Class timeline	1, 5 & 6 Treaty of Paris
<u>Objectives:</u> Through individual work students will gain a through understanding of the road to revolution.	Student will analyze the treaty of Paris and its connection to the French and Indian War.
<u>Activities:</u> - WU – Make sure you are ready to present your topic of the timeline.	-WU- Unit title page -Using the hand out with excerpts from the Treaty of Paris extract meaning of each of five articles.
<u>Assessment:</u> - Homework was to prepare the information that was collected the past two school days. By now it should be ready to glue on the time line.	If time allows quiz over the French and Indian war and the Treaty of Paris and handout.
<u>Modification:</u> Based on individual student need.	Varies depending on individual student needs.
<u>Closure:</u> Connect the individual events to make a continuous string of events.	Preview how the colonists now want this land and how the British won't want to give it up.

Wednesday

<u>Class:</u> 2 & 4 Class timeline cont.	1, 5 & 6 The King's M & M's
<u>Objectives:</u> see above	Students will participate in a simulation that displays what leads to the colonies

	eventual revolt against Brittan.
<u>Activities:</u> - WU – what did you learn yesterday?	Short quiz to asses knowledge from previous two days (if not done).
<u>Assessment:</u> -presentations	Discussion
<u>Modification:</u> Based on individual student need.	Based on individual student need.
<u>Closure:</u> see above	Debrief

Thursday

<u>Class:</u> 2 & 4	1, 5 & 6 Road to Revolution
<u>Objectives:</u>	Students will form a foundation in which to lay fundamentals of the American revolution.
<u>Activities:</u> <u>Warm-up</u>	- WU - Think back to yesterday's simulation. In five sentences, discuss how it felt to be who ever you were (taxed colonist, tax collector, parliament or the king). -Students will work in pairs or individually to fill out a chart asking for basic information on events from the pre-revolutionary period.
<u>Assessment:</u>	Notes in spiral
<u>Modification:</u>	Based on individual student need.
<u>Closure:</u>	Review handout and give homework.

Friday

<u>Class:</u> 2 & 4	1, 5 & 6 Class timeline
<u>Objectives:</u>	Research information on a topic of the American Revolution.
<u>Activities:</u> <u>Warm-up</u>	In the library (? textbook) ask students to research information on a topic from the American Revolution. Students will find an illustration to replicate or print, five facts about the event and the date of the event for the class time line.
<u>Assessment:</u>	Work that will be attached to the class time line.
<u>Modification:</u>	Topics can be varied for individual student needs.
<u>Closure:</u>	Introduce homework

3) **Bridget Keller Sample Lesson Plan Apprentice Teaching Semester**

Lesson Plan for Monday, September 26, 2005

Introduction

Learning Objective:

Students will define the vocabulary words from Chapter 3 as well as develop sentences using the vocabulary words.

TEKS:

(19) Culture. The student understands the history and relevance of major religious and philosophical traditions.

The student is expected to:

(A) compare the historical origins, central ideas, and the spread of major religious and philosophical traditions including Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam, and Judaism; and

(22) Culture. The student understands how the development of ideas has influenced institutions and societies.

The student is expected to:

(A) summarize the fundamental ideas and institutions of Eastern civilizations that originated in China and India;

Preview:

Today you are going to identify the vocabulary from Chapter 3. Define them and demonstrate with a sentence that you understand what the word means. Underline the vocabulary word in red. This is due at the end of class today.

Body

1. Have vocabulary words written on the board for the students to copy.
2. Demonstrate on the board what to do...define the word and then write a sentence for them.
3. Allow students to work quietly and monitor them.
4. Ask students to pass up their work.

Conclusion

Spend the last 3 minutes of class quizzing students on the meaning of the vocabulary words.

Lesson Plan for Tuesday, September 27, 2005

Introduction

Learning Objective:

Students will describe the origins and spread of the Hittites, Aryans, Minoans, and Phoenicians. Students will compare the 4 civilizations and summarize the impact that each had on those they conquered or traded with.

TEKS:

(6) History. The student understands the major developments of civilizations of sub-Saharan Africa, Mesoamerica, Andean South America, and Asia.

C) summarize the major political, economic, and cultural developments of civilizations in China, India, and Japan.

(22) Culture. The student understands how the development of ideas has influenced institutions and societies.

The student is expected to:

(A) summarize the fundamental ideas and institutions of Eastern civilizations that originated in China and India;

(25) Social studies skills. The student applies critical-thinking skills to organize and use information acquired from a variety of sources including electronic technology.

