

History Learning and Teaching Today: Learning What? Becoming What? By What Practice?

Yifat Ben-David Kolikant, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, yifatbdk@mscc.huji.ac.il

Sarah Pollack, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Sarah.pollack@mail.huji.ac.il

Brad Fogo, Stanford University, bfogo@stanford.edu

Tsafir Goldberg, University of Haifa, tgoldberg@edu.haifa.ac.il

D. Kevin O'Neill, Simon Fraser University, koneill@sfu.ca

Laura D'Amico, Simon Fraser University, ldamico@sfu.ca

Sheryl Guloy, Simon Fraser University, sga55@sfu.ca

Discussant: Avishag (Abby) Riesman, Teacher's College, Columbia University, ar3230@tc.columbia.edu

Abstract: History is intimately connected with personal and collective processes of becoming. It is also a field of contest among curriculum-makers, teachers, parents and scholars over who and what children will be; and this contest has greater consequences as our world grows more crowded and more connected. School curriculum-makers and teachers have never had a monopoly on what children learned about the past; but today, the Internet makes encounters with differing historical narratives ever more common. In this symposium, scholars from three countries (Israel, Canada and the United States) will come together around a collection of unique studies addressing the question of how teachers can be better prepared to help their students navigate the increasing challenges of learning and becoming in today's increasingly globalized and internetnetworked world.

Introduction

History is intimately connected with personal processes of becoming, wherever and whenever one lives. As MacMillan (2008) writes, "For all of us, the powerful and the weak alike, history helps to define and validate us." (p 57) In view of the power that history has to shape who we become (individually and collectively), developed nations and states throughout the past century have diligently crafted their history curricula to shape the identities and loyalties of their citizenry (Loewen 1995; Coles 2000). At the same time, parents, teachers and peers often promote different accounts of students' past than schools do, perhaps ones more allied to ethnic and class identities (Coles 2000). Finally, amidst this competition over students' identities, academic historians and history educators have worked to establish and reinforce a place for the unique epistemic practices of their discipline in students' understanding of the past (Kuhn et al., 1994; Wineburg, 1999; Seixas 2000).

Thus, history education must be viewed as a field in which learning and becoming are very much at issue, and very much contested. This contest has greater consequences as our world grows more crowded and more connected, because the differences among these contesting claims to the understanding of the past become more pressing. Life in a globalized and internetnetworked world involves increasingly frequent encounters with "others" whose values, culture, and narratives of the past may differ from ours. Such encounters may both exacerbate conflict and present potential for learning. In many western nations, the idea of global awareness and its importance in the core curriculum is being asserted (e.g. p21.org), but achieving this goal is nontrivial, and may be incompatible with the most common practices of textbook-driven history teaching. What is certain is that teachers of history must in some way be ready to recognize and address the inevitable conflicts and disjunctions among the accounts of the past that enter their classrooms, and perhaps take advantage of the pedagogical potential they provide.

Our symposium draws together scholars from three countries and various disciplinary perspectives to examine what students and teachers of history are learning, what they are becoming, and by means of what practices. The first two presentations address the possibilities and challenges involved in integrating historians' epistemic practices into instruction. Fogo's study examines the practices that expert history teachers and teacher educators promote to address the challenges of teaching history discussed earlier. He conducted a Delphi study involving three rounds of ratings, comments, and suggestions made by a panel of 26 expert history educators across the United States. These resulted in a list of nine core teaching practices that the respondents suggested a skilled history teacher must master. The Delphi panel attained an uncommonly high degree of consensus around this set of practices, which are nonetheless uncommon in history teaching today.

The second study, by O'Neill, D'Amico and Guloy, examines how more typical practices of history teaching shape students' understandings of historians' practices, with particular emphasis on why they construct differing accounts of the past. The study examines a series of in-depth interviews with five practicing historians and seven secondary students in western Canada, which focused specifically on why historical accounts may differ. Prompted by a series of survey questions that they answered and explained aloud, students stressed the

social functions of history and what they believed historians *should* do, such as reinforce national identity by getting to the truth of things. For their part, historians interrogated what it means for students to hold a “sophisticated” understanding of the discipline. For historians in some specializations the pursuit of an ultimate truth was considered quite naïve and a sign of inadequate education; but others saw this view as legitimate depending on the context. Overall, the study puts into relief how typical practices of history teaching lead to simplifications of historians’ varying epistemologies and practices.

