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ABSTRACT

This action research study examined the impact of the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) on how students interacted with actual and virtual historical sites and museums. From September 2017 to May 2018, students engaged in analysis and evaluation of online exhibits and actual sites in the Washington, DC, and Columbia, South Carolina, areas using the 32 prompt HTM guide. The HTM was designed to develop not only students’ analytical abilities but also consideration of social justice issues such as racism and sexism in the exhibition and memorialization of history. Using qualitative data from student HTM guides, papers, teacher observations, and written interviews, I will modify future cycles of this action research study to make both actual and virtual trips to historical sites and museums into lessons on historical thinking. I will also share my findings, the HTM, and list of resources with colleagues at my school and beyond so that others can help students develop their historical thinking skills even if socio-economic factors make off-campus trips unlikely.
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1.1 Introductory Background

Chapter 1 of this Dissertation in Practice describes an action research study that intended to change field studies to historical sites and museums into opportunities for students to develop their historical thinking. The best teachers are introspective thinkers engaged in an ongoing “critical examination of one’s own practice” (Mertler, 2014, p. 44), and an effective and systematic method to do so is through action research. One way to identify a pedagogical area needing improvement is by “exploring the relationship between your beliefs and practice” (Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014, p. 48). While I would like to claim my classroom stresses historical inquiry, I must admit that historical content often receives much more emphasis. Furthermore, even when I have taken my students off campus to see where important history took place, I have most often failed to capitalize on these opportunities to encourage higher level thinking.

In social studies, there is a tendency to emphasize content. State standards often expect teachers to cover centuries of material resulting in a curriculum that is “a mile wide and an inch deep.” For example, in South Carolina, sixth grade teachers are expected to cover “Early Cultures to 1600,” seventh grade “Contemporary Cultures: 1600 to the Present,” and eighth grade “South Carolina: One of the United States” from the Pre-Columbian period to the present (South Carolina Department of Education, 2011). While the state’s support documents help make the content more manageable, they are
still rather lengthy (sixth grade 76 pages, seventh grade 102 pages, and eighth grade 126 pages). The emphasis is on narrative and facts, which are tested by the Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS) each spring, although the 2017-2018 school year only evaluated seventh grade social studies (South Carolina Department of Education, n.d.b; 2017).

Traditional methods to “cover” this content are lectures and a strong dependence upon textbooks. While there are no studies examining the pedagogy of South Carolina social studies teachers, Bolinger and Warren (2007) conducted a study in which they surveyed 420 elementary, middle, and high school teachers in the Vigo County School Corporation in Indiana. These teachers had an average of 15 plus years of teaching experience and over half had master’s degrees. With only 140 teachers returning the survey (38 of whom were secondary teachers), the study’s results lack generalizability, but the findings were interesting. When asked what they thought were effective teaching methods, secondary teachers (who could write more than one answer) listed lecture (63%), discussion (31.5%), projects (18.4%), and cooperative learning and debate (15.8% each), with worksheets outranking research by 13% to 11.4% (p. 81). When I first began working on this action research study, my curriculum included lectures and outlines, but I wanted to incorporate more hands-on activities and inquiry, especially during trips to historical sites and museums.

The use of museum trips was not even mentioned by secondary teachers in the Bolinger and Warren (2007) study. However, Marcus, Levine, and Grenier (2012) conducted a survey of Connecticut social studies teachers on their use of museums, and it was found that while they did take students on trips, on average they did not have
students critically examine how these sites portrayed history. I wanted to change this about my own practice and used action research to do so.

1.2 Problem of Practice Statement

My Problem of Practice was the need to transform field studies into opportunities for students to engage in historical thinking. Each year, I usually take around 70 eighth grade students in The Academic Magnet at Peer Middle School (pseudonyms and referred to hereafter as TAM and PMS, respectively) on a four-or-five-day trip to Washington, DC where students visit history sites such as the Capitol, the Supreme Court, the Smithsonian’s Air and Space Museum, the National Archives, the Holocaust Museum, Ford’s Theatre, and numerous memorials. Over the years there have been other field trips to various destinations as well.

Often, I have used a field study guide or project containing content and sometimes higher-level thinking prompts to direct students in what they needed to do while there or upon their return. Other years, students did nothing or very little during a field study, which I may or may not have examined or graded. Instead, I have trusted students to learn from walking around on their own or from the docents, re-enactors, and activities provided by the sites themselves. Even then, I have not been strict with enforcing student attention during free time at the sites. While I wanted students to have the freedom to explore the different sites, some structure needed to be imposed so that adolescents, prone to socializing, shopping, and sitting or lying down, also authentically interact with sites, artifacts, and other primary/secondary sources. In a comprehensive effort to revise my curriculum to emphasize inquiry and make my pedagogical practice more organized,
focused, and intentional, it was important that field studies reinforced the development of historical thinking.

In addition to the immediacy of the problem of practice as described above, there was a long-term component impacting students themselves. Rosenzweig and Thelen’s (1998) study revealed that 57% of Americans had toured a historical site or museum within the last year and that they rated the reliability of museums as 8.4 on a 10 point scale (pp. 241, 244). The problem is that museums are not as objective or accurate as this trust implies. Loewen (1999) stressed that many historical sites emphasize white male privilege and accomplishments while leaving out or distorting those of African Americans, Native Americans, and women. In fact, “the history written on the American landscape is largely the history of the federal governments – United States of America and Confederate States of America – and particularly of their wars” (Loewen, 1999, p. 5). Students need to approach these sites with some skepticism and understand that these places “are interpreters of history and recognize the political, social, and economic factors that influence them” (Marcus, 2007, p. 106). If students are not taught the interpretive aspect of historical sites and museums, they could grow into adults who accept things at face value without asking questions. Analyzing such places will help develop their thinking skills, which they will be able to apply to other areas of society. Barton and Levstik (2004) argued that the point of teaching history is to help people “recognize that citizens enter the public sphere with deeply felt, and potentially conflicting, conceptions of the collective future, and that the purpose of democratic politics is to develop shared interests and visions,’’ which they called “the common good” (p. 34). Critical thinking skills, empathy, and a sense of justice for all social
groups are necessary for this to be accomplished, and intentional pedagogy using historical sites and museums can help guide students in this direction. If I fail to do my part in developing students’ historical thinking, then I will be contributing to the poor citizens they might become.

**The research site.** Peer Middle School (PMS) is the oldest middle school in a suburban district in South Carolina and exhibits wide racial and socio-economic diversity. As of November 2017, PMS educated 1258 students composed of 638 females and 620 males with 400 sixth graders, 446 seventh graders, and 412 eighth graders. The largest group was 773 African Americans (61.4%) followed by 215 Whites (17.1%), 142 Hispanics (11.3%), 84 Asians (6.7%), 34 students who consider themselves as belonging more than one race (2.7%), 7 Native Hawaiians or Pacific Islanders (0.6%), and 3 American Indians or Alaska Natives (0.2%; Pearson School Systems Power School, 2017a, Nov. 13).

The school has three magnet programs - The Academic Magnet (as mentioned earlier, a pseudonym referred to as TAM), the Single Gender School (a pseudonym and referred to as SGS), and a fine arts magnet open to everyone attending PMS. Like other middle school magnet programs in the district, both TAM and SGS use standardized test scores, a teacher recommendation, grades, a group problem-solving activity, an interview, and a timed writing sample in their selection of students. These two programs dramatically change the socio-economic demographics of the school. Without TAM or SGS, the percentage of African American students would increase dramatically by almost 15 points (61.4% to 76.3%) while the White population would experience a decrease of nearly 11 percentage points (17.1% to 6.2%). The Asian population would also drop by
5.3 percentage points from 6.7% to 1.4%, but Hispanic students would increase slightly from 11.3% to 13.2%. Finally, other ethnic groups would experience a very slight decrease of about a half percentage point from 3.5% to 2.9% (Pearson School Systems Power School, 2017a, Nov. 13; 2017b, Nov. 13; 2017, Nov. 15). While the 2017-2018 statistics for free-reduced meals are not readily available, a 2015 Richland School District Two report stated that the school’s population qualifying for free-reduced meals would increase from over half to 83% without TAM or SGS students (p. 3). These two programs have a significant impact on the racial and socio-economic composition of the school.

**The student-participants.** The student-participants in this action research project were eighth grade students in TAM. While I had all of my students analyze historical sites and museums using the HTM, I selected just one of my classes to collect and evaluate the data for this action research study. The class was made up of 15 students (6 females and 9 males) aged 13 and 14 years. Racially, there were 6 Asians, 5 Whites, 3 African Americans, and 1 student of two or more races (Pearson School System Power School, n.d.). This sample was an advanced group of readers with a mean reading percentile of 94.2% on the September 2017 administration of the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP). Their scores ranged from a low of 83% to a high of 99%. In fact, only three students scored in the 80th percentile while the remaining 12 placed in the 90th percentile (Frontline Education, 2016). Limiting my data collection to one class provided ample qualitative data that could be analyzed in a reasonable manner than four full classes of 71 students.
The role of the teacher. Within TAM, I teach eighth grade social studies – a South Carolina and U.S. history survey course. In educational research, there are different ways a researcher can approach his or her student-participants. Mertler (2014) discussed a spectrum of “Observer . . . Observer as Participant . . . Participant as Observer . . . Full Participant” (p. 94, Figure 4.1). In the role of the first two, a teacher-researcher has little, if any, interaction with students. These roles were neither realistic nor desired in this case. Because the goal of this action research study was to improve instruction by making field studies into opportunities for students to develop historical thinking and I was responsible for teaching students, it would be neither sensible nor ethical for me to step back and only watch the students attempt to engage in historical inquiry. In fact, one problematic aspect of my teaching was that I did not involve myself as much as I should when my students were working with primary sources. Often these were assigned as in-class work or homework rather than interactive activities with close teacher monitoring. For this action research study, I needed to be a full participant who “is first and foremost part of the group . . . who also happens to be collecting data on the group” (Mertler, 2014, p. 94). This approach allowed me to play an active role in the students’ learning by asking guiding questions or providing didactic instruction as needed. While doing so, I recorded my observations in a field journal.

1.3 Research Question

In an effort to transform field studies into historical inquiry exercises, the research question for this action research project was:
**RQ1:** How does the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) change eighth grade students into critical thinkers during field experiences at historical sites and museums?

Before proceeding further, it is necessary to examine several components of the Research Question by defining four key terms – historical/critical thinking, field experiences, historical sites, and museums.

*Historical/critical thinking* means the critical reasoning process historians use in their examination of sources (both primary and secondary in text, images, recordings, and artifacts) to reconstruct, interpret, and evaluate the past. The literature also uses other terms such as *inquiry* or *historical reasoning* (for the former, see Barton & Levstik, 2004, pp. 185-194; for the latter, consult van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008). It also includes the idea of “empathy, or historical perspective-taking . . . [which] is the ability to see and understand the world from a perspective not our own” (Seixas & Peck, 2004, p. 113). In this action research study, historical thinking involves six C’s – creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism. Consequently, each of these has a separate section in the Historical Thinking Method for Historical Sites and Museums (HTM), which may be found in Appendix A.

To help students cover each type of thinking in their analysis, the HTM provides prompts - creation (eleven prompts), context (two prompts), content (eight prompts), connection (five prompts), corroboration (three prompts), and criticism (three prompts). Students used this instrument to analyze a historical site, museum display, monument, etc., which were referred to as “exhibits.” Text, visual images, artifacts, sculpture, and architectural elements were referenced as “items.”
While Chapter 2 discusses the literature behind the HTM (Baron 2012; Barton & Levstik, 2004; Marcus, Stoddard, & Woodward, 2012; Stanford History Education Group, n.d.; Wineburg, 1991, 2001), and Chapter 3 discusses the instrument itself in greater depth, a brief introduction of it is provided here. The first component, *creation*, is concerned with the basic details of who, what, when, where, and why of an exhibit’s origins and the students’ initial thoughts about the historical topic. *Context* addresses how the exhibit fits into the larger historical settings of its topic and when it was created. *Content* involves examining points of view present and absent; evidence and information; issues concerning race or sex/gender; and unanswered questions. As students analyzed an exhibit, they began to make *connections* by considering their own viewpoints and reactions, its similarities or relevance to a contemporary topic, and what could be done in response. Students then moved on to judge an exhibit’s reliability, called *corroboration*, by comparing and contrasting it to other sources of information and considering its biases and evidence. Finally, students engaged in *criticism* or evaluation of the positive and negative features of an exhibit. The HTM guide was the central analysis tool of this study and helped students think critically about historical sites and museums rather than browse a site as a casual tourist.

*Field experiences* is another phrase for field trips or studies, and these three terms should be considered synonymous. Because trips off campus can only take place a few times a year, this action research study used both actual and virtual sites. The former involved traveling to the physical location of a historical site or museum while the latter had a number of meanings. First, virtual may refer to an online source which may or may not have a physical location as well. For example, museums sometimes put exhibits on
their websites. Second, virtual may involve students examining digital photographs of an exhibition on a screen or as printed copies they can handle. In other words, virtual should be understood as ways students interacted with historical sites or museums without physically going to their actual geo-spatial locations.

Among the sources historians can use are historical sites and museums. While these are listed separately, the two are interrelated. In fact, Marcus, Stoddard, and Woodward (2012) stated museums should be thought of to “include artifact- and display-based museums, state history museums, historic forts, house museums, living history museums, memorials, monuments, and other heritage sites” (p. 5). Furthermore, many museums provide online virtual field studies or will send staff or curriculum to school sites (Marcus, Stoddard, & Woodward, 2012). This broader understanding of the term museum is important as one reads the details of this action research study.

The goal of this action research project was to apply historical inquiry to the examination of actual and virtual historical sites and museums. Marcus (2007) suggested that museums be treated as sources themselves. Too often teachers take students to historical sites and museums so they can learn more history and see where events took place. Neither of those goals is necessarily wrong, but the location could be used to emphasize thinking rather than just content. Museums could be “criticized as artifacts and subjective representations of the past” (Marcus, 2007, p. 106). After examining how historical sites often struggle over their role as educational facilities versus businesses, whether their mission is to be museums or memorials, and the pressure of political and popular support of or opposition to certain exhibits, Marcus (2007) suggested that teachers have students examine these aforementioned issues as well as the thought
process behind the development of exhibits and the perspectives that are not included. Considering that one study found people believed museums were better sources of information than books or teachers (Rosenzweig, 2000, p. 273), it is important that students learn to interrogate museums critically.

1.4 Purpose Statement

The primary purpose of this action research project was to implement the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) with secondary students as they visited actual and virtual historical sites and museums. The secondary purpose was to lay the foundation for them to become critical consumers of public history as they grow into adult citizens. The final purpose was to develop an action plan to share with other social studies teachers who want to develop students’ historical thinking skills when interacting with actual and virtual historical sites and museums.

There were both pedagogical and practical reasons for why this action research study was significant and justified. Pedagogically, both national social studies organizations and the state of South Carolina recognize the importance of historical thinking. The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS, 2013) has stressed the importance of “the application of knowledge . . . [to] develop questions and plan inquiries; apply disciplinary concepts and tools; evaluate and use evidence; and communicate conclusions and take informed action” (p. 7). Notice what was not listed – the accumulation of a vast reservoir of facts. What is troubling is that one of the common field trip exercises is the scavenger hunt, which is little more than a timed fact-finding venture. While it can be a fun experience that forces students to focus on a museum’s exhibits, a scavenger hunt fails to develop critical thinking skills. Similarly, the National
Council for History Education (NCHE, n.d.) has advocated for historical thinking in *History’s Habits of Mind*, which recommended that students be able to:

- Perceive past events and issues as they might have been experienced by the people of the time, with historical empathy rather than present-mindedness.
- Read critically, to discern differences between evidence and assertion and to frame useful and appropriate questions about the past.
- Interrogate texts and artifacts, posing questions about the past that foster informed discussion, reasoned debate and evidence-based interpretation (3rd, 4th, & 5th Habits).

Both the NCSS and NCHE have stressed the importance of cognition in the teaching and learning of history.

Finally, the South Carolina Department of Education (2011) has also included historical thinking in its “Social Studies Literacy Skills for the Twenty-First Century,” requiring that students be able to “evaluate multiple points of view or biases,” “analyze evidence, arguments, claims, and beliefs,” (p. 126) and “cite specific textual evidence to support the analysis of primary and secondary sources” (p. 129). Both the private and public sectors of history education, at the national and state levels, are in agreement that students need to think in social studies and not just master factual information.

However, teachers often do not use historical sites and museum field studies to work on these skills. In a previously mentioned survey of 94 Connecticut social studies teachers on their use of museums, it was found that on average they “rarely” or “sometimes” required “students to evaluate or analyze the way a museum presents the past (e.g., ideology of the museum, potential political influences on the museum,
perspectives included and/or left out, etc.)” (Marcus, Levine, & Grenier, 2012, p. 83). While the generalizability of this study needs confirmation by more research, I must admit that I have rarely, if at all, used historical sites or museums this way and have missed rich opportunities to have students engage in historical thinking, a characteristic of best practices and encouraged in the national and state standards.

Another reason for transforming field studies into inquiry exercises was because visiting historical sites and museums can be an important experience that leads to life-long learning. Dewey (1938) stated that teachers “should know how to utilize the surroundings, physical and social, that exist so as to extract from them all that they have to contribute to building up experiences that are worth while” (p. 40). Field studies can meet these criteria in a variety of ways. For some students, a trip to a historical site or museum can pique a life-long curiosity of the past. In my case, a fifth grade field trip to Washington, DC included a visit to Ford’s Theatre where I stared at the gun used to assassinate Lincoln. That experience contributed to a fascination with history that flowered into a career. However, even if a love for history is not sown in the minds of students, the critical thinking skills developed during historical site and museum visits can play a valuable role. Because of their ability to question and think critically, students will not “become easy marks for snake-oil vendors of all persuasions” (Wineburg, 2001, p. 83). VanSledright (2004) argued the same point when he contended that “historical thinkers are tolerant of differing perspectives . . . [and] are skilled at detecting spin, hype, snake-oil sales, pitches, disguised agendas, veiled partisanship, and weak claims” (p. 232). Such a view of historical sites is consistent with the New London Group’s (1996) emphasis that “multiliteracies . . . creates [sic] a different kind of pedagogy, one in which
language and other modes of meaning are dynamic representational resources, constantly being remade by their users as they work to achieve their various cultural purposes” (p. 64). In the case of historical sites, creators certainly have a “cultural purpose” in depicting history a certain way, and those visiting these sites read and interpret these sites based on their own cultural understanding of the past and present. Making students aware of the subjectivity of historical sites and teaching them literacy skills in reading them is important when one realizes that it is very likely that museums will be an important source of knowledge exploration in the future. Only about 17% of Americans formally study U.S. history beyond high school (Loewen, 1999, as cited in Marcus, Stoddard, & Woodward, 2012, p. 8), while in 2006, nearly 150 million adults visited some type of museum (Griffiths & King, 2008, as cited in Marcus, Stoddard, & Woodward, 2012, p. 8). Hopefully, the critical thinking skills students learned in my class will serve them well in their future visits.

Finally, it was important that the results of this action research study be disseminated beyond my classroom and students. While I was most concerned with solving a pedagogical problem in my own curriculum, it is likely that others may have similar issues. Mertler (2014) agreed:

Simply because you have undertaken this project in order to help you solve a problem that is more local and perhaps more personal in nature does not mean that no one else will be interested in the results that you have obtained. The vast majority of educators are constantly looking for ways to improve their practice . . . it is the nature of their profession. (p. 43)
Consequently, I will develop an action research plan to share the results of the study, the HTM, and other resources with colleagues on the school, district, state, and potentially, national levels.

1.5 Social Justice Issues

Dana and Yendol-Hoppey (2014) observed that action research “may come from your desire to effect social change by exploring questions of race, class, gender, or ability” (p. 56). While this “passion” was not the impetus for my choice of topic, I have come to believe social justice is an important subject that can be promoted in my use of historical sites and museums to teach historical thinking.

Social justice is a broad topic touching on a number of issues, but it can be succinctly defined as the “full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs” (Bell, 2013, p. 21). The opposite is oppression, and many groups historically and presently have felt its devastating effects for “the characteristics of this system were built long before we existed, based upon history, habit, tradition, patterns of belief, prejudices, stereotypes, and myths” (Harro, 2013, p. 47). The content of my course, South Carolina and U.S. history, easily lends itself to an examination of two forms of oppression – racism and sexism. Even a cursory examination of United States history reveals countless examples of both (Lipsitz, 2013; Roppolo, 2013; Weber & Shrum, 2010).

To facilitate effectively the analysis of oppression and social justice, I must also address what Williams (2013) labeled “The Emperor’s New Clothes” – white privilege. Lipsitz (2013) observed that “as the unmarked category against which difference is constructed, whiteness never has to speak its name, never has to acknowledge its role as
an organizing principle in social and cultural relations” (pp. 77-78). When it comes to teaching history, one can often add “maleness” to the picture. For example, a close examination of the South Carolina state standards for social studies supports the primacy of white male privilege.

**Social justice and the curriculum.** There are seven broad standards and 39 indicators providing greater specificity. If one just looks for names (including individuals named in court cases) in these indicators, seven white men, four black men, and three black women are mentioned. Noticeably absent are white women. Now, there are some people who are referenced collectively such as the state’s signers of the Declaration of Independence, the four white leaders at the Constitutional Convention, the white Doolittle Raiders, and the black Tuskegee Airmen (South Carolina Department of Education, 2011, pp. 60-70). However, when one examines the support document, which provides more detail about what each indicator means, the picture is quite different. Excluding court cases but not adjectival uses of names, 62 white men, 9 black men, 5 white women, and 5 black women are mentioned (South Carolina Department of Education, n.d.b). While much of this is because white men welded political, social, and financial power, the indicators could have included more variety. It brings to mind one of McIntosh’s (1990) examples: “When I am told about our national [or state] heritage or about ‘civilization,’ I am shown that people of my color made it what it is” (p. 31).

**Social justice and the historical thinking method.** An important objective was for students to learn how to analyze a historical site or museum exhibit addressing the 6 C’s of the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) - creation, context, content, connection,
corroboration, and criticism. In the section labeled “Content,” their analyses directly examined racism and sexism in prompts 17 and 18:

17) What viewpoints or perspectives are NOT addressed in this exhibit? These could include those of women, other minority groups, or other interpretations of the topic.

18) How does the exhibit relate positively or negatively to race or sex/gender?

The five questions under “Connection” also required students to think about their own views on the exhibit’s topic, how it might be connected to something today, and what they might do to address it. As students examined historical sites and museum exhibits, I wanted to help them make connections in the present with past racial and sex/gender issues. These questions were as follows:

22) How is the exhibit’s viewpoint or perspective similar to or different from your own?

23) What personal influences have led you to having your viewpoint or perspective?

24) What emotions and/or thoughts do you experience as you analyze what this exhibit tells you about the past? What in the exhibit prompts this reaction?

25) Explain any connection you can make from this exhibit to the present day.

26) Explain what you might do about this connection.

Stone (2007) in his analysis of Dewey’s view of history stated that “thinking, which always occurs in the present, begins with a troublesome situation about some past situation which we wish to lay to rest in the present” (p. 177). The above questions
Social justice in museums. Social justice also intersects with using field studies to teach historical thinking when it comes to the analysis of how race and gender are portrayed at historical sites and in museums. The South Carolina State Museum is a good example. While the prehistoric, colonial, Revolutionary, antebellum, and Civil War periods are chronologically addressed, the rest of the Palmetto state’s history is glossed over with exhibits that fail to tell even close to the full story. In fact, while the state’s economic history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is covered in more depth on the floor below, on the history level African American achievements during Reconstruction, the sad legacy of Ben Tillman’s racist regime, and the civil rights movement are not addressed. One step in the right direction is a temporary exhibit entitled “South Carolina and Reconstruction, 1865-1876” that examines it more closely (Mack, 2018, May 23-29). In the meantime, among the permanent exhibits are the two Confederate flags that hung in the South Carolina House of Representatives and the Senate and the one that flew over the State House dome, which are featured in a prominent exhibit, compliments of a bill passed by the General Assembly in 2000. Despite women playing an important role in the fight for civil rights and even reaching the highest levels of government as the state’s lieutenant governor, chief justice, and governor, no space is provided to these achievements. As of 2015, some women and African Americans were featured at the South Carolina Hall of Fame kiosk that allows visitors to access brief biographies of the 65 white men, 15 white women, 8 black men, 4 black women, and 1 Native American who have been inducted. Even the museum’s
introductory video downplays ethnic diversity featuring an older white man telling South Carolina’s story to an audience of less than ten people, only one of whom is an African American man. The State Museum illustrates how a history-related site can be an opportunity for student analysis and historical thinking about social justice and oppression (cf. Loewen, 1999; Orange & Carter, 2012; Segall, 2014). Consistent with Marcus (2007) and Segall (2014), students can learn to approach museums as biased sources often in need of a social justice awakening.

**Social justice and equal access to historical sites and museums.** It was very important that socio-economic factors not prevent even one of my students from being able to participate in field studies to historical sites and museums. All students should have equal access to this important part of the curriculum. As mentioned before, Richland School District Two (2015) reported that only 6% of the three grade levels of The Academic Magnet (TAM) were on free-reduced meals (p. 3), but for those few students paying for field studies can be difficult. Even families who do not qualify for meal assistance may find it financially onerous. The 2017 Washington, DC trip alone was $750. Fortunately, TAM has a private foundation of parents and teachers. It raises money to pay for classroom needs and helps students who cannot afford to pay part or all of the costs of the overnight trips. Occasionally, the foundation pays for parent chaperones as well. Even so, occasionally a student, for whatever reason, did not attend the trip.

What about students beyond my economically-privileged group? Classism is a challenge to a socially just society. Currently, the United States has some serious issues. Over a third of its wealth is in the hands of the top 1%, but 13% of the population is
classified as poor (Mantsios, 2013, p. 151). America’s aristocracy has increased its percentage of wealth from 22% in 1976 to 38% in 2001 (Collins & Yeskel, 2013, p. 163). Meanwhile, one out every three workers is not employed in full-time, dependable jobs (Collins & Yeskel, 2013, p. 159). Nearly half a decade later with a 3.9% unemployment rate in the United States, one would think that all is well, but 66% of those employed fail to make at least $20 per hour. While the United States has 16.1 million poor families, another 34.7 million are what the community-service organization United Way describes as Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed meaning they do not make enough money to meet their financial needs each month (Luhby, 2018 May 18). It should come as no surprise then that in contrast to Germans and Japanese who save 10.8% and 7% respectively, Americans typically save just 1.4% (Collins & Yeskel, 2013, p. 158). In fact, not only are Americans saving little, they are in debt. Each household has an average debt of $13,000 (Collins & Yeskel, 2013, p. 158). For those with children, they must worry about how to pay for college with many students having to take out loans. In 2003, college students on average owed $18,900 (Collins & Yeskel, 2013, p. 159), and in 2011 the New York Fed stated that college students nationally owed $550 billion (Jaffe, 2013, p. 177). Behind these statistics are real people, and they probably describe many of the people at my school, the majority of whose students qualify for free or reduced meals.

Obviously, neither I nor the school were in a financial position to ensure that all students had the opportunity to go on extended overnight field studies. With 412 students in the eighth grade alone (Pearson School Systems Power School, 2017, Nov. 13), a $750 trip to Washington, DC would cost $309,000! There were some steps, however, that I could take to promote more historical thinking using the virtual component. Once the
data of this action research study has been analyzed and interpreted, I will develop an action research plan. It is my intent to share both the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) guide and virtual sites with colleagues on the district level and at the annual conference of the South Carolina Council for the Social Studies. Due to the financial costs, many schools and parents may be unable to leave the school grounds to take students on day or overnight trips to historical sites or museums. However, online trips could provide the next best thing. My school district is classified as 1:1, meaning every student has a computer device with internet access. In addition, digital photography can be used to bring sites to the students. Hopefully, these virtual experiences with historical sites and museums will encourage teachers to work in their unique situations to plan and creatively finance off-campus field trips for students of all socio-economic classes. If this were to happen, then at least a step would have been taken to provide more students with exciting learning opportunities.

1.6 Action Research Design

According to Mertler (2014), “systematic reflection in the form of action research can provide the stimulus for changing and improving practice in order to make it appropriate for these unique individuals with whom we work” (p. 23). One area in which I have fallen short is the effective use of field studies. Rather than trusting the sites and docents to make the experience memorable and interest the students in history, I should have intentionally designed these trips to develop historical thinking. In other words, I should have been “committed to taking action and effecting positive educational change based on their findings” (Mills, 2007, p. 3). That is exactly what I did in this action research study.
There are different action research models. For this study, Mertler’s (2014) model of planning, acting, developing, and reflecting fit with my approach to improving my pedagogy. During the planning stage, the teacher-researcher identifies the problem, investigates the literature and input of other professionals, and develops a plan. The acting stage involves the implementation of the plan and the collection and analysis of data. Based on this interpretation of the data, the teacher-researcher moves into the development stage and creates an action plan and shares the study and its results with other professionals. Finally, the teacher-researcher reflects on the process thus far setting the stage for the next cycle. Important to keep in mind is that “teacher-researchers engaged in action research often find themselves repeating some of the steps several times or perhaps doing them in a different order” (Mertler, 2014, p. 16).

There were two cycles in this action research study - “Cycle 1: Preparation” (from spring 2016 until the 2017-2018 school year) and “Cycle 2: Answering the Research Question” (data collection period of the 2017-2018 school year and summer). I spent from the spring of 2016 to the spring of 2017 in the planning step of the first cycle. This involved designing a data collection plan, reading the professional literature, and developing the Historical Thinking Method (HTM). I also considered sites in Washington, DC and Columbia, South Carolina, and at some point, began to investigate possible online sites. The acting stage of Cycle 1 in May 2017 resulted in revision of the HTM based on its use with students as they analyzed photographs of the State House statue of Governor Benjamin Ryan Tillman. Both Cycle 1’s development stage and Cycle 2’s planning stage pretty much took place concurrently as I transitioned into the
data collection of the 2017-2018 school year. Throughout this process, I reflected on the study prompting further planning and development.

“Cycle 2: Answering the Research Question” is the main topic of this Dissertation in Practice. The planning stage of this cycle overlapped the development and reflection stages of Cycle 1, during which the HTM and a calendar of actual and virtual historical sites and museums was more solidified and continued into the acting stage of data collection and analysis, which took place between September 2017 and May 2018 when students worked individually and in groups analyzing both actual and virtual historical sites and museums. There were a total of nine activities during which students applied critical thinking to historical sites and museums. To evaluate their cognitive processing of such a site, the first opportunity involved students recording their thoughts in a stream of consciousness style as they analyzed the National Archives and Records Administration’s virtual exhibit Bill of Rights and You (2016, December 8; see Appendix B). I then introduced the HTM, and showed them how apply it using a virtual exhibit on the colonial botanist Eliza Lucas Pinckney (see Appendix C).

The next six opportunities included: 1) photographs of Catawba Chief Hagler’s monument in the Town Green of Camden, South Carolina - see Appendix D; 2) one of the following Washington DC area sites - an exhibit at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, the Vietnam Women’s Memorial, an exhibit at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and Culture (NMAAHC), or The Dilemma of Slavery exhibit at Mount Vernon - see Appendices E-J; 3) photographs of an exhibit entitled A Woman’s War at NMAAHC – see Appendix K; 4) more photographs of a monument dedicated “To
the Faithful Slaves” of the Civil War - see Appendix L; 5) photographs of a statue of South Carolina’s controversial Governor and Senator Benjamin Ryan Tillman - see Appendix M; 5) either an online exhibit of nineteenth century politician Robert Smalls or civil rights crusader Septima Poinsette Clark - see Appendices N and O; 6) photographs of one of four monuments on the South Carolina State House grounds - the African American, the Confederate Women, the Strom Thurmond, or the Wade Hampton monuments - see Appendices P-S. In their State House monument activity, students recorded their analysis in note-format without a copy of the HTM and wrote narratives explaining their analyses. This activity was compared to their first one to observe if practicing the HTM had led to its elements becoming a natural part of how students analyzed sites. These nine opportunities helped students become more adept critical thinkers as they analyzed sites related to women and other minority issues.