(C) analyze information by sequencing, categorizing, identifying cause-and-effect relationships, comparing, contrasting, finding the main idea, summarizing, making generalizations and predictions, and drawing inferences and conclusions;

Preview:

Today we are going to discuss 4 different groups of people: Hittites, Aryans, Minoans, and Phoenicians. Where did they live, what did they believe... You will use this chart to keep track of the information as we discuss it in class.

Whatever is not finished in class will be homework.

Body

1. Hand out chart for students to take notes.
2. Briefly discuss the Indo – European migrations
 - a. Who were they? Why did they migrate? Language?
3. Follow the headings on the chart to compare different aspects of the groups
 - a. Location, time period, religion, writing....

(Students have prior knowledge having done the workbook sections)

Conclusion

I will put up a map on the overhead and ask for student volunteers to come up and label the 4 areas that we just discussed. For example, have a student come up and circle the area where the Hittites came from and where they migrated to. What impact did that have on the people already living there? On the Hittites?

Homework:

Students need to finish filling out the chart. Due Wednesday.

Lesson Plan for Wednesday, September 28, 2005

Introduction

Learning Objective:

Students will produce a map outlining the origins and movement of the Minoan, Phoenician, Hittite, and Aryan civilizations.

TEKS:

(11) Geography. The student uses geographic skills and tools to collect, analyze, and interpret data.

The student is expected to:

(A) create thematic maps, graphs, charts, models, and databases representing various aspects of world history; and

(B) pose and answer questions about geographic distributions and patterns in world history shown on maps, graphs, charts, models, and databases.

Preview:

Today you are going to do a map project about the Minoans, Phoenicians, Hittites, and Aryans. It will be due at the end of class

Body

1. Pass out maps and instructions
2. Read over the instructions with the students and ask if there are any questions
3. Monitor students as they work

Conclusion

After collecting the map, ask students questions about each of the civilizations. Where did they Aryans migrate to? What sea did the Phoenicians trade along?

Lesson Plan for Thursday, September 29, 2005

Introduction

Learning Objective:

Students will review their knowledge of Chapter 3 during an in class game.

TEKS:

(6) History. The student understands the major developments of civilizations of sub-Saharan Africa, Mesoamerica, Andean South America, and Asia.

C) summarize the major political, economic, and cultural developments of civilizations in China, India, and Japan.

(19) Culture. The student understands the history and relevance of major religious and philosophical traditions.

The student is expected to:

(A) compare the historical origins, central ideas, and the spread of major religious and philosophical traditions including Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam, and Judaism; and

Preview:

We are going to review what you have learned in chapter 3 for your test tomorrow. I have questions dealing with the people, religions, and ideas that we have learned about and we are going to play a game in class.

Body

1. Split the class into 2 groups – boys against girls- and briefly go over instructions (we have played before so they know what to do).
 - a. ask one student to be the scorekeeper
 - b. get through as many questions as time permits.

Conclusion

End game 5 minutes before the end of class and go over the information that the students seem to have the most difficulty answering. For example, if they are having trouble answering questions dealing with Hinduism, we will go over the tenants of it together. Study for test!

Lesson Plan for Friday, September 30, 2005

Students will take their Chapter 3 test.

4) **Ignacio Longoria Sample Lesson Plan Apprentice Teaching Semester:
Lesson Plan
24 October 2005 (Monday)
Byzantium Continued – The Great Schism**

Objectives:

- 1) Identify what the Hagia Sophia is and its significance.
- 2) Identify and describe the role of the Empress Theodora in Justinian's government
- 3) Explain why the Eastern and Western churches created two traditions

Activities:

Introduction: (5 minutes)

Students should take out a sheet of paper for a Pop quiz over the vocabulary. (see matching pop quiz #1 attached)

Activity #1: (8 minutes) – The Hagia Sophia

Place the transparency of the Hagia Sophia and ask the students to describe what they see in the picture.