Our final two presentations provide models of how integrating historians’ practices curricular interventions can prove fruitful in addressing the challenges and possibilities of learning and becoming in the context of a deeply entrenched historical conflict. Both studies took place in Israel, a bi-national country in which Jewish and Arab children are educated in separate schools but follow the same national curriculum. The research of Ben-David Kolikant and Pollack revolves around a dialogically-oriented curricular intervention involving pairs of Jewish-Israeli and Arab-Israeli youth working together online to examine historical events pertaining to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Goldberg’s research takes place in the same national context, but examines the effects of a quasi-experimental intervention in which one group of students received a curriculum involving conflicting sources that was oriented toward historians’ disciplinary practice. A comparison group instead studied an exam-oriented textbook excerpt. Both studies highlight the feasibility of incorporating historical thinking into the classroom and shed light on learning processes in these classrooms.

After a short (5 minute) introduction, each set of presenters will be given 10 minutes to overview their work for the audience as a whole. Then, each group of presenters will take one corner of the room to meet and dialogue with interested participants for 15 minutes on the question of whether, or in what ways the “disciplinary practice” approach to history teaching is at odds with an approach that stresses students becoming loyal participants in a national collective. For the following 15 minutes, participants will return to their seats and our discussant will lead a whole-group discussion about the challenges and possibilities of learning and becoming in relation to history. Finally, our discussant will have 10 minutes to make her own closing remarks.

Defining Core Instructional Practices for Teaching History

Brad Fogo, Stanford University

Educational researchers call for identifying effective teaching practices to inform and improve pre and in-service teacher education. Researchers have focused on teaching practices across grade levels and subjects, and use different vocabulary for identifying effective practice. For example, Ball and Forzani (2009) have detailed several “high leverage” teaching practices; Kazemi, Franke, and Lampert (2009) focus on “high quality” “instructional strategies;” and Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald (2009) describe “core” practices.

The new core practice research work has largely overlooked history-social studies. This is not to suggest a poverty of research on the teaching of history. Rather, the field has grown steadily over the past three decades. Researchers have identified different types of teacher knowledge (Evans, 1990; McDiarmid, 1994; Yeager & Davis, 1995), crafted portraits of good history teachers (Bain, 2006; Brophy & VanSledright, 1997; VanSledright, 2011), described “ambitious” and “authentic” history teaching (Grant & Gradwell, 2010; Saye et al., 2013), and examined the impact of accountability policies on elementary and secondary history instruction (Grant, 2006). Much of this work, however, revolves around small case studies of teachers, and, as noted by Wilson (2001), does not focus squarely on the links between teaching and learning. The empirical base connecting teaching with learning history remains thin.

My research focuses on the following questions: Is there a set of core instructional practices for teaching history? If so, what are they? What teaching practices impact students’ ability to engage in historical analysis and understand the major explanatory accounts and concepts of history? Here, I discuss findings from a Delphi panel survey of 26 expert history educators - teachers, teacher educators, and educational researchers - focused on developing consensus around a set of core teaching practices for secondary, history education (Fogo, 2014). Researchers have used Delphi surveys across the social sciences to facilitate expert group work for decades. The approach involves multiple rounds of survey analysis to develop group consensus around specific issues and decisions (Clayton, 1997). Participants are selected in respect to their expertise on topics under consideration, and remain anonymous throughout the process.

I sought to draw from the expertise of three groups of history educators in this study: master high school history teachers, history teacher educators, and leading researchers in the field of history education. Eleven teachers and 15 teacher educators/educational researchers were recruited for the panel. Criteria for teachers focused on creating a diverse, national sample of award winning teachers with extensive experience teaching secondary American and world history courses. I selected teacher educators and researchers from university-based education, history, and teacher education programs. They were identified as leaders in the field through their research and teaching experience.

This study used an on-line survey format. Each round of the survey consisted of two parts. In part one, participants rated titles and short descriptions of teaching practices on a 5-point Likert scale indicating whether

they thought the practice should be considered core (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree). Core teaching practices were defined as the “instructional repertoire (strategies, routines, and moves) teachers enact that have great potential to impact students’ ability to engage in historical analysis and understand the major explanatory accounts and concepts of history.” Participants provided justifications for each rating and suggestions for revising titles and descriptions. In part two of the survey, participants generated additional core practices. They were asked to include a practice title and description, along with a justification for the practice. Participants repeated this process of rating, commenting upon, and suggesting practices across three survey rounds. The final round of the survey included a third section where participants selected practices they considered most important for effective history teaching, for pre-service teacher education, and for in-service professional development.

Analysis of data between rounds included compiling a rank ordered list of the teaching practices based upon average ratings, modes, and standard deviations. Additionally a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to identify possible differences between the responses of teachers and teacher educators/researchers after each round. Suggested practices were coded and grouped by emergent themes. New practices were crafted for practices suggested by multiple participants. Between rounds, participants received summaries of ratings, comments, and suggestions, along with explanations of edits and additions made to practice titles and descriptions.