Next, I had students respond in writing to three interview prompts. The first one asked: “Would you say that the HTM has changed how you analyze a historical site or museum exhibit? Explain with details.” The second prompt requested students to re-examine the 32 prompts of the HTM and explain which ones they found most difficult and explain why. Finally, the third prompt asked students to “write any other thoughts on the HTM including suggestions on how to make it better. Please feel free to comment on sites that we analyzed or ones you wished we had examined.” Their responses helped me to triangulate my observations, their written work, and their interview responses. For a copy of these interview prompts, see Appendix T.

Once the data had been collected and analyzed, Cycle 2 transitioned to the development and reflection stages. Data in both cycles of this action research study were
qualitative. I wrote a reflection on the first use of the HTM in the spring of 2017 and kept a field journal during Cycle 2. In addition, student HTM responses, written explanations, and final written interviews provided qualitative data to answer the Research Question. A more detailed discussion of the data collection process can be found in Chapter 3 of this dissertation and in Appendix U: Data Collection Plan. I continued to reflect on what I had learned and how to share my knowledge with colleagues, and considered steps for the next cycle to improve my students’ critical thinking at actual and virtual historical sites and museums. My final conclusions are discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of this dissertation.

1.7 Ethical Considerations

When it comes to both teaching and research, ethics is of utmost importance. Simply stated, ethics (n.d.) is “an area of study that deals with ideas about what is good and bad behavior.” The study of ethics, however, is anything but simple. It can be a daunting task and one in which “there are few absolutes” (Mills, 2007, p. 113). Perhaps the most succinct and practical advice is found in deontological ethics, which advocates the Golden Rule – treat others the way you want to be treated (Flinders, 1992, as cited in Mills, 2007, p. 112). Applied to action research, ethics is concerned with how the teacher-researcher treats the participants in his or her research and the integrity he or she uses in the collection, analysis, and reporting of all data.

There are some practical steps I have taken and will complete to ensure that my action research study is an ethical one. After consulting one of the district’s assistant superintendents, I learned that the district does not require any formal process to approve an action research study for a dissertation. He did state that I should discuss the study
with my principal, which was done. To provide for accurate disclosure, I drafted both a parental consent form and a student assent form (modeled on Mertler, 2014; see Appendices V and W). These two documents describe the action research study, its voluntary nature concerning data collection, and a promise of confidentiality (Mertler, 2014, p. 108). I also took three additional steps to make my study ethical. First, in June 2017, I took the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative’s (CITI) online course entitled “Human Research - Social and Behavioral Researchers -1 Basic Course.” Second, in an effort to fulfill both ethical obligations and the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), I used pseudonyms for the school, magnet program, and the students themselves. A list of student names and their pseudonyms were kept in a secured location. Third, I submitted his action research study to the University of South Carolina’s Institutional Review Board before I formally collected student data using the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) on actual and virtual trips to historical sites and museums.

In addition to these ethical procedures, an important ethical question that all teacher-researchers should consider is the relationship of their instruction and research. Unlike other forms of research, action research is not concerned with the generalizability of its findings. Its goal is to improve what is happening in the teacher’s classroom. Mills (2007) observed that “all action researchers . . . are committed to a critical examination of classroom teaching principles and the effects teachers’ actions have on the children in their care [emphasis added]” (p. 8). It could be argued that once a teacher-researcher begins to engage in action research that there is not a dividing line where teaching
becomes research or vice versa. Action research is the process whereby the teacher-researcher becomes or solidifies himself or herself as a good ethical teacher. Engagement in teacher inquiry as a form of professional development simply makes the normal, everyday work of teaching less happenstance and more visible, heightening the opportunity for teachers to improve learning conditions in their classrooms on a regular basis. (Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014, p. 149)

This process of closely examining one’s practice and targeting areas needing improvement is important for a teacher to grow and improve instruction. To be honest, I needed to pull myself out of my teaching rut and systematically transform my classroom into an inquiry-based environment. Using actual and virtual historical sites and museums to develop historical thinking in students was an ethical step in this direction.

1.8 Dissertation in Practice Overview

This action research study into the impact of the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) upon student interaction with actual and virtual historical sites and museums will be discussed in subsequent chapters. The overall layout of this Dissertation in Practice is as follows:

Chapter 1: Introduction
Chapter 2: Review of Related Literature
Chapter 3: Action Research Methodology
Chapter 4: Findings, Discoveries, Reflections, and Analyses
Chapter 5: Summary of Conclusions, Action Plan, and Future Research
References
Appendices

In the end, I answered the initial research question of how the HTM changed eighth grade students’ historical thinking as they interacted with historical sites and museums. The results of this action research study will then be used to make whatever adjustments are needed to ensure that actual and virtual trips to historical sites and museums become opportunities for future students to grow in their historical thinking.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will begin by briefly reviewing the problem of practice of this action research study, its purpose and rationale, the causes of the problem, and the guiding research question. A literature review will follow explaining its importance, relationship to the methodology described in Chapter 3, and the theory and historical context of the literature used to solve the problem of practice. A list of key concepts and their definitions will then conclude this chapter.

The problem of practice. The problem of practice addressed in this action research study and discussed in this dissertation was how to guide students to think critically during field studies to historical sites and museums. Without scaffolding, most students will spend time socializing and shopping rather than engaging with the historical exhibits themselves. These trips were an important part of my curriculum and included a trip to Washington, DC, and it is hoped that school-sponsored or independent field trips to local destinations such as the South Carolina State House or the South Carolina State Museum might become key components of the history curriculum. Finally, I planned to incorporate the use of virtual field trips and take advantage of the internet and photographs to provide even more opportunities for historical thinking without having to leave the school campus.
This problem of practice not only concerned my pedagogy but also the students themselves. Despite the fact that historical sites and museums are “interpreters of history” (Marcus, 2007, p. 106), people believe in their accuracy and objectivity (Rosenzweig & Thelen, 1998). However, historical sites often fail to live up to these expectations. Many times, they only portray the white male version of history at the expense of other racial and gender groups (Loewen, 1999). If my students were to grow into responsible citizens, they would need to be able to think critically and question historical narratives, symbolism, and exhibits in terms of social justice. The fact is that “if we cannot face our history honestly, we cannot learn from the past” (Loewen, 1999, p. 8). In other words, not solving this problem of practice would at least delay, if not hinder, my students from growing into the thoughtful citizens needed for a more just society.

The purpose statement or rationale. This action research study had several purposes. First, I developed a Historical Thinking Method (HTM) guide (see Appendix A: The Historical Thinking Method for Historical Sites and Museums), which students used to analyze, interpret, and evaluate actual and virtual historical sites and museums. These cognitive skills were congruent with the Scholar Academic theorists’ view “that children learning the discipline should engage in the same type of activity as the scholar doing research” (Schiro, 2013, p. 47).

Alexander (2010), the director of the Maryland Historic Trust’s Museum Advancement Program, urged her colleagues in the museum profession to think about how they could engage students in higher level thinking. Inspired by the work of science
educators and museum professionals, Alexander (2010) developed “‘Six Strands’ for History Museums” (p. 239) and proposed that:

Learners in history museums . . . will:

1. Interact with real objects, documents and settings.
2. Assess data (written, aural, visual and three-dimensional) to support an argument.
3. Use evidence to explicate abstract concepts such as progress, nationalism, manifest destiny.
4. Appreciate the impact of place on human interactions (landscape, architecture, personal and private environments).
5. Sense the consequences of change on individuals and institutions.
6. Be inspired to pursue a new interest and learning adventure.

However, even if museums answer Alexander’s (2010) call, they cannot do it alone. Teachers need to emphasize historical thinking in the classroom so that when they take students on field trips to historical sites and museums the experience is a reinforcement of what they already know how to do and an opportunity to strengthen these skills.

A second purpose was for students to become more critical toward public history and continue this attitude into adulthood. Following the lead of Social Efficiency theorists, teachers often tell students that they are training them for the next phase of their schooling or their future adult lives. Bobbitt (2013) opined:

Education . . . must, therefore, train thought and judgment in connection with actual life-situations . . . . It is also to develop the goodwill, the spirit of service, the social valuations, sympathies, and attitudes of mind necessary for effective
group-action where specialization has created endless interdependency. It has the function of training every citizen, man or woman, not for knowledge about citizenship, but for proficiency in citizenship. (p. 11)

Similarly, I wanted my students to grow in their critical thinking skills and continue to do so as adults to perpetuate and improve this nation’s democracy.

Finally, I will share the results of this study and the HTM guide with colleagues so they can choose to use actual and virtual school field trips to develop their students’ historical thinking skills as well. All students, whether or not they are the academically-oriented students of the magnet program in which I work, deserve experiences and instruction that will help their growth in critical thinking. I will aid the cause of social justice by making the overall results of my study and the HTM guide available to fellow social studies teachers. It is hoped that they will build upon this action research study by implementing at least some of its ideas and in doing so improve the quality of instruction in their classrooms.

**Research question.** All good research starts with at least one question, often more. Parsons and Brown (2002) suggested that a teacher ask himself or herself: “What can we do to enhance our effectiveness as teachers” (p. 159)? In other words, what could I do to improve my use of field studies both actual and virtual? In fact, I have rarely used virtual ones at all. In answering this question, I developed a guide entitled the “Historical Thinking Method” (HTM) for students to use when analyzing a historical site or museum exhibit. My desire to improve how I use field studies and the HTM were synthesized into the following action research study:
**RQ1:** How does the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) change eighth grade students into critical thinkers during field experiences at historical sites and museums?

Using qualitative methods as described in Chapter 3 of this dissertation and below in the section entitled “Methodology,” I explored the relationship of the HTM guide and my students’ learning during actual and virtual field studies at historical sites and museums. More specifically, I examined how they changed over time in their analysis of the site’s creation, context, and content, their connection to it, corroboration of its reliability, and criticism of its strengths and weaknesses.

### 2.2 Importance of a Literature Review

Essential to answering this research question was a review of the relevant literature. Mills (2007) astutely observed why doing so is important: “You can locate yourself within the research literature and find support for what you are doing or be challenged by what other researchers have done and how they have tackled a particular problem” (p. 29). Drawing on the wisdom of the past helped me solve my problem of practice in a more efficient and effective manner.

The problem needing a solution was defined in the research question and was composed of two parts. First, historical thinking must be clarified for it is a broad topic. Second, how to use historical sites and museums in authentic ways to encourage student engagement and critical thinking needed further research. Teachers have been taking students on field trips for a long time. What ideas have they found that work with students? The importance of these two elements of the research question will be addressed below.
Historical thinking is an academically challenging process. Some have even doubted that young students can really comprehend history (Barton & Levstik, 2004, pp. 13-17). The following literature review will correct this invalid assumption. However, historical thinking is not easy, and if I were going to be successful in teaching my students how to think at historical sites and museums, I needed all the help I could find. Fortunately, many education experts have paved the way with numerous primary studies and secondary syntheses.

While the specifics will be covered in the section below entitled “Theoretical Base,” it might prove helpful to provide an overview. If one is going to help students learn how to think historically, it is important to understand what this means. The Historical Thinking Project (n.d.), the National Center for History in the Schools (n.d.), van Boxtel and van Drie (2013), and the Stanford History Education Group (n.d.) have provided models describing what is involved in critically thinking about history. Particularly important was the work of Wineburg (1991, 2001) and the Stanford History Education Group (n.d.) whose model was used to develop the Historical Thinking Method (See Appendix A), the primary tool used in this action research study. In addition, the work of Baron (2012, 2013), who applied Wineburg’s paradigm to the study of historical buildings, also influenced the HTM. The idea of empathy (Barton & Levstik, 2004) was included in the HTM and the study’s design as well. The question of whether academically talented 13 and 14 year olds would be able to think critically about historical sources was answered affirmatively in the work of Foster and Yeager (1999), Lee and Ashby (2000), VanSledright (2002), and Reisman (2012). In short, this literature review situated the development of the Historical Thinking Model in its proper context.
How teachers can use historical sites and museums to encourage historical thinking was also grounded in the literature. Central to this action research study was the idea that historical sites and museums are biased sources that should be analyzed and interpreted like more traditional sources. There are a number of studies that confirm that historical sites and museums have their own subjective and at times erroneous points of view (Loewen, 1999). The patriotic slant of Mount Vernon (Fitzgerald, 2011), problems with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and the National Museum of the American Indian (Segall, 2014), and the recent emphasis of human rights in museums (Orange & Carter, 2012) were reminders that museums have their own intentional and unconscious agendas.

How a typical history teacher can use subjective museums to engage students in historical thinking was the essential pedagogical task of this action research study. Marcus, Stoddard, and Woodward (2012) provided a thorough analysis of the different types of historical sites and museums as well as eleven case studies featuring teachers skilled in making field studies worth the time because of their academic rewards. In writing about *Man: A Course of Study*, Bruner (2013) observed that in designing the curriculum “we must solve a formidable intellectual problem ourselves in order to be able to help our pupils do the same” (p. 80). I needed to solve this problem of practice so that my students would think historically on field studies to historical sites and museums. The literature review was a key part of solving this challenge.

2.3 Methodology

This section will briefly address three key topics – the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) guide, the action research study itself, and data collection.
The Historical Thinking Method was the key pedagogical tool used in this study. Modeled after the Historical Thinking Chart of the Stanford History Education Group (n.d.), the HTM, however, was modified to address historical sites and museum exhibits and address the affective aspect of historical thinking. There are six components called historical concerns – creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism. The first, second, third, and fifth concerns correspond in many aspects to the Historical Thinking Chart’s sourcing, contextualization, close reading, and corroboration.

*Creation* is concerned with eleven prompts in which students answer the basic what, who, when, why, and where questions about an exhibit. Next, *context* requires a consideration of the historical background of both the exhibit’s topic and the time when the exhibit itself was created that may have affected its final form. The third component of the HTM is *content*. It focuses not only on the information the exhibit provides but also its point of view or subjectivity, those perspectives not included, relationship to race or sex/gender, and unanswered questions. The fourth historical concern of the HTM addresses the affective aspect of historical thinking. *Connection* is related to the idea of empathy, which Voss (1998) defined as when a person “place[s] herself in the position of another person, seeing the world and perhaps feeling as that other person” (10th paragraph). The HTM asks for students to explore their empathetic connection to a historic event or person by considering their own views in relation to those of the exhibit, what led them to have these opinions, the emotions or thoughts the exhibit prompts, how the exhibit’s topic might be similar to an issue today, and if so, what the student might want to do about the contemporary situation. *Corroboration* requires students to confirm, qualify, or discount the exhibit’s reliability. Finally, *criticism*, the final component, asks
for students to critique the exhibit by discussing their overall evaluation of the exhibit and suggesting ways it could be improved. Wineburg (2001) called historical thinking an “unnatural act,” and the purpose of the HTM was to provide some necessary scaffolding. A more detailed explanation of the HTM can be found in Chapter 3.

To help students in their use of the HTM, this action research study used Mertler’s (2014) four-step cyclical model – planning, acting, developing, and reflecting. The actual study was composed of two cycles, which were introduced in Chapter 1 and will be covered in greater detail in Chapters 3 and 4. In short, the first one began in the spring of 2016 and included the 2016-2017 school year and was entitled “Cycle 1: Preparation.” This cycle focused on reading the professional literature, developing the HTM, and considering sites and exhibits in Washington, DC and Columbia, South Carolina as well as online historical sites and museums, which I used in Cycle 2 of the study. “Cycle 2: Answering the Research Question” was conducted during the 2017-2018 school year. Its planning phase overlapped Cycle 1’s development and reflection phases. It was at this time that the HTM and a calendar of the sites were more solidified. The acting stage, which involved teaching and data collection, took place during the school year itself from September 2017 to May 2018. During this stretch of time, students had nine opportunities to engage in historical thinking with actual and virtual historical sites and museums. The first virtual exhibit was used to establish a baseline of how students analyzed one on their own followed by an introduction to the HTM using another virtual site. After practicing the HTM on six actual and virtual historical sites and museum exhibits, students concluded the study by analyzing a final one without the benefit of the HTM, thus showing how much they had internalized the thinking process.
To triangulate my observations with their thoughts about how they had grown in their historical thinking, I administered a written interview of three prompts prior to the previous activity. Students were asked to write about whether they thought using the HTM had “changed how you analyze a historical site or museum exhibit.” Next, students were asked to explain which of the HTM’s 32 prompts they found most difficult. Finally, the students were given the opportunity to offer their thoughts about how to make the HTM better and provide feedback on the sites they had examined and make suggestions for new ones. This interview handout can be found in Appendix T.

The data collected in this action research study was qualitative in nature. The HTM guides as well as other writing assignments were used to evaluate students’ critical thinking strengths and weaknesses. However, student work was not enough. Schiro (2013) described the teacher as a “diagnostician” and that “one of the first, and continuing tasks of teachers is to carefully observe and chronicle the nature of the students in their care” (p. 137). I listened and watched as students engaged in historical analysis of an exhibit. What thinking was leading to what they wrote down? Montessori (2013) observed that “the master is to study man in the awakening of his intellectual life” (p. 24). To capture these moments when the synapses of their brains were in overdrive, hit a bump in the road, or in confusion slowed to a stop, I wrote notes in my field journal. I sometimes conducted interviews or member checks (Hendricks, 2009, pp. 114-115; Mertler, 2014, p. 137). For a detailed schedule of the study, see Appendix U.
2.4 Theoretical Base

The following review examines primary and secondary literature of the two components of the research question – historical thinking in general and how it can be done at historical sites and museums.

In the last 25 years, cognitive psychologists and educators have written much about historical thinking. In fact, the topic is a vast one and includes general models of how one engages in this type of cognition and what is involved in applying it to textual and visual primary and secondary sources. What follows is an examination of four models or frameworks of historical thinking, a consideration of whether thirteen and fourteen year old students are able to engage in this sophisticated thinking, and studies that illustrate how this can be used in the classroom. Next, how historical thinking can be used at historical sites and museums and the synthesis of these ideas into the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) will be addressed.

**Historical thinking.** Perhaps the best way to explain what is involved in historical thinking is to examine several models (McKernan, 2015) or frameworks (van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008) that summarize and relate its various components.

The Historical Thinking Project, housed at the University of British Columbia and formerly overseen by Peter Seixas, identified six key elements of historical thinking:

To think historically, students need to be able to:

1. Establish *historical significance*
2. Use *primary source evidence*
3. Identify *continuity and change*
4. Analyze *cause and consequence*
5. Take *historical perspectives*, and
6. Understand the *ethical dimension* of historical interpretations. (The Historical Thinking Project, n.d.).

First, historical significance addresses the issue of what is important enough in the past to warrant close study. Some topics such as World War II or Abraham Lincoln fall in this category, but what about events or people who are not so well-known? In historical study, they become important if they are used to understand better the issues, events, and people whom historians already recognize as significant. The second element of historical thinking involves the reading of primary sources or firsthand accounts. However, they must not be read as sources of “information” but as “evidence.” Historical thinking means to “set them in their historical contexts and make inferences from them to help us understand more about what was going on when they were created” (The Historical Thinking Project, n.d.). Third, studying the past reveals the panorama of history characterized by both continuity and change. One period of time may feature great changes in a particular area while other aspects appear to remain the same. At the center of continuity and change is the fourth area of historical thinking, that of cause and consequence. In essence, this element of thinking involves asking why something happened and a recognition that “causes are thus multiple and layered, involving both long-term ideologies, institutions, and conditions, and short-term motivations, actions and events” (The Historical Thinking Project, n.d.). Although not specifically addressed in the project’s discussion, consequences can also be examined in terms of their immediate and long-term impact. A fifth component of historical thinking is historical perspectives, also known as empathy, a topic that will be examined in greater detail in this literature review. Basically, this element involves a person “understanding the social, cultural,
intellectual, and emotional settings that shaped people’s lives and actions in the past. . . . [and] the vast differences between us in the present and those in the past” (The Historical Thinking Project, n.d.). The final and sixth component of historical thinking, ethical or value judgment, recognizes that historians should not “impose our own anachronistic standards on the past” while at the same time conceding that “there is [always] an ethical judgment involved,” especially when it concerns topics such as slavery, the conquest of the Americas, or the rise of Nazism (The Historical Thinking Project, n.d.).

The National Center for History in the Schools at the University of California Los Angeles published their own Historical Thinking Standards, comprised of:

1. Chronological Thinking
2. Historical Comprehension
3. Historical Analysis and Interpretation
4. Historical Research Capabilities

Chronological thinking involves the understanding of time in terms of past, present, and future with narratives having a beginning, middle, and end. Among the important skills in chronological thinking is the comprehension of and the ability to use “calendar time” as well as the reading of timelines and production of one’s own (National Center for History in the Schools, n.d.). The second thinking standard is the historical comprehension of different types of sources. Can a student source the document (Reisman, 2012, p. 104; Stanford History Education Group, n.d.; Wineburg, 1991, p. 79) and close read it while “taking into account . . . the humanity of the individuals and
groups involved” (National Center for History in the Schools, n.d.)? This important skill also entails recognizing facts and opinions, the key questions, and point of view. Third, students should be able to analyze and form their own interpretations of sources by comparing and contrasting them, seeing the different points of view, explaining cause and effect, recognizing how well or not an author defends his or her claims with evidence, and conceeding that historical theses may change in the future if more information comes to light. Fourth, it is important for historians to have strong historical research skills. Can they develop good research questions, find and question sources, use quantitative methods when appropriate, and support their claims with evidence? When sources fail to provide all needed for a complete analysis, a good historical thinker is able to use reason and “elaborate imaginatively upon the evidence” (National Center for History in the Schools, n.d.). The fifth and final historical thinking skill is the ability to engage in examining historical issues and past decisions by “analyzing the alternatives available to those on the scene, evaluating the consequences that might have followed those options for action that were not chosen, and comparing with the consequences of those that were adopted” (National Center for History in the Schools, n.d.).

Another framework for understanding historical thinking is the work of van Boxtel and van Drie (2013). This model is visually represented as two concentric circles, with the inner one containing the three goals of historical reasoning attained using its six key elements:

Historical reasoning is defined as [Goal 1] constructing or evaluating a description of processes of change and continuity, [Goal 2] an explanation of a historical phenomenon, [Goal 3] or a comparison of historical phenomena or...

Historical inquiry begins with a question, but interrogation continues throughout the process. As one works with sources, it is important to understand them, their claims, and information considering the “temporal, spatial and social context” (van Boxtel & van Drie, 2013, p. 45). The use of substantive and second-order concepts needs further explanation. The former are often found in vocabulary lists of textbooks or teacher study guides. They are important topics or terms such as feudalism, constitution, or suffrage. Second-order concepts are what historians do or use. Van Boxtel and van Drie (2013) list “evidence, cause, explanation, empathy, time, space, change, source, historical significance and fact” (p. 46) as examples of these concepts, which are also important in the other models of historical thinking. In other words, “substantive history [or concepts] is the content of history, what history is ‘about’” while second-order concepts “shape the way we go about doing history” (Lee & Ashby, 2000, p. 199). Historical arguments and sources, the final two elements of their framework, are interrelated as the first is based on the second and can often be challenged by examining different sources.

The final model is based on the work of Sam Wineburg (1991, 2001) and the Stanford History Education Group (n.d.). Their model has four major components – sourcing, contextualization, corroboration, and close reading. In sourcing a text, the historian is concerned with the author, his or her point of view, when and where the
source was written as well as why, and its reliability. Contextualization is focused on “understand[ing] how context/background information influences the content of the document” (Stanford History Education Group, n.d.). Corroboration evaluates the reliability of a source by comparing and contrasting it with other sources. Finally, close reading involves the reader examining the author’s opinions and use of evidence and language to support and convey his or her claims. This model is summarized in the group’s Historical Thinking Chart.

Thus far, much of the emphasis has been on the cognitive side of historical thinking, but there is an emotional or affective aspect that deserves to be addressed. It is often referred to as “empathy.” Barton and Levstik (2004) dissected this controversial term into “perspective recognition,” which they defined as “explaining historical actions in terms of the attitudes, beliefs, and intentions of people in the past” (p. 223) and “caring,” where students “make personal connections to history” (p. 241), which may lead them to address current issues similar to ones in the past. This element of historical thinking, although more affective than cognitive in nature, is more inclined toward Social Reconstructionism. It could lead to students contemplating individuals and groups who were or have been oppressed. They might be persuaded to at least consider, if not help, “dialogue . . . between those who deny other men the right to speak their word and those whose right to speak has been denied them” (Freire, 2013, p. 157). Using it to understand and address social justice issues makes history relevant to contemporary society. In fact, the HTM uses the singular version of Barton and Levstik’s (2004) term “connections” as its fourth C. Because people are thinking and feeling beings, it makes sense that both elements of historical empathy should be considered when studying the past.
Endacott (2010) explored how to teach students to engage in historical empathy through the studying of important decisions in the past. Examining the decision-making processes of George Mason on whether to sign the Constitution, Thomas Jefferson on sacrificing his political principles and purchasing the Louisiana Territory, and James Madison on going to war with Britain provided opportunities for empathy. Endacott (2010) stressed that successful empathy involved “a combination between focus on other and focus on self” (p. 12). Otherwise, the student feels sympathetic and emotional in the former or so absorbed in the latter that he or she forgets the historical person’s real situation. His qualitative study involved 95 students attending eighth grade in a Midwestern middle school in the suburbs, which he then narrowed down to a purposive sample of 20 students. His analysis of their first person narratives of Mason, Jefferson, and Madison led him to conclude that overall they were successful in “avoid[ing] sympathizing with their subjects or overpowering them with an egocentric approach” (Endacott, 2010, p. 33). He also found that a key to successful historical empathy in students was to provide students with the primary sources to understand what the individuals were thinking and why.

Each of the four models described above – the Historical Thinking Project (n.d.), the National Center for History in the Schools (n.d.), van Boxtel and van Drie (2013), and the Stanford History Education Group (n.d.) – as well as role of empathy reveal that historical thinking is a complex process that requires the teacher to be intentional in curriculum design and execution and the student to be attentive and persistent. Given these demands, one might legitimately question whether students are cognitively developed enough to handle it. A number of studies have examined this question (e.g.

At first glance, Wineburg (1991, 2001) seemed to contradict that students can effectively engage in critical thinking with historical sources. He studied how eight history professors and eight high school students read and analyzed primary and secondary sources, eight textual and three visual, on the 1775 Battle of Lexington. His methods involved them stating aloud their thought processes as they examined the documents. The history professors (four American history experts and four specialists in Japanese, British, and Islamic history) were effective in their ability to source, contextualize, and corroborate the sources. In contrast, students did not use these skills and sided with the textbook passage even when it differed from both American and British primary accounts. These students were not below average readers. In fact, they were college-bound students with an average grade point average (GPA) of 3.54 and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) score of 1227 (Wineburg, 1991, p. 74). This study suggested that students were not ready for the complexities of historical thinking.

However, what must be remembered is that these students were given only the sources and told to read them and reconstruct what happened. The researchers provided no scaffolding for the activity because Wineburg wanted to observe how they thought naturally without assistance.

In contrast, Reisman (2012) conducted a quantitative study in which scaffolding was provided, and the results were different. The six-month research project involved 236 high school juniors from five high schools in the San Francisco area. Using multiple pre and post-tests as well control and experimental groups, Reisman measured the impact
of Reading Like a Historian – an online collection of lessons that focus on historical thinking. In fact, the Historical Thinking Chart (Stanford History Education Group, n.d.), which became the inspiration for this teacher-researcher’s Historical Thinking Method, is one of the materials from this program. The teachers taught from 36 to 50 of the 83 lessons. Each one provided important historical background, a key question, documents, and pedagogical materials to aid teachers. Students worked in small groups on the analysis and then engaged in whole class discussions. Data analysis revealed that students improved in their ability to source and close read the documents, but not so much in contextualizing and corroboration. Reisman (2012) speculated that these two skills might have been better developed if the whole class discussion component had been implemented more consistently. It must also be remembered that his study used multiple choice questions to evaluate these skills, and perhaps qualitative observations would have been a better gauge on how well students could contextualize and corroborate sources.

Nonetheless, contextualization is a difficult skill for it involves “placing an event in its proper context – within the web of personalities, circumstances, and occurrences that surrounds it” (Reisman & Wineburg, 2008, p. 202). However, there are methods to help students improve this essential skill. For example, Reisman and Wineburg (2008) suggested the website Historical Thinking Matters, a joint project between their Stanford History Education Group and George Mason University’s Center for History and New Media. The site itself has lessons that foster contextualized thinking with a focus on three primary strategies – the provision of historical background, inclusion of questions addressing sourcing, contextualization, close reading, and corroboration of the featured
documents, and videos of historians reading the documents and stating out loud what they are thinking as they attempt to make sense of what they read. In addition, students can listen to comments that explain what the historians were doing in the videos. Students are then able to see how to think historically about sources.

Endacott (2011) suggested another approach to help with contextualization. He proposed the use of themes across a history course to help students understand the relationships of events in history. Specifically, he explained how to focus the study of history by asking: “How has history been affected by the balance between the use of power and protection of liberty” (Endacott, 2011, p. 74)? Using small groups and whole-class discussion, the students generate definitions of power and liberty; list and categorize examples of how these two ideas are exercised, limited, and in the case of liberty, protected; and examine how they are typically inversely related. Throughout the year, students analyze historical events in light of these themes in understanding the idea of continuity and change. The ideas of power and liberty are replete with opportunities to address social justice issues in history such as how African Americans, Native Americans, and women have been treated (Endacott, 2011, p. 76). His recommendation to anchor the plethora of content covered in a survey course is an excellent way to help students cognitively organize what can sometimes seem an overwhelming amount of factual knowledge. However, it must also be remembered that generalized themes should not be overemphasized causing the students to fail “to appreciate the particular [emphasis added] policies, institutions, worldviews, and circumstances that shape a given moment in time” (Reisman & Wineburg, 2008, p. 202). In other words, one needs to be careful that students do not see history in such a broad context that they fail to understand
the more focused context of the period under study. Endacott (2010) recognized this danger of presentism when students compare the past and present admonishing that they need to remember that “two events that occur at different historical points can never be exactly the same” (p.77).

Other studies have suggested that students can handle the major components of historical thinking. Foster and Yeager (1999) conducted a study of 51 English students living about an hour outside of London. They selected the Boston Massacre of 1770 to evaluate the historical thinking of 12 year olds. After a brief lecture on the relationship of the British government and the American colonists, the students engaged in a 55 minute writing exercise during which they analyzed and answered nine questions (some had multiple parts) using a Boston Gazette article, the trial testimony of the British Captain Thomas Preston, Paul Revere’s well-known engraving of the event, another piece of artwork, and the testimony of a doctor who had treated one of the American victims. The researchers then interviewed two groups of three students for 30 minutes before qualitatively analyzing the data. They concluded that students had the ability to critique sources, find biases and ambiguities, and seek out other flaws in the evidence. This finding indicates that sources indeed can be used successfully with young children; certainly the vast majority of 12-year-old pupils in this study were reasonably competent and comfortable with source material. What they were less able to do was to judge what constitutes a good source, then to apply that knowledge toward the sorting out of particular historical questions and competing viewpoints (Foster & Yeager, 1999, pp. 313-314). Of course, this study was a limited in scope and its generalizability
questionable. However, additional research has been done that concludes even younger students can think historically.

VanSledright (2002) spent over four months teaching colonial American history to 23 fifth graders – 12 girls and 11 boys comprised of seven African Americans, seven Whites, six Hispanics, and three Asian Americans with about 40% qualifying for free-reduced meals. Academically, the class contained students “with learning difficulties and behavioral issues” (VanSledright, 2002, p. 31). Using primary and secondary sources, VanSledright successfully scaffolded the students in historical thinking. Based on a pre and post source activity and interviews with a purposive sample of 8 students, VanSledright (2002) concluded:

With these fifth-graders (and their classmates, to the extent that these eight are representative of them), we witness appreciable growth in their capacity to think and reason historically. This appears to be especially the case with respect to their approach toward reading sources of historical evidence and evaluating their status. All eight showed important developments in acquiring a specialized vocabulary for sorting out, categorizing, and analyzing such sources. (p. 135)

In this case, source activities and projects on topics such as Jamestown’s Starving Time in the winter of 1609-1610 and the Boston Massacre resulted in pre-adolescents growing in their historical reasoning skills. These studies by Foster and Yeager (1999) and VanSledright (2002) suggest that historical thinking activities are developmentally appropriate for the eighth graders in my academic magnet program.