Discussion should center around these questions:

- a) What does the plain exterior of the church represent? (daily world; earthly life) the interior? (ideal spiritualized universe)
- b) How is the Hagia Sophia a combination of east and west? (the size and thick pillars are influenced by Rome; the design and decoration are influenced by the East)
- c) What has been the history of the building? (Largest Christian cathedral in Constantinople – crown jewel; After 1453 became a mosque; now a museum)

Activity #2 (15 minutes) – The Empress Theodora

Students will read the worksheet on the Empress Theodora and fill out the back of the worksheet they were given on Friday. If the worksheet is not available then have them take notes on a separate sheet of paper. (8 minutes)

Discuss the worksheet to answer these questions:

- a) According to the worksheet, what obstacles did Theodora overcome to become empress? (poor family, actress (looked down upon then – as well now)
- b) What event best demonstrated her strong role in the politics of the Byzantine empire? (her actions during the revolt)
- c) What was the Nika rebellion, and how was the outcome affected by her actions? (rebellion began as a shouting match in the hippodrome during a chariot race – exploded into full rebellion – rallied Justinian with her speech – rebellion was crushed)

Activity #3: (17 minutes) – The Great schism

Students should open their books to page 272.

Hand out worksheet/transparency 2.1E: the Icon of Mary and Jesus

Discuss the debate concerning icons during this time period. Students are to fill out the worksheet using their books.

Discuss:

- a) What is an icon? (a representation of sacred persons or events)
- b) Why were some Byzantine Christians opposed to the use of icons? (worried people would worship the icons instead of God) What were they called? (Iconoclasts)
- c) What other fundamental differences divided the 2 churches?
 - a) Catholic (which means “universal”) – masses in Latin; Pope was supreme religious authority; clergy celibate; icons respected
 - Orthodox (“correct belief”) – Masses in Greek; priests and other clergy not required to be celibate; Emperor superior to bishop of Constantinople

Activity #5: (5 minutes)

Students are to complete the Byzantine Empire timeline worksheet for homework/review. They will have a quiz on Tuesday over the material covered today and on Friday. They are also to look over chapter 12 section 2. They should consider the following question:

- a) How did the geography of the Asian Steppe benefit or hinder the rise of the Mongolian empire?
- b) What did it take to finally unite the Empire?

Assessment: Students are to complete the worksheet timeline for homework. They will have a quiz on Tuesday over the material covered today and on Friday.

Lesson Plan
25 October 2005 (Tues.)
The Mongolian Conquests

Objectives:

- 1) Describe the geography of the Steppe and the lifestyles of nomadic and settled peoples
- 2) Explain the Khan’s success in conquering most of Asia and parts of Europe
- 3) Summarize the extent of the Mongol empire and its divisions

Activities:

Quiz: (10 minutes)

Students will complete Quiz #2 over the Byzantine Empire.

Introduction: Discussion about the Mongols (5 minutes)

Ask the students the following question: Who was Genghis Khan and what was he famous for?

(answers may range from – warlord; conqueror; leader of the Mongol empire; etc..)

After some discussion tell the students that we are going to study the Mongols and Genghis Khan

Activity 1: Power point Presentation over the Mongols (25 minutes)

Sections:

- a) The Asian Steppe
- b) Lifestyle of the Mongols
- c) Genghis Khan unites Mongols begins to conquer
- d) reasons for his success
- e) the four Khanates

Activity 2: Self-Guided Reading (10 minutes)

Students will Read “A meeting with Genghis Khan” and consider the following questions:

- 1) Who is the author of the article and what point of view does he bring to the article?
- 2) How is Genghis Khan described?
- 3) Does this article change your previous opinion of Genghis?

Assessment: Students will turn in their questions at the end of the period for daily credit.

Homework: Students are to read and take notes over chapter 12 section 3 – Empire of the Great Khan

Lesson Plan
26 October 2005 (Weds.)
Kublai Khan and Marco Polo

Objectives:

- 1) Summarize Kublai Khan’s conquest of china

- 2) To describe Mongol rule in China
- 3) To identify the importance of Marco Polo's journey's
- 4) Describe the fall of Mongol rule

Activities:

Introduction: (5 minutes)

Review of the Previous Day:

- 1) Who was Genghis Khan?
- 2) Which of the 4 Khanates included China? (the Khanate of the Great Khan)

Activity 1: Kublai Khan Web (15 minutes)

Using their textbooks students will complete a Kublai Khan web worksheet. After completion they will be asked several questions including:

- 1) How did Khan overcome the difficulty of governing China? How might this system have affected the Chinese?
- 2) How did the opening of trade affect China? Was such an opening a good thing or a negative thing for China?

Activity 2: Marco Polo readings (20 minutes)

Students will read 2 selections from Marco Polo's travels and answer the DBQ's created for them.

Selection 1: Kublai Khan In Battle, 1287

Selection 2: TBD (to be decided)

Question:

- 1) Why would Khan have employed Marco Polo?