In round one, participants rated and commented on 10 practices. Each practice included a title and one to two sentence descriptions. Practices were crafted from the literature and intended to reflect both ambitious and more traditional teaching. Three of the initial practices were dropped for round two and eight new practices were added based upon the ratings and suggestions of panelists. In round two of the survey, participants rated and commented on 15 teaching practices. These practices were consolidated into 12 practices for round three.

After three rounds of the survey, strong consensus developed around nine practices:

- Use Historical Questions
- Select and Adapt Historical Sources
- Explain and Connect Historical Content
- Model and Support Historical Reading Skills
- Employ Historical Evidence
- Use Historical Concepts
- Facilitate Discussion of Historical Topics
- Model and Support Historical Writing
- Assess Student Thinking about History

The final average rating for these nine practice titles and their descriptions was 4.85 out of 5.00. For seven of these practices, ratings steadily increased and standard deviations decreased with revision, development, and consolidation across rounds.

In stark contrast to many group efforts focused on making history education decisions, this Delphi panel offered consistently constructive feedback and suggestions along with increasing amounts of agreement across rounds. The work of this panel is also unique in providing empirically based warrants for a coherent set of teaching practices that together represent a disciplinary, inquiry-based approach to teaching and learning history. Each of the practices crafted in this study can be further elaborated and validated. Nonetheless, as portraits of instructional practice, they can help teachers, teacher educators, and professional development providers plan, implement, and reflect upon ambitious, authentic history teaching. Moving forward, the results of this survey might also help focus study designs and assessment measures to examine the development of teacher practice and how these history teaching practices, or combinations of them, relate to students’ learning of prescribed textbook accounts, understanding of historians’ research practices, and understanding of themselves as historical thinkers and actors.

High School Students’ and Historians’ Ideas about Practices of Historical Storytelling

D. Kevin O’Neill, Laura D’Amico and Sheryl Guloy, Simon Fraser University

As Fogo discusses, ambitious history teaching aims to engage students in some of the disciplinary practices of historians, such as reasoning with primary-source evidence and writing accounts of the past. However these practices may make little sense to students who hold assumptions about historical accounts that are inconsistent with those of historians. For example, it is common for students to speak and act as if a historical account can tell exactly what happened in the past. Many historians consider this a naïve view, since any story must inevitably attend to some details and exclude others. A narrative must be selective; it simply cannot capture everything that happened. Students who expect a historical account to be a copy of the past will be left “helplessly shrugging their shoulders in the face of competing stories” (Lee & Shemilt 2004, p. 31) if their teachers ask them to examine sources without first addressing the reasons why historical accounts may differ.

We conducted in-depth interviews with five practicing historians and seven secondary school students about why historians tell different stories about the past. The data were collected during validation of an online survey that will enable teachers to quickly assess the epistemological assumptions about history that their students bring into class, and how these change through instruction (O'Neill, Guloy, and Sensoy in press). One question runs as follows:

If a historian is learning about the events of a period and finds two stories about them that disagree, what should she do? Rate each statement from 1 to 5 (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree):

- She should ignore both stories. It does not make sense for historians to disagree
- Try to figure out which author is less biased or was closer to the events, and use only that one
- Make an educated guess about what most likely happened, based on other evidence
- Learn about the authors and try to understand how they looked at and felt about the events

Our survey questions were informed by a popular theory which aims to describe the increasingly sophisticated ideas that students develop as they understand more about the nature of historians' research (Shemilt 1987). Shemilt's theory describes four discrete stages through which students progress, given appropriate learning experiences. Beginning with a naïve view that it is unproblematic for historians to know what happened, students can develop an appreciation that author bias and incomplete evidence produce important methodological challenges for them. At the apex of development, according to the theory, is the view that while bias and limited evidence are important, historians' accounts may also differ simply because they seek to answer different questions.

In addition to being useful in refining our survey instrument, the validation interviews provided a rare opportunity to examine and contrast how historians and students reacted to the theory embodied in it. In their interviews, our 5 historians (all tenure-track history professors whose specialties varied widely, including Latin American and Middle Eastern history) were asked to check whether the survey questions adequately reflected Shemilt's 4-stage theory. In explaining their judgments and offering refinements to the questions, the historians also reflected on the adequacy of the theory in describing their colleagues' practices, as well as the challenges they face in helping students understand and engage in those practices. On one hand, Shemilt's theory was seen to fit well with ideas that the historians recognized among their students, and even their colleagues:

Interviewer: Do you identify any of these statements with students that you are teaching or have taught?