**Museums and historical sites.** While much literature examines historical inquiry with primary and secondary textual and visual sources, both the cognitive and affective
components of historical analysis can also be done with historical sites and museums. McKernan (2015) pointed out that “a history museum is, after all, a representation of the past by expert historians, in much the same way any secondary source is” (p. 7). Valdeón (2015) also observed that

museums are public spaces where visitors are faced with small bits of information that have been carefully selected, conveniently complemented with drawings and pictures, and carefully arranged to create a particular reading of the events depicted and of the actors involved in them. (p. 365)

Too often teachers, including myself, take students to historical sites and museums so they can learn more history and see where events took place. Neither of these goals is necessarily wrong, but the location could be used to emphasize thinking rather than just content. Museums could be “criticized as artifacts and subjective representations of the past” (Marcus, 2007, p. 106). After examining how historical sites often struggle over their role as educational facilities versus businesses, whether their mission is to be museums or memorials, and the pressure of political and popular support of or opposition to certain exhibits, Marcus (2007) suggested that teachers have students examine these aforementioned issues as well as examine the thought process behind the development of exhibits and the perspectives that are not included. Considering that one study found people believed museums were better sources of information than books or teachers (Rosenzweig & Thelen, 1998, p. 235), it is important that students learn to interrogate museums.

The fact that museums have a viewpoint students should critically examine is reinforced by the literature. Not surprisingly, one sees a nationalistic bias in historic sites
and museums in and near Washington, DC. This fact takes on an added importance because I annually take my students on a five-day field trip to the nation’s capital. One of the places we visit is Mount Vernon – the home of George Washington. Fitzgerald (2011) compared and contrasted the 38 textual components of Mount Vernon’s Donald W. Reynolds Museum and Education Center and a middle school U.S. history textbook entitled *Creating America: A History of the United States*. Specifically, Fitzgerald (2011) performed a frequency count on both the museum and textbook using Nathanson’s (2002) four characteristics of a patriot: “‘1. A special affection for one’s own country; 2. A sense of personal identification with one’s country; 3. A special concern for the well-being of one’s country; 4. A willingness to make sacrifices to aid or protect one’s country’” (as cited in Fitzgerald, 2011, p. 243). The textbook had ten examples of three of the above criteria (no examples of #1) while the museum text had 16 examples covering all four characteristics. While this is not particularly surprising for one would expect Washington to be portrayed in a patriotic light at his own home, nevertheless it is another reminder of how museums can have a biased point of view.

Segall (2014) pointed out other possibilities for student analysis in his focus on two other museums in Washington, D.C. – the National Museum of the American Indian (which he abbreviated NMAI) and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (which he abbreviated HM), the latter of which is a mainstay on my field trip agenda. Segall (2014) contended that the NMAI downplays the horrors of the Columbian Exchange on Native Americans. For example, he mentioned that the exhibits dealing with the destruction of America’s indigenous peoples are on a poorly lit route that requires visitors to retrace their steps through the main exhibits. Meanwhile, the HM
addresses the horrors of Jewish genocide, but fails, among other things, to connect such racism to its American version. His specific case study confirmed Marcus’s (2007) contention that museums themselves can become the focus of historical thinking. While Segall provided ideas that I could use when my students tour the HM, what is equally important is the reminder that museum analysis can be an opportunity for students to engage with issues of social justice.

In fact, historical sites and museums can become education centers for social justice and “a force for social regeneration” (Counts, 2013, p. 46). Apple (2008) observed that “in their role in defining a large part of what is considered to be legitimate knowledge, they [schools] also participate in the process through which particular groups are granted status and which groups remain unrecognized or minimized” (p. 254). Historical sites and museums, by virtue of their educational role, can be both teachers and extensions of the school campus. As such, they have the potential to restore “unrecognized or minimized” (Apple, 2008, p. 254) groups and fulfill Counts’ worthy goal.

Orange and Carter (2012) identified two types of museums which promote social justice. First, there are those which “explicitly make human rights their core institutional mission,” and then others which engage in a “human rights museology [which] . . . denotes a form of practice that addresses issues central to human rights – promoting social justice, cultural diversity, and inclusive societies” (pp. 260-261). Liverpool’s International Slavery Museum, the Canadian Museum for Human Rights, and the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum were three institutions they discussed. Orange and Carter (2012) also pointed out that museums will have to decide what human rights problems
they will examine, how this might impact who financially sponsors the museum, and define and evaluate their objectives. While this new direction for museums is laudable, it will still be important for students to learn how to recognize bias in its positive form and whether or not exhibits provide opposing viewpoints so that their stories can be fully understood.

The above studies confirm that museums are not objective narrators of history. They too are subjective in what they say, include, or exclude, much like textbooks and primary source documents and visuals. So, how might historical sites and museums be used to teach historical thinking?

Baron (2012) developed a historical site inquiry model based on the audio-tapes of five professional historians as they walked around Boston’s Old North Church, best known for its role in the signaling of Paul Revere on the night of his historic ride. Inspired by Wineburg’s (1991) model of sourcing a document by examining where it came from before reading it, contextualizing a document by determining where and when it fits in history, and corroborating a document by comparing it to others, Baron (2012) found that it was inadequate for analyzing historical sites. Rather, she recommended a five part model that incorporates his three major elements. First, origination is really both sourcing and contextualization and asks, “How did this building come be to [sic] in this place” (pp. 838, 844)? Second, Baron coined a new term replacing corroboration with intertectonality, which involves comparing a building to other buildings answering the question, “How does what they did here compare with what has been done elsewhere” (p. 839, 844)? Third, the dating of contextualization finds its counterpart in the analysis of a building’s stratification which answers, “What are the multiple time
periods evident in this building, and what do they tell me about its history” (p. 840, 844)?

Fourth, a historian must use the skill of *supposition*:

> When historians find themselves in a situation where the evidence on its own does not resolve the query, they take a very controlled imaginative leap to suggest a plausible scenario or outcome. The question they ask is “Given the available evidence, my prior knowledge, and how I understand the world to work, what plausible scenario or outcome could explain this feature or phenomenon?” (p. 844)

Wineburg touched on this element without examining it in detail (Baron, 2012, p. 842).

Fifth, Baron moved beyond Wineburg and included empathic insight, which answers the question, “Given the available evidence, my prior knowledge, and how I understand the world to work, how would the people who occupied this space have responded (socially, emotionally, intellectually) to the space and the circumstances of the time” (p. 844)?

What is helpful about this study is its emphasis on the analysis of historic buildings rather than just documents, which receive most of the scholarly focus.

Baron (2013) followed up this study by applying this model to 15 history teachers ranging from fifth grade through high school. After audio-taping their tours of the Old South Meeting House in Boston and having them create lesson plans describing what they would do to prepare students for a school trip, what they would do while there, and what they would do afterward back at school, the teachers participated in three hours of primary source work followed by a tour of the Old North Church and the creation of more lesson plans. Baron found that the source training led to more active teacher involvement at the Old North Church and higher-level thinking lesson plans that
incorporated primary sources. While her recommendations concerning professional
development were not relevant to this action research study, she touched on something
important when she stated:

Framing the inquiry into the document sets in terms of the choices that historic
agents made provided teachers a way into the story of the historic site, modeled
how to offer what they learned to their students, and the materials to effectively
enact that transfer. (Baron, 2013, p. 167)

While Baron did not explicitly state that source work should be used to prepare students
for field trips, it is not a leap in logic to suggest that if it worked with teachers, then
trying it with students could be a step in the right direction. Baron (2013), however,
cautioned that “the process of engaging in document-based source work incited curiosity
about the related historic site, a necessary precursor to historical thinking, but not
historical thinking itself” (p. 167).

Drake and Brown (2003) suggested an approach to using primary sources in the
classroom that involves centering a lesson on one primary source (called “a 1st-order
document”) supplemented with “2nd-order documents,” which contradict or confirm the
main document. After working with these documents, each student could then find
another document or source (called “a 3rd-order document). These 2nd and 3rd-order
documents could include textual and visual sources as well as artifacts. While Drake and
Brown described using the documents in a classroom setting, it might be an excellent pre-
field trip exercise to prepare students for further historical thinking when they visit an
actual or virtual historical site or museum.
In addition to these more scholarly studies on teaching historical thinking, researchers have shared what they have found works with their students as well as what master teachers do in the public schools. Marcus, Stoddard, and Woodward (2012) published their study on how museums can be used to teach history. Emphasizing the need for teachers to use pre-trip and post-trip lessons in addition to active learning during the visit itself, they included background on different types of museums along with 11 case studies of how real teachers use them. The volume featured the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, the Minnesota History Center, New Hampshire’s Fort at No. 4 and New York’s Fort Ticonderoga, Iowa’s Johnson County Historical Society, Connecticut’s Mark Twain House, America’s Historic Triangle (Colonial Williamsburg, Jamestown, and Yorktown), and Connecticut’s September 11 memorials and monuments. Each chapter discussed what specific teachers did to prepare students for the trip, the activities during the trip itself, and the closure process once the students returned to school.

Key to the success of a field study is preparation of the students. Most needed is proper contextualization of what they will be seeing and experiencing. The 11 teachers featured in Marcus, Stoddard, and Woodward’s (2012) analysis employed a variety of strategies to contextualize their upcoming trips – lectures, timelines, discussions, reading and interpreting textual and visual sources, videos, and small group activities among them. One teacher had students research documents and visuals and develop the questions they planned to ask during the trip itself and then take a virtual tour of the living museum site they were going to visit. In another case, the teacher invited a historian to speak to his classes on how he researched oral histories and the historical
background of local buildings. In addition, three teachers’ efforts highlighted the need for them to engage in personal research to make a trip successful. The teacher who took his students to the Holocaust Museum stated that “it took me three or four visits to the USHMM before I figured out what was ‘essential’ for my students to know” (Marcus, Stoddard, & Woodward, 2012, p. 42) and concluded that if he had not gone that “there is no way I could understand what students would experience . . . my guiding activities would have been a complete failure without that pre-visit” (p. 44). In addition, a teacher should research the site and know the history well so that he or she can help students understand it better. Both teachers who used September 11 monuments in their instruction, one on a field trip and the other as an in-class introductory activity before students went on their own independent trips to Civil War and other monuments, did detailed research to prepare for their classes. Pre-trip work during curriculum development and in the classroom to build students’ contextual understanding is important for a successful field trip.

The 11 case studies also provided many suggestions for what students can do during the visit itself. Of course teachers availed themselves of programs and tours the different sites offered. However, they also used questions to guide the trip, either ones students had written in the case of the visit to Williamsburg or most often ones the teacher had written. It is important that teachers provide both structure and choice on field studies. For example, the teacher who took her students to the Minnesota History Center instructed them to visit certain exhibitions, but also allowed them to choose one artifact or story they wanted to write about in their journals “describing the object or story and their reaction to it, how it made them feel, what it made them think about, and
what they found interesting about it” (Marcus, Stoddard, & Woodward, 2012, p. 63).

Providing students with written guidance along with latitude in what they analyze is an important consideration for teachers taking their students to a historical site or museum. Structure and choice in a trip to a historical site or museum make the experience both academically worthwhile and enjoyable.

Even when the trip is over, learning continues. In my case, it was my hope that over time students would become more proficient at critically thinking about sites they visited. In addition, it is important for a teacher to provide closure so that what students have learned can be processed, and if need be, formally evaluated. The 11 teachers featured in Marcus, Stoddard, and Woodward (2012) used a number of strategies to help students process what they had experienced. Whole class discussions, small group activities and discussions, the use of photographs of the sites, and further primary source work were some examples of what the teachers did. Two teachers had students design new displays using some of the artifacts they examined at the museum or new monuments based on different perspectives. For example, after visiting different September 11 memorials, groups of students designed new monuments illustrating different points of view of those involved that fateful day. During the subsequent gallery walk, students answered questions provided by the teacher to analyze the different monument designs. Another good idea is to follow the example of the teacher who took his classes to the Holocaust Museum and sometimes invited a guest speaker or showed a video as one of the follow-up activities.

In addition to using photographs to encourage discussion, as mentioned above, pictures can be put to use in other ways. Marcus and Levine (2011) suggested that
photography itself could be employed as a tool during a field trip. In addition to providing students with questions to ask museum staff and answer using the different exhibits, students could take photographs of what they learned or questions they wanted answered. They would keep track of both in a “photo log” (Marcus & Levine, 2011, p. 106). In an age of ubiquitous cell phones, students would enjoy taking pictures of places they are visiting.

As seen in the preceding review, the literature offers much advice on how to use historical sites and museums to develop students’ historical thinking, some which I took to heart. The Historical Thinking Method itself was developed using the Stanford History Education Group’s (n.d.) model. In addition, Baron’s ideas of origination and intertextonality were helpful additions to the HTM’s questions about the creation of a historical site or museum exhibit. Barton & Levstik’s (2004) explanation of empathy contributed to its inclusion in the Historical Thinking Method guide and hopefully encouraged students to stay engaged analyzing an exhibit because of an emotional element. The literature also emphasized the importance of pre-field trip work, especially in providing students with the background information or context to analyze effectively an exhibit (Foster & Yeager, 1999; Marcus, Stoddard, & Woodward, 2012; Reisman, 2012; VanSledright, 2002; Wineburg, 1991, 2001). To aid in contextualization, including relevant substantive concepts would aid students in seeing the big picture (van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008, 2013). Baron’s (2013) work with teachers recommended that primary sources be used before touring a site and Drake and Brown’s (2003) suggestion of using first, second, and third order documents are two additional suggestions on how to build context. Marcus, Stoddard, and Woodward’s (2012) case studies could be particularly
helpful in planning for a Washington, D.C. trip. For example, an excellent closing activity could involve grouping students who analyzed the same exhibit together. They could share their photographs of the exhibit (Marcus & Levine, 2011) and design their own exhibit sharing details from their analyses. A gallery walk could then publish those results for the benefit of their classmates. These are some of the important suggestions from the literature, some of which impacted this action research study.

2.5 Historical Context

As delineated in the preceding literature review, historical thinking is a complex process, but not a new one. It is at the heart of what historians do as they research and write their accounts, produce their documentaries, and design historical sites and museum exhibits. Having students interact with these products in a critical way is what Barton and Levstik (2004) identified as “the analytic stance,” a subcategory of which is “not to retain specific interpretations constructed by historians or found in textbooks but to understand the process of developing historical accounts” (p. 82). In this action research study, these accounts include those at historical sites and museums.

Contemporary attempts to engage students in this type of historical thinking have their roots in the New Social Studies of the 1960s and 1970s and its counterpart in Britain (Barton & Levstik, 2004, p. 82). During the former, the primary emphasis was for students to engage in inquiry exercises where they participated in lessons similar to what social scientists actually do (Bruner, 2013; Massialas, 2009; Rice, 1992). Barton and Levstik (2004) singled out the Amherst Project. Using teachers, it produced a number of inquiry exercises, such as those focused on the Battle of Lexington and Truman’s decision to drop the atomic bomb, in which students analyze primary sources trying to
determine if what really happened can be settled in the former and the ethics of decision-making in the latter (Brown, 1996). Unfortunately, for a number of reasons, the New Social Studies did not change the paradigm of history teaching (Brown, 1996; Fenton, 1991; Massialas, 2009; Rice, 1992), and the essentialist emphasis of content rather than inquiry emerged as dominant as ever in the typical history curriculum.

Britain was also involved in revising history curriculum and making it more inquiry-focused. In 1973, a new program called the School’s Council History 13-16 Project (SCHP) was begun at the University of Leeds. In 1984, four years before its end, the SCHP’s curriculum was used in 25% of the United Kingdom’s high schools (Roy Rosenzweig Center for History & New Media at George Mason University, n.d.; Rosenzweig & Weinland, 1986). For three years, British students took courses focused on inquiry into the historical process and particular topics. For example, their beginning course “What is History?” introduced the historical method of evidence analysis and evaluation followed by “Study in Development,” “Enquiry in Depth,” “Studies in Modern World History,” and “History Around Us.” These four courses allowed students to focus on specific topics such as the history of medicine, Elizabethan England, the Irish Question, and Industrial Archaeology, to name just a few. Rosenzweig and Weinland (1986) observed that “the critical element . . . turns on the treatment of historical fact as ‘evidence,’ as information necessary to prove an [sic] hypothesis or provide the answer to a question” (p. 269). A glance through the dates of the primary and secondary literature cited in this chapter reveals that much work has followed in the steps of the New Social Studies and the School’s Council History 13-16 Project. Applying this analytical
approach to historical sites and museums - the topic of this action research study – made sense because they, too, are subjective interpretations of the past.

While it is important to understand this action research topic in light of the literature on historical thinking, it is equally essential to see how this study related to the general ideologies and philosophies of education. In fact, developing students’ historical thinking at historical sites and museums is a complicating amalgamation of both. At its most basic level, I wanted my students to be able to think like historians about sources, specifically historical sites and museums. In this sense, this study was consistent with the Scholar Academic ideology, which believes in “introducing children into both the knowledge base of a discipline and the ways in which academicians within the discipline think [emphasis added], feel, and communicate” (Schiro, 2013, p. 20). The HTM itself is a tool based on the cognitive theory of learning in that its purpose was to provide students with a schema they could use when they encountered a historical site or museum exhibit (Driscoll, 2000, p.146). On the other hand, it was hoped that students would begin to realize that “history is not the past; it is the sense we make of the past” (Yellis, 2009, 54 para.). Such an epistemology is certainly more consistent with the Learner Centered and Progressive conception of knowledge. This view, known as constructivism, claims that knowledge is actively constructed, invented, created, or discovered by learners. It is not passively received by them and stored in their minds as photographic images of objective reality – it does not magically appear in their mind in a form identical to what a teacher, book, or real life experience might have transmitted to them. (Schiro, 2013, p. 142)
The same could be said about the creators of historical sources such as textbooks, primary documents, visuals, museum exhibits, monuments, and memorials. In fact, Wineburg (2001) observed that

the traditional view, in which knowledge goes from the page of the text to the head of the reader, is inadequate. But the metacognitive view, in which knowledge is constructed by students questioning themselves about a fixed and friendly text, is equally inadequate. We could do no better than to heed the words of Robert Scholes [1985]: “If wisdom, or some less grandiose notion such as heightened awareness, is to be the end of our endeavors, we shall have to see it not as something transmitted from the text to the student but as something developed in the student by questioning the text.” (p. 83)

In other words, in learning how to analyze and interpret such historical sites and museums, students were engaged in a progressive and constructive activity. The source was not seen as the final say about its topic nor a text with static meaning, but one to which students themselves brought their own interpretations. In fact, the connection section of the HTM was constructive in its emphasis for it asked students “how . . . the exhibit’s viewpoint or perspective [is] similar to or different from your own?”

This action research study and the HTM should also be understood in terms of Vygotsky’s work. The students themselves typically worked with each other as they analyzed an exhibit in addition to having access to me as their teacher. In this way, they were able to push themselves beyond what they may have been able to do on their own. Vygotsky labeled this as the zone of proximal development (Driscoll, 2000, pp. 246-248). Considering that people usually visit historical sites and museums with others and that
middle school teenagers are very social, it made sense for them to use the HTM in pairs or groups rather than completely alone, although some students did prefer to work alone. Even in those cases, they still had the option to ask me or classmates for help if they felt they needed it. This action research study was a social one consistent with Vygotsky’s theory of learning (Driscoll, 2000) and students’ natural inclinations.

In contrast, the current emphasis of history in the public schools is what can the individual do with factual content. For example, an examination of the South Carolina State Standards (South Carolina Department of Education, 2011) reveals a heavy emphasis on factual knowledge although the verbs themselves demand higher level thinking than just recall. As mentioned in chapter 1 of this dissertation, the South Carolina Support Documents for sixth, seventh, and eighth grades are 76 pages, 102 pages, and 126 pages, respectively (South Carolina Department of Education, n.d.b). The vast majority of these pages are devoted to a narrative explanation of the content of these historical periods. Unfortunately, the amount of content required can result in the teacher focusing on it and not as much on higher level intellectual skills, especially the authentic historical thinking described in this chapter. So much information to cover can preclude time-intensive curriculum that turns students into thinkers rather than memorizers. In a survey of Mississippi and Tennessee high school social studies teachers, Vogler (2008) found that nearly 62% of the former devoted over two months preparing students for the state test (p. 24). When pondering why these teachers were prone to use “teacher-centered” as opposed to “student-centered” methodologies, despite the fact that in Mississippi the state test emphasizes the former pedagogy, Vogler (2008) suggested several possibilities, one of which was time:
Time . . . has never been an ally of teachers. A common complaint of teachers for decades has been a lack of classroom time to provide adequate coverage of the curriculum. To combat this problem, teachers have used practices that allow for maximum content coverage in a minimum amount of time. Now in this era of testing, accountability, and standards, time (or the lack of time) has become an even greater enemy of teachers. (p. 24)

I myself have felt the pressure to finish the content by May so that my students would be prepared to take the Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS). Consequently, he was unable to cover some topics in as great depth as he would have liked and incorporate more advanced thinking activities than he did.

Today’s essentialism has a strong hold on education’s power brokers. Since 1635, it has been the dominant education philosophy, except from the end of the nineteenth century until the middle of the twentieth when progressivism challenged it (Oliva, 2009, p. 160). The 1990s to the present have seen the Social Efficiency take the content of the Scholar Academics and transformed the public schools into meccas of high stakes standardized testing, and authentic history learning has suffered. There appears to be a shift in emphasis though. During the 2017-2018 school year, the South Carolina State Department of Education began to hold meetings where it revealed the proposed South Carolina Social Studies College-and-Career-Ready Standards . . . Anticipated 2020. These new standards have reorganized the content into six historical thinking skills – comparison, causation, periodization, context, continuities and changes, and evidence (South Carolina Department of Education, n.d.a). In the meantime, the goal of this action research study was to implement historical thinking into my field studies to
historical sites and museums, both virtual and actual. It was hoped that it would begin a systematic realignment of his overall curriculum in a more progressive and constructivist direction.

2.6 Key Concepts/Glossary

The following concepts have been defined in the text where they appeared, but they are conveniently listed below in alphabetical order:

**Actual and virtual historical sites and museums** refers to historical sites and museums accessed by physically visiting their locations (actual), accessing online displays (virtual), or examining exhibits through photographs (virtual). Because we were only able to go on one off-campus field trip this year, I used both types in this action research study. The important role of the internet in students’ lives made the critical analysis of online sites important as well.

**Connection** is the fourth element of the Historical Thinking Method (Barton & Levstik, 2004). It is the empathetic component asking for students to compare and contrast their points of view with the exhibit’s perspective. In addition, students are asked to compare it to contemporary events and asked to consider what they might do to address those issues.

**Content** was the third element of the Historical Thinking Method. It involves recognizing the points of view present or absent, evidence, information and development of new questions.

**Context** is the second element of the Historical Thinking Method. It is concerned with the relevant historical background of the topic of an exhibit as well as when it was created.
Corroboration is the fifth element of the Historical Thinking Method. Checking the reliability of an exhibit or source by examining other sources is its emphasis.

Creation is the first element of the Historical Thinking Method. It involves describing an exhibit and answering who created it, why they did so, and when it was done. In addition, students are asked to consider if and how the location of the exhibit is significant. Finally, if the exhibit is a monument or memorial, students are to learn the story behind its creation and how other forms of architecture may have influenced its design.

Criticism is the sixth and final element of the Historical Thinking Method. Students are asked to evaluate the positive and negative aspects of a particular exhibit.

Empathy is an affective element in historical thinking in which students attempt to understand the past the way its participants understood it and feel some type of bond with them (Barton & Levstik, 2004).

Exhibit on the Historical Thinking Method guide refers to historical sites, museum exhibits, monuments, and memorials.

Historical thinking refers to one of the components of the “analytical stance” (Barton & Levstik, 2004), which is concerned with analyzing sources, including historical sites and museums, as evidence supporting a particular viewpoint. Included is the component of historical empathy as defined above.

Historical Thinking Method (HTM) is the 32 prompt guide (see Appendix A) that helped students analyze the creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism of an exhibit. These terms are defined in this glossary.
Items on the Historical Thinking Method guide refer to an exhibit’s artifacts, architectural elements, sculpture, text, and visual elements.

Presentism is a mindset in which a person viewed the values and ideas of the past from the perspective of the present. Many times it involves a belief that today’s society is better than the past and contemporary people are more intelligent than their ancestors (Lowenthal, 2000, pp. 65-67).

Primary sources are one of the major pieces of evidence historians use to reconstruct what happened in the past. They are created by an event or someone who witnessed or participated in the event. Examples include diaries, letters, photographs, and artifacts.

Second-order historical concepts describe what historians do and their tools. For example, using evidence is a second-order historical concept (Lee & Ashby, 2000; van Boxtel & van Drie, 2013).

Secondary sources are sources created by someone studying the event. Examples include scholarly articles and textbooks.

Sourcing is when a person examines a document’s author, when and where it was created, the reasons for it, and whether it is reliable or not. It is one of the elements emphasized in the Stanford History Education Group’s model and corresponds to “creation” in the HTM.

Substantive historical concepts are the big ideas of history like feudalism or constitution. They are what is thought of as the discipline’s content (Lee & Ashby, 2000; van Boxtel & van Drie, 2013).
CHAPTER 3
ACTION RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The focus of this chapter is on the methodology that will be employed to answer the following research question: How does the Historical Thinking Method (HTM; see Appendix A) change eighth grade students into critical thinkers during field experiences at historical sites and museums?

Rather than simply engage in a fact-finding scavenger hunt or casually examine exhibits with little thought, students needed to be using school field trips to develop higher level thinking skills. Whether students were off campus at an actual site or examining one virtually, they should have approached the exhibits as a historian would using the HTM, a 32 prompt guide that had students examine the six C’s – creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism. Action research, qualitative methodology, sample selection, the HTM guide, the design and timetable of the study, validity, data analysis, and ethics will be addressed in this chapter.

3.2 Purpose of the Study

There were several purposes of this action research study. Its primary purpose was to answer the research question by implementing the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) with my eighth grade students to aid them in critically interacting with actual and virtual historical sites and museums. In doing so, students learned how to “interrogate texts and artifacts, posing questions about the past that foster informed discussion,
reasoned debate and evidence-based interpretation” (National Council for History Education, n.d., 5th Habit). Rather than focusing on factual acquisition, students were involved in an interpretative exercise similar to what historians do.

The second purpose built upon the first and was more long-term in nature. I was training them to become better citizens who would understand how to critically evaluate the public interpretation and display of history. In a national phone survey, Rosenzweig and Thelen (1998) found that 57% had visited “history museums and historic sites” in the past year (p. 234) and rated museums 8.4 out 10 on a “trustworthiness” scale (p. 244). Because of the important role historical sites and museums play in teaching history to their visitors, students needed to be trained how to think critically about what was being communicated.

The third and final purpose of this study was for me to develop an action plan to disseminate this approach to interacting with historical sites and museums. I annually present at district and state meetings and will use these opportunities to share the HTM approach to historical sites and museums with other social studies teachers. It is hoped that these professional colleagues will take the HTM, adapt it to the needs and abilities of their students, and impact the historical thinking of students beyond my classroom.

3.3 Statement of the Problem of Practice

The Problem of Practice was that I did not use field studies to historical sites and museums to develop historical thinking. Overnight field trips are selling points in the recruitment of students to The Academic Magnet at Peer Middle School (pseudonyms and hereafter referred to as TAM and PMS, respectively). In eighth grade, I typically take my students on a four-or-five-day trip to Washington, DC. Students visit a variety
of sites such as the Smithsonian’s Air and Space Museum, Ford’s Theatre, the Holocaust Museum, Mount Vernon, the National Archives, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, and the Jefferson, Korean, Lincoln, Martin Luther King, Jr., Vietnam, and World War II memorials. In addition, past students have also visited Colonial Williamsburg, Jamestown, and Atlanta. During the data collection of the upcoming 2017-2018 school year, we visited Washington, DC in November 2017.

During these field studies, our team of teachers used to require students to complete a field study guide or a project. Recently, both the science and English Language Arts teachers required a scavenger hunt and writing assignment, respectively. Although the last several years are somewhat of a blur, I can say that I have not given any major assignment for an overnight trip in a number of years except for May 2016’s trip to Atlanta. Even then, it was assigned to give students something to do while in the Civil Rights Museum and I did not grade it, although they did receive credit in English class. In addition, after the fall 2016 field study to Washington, DC, I did have students write their thoughts about the trip in their journals, which I did not read or grade, but they certainly have not had a major field study guide or project to complete for history class. Instead I have trusted the staff, tour guides, and the sites’ exhibits to educate the students. While I did not want students to be absorbed in the completion of a field study guide and miss seeing and experiencing the atmosphere of the historical sites and museums, it is important that these opportunities for historical thinking not be squandered. Days off campus at historical sites and museums should be used for more than knowledge acquisition or opportunities to see where history took place. Intentional historical
thinking was missing and that problem of practice needed to be addressed in this action research study.

The problem with my pedagogy could contribute to the students themselves failing to become analytical citizens who could make positive contributions toward American democracy and society. Considering that 57% of Americans tour historical sites and museums each year and rate these places 8.4 on a 10 point scale in terms of reliability, it was important students learn that these sites could be inaccurate and subjective sources which often neglect non-White male perspectives (Rosenzweig & Thelen, 1998, pp. 241, 244; Loewen, 1999; Marcus, 2007). If I failed to help my students develop their analytical and evaluative skills, I might have contributed to them not becoming the open-minded citizens needed for Americans to collaborate for “common good” (Barton & Levstik, 2004, p. 34).

3.4 Research Design

A qualitative action research study was used to answer the Research Question: How does the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) change eighth grade students’ critical thinking during field experiences at historical sites and museums?

The study itself involved a sample class of 15 students who used the HTM to analyze and evaluate historical sites and museums. This section will discuss why action research was the best approach to answer the Research Question, methodology, the sample, the Historical Thinking Method, the schedule and design of the study, validity issues, qualitative analysis techniques, and ethics.

**Action research.** As delineated above, it is obvious that I had a problem to solve – to use class trips to historical sites and museums in the development of students’
historical thinking. The most appropriate methodology to solve this problem was action research because its “purpose . . . is for practitioners to investigate and improve their practices” (Hendricks, 2009, p. 3). At its heart, action research is a pragmatic investigation into improving teaching. Mills (2007) differentiated between “critical action research” and “practical action research” stressing that the latter “places more emphasis on the ‘how-to’ approach” (pp. 6-7). Articulating its practicality, he identified five basic tenets:

Teacher researchers have decision-making authority.

Teacher researchers are committed to continued professional development and school improvement.

Teacher researchers want to reflect on their practices.

Teacher researchers will use a systematic approach for reflecting on their practice.

Teacher researchers will choose an area of focus, determine data collection techniques, analyze and interpret data, and develop action plans. (p. 9)

Each of these statements described my situation. First, I had a voice in what field studies and sites were selected as well as what students would be required to do academically on these trips. Second, I had long been involved in growing as a professional, improving my own pedagogy, and wanting to help others do so as well. I annually present at the South Carolina Council for the Social Studies, am National Board certified, and co-authored an eighth grade textbook on the history of the Palmetto State entitled *The South Carolina Journey*. Third, I have often reflected on my curriculum and realized that both the content and the methodology of my actual teaching needed more intentional reflection and action. Mertler (2014) stressed that “this process of systematically collecting
information followed by active reflection – all with the anticipation of improving the teaching process – is at the core of action research” (p. 13). Finally, the conducting of an action research study with its concomitant emphasis on planned reflection was used to solve my problem of practice, answer the research question, and become an on-going model for future improvement. The details of how this was accomplished will be addressed shortly.

Within action research itself, there are different models teachers can employ to answer their research questions and solve their problems of practice. Regardless of which model is used, all of them share certain characteristics. Referencing Mills (2011), Mertler (2014) summarized that once a subject or problem has been identified, all the “models . . . involve some observation . . . of current practice followed by the collection and synthesis of information and data . . . [with] some sort of action . . . which then serves as the basis for the next stage” (p. 14). Mertler’s own model was employed in this action research study.