Activity 3: Fall of the Empire (10 minutes)

Students will compare the decline of the Mongol empire with the decline of the Roman and Byzantine empire by making a chart which lists similar and unique causes.

Assessment: Students will turn in their DBQ's for a grade.

Homework: Students are to read Chapter 12 section 4.

References

- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 377 - 392). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Anderson, D. S., & Piazza, J. A. (1996). Changing beliefs: Teaching and learning mathematics in constructivist preservice classrooms. *Action in Teacher Education*, XVIII(2), 51-62.
- Applebee, A. N. (1996). *Curriculum as conversation: Transforming traditions of teaching and learning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Applefield, J., Huber, R., & Moallem, M. (2000-2001). Constructivism in theory and practice: Toward a better understanding. *High School Journal*, 84(2), 35-54.
- Armento, B. J. (1996). The professional development of social studies educators. In Sikula, J., Buttery, T. & Guyton, E. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Benz, C., & Newman, I. (1985). Seventeen teaching competencies: Perceptions of first year teachers. *Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Midwestern Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL*.
- Berlin, E., & Fab, J. (Writer) (2004). Paper clips. In Fab, J., Johnson, R. M. & Pinchot, A. D. (Producer): Miramax Film Corporation.
- Bloom, B. S. E., Englehart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: Longman.
- Blumenfeld, P., Soloway, E., Marx, R., Krajcik, J., Guzdial, M., & Palincsar, A. (1991). Motivating project-based learning: Sustaining the doing, supporting the learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 26(3&4), 369-398.

- Bohan, C. H., & Davis, O. L. (1998). Historical constructions: How social studies student teachers' historical thinking is reflected in their writing of history. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(2), 173-197.
- Brandt, R. (1988). On students' needs and team learning, *Educational Leadership* (Vol. 45, pp. 38): Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Draper, R. J. (2004). Making sense of a failed triad: Mentors, university supervisors, and positioning theory. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(5), 407.
- Cambourne, B. (1988). *The whole story: Natural learning and the acquisition of literacy in the classroom*. Gosford, New Zealand: Ashton Scholastic.
- Cazden, C. (1993). Vygotsky, Hymes, and Bahktin: From word to utterance and voice. In Forman, E. A., Minnick, N. & Stone, C. A. (Eds.), *Contexts for learning: Sociocultural dynamics in children's development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chaiklin, S. (2004). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction. In Kozulin, A., Gindis, B., Ageyev, V. S. & Miller, S. M. (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 39-64). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chase, S. E. (2005). Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 651-679). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- City Independent School District. (2005). Local school information site. Retrieved August 18, 2005, from <http://www.austinisd.org/schools/details.phtml?id=037&lang=>
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). The new teacher education: For better or for worse? *Educational Researcher*, 34(7).

- Cook, L. S., Smagorinsky, P., Fry, P. G., Konopak, B., & Moore, C. (2002). Problems developing a constructivist approach to teaching: One teacher's transition from teacher preparation to teaching. *The Elementary School Journal, 102*(5), 389-413.
- Cornbleth, C. (2002). What constrains meaningful social studies teaching? *Social Education, 66*(3), 186.
- Crotty, M. (2003). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 166-173.
- Davis, O. L., Jr. (1998). Thinking in the school subjects: Toward improved teaching and learning. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 13*(3), 205-209.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. *The School Journal, LIV*(3), 77-80.
- Dewey, J. (1998). *Experience and education*. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Donlevey, J. (2000). The dilemma of high-stakes testing: What is school for? *International Journal of Reading Instruction, 27*(4), 331-338.
- Doolittle, P. E., & Hicks, D. E. (2003). Constructivism as a theoretical foundation for the use of technology in social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 31*(1), 71-103.
- Drake, F. D., & Brown, S. D. (2003). A systematic approach to improve students' historical thinking. *The History Teacher, 36*(4), 465-489.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record, 103*(6), 1013-1055.

- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 361-376). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fosnot, C. T. (2005a). Preface. In Fosnot, C. T. (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fosnot, C. T. (Ed.). (2005b). *Teachers construct constructivism: The center for constructivist teaching/teacher preparation project*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fosnot, C. T., & Perry, R. S. (2005). Constructivism: A psychological theory of learning. In Fosnot, C. T. (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Foster, S. (1999). Using historical empathy to excite students about the study of history: Can you empathize with Neville Chamberlain? *Social Studies*, 90(1), 18.
- Freire, P. (2003). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Garman, N. (1994). Qualitative inquiry: Meaning and menace for educational researchers, *Mini-conference on Qualitative Research*. Flinders Institute for the Study of Teaching, The Flinders University of South Australia, Adelaide.
- Glasser, W. (1990a). The quality school. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 71(6), 424.
- Glasser, W. (1990b). *The quality school: Managing students without coercion*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.
- Grant, S. (2003). *History lessons*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- Green, S. K., & Gredler, M. E. (2002). A review and analysis of constructivism for school-based practice. *School Psychology Review*, 31(1), 53-70.
- Grossman, P. L. (1992). Why models matter: An alternate view on professional growth in teaching. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(2), 171.

- Harris, K., & Alexander, P. (1998). Integrated, constructivist education: Challenge and reality. *Educational Psychology Review*, 10(2), 115-127.
- Harris, K., & Graham, S. (1994). Constructivism: Principles, paradigms, and integration. *The Journal of Special Education*, 28(3), 233-247.
- Henson, K. (2003). Foundations for learner-centered education: A knowledge base. *Education*, 124(1), 5-16.
- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1983). Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: Some techniques of data reduction and display. *Quality and Quantity*, 17(17), 281-339.
- Karpov, Y. V. (2003). Development through the lifespan. In Kozulin, A., Gindis, B., Ageyev, V. S. & Miller, S. M. (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 138-155). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaufman, D. (1996). Constructivist-based experiential learning in teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, XVIII(2), 40-50.
- Kliebard, H. (1986). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893 - 1958*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Kozulin, A. (2003). Psychological tools and mediated learning. In Kozulin, A., Gindis, B., Ageyev, V. S. & Miller, S. M. (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 15-38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, MA.
- Litowitz, B. (1993). Deconstruction in the zone of proximal development. In Forman, E. A., Minnick, N. & Stone, C. A. (Eds.), *Contexts for learning: Sociocultural dynamics in children's development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Loewen, J. W. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: New Press.

- Lortie, D. C. (1975/2002). *Schoolteacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Matthews, M. (2000). Appraising constructivism in science and mathematics. In Phillips, D. (Ed.), *Constructivism in education* (pp. 161-192). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: Toward a shared craft. *Educational Researcher*, 13(5), 20-30.
- Mintrop, H. (2001). Educating students to teach in a constructivist way - can it all be done? *Teachers College Record*, 103(2), 207-239.
- Moll, L. C., & González, N. (2004). Engaging life. In Banks, J. A. & Banks, C. A. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 699-715). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint.
- Moll, L. C., & Whitmore, K. F. (1993). Vygotsky in classroom practice: Moving from individual transmission to social transaction. In Forman, E. A., Minnick, N. & Stone, C. A. (Eds.), *Contexts for learning: Sociocultural dynamics in children's development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- National Council for History Standards. (1996). National standards for history. Retrieved August 7, 2005, 2005, from <http://nchs.ucla.edu/>
- Naylor, S., & Keogh, B. (1999). Constructivism in the classroom: Theory into practice. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 10(2), 93-106.