Historian 5: Oh yeah! Oh yeah. In fact I have colleagues who are still at stages 1 and 2. Honestly.

On the other hand, historians identified several ways in which the theory's valuation of the most "sophisticated" understanding of historians' work was problematic. One interviewee (Historian 1) whose work focuses on 20th-century America, suggested that the time period under study was important to what one considers sophisticated, stating "it's probably more challenging for the medievalists to get the students to understand even that there *is* a historical debate." Another historian who studies Latin America identified social status as an important element in shaping people's sophistication with regard to varying historical accounts:

Historian 3: If you want to know about...the problems of perspective and truth and formal systems of understanding—talk to a Latin American woman. Or an indigenous person. They have a sophisticated understanding of account to the past and accounts of truth, that it is about the position that they occupy in society.

Finally, an interviewee who specialized in Middle East history suggested:

Historian 5: Particularly when it comes to...controversial subject matter, the notion that what you're teaching is in some fundamental way "true" becomes very important for many people.... There is something [bad] that happened, and as long as we get to the truth of what happened, then we can solve all these problems.

Our 7 high school students represented a wide range of academic ability and included recent immigrants. Recruited with the help of their teacher, they were asked to complete our survey while thinking aloud. Unsurprisingly, the high school students did not know enough about the varying specializations in history to see how a historian's specialization or audience might influence the value that is placed on different explanations of differing accounts. Students' ideas were instead largely shaped by their understandings of the unifying social function of history as taught in school (as discussed below by Goldberg). As they explained their

answers to us, their ideas about what historians do and *should* do came out clearly. Student 6 stated, “Some people can say really stupid things about what happened, and they know it’s not true, and the historian tries to see which one is actually the most proper story.” This and other answers stressed the importance of historians’ contribution to a national dialogue by “setting the story straight.”

Students also viewed historians’ accounts as identifying the mistakes that have been made in the past, in order to correct or avoid them in the future with improved laws and policies:

Student 2: I think historians are the people who try to improve our society by looking at what people did beforehand. And instead of more like interpreting that, they also try to use that to improve our society.

Straightening out competing stories, or getting “the whole story” by working methodically with a wide range of evidence and testimony, was viewed by the students as important for social cohesion:

Student 3: They should look more and find more evidence to make sure that evidence is true. So the citizens can know the true story.... Let’s say [some people claim] that it was their great, great, great grandfathers that made this place. Other people could say [the same thing] and they could get into a fight. And it could be a bad situation.

This view of the historian as a national or international referee (a role that many historians would disavow) may have been influenced by the nature of the social studies curriculum in our setting, which emphasizes diversity and inclusion. But as one of our historians reminded us, the nature of formal education itself can encourage a naïve view of historians’ practices:

Historian 3: Students struggle with...the idea of multiple, viable accounts [because] they’re in a class. They figure if they get the authoritative account, they’ll do well on the test.

All of these voices, students’ and historians’ together, prompt us to suggest that there is not a single pinnacle of historians’ practices that we can agree upon and initiate students into. Rather than viewing a learner’s understanding of historical research practices as developing along a single, linear scale as Shemilt conceived it (and which many history educators seem to accept), a better way to represent them may be as an interrelated system of beliefs, similar to what Schommer-Aikins (2004) has developed for more generic epistemological beliefs. Such a multidimensional way of understanding what students are learning about historians’ practices will be more able to accommodate the fact that the values historians (and teachers) associate with different epistemic practices are subject to a variety of competing contextual influences. This is the understanding that we are bringing to the design of our online survey, www.historyconcepts.org, which we hope will become a useful tool for history teachers at both the secondary and postsecondary levels.

Becoming Dialogical through Internally Persuasive Discourse with a Conflicting Other

Yifat Ben-David Kolikant and Sarah Pollack, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

As discussed in our introduction, encounters with Others can potentially broaden people’s horizons and enrich their experiences; but they can also pose conflicts and cause people to become entrenched in the local and the familiar (Hermans & Dimaggio, 2007). In such a reality, dialogicality becomes an important asset. School can educate students to become part of a more plural society by enhancing students’ ability and willingness to perceive, recognize, and deal with differences, conflicts, and opposition, and to arrive at workable solutions (Hermans & Dimaggio, 2007). Ideally, schools can facilitate students in exploiting the learning potential of these encounters. Specifically, the availability of myriad voices can serve as an opportunity for people to critically reflect on what they know (or think they know) in light of alternative viewpoints and the differing perspectives of others.