Mertler’s (2014) model involves four basic steps – planning, acting, developing, and reflecting. During the planning stage, the teacher-researcher identifies the problem, investigates what other professionals and the literature suggest, and designs a plan. The acting stage is when this plan is put into practice and data is collected. The teacher-researcher then interprets the data and develops an action plan – “a proposed strategy for implementing the results of your action research project” (p. 43) - and shares the process and results with other professionals. The teacher-researcher also takes time for summative reflection of the study and its findings so that the next cycle can be effective. While this process seems rather straightforward, it must be remembered that “action
research . . . is not a linear process” (p. 37) and includes a “cyclical and spiraling nature” (p. 38).

**Methodology.** Action research can be done using quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods approaches. Traditional quantitative studies use the scientific method “to establish relationships between variables and look for and sometimes explain the causes of such relationships” (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2015, p. 10). In doing so, they are focused on the analysis of numbers and patterns to justify their interpretations, which they then generalize to the larger population. Traditional qualitative approaches assume the postmodern viewpoint that there are many realities, and their goal is “understanding [specific] situations and events from the viewpoint of the participants” (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2015, p. 10) with little, if any, concern about generalizability. Finally, a mixed-methods approach uses both quantitative and qualitative tools to arrive at a more complete picture of what it is being studied. Influenced greatly by the philosophy of pragmatism, this third method emphasizes to “use whatever works” (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2015, p. 557).

While this action research study was not a mixed-methods one, it too followed a practical approach and used qualitative methods to answer its research question: How does the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) change eighth grade students’ critical thinking during field experiences at historical sites and museums? In answering this question, I wanted to understand what and how students thought in their interactions with historical sites and museums. Could they analyze, evaluate, and connect with these places or were they simply casual consumers of what was exhibited? Reading students’ written thoughts, listening to what they said, observing their interactions with peers at
historical sites and museums, and asking probing questions were the best methods to answer this question. This was what Dana and Yendol-Hoppey (2014) meant when they stated “that teacher questions and the resulting summative analysis techniques tend to be more qualitative in nature since teacher questions often seek to understand a process or nature of a classroom phenomenon” (p. 167). Understanding the historical thinking process of students could best be accomplished through the inductive analysis of their thoughts expressed in words.

Another shared characteristic of traditional qualitative research and this action research study was its lack of emphasis on generalizability. Citing McMillan (2004), Mertler (2014) stated that “the overarching goal of action research is to improve practice immediately with one or a few classrooms or schools” (p. 13). I was focused on improving my specific students’ critical thinking at historical sites and museums, not on generalizability. However, I did want to share my results with other teachers so that they could perhaps adapt some of my ideas to use with actual and virtual historical sites and museums. In order to facilitate this transferability, I have provided a thick description of the context of my action research study (Hendricks, 2009, p. 115; Mills, 2007, p. 86).

**Sample.** At the center of this context were the students themselves. I teach eighth grade social studies in The Academic Magnet (TAM) at Peer Middle School (PMS). As of November 2017, TAM’s eighth grade population was composed of 34 Whites, 22 Asians, 12 African Americans, 2 Hispanics, and 1 student who identified as two or more races, totaling 33 females and 38 males (Pearson School Systems Power School, 2017, Nov. 15). These students were divided among four classes, one of which was selected as the sample examined in this action research study.
Traditional researchers prefer random samples for generalizability purposes, but “rather than choose participants randomly or systematically, they [action researchers] work with the individuals . . . around whom their everyday practices revolve” (Hendricks, 2007, p. 3). Mertler (2014) agreed stressing that “action research allows teachers to study their own classrooms . . . their own students [emphasis added] . . . in order to better understand them and to be able to improve their quality or effectiveness” (p. 4). In fact, I used the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) with all of my students, but I selected only one of my classes for data collection and analysis. Limiting the sample size to a single class made it easier for me to record observations and made the amount of qualitative data manageable for analysis.

To understand more fully the impact of the HTM on students’ interaction with historical sites and museums, I selected a class that exhibited both racial and gender diversity and provided solid qualitative data. The six females and nine males of this class were 13 and 14 years of age and consisted of six Asians, five Whites, three African Americans, and one student of two or more races (Pearson School System Power School, n.d.). They were also very strong readers. Three students scored in the 80th percentile and 12 in the 90th percentile of the 2017 September administration of the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) with a class mean of 94.2% (Frontline Education, 2016). The data collected from this sample class helped me adjust the way I use field studies so that students can grow in their historical thinking.

**The schedule and design of the study.** In this study there were nine opportunities for students to analyze and evaluate actual and virtual historical exhibits. The first site they examined was the National Archives and Records Administration
online exhibit *Bill of Rights and You* (2016, December 8). After completing the preparatory background work (see Appendix B), the students analyzed the actual exhibit. They were asked to write their thoughts in a stream of consciousness style while I recorded my observations in a field journal. A copy of these directions can also be found in Appendix B. Wineburg (2001) and Baron (2012, 2013) used a similar approach but audio-taped their comments. Such a method would not have worked in a confined class setting with 15 students speaking into recorders, so the journaling approach was preferred. I read over the analyses and consulted with students whose responses were unclear or needed clarification. This provided a clearer picture of how students examined an exhibit on their own without much guidance. In other words, it provided a qualitative baseline of how they thought when examining exhibits (Hendricks, 2009, pp. 106-107).

The next step in the action research study was introducing the students to the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) for Historical Sites and Museums (see Appendix A) using the virtual site was the South Carolina Hall of Fame’s online exhibit on Eliza Lucas Pinckney (“South Carolina Hall of Fame inductees N-S,” 2008), an important eighteenth century woman best known for her work with indigo. After a class period of background reading and note-taking (see Appendix C), we went through the HTM as a class and applied it to the exhibit. What was not finished was completed for homework, and on the next day, I finished going over the analysis. I did not spend much time, if any, addressing HTM #19 that asked for students to write down the additional information provided by the source because most students already knew how to take factual notes from a source, although not always as thorough as they should. The purpose of this
Their first opportunity to do so was the third activity in which they analyzed and evaluated the statue of the Catawba chief “King Hagler” located in the Town Green of downtown Camden, South Carolina. This monument actually consists of two statues facing each other – Chief Hagler and Joseph Kershaw, one of the county’s colonial founders. Students focused primarily on the Native American although they did pay attention to both. Once again they spent time preparing for their analyses by reading and taking notes on Hagler and the Catawba (see Appendix D), and then in groups of two or three used the HTM to analyze photographs of Hagler’s monument while I was available for questions and help when needed.

The fourth analysis opportunity took place when students went to Washington, DC on the annual eighth grade field study from November 6-10, 2017. Students ranked their preferences and were assigned one of six possible sites: an exhibit of their choice at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, the Vietnam Women’s Memorial, an exhibit of the their choice at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and Culture, or The Dilemma of Slavery exhibit at Mount Vernon. In the days leading up to the trip, students took notes in their DC journals on the websites listed on their preparation assignments (see Appendices E-J). These different sites provided students with important background information on the historical topics and the creation of the exhibits. While on the field study, they took photographs of their assigned sites and if time and weather allowed
began to apply the HTM. Upon their return to school, they completed their analysis and wrote it in a more formal paper (see Appendix X).

Between March and May, students engaged in four more activities (#5-8) in which they used the HTM to analyze historical sites and museum exhibits. Their fifth opportunity was the March analysis of photographs of another exhibit at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and Culture entitled *A Woman’s War*, which addressed African American women and the Civil War (see Appendix K for preparatory curriculum). In April, students’ sixth activity involved examination of photographs of a Fort Mill, South Carolina monument entitled “To the Faithful Slaves,” an example of the Lost Cause mythology surrounding the Civil War (see Appendix L for background materials). Later that month, the Benjamin Tillman Monument on the State House grounds was the seventh site students applied the HTM. Tillman was a governor, U.S. senator, and patron of Clemson and Winthrop Universities who greatly contributed to the political and social ostracism of African Americans in South Carolina with his racist speeches, support for lynching, and leadership in the writing of the 1895 state constitution that disenfranchised blacks. After their preparation work (see Appendix M), students then analyzed photographs of the statue and its inscriptions using the HTM. Afterward, they wrote short essays arguing for keeping Tillman’s statue, changing the monument, or removing it. The eighth site, and the final one students used the HTM to analyze, was a choice between two virtual exhibits at the South Carolina Hall of Fame - Civil War naval officer and nineteenth century politician Robert Smalls or civil rights activist Septima Poinsette Clark. The preparation curriculum for these two activities can be found in Appendices N and O, respectively.
These four activities provided students practice in applying the HTM, and I helped them along the way.

The ninth activity was intended to be a second off-campus field trip in May 2018, but the scheduling did not work out so I had to improvise and create a virtual one. To introduce them to the State House and its grounds, the students completed a virtual tour (The Legislative Services Agency, n.d.) and completed a factual handout I created entitled “A Virtual Tour of the State House and Grounds” (see Appendix Y). The actual analysis sites were the African American, Confederate Women, Strom Thurmond, and Wade Hampton Monuments. After students had completed preparation work for the monument they chose and were assigned (see Appendices P-S), they were sufficiently ready to analyze photographs of their respective sites. However, unlike the previous opportunities, they were not provided a copy of the HTM because the purpose of this final activity was to see to what degree they had internalized the process by comparing this activity’s work with their initial musings in September’s analysis of the Bill of Rights exhibit. They were instructed to analyze and evaluate the monument, provided the same definitions as they were previously in the Bill of Rights activity, and reminded they could write their thoughts down in note format. A copy of the directions handout that was tailored for each of the four sites - African American, Confederate Women, Strom Thurmond, and Wade Hampton - can be found in the corresponding appendices (P, Q, R, and S, respectively). Finally, they wrote their analyses as a more formal paper to make sure I understood what their notes meant.

By the end of the year, students had analyzed a total of four museum exhibits and four monuments/memorials/statues plus one more of either depending upon the site they
had examined in Washington, DC. Eight of the nine activities involved students examining these historical sites virtually (either online or through photographs), and the other opportunity took place during a field trip to Washington, DC. This study was similar to Fisher and Frey’s gradual release model in which a teacher models how to do a skill, then the class does it with the teacher, followed by the students working collaboratively, and finally the students work individually (“Gradual Release Model,” n.d.). I did the first two together when we did the Eliza Lucas Pinckney analysis. Then the next six HTM analyses were usually done cooperating with others although often students also worked alone at least some of the time. The final analysis of the State House monument was done alone.

To provide another source of data to answer the Research Question, I had students complete a written interview of three prompts. They began by reflectively answering, “Would you say that the HTM has changed how you analyze a historical site or museum exhibit? Explain with details.” Then students discussed which of the HTM’s 32 prompts presented the greatest difficulties and why. The final prompt asked students to suggest what would make the HTM better, what they thought about the sites they had analyzed, and other ones they recommended be added to the process. Their answers were another source in the triangulation of data, and the interview protocol can be found in Appendix T.

During the late spring and summer of 2018, I transitioned from the acting step of Cycle 2 to the development and reflection steps. After summatively reflecting on Cycle 2, I began to develop an action plan for the next school year, which included the continuance of using historical sites and museums to teach critical thinking. I also
continued to think about a presentation on the HTM with fellow professionals at the school, district, and state levels, the latter being at the annual conference of the South Carolina Council for the Social Studies (SCCSS). In fact, I have already applied to present at a district in-service in August and the SCCSS’s annual conference this upcoming fall. The Data Collection Plan for Cycles 1 and 2 is located in Appendix U.

The historical thinking method. At the center of this action research study was the Historical Thinking Method (HTM). This section describes the final version of the HTM followed by another section discussing the design and schedule of this action research study. For a final version of the HTM, consult Appendix A.

The HTM grew out of and alongside of another analysis tool. Using the “Historical Thinking Chart” (Stanford History Education Group, n.d.), I have spent the past two plus years from 2015 through 2017 developing a handout for students to use in the analysis of primary source documents. I named it the Text Analysis Guide (TAG; see Appendix Z for its latest version). The HTM was begun in the spring and summer of 2016, and a close examination of both the TAG and HTM shows that each address creation, context, content, and corroboration about their document or exhibit. The HTM, the analytical centerpiece of this action research study, is a 32 prompt guide divided into six main sections known as the “Six C’s” – creation (eleven prompts), context (two prompts), content (eight prompts), connection (five prompts), corroboration (three prompts), and criticism (three prompts). During the first three HTM activities – the Eliza Lucas Pinckney virtual exhibit, the Hagler monument, and the Washington, DC area sites – the HTM itself was revised: the addition of a new prompt (#11); prompts #2 and 3 were reversed; a follow-up question was added to prompt #24; clarification about bias as added
to #14; directions and wording were changed or added; and stylistic changes such as completely capitalized words and bold print were used for emphasis. I decided to stop making adjustments to the HTM beginning with the fifth activity (*A Woman’s War*). The discussion below is based on this final HTM version.

The first section of the HTM was focuses on the creation or origin of the historical site or museum. When examining documents, Wineburg (1991, 2001) and Reisman (2012) called this “sourcing” while Baron (2012, 2013) labeled it as “origination” when applying it to historical buildings. Students are asked to identify what they are examining, discuss their personal views of the exhibit’s topic, and describe the exhibit itself (prompts #1-3). They then determine who created the exhibit and its items (text, visual images like photographs and artwork, artifacts, sculpture, and architectural elements), the reason(s) for and date of their creation, and the significance of the exhibit’s location or immediate surroundings (prompts #4-7). The last of these questions is not one students may naturally be inclined to address, but it is an important one because location can reveal something about the creator’s purpose for the exhibit. For example, a September 11th memorial in Connecticut with New York City in the background is certainly not just happenstance (Marcus, Stoddard, & Woodward, 2012). If the exhibit is a memorial, monument, or building, students then address the story behind its creation, discuss it in relation to other examples or artistic inspirations, speculate why it might have been designed this way, and find out the reasons behind its design (prompts #8-11).

*Context* is the next topic of the HTM, but its second-place position is misleading. Context is concerned with how a historical site or museum fits into the bigger picture of history. More than likely, students in this study did not possess this knowledge unless I
had done my job in preparing them in the days leading up to the visit. This prior instruction was very important for students to be able to contextualize what they analyzed during a field trip or virtual exhibit analysis. There are actually two contexts students need to understand – the topic of the site and the time it was created or preserved (Marcus, Stoddard, & Woodward, 2012). For example, the context of the Vietnam Memorial in Washington, D.C. would include the war overseas and its perception on the home front. However, the later design and construction of the wall itself took place within another historical context that needs to be analyzed. I had to make sure that the information necessary for contextualization was provided to students either at the site itself or in the classroom prior to the trip. In the activities prior to and after the trip, teachers should connect the sites to the big ideas and periods of history and how their analyses of the sites are similar to what historians do (van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008). Context is important not only to understand an exhibit but also to prevent subjective interpretation from transforming the exhibit into a mere piece of art. Context is addressed in prompts 12 and 13.

The third section of the HTM is concerned with content. Particularly important is for students to pay careful attention to how information is used to support claims or viewpoints. Often, claims are made with few facts to justify them (prompts #14-15). Students are also asked to consider how the elements of an exhibit – its use of large fonts to emphasize certain text or architectural features – reveal the creator’s point of view (prompt #16). It is no accident that Abraham Lincoln sits on a throne like Zeus in a Greek temple. This touched on Baron’s (2012) idea of “interectonality,” which involves the viewer asking: “How does what they did here compare with what has been done
elsewhere” (p. 844)? This same idea is also examined in creation’s prompts #9-11 discussed above. Equally important are viewpoints not present or misrepresented, especially those of women and minority groups (prompt #17). These questions encourage students to think about how a historical site or museum relates to social justice issues, especially race and sex/gender (prompt #18). For example, Segall (2014) was critical that the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum did not connect the anti-Semitism of Nazi Germany to American racism. Next, students take notes on the additional information the exhibit provides about the topic itself and write down one key quote or more that captures what they feel the exhibit is saying about its topic (prompts #19-20). Finally, students are asked to write down questions they wish the historical site or museum answered but does not (prompt #21). These questions could then be used as part of a post-trip activity and help students understand that history is an on-going investigation.

The fourth section of the HTM requires students to find a connection with the past. Another more common term is historical empathy. Barton and Levstik (2004) argued that historical empathy should be considered as “perspective recognition” and “caring.” The former consisted of considering the different viewpoints of the time-period and “the recognition that our own attitudes, beliefs, and intentions are historically and culturally situated, just as those of people in the past were” (p. 223). The first two questions of the HTM are concerned with perspective recognition. Students are asked to consider how the exhibit’s viewpoint or perspective is similar to or different from their own and then examine what influences have led them to having their viewpoints (prompts #22-23).
The final three questions of the connection section addresses the second type of historical empathy – caring. It is at this point that the HTM turns its focus from the intellectual analysis of the exhibit to the students’ thoughts and emotions – how they connect to the past (prompt #24). Barton and Levstik (2004) elaborated on the four types of caring:

*Caring about* refers to our historical interests, the topics about which we want (and feel we need) to learn. *Caring that* is the basis for moral judgments about the past, our reactions to the consequences of historical events. *Caring for* is . . . the desire to help people in the past, even though such assistance is impossible and it can be a powerful incentive to engage in the other aspects of historical study. Finally, *caring to* refers to the willingness to apply what has been learned in history to problems in the present. (pp. 241-242)

The goal of this component is to make the historical site or museum relevant to the student in a contemporary and personal manner (prompt #25). This idea of *caring to* involves students, moved by events of the past, wanting to change present issues of social injustice (prompt #26). Achieving this outcome might require devotion of class time on current events and issues in ways that relate to students’ personal lives so that they have the background to connect the present to historical sites or museums.

The fifth section of the HTM is *corroboration*, a possible post-trip activity. It asks for students to consult other sources to compare and contrast with the exhibit (prompts #27-28). Once this is done, the students discuss its reliability (prompt #29). A student’s evaluation should be based on his or her comparison work with other sources and include the work they did with prompts #14-15 and 17-19 where they looked at the
bias, evidence, missing viewpoints, and its positive or negative connection to race or sex/gender. This component of historical thinking helps students realize they should question and interact with historical sites and not just accept them as authoritative.

The sixth and final section of the HTM is criticism. Students are prone to give their opinions on most topics. These questions ask for them to critique the positive and negative aspects of the exhibit (prompt #30) and discuss what they find impressive about the exhibit itself (prompt #31). Furthermore, students are encouraged to suggest how they would change about the exhibit to make it better and why these adjustments should be made (prompt #32). These questions require analysis, evaluation, and creation – cognitive activities high on Bloom’s revised taxonomy (Krathwohl, 2002). Students need to realize that studying history is not just about factual knowledge and other peoples’ opinions but also about what they the students think.

Validity. To answer the research question of how the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) changed eighth grade students’ critical thinking during field experiences at historical sites and museums, this action research study needed to ensure that the design resulted in quality data. Mertler (2014) stated that a study’s “rigor refers to the quality, validity, accuracy, and credibility of action research and its findings” (p. 27). Central to the idea of rigor then is validity, which Mills (2007) defined as “whether the actual solution to a problem (our planned intervention) actually solves our problem” (p. 85). In other words, if the HTM changed how students interacted with historical sites and museums (i.e., improves their historical thinking), then this action research study will have been a valid one.
However, validity needs to be analyzed further. Hendricks (2009) recommended that the teacher-researcher whose goal “is purely to inform your own educational practice, you may wish to focus on truth value validity, outcome validity, and catalytic validity” (p. 113). In addition, I will also share the HTM guide with school and district colleagues as well as present what I have learned at the annual conferences of the South Carolina Council for the Social Studies (SCCSS) and perhaps the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). Consequently, applicability or transferability validity will also be considered.

To evaluate whether an action research study passed the test of truth value validity, I should ask: “In what ways can I ensure my results are accurate and truthful?” (Hendricks, 2009, p. 113). There are several methods to achieve a positive answer to this important question. One way is to collect data consistently over a long period of time (Creswell, 2009, p. 192; Hendricks, 2009, pp. 114-115; Mertler, 2014, p. 137). The data collection in this action research study included nine analyses of online or actual historical sites or museum exhibits from September 2017 to May 2018. The first analysis acted as a pretest followed by seven opportunities to use the HTM with the final activity serving as a posttest of how well students had internalized the HTM. A second strategy is triangulation or “polyangulation,” which “simply means that there is more than one source of data” (Mertler, 2014, p. 11). An examination of the Data Collection Plan in Appendix U reveals that each of the ten student opportunities to analyze historical sites and museum exhibits resulted in at least two sources of data, sometimes more. These included completed HTM guides, other written products, and teacher observations. In the end, “collecting multiple forms of data and triangulating them will help increase the
credibility of your findings, and this will ultimately impact the validity of your study” (Hendricks, 2009, p. 81).

Another important concern was for the observations in my journal to be accurate. The journal itself was a record of my thoughts as well as observations of students applying the HTM to actual and virtual historical sites and museum exhibits. Sometimes, I asked students if I found myself confused or unsure if I heard and remembered questions or comments correctly. This member checking aided in the journal’s validity.

Hendricks (2009) also paired truth value validity with process validity, which is concerned with answering the question: “What do I need to do to ensure I have looked deeply at the problem so I understand the ways context and processes have impacted results” (p. 113)? One method to improve these validities is for a teacher-researcher to acknowledge any biases (p. 115). Mills (2007) actually recommended for the teacher researcher “to develop a list of propositions about what they think they will find during the course of their investigations” (p. 97). Initially, I believed that the baseline activity where students write their analyses in a stream-of-consciousness style would reveal that most students would focus primarily on visual aspects of exhibits and interesting factual content. They would not naturally answer the majority of the 32 prompts on the HTM guide. However, I expected to see progress during the course of the study, and while they may not apply all the questions to their final analysis in the spring when they did not have the HTM guide, they would still address more of its elements than they did in their first activity in the fall. With these biases clearly stated, I was careful to let the data speak for itself.
Two other validities important in this action research study were outcome validity and catalytic validity. The former involved answering the question “How will I use results for continued planning, ongoing reflection, and deepening my personal understanding” (Hendricks, 2009, p. 113)? In other words, the results of “Cycle 2: Answering the Research Question” will be foundational in the continued development of pedagogies to teach students how to think critically at historical sites and museums. In his discussion of Anderson, Herr, and Nihlen’s (1994) views on outcome and catalytic validities, Mills (2007) concurred with Hendricks stating that a “study can be considered [outcome] valid if you learn something that can be applied to the subsequent research cycle” (p. 91). However, the reflection of outcome validity means little if nothing is done with the new knowledge and planning. It is at this point that catalytic validity plays an important role for it “require[s] that the participants in a study . . . take action on the basis of their heightened understanding of the subject of the study” (Mills, 2007, p. 91).

Hendricks (2009) recommended that these two validities require “continuous, ongoing reflective planning” (p. 115), which I will implement as I continue to use the HTM to teach future students how to critically analyze historical sites and museum exhibits.

The final validity that was important for this action research study was applicability/transferability validity. Transferability for qualitative research simply means “the degree to which an individual can expect the results of a particular study to apply in a new situation or with new people” (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2015, p. G-9). Hendricks (2009) suggested asking: “How might my results be useful beyond my particular classroom and with other students” (p. 113)? It is my intention to share my findings with colleagues and at conferences. I will provide a thick description of the
study’s site and the sample students including demographic information as well as reading skills as measured by the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) so that others will have a benchmark to work from in adjusting, if necessary, the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) to fit the needs and skills of their students. I will also review important literature, discuss the research process, and explain any changes I made based on reflection during the study (Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014, p. 224).

Qualitative data and analysis. There were two steps in the acting stage of Mertler’s model (2014, p. 37-38) - collecting data and then analyzing it. While the former has been addressed in a preceding section, it is important to examine how the data was analyzed. This topic will be covered more fully in Chapter 4: Findings, Discoveries, Reflections, and Analyses.

Rather than wait until the end of the action research study, I analyzed the data both formatively and summatively. The former involved “carefully considering data as you collect it, and using your consideration of it to help inform instructional decisions and next steps in your inquiry” (Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014, p. 158). Hendricks (2009) concurred preferring the term “interim analysis” from the work of Huberman and Miles (1998) and defining it as “looking at and thinking about data as it is collected and then making changes or additions to strategies if necessary” (p. 128). This ongoing data analysis was important because I am not just concerned with answering the research question after the fact. I wanted to make sure that I helped the current sample of students learn and grow in their historical thinking. By formatively analyzing the data, I fulfilled my ethical obligations to ensure that students were learning. My adjustments to the HTM discussed above exemplifies the formative process. I adjusted it based on what I
observed students needed. Summative analysis would only benefit me in the writing of my dissertation and future students in the changes I would make to how I would use the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) and field studies to historical sites and museums. It was important that all students – the ones involved in the study and future ones – benefit from this action research study.

Summative analysis of data occurred at the end once collection was complete. In fact, the vast majority of my analysis, especially after the Washington, DC trip took place summatively. I then followed “the steps fundamental to qualitative data analysis (organize, describe, and interpret)” (Parsons and Brown, 2002, p. 55). Mertler (2014) explained that the first step is to organize the data by “the development of a system of categorization, often referred to as a **coding scheme**, which is used to group data that provide similar types of information” (Mertler, 2014, p. 163). It made logical sense that the HTM guide’s six analysis categories of creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism became my codes. The second and third steps of description and interpretation took place concurrently as I learned how the data answered the original research question of how the HTM impacted the students’ field experiences at historical sites and museums. Interpretation involved “look[ing] for aspects of the data that answer your research questions, that provide challenges to current or future practice, or that actually may guide future practice” (Mertler, 2014, p. 165). I began by analyzing the Bill or Rights activity to understand how students analyzed an exhibit before learning the HTM. Then I went through student work (HTM and essays) for each of the six codes – creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism – of their analyses of the King Hagler statue, the Washington, DC site, *A Woman’s War exhibit*, “To the
Faithful Slaves” monument, the Benjamin Tillman monument on the State House
grounds, and the Robert Smalls or Septima Clark online exhibit at the South Carolina
Hall of Fame. Then I analyzed how they analyzed a State House monument on their own
without the HTM to guide them. Throughout this process, I organized using charts to find
similarities and differences and read student work multiple times. During this process
and predominantly at the end, I consulted my field journal notes. This description of the
three steps of summative analysis belie its complexity. Dana and Yendol-Hoppey (2014)
aptly described summative analysis:

> The process is “messy,” “murky,” and “creative,” because . . . at the start of the
> summative analysis process, you are not quite sure what this picture of your
> learning will look like – you must be patient as you allow your data to “speak” for
> itself and to lead you to your findings. (p. 168)

While this process appeared linear, it was more iterative in nature, but in the end it led to
what is laid out in Chapter 4. Through immersion into the data, I was able to determine
what the data had to say and its implications for my practice.

**Ethics.** An important consideration of all research is the role of ethics in both
data collection and analysis as well as respecting the confidentiality of student-
participants. Mertler (2014) elaborated that the teacher-researcher’s “ethical
responsibilities include not fabricating or falsifying any data or results and protecting the
confidentiality and anonymity of your participants” (p. 257-258). Special attention will
be given to these important ethical areas – data and students.
To assure that data is thorough and accurate, I used multiple sources of data as explained above. I also pored over my data and analysis more than once to assure its validity.

In addition, I fulfilled my ethical obligations regarding my students. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this dissertation, I took “Human Research – Social and Behavioral Researchers – 1 Basic Course” – an online class by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative – in June 2017. In July 2017, before Cycle 2 when data was formally collected, I also submitted his action research proposal to the University of South Carolina’s Institutional Review Board for approval. Finally, I assured student confidentiality in a number of ways. First, “Cycle 1: Preparation” did not require consent or assent forms because no formal data was collected for dissertation analysis or shared at professional conferences. In fact, revision of the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) based on students’ use of it was consistent with how curriculum is developed in my classroom. I regularly adjust my curriculum in light of what works with students and what does not. During “Cycle 2: Answering the Research Question,” letters of consent for parents and assent for students (see Appendices V and W) were sent home so that I could formally collect data and use it in both my dissertation and presentations. However, to assure that students’ right to privacy was guaranteed, I used pseudonyms for any identifying information such as the students’ names. In addition, any paperwork linking students and their pseudonyms was kept in a secured location. In the past, when I presented at conferences, my school was typically listed as part of the identifying information in the conference program. Consequently, in the future when I present at such conferences or in district in-services, I will be careful to speak in generalities, use
only student pseudonyms, provide MAP score averages or ranges for the group not individuals, and avoid specific student descriptions to maintain confidentiality. I will provide a thick enough description to allow for transferability but not for identification of any specific student. Any shared sample data such as student work will also be in a typed format to further ensure privacy.

3.5 Conclusion

The “wondering” (Dana & Yendol-Hoppey (2014) or purpose of this action research study was to answer how the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) would change the thinking of eighth grade students in their interaction with actual and virtual historical sites and museums. With a need to make field studies to Washington, DC and local sites exercises in historical thinking, I engaged in a qualitative action research study. Rather than depending only on tour guides and exhibits to teach my students, I designed activities using the HTM. Mills (2007) stated that “this goal of teachers to be professional problem solvers who are committed to improving both their own practice and student outcomes provides a powerful reason to practice action research” (p. 10).

To solve the problem of not using historical sites and museums to develop critical thinking, I designed a HTM guide (see Appendix A) and a research plan of nine activities to pre-assess, train, and evaluate students’ growth in higher level cognition (see Appendix U). The qualitative data was analyzed and a new action plan to share the results with other professionals and steps for the next cycle will be developed. In the end, this action research study furthered both my professional growth and the critical thinking skills of my students.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS, DISCOVERIES, REFLECTIONS, AND ANALYSES

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will first review this action research study’s problem of practice, purpose statement, and research question. Attention will then shift to methodology, qualitative data collection, and coding. Most of this chapter will focus on analysis of the data and what it reveals about students’ historical thinking at virtual and historical sites and museums.

Origin and problem of practice. Each year I take 70 or so eighth graders to Washington, DC where we visit a plethora of historical sites and museums such as the Capitol, Ford’s Theatre, the Holocaust and Smithsonian museums, Mount Vernon, and numerous memorials. The instructional problem in touring these locations concerned what students should be doing academically. On the one hand, I did not want them so focused on completing a field study guide that they missed experiencing what the site had to offer, but I also did not want them to be so casual and social in their interactions that opportunities for real academic growth were squandered. In addition, field trips were expensive in terms of money and time but they offered students the chance to study history in less traditional and more authentic ways. One alternative to overcoming these difficulties was the use of technology to take virtual trips to historical sites and museums. Virtual trips could involve visiting websites or examining sites through the use of digital photographs students actually handle and analyze. Regardless of the type of trip,
physically traveling to the site or virtually examining it, the problem of practice was how to use these excursions to teach students to think historically and critically about what they were seeing.

**The purpose statement or rationale.** This action research study had three primary purposes. First, I wanted to use the Historical Thinking Method (HTM; see Appendix A) to teach students how to think critically about actual and virtual historical sites and museums. Second, the analytical activities of this study were intended to contribute to students’ development in critical citizenship. Third, I wanted to develop an action plan to share the results of this study with other social studies teachers so they could begin to revise their own pedagogy to help students become skilled analysts of public history.

**Research question.** To transform actual and virtual field studies into opportunities to help students grow in critical thinking, the following research question was the focus of this action research study:

**RQ1:** How does the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) change eighth grade students into critical thinkers during field experiences at historical sites and museums?

The HTM (see Appendix A) was the primary pedagogical instrument to guide and train students in their critical analyses. It consists of six sections and 32 questions – **creation** (eleven prompts), **context** (two prompts), **content** (eight prompts), **connection** (five prompts), **corroboration** (three prompts), and **criticism** (three prompts). A detailed discussion of the HTM can be found in Chapter 3 (see the fifth labeled subsection of “3.4 Research Design”).
**Methodology and data collection.** As stated numerous times, this dissertation examines an action research study. Mertler (2014) described action research as a “systematic inquiry conducted by teachers . . . with a vested interest in the teaching and learning process or environment for the purpose of gathering information about . . . how they teach, and how their students learn” (p. 305). Consistent with this definition, the current study aimed to answer a pedagogical problem, namely how to use actual and virtual field studies to historical sites and museums to teach students to think critically.