- Noddings, N. (2005). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Palinscar, A. S. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 345-375.
- Palinscar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition & Instruction*, 1(2), 117.
- Parker, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Phillips, D. C. (1995). The good, the bad, and the ugly: The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Researcher*, 24(7), 5-12.
- Prawat, R. (2000). The two faces of Deweyan pragmatism: Induction versus social constructivism. *Teachers College Record*, 102(4), 805-840.
- Prawat, R., & Floden, R. (1994). Philosophical perspectives on constructivist views of learning. *Educational Psychology*, 29(1), 37-48.
- Reiber, R. W., & Carton, A. S. (Eds.). (1987). *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky volume 1: Problems of general psychology*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Richardson, V. (2003). Constructivist pedagogy. *Teachers College Record*, 105(9), 1623-1640.
- Schallert, D., & Martin, D. (2003). A psychological analysis of what teachers and students do in the language arts classroom. In Flood, J., Lapp, D., Squire, J. R. & Jensen, J. M. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching in the English language arts* (pp. 31-45). New York: Macmillan.
- Schwab, J. J. (1978). *Science, curriculum and liberal education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Seixas, P. (1993). Historical understanding among adolescents in a multicultural setting. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 23(2), 301-327.
- Seixas, P. (1994). Preservice teachers assess students' prior historical understanding. *Social Studies*, 85(2), 91-95.
- Seixas, P. (1998). Student teachers thinking historically. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 310-341.
- Shapiro, A. (2000). *Leadership for constructivist schools*. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press, Inc. Technomic Books.
- Shepard, L. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29(7), 4-14.
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Shulman, L. (2000). Teacher development: Roles of domain expertise and pedagogical knowledge. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 21(1), 129-135.
- Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L. S., & Johnson, T. S. (2003). The twisting path of concept development in learning to teach. *Teachers College Record*, 105(8), 1399-1436.
- Smerdon, B. A., Burkam, D. T., & Lee, V. E. (1999). Access to constructivist and didactic teaching: Who gets it? Where is it practiced? *Teachers College Record*, 101(1), 5-34.
- Smith, T., & Ragan, J. (1999). *Instructional design*. New York: J. Wiley and Sons.
- Spoehr, K. T., & Spoehr, L. W. (1994). Learning to think historically. *Educational Psychologist*, 29(2), 71-77.
- Stake, R. E. (1994). Case studies. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Staley, D. J. (2002). A history of the future. *History and Theory*(41), 72-89.
- Standards, N. C. f. H. (1996). National standards for history. Retrieved August 7, 2005, 2005, from <http://nchs.ucla.edu/>
- Tatto, M. T. (1998). The influence of teacher education on teachers' beliefs about purposes of education, roles, and practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(1), 66-78.
- Terhart, E. (2003). Constructivism and teaching: A new paradigm in general didactics? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35(1), 25-44.
- Texas Education Agency. (1998). Texas essential skills and knowledge. Retrieved August 7, 2005, 2005, from <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index.html>
- Texas Education Agency. (2005). 2003-04 academic excellence indicator system campus reports. Retrieved August 18, 2005, from <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/2004/campus.srch.html>
- van der Veer, R., & Valsiner, J. (1991). *Understanding Vygotsky: A quest for synthesis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- VanSledright, B. A. (2002). *In search of America's past: Learning to read history in elementary school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- VanSledright, B. A. (2004). What does it mean to think historically? And how do you teach it? *Social Education*, 68(3), 230-233.
- VanSledright, B. A., & Afflerbach, P. (2000). Reconstructing Andrew Jackson: Prospective elementary teachers' readings of revisionist history texts. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 28(3), 411-444.

- von Glasersfeld, E. (1987). Learning as a constructive activity. In Janvier, C. (Ed.), *Problems of representation in the teaching and learning of mathematics* (pp. 3-17). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- von Glasersfeld, E. (2005). Introduction: Aspects of constructivism. In Fosnot, C. T. (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Wertsch, J. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Westerman, D. A. (1991). Expert and novice teacher decision making. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(4), 292-305.
- Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Witmer, M. M. (2005). The fourth R in education-- relationships. *Clearing House*, 78(5), 224.
- Yeager, E. A., & Davis, O. L., Jr. (1995). Between campus and classroom: Secondary student-teachers' thinking about historical texts. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29(1), 1-8.
- Yeager, E. A., & Wilson, E. K. (1997). Teaching historical thinking in the social studies methods course: A case study. *The Social Studies*, 88(3), 121-127.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zeichner, K. (2002a). Beyond traditional structures of student teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 59-64.

Zeichner, K. (2002b). Beyond traditional structures of student teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 59.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (1990). Reflective teaching and action research in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 16(3), 235-255.

Vita

Caroline Cecelia Sullivan was born in Ankara, Turkey on 2 November 1970 to parents John Paul Sullivan and Caroline Virginia Ellwood Sullivan. After attending various elementary and middle schools, she enrolled in Annandale High School, Annandale, Virginia, during her ninth grade year prior to attending Winston Churchill High School in San Antonio, Texas, for the next three years and graduating Magna Cum Laude. Thereafter she attended the University of Texas at Austin completing a Bachelor of Science in Speech in August 1993 and a Bachelor of Arts in Spanish Civilization in December 1993. In December 1996, she earned her Texas Lifetime Teacher's Certificate through The University of Texas at San Antonio and taught Spanish at the middle school level and Speech Communications at the high school level in Austin Independent School District. She began graduate studies at The University of Texas at Austin in August 1998 and completed a Master of Education degree in August 2001; she entered the doctoral program in Curriculum Studies with an emphasis in Social Studies in August 2002.

Permanent address: 1311 Romeria Drive, Austin, Texas, 78757

This dissertation was typed by the author.