Internally Persuasive Discourse and the Doing History Together Project

The *Doing History Together* project (funded by the Israeli Science Foundation (ISF grant number 1236/09)) was launched as part of such an endeavor. In this project, students from opposite sides of a bi-national conflict collaboratively e-investigate a historical event from their in-groups’ shared troubled past. Our instructional model was inspired by Bakhtin’s (1981) dialogic stance, which states that our entire population exists in a continuous dialogue with the surrounding world. Bakhtin (1981) distinguished between two types of discourse:

authoritative discourse (AD) and *internally persuasive discourse* (IPD). In AD, utterances and their meaning are not negotiable, let alone modifiable, when interacting with another voice; rather, such discourse requires unconditional alliances (Wertsch, 1991). History education in many countries nurtures AD, by teaching national narratives such as truth and discouraging critical thinking, for example, by setting evaluation on multiple choice information-focused questions (Pingel, 2008).

In contrast, our model is aimed at provoking and encouraging students to critically examine their ontological truth—ideas, viewpoint, knowledge, beliefs, concerns and so forth—in light of alternatives presented by an Other, an interlocutor whose own ontological truth may differ and perhaps even be contradictory. Such a discourse is termed IPD by Bakhtin. The main role of the peer in our model is not to enable the group to achieve a joint goal, but rather, to create a dialogic agency in each other. We share Matusov's (2009) view that such a process can bring participants "to transcend their ontological circumstances" (ibid., p. 208), and become aware of the cultural bias associated with what they know or think they know as well as to be more tolerant of other viewpoints, even if they conflict with their own -- which might mitigate tensions within a diverse society.

We decided to test these ideas in history classes because history can serve as a powerful venue to establish IPD, given its multiplicity and interpretive nature (e.g., Seixas, 1993; Seixas and Peck, 2004; Wineburg, 2001). Historiography can be described as navigation among conflicting voices and languages (involving, *inter alia*, the voices of those who lived in the past, and the voices of other historians, cf. Wertsch, 1991). In other words, historiography is about IPD.

The activities emphasized multi-perspectivity. The students were given primary and secondary sources that all together presented multiple perspectives regarding the event and were asked to read the sources and compose accounts of the event, first in ethnically homogenous pairs and then in bi-ethnic quartets, comprising two pairs. The activity took place in a Wiki-like environment. Specifically, after uploading their essays to the wiki, each pair was asked to read and comment on the Other pair's essay, and then the foursomes (comprised of the two pairs) were instructed to collaboratively produce a joint essay, which could either contain one account agreed upon by all peers, or two (or more) answers followed by an analysis of the nature of the disagreement between them. To this end, the two pairs first communicated through the Wiki environment asynchronously, and after about two weeks through a 90-minute synchronous textual e-discussion.

The Study

In order to gain insights on the learning outcomes as well as on the learning processes that took place within the context of the activity, we investigated two enactments of the DHT model in Israel, in which 52 Israeli Jewish and 52 Israeli Arab/Palestinian students from 4 schools investigated events from the Israeli-Palestinian conflict's past. Enactment 1 concerned the issuance of Churchill's White paper (1922) issued by the British in face of the growing tension in the area, and enactment 2 concerned the issuance of the UNSCOP report, in 1947, in which the partition plan to divide the territory into two states was recommended and later accepted by the UN. Our main data sources were the essays (of the pairs and the foursome) as well as the transcripts of the textual e-discussions.

The Collaboration Process: From Authoritative Discourse to IPD

Thematic analysis of the pair essays reflected that the participants had employed an AD on the topic. Specifically, participants chose to include themes that were aligned with their in-group narrative and ignore those that did not. Themes that were common in the answers of Arab participants did not appear in the answers of the Jewish participants and vice versa. Such behavior is in line with the literature (Bar-tal & Salomon, 2006; Wertsch, 1998, 2000). This brought about two dichotomous interpretations of the event. Specifically, in the relational triangle among the British, Jewish, and Arab historical agents described by the Arab participants, the British historical agent supports the version of the Jewish agent at the expense of the Arab agent, who is discriminated against and whose rights are violated. In contrast, the Jewish participants described a relational triangle in which the British historical agent acts in an even-handed manner toward the Jewish and Arab historical agents.