This qualitative study consisted of two cycles - “Cycle 1: Preparation” (from spring 2016 through the 2016-2017 school year and summer) and “Cycle 2: Answering the Research Question” (the 2017-2018 school year and summer). The former involved reading the professional literature, developing the HTM, considering actual and virtual historical sites and museums especially in Washington, DC and South Carolina, and a trial run with students using the HTM, photographs, and related source materials on Benjamin R. Tillman’s State House Monument. Cycle 2, the focus of this dissertation, followed Mertler’s (2014) four stages of planning, acting, developing, and reflecting and was iterative with Cycle 1, consistent with his contention that “teacher-researchers engaged in action research often find themselves repeating some of the steps several times or perhaps doing them in a different order” (p. 16). The data analyzed in this chapter were collected from nine activities, which were described in detail in Chapter 3.

The sample group of this study was composed of 15 students – six females and nine males. Employing pseudonyms, there were two African American females (Harriet and Mary) and one male (LeBron), two Asian American females (Indira and Sima) and four males (Khan, Nehru, Ranjit, and Sid), two White females (Rachel and Taylor) and
three males (Carl, Frank, and Larry), and one student who identified as two or more races (Chinese and White; Watson). For different reasons, the sample size sometimes dropped by one or two if a student did not complete or turn in the assignment or in one case a nameless paper could not be definitively confirmed to be from the sample class.

4.2 A Description of the Historical Sites and Museum Exhibits

To arrive at a baseline of their analysis skills, students were told to analyze and write down their thoughts on a virtual exhibit of the Bill of Rights. Sitting in the lobby of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, the Bill of Rights and You is composed of four panels creating a three-dimensional quadrilateral sitting on a cubic base. The students, however, analyzed a digital version of each panel on the National Archives and Records Administration website. The first panel is entitled “OUR BILL OF RIGHTS IS 225 YEARS OLD.” Its background is the left side of Howard Chandler Christy’s artistic depiction of day the Constitution was signed and includes a brief introduction of the Bill of Rights, a discussion of the amendment process, and an explanation of where the Bill of Rights is displayed in the Rotunda of the National Archives. The right side of Christy’s painting dominates the second panel, “Creating the BILL OF RIGHTS,” which provides a brief account of how these first ten amendments came to be and their author James Madison. “KNOW YOUR RIGHTS,” the third panel, briefly lists the main rights of the first ten amendments. The fourteenth is also featured because it is used to apply these federal rights to state governments, an idea called incorporation. Thomas Jefferson’s quote that “WE MIGHT AS WELL REQUIRE A MAN TO WEAR STILL THE COAT WHICH FITTED HIM WHEN A BOY, AS CIVILIZED SOCIETY TO REMAIN EVER UNDER THE REGIMEN OF THEIR
BARBAROUS ANCESTORS” is appropriately included. The final panel proclaims that “THE BILL OF RIGHTS ALLOWS US TO PRACTICE ANY RELIGION, SPEAK FREELY, AND MAKE A CHANGE,” obviously devoting its space to the first amendment. Various photographs depict civil rights and women suffragette marches, people at worship and in prayer, citizens signing a petition, and a press conference. This exhibit provided all 15 students an opportunity to learn about the Bill of Rights as well as to reveal their thinking processes when examining a museum display.

The first exhibit students applied the HTM was on the South Carolina Hall of Fame’s online exhibit of Eliza Lucas Pinckney. Located in the lobby of the Myrtle Beach Convention Center, the museum currently honors 97 men and women. Mounted on off-white backgrounds in heavy-framed black cases fronted with protective glass panels are painted or photographed portraits and placards explaining the inductees’ merits. In the center of the exhibit are video kiosks where visitors can watch short videos on each of the honorees. The online version includes the picture, text, and video together. A 2008 inductee, Pinckney is shown from a side angle and attired in a long-sleeved, blue dress with a white shawl. Turned left toward the audience, her face features dark, intelligent eyes, reddened cheeks, and a petite, angular nose. Her raven hair rests on either side of a long, ivory neck clearly depicting Pinckney in the prime of life. The placard provides a brief biography and extols her role in making indigo a profitable crop for South Carolina, her marriage to Charles Pinckney and their subsequent children, and her keen intelligence and conversation prowess. The video concurs with this same view (“South Carolina Hall of Fame inductees, N-S,” 2008). This exhibit was used to introduce the HTM to all 15 students as began learning how to analyze a historical site or museum exhibit in a more
systematic and thorough way. Because it was used to introduce the HTM as I walked them through it, this exhibit and its data will not be discussed in the analysis that follows.

The next exhibit was the Chief Hagler statue, which is located in the center of Camden, South Carolina on the Town Green, tucked behind buildings on the city’s main street. It was at this point that all 15 students began to apply the HTM on their own with my assistance. On a base of grey granite topped with a slab of pinkish granite stand two bronze figures – Hagler, chief of the Catawba, and Joseph Kershaw, one of the founders of Camden. On the left, the former is dressed in tradition Native American garb including moccasin boots and adorned with jewelry and feathers. His strong hands hold a clay pot, symbolic of the pottery for which his tribe is still well-known. Facing Hagler on the right is Kershaw dressed in knickers, a buttoned vest and ruffled shirt, and a coat. In his hands are small and large bags symbolizing trade. The countenances of both men are calm and friendly. Engraved on the granite base are details about each man.

KING HAGLER

c1700 – 1763

CHIEF OF CATAWBA NATION 1750 -1763

“PATRON SAINT OF CAMDEN”

BRAVE WARRIOR – PEACEMAKER

SOUTH CAROLINA HALL OF FAME

JOSEPH KERSHAW

1727-1791

BORN IN ENGLAND – SUCCESSFUL BUSINESSMAN

“FATHER OF CAMDEN”
PATRIOT AMERICAN REVOLUTION
SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATOR
Together, both are extolled as “EARLY DEFENDERS OF PEACE AND LIBERTY IN THE FOUNDED OF CAMDEN AND KERSHAW COUNTY.”

The third exhibit students analyzed varied. They could choose any museum display at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, the Vietnam Women’s Memorial, an exhibit at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and Culture, or *The Dilemma of Slavery*” exhibit in the J. Hap and Geren Fauth Gallery at Mount Vernon. In the sample, four students (Larry, Rachel, Ranjit, and Sima) chose an exhibit at the Holocaust Museum; three students (Nehru, Taylor, and Watson) examined Dr. King’s Memorial; one student (Carl) analyzed the Lincoln Memorial; another student (Indira) opted for the Vietnam Women’s Memorial; three of them (Harriet, LeBron, and Mary) selected a display at the African American Museum; and the remaining three students (Frank, Khan, and Sid) settled on the Mount Vernon slavery exhibit.

Each of the four students – Larry, Rachel, Ranjit, and Sima – examined different Holocaust Museum exhibits. Larry analyzed an exhibit entitled *From Citizens to Outcasts*, which includes photographs and signs showing how Hitler and the Nazis slowly reduced the rights and status of Jews. Rachel examined a display entitled *Documenting Life and Death in the Warsaw Ghetto* that discusses the Oneg Shabbat Archive of documents and artwork that Jews “buried in metal containers in the ghetto to preserve them for posterity” (exhibit text). Included are some of these items as well as what Rachel described as “a sizable, rusted, breaking milk can” from a ghetto in Warsaw,
Poland. Ranjit selected an exhibit on the ghetto in Lodz, Germany, which includes four German documents. Finally, unlike her peers’ exhibits, which addressed Jewish life prior to concentration camps, Sima chose to analyze an exhibit discussing how Jews were executed in gas chambers. Flanked by dark panels containing text on “KILLING CENTERS” and “MURDER BY GAS” stands a heavy metal door with a peephole allowing an executioner to see his victims suffocating. Lying around are empty canisters with a central glass cylindrical case holding what the exhibit says are “INERT” Zyklon B pellets. These four examples provided Larry, Rachel, Ranjit, and Sima an opportunity to apply the HTM to an actual museum exhibit in contrast to a virtual one.

The next site – the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial - consists of three major components: the Mountain of Despair, a Stone of Hope, and a crescent wall, all made of granite. The main entrance takes the visitor through a chasm splitting the Mountain of Despair and leading to the missing middle piece called a Stone of Hope, out of which a somber Dr. King emerges facing the tidal pool separating the civil rights leader from the Jefferson Memorial. Two walls arc north and south of the entrance and provide a granite surface upon which are etched eight quotes on the former and six on the latter (National Park Service, 2016, November 29; 2016, May 2).

One of Dr. King’s most famous speeches – “I Have a Dream” – was given at the next memorial. The Lincoln Memorial is a large marble Greek temple in which a 19 foot Lincoln sits on an impressive throne. On the walls to the 16th president’s left and right, his Second Inaugural and Gettysburg Addresses are etched into limestone with Jules Guerin’s two murals Reunion and Emancipation displayed above each (Abraham Lincoln Online, n.d.).
To the right of the Lincoln Memorial lies the Vietnam Wall where nearby stands the Vietnam Women’s Memorial. On a circular base of granite, three bronze women honor the thousands of healthcare workers who helped in the conflict. An African American woman stands with an upward gaze “in search of a med-i-vac helicopter or, perhaps, in search of help from God” (Goodacre, n.d.). Next to her is another woman holding an injured soldier lying on a stack of sandbags, while the final woman kneels with a downcast head as “she stares at any empty helmet, her posture reflecting her despair, frustrations, and all the horrors of war” (Goodacre, n.d.). Park benches and fully-grown trees complete the setting.

The Smithsonian’s newest museum honors the history and culture of African Americans. Harriet, LeBron, and Mary chose different exhibits in this massive shrine to a long-neglected area of American history. Harriet chose an exhibit entitled *Jim Crow Laws* that features a photograph of two separate water fountains, one for whites and an inferior version for those designated as “colored.” To the side is a model or actual artifact of one African Americans had to use. LeBron decided to focus on slave life in the Chesapeake Bay. His display includes information on where in Africa they migrated from, relationships between Africans, indentured servants, and Native Americans, items they used, and the legal evolution of slavery. Finally, Mary analyzed an exhibit entitled *The Rise of the KKK*. Within a glass case is an empty white hood from Walterboro, South Carolina. To its left is a copy of Charles Carroll’s 1900 book entitled *The Negro A Beast or in the Image of God* (The Preitauer Black History Collection, n.d.) and opposite is an issue of *Le Journal Illustré* featuring a cover page sketch of four African American men hanging from a tree. Below is a large placard containing information about the Ku
Klux Klan with an 1870 drawing of North Carolina Klansmen. While forming a very small sample size of what the museum had to offer, these three displays provided these students experience using the HTM.

The final Washington, DC field study site that students could select was located in the Education Center’s J. Hap and Geren Fauth Gallery at Mount Vernon. The exhibit was entitled *The Dilemma of Slavery*. A rather large display, it consists of five major sections. On the far left are two artifacts displaying the annual clothing given to slaves and their daily rations of cornmeal and fish. Next is a video monitor where one can watch three historians (Dr. Edna Greene Medford of Howard University, Dr. Ira Berlin of the University of Maryland, and Dr. Dennis Pogue of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association), three descendants of Mount Vernon slaves (Shawn Costley, Zsun-nee Matema, and Judge Rohulamin Quander), and two other women (Sheila Coates of Black Women United for Action and an unknown white woman) discuss answers to four questions: “How did Washington treat his slaves? What was it like to be enslaved at Mount Vernon? Why didn’t Washington free his slaves during his lifetime? What happened to Washington’s slaves after he died?” The next section of the exhibit is at its center. A long list of many of the slaves flanks a large painting showing Washington speaking with his overseer while slaves work in a field. The exhibit’s title *The Dilemma of Slavery* dominates the top of the painting, and a placard includes a quote from Washington saying that “there is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do, to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it.” A brief discussion follows of his conflicted feelings and how he decided to free his slaves when he died “setting an example for others to follow.” Continuing to the right side of the exhibit, another placard proclaims
“CHANGE OF HEART CHANGE OF MIND” with a timeline showing the evolution of Washington’s views of and actions involving slavery. On the far right is an exhibit examining “THE SLAVES OF MOUNT VERNON.” It includes two paintings, one showing a slave believed to be Christopher Sheels serving Washington’s family and another featuring Hercules the chef. A large placard fronts this display with biographies of George Washington’s valet William Lee, Martha Washington’s servant Oney Judge, a female field hand Suckey Bay, the maid Caroline, and the aforementioned chef and cook Hercules. The final part of the exhibit features a glass case of unearthed artifacts from Mount Vernon.

After returning from Washington, DC the students continued developing their historical thinking skills on virtual sites. The fourth opportunity students could apply the HTM was on photographs of a Civil War exhibit entitled A Woman’s War from the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and Culture. Below its title is an 1863 quote from former slave Harriet Ann Jacobs after Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation: “To battle for freedom and justice of the slave, I go to the District of Columbia, where the shackles had just fallen.” Featured front and center are three photographs and biographies of Charlotte Forten Grimké (an African American abolitionist who worked in the Port Royal Experiment in South Carolina), Harriet Tubman (known for her involvement in the Underground Railroad, nursing and spy work during the Civil War, and leader of the 1863 Combahee River Raid in the South Carolina lowcountry), and Susie King Taylor (an escaped slave who served as a laundress, teacher, and nurse assistant with African American troops). Below lie two artifacts – Grimké’s diary and a field medical kit, which unfortunately had been temporarily removed from the
display. At the lower half of the exhibit is a large paragraph discussing “Women on the Front” centered between two large photographs – one showing a rundown building of African American laundresses and another depicting both male and female refugees who aided Union troops. A transcription of the exhibit’s text can be found in Appendix K. In this activity, the sample size as 14 students because Ranjit did not turn in his analysis.

The fifth exhibit was the first of several inspired by the Lost Cause. Located in Confederate Park in downtown Fort Mill, South Carolina is a monument entitled “To the Faithful Slaves.” Sitting atop a four-step brick pyramid is a marble obelisk with a block base. On one of the sides is a relief depicting a seated slave with a white child in her lap while another panel shows a field slave holding a scythe and relaxing on a log under the shade of a tree. The other two sides feature engraved text with one praising:

THE FAITHFUL SLAVES WHO, LOYAL TO A SACRED TRUST, TOILED FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE ARMY, WITH MATCHLESS DEVOTION, AND STERLING FIDELITY GUARDED OUR DEFENSELESS HOMES, WOMEN AND CHILDREN, DURING THE STRUGGLE FOR THE PRINCIPLES OF OUR “CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA.”

The final side “IN GRATEFUL MEMORY OF EARLIER DAYS” names ten slaves, eight of whom share the surname of Samuel E. White who erected the monument and gave the land to create Confederate Park. The complete text can be found in Appendix L. In this activity, the sample size as 13 students excluding Harriet and Larry.

The sixth historical site was the State House monument of Governor Benjamin R. Tillman. Located on the right front side of the South Carolina State House stands a bronze statue of the 59th governor of the Palmetto State. Four marble steps lead up to its
granite base atop which stands a serious-looking Tillman with a paper scroll in his right hand and dressed in a suit with a long overcoat. The front side inscription announces his name and credits the monument to “THE LEGISLATURE, THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND PRIVATE CITIZENS OF SOUTH CAROLINA.” The other three sides feature bronze plaques praising Benjamin for his professional accomplishments and includes one of his patriotic quotes (see Appendix M for the texts in full). In this activity, the sample size as 14 students excluding Rachel.

The seventh and final site students used the HTM to analyze was a choice of either the South Carolina Hall of Fame’s exhibit on Robert Smalls or Septima Poinsette Clark. Like their fellow inductee Eliza Lucas Pinckney, Smalls and Clark are honored with a picture, in their case a photograph, a placard, and a video. Smalls’s photograph depicts a middle-aged overweight man with a neatly trimmed goatee and wearing a dark suit, white shirt, and black bowtie. While his post-Civil War career is addressed in the placard’s text and the video, it is his famous escape from slavery on board the Planter that stands out. See Appendix N for a transcript of the video. Clark’s photograph shows an older woman appearing to listen intently with alert eyes behind a stylish set of glasses. She is wearing a collared jacket over a white blouse and three strings of pearls grace her neck. Both the placard and the video emphasize her use of education to help the civil rights movement and the critical role she played. A transcript of the video can be found in Appendix O. Excluding Rachel and Ranjit, seven students analyzed the Robert Smalls exhibit, six the Septima Clark exhibit.

The students’ final analysis involved them selecting one of four State House monuments honoring African Americans, Confederate Women, Strom Thurmond, or
Wade Hampton. Before discussing the students’ analyses, it will once again prove beneficial to describe each of these monuments in turn.

The African American monument is a complex one and difficult to describe. It is highly recommended for the reader unfamiliar with it to consult Botsch (2002) and the “African American Monument – Columbia, South Carolina” (n.d.). Sitting on the left side of the State House, the monument is composed of five major parts. In the center stands an obelisk identifying the sculptor Ed Dwight and the political leaders responsible for its erection. In front is a granite table with a map of the Middle Passage and stones from Senegal, Sierra Leone, Ghana, and the Congo, areas which many South Carolinian slaves called home before they were forcibly deported to the New World. On the walkway leading up to this exhibit lies a metal sculpture of a slave trade ship with its prisoners packed as freight in its hold. To the right and left of the obelisk are twelve bronze panels illustrating African American history from arrival as enslaved prisoners to the important work free modern African American citizens have accomplished in the arts, law, science, and sports. For more details about the text and organization of the monument, see Appendix P.

The Confederate Women’s monument was another option students could analyze. Located in the far back of the State House grounds, this bronze monument is dedicated “TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA WOMEN OF THE CONFEDERACY” and features a woman seated on a throne with an open book in her lap. Behind her is a large angel flanked by two smaller cherubim with the former grasping a trumpet in one hand and in the other holding a laurel wreath over the Southern matron’s head. Mounted on the sides of its granite base are bronze plaques praising women for their role during the Civil War
and claiming that “THE FRUITS OF THE NOBLE SERVICE OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE SOUTH ARE OUR PERPETUAL HERITAGE.” The creators also extol the women for their help after the war and their “CONVICTION THAT FROM THE ASHES OF RUIN WOULD COME RESURRECTION OF TRUTH WITH GLORIOUS VINDICATION.” The rest of the text can be found in Appendix Q.

The Strom Thurmond monument is located front and center behind the State House. The bronze statue depicts the confident older leader in full stride on a granite base engraved with his accomplishments, awards, and children, even Essie Mae Washington-Williams, a child he conceived with his family’s African American maid before he was married and kept secret throughout his life. To read the full text, consult Appendix R.

The final monument students could choose to analyze featured Wade Hampton. Seated astride a trotting horse, a bronzed Hampton surveys to the right from his heightened vantage point thanks to the monument’s tall granite base. His leadership of the Hampton Legion during the Civil War and his career as the state’s governor and U.S. senator as well as his birth and death dates are engraved in stone. Mounted on two sides are bronze plaques of important Civil War battles he fought in. Nicely manicured flowers soften the harsh lines of the granite base and stone surface surrounding the monument. Its inscriptions can be read in Appendix S.

4.3 Description of How Data Was Analyzed

This data was qualitative in nature. For their eight activities, I took notes on students’ questions and comments. The students’ notes on their analyses of the Bill of Rights exhibit and the State House monuments, written narratives of their Washington,
DC site and State House monument analyses, essays on what should be done with the Benjamin Tillman statue, HTM answers for the seven sites they used the instrument, and a final written interview preceding the final activity of the study provided the data analyzed in this chapter.

In order to analyze and interpret this qualitative data, I used a coding scheme, which Mertler (2014) defined as a “system of categorization used to group qualitative data so that they provide similar types of information” (p. 306). Repetition of certain words or phrases become the organizing topics in such analysis. Consequently, the HTM’s six components – creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism – played a prominent role in organizing this data as did the idea of social justice, which students considered in their analysis of a site’s content. These seven topics along with a close examination of how students analyzed before and after practice with the HTM formed the major headings of the analysis below.

The actual process of analyzing the data was a time-consuming, iterative one. After reading, analyzing, and writing about the preliminary Bill of Rights activity, my efforts became more systematic. I read through the six historical concerns – creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism – one at a time for each of the six activities in which the students used the HTM on their own – the Chief Hagler statue in Camden, the Washington, DC site, the *Women at War* Smithsonian exhibit, the “Faithful Slaves” monument in Fort Mill, the Benjamin R. Tillman State House monument, and the Robert Smalls or Septima Poinsette Clark virtual exhibit at the South Carolina Hall of Fame. As I did so, I compared and contrasted their responses and looked for any patterns. In addition, I also consulted my field journal at different times to
provide a fuller picture of what happened during the process. For the final analysis, which involved the South Carolina State House monuments to African Americans, Confederate Women, Strom Thurmond, and Wade Hampton, I read through the students’ notes and reflective essays in which they explained their analyses. I also examined my field journal to arrive at my final analysis. Finally, I then analyzed the students’ interview responses.

In the discussion that follows, we will examine students’ historical thinking one component (creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism) at a time from their initial activity with the Bill of Rights and You exhibit through the six exhibits they used the HTM on their own and culminating in their analyses of the State House monuments. Students’ comments about the study and the HTM will conclude our analysis.

4.4 Findings and Interpretation of the Creation Data

The creation section of the HTM consisted of ten prompts (later an eleventh one was added, which is discussed in Chapter 3) and addressed the story of how the exhibit came to be. Most importantly, the HTM asked who was involved in its creation, its purpose, when they did so, the significance of its location, and the story behind it all.

Creator of the Bill of Rights and You exhibit. One of the first considerations in analyzing an exhibit was who actually created it. In their initial Bill of Rights and You analysis without the HTM, the students focused on the creation of the topic rather than the exhibit itself. For example, eleven of the fifteen students at least mentioned some information related to the writing or adoption of the first ten amendments. While five students (Carl, LeBron, Nehru, Ranjit, and Sima) referenced Congress, Harriet, Mary,
and Sima were the only students to specifically mention James Madison who actually wrote the Bill of Rights. In contrast, none of the fifteen students identified the National Archives, which houses the Bill of Rights and Constitution, as the creator of the exhibit.

**Creator of the Hagler monument.** In their analysis of the Chief Hagler monument in Camden, South Carolina, students began to improve in this area. Four people were involved in the creation of this monument - Maria J. Kirby-Smith the sculptor, John Hagins, Jr. the financial sponsor, and John Burns and Lynda Solansky who provided the granite base. On Ranjit and Sima working together both identified and fully explained all four people involved. Five students (Carl, Harriet, Khan, Nehru, and Rachel) identified both Kirby-Smith and Hagins (with the “Jr” or without it) while four students identified just the sculptor (Frank, Larry, Mary, and Watson) or the financial backer (Indira, LeBron, Sid, and Taylor). However, the majority of students (Frank, Larry, Watson, Mary, Sid, Indira, LeBron, and Taylor) just wrote a name down (Carl and Rachel wrote two names) and failed to explain what that person or those persons did. In fact, only Harriet, Khan, Nehru, Ranjit, and Sima actually explained the contributors’ roles. However, unlike their analysis of the Bill of Rights exhibit, the students did focus on the people that made the exhibit and not just the topic of the exhibit.

**Creator of the Washington, DC exhibits.** In their remaining activities using the HTM, students continued to be incomplete in their identification of the creators of exhibits. For example, students responsible for the Martin Luther King, Jr., Lincoln, and Vietnam Women Memorials continued to credit some but not all who were responsible for their sites. In the case of the first site, the students identified Congress who approved its construction (Nehru and Taylor), Dr. King’s fraternity Alpha Phi Alpha (Nehru and
Taylor) and the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Memorial Project Foundation who controlled the details of its design and creation (Nehru and Watson), ROMA Design Group whose plans won the contest (Nehru), Master Lei Yixin the Chinese sculptor (Nehru, Taylor, and Watson), and Nick Benson and his workers who engraved the text (Nehru; National Park Service, 2016, November 29). Carl was the sole student in the sample who analyzed the Lincoln Memorial. He only mentioned Henry Bacon and Daniel Chester French whom he identified as the architects when a more complete answer would have included President Taft and Congressman Shelby M. Cullom and Joseph G. Cannon who set up the Lincoln Memorial Commission, architect Henry Bacon who designed the structure, the sculptor Daniel Chester French, and muralist Jules Guerin who painted *Reunion* and *Emancipation*. Similarly, Indira was accurate but incomplete in her identification of the Vietnam Women’s Memorial’s creators which included a Vietnam War nurse named Diane Carlson Evans, the Vietnam Women’s Memorial Project (VWMP), sculptor Glenna Goodacre, and landscape designer George Dickie. Her identification of Evans and Goodacre continued to illustrate the need for students to be more thorough in their answers.

Students analyzing Mount Vernon’s *The Dilemma of Slavery* continued this tendency. With my encouragement, Frank, Khan, and Sid contacted Mount Vernon after we had returned from our trip and asked who created the exhibit. Their email correspondence with the Exhibitions Registrar resulted in a detailed explanation of those involved included the architectural firm of GWWOO, Inc., Christopher Chadbourne and Associates (Boston, MA), Museum Design Associates (Cambridge, MA), Dennis Earl Moore Productions (Brooklyn Heights, NY), The History Channel, and Mount Vernon’s
former President and Vice President for Education Jim Reese and Anne Bay who
oversaw what went into the exhibits. All three students obviously identified the creators
in their HTM notes or analysis papers, although some of Khan’s wording in his analysis
paper was written exactly like the email without a citation. Their answers left out the
architectural firm, but that was okay because I wanted them to be concerned with the
exhibit itself and not the larger building. Sid’s answer was complete in who it listed, but
it failed to explain who did what while Frank mistakenly combined “Christopher
Chadbourne with the Museum Design Associates of Cambridge” rather than recognizing
them as separate firms like the email implied. Frank also failed to include Dennis Earl
Moore Productions, but he did explain what the others contributed to the project. Khan’s
answer was both complete in who he discussed and crediting their contributions. The
students did a solid job in addressing who created this exhibit, although their answers
could have been more complete.

Creator of A Woman’s War museum exhibit. After their respective
Washington, DC sites, the third exhibit students analyzed using the HTM was entitled A
Woman’s War at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and
Culture. They examined it using the photographs I had taken while in Washington, DC.
The students continued to do well in analyzing the creation of an exhibit. All of the
students who turned in this assignment correctly identified the creator of the exhibit as
the museum itself, but that may be misleading because in my field journal I noted that
“during the classes, trouble w/ who created it & when,” so I may have ended up helping
them with this prompt.
Creator of the faithful slaves monument. The fourth site students analyzed using the HTM was a monument “To the Faithful Slaves” located in Confederate Park in downtown Fort Mill, South Carolina. Concerning who created the exhibit, twelve of the 13 remaining students in the sample correctly identified Samuel E. White as a key figure in the erection of this monument. However, the monument itself also states White honored the former slaves “with approval of the Jefferson Davis Memorial Association,” and only two students (Nehru and Ranjit) acknowledged this fact in their answers. One interesting observation was that three students (Frank, Indira, and Watson) believed that Jefferson Davis himself approved the memorial and did not realize that Lost Cause groups often took his name for their organizations. Frank, Indira, and Rachel were also confused by the Confederate Park’s Historical Marker sign and attributed the Fort Mill Township Historical Society with creating the monument when the organization was responsible only for the sign itself. Another mistake was Nehru listing the honored slaves as contributors to the monument’s creation. However, overall, students did fairly well with recognizing the central role Samuel E. White played in the establishment of this historical site.

Creator of the Tillman Monument. Their analysis of the Benjamin Tillman Monument continued to show that students could identify a site’s creator but often fell short in crediting everyone involved. The question of who created the monument was an involved one because students needed to examine three different spots. On the front of the monument below the statue is an engraving that clearly states: “THIS MONUMENT ERECTED BY THE LEGISLATURE, THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND PRIVATE CITIZENS OF SOUTH CAROLINA.” Ten of the 14 students identified all three groups
in their response, most often using the exact wording or close to it. Four students (Carl, Harriet, Larry, and Mary) failed to mention all three groups although there was overlap among them. Three of these students credited the party and the people: “the democratic party of the citizens of South Carolina (Carl);” “the democrats of the state of South Carolina (Larry);” and “the democratic party and the citizens of South Carolina (Harriet).” The remaining student Mary left out the people and identified the creators as the “Legislature and Democratic Party of south carolina.” However, only two students looked beyond the frontal inscription and included either the sculptor or the commission who oversaw the monument. Khan actually credited the artist who physically created the statue – Frederick C. Hibbard. Sima, on the other hand, noticed a small plaque that listed the names on the Tillman Memorial Commission, but she decided the name of the group was enough. Overall, students did well in answering who was responsible for creating the exhibit.

**Creator of the Smalls and Clark museum exhibits.** In the sixth and final activity the students analyzed using the HTM, they had a choice among two virtual museum exhibits located at the South Carolina Hall of Fame in Myrtle Beach. Eight students (Carl, Larry, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, Ranjit, Sid, and Sima) selected the Robert Smalls exhibit while the remaining six (Frank, Harriet, Indira, Khan, Taylor, and Watson) opted for the display featuring Septima Poinsette Clark. All of the students correctly identified the South Carolina Hall of Fame as the creator of these exhibits. However, my field journal includes conversations with Carl, Mary, and Nehru helping them see that it was the museum staff who had directly created the exhibit. Nehru thought the government was its creator because it paid the salaries of the museum people, and in his
HTM notes he went further to observe that South Carolina, Myrtle Beach, and the local chamber of commerce financially supported it.

**Creator of the State House monuments.** In their final activity involving the African American, Confederate Women, Strom Thurmond, and Wade Hampton Monuments on the State House grounds, students analyzed without the help of the HTM to see what they had learned how to do on their own. Concerning the creators of these exhibits, all but two (Larry and Ranjit) mentioned at least some of those responsible for the creation of their exhibits. Interestingly, only three students (Khan, Nehru, and Sima) actually included the name of the sculptor responsible for their exhibit. Others focused on the people who had hired the artist, sometimes in just a broad sense. For example, in their analyses of the African American Monument, Mary mentioned “the people in the SC government” while LeBron listed the different commissions but not specific names of their members. In contrast, Sima’s analysis of the Confederate Women Memorial included the sculptor F. W. Ruckstuhl, South Carolina men, the General Assembly, and the maker of the plaques William E. Gonzales. While they continued to leave out some details, the students had made progress since their analysis of the Bill of Rights exhibit when they had not addressed this question at all.

**Purpose of the Bill of Rights and You exhibit.** Another important consideration in the creation of an exhibit is its purpose. In the baseline analysis of the *Bill of Rights and You* exhibit, none of the students identified why the exhibit itself was created. Carl, Frank, and Sima note that it is 225 years old but did not explicitly state that the purpose of the exhibit was to celebrate the anniversary. It appeared just as a fact they wrote
down. To remind students to consider the purpose of an exhibit, the HTM included prompts #5 and #8:

5) Why were the exhibit and items created?

8) What is the story behind its creation?

Once students had the HTM to remind them to examine an exhibit’s purpose, they did much better in addressing it.

**Purpose of the Hagler monument.** This improvement was visible in their analysis of Chief Hagler’s statue in Camden, South Carolina. The point of the memorial was to recognize Hagler for being a peacemaker between the Catawba and the colonists, and in doing so, honor the Catawba tribe. In addition, John Hagins, Jr. erected this site in remembrance of his father who had lived Camden and greatly appreciated the city’s history. All 15 students addressed at least one aspect of the purposes described above. More specifically, thirteen of them touched on some element of these purposes by mentioning or implying at least once the idea of peace, a treaty or truce, or a relationship between these two people groups at some point in the creation prompts. For example, Carl and Frank, who worked together, stated that the monument’s purpose was to “to honor a relationship between the Colonists and Native Americans in South Carolina” (Frank). Harriet implied peace when she observed that Hagler “helped majorly in the widespread of ethnicity and celebration of cultures in Camden.” At some point in their notes on the exhibit’s creation, eight students (Harriet, Indira, Khan, LeBron, Nehru, Sid, Sima, and Taylor) also recognized that John Hagins, Jr. wanted to remember his father with the site. In contrast, however, only three of the students (Harriet, Indira, and Taylor) mentioned that the site also honored the Catawba, and not just their chief, for the tribe’s
six millennium in the colony. What was encouraging in their application of the HTM was that all of the students recognized the monument’s purpose was beyond just information in contrast to their first analysis of the Bill of Rights exhibit.