Interestingly, however, although the participants were given an opportunity to write separate summaries, 58% of them produced joint essays that included one account apparently acceptable or tolerable for all four peers. We termed these joint texts *mosaics* because in their production the students used themes (or metaphorically, "bricks") taken from the two pairs' essays and interwove them into one joint account. These mosaics did not contradict either of the in-group historical (meta-)narratives. Namely, there was no evidence that the participants abandoned their in-group narratives. However, the joint accounts reflected improved perceptions of the historical agents, the constraints under which these agents operated, their interrelations, and an attribution of responsibility for the events to the historical agents in their own in-group as well. These accounts implied that IPD did occur among these participants. However, they transcended their one-dimensional

perception stemming from the homogeneous stage. The remaining 42% of the foursomes did not produce a joint essay, but rather, uploaded one or two of the pairs' essays, sometimes after it had been edited.

In order to shed light on the process by which these mosaics were produced as well as to better understand what impeded the production of joint essays in the other foursome, a discourse analysis was conducted on the transcripts' e-discussions of the foursome.

Except for two e-discussions in which one side expressed a muffled voice as if attempting to avoid a confrontation, all e-discussions were lively and collaborative. The historical discussions were for the most part disputatious. The most common collaboration process (found among 14 e-discussions) included three discursive stages. In Stage 1, the discussion was characterized by participants' parallel adoption of an AD-like interaction style, with participants getting their wires crossed. Each pair in the discussion viewed their opinion as the truth, which they must convey or explain to the other pair, who does not know or understand it. Apparently the participants continued the same AD that was expressed in their pair essays.

In Stage 2 the limits of the own viewpoints became apparent to the participants. Consequently, each tried to make his own voice approachable to the Other, by initiating a discussion on the meaning of ideas. In this phase, a two-sided examination of the event took place in a distributive manner. Participants examined their argument in light of "hits" by the Other: the flaws the Other detects in the argument and the alternatives he or she provides.

Finally, in Stage 3 fission occurred. We borrowed this term from the field of physics, where it denotes a process in which an atom's structure becomes unstable as a result of a hit by an external neutron. In our metaphor, we envision "cracks" forming in one's narrative, one's truth, hitherto primarily shaped by surrounding in-group narratives as the Other arguments "hit" it. Fissions are those moments when the familiar and up-to-that-moment reasonable truth is seriously re-examined. In these e-discussions IPD occurs.

Usually (13 out of the 14 e-discussions) this stage was followed by an organizational episode, in which one side suggested a mosaic-like text segment for the joint account that took into consideration the Other's perceptive. Usually, this text was accepted by the Other peers. Two other mosaics were constructed by a process resembling that described extensively in the literature, for example, by Roschelle and Teasley (1992), whereby the group's mutual engagement is around a shared goal. The remaining 8 e-discussions were characterized by cycles of dispute (resembling stage 1), in which no collaborative elaboration took place. These e-discussions resulted in zero joint essays.

In light of the above, we can view all the mosaic-like essays as products of elaborative e-discussions. Although they align with both in-group narratives, they do not represent an offhanded compromise, but rather a change in students' discourse from AD to IPD. Through these e-discussions students had an opportunity to re-examine their truths in light of alternative truths presented by another, and as they learned the limitations of their voices, and witnessed the tenability of the Other's voice to their "attacks," they became more tolerant of the existence of Other, conflicting voices, thus allowing them to co-exist in their joint essays. These mosaics thus represent a more multi-faceted understanding of the historical events studied, gained through IPD. These findings strengthen our belief that continuous participation in dialogic activities such as in the doing-history-together project will encourage and facilitate students to become more dialogical, more respectful of diverse opinions, and thereby facilitate a plural, tolerant society.

Becoming a Dialogical Illocutor through Disciplinary Practice

Tsafrir Goldberg, University of Haifa

The field of history education has witnessed some vociferous controversies about the feasibility and desirability of attempting to engage students in historical critical thinking practices. Of particular relevance to this symposium, scholars have questioned whether students can become both "little historians," analyzing sources and meta-narratives critically, *and* loyal members of their collective at the same time (Linenthal & Englehardt, 1996; Naveh & Yogeve, 2002; Shemilt, 2000). This question is echoed in the contribution of O'Neill, D'Amico and Guloy above.

The issue of engagement with conflicting meta-narratives has also been at the center of attention in peace education. In the last decade it was claimed that historical narratives serve to legitimize and prolong inter-group conflicts (Bar-Tal & Salomon, 2006). Generally, collectives tend to promulgate an authoritative self-justifying historical narrative through commemoration and history teaching, which tends to ignore or denigrate out-group perspectives (Ferro, 1984). It is assumed that engagement with and acknowledgement of out-group narrative would lead to better intergroup dialogue (Bar-On & Adwan, 2006). Thus it appears that historical sense making practices such as critical analysis of conflicting accounts may serve not just in induction into the community of practice, but also in bridging between conflicting collective identities (McCully, 2010).