**Purpose of the Washington, DC exhibits.** In their analysis of exhibits during their Washington, DC field study, students did fairly well. For example, Larry accurately observed that “just like most of the Holocaust Museum, it [his exhibit] is built to inform many people about how horrid the Holocaust was so that something like that never happens to humans again.” However, Larry did not stop there. He argued further that “the full details of the event are not always discussed and it is rare that people get to see the events that led up to the extermination of so many people. Therefore, this powerful exhibit was created.” Students analyzing Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial recognized its purpose was “to honor MLK & all he has done for our nation” (Taylor) and “to honor MLK, who gave his life fighting for African Americans rights peacefully . . . for making a lot of progress in the Civil Rights Movement, and being the driving force even when deceased” (Nehru). Both Carl and Indira correctly described the purposes of the Lincoln and Vietnam Women’s Memorials, respectively, with the former stating it was “to honor and remember Abraham Lincoln” and his “contributions to human rights, ending slavery, and ideas of reuniting America after the Civil War,” and the latter recognizing its purpose “to honor the women & nurses who fought & gave their lives in the Vietnam War.” At the African American History Museum, Harriet correctly acknowledged that the purpose of the *Jim Crow Laws* exhibit was “to expose the differences in the treatments of the different races . . . [and] to remember the past of black people so that we can honor and appreciate the differences today.” Similarly, students analyzing *The Dilemma of Slavery*
understood the exhibit’s purpose was “to show the life of the slaves that worked at Mount Vernon and what George Washington thought of them” (Khan) or “to show the good and bad things about George Washington about the topic of slavery” (Sid).

Some students had to work a little harder or over interpreted an exhibit’s purpose. At first, Sima described her exhibit on the gassing of the Jews during the Holocaust as trying “to inform,” so I helped her see that she needed to think about the perspective of the museum toward the Holocaust leading to her elaborating that it was meant to “inform the reader about how the people . . . died from gassing, and at which centers . . . to evoke the emotion of sorrow . . . and ties back to the main idea of the Holocaust, and plays a part in the ‘telling’ of this story.” In her analysis of the Rise of the Ku Klux Klan, Mary explained that her display’s purpose was “to show how African Americans went through a time when they were hated by a race and show how they progressed.” While the exhibit itself did address the first half of what she observed, it did not discuss how African Americans progressed to a more tolerant era, although other exhibits continued the story in that direction. However, both Sima and Mary ended up correctly explaining the exhibits’ purposes even though the latter went a bit too far.

**Purpose of the next four exhibits.** The students did well in identifying the purposes of the four exhibits. Every student recognized that the Smithsonian’s *A Woman’s War* intended “to recognize black women in the civil war” (Rachel) by “showing how African American women helped the Union in the war effort even after being oppressed” (Harriet). Similarly, each of the 13 students correctly identified the purpose of “To the Faithful Slaves” monument although sometimes one had to read other parts of the HTM to determine this recognition. However, one student’s answer needs
comment. Carl correctly stated that the monument was meant “to honor the black people,” but he then added that they “fought for the confederacy,” which goes beyond the information provided on the historical site and contradicts the preparation work’s contention that “there are a total of seven Union eyewitness reports of black Confederates. . . . There is no record of Union soldiers encountering an all-black line of battle or anything close to it” (Smith, n.d.). The students continued to excel in identifying an exhibit’s purpose in their analyses of the Benjamin Tillman Monument on the State House grounds. Twelve students used the verb “honor” in their answer to prompt #5, which asked, “Why were the exhibit and items created?” Both Harriet and Watson wrote “to remember” and “remembered,” respectively, but the former wrote elsewhere that the monument was placed in “an honorable place.” While these terms can mean different things, it is obvious that they also overlap, and Mary exemplified this in her answer that the monument was intended “to honor/remember Ben Tillman.” Finally, every student recognized that the South Carolina Hall of Fame’s purpose in their exhibits on Robert Smalls and Septima Clark was to honor them. Mary actually used the verb “inform,” but she obviously meant “honor” as well because she commented later that the South Carolina Hall of Fame included “the people that contributed the most . . . and that were the greatest at what they did.”

Purpose of the State House monuments. In their final analysis of the African American, Confederate Women, Strom Thurmond, and Wade Hampton Monuments, the students showed that they did not need the HTM to remind them to look for an exhibit’s purpose. Thirteen of the 15 students (excluding Larry and Watson) directly addressed this question. However, even Larry and Watson implied the purposes of the African
American and Strom Thurmond monuments, respectively. The former was quite detailed in explaining the story of African Americans, and the latter hinted at the idea of honor when he observed that Thurmond was “put above like this to show power above everyone else.” The students had improved dramatically since their first analysis activity with the *Bill of Rights and You* when none of them addressed the purpose of the exhibit itself.

**Date of the exhibits.** When the students began this action research study, they basically ignored identifying when an exhibit was created. In fact, only three students even mentioned that it was the 225th anniversary of the Bill of Rights adoption and certainly did not do the math and calculate the creation date of the *Bill of Rights and You* exhibit as 2016. However, once they began to analyze sites using the HTM, prompt #6 reminded them to determine when an exhibit was created, and this was evident in their Chief Hagler analysis, which every student correctly dated at October 25, 2012.

However, their dating of the Washington, DC exhibits was prone to careless errors or incomplete information. In fact, only six students (Frank, Khan, LeBron, Nehru, Sid, and Taylor) included the correct month, day, and year. Harriet only wrote the month and year while Carl, Indira, and Sima just wrote the year. Larry, Rachel, and Watson made errors in the writing of the date. For example, Rachel wrote the Holocaust Museum opened a year later in 1994. While Mary did discuss the dates of artifacts in the exhibit, she simply wrote that the “exhibit was created sometime in the 2000s,” which was at least better than Ranjit’s answer that he did “not know when the exhibit was created or when the items were put on display” despite having read when the museum opened in his preparation work. Needless to say, the students regressed in addressing when exhibits were created.
The next exhibit students analyzed using the HTM was *A Woman’s War*. All but three students (Carl, Larry, and Watson) inferred that the exhibit was created around when the museum opened in 2016. Carl was close when he wrote “sometime in the 2000’s,” while Larry did not put an actual date but like the other twelve students concluded it must have been “whenever the entire exhibition [of the museum] was set up.” Watson, on the other hand, just observed that “it is not explicitly stated.” The overwhelming majority of them identifying when might be misleading because my field journal stated that “during the classes, trouble w/ who created it and when.” Most likely, I had to help them, probably through the use of questions, and I may have even just told them. The problem with a museum exhibit is that unlike a memorial, monument, or sculpture, the creator engrave the date marble. Therefore, students continued to need assistance in this area.

Correctly identifying when the “To the Faithful Slaves” monument was created should have been fairly easy considering the engraved text states “1895 Erected by . . . .” In fact, all of the students answered this prompt correctly except for one. Rachel wrote that it “was established in 1891 and everything was erected in 1988.” It was obvious that she was confused by the Historical Marker sign that said the park was officially founded in 1891 and the sign itself was posted in 1988. She failed to consider what the monument itself said. However, it was clear that students succeeded in answering this important question about the creation of the monument.

Students successfully dated the Benjamin Tillman Monument and the South Carolina Hall of Fame exhibits on Robert Smalls and Septima Clark. All 14 students correctly identified Tillman’s date with 11 students writing the full date of May 1, 1940
and three (Carl, Harriet, and Mary) opting just the month and year. Indira actually wrote May 1, 1950, which was obviously a typing error. Concerning the Smalls and Clark exhibits, every student wrote down the correct year the sites (2010 and 2014) provided except for Mary who wrote “some time in the 2000s,” technically correct but lacking the precision of her peers.

In their final analysis of the State House monuments when students were not given the HTM, only eight of the 15 students successfully identified the date of their exhibits and Larry, LeBron, Mary, Rachel, Ranjit, and Watson failed to do so. Taylor’s identification of 1906-1911 date rather than 1909-1911 for the Confederate Women’s Memorial was obviously a typing error. While it was understandable that Ranjit and Watson probably limited themselves to the Strom Thurmond monument itself and did not remember its date from their preparation work, the failure of Larry, LeBron, and Mary to notice the date prominently displayed on the African American’s central obelisk was inexplicable. Mary even wrote that “there is exact no date!” The same could be said about Rachel’s neglecting the date of the Confederate Women’s Memorial when its 1909-1911 date is on its front plaque. While eight students is over half of the students and is significantly more than the zero who did so in the Bill of Rights and You analysis, it was still disappointing that seven students failed in this regard.

The Bill of Rights and You exhibit: Significance of its location. Despite showing them a photograph and explaining how the Bill of Rights and You could be found in the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, none of the students mentioned neither its physical nor virtual location. In fact, the three students (Larry, Ranjit, and Nehru) who answered this question at all were more concerned with the Bill
of Rights display in the Rotunda where it “sits beside the Declaration and Constitution. I like how they are all together” (Nehru). Students were more concerned with the topic and did not adequately consider the exhibit itself.

**The Hagler monument: Significance of its location.** Consequently, it was important for the HTM to train them to consider this aspect in answering prompt #7. During their analysis of the Chief Hagler monument, ten students correctly identified Camden as the statue’s location when answering the prompt while the other five (Khan, LeBron, Mary, Rachel, and Sid) mentioned Camden at some point in their HTM analyses. Some of their answers failed in specificity. Harriet, Indira, and Taylor mentioned that Camden was where Hagler and the Catawba lived while Carl, Frank, Larry, and Watson observed that Hagler and Kershaw lived in Camden. Technically, Hagler and the Catawba lived in the general area, not in the city itself. On the other hand, others (LeBron, Khan, Nehru, and Sid) correctly mentioned that the site was in a park, and three (Rachel, Ranjit, and Sima) actually identified it as being in the Town Green. Four students stressed that the location’s purpose was so more people would see it. Nehru observed that the monument’s location “being near the center of downtown Camden is important because this is where most people can see it.” LeBron and Sid agreed “that many people will see once they go and roam around the park,” and Sima elaborated saying that “this is done to attract more people, around greenery, and the descendants of Native American Tribes.” This activity did reveal some of the limits of virtually examining a site. The city map and photographs were limited in what they revealed about the location itself. Rachel wrote that the park was in “clear view” and Nehru believed it provided a “peaceful location away from the city noise.” In truth, the
park is actually tucked away behind buildings lining the main street through town. However, once again, the students addressed location much better than they did when examining the Bill of Rights exhibit.

**The Holocaust exhibits: Significance of their locations.** When it came to discussing the significance of their Washington, DC exhibits, students had mixed results. Both Rachel and Sima addressed this question well. At times Rachel seemed to contradict herself. In her HTM notes, she claimed that its location was “in the opening of the floor so everyone sees it,” but then in her analysis paper she observed that “it isn’t designed to catch one’s eye” and that the exhibit is “hidden in a corner near the start of the second floor . . . it’s small and not super memorable unless you stop to draw it in.” Seeing the exhibit myself, I can understand her observations. It is not as memorable as other exhibits that focus on more disturbing topics such as the gas chambers and the graphic photographs. As Rachel observed: “it was nowhere near as horrible or important as some of the other exhibits but it still conveys a crucial message.” While Rachel’s analysis is not perfect, she showed some sophistication and included details in her notes and discussion. Sima’s discussion of the significance of the exhibit’s location focused on its relation to nearby exhibits. She specifically mentioned *Medical Experiments in the Camps* as well as one on *Slave Labor*, which discuss the ways the Nazis killed Jews. What was insightful was her conclusion that her “exhibit must have been placed in the center because it potrays [sic] the most severe killing method.” In contrast, Ranjit just stated that his exhibit on the Lodz, Germany ghetto was “with other exhibits surrounding it going into detail about other ghettos and camp,” and Larry did not even bother to address the question claiming “there is none.”
The King Memorial Significance of its location. Similarly, students analyzing the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial’s location and its significance had varying levels of success. Disappointingly, Watson’s analysis consisted of just one word – “Nothing.” On the other hand, the other two students did well. Taylor was the only one to mention the memorial’s address of 1964 being the same year the Civil Rights Act was passed. She also touched ever so slightly on the National Park Service’s discussion of the exhibit’s symbolic importance stating that “this memorial was put on the national mall along with other famous memorial[s] who have all impacted our nation.” While Nehru did not address the above points, his answer was even more thoughtful. He began by acknowledging that the monument’s location “in D. C, which gives it a rank of high importance. It shows MLK helped the nation as a whole.” He then continued his response by connecting the physical environment to the monument’s deeper meaning: The immediate surroundings include many trees, shrubs, and a body of water called the Tidal Basin. All of this sets a peaceful and happy mood for the viewers. This is important because MLK fought for peace and equality between whites and blacks; he aimed for a positive change.

Two of the three students showed they understood how to analyze the significance of an exhibit’s location.

The Lincoln and Vietnam Women’s Memorials: Significance of their locations. Both Carl and Indira thought about what they wrote in answering the significance of the Lincoln and Vietnam Women’s Memorials. The former acknowledged that it is in Washington, DC because “Lincoln was a President and Washington D.C is our Nation’s capital, where the President works,” Carl speculated that...
its proximity to the reflecting pool was “so when you look into the reflecting pool, you will see the memorial in the water. It is also in a wide and open area to make it look bigger and very important.” The latter addressed both the location and significance of the Vietnam Women’s Memorial:

The location of this memorial is significant because it adds more feeling to the already emotional memorial. It is located in Washington D.C., the nation’s capital, which is the head of the entire country and is seen as one of the most important places in the United States. To have a memorial there means that the topic is very important to our country’s history. It is also located next to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

While Indira could have included more details, it was obvious she had a solid understanding of how to analyze the creation of an exhibit.

African American Museum and Mount Vernon exhibits: Significance of their locations. The remaining six students analyzed location and its significance for three exhibits at the National Museum of African American History and Culture (Harriet, LeBron, and Mary) and The Dilemma of Slavery at Mount Vernon (Frank, Khan, and Sid). Harriet explained that the location of her exhibit Jim Crow Laws was significant because the museum itself is in the capital of the United States where the federal government functions and that “it is a building only honoring African Americans, this is important because, African [sic] Americans were always ranked subordinate to white people in America’s past.” Her two peers were rather general with LeBron commenting that his exhibit on Africans in the Chesapeake “was put in the slavery section . . . because it’s about Slavery in a certain region,” and Mary noted that the museum is organized
chronologically and “the Rise of the KKK exhibit was between slavery and the civil rights movement.” Frank, Khan, and Sid did not address this prompt adequately for they should have considered that even though Mount Vernon was Washington’s home, the museum staff was willing to consider the positive and negative aspects of his life and legacy. The closest was Khan’s analysis when he noted that the exhibit’s “intended audience is made up of people who are interested in George Washington’s Mt Vernon.” However, his answer would have benefitted from exploring the idea of what these “interested” people would expect to learn about Washington and how the exhibit confirmed or altered their views of this iconic figure in American history.

A Woman’s War: Significance of its location. After their respective Washington, DC sites, the third exhibit students analyzed using the HTM was entitled A Woman’s War at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and Culture. Its location was an easy one to answer because when I explained the activity I told them that it was located in the Civil War section of the Smithsonian. Their explanations about “the significance of the exhibit’s location” (HTM prompt #7) needed more depth. Most Civil War exhibits address what men did during the war, and considering they were politically and militarily in power that makes sense. However, women contributed greatly to the war as well. This issue will be addressed in greater detail when we examine their analyses of the content of the exhibits. Eight of the students just mentioned the exhibit was in the Civil War area. The other six (Carl, Harriet, Khan, Larry, Sid, and Taylor) addressed different aspects of the site’s location. Carl took a broader view that the exhibit was in “Washington, DC and it is the capital of the US,” but failed to connect how women being recognized in this important city is
significant – a missed opportunity. Harriet, herself an African American female, pointed out that the exhibit is in an African American museum and that “this is important because african americans were not always appreciated for what they did.” Is she referring to the museum, the exhibit, or both? Khan commented that its significance was “it talks about African American women in the Civil War,” but he should have elaborated making it clear if he meant that women are often given little attention for their roles during this conflict. Larry was very brief stating that the exhibit “fits within the theme of minorities that helped during the war,” but did not explain whether he was considering minorities from the perspective of race, gender, or both. Sid believed that “the location of it is significant because it was when African-Americans gained their rights during the Civil War,” but his comment addressed why the war was significant, not so much the location of the exhibit. Although one could argue that the war’s importance makes an exhibit on a topic about the war important. At the very least, Sid could have explained his thoughts more fully. Finally, Taylor hinted at why a woman’s exhibit in the Civil War section was significant when she observed that “these women impacted the civil war,” but she too could have explained her thoughts more fully to include how men dominate Civil War exhibits. This activity revealed that students had room to improve when it concerned discussing how significance and location are related.

The faithful slaves monument: Significance of its location. Next, students analyzed the location and significance of the “To the Faithful Slaves” monument in Confederate Park in downtown Fort Mill, South Carolina. Concerning its location, only Nehru actually included all of three details in his analysis. Carl, Frank, Indira, and Ranjit mentioned two facts - Fort Mill and South Carolina. The rest wrote down just one fact
about the monument’s location. Khan, Mary, Sid, Sima, and Taylor acknowledged Confederate Park while LeBron and Rachel both cited Fort Mill. However, Rachel remembered my written and spoken comment that it was “near Carowinds.” The one student who failed to mention any of the specific details was Watson who just wrote that the monument was located in “confederate territory.” Concerning the significance of its location, only three students (Carl, Rachel, and Ranjit) considered its site in relation to visitors. Carl observed the reason for it being “in downtown fort mill [was] so everyone can see it” while Rachel believed its location was “in the middle of the park near Carowinds so it attracts the most attention,” although it is not anywhere near the park and probably does not benefit from those tourists. Ranjit pointed to significance acknowledging that its “location is significant because as it [is] in a Confederate state in downtown where many people can see it and honor the memories of the Civil War.” In their answer to prompt #7, nine students mentioned that the location was related to the Confederacy. Two of the remaining four (Mary and Taylor) identified “surrounded by confederate monuments,” and “Confederate Park, near other monuements [sic],” respectively, showing that they recognized the significance of its location. However, one need only look at Rachel’s HTM analysis and see “the South” and “lost cause belief” to realize that she, too, understood the significance of the location. Similar to Rachel, the final student Nehru had already mentioned Confederate Park and the Lost Cause so his answer to prompt #7 focused on describing the location in addition to the monument itself, which he had already discussed in his response to prompt #2. While none of the 13 students considered every aspect of the location’s significance, all of them addressed at least one element.
**The Tillman Monument: Significance of its location.** Students continued to show that they understood location and significance in their analyses of the Benjamin Tillman Monument on the State House grounds in Columbia, South Carolina. Twelve of the 14 students correctly stated it was at the State House. The two students whose answers needed a closer examination were Carl and Mary. The former’s answer that “it is near the capital of South Carolina . . . in the middle of the city” probably meant the capitol, so he would join the other twelve who correctly identified its location. Mary’s answer, though, was that the statue was “in the middle of South Carolina” and lacked the specificity the prompt was asking for. However, thirteen of 14 correctly identified or implied its physical location.

The significance of the monument’s location was that it is in the front, right sector of the State House, the seat of political power, where its many visitors can see it and read a positive version of his legacy. All 14 students touched on some element of this significance. Six of them emphasized the idea of “importance” (Harriet, Khan, LeBron, Nehru, Ranjit, and Watson). For example, LeBron stated that “the state house is a very important building in SC, making it seem as if Tillman is a very important person.” Harriet addressed both Tillman’s importance, labeling him “an influential politician,” and the importance of the State House, “which is where many meeting[s] occur to discuss the next moves of SC.” However, importance was not the only emphasis students offered in their answers to HTM prompt #7. Four students (Carl, Indira, Sid, and Taylor) emphasized that Tillman’s political career connected him to the center of state politics – the State House – and that was the reason for his monument’s location. For example, Carl clearly expressed this interpretation when he wrote the location was “because he was
part of the state’s government,” and Taylor agreed in more general terms that it was due to “his role in the state and all he did.”

Three of the remaining four students’ (Frank, Larry, and Sima) answers lacked necessary elaboration. Frank stated the monument “is located at the State house which is where present political figures meet” but failed to articulate the connection between this fact and Tillman himself. Larry’s observation that the monument “is easily accessible [sic] from people around” did not really say why he was given such a prominent location, but one would assume based on his answer that the monument was intended “to help honor” him “& his work as a govener [sic]” it was so people could do so. Finally, based on the State House grounds map, Sima just observed that Tillman’s monument was near where Assembly and Gervais Streets meet “maybe to keep a seperate [sic] section for Ben Tillman.” However, she did not explain why they would do this although one can infer once again that it was a way to honor him based on her discussion on the monument’s purpose.

The final student Mary did not connect the importance of the State House and Tillman as a political figure. In contrast, she recognized his important contributions to the state, although she understandably disagreed with his racial views. She interpreted the location as being in the middle of the state that he had done so much for: “It is in the middle of South Carolina which is important because he did things for all of South Carolina all around such as Clemson university the government and the farmers.” Her understanding of the location’s significance differed markedly from her peers.

**The Smalls/Clark museum exhibits: Significance of its location.** The students’ explanations of the location and significance of the Robert Smalls and Septima Clark
exhibits could have included three main points. First, all thirteen students who analyzed this exhibit (minus Rachel and Ranjit) correctly pointed out that the exhibits were in the South Carolina Hall of Fame. Second, only four (Larry, Nehru, Sid, and Sima) mentioned that the physical location is Myrtle Beach, a mecca for vacationers (Larry, Nehru, Sid, and Sima). Third, Sima was the sole student who elaborated that the museum is in the lobby of the convention center so many visitors could view it.

The State House monuments: Significance of its location. Finally, without the HTM to remind them to discuss the location and significance of their assigned State House monuments, 12 of the 15 students identified their locations as at the State House. Regarding the other three, Carl only noted that it was in Columbia, and Larry and LeBron neglected to address its location at all, perhaps thinking that since all four monuments were on the State House grounds its location was understood. In contrast, only eight students attempted to discuss the significance of their monuments’ locations with Frank, Larry, LeBron, Nehru, Sid, Taylor, and Watson not doing so. Both Khan and Sid also erroneously located Wade Hampton’s statue in the front of the State House when it sits on the left backside of the property. However, once again considering that none of the students addressed these topics in their Bill of Rights analyses, the students had made progress in doing so.

4.5 Findings and Interpretation of the Context Data

The next element of historical thinking is context. This section of the HTM has two key questions, which ask students to consider what was happening in history at the time of the exhibit’s topic (prompt #12) and the creation of the exhibit itself (prompt #13). While this section only included two questions, my memory and field journal
reveal that contextualization was quite difficult for students, especially prompt #13. The analysis below will discuss how students progressed in this area of historical thinking.

**The contexts of the Bill of Rights and You exhibit.** In their analysis of the *Bill of Rights and You* before they were introduced to the HTM, students were somewhat mixed in addressing the context of the Bill of Rights and the exhibit. On the positive side, thirteen of the 15 students (not Rachel or Sid) at least touched on the context of the Bill of Rights, but none of the students directly discussed the context surrounding the exhibit’s creation. In the latter case, it is possible that Carl, Frank, and Sima’s response that the Bill of Rights was 225 years old was a recognition that the exhibit was celebratory in its purpose. Such a statement in Frank’s case might be giving him too much credit for he did not appear to be pointing out that the Bill of Rights was 225 years old but simply labeling his analysis by the panel’s title. What was interesting was that all but two students (Rachel and Sid) wrote something about the historical events involved in the writing and adoption of the Bill of Rights although the former did state that people have tried to amend the Constitution 11,000 times. Sometimes, as in the cases of Frank, Larry, and Khan, these observations were rather brief. Frank just wrote a rather general summary that one of the exhibit’s panels had “detailed facts with specific numbers and dates” but failed to follow the exhibit’s example and provide some; Larry commented that “there originally was no Bill O’ Rights;” and Khan agreed with the exhibit that “not having a bill of rights at first was a bad idea . . . [and the] Bill of rights was ratified Dec 15 1791.” It was obvious that the students’ contextual analysis of both the exhibit and its topic needed further development although they showed some skill in addressing the latter.
The contexts of the Hagler monument. In their analysis of the Hagler exhibit, the students were fairly successful in explaining the historical context of the Catawba chief. Two-thirds of the students mentioned conflict between Native Americans and the colonists. For example, Khan wrote that “Europeans were traveling over to North America and were colonizing wherever they wanted.” Six students (Frank, LeBron, Rachel, Ranjit, Sid, and Sima) mentioned or alluded to the French and Indian War. Finally, three students (Nehru, Ranjit, and Sima) brought up the subject of diseases. Nehru observed that “colonists . . . brought diseases to them,” and Ranjit and Sima specifically mentioned smallpox. Overall, the students did a solid job recognizing the historical context of Chief Hagler.

When it came to the historical context of when the exhibit was created in 2012, fourteen of the 15 students all mentioned how things have changed. The one exception was Larry who cryptically wrote “Native History.” The others stressed how racial relations are presently more positive. In fact, five students (Harriet, Indira, Ranjit, Sima, and Taylor) included President Obama as proof that things were racially better than in the past. Students emphasized this change in phrases such as “peaceful” (Khan and Rachel), “honor/Honor” (LeBron and Sid), “respect” (Carl), “treat . . . better” (Carl and Frank), “treated equally” (Khan), “accepting of other people” (Ranjit), “becoming more diverse and accepting” (Sima), “much different viewpoint” (Watson), and “more open to our Indian history” (Rachel). Mary observed that “there was less wars no slavery and America expanded so there wasn’t a fight for territory.” While it certainly can be argued that racism is still present, these students believed that the nation has made progress, and
they believed that Hagler’s induction into the South Carolina Hall of Fame was illustrative of this trend.

**The contexts of the Holocaust exhibits.** The students’ next opportunity to analyze and explain the context of a historical site or museum exhibit was during their field study to Washington, DC and the days after their return.

In their contextual analyses of the exhibits at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) Larry, Rachel, Ranjit, and Sima addressed the immediate contexts of the topics featured in their exhibits. For example, Rachel provided a vivid description of the Warsaw ghetto “where they were not given enough to sustain their most basic needs” and felt compelled “to hide their memories inside this milk can and other containers, so the Nazis couldn’t erase their culture and connections.” However, they did not address the bigger question of why the Holocaust occurred. Even Sima, whose discussion on the killing centers was very thorough with statistics and included a discussion about how the “Germans and their collaborators destroyed evidence of their annihilation of Jews,” never explored the question of why the Nazis perpetuated the Holocaust. Their analyses of the context of the exhibits were not as thorough as they needed to be.

When it concerned the context of when the exhibit was created, the students showed varying levels of skill in addressing this prompt. Larry just wrote “modern america” in his HTM notes and mentioned the museum’s four year construction process and opening on April 27, 1993. He did not bother to explain how modern society related to this exhibit. Why was the museum, and therefore the exhibit, created when it was? Ranjit’s wrote even less conceding that he did not “know when the exhibit was created so
I can’t answer this.” Unlike her two peers, Rachel was on track when she briefly observed “that people have begun remembering and commemorating the people who died in the Holocaust.” However, it was Sima who excelled in her contextual explanation. She went through a history of Holocaust denials, how French and Canadian courts convicted deniers, and how Israeli and French governments passed laws against such viewpoints. Consequently, “Holocaust survivors, volunteers, Congress the council, and other caring people decided to take part in history, and created the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.” While Ranjit could not explain the context, Larry began to but did not finish, and Rachel summarized it too broadly, Sima exemplified how to write a rich explanation of the context of the museum and the exhibit within it.

The contexts of the King Memorial. The students who analyzed the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial were successful in their description of the historical context of its honoree, and two of the three did as well when it came to understanding the context of the time the memorial was dedicated. Concerning the former, Nehru, Taylor, and Watson all mentioned King’s role fighting against Jim Crow society. Nehru discussed segregation, “white supremacist groups like the KKK,” and how “Blacks were fighting for equality and rights.” Likewise, Taylor observed that “Whites and blacks were separated, blacks were not treated equally which caused riots and violence across the nation,” and Watson commented that “at the time segregation was still in effect and MLK was a civil rights leader, advocating for human rights.” However, only Nehru and Taylor correctly examine the context of when the memorial was dedicated in 2011. The former stressed that “all sexes and races had equal rights . . . everyone was treated equally . . . male and female of all races were able to vote . . . things were peaceful . . . nothing was
segregated,” a rather rosy picture of racial relations despite evidence to the contrary. However, his point that things have improved in many ways was a fair point. Similarly, Taylor pointed out that its dedication was on the March on Washington’s 48th anniversary and that “at this time in history, there was no longer segregation.” Watson fell short in this regard only referencing the controversy over statue’s main quote, “I was a drum major for justice, peace and righteousness,” which conflated a longer quote, ignored the speech’s larger context, and made King appear conceited. Watson wrote nothing about how there had been enough racial progress to support a memorial honoring the most visible leader of the civil rights movement. All three students showed mastery of contextualizing Dr. King and the memorial’s construction and dedication except for Watson who succeeded in the former but not the latter.

**The contexts of the Lincoln and Vietnam Women’s Memorials.** Both Carl and Indira addressed the essential contexts of the Lincoln and Vietnam Women Memorials, respectively. Concerning the topic of the historical site, Carl pointed out that Lincoln was President during the Civil War, which was “mostly over the use of slavery in the southern United States. Lincoln believed that all men should have equal rights and no man should be property of another.” While Carl’s characterization of the Civil War could use some refinement, one only needs to read the “Declaration of the Immediate Causes Which Induce and Justify the Secession of South Carolina from the Federal Union” (“Confederate States of America,” 2008) and the Emancipation Proclamation to confirm Carl’s main point that Lincoln was slavery’s Grim Reaper. In his consideration of the memorial’s context in 1914 when its construction began, Carl observed that “our country, now unified, was anti-slavery, but unfortunately still segregated. President
Lincoln was very respected for his contributions to the U.S. during his presidency and his life, therefore American wanted to build a memorial to honor him.” His succinct explanation captured the major elements of the exhibit’s context. Similarly, Indira’s contextual analysis of the Vietnam Women’s Memorial was on target. She correctly mentioned the Vietnam War and the concurrent Cold War, but she needed to explain the Cold War connection. Next, she turned her attention to women’s challenge of sexism: “Gender roles were also very strong during this time. Women were expected to stay at home and care for their family. This is very different from the Vietnam War, where women were able to serve for their country.” She continued with this theme in her discussion of 1993 when the memorial was finally dedicated. That same year “Janet Reno became the first woman Attorney General . . . [and] the Supreme Court ruled sexual harassment in the workplace illegal. Both . . . were big steps in the ongoing battle for women’s rights.” Indira viewed the memorial as a symbol of the ongoing feminist movement. Both she and Carl successfully considered their exhibits’ contexts.

The contexts of the African American Museum exhibit. Harriet, LeBron, and Mary each correctly discussed the historical contexts of their exhibits’ topics at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and Culture. In her discussion of Jim Crow Laws, Harriet correctly pointed out that whites, angry over slavery’s demise, passed these laws “in order to keep in the black people’s minds that they were below those that were white.” To understand his exhibit on Africans in the colonial Chesapeake, LeBron recognized one must understand “the ‘need’ for laborers to work was increasing, so indentured servitude was slowly becoming lifelong slavery because it was a cheaper option. Doing this allowed for more slaves and increased the
profit of landowners.” Mary’s analysis of *The Rise of the Ku Klux Klan* included an explanation that whites denied blacks their rights and “their [sic] was one group that really hated them and that was the KKK so the KKK was killing/burning and hanging just because the color of their skin.” In addition, all three correctly described the racial context of 2016 when the museum opened as a time when “African Americans are appreciated and in most cases equal to those that are white” (Harriet). LeBron offered an interesting opinion that “if this museum had been put up in said years [which he mentioned in his notes as 1920-1970], the creators would run the risk of it being bombed, burned, their houses being destroyed, and their lives being threatened.” He clearly recognized that much had changed allowing the NMAAHC. These three students were successful in their discussion of the context of their topics and contemporary society when the museum opened.