Thus for example, Barton and McCully (2010) reported the evolving Internally Persuasive Discourse among adolescents in Northern Ireland while engaged in disciplinary critical inquiry of the Protestant and Catholic historical perspective. Ben-David Kolikant and Pollack report similar development in an Israeli

context. However, most of the writing on this potential outcome remains theoretical or anecdotal. Hardly any of the writing on the topic used empirical methods or compared effects to those of conventional history teaching or to a control group.

To fill this gap, a study in a quasi-experimental random allocation design compared the effects of studying a conventional, authoritative textbook history of the Jewish Arab conflict with the effects of engaging in critical disciplinary practices with sources on the topic. Israeli–Palestinian and Israeli-Jewish adolescents were randomly allocated to one of the two learning conditions, in which they individually studied the causes of the 1948 Jewish-Arab War and the birth of the Palestinian refugee problem. Prior to and following the learning intervention they wrote essays representing their perception of the topic, and filled questionnaires regarding in-group identification and interest in out-group. Compositions were analyzed to track socio-cognitive bias, responsibility attribution and argumentative structure.

Two weeks later participants proceeded to engage in bi-national small group conversations about the historical topic and about possible solutions to the problem. Discussions were recorded, transcribed and analyzed for discussion style and joint decision-making, which were compared between the two learning conditions and with those of a control group.

Analysis of individual written work showed a marginally significant difference in the frequency of social cognition bias between learning conditions. The Conventional learning condition presented a higher frequency of attribution bias compared to the Critical Disciplinary condition. There was no significant difference between the learning conditions in argumentative structure or attribution of responsibility.

Analysis of bi-national discussions showed a significant difference between the learning conditions in social domination and in the frequency of joint decision-making. The conventional authoritative learning condition featured a higher frequency of domination by the Jewish participants and a lower frequency of joint decisions about the historical topic and about the future than both the critical disciplinary condition and the control. It also appears that Jewish participants in the critical disciplinary condition presented a more evaluative epistemic stance towards sources than participants in the conventional condition, aligning with the higher conceptualization of historian's practice by adolescents reported in O'Neill's study.

These findings taken as a whole may be interpreted to imply that engagement in disciplinary practice promoted learners' "disciplinary" identity to a certain degree, as indicated by lower socio-cognitive bias and evaluative-epistemic stance. It may be that such an engagement in community of practice can explain the more collaborative and rational bi-national dialogues (Driver et al, 2000). This interpretation appears to be aligned with Ben-David Kolikant & Pollack's findings about the relation between engagement in practice and dialogicality. Thus it seems that becoming a more dialogic inter-community illocutor may have been achieved through engaging in disciplinary practice or becoming a member in a disciplinary community. By contrast, it seems that conventional history teaching may impede both engagement in disciplinary community and in cross community negotiation.

Implications

The contributions to this symposium address in different ways the challenges that students face in doing the difficult identity work that a diverse, connected global society requires of them. Previous research suggests that schools, teachers and parents often make demands that emphasize students becoming loyal members of national or regional groups, ethnic groups or classes, and/or academic high-achievers. At times, these demands can grate against the extra-national disciplinary norms that history education scholars and master history teachers would prefer to emphasize. Fogo's work reveals a strong consensus among the participants in his Delphi study regarding the place that historical research practices should have in history classrooms. However, the nine core practices he lists are anything but common in many history classrooms today, partly because many teachers (at least in the U.S. and Canada) have little background in the discipline of history (Ravitch 2000). O'Neill, D'Amico and Guloy's research sheds light on the gulf of understanding that this state of affairs creates between academic historians and students in mainstream high school history classes. However, the contributions of Goldberg and Ben-David Kolikant and Pollack provide evidence that creative pedagogical designs that emphasize disciplinary norms can succeed in better equipping students to navigate claims to their loyalty and identity - even under circumstances of deeply entrenched historical conflict.

We hope the unique plan we have in place for organizing our session, together with the participation of our discussant and co-facilitator Abby Reisman will enable conference attendees to participate with us in developing a better understanding of the challenges and opportunities of learning and becoming that school history presents.

References

Bain, R. (2006). Rounding up unusual suspects: Facing the authority hidden in the history classroom. *Teachers College Record*, 108(10), 2080–2114.