**The contexts of Mount Vernon’s slavery exhibit.** Frank, Khan, and Sid’s analysis of Mount Vernon’s *The Dilemma of Slavery* illustrated once again that students can contextualize historical exhibits. Concerning the historical context of Washington owning slaves, Frank mentioned the Revolutionary War, the necessity of slaves “to help upkeep Mount Vernon while he was gone,” and the pervasiveness of slavery. Khan insightfully explained that Washington came to the “realization that slavery is evil, despite living in a society that accepted slavery as an everyday aspect of life,” but he knew that it was a volatile subject that could break the country apart and therefore “avoided addressing the topic altogether” for “the era that George Washington lived in influenced his decisions as president.” Sid’s discussion was the most comprehensive of the three mentioning Washington’s role in the Revolutionary War, the Slave Fugitive
Laws, the Slave Trade Act, the Bill of Rights “which guaranteed basic rights to Americans, but did not grant rights to slaves,” and the plantation system. When it came to the context of the exhibit’s 2006 creation, all three students discussed how African Americans now have rights. For example, Khan observed that “this exhibit was made when African American civil rights are supported,” and Sid wrote that “people now also respect African-Americans much more than they did when slavery was not abolished . . . [and] can also hold political office.” These three students showed that they understood contextualization in their analysis of *The Dilemma of Slavery*.

**The contexts of A Woman’s War exhibit.** After their analyses of the Washington, DC field study sites, the students’ next opportunity was a virtual examination of the Smithsonian’s *A Woman’s War* exhibit. The students continued to excel in their understanding of the historical context of the topic. Every student mentioned the Civil War directly or it was clear from their notes in other places of the HTM. Frank, Indira, Larry, Mary, Nehru, Rachel, Sid, and Taylor also recognized how women’s status in society was lesser than that of men and LeBron implied as much when he observed that “African Americans weren’t respected, much less African American women.” Five students (Carl, Harriet, Indira, Khan, and Sid) also included the abolition movement or slaves escaping northward to freedom. The students clearly showed they understood how to analyze the historical context of the exhibit’s topic.

Likewise, the students were insightful in their discussion of the racial context of the exhibit, which was publicly available beginning in 2016. Five students noted the racial situation in referencing either President Obama (Indira and Watson), Black Lives Matter (LeBron), or both (Frank and Nehru). Indira observed that Obama’s presidency
was “important b/c [because] he was the first African American pres. [president] of the USA, which was a breakthrough for Af. Am. [African Americans],” and LeBron commented that “black people were a lot more accepted into society as people instead of property or trash.” Three other students also addressed the racial context without bringing up Obama or Black Lives Matter. Carl, a white male student, believed in the equality of everyone and that “black people have the same rights and Freedoms as White people,” while Harriet, a black female, appeared a bit more skeptical when she wrote that “African Americans are supposed [emphasis added] to be completely equal at the time this exhibit was created.” Sid did not mince words when he clearly stated that “African-American’s also got more rights . . . but there are still some instances that African-Americans did not get the same rights as white people.” In sum, eight students recognized to some degree the racial context when the exhibit was created.

Another contextual point the students made concerning the exhibit was women’s rights. Six of the students examined this topic. Larry, Mary, Sima, and Taylor observed that women had made progress in their fight for equal rights but that more work still needed to be done. Larry commented that “today we still struggle with discrimination among races and the two genders . . . it still exists in the minds of some horrid people.” Taylor concurred with Larry observing that “women’s rights are still prominent [sic; prominent] because men & women are supposed to be equal, however, they are not displayed that way.” In contrast, Khan was more optimistic about women’s rights in 2016 concluding that “women had equal rights,” and Rachel observed that the exhibit “shows steps in feminism.” Common to all of these students was their understanding that women’s rights should be examined to understand the context of the exhibit.
The contexts of faithful slaves monument. The students’ next opportunity to show how well they could analyze the context of an exhibit involved the “To the Faithful Slaves” monument in Fort Mill, South Carolina. Its topic was to laud those slaves who had remained faithful to their white owners and families during the Civil War, and it was erected in homage to the Lost Cause, a belief that the South was not fighting for slavery per se, but for states’ rights. Its defeat did not mean the South was wrong, but that it could not overcome the vast resources of the North, and Confederate soldiers, dead and alive, should be honored for their courage. Believers of this ideology argued that slavery was not so bad and that slaves had helped the Confederate side. They proceeded to erect statues all over the South enshrining the Lost Cause in stone with an intensity reminiscent of their devotion to secession and war. In short, the historical context of the monument’s topic was the Civil War and what the slaves did during it, and the context of the monument itself was the Lost Cause.

Students did well in analyzing the context of this monument. Eight of the students (Frank, Indira, LeBron, Khan, Mary, Nehru, Sid, Sima, and Taylor) mentioned the Civil War and the Lost Cause somewhere in their HTM analyses. While Carl identified the Civil War as the background of the exhibit’s topic, he incorrectly placed the creation of the monument during “the civil rights movement” when “African americans were starting to get equal rights,” when in fact, the exact opposite was happening. This was the era of Ben Tillman and the state constitution of 1895 when African Americans lost their voting rights and constantly feared the lynch mob. Three students (Rachel, Ranjit, and Watson) discussed the Lost Cause ideology as the context for both the topic of the monument and for when it was dedicated, but it was clearly evident that they
understood that the Civil War was the broader context. Finally, Mary described slaves as “fighting on the same side as their masters,” despite Smith’s (n.d.) argument that the South did not use black soldiers, which they had read in preparation to analyze the monument. There may have been confusion because the monument does say that the “SLAVES . . . TOILED FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE ARMY,” but that did not mean fighting per se. Others made a similar mistake in the overall analyses. Overall, students did an admirable job in examining the topic and exhibit’s contexts.

The contexts of the Tillman Monument. The next exhibit students used the HTM to analyze historical context was the statue of Benjamin R. Tillman on the State House grounds. Considering that Tillman lived from 1847 to 1918, a number of topics could have been provided concerning the historical context of his life. Looking for key words, eight students mentioned the Gilded Age; six students cited African Americans; six students referenced farmers’ difficulties; three students mentioned industrialization and/or the Populist Party; and only two (Taylor and Sima) included the Progressive Era. All of these topics were relevant to the time period and Tillman’s life and career. However, only seven of twelve students explained in their answer to prompt #12 to some extent how these historical topics related to Tillman, although Indira did so in her prompt #8 response. For example, after explaining that African Americans had political power during Reconstruction, Harriet stated that “people like Benjamin Tillman didn’t want Blacks to have all of this power so he made many rules that were unfair in order to stop African americans from having political power.” In contrast, five students explained what was going on in history but did not relate their explanation to Tillman himself. LeBron wrote that “The gilded age was taking place and farmers were struggling and
they were blaming the gov.” However, the reader is left wondering what this correct description has to do with Tillman. The one remaining student was Larry who only wrote “WWI & gilded age” leaving the reader to figure out how Tillman related to either one. Once again, the great majority of students discussed at least some of the historical context of Tillman, although explicitly explaining the connection could use improvement.

Ten of the 14 students adequately addressed the historical context of this 1940 exhibit. Carl, Frank, Harriet, Indira, Khan, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, Sid, and Watson pointed out that South Carolina’s racist society allowed for the creation of this monument. Harriet summarized it well when she wrote: “At this time, Benjamin Tillman’s views were normal and accepted and many thought his racial views were okay. Because of this, he was honored because what he thought of blacks was not abnormal.” The students’ recognition of how society’s norms impacted the memorialization of historical figures showed their critical thinking skills.

The contexts of the Smalls and Clark museum exhibits. The final activity during which students used the HTM to analyze context was their examinations of either the Robert Smalls or Septima Clark exhibits on the South Carolina Hall of Fame website. Overall, students did well in discussing the context of the exhibits’ topics but could have been more thorough in their answers. Of those who examined the Smalls exhibit, all seven students (Carl, Larry, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, Sid, and Sima) correctly mentioned or implied the Civil War. However, Robert Smalls was also an active political leader during Reconstruction and the Jim Crow era that followed. Only Larry mentioned the former. No one addressed the later period at all except for Sid who mistakenly placed Jim Crow laws during the Civil War. When it came to contextualizing Septima Clark, all six
students (Frank, Harriet, Indira, Khan, Taylor, and Watson) had no trouble whatsoever in mentioning the civil rights movement.

With Smalls and Clark’s inductions into the South Carolina Hall of Fame in 2010 and 2014, respectively, both groups of students had the same context to discuss concerning the exhibit itself. Twelve of the 13 students expressed or implied that the nation had racially progressed since Smalls’ life. Specifically, Watson mentioned “Black Lives Matter,” while five of the students (Harriet, Indira, Mary, Nehru, Taylor) included Obama in their answers. For example, Harriet wrote that:

African Americans are now able to vote without having to go through obstacles, they are not segregated from everyone else, they are able to learn and work alongside whites. Obama was also the president during this time which shows how the country had many huge moves toward equality because during her time a black man would never be able to be president.

A significant number of students also believed that equality was a reality in modern America. In fact, five students said as much: “In 2010, African Americans had equal rights with other people” (Carl); “Equal rights have since been established” (Frank); “the problems of racism and inequality had been resolved and AAs [African Americans] were equal to other people” (Khan); “the early 2000s were a time in which African Americans were able to completely catch up [emphasis added] to the whites in society” (Nehru); “In 2014, african americans also had rights and were equal” (Taylor). While students’ pointed out that today society is more open toward people of color, their belief in racial equality could be more nuanced (e.g., Neville, Awad, Brooks, Flores, & Bluemel, 2013).
The contexts of the State House monuments. In their final activity in which they analyzed one of the State House monuments without the HTM, every student at least touched upon the historical context of the exhibit’s topic (i.e., African Americans, Confederate women, Strom Thurmond, and Wade Hampton). However, addressing the historical context of the exhibit itself was another matter. Seven of the students (Carl, Frank, Harriet, Khan, Nehru, Sima, and Taylor) at least correctly touched upon the context of when the monument was erected. However, even though the Confederate Women and Wade Hampton Monuments were erected during the growth of the Lost Cause ideology, only Sima addressed this southern myth at all. Carl, Indira, Nehru, Rachel, Sid, and Taylor did not do so. In her examination of the Confederate Women’s Monument, Rachel appeared confused in her discussion and conflated the topic and exhibit’s contexts. She wrote that “at the time of the statues [sic] erection, the Civil War was in full swing,” but the exhibit was created in the early 20th century. Furthermore, she later wrote that “now that women’s rights are becoming more of a widespread topic, the recognition of such supportive characters is overdue.” Did she mean the crusade for the 19th amendment which was occurring at the time of the monument’s creation or the present day? In contrast, Mary completely missed the mark in discussing the African American Monument’s context because she failed to see that it was dedicated in 2001. She believed that Obama’s presidency and the exhibit were related despite the fact that Obama’s election and inauguration would not take place for another eight years. When compared to their initial Bill of Rights and You analysis, students continued to show an understanding of the topic’s historical context. While none of the students originally
addressed the exhibit’s context, seven out of 15 students did so with their State House monuments, an improvement, but also confirmation that more work remained to be done.

4.6 Findings and Interpretation of the Content Data

The next type of historical thinking concerned the content of a historical site or museum exhibit. This section of the HTM consisted of eight prompts, which asked for students to discuss the exhibit’s point of view or bias (prompt #14), the evidence it offered to support its opinion (prompt #15), and a quote that captured the essence of the exhibit (prompt #20). Students then examined how an exhibit’s design reinforced its bias (prompt #16), identified missing perspectives (prompt #17), and discussed how it related positively or negatively to race and sex/gender (prompt #18). After taking detailed notes on its content (prompt #19), the students then pose open-ended questions that could be answered through research (prompt #21). The following analysis will first turn its attention to how well students addressed the viewpoint or bias of an exhibit and will consider prompts #14, 15, and 20 holistically rather than individually.

Bias and evidence in the Bill of Rights and You exhibit. Prior to their introduction to the HTM, in their initial activity analyzing the Bill of Rights and You, students addressed the facts provided in the exhibit, but in general, they did not discuss how the exhibit itself was complimentary or biased toward the Bill of Rights. Perhaps they took this perspective for granted because they agreed that the first ten amendments were important in that they protected what the students believed to be good rights. Of the 15 students, only five of them (Khan, Larry, Sima, Indira, and Carl) appeared to imply the exhibit’s bias in their analyses, and even then, it might just have been their personal opinions of the Bill of Rights. For example, after reading Thomas Jefferson’s quote
“WE MIGHT AS WELL REQUIRE A MAN TO WEAR STILL THE COAT WHICH FITTED HIM WHEN A BOY, AS CIVILIZED SOCIETY TO REMAIN EVER UNDER THE REGIMEN OF THEIR BARBAROUS ANCESTORS”), Khan commented that the “quote makes sense – amendments are essential – I like the quote.” In doing so, he could have been indirectly acknowledging the exhibit’s positive viewpoint toward amendments. In response to the exhibit’s list of rights in each amendment and Jefferson’s quote, Sima observed that the U.S. was a “civilized society because of protected rights.” The first two words of her comment appeared in Jefferson’s statement, and her use of them showed a possible awareness of the exhibit’s bias, her personal opinion, or a combination of both. However, these examples illustrated that none of the students blatantly stated in their observations that this exhibit was biased and favorable toward the Bill of Rights.

**Bias and evidence in the Hagler monument.** Students began to use the HTM on their own to recognize an exhibit’s bias when they analyzed the Hagler monument. All 15 students recognized that it was biased in his favor. In their discussion of evidence supporting the monument’s bias, students could have included four pieces of information about Hagler from the engraved text – “‘PATRON SAINT OF CAMDEN’ BRAVE WARRIOR – PEACEMAKER SOUTH CAROLINA HALL OF FAME.” In addition, the front of the monument said the following about Chief Hagler and Joseph Kershaw, whom the students were not required to include in their analyses: “EARLY DEFENDERS OF PEACE AND LIBERTY IN THE FOUNDING OF CAMDEN AND KERSHAW COUNTY.” Nine students (Frank, Harriet, Indira, Khan, LeBron, Nehru, Sid, Sima, and Watson) cited three of the four pieces of evidence. Five students (Carl, Larry, Mary, Rachel, and Taylor) mentioned two facts to support the monument’s Hagler
bias. Finally, Ranjit only noted that Hagler was the Patron Saint of Camden, but both he and Sima also termed Hagler as Kershaw County’s “savior.” More students could have improved by explaining why they selected a particular quote as illustrative of the exhibit’s main point (prompt #20). Six of them (Carl, Frank, Larry, Mary, Rachel, and Watson) did not do the latter. However, despite this shortcoming and the fact that no students included all of the possible information the monument provided to support its positive view of Hagler, they still did fairly well in addressing the bias of this historical site.

**Bias and evidence in the Holocaust exhibits.** During the Washington, DC field study, Larry, Ranjit, Rachel, and Sima displayed varying levels of success in discussing the bias and evidence of *From Citizens to Outcasts*, an exhibit on the Lodz ghetto, *Documenting Life and Death in the Warsaw Ghetto*, and an exhibit on the gassing of Jewish prisoners at concentration camps, respectively. Overall, Larry, Ranjit, and Rachel’s analyses lacked the necessary detail. They recognized that their exhibits viewed the Holocaust with the revulsion it so deserved: “awful” (Larry); “has some negative bias since the topic is not positive and they don’t write the info like they like this happening” (Ranjit); and “most definitely has a bias against the Holocaust and the Nazi party’s beliefs and actions” (Rachel). However, only Larry and Rachel offered any evidence of the exhibit’s bias. The former quoted examples of the anti-Semitic signs the Germans posted and the latter cited “how cruelly the Jews were treated, and . . . that they had to bury documents so their history and memories would endure.” Ranjit just claimed that “all of the exhibit is evidence.” While Larry and Ranjit included a key quote, neither explained how it was illustrative of the exhibit’s meaning, and Rachel failed to even
identify a quote. In contrast, Sima’s analysis of the exhibit on how Germans gassed Jews was very thorough. She observed that the exhibit’s perspective was twofold with a “negative bias toward the Nazis, and positive bias towards the helpless Jews.”

Emphasizing the exhibit’s tragic message, its opening line that “in the summer 1941, Nazi Germany began the systematic mass murder of Europe’s Jews” caught Sima’s eye. She noted that “the exhibit purposefully starts off like this, to evoke a negative feeling toward the Nazis.” However, she selected a different quote to describe the exhibit’s main point. For her, the text that “nearly 2.7 million Jews died in the killing centers. Tens of thousands of Poles, Roma and Sinti (Gypsies), Soviet prisoners of war, and others were also killed at these sites” best illustrated the exhibit’s essential point. These four students certainly varied in addressing an exhibit’s bias.

**Bias and evidence in the King Memorial.** Three students (Nehru, Taylor, and Watson) analyzed the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial. All three of them recognized the site’s obvious bias for its honoree with Nehru noting that the memorial “implies Martin Luther King is an extremely important and great man . . . loving and wanted peace.” The site itself did not discuss factual information but had numerous quotes by King. While Nehru and Taylor identified the key quote as “Out of the mountain of despair, a stone of hope,” Watson selected a different quote, but he viewed this quote as significant as well. Both Nehru and Taylor explained the quote’s meaning, but Taylor was most clear and succinct in her identification of “segregation as a mountain of despair, but there is hope for equality.” It was clear that all three correctly interpreted the memorial’s bias for the famous civil rights leader.
Bias and evidence in the Lincoln and Vietnam Women’s Memorials. Carl and Indira successfully analyzed the bias of the Lincoln Memorial and the Vietnam Women’s Memorial, respectively. Carl correctly recognized that the memorial was biased toward Lincoln stating that he “was an amazing president that changed American forever” and identified the key quote of the exhibit as: “In this temple as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union, the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever.” He even explained why he selected this quote arguing that “people will always love and honor our 16th President for saving African American’s [sic] from lives of slavery and unifying our country regarding the importance of human rights for all people.” While I agree with his sentiments, Carl did wax hyperbolically for Lincoln himself had not fully embraced complete equality by the time he was assassinated. Indira’ discussion was thorough as well. She recognized the bias of the Vietnam Women’s Memorial toward women citing words such as “commitment” and “courage” from the placard. For evidence, she noted that “the women saved 98% of those they helped,” but could have included more evidence from the notes she took in answering prompt #19 about additional information. Astutely, she understood the key quote that “despite the lack of national recognition, these women demonstrated courage, commitment, and sacrifice” was stressing that these women were not about attention and glory but about “play[ing] a part in helping the nation.” Both Carl and Indira understood how to recognize and discuss their exhibits’ biases.

Bias and evidence in the African American Museum exhibits. The fourth site – the National Museum of African American History and Culture (NMAAHC) – was where Harriet, LeBron, and Mary analyzed an exhibit. Harriet’s analysis of Jim Crow
Laws was the most thorough of the three. She recognized that while the exhibit seemed to be neutral in its message “it is implied that they were against it [the Jim Crow laws] because it [the exhibit] was created in a place that was to honor and celebrate African Americans.” The discrepancy in the quality of the separate facilities was a theme in Harriet’s analysis. In fact, she identified as the key quote that “most often the facilities reserved for use by African Americans were inferior in quality” and in her notes observed that “the black ones [water fountains] are moldy & the white ones are big & very clean.”

LeBron’s analysis was much briefer than Harriet’s mainly because he believed the exhibit to be factual and did not consider the exhibit’s creator or place as implying a viewpoint. In fact, he stated that “there isn’t anything that shows any bias.” His photographs of the exhibit allowed me to read some of it, and I would concur that the exhibit does appear to be quite objective. The emphasis seemed to be how the status of Africans changed over time resulting in race-based slavery. Unlike LeBron, Mary recognized that The Rise of the Ku Klux Klan was “biased because it talks badly about the Whites” and included as evidence the quote that “Klansmen escalated their violence to discourage African Americans from voting or running for office.” These three students addressed the major points concerning the bias of their exhibits.

**Bias and evidence in Mount Vernon’s slavery exhibit.** The final three students – Frank, Khan, and Sid – analyzed the content of Mount Vernon’s exhibit The Dilemma of Slavery. Rather than treat the HTM’s prompts on content analysis separately, the following discussion will view them more holistically. Both Frank and Sid argued that the exhibit’s view of Washington was a mixed one. Frank cited the small food rations, the amount of clothes each slave received, and “the video when they talk about how
poorly he treated his slaves.” For Frank, the exhibit’s “‘turning point’” was the key quote: “As Washington grew older, he found it increasingly difficult to justify slavery in a country founded on liberty.” However, he could have gone into more detail about the rest of the exhibit, which discussed Washington’s dual legacy regarding slavery, including freeing his slaves after he died. Sid noted that the exhibit revealed how Washington supported and opposed slavery. However, Sid’s contention that the president signed “two slave laws that go against slavery” was not historically accurate. In fact, Washington signed a law requiring that runaway slaves be reunited with their masters (Dunbar, 2015, February 16). Sid identified and explained a quote that showed Washington’s struggle with slavery: “There is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do, to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it.” Khan’s interpretation was slightly different in that he chose to focus on the exhibit’s “bias towards the opposition of slavery.” He found great significance in the president’s “realization that slavery is morally wrong” and even felt that the exhibit’s acknowledgement that “the talents and energy of slaves touched every aspect of the Mount Vernon estate” revealed its anti-slavery bias. The fact that Washington eventually freed his slaves “‘setting an example for others to follow’” was another key piece of evidence that Khan believed justified his interpretation of the exhibit’s bias. The students clearly understood the exhibit’s bias.

**Bias and evidence in *A Woman’s War* exhibit.** After their content analysis of the Washington, DC sites, the students’ next opportunity involved *A Woman’s War* exhibit at the Smithsonian, which they all recognized as biased in favor of African American women’s contributions to the Civil War. For example, Larry commented that
the exhibit’s viewpoint was “very progressive. It shows women and black people in a very positive light, and while there is not much wrong with this, it is bias.” Similarly, Sima concluded that “the bias of this museum is towards AA [African American] women and their actions during the Civil War.” They also explained why they interpreted the exhibit this way, and 12 of the 14 (excluding Mary and Larry) either included a quote or referenced one in their answers to the next prompt (#15) on the HTM. The students certainly showed the ability to find bias.

They were also able to support their conclusions with evidence. For example, half of the students (Frank, Indira, Khan, LeBron, Nehru, Taylor, and Watson) quoted or made reference to the exhibit’s statement that “Susie King Taylor (1848-1912) bravely [emphasis added] seized her freedom at age 14.” Another interesting observation was that seven of the students (Carl, Frank, Harriet, Indira, LeBron, Mary, and Nehru) pointed out that this bias could be seen in the creators’ omission of negative information about these women. Indira concurred that “it only talks about the accomplishments of the women & does not include any negative facts,” and Harriet pointed out that the exhibit “left out the fact that she [Tubman] threatened to kill them if they threatened her freedom . . . they don’t show one of the very radical things she did.” Finally, most students offered multiple pieces of evidence for the bias if their answers to prompts #14, #15, and #20 are combined. Some such as Carl and Mary offered two facts/quotes while LeBron and Rachel offered over 10. All students identified a key quote, and most attempted to explain it. Overall, the students did well in recognizing and explaining the bias of the exhibit.
Bias and evidence in the faithful slaves monument. In the fourth activity using the HTM, students analyzed the content of a monument in Fort Mill, South Carolina that honors “FAITHFUL SLAVES” during the Civil War. Concerning the source’s bias, all 13 students clearly recognized its pro-Confederate view that southern slaves were loyal during the conflict. However, some students described it differently. Most students, eight in fact, placed the bias on the African Americans themselves. For example, LeBron stressed that the monument was “biased towards African American Slaves in the way as describing them as faithful, loyal, toiled for the support of the army.” In contrast, Mary and Taylor viewed the bias from the white perspective with the latter writing that “the point of view is from the slave owner. He believed that these slaves were loyal and helpul [sic] and honored them.” Finally, three students (Carl, Frank, and Indira) emphasize both sides involved in this honor. The latter wrote that there is “a bias for the Confederacy & makes them look honorable. It also makes it seem like the slaves were loyal & liked staying w/their masters.” Whichever way they approached the monument, it was erected based on a belief “that the slaves helped the Confederate cause” (Nehru).

What evidence does the monument provide for this bias? That was the question students needed to consider next. Most students either quoted or explained what the slaves did according to the monument. Students clearly identified evidence to support their understanding of the source’s bias and what the exhibit offered in support of its view. The text of the monument credits the slaves with supporting the army and guarding the home front while the two engraved reliefs of a woman holding a baby and a field hand sitting on a log near the crops illustrate the latter. Nine of the 13 students included both the military support and domestic roles the slaves provided. Mary neglected to
mention their work in supporting the South’s military, and both Carl and Frank wrote nothing about the slaves’ fidelity on the home front. In Khan’s case, he referenced the key quote that included these two facts, but he failed to write it out fully, so his inclusion of these two facts was implied. It was obvious that students were able to identify what the exhibit offered to support its viewpoint.

**Bias and evidence in the Tillman Monument.** The students next examined the viewpoint of the Benjamin Tillman Monument on the State House grounds. All 14 of the students recognized that the monument viewed Tillman in a positive way, but needed to address the HTM’s prompts more fully. In discussing evidence of the bias, most often students used quotes from the monument, which included information but not necessarily specific details. For example, nine of the students (Carl, Harriet, Indira, LeBron, Nehru, Ranjit, Sid, Taylor, and Watson) referenced or quoted in full or part that “LOVING THEM HE WAS THE FRIEND AND LEADER OF THE COMMON PEOPLE. HE TAUGHT THEM THEIR POLITICAL POWER AND MADE POSSIBLE FOR THE EDUCATION OF THEIR SONS AND DAUGHTERS.” Only Nehru, however, included the rest of text that referenced Tillman’s involvement with Clemson and Winthrop. To LeBron’s credit, he added some other information as well. However, despite the fact that the monument lists Tillman’s political accomplishments, only Khan included the evidence of his service as governor and U.S. senator. Three students (Frank, Larry, and Mary) just summarized rather than specify the evidence. For example, Frank wrote that the creators of the monument “go into depth on his accomplishments [sic] and his good qualities.” Finally, ten students fully answered prompt #20 which asked for students to
write a key quote and explain it, but Carl, LeBron, Taylor, and Watson failed to do the latter. The students’ analyses revealed a need to address the HTM’s prompts more fully.

**Bias and evidence in the Smalls and Clark museum exhibits.** The students’ final use of the HTM to analyze an exhibit’s bias addressed the South Carolina Hall of Fame’s exhibits on either Robert Smalls or Septima Clark. All 13 students recognized the positive bias of the exhibits. For example, Sid wrote that “this source is biased towards Robert Smalls because it is honoring how Robert Smalls and his bravery when he successfully escaped the clutches of slavery,” and Khan observed that “this exhibit has a bias towards Setima [sic] Clark because it highlights her achievements.” Based on their responses to prompts #14 and #15, nine of the 13 students (Frank, Harriet, Indira, Khan, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, Sid, and Sima) included quotes and information. In contrast, Carl, Larry, Taylor, and Watson generalized the evidence rather than provide specific details. For example, while Carl generalized that “the exhibit only gives positive information about Robert Smalls and not negative information,” Taylor similarly observed that the creators of the Clark exhibit “tell the positives to show what great accomplishments and things she did for our nation.” Finally, in answering prompt #20 every student provided a key quote, but only eight (Frank, Harriet, Indira, Khan, Nehru, Sid, Sima, and Taylor) also explained why they selected it. The other five students – Carl, Larry, LeBron, Mary, and Watson – failed to do so. In short, the students who analyzed the Smalls exhibit had mixed success in addressing the bias and evidence in the content section of the HTM.

**Bias and evidence in the State House monuments.** In their final analysis, students examined one of the State House monuments, but they were not given a copy of the HTM to see how well they recognized this in exhibits without its scaffolding. Every
student, with the exception of Mary, recognized that the monuments were biased in favor of their topics and offered some specific or general evidence to justify this interpretation. For example, Khan pointed out that the pro-Thurmond monument included awards the old senator had received – the Presidential Citizens Medal, the Presidential Medal of Freedom, and the Order of the Palmetto. In contrast, Sid’s evidence for bias in Hampton’s Monument was a general observation that “it is dedicated to the good things that he did for SC . . . [and] there are no facts on the statue that show that [sic] bad things that he did in his life.” Only three of the four monuments - the African American, Confederate Women’s and the Strom Thurmond Monuments – had enough text for students to cite textual examples showing bias in word choice, and seven of the eleven students (Frank, Harriet Khan, Larry, Rachel, Sima, and Taylor) included at least one quote or key word illustrating the monument’s bias. For example, Taylor listed 15 words or phrases such as “unconquerable spirit” and “fortitude” to prove the bias of the Confederate Women’s Monument.

However, some students did not do as well in explaining the evidence illustrating or supporting the exhibit’s bias. Indira wrote that the Wade Hampton Monument was intended “to honor . . . his accomplishments” but then later lamented that “it does not have any information on Hampton’s . . . achievements” despite her notes that he was a governor and U. S. senator. Watson cited bias in how the Strom Thurmond statue is above its viewers, but did not discuss any of the monument’s information that placed the leader in a positive light. Three students (Larry, LeBron, and Mary) had issues with the African American Monument. Larry never wrote clearly that it was biased toward blacks, but hinted at it when he commented that “they were ripped from their land
without permission.” While LeBron stated that the “exhibit is biased towards African Americans,” he must have assumed his description of the exhibit was evidence enough. Finally, despite preparation work that included information about the monument’s black sculptor Ed Dwight, Mary stated that the site was “from the point of view of someone not black!” Even though she used “achievements” and “progression” in her description of the monument’s story, she concluded that “it only states facts or from First person view and nothing is inferred or implied.” Overall, considering that none of the students directly addressed the pro-bias of the Bill of Rights and You exhibit, students made impressive progress in recognizing bias, but they needed to follow the lead of Khan and Taylor and elaborate in their explanation of evidence.

**Design and bias in the Bill of Rights and You exhibit.** In addition to the text revealing the monument’s bias, another consideration in analyzing the content of an exhibit is how its design reinforces the bias (HTM prompt #16). In their Bill of Rights and You exhibit, only three of the fifteen students appeared to address some element of design. For example, Rachel observed that the display was “well-designed, caught my eye [and] well written and good use of space.” Khan liked the inclusion of Jefferson’s quote that a society should periodically change the rules of government saying it “makes sense – amendments are essential – I like the quote.” Frank made a number of comments such as “bigger and bold words stand out.” However, we have already discussed how none of the students clearly stated that this exhibit was biased toward the Bill of Rights. Consequently, any mention of design elements lacked a definitive link to viewpoint or bias.
Design and bias in the Hagler monument. In their analysis of Chief Hagler’s monument, the students’ responses can be summarized in seven categories: construction materials, facial expression, dress, landscaping, elevated position, size, and lack of weapons. First, six students commented on the composition of the statue with Indira, Ranjit, and Taylor simply stating it was made of bronze, Harriet and Sima commenting “a strong material,” and Carl concluding that “the bright bronze and iron on the statue shows his importants [sic].” Second, the same number of students drew attention to the facial expression. For example, both LeBron and Sid wrote that the Catawba chief “is smiling . . . and seems very amiable towards the white english settler” (Sid). Third, Frank, Harriet, Indira, Taylor, and Watson also commented on Hagler’s dress. Frank and Watson were the most descriptive in their explanations. The former specifically observed that Hagler’s “necklace and arm ‘bands’ help draw attention and shows importance,” and the latter that “his bright jewelry draws attention to him and shows his high status.” Fourth, five students also included the landscaping in their answers concerning how the design reinforced the exhibit’s bias. While Rachel simply wrote that it was in the Town Green, the other four – Harriet, Indira, Khan, and Taylor – noticed the landscaping itself. Khan elaborated that the statue “is placed in the middle of a park, with flowers and grass placed all around it,” and both Harriet and Indira clearly stated that the flowers were a matter of “respect.” Fifth, four students (Harriet, Indira, Khan, and Taylor) pointed out that “the two statues [Hagler and Kershaw] are elevated, implying that people look up to them.” Sixth, another three students commented on the size of the statues with Carl and Frank observing that “they are bigger than normal humans which makes them seem more important” (Carl) and Watson agreeing that they are “larger than life.” While it is
difficult to tell whether they were indeed bigger, the students showed they understood how size can be used in design to imply importance. Seventh, Mary, Rachel, and Sima also observed that the statue’s lack of “guns” or “weapons” emphasized peace. The students did well in explaining how the design elements of this historical site conveyed a biased interpretation of the subject matter.

**Design and bias in the Holocaust exhibits.** The next opportunity to analyze an exhibit’s bias and design took place on the field trip to Washington, DC in November 2017. Larry, Ranjit, Rachel, and Sima were mixed in their attempts to do so at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM). Neither Larry nor Ranjit discussed in much detail how the exhibit’s design and message were related with the former only mentioning that there were photographs and signs and the latter observing that his exhibit’s design “reinforce[d] the point of view by putting docs [documents] on display.” In contrast, Rachel probed more deeply when she observed that the exhibit *Documenting Life and Death in the Warsaw Ghetto* “isn’t designed to catch one’s eye, but if you look at it, there are deep lessons and emotion buried in a simple, rusty milk can.” Finally, Sima’s analysis was most precise when she commented that her exhibit on the gassing of Jews used the “black, charred, black gas chamber door” and a grid of “black bars around the exhibit [to] create a feeling of ‘trapped’” to reinforce its negative message.

**Design and bias in the King Memorial.** Nehru, Taylor, and Watson also found significance in the design of the memorial. Nehru was the most detailed of the three calling attention to the height of the statue and how “King is also looking straight ahead with his arms crossed; when standing at his feet, King seems superior and important.” He also felt that the “peaceful setting and mood” created by the vegetation and Tidal
Basin reflected that “King himself, was peaceful and loving.” Taylor found significance in the granite used to create the memorial because it “is a prestigious rock . . . very expensive.” Watson placed great emphasis on the split mountain “because it shows MLK opening a gap in the mountain of despair.” It was clear that these students understood how design can reinforce the creators’ message.

**Design and bias in the Lincoln and Vietnam Women’s Memorials.** Both Carl and Indira were adept in connection perspective and design. Carl understood that the Lincoln Memorial’s design and message were symbiotic and interpreted the statue’s size and the fact that it “is surrounded by a giant room made of very pretty and bright marble” as evidence of the monument’s positive perspective on Lincoln. Indira also understood how the design and message of the Vietnam Women’s Memorial worked in tandem, observing that “the statues are also life sized and made of bronze, making them seem very strong [sic] respected” and that they “are on a large pedestal, which raises them above the ground.”

**Design and bias in the African American Museum exhibits.** At the National Museum of African American History and Culture, Harriet, LeBron, and Mary differed in their analysis of the exhibits’ design. In her examination of *Jim Crow Laws*, Harriet pointed out that it was “placed in the middle, very well lighted, was in a different color, wasn’t too wordy so it was more inviting.” However, she moved beyond obvious features and observed how the artifacts reinforced the placard’s text. Her key quote that “most often the facilities reserved for use by African Americans were inferior in quality” was illustrated by the two water fountains - “the black ones are moldy & the white ones are big & very clean.” LeBron’s analysis lacked the same sophistication with him only
describing the design and observing that it had “information and stories about what slaves did and what life was like.” Similarly, Mary just commented that *The Rise of the Ku Klux Klan* had a KKK hood and what she described as “journals,” but she did not explain how the negative view of the Klan could be seen in the creators’ design decisions, such as the cover page of *Le Journal Illustró*, which featured a sketch of the lynching of four African American men. It was obvious that while Harriet excelled in analyzing design, both LeBron and Mary needed to be more detailed in their descriptions.

**Design and bias in Mount Vernon’s slavery exhibit.** Concerning Mount Vernon’s exhibit *The Dilemma of Slavery*, Frank, Khan, and Sid were mixed in their analysis of design. Both Frank and Sid argued that the exhibit’s view of Washington seemed to change as one moved from left to right. In discussing the left side of the exhibit and its negative view of Washington, Frank cited the small food rations, the amount of clothes each slave received, and “the video when they talk about how poorly he treated his slaves.” For Frank, the exhibit’s “‘turning point’” was a key quote: “As Washington grew older, he found it increasingly difficult to justify slavery in a country founded on liberty.” However, he could have gone into more detail in this prompt about the rest of the exhibit, which discussed Washington’s dual legacy regarding slavery, including how he freed his slaves in his will but in the meantime some of them escaped. Both Khan and Sid misinterpreted the large painting of slaves working in the field with Washington looking on. Khan believed the artwork “shows that the slaves work and George Washington has an issue with that,” and Sid believed it showed Washington “as assisting the slaves working on the plantation.” There is neither an explicit statement nor an implied context warranting such an interpretation. In fact, it appears that Washington
is speaking with his overseer. It was clear that Frank, Khan, and Sid did not perform as well in connecting the exhibit’s bias and its design.

**Design and bias in *A Woman’s War* exhibit.** The students showed more consistency in their discussion of how design reinforced the exhibit’s perspective in their analysis of the Smithsonian’s *A Woman’s War*. The two most prominent topics students brought up concerned the pictures and the wording. Nine students (Carl, Frank, Indira, LeBron, Larry, Mary, Rachel, Taylor, and Watson) commented about the pictures. Four of these students were just descriptive – e.g., “very dark and the pictures in it stand out more” (Carl) and “pictures . . . are prominent” (Rachel). However, the remaining five students linked the size or location with the women’s importance. For example, Indira commented that “the pictures of the women are the biggest part of the exhibit & are made to stand out the most. This makes the women look respected, strong, & like good leaders.” Both Khan and Sima, who initially needed help from me according to my field journal, ended up recognizing how the wording and size worked together to reinforce the message that women were the topic of this exhibit. The former wrote that:

> “A Woman’s War” and “Women on the Front” both are the largest in font and have the word “women” in common. This emphasizes the bias of feminism in the exhibit and it also shows that the exhibit is about women.

Overall, the students did an admirable job in discussing how the design reinforced the exhibit’s perspective.

**Design and bias in the faithful slaves monument.** Students next turned their attention to how the design of “To the Faithful Slaves” monument reinforced its appreciation for slaves who had remained loyal to their masters and the Confederate
cause. Three elements emerged among multiple students. First, while nine students referenced at least one of the two reliefs on the monument, seven of them specifically mentioned the one of a slave woman holding a white baby in front of the mansion. Khan wrote that this art “demonstrates [sic] how slaves protected their owner’s children” while Rachel felt it “especially ‘shows’ her content with her enslavement.” Second, Mary and Taylor interpreted significance in the marble of the monument because of its expense and implied that it was a testament to the creator’s appreciation. Third, LeBron and Nehru felt that the landscaping reinforced the message of the monument. LeBron observed that “the exhibit [meaning Confederate Park where the monument is located] is spread out, and the green grass and trees make it seem peaceful,” which “give off a positive feeling which makes the viewers seem positive toward the slaves” (Nehru). The students gave deep thought about how the message and design itself complemented each other.

**Design and bias in the Tillman Monument.** Students’ interpretations of how the Benjamin Tillman Monument’s design reinforced positive perspective focused on two elements. First, students believed that Tillman’s physical elevation above viewers sent a clear message of his importance. Eight students (Harriet, Indira, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, Sid, Taylor, and Watson) noted this in their analyses. For example, Mary observed that his placement conveyed “how he is more powerful than others because when people go to look at the statue they have to look up.” Nehru extended Mary’s interpretation saying that “people will have to look up to him while he looks down upon them.” The second design element students discussed was Tillman’s face. Five students (Frank, Harriet, Larry, Ranjit, and Sima) found meaning in the former governor’s visage. Frank, Larry, and Sima used the word “stern” to describe his expression while Harriet commented that
“his face is straight which shows he is bold and a fierce leader.” Ranjit, in contrast, only implied this aspect of the design when he noted that the statue depicted Tillman “as a strong person looking at his citizens.” The students’ observational and interpretative skills were well-executed.

**Design and bias in the Smalls and Clark museum exhibits.** The students continued to show their skill in analyzing design in the South Carolina Hall of Fame exhibits on Robert Smalls and Septima Clark. All of the students addressed this issue except Larry, who inexplicably claimed “I cannot see the exhibit.” Ten of them commented on some aspect of the honoree’s photograph with five commenting on its size as “large” (Khan). Six students also discussed the role of lighting in the exhibits’ design. For example, Nehru and Sima, who worked together, mentioned the “3 large lights, multiple recessed lights, wide pillars, gold letters, and marble flooring” (Nehru) and credited its design with “a positive feeling of seriousness and importance” (Nehru) and “a sense of significance and care” (Sima). The students clearly understood the relationship between an exhibit’s perspective and its design.

**Design and bias in the State House monuments.** In their final exhibit analyses of the State House monuments without the HTM, every student except for Ranjit at least touched on design and bias. For example, the Confederate Women’s Monument has an angel holding a wreath over the head of a southern woman. Rachel interpreted this laurel crown to be a “symbol of victory and respect [that] is being given to the women as a symbol of their constant support.” Another example was how five of the eight students (Carl, Frank, Khan, Sid, and Watson) who analyzed the Strom Thurmond and Wade Hampton Monuments found significance in the statues’ locations relative to visitors: “he
[Thurmond] is standing above ground, forcing people to look up at him – shows his importance” (Frank). Finally, LeBron who described how the African American Monument depicted the crowded conditions of the transatlantic slave trade and later in his analysis observed that one of the purposes of the exhibit was to “show people the struggles we went through.” The students’ continued to show they understood how a monument’s design communicates its perspective. The increase from three students who may or may not have linked bias and design in the Bill of Rights and You analyses to 14 who did so to some degree showed that students definitely grew in this aspect of historical thinking.

**Missing viewpoints in the Bill of Rights and You exhibit.** Another important consideration of a historical site or exhibit’s content is what it leaves out. Subjectivity can be found not only it was is said, but what is not. In the HTM’s prompt #17, students were asked to identify viewpoints that were missing from an exhibit. In their initial analysis of the Bill of Rights and You exhibit, only two students (Khan and Taylor) discussed the opinions of those who might disagree with any of these amendments. Khan mentioned that “a lot of people argue agaist [sic] or for the right to bear arms,” and Taylor wondered “why aren’t their [sic] laws passed that contain our freedom of speech,” later discussing how the government should pass a “law that talks about discriminating our nation. You can disagree but you shall not publicly protest & cause harm to others.” Taylor was considering the view of someone advocating the revision of the First Amendment. However, these two students were the exception. This fact should not come as a surprise considering that none of the students clearly discussed the exhibit’s
bias towards the Bill of Rights. At the beginning of this study, students certainly needed to improve in their identification of an exhibit’s missing viewpoints.

**Missing viewpoints in the Hagler monument.** In their analysis of the Hagler monument, the most common groups whose views students identified as missing were the white colonists (11 times), other Native American tribes (7; 10 if the Catawba references are included), and women (5 times). There were five instances where students identified the British, Joseph Kershaw, and slaves. Finally, soldiers, their families, and Hagler were each mentioned once. Considering that the statue has a pro-Hagler bias because of his peaceful attitude toward whites, those who cited the colonists failed to consider that most colonists probably liked him. The best answer for this particular prompt was the viewpoint of those who opposed him. Only four students (Nehru, Ranjit, Sid, and Sima) considered this possibility. For example, Ranjit mentioned “the enemy tribe members in the Iroquois” and Sima observed that “boths’ [sic; meaning Hagler and Kershaw] enemies viewpoints are not addressed.” Recognizing relevant missing viewpoints was one area that students showed they needed additional work to master.

**Missing viewpoints in the Washington, DC exhibits.** During their analyses of the different sites in Washington, DC, students were very mixed in their identification of missing viewpoints. At the Holocaust Museum, only Rachel was clear that the Nazi perspective was absent from the exhibit while Larry just referenced the Allied powers, and Ranjit wrote “the Jews, prisoners, Hitler, Jewish Council,” leaving one to wonder whose viewpoint was displayed. With her tendency to be too detailed in her work, Sima listed six groups: “Real Holocaust survivors, real Nazis, Germany’s allies, scientists who created Zyklone [sic] B, leaders of the killing centers, and the curators of the State
Museum at Majdanek, Lublin, Poland.” However, more is not always better, and she should have noted that with the exhibit’s anti-Nazi bias the view of Germans was missing. They are included in her list but so is almost everyone else.

Two of the three students who analyzed the King Memorial correctly identified the missing perspectives. Both Nehru and Watson recognized that the views of those opposed to black equality were not represented. While the latter succinctly identified “racists [sic] whites,” the former explained more fully that the memorial did not include “the viewpoint of people who did not believe he was a great man . . . the viewpoint of people who believed whites should always be considered better than blacks . . . [those who] believed . . . that King was ignorant, fighting for what could never happened.” Taylor just listed the missing viewpoints as “other African Americans, Caucasians, and members of society,” a rather broad list that failed to specify white segregationists.

Both Carl and Indira partially identified the missing viewpoints of the Lincoln and Vietnam Women’s Memorial, respectively. While Carl correctly recognized that the “viewpoints of southern slave owners” were absent for they certainly did not hold him in such high esteem, he did not consider other viewpoints such as Northern politicians and military leaders who disparaged him during the Civil War. Carl also identified females’ and children’s viewpoints as missing, although the latter group would not be particularly relevant in building this memorial. In her analysis of the Vietnam Women’s Memorial, Indira identified the missing viewpoints of male colleagues, men who did not go to Vietnam, and their patients. However, the last group probably had the same view as the memorial considering these women helped save their lives. Indira should have explained her answer more fully to include men who were unreceptive to the idea of women serving
in the war in any way at all. Both Carl and Indira had room to improve when discussing missing viewpoints.

Those students analyzing exhibits at the National Museum of African American History and Culture achieved different levels of success in identifying missing viewpoints. In her examination of *Jim Crow Laws*, Harriet noted that the exhibit did not include “the people who were pro segregation, and the people who were against it.” Similarly, in keeping with his interpretation of the exhibit on Africans in the Chesapeake as an objective source of information, LeBron felt that it neglected “the perspectives of many slaves [sic] owners or whites in general, other slaves’ perspectives, or the government perspective.” However, the exhibit discussed what whites thought, quoted a law that declared a child’s status to be the same as his or her mother, and included some documents associated with an African American couple named Anthony and Mary Johnson. Perhaps, he thought the exhibit needed to include more or he did not sufficiently think about the above points. In *The Rise of the Ku Klux Klan*, Mary realized that the viewpoints of its members and whites were missing and that the exhibit was “positive towards the Blacks but negative toward the whites.” Two of the three students were definitely correct in their discussion of neglected perspectives.

At Mount Vernon’s *The Dilemma of Slavery*, Frank recognized that opinions of the slaves themselves were not examined and wanted to hear from their owner “his reasoning for owning slaves, and his decisions as a slave owner.” Similarly, Khan acknowledged that the slaves’ viewpoint was absent from the exhibit noting that it also neglected the views of Martha Washington and their visitors. Sid agreed with Khan in recognizing that Martha Washington’s views were not considered in the exhibit, and he
also wondered about what Native Americans thought about slavery at Mount Vernon, although by this time, there were few, if any, in Tidewater, Virginia. While their main point that the exhibit focused on Washington himself is a valid one, students could have pointed to the examples of the slaves making their viewpoints evident such as when they escaped. Nonetheless, they did recognize the key perspective missing from the exhibit.

**Missing viewpoints in *A Woman’s War* exhibit.** When discussing the missing viewpoints of the Smithsonian’s *A Woman’s War*, the students needed to be more specific and clearer in what they meant. For example, Sima listed “white men, Confederate soldiers, Union soldiers, black soldiers, young, female children, slaves, real plantation/relief workers, suffragists, slave owners/masters, Congress, and more.” She obviously listed everything she could think of. Sometimes, their answers were unclear or vague. Khan wrote “white men, women, and black men.” Was he referring to all women or just white ones? Mary listed “white men, women, and Black men, and other minorities,” but who are these other minority groups? Allowing for some interpretative subjectivity, the most common answer of missing viewpoints was that of whites. Twelve students identified whites in general: eight students mentioned white men; six students listed white women; LeBron just wrote “many whites;” Harriet penned “white people or men that disagreed w/ the women fighting in war;” and Taylor wrote “other women,” which could refer to both racial groups. Five students mentioned a more specific group of whites – those supporting the Confederacy, whether referring to them in general (Carl), slave owners (Nehru, Sima, Taylor and Watson), or soldiers (Sima). Nine students referenced black men (Khan, Mary, Rachel, Sid, and Taylor), slaves (Sima and Taylor), African Americans (Frank and Indira), and of course Taylor’s “other women,”
which could include African Americans. Finally, another five students mentioned people with whom the African American women worked: “people who fought with the women” (Frank), “the men that worked alongside the women in war” (Harriet), “the soldiers who fought alongside the black women” (Indira), “the fellow nurses, the other slaves watching fellow freedmen work on the war effort” (Larry), and “union soldiers, black soldiers . . . real plantation/relief workers” (Sima). It was clear that the students recognized there were missing viewpoints from the exhibit.

**Missing viewpoints in the faithful slaves monument.** Students were successful in their identification of missing perspectives in the “To the Faithful Slaves” monument. All of them but Carl identified either slaves, African Americans, or blacks. However, even Carl implied this viewpoint was missing when he wrote that “the confederates [sic] respect and honor the slaves who helped them in the Civil War.” The other most common answer was northerners or the Union, which included its soldiers. Nine students identified this group, and only Mary, Rachel, Taylor, and Watson did not. However, Mary did mention “slaves and othe [sic] racial groups,” which would include whites in general but was too broad to be helpful. It was clear that students recognized that the viewpoint of the slaves themselves about the Civil War was missing in this monument dedicated to them.

**Missing viewpoints in the Tillman Monument.** In their analysis of the Tillman Monument, students also showed that exhibits exclude other viewpoints. In fact, 13 of the 14 students sans Taylor acknowledged that African Americans’ opinions about Tillman were absent. In her case, she recognized his racism, but did not mention it when she answered prompt #17, which asked students for missing perspectives. Consistent
with political reformers, Tillman was a controversial leader in his own day. Four students specifically mentioned that his “opponents” (Sima), “people that disliked him” (LeBron), and “Conservatives” (Indira and Sid) were left out, and Harriet included “his friends that he put out if they lost his favor in the government.” The students showed mastery in answering this prompt.

**Missing viewpoints in the Smalls and Clark museum exhibits.** The students continued to show their recognition of missing viewpoints in their analyses of the Robert Smalls and Septima Clark exhibits. In the case of the former, six of them (Carl, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, Sid, and Sima) specifically mentioned the Confederates’ perspective as missing. Only Larry did not identify the Confederate perspective as missing. In the case of the Clark exhibit’s positive view of a civil rights figure, one would assume that students would quickly realize that the view of white segregationists was missing. Three of them clearly did so. Frank and Khan cited “racist [sic] white men’s feelings” and “racist white people’s viewpoints,” respectively, while Harriet referenced “those that were against her views such as the white people around her.” Overall, students recognized the key viewpoints missing.

However, there some students who made some mistakes in their discussion. First, Nehru, Sid, and Sima noted that the Smalls exhibit failed to include the perspectives of his wife and children, but they would have shared the exhibit’s favorable view of him. Second, Indira, Taylor, and Watson probably meant white segregationists when they listed “white women” (Indira and Watson) and “white’s [sic] (Taylor), but they should have been careful not to stereotype all whites as racists and unsupportive of Clark. Third, sometimes students listed groups whose thoughts they believed were missing when
indeed they were included in the exhibit. For example, Indira and Taylor wondered what “other civil rights activist[s]” thought despite the exhibit saying she was “under appreciated by Southern male activists” and that Martin Luther King, Jr. believed her to be “The Mother of the Movement.” Both Frank and Khan wanted to know what her family thought despite the fact that the exhibit’s video closes with her grand-nephew D. Michael Clark claiming that “without Septima Poinsette, you have no Martin Luther King; you have no Rosa Parks; you don’t have a President Obama.” While students typically recognized important missing viewpoints, they did show in these instances there was room for improvement.

**Missing viewpoints in the State House monuments.** In their final analysis without the HTM, students turned their attention to identifying the missing viewpoints of the State House monuments. Eight (Frank, Harriet, Indira, Khan, Nehru, Ranjit, Sid, and Sima) clearly identified them, two (Carl and Larry) perhaps implied them, and five (LeBron, Mary, Rachel, Taylor, and Watson) neglected to address them at all. For example, Ranjit correctly noted that the Strom Thurmond Monument certainly excludes “the viewpoints of his opponents, the African American[s] who did not like his belief in segregation, and the white people who did not support his views on segregation either.” However, three of the eight students (Frank, Khan, and Sima) were not completely correct in their identifications of missing viewpoints. Frank wrote that “the viewpoints of his [Thurmond’s] friends and family are not addressed,” but failed to realize that they would agree with the monument’s viewpoint. He did mention “his fellow congressmen,” but he needed to differentiate between his political allies and opponents. While Khan acknowledged that the views of African Americans and Thurmond’s secret child Essie
Mae Washington-Williams were missing, he also said that Thurmond’s view was missing, but considering he was still alive and attended the monument’s dedication, his view was most definitely present. Similarly, Sima had issues because her list was too long and included people who shared the monument’s perspective: “CSA men, women in the Union, Union men, children, women suffragists, the women opposers [sic], and the women supporters.” In fact, Confederate men sponsored the monument; women suffragists might agree or disagree depending upon their Civil War loyalties; and “the women supporters” would by definition agree with the site’s pro-Confederate women.

Two students seemed to imply missing viewpoints. Carl observed that he did not believe that the Wade Hampton Monument would exist “in the present day where African Americans are considered completely equal, and the idea of discrimination is not tolerated in the government or amongst the people of South Carolina,” and Larry perhaps alluded to those who opposed the African American Monument when he that despite the abolition of slavery and the fact that “African Americans . . . live among the rest of the US today, there are still many who are not satisfied with the status quo.” It will be recalled that only two students discussed missing viewpoints in the initial Bill of Rights and You activity. In contrast, if one includes Carl who implication is much clearer than Larry’s, then six students (Carl, Harriet, Indira, Nehru, Ranjit, and Sid) correctly recognized the missing viewpoints in their final State House monument analysis. While there continued to be room for improvement, students had made progress.

**Race and gender/sex in the Bill of Rights and You exhibit.** Another important component of an exhibit’s content can be what it says about race and gender/sex (prompt #18). In their baseline analysis of the Bill of Rights and You, only four of the 15 students
clearly made observations about race or gender – Ranjit, Sid, Sima, and Taylor. For example, the fourth panel, which addressed the first amendment and the civil rights movement, prompted Ranjit to ask: “So without the 1st ammend. [sic] the people involved in the civil rights act could have just been killed immediately for protesting the govt.?” Similarly, Sid observed that “African-American civil rights [activists] used the first Amendment rights to protest against discrimination” and that “women used their rights of speech, press, petition [sic], and assembly to demand full voting rights.” However, it appeared that Sid basically copied down the text from the fourth panel and changed one word in each of the two quotes. While he needed to work on not plagiarizing at least he did consider race and gender by what he wrote down. Sima also mentioned that “the African American discrimination stopped because of the first law [amendment]. - Blacks are now judged as Whites! So only Black men had rights, but not Black women?” She was referencing two panels - one that said Martin Luther King, Jr. and other “African American civil rights leaders used their First Amendment rights to protest discrimination” and another one that read “women of color still faced barriers to voting throughout the 20th century.” Sima also observed that women’s exercise of the First Amendment “led to women suffrage.” Finally, Taylor voiced impatience with the slow pace of equality for women questioning: “Why weren’t women allowed to vote until 1920, we are equally as important?” These four students clearly addressed racial and gender issues in their written analysis of the exhibit.

**Race and gender/sex in the Hagler monument.** In their student-directed use of the HTM, all 15 students correctly interpreted the Hagler monument in terms of race. Ranjit commented that “there is no racism or sexism in the statues,” most likely because
the statue was positive towards race and made no comment considering gender or sex. In fact, Sima made the same statement as Ranjit but then elaborated about the statue’s “positive aspects of race.” She went on to discuss Hagler and Kershaw’s “bond” and that while they “clearly have different races, but nevertheless respect each other.” Other students similarly emphasized the “anti-racism/s” (Carl, Frank, and Larry) and the idea of equality (Mary and Rachel) while LeBron pointed out that American Indians “were not usually appreciated back then” and Khan concurred that whites “generally thought of the Native Americans there as less than them.” Hagler pursued a policy of peace in a time when Native Americans and whites “were usually opposing” (Indira), “don’t usually get along” (Taylor), and “the native americans usually did not like the whites” (Harriet). In fact, the latter group “treated the Native American race differently by mistreating them physically, and even when trading” (Nehru). The students were quite adept at recognizing the racial aspects of this historical site.

**Race and gender/sex in the Washington, DC exhibits.** In their analyses of the Washington, DC historical sites and museum exhibits, the students excelled in recognizing their relationship to race and gender/sex. Larry, Ranjit, Rachel, and Sima identified the racial theme at the Holocaust Museum. Sima discussed the negative fact that so many people were killed but noted the positive message that exhibit “was made TO honor the Jews, by POTRAYING [sic] what had happened to them. It serves to seek sorrow and sympathy from the visitors.” At the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial, Nehru, Taylor, and Watson recognized its racial subject, but the first two also addressed the issue of gender/sex in greater depth. Nehru observed that with King’s belief in “equality between all races and genders, this memorial relates positively to everyone and
against both racism and sexism.” Taylor noted that “the first AA [African American] memorial to be put on national mall,” but bemoaned the fact that it illustrated again that women are not honored on the mall with the sole exception of Eleanor Roosevelt, whom she mistakenly placed at the John F. Kennedy memorial when she meant the Franklin D. Roosevelt site. These students certainly understood the racial elements of their historical sites.

Both Carl and Indira examined their exhibits in terms of race and gender/sex. Understandably, Carl interpreted the Lincoln Memorial as relating “positively to race because Abraham Lincoln worked towards equal rights for African Americans in America.” While his inclusion of equal rights was an overstatement of Lincoln’s views, Carl’s main point that “Lincoln worked towards equal rights” allowed for a historically tenable argument that the president was evolving in that direction. Indira’s exhibit, the Vietnam Women’s Memorial, was the one site devoted completely to women, which she correctly identified. As has been explained above, she recognized the positivity of the exhibit toward women because it “is dedicated entirely to women who served and is giving them the recognition they deserve for helping so many people.” However, Indira missed an opportunity to address race when she failed to notice that one of the statues featured an African American nurse looking skyward in search of help for them and the soldier they are treating. Nevertheless, both Carl and Indira analyzed the relevant issues in their memorials.

All three exhibits at the National Museum of African American History and Culture and The Dilemma of Slavery at Mount Vernon had obvious racial aspects. In the case of the former, Harriet noted that Jim Crow Laws did not include the opinions of
those for or against segregation, but she recognized that it “says negatively that the races wouldn’t work together.” In his exhibit on Africans in the Chesapeake, LeBron recognized that slavery was negative, and therefore the exhibit related as such to race. Mary commented that *The Rise of the Ku Klux Klan* was “positive towards the Blacks but negative toward the whites.” At Mount Vernon, Frank felt the exhibit related both positively and negatively toward race because while it “does show the evil in slavery . . . it turned out okay for the slaves of Mount Vernon, since they were freed.” Frank failed to note that Martha Washington’s slaves nor those her husband had rented were freed, but nonetheless his point that the exhibit related in different ways to race was a valid one. Khan’s main argument is that *The Dilemma of Slavery* “reacts negatively towards racism, or positively towards racial acceptance.” In contrast, Sid focused on the negative reality that slaves labored “long hours” and were “physically abused by their white, male owners.” Despite its discussion of individual female slaves, only Khan discussed this part of the exhibit. These six students recognized the racial aspects of their exhibits, but Frank and Sid should have addressed the gender/sex issues at Mount Vernon.

**Race and gender/sex in A Woman’s War exhibit.** Considering that the next exhibit students analyzed was entitled *A Woman’s War* on African American women, it came as no surprise that every student recognized the exhibit’s relevance to both. However, there were differences in what the students noticed. Ten students felt the exhibit was positive toward African Americans and women. For example, Carl commented that “the exhibit [sic] relates positively [sic] to race and gender because it talks about African American women’s achievements [sic] in a time where they were looked down upon,” and Taylor wrote that “this exhibit empowers women & african americans.”
Both Harriet and Nehru discussed how the exhibit was positive and negative concerning race and gender with the former observing that Grimké, Tubman, and Taylor’s “were allowed to fight in war which is a large step for women at the time.” In truth, only Tubman was directly involved in a military exercise. Notwithstanding, Harriet then qualified her optimism noting that “it was out of the ordinary for women to be able to fight in war especially if they are black because they are believed to be inferior.” All fourteen students were able to recognize the racial and gender aspect of this exhibit.

**Race and gender/sex in the faithful slaves monument.** In their analysis of the “To the Faithful Slaves” monument, all of the students explained the monument in terms of race, but they explained it negatively or positively depending upon from what perspective they considered it. Nearly half of the students (Carl, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, Taylor, and Watson) viewed it positively because “it is about black people helping whites” (Carl), “states how faithful African Am [American] slavers are to their owners” (Mary), and “doesn’t say anything bad about them” (Watson). Sid did not view its message so optimistically and without mincing words wrote that this monument “relates negatively . . . because it shows that the slaves are helping the confederates preserve slavery and this is going against their own freedom.” The remaining six students (Frank, Indira, Khan, Rachel, Ranjit, and Sima) were more nuanced in their explanations recognizing that the monument could be viewed in both ways. Khan’s answer was most precise: “From the Lost Cause’s perspective, the monument is positive towards AAs [African Americans] and slavery. However, from our perspective nowadays, we see this as negative because they’re still supporting slavery.” While the students’ answers
approached the racial message from different angles, they obviously understood the racial context of this monument.

**Race and gender/sex in the Tillman Monument.** In their analysis of race and gender/sex in the Tillman Monument, the students predominantly focused on white males, white people, or Tillman as a racist. Students noted in their answers to prompt #18 and elsewhere in their HTM responses that race is absent from the exhibit or that Tillman himself was a racist. For example, Sima noted that “Tillman despised the black race; this monument provides no information on Tillman with the black race.” In addition, five students (Frank, Indira, Khan, Nehru, and Taylor) mentioned sex or gender in their answers. Indira wrote that the “exhibit relates . . . negatively to African Americans of both genders, as Tillman did not want any blacks to have political power” while Nehru stressed how “Tillman helped the common white people,” which meant “all sexes and genders of white people.” Frank pointed out that Tillman “helped make it possible for guys and girls to get an education by creating schools [Clemson and Winthrop]. Taylor’s comment that “women did not have as many rights as men” could have included further explanation that Tillman was unsupportive of women suffrage. However, it was clear that students understood that the monument related to race and sex or gender issues.

**Race and gender/sex in the Smalls and Clark museum exhibits.** The students continued to excel in their recognition of race and gender/sex in their final analysis using the HTM. All of the students analyzing the Robert Smalls exhibit at the South Carolina Hall of Fame except for Mary believed the exhibit was positive toward race. Even she realized the exhibit’s positive bias toward Smalls; she just mentioned the negative fact
that “White masters kept him slaved [sic] which is negative.” Sid pointed out that Smalls “escapes the Confederacy in a ship and rides to the North for safety against slavery and this is a positive thing about how African-Americans were starting to fight for their rights.” The story of a heroic African American man made identifying the exhibit’s positive connection to race an easy task. Similarly, students examining the Septima Clark exhibit recognized both aspects because the subject matter was an African American woman. All of them believed it was positive toward women and African Americans with Frank