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ball, D., & Forzani, F. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 497–511
- Bar-On, D. & Adwan S. (2006), the Psychology of a better dialogue between two separate but interdependent narratives, in R.I. Rothberg, (Ed.), *Israeli and Palestinian narratives of conflict: History's double helix*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 205-224.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Salomon, G. (2006). Israeli-Jewish narratives of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: Evolution, contents, functions, and consequences. In R. I. Rothberg (Ed.), *Israeli and Palestinian narratives of conflict: History's double helix* (pp.19-46). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Barton, K. C., & McCully, A. W. (2010). You can form your own point of view: Internally persuasive discourse in Northern Ireland students' encounters with history. *Teachers College Record*, 112(1), 142–181.
- Brophy, J., & VanSledright, B. (1997). *Teaching and learning history in elementary schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Clayton, M. (1997). Delphi: A technique to harness expert opinion for critical decision - making tasks in education. *Educational Psychology*, 17(4), 373–386.
- Coles, R. (2000). *The political life of children*. Boston, MA: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Davis, O., Yeager, E., & Foster, S. (2001). *Historical empathy and perspective taking in the social studies*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Driver, R., Newton, P., & Osborne, J. (2000). Establishing the norms of scientific argumentation in classrooms. *Science Education*, 84, 287–312.
- Evans, R. (1990). History, ideology and social responsibility. *Social Science Record*, 27(2), 11–17.
- Ferro, M. (1984). *The use and abuse of history, or, how the past is taught*. London: Routledge
- Fiske, S. T. (2002). What we know now about bias and intergroup conflict, the problem of the century. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11, 123-128.
- Fogo, B. (2014). Core practices for teaching history: The results of a Delphi panel survey. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 42, 151-196.
- Goldberg, T., Schwarz, B.B & Porat, D. (2008) Living and dormant collective memories as contexts of history learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 18, 223-237.
- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching*, 15(2), 273–289.
- Hermans, H. J. M., & Dimaggio, G. (2007). Self, identity, and globalization in times of uncertainty: A dialogical analysis. *Review of General Psychology*, 11(1), 31–61.
- Kazemi, E., Franke, M., & Lampert, M. (2009). Developing pedagogies in teacher education to support novice teachers' ability to enact ambitious instruction. In *Crossing divides (Proceedings of the 32nd annual conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia, pp. 11–29)*. Palmerston North, NZ: MERGA.
- Kuhn, D., Weinstock, M., & Flaton, R. (1994). Historical reasoning as theory-evidence coordination. In M. Carretero and J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Cognitive and instructional processes in history and the social sciences* (pp. 377–402). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Loewen, J. W. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- MacMillan, Margaret. 2008. *The uses and abuses of history*. Toronto: Penguin.
- Matusov, E. (2009). *Journey into dialogic pedagogy*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Publishers.
- McCully, A. (2010) The contribution of history to peace building. In G. Salomon and E. Cairns (Eds.). *Handbook on peace education*. New York: Psychology Press, 213-222.
- Naveh, E., & Yogeve, E. (2002). Historiot: Likrat dialog im ha'etmol. [Histories: towards a dialog with yesterday]. (Hebrew) Tel-Aviv, Israel: Bavel.
- O'Neill, D.K., S Guloy, and Ö Sensoy. (in press). Strengthening methods for assessing students' metahistorical conceptions: Initial development of the historical account differences survey. *The Social Studies*.
- Pingel, F. (2008). Can truth be negotiated? History textbook revision as a means to reconciliation, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 617(1), 181-198.
- Ravitch, D. (2000). The educational backgrounds of history teachers. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching and learning history: National and international perspectives*. New York: New York University Press.
- Roschelle, J. & Teasley S.D. (1995) The construction of shared knowledge in collaborative problem solving. In C.E. O'Malley (Ed), *Computer-supported collaborative learning* (pp. 69-197). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Schommer-Aikins, M. (2004). Explaining the Epistemological Belief System: Introducing the Embedded Systemic Model and Coordinated Research Approach. *Educational Psychologist*, 39(1), 19-29.

- Seixas, P. (1993). Historical understanding among adolescents in a multicultural setting. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 23(3), 301–327.
- Seixas, P., & Peck, C. (2004). Teaching historical thinking. In A. Sears & I. Wright (Eds.), *Challenges and prospects for Canadian social studies* (pp. 109–117). Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.
- Shemilt, D. (1987). Adolescent ideas about evidence and methodology in History. In *The History curriculum for teachers*, edited by Christopher Portal, 39–61. London, England: Falmer.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- VanSledright, B. (2011). *The challenge of rethinking history education: On practices, theories, and policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wertsch, J. (2000). Is it possible to teach beliefs, as well as knowledge about history? In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history* (pp. 38–50). New York: New York University Press.
- Wilson, S. (2001). Research on history teaching. In *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 527–544). American Educational Research Association.
- Wineburg, S.S. (1999). Historical thinking and other unnatural acts. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 80, 488–499.
- Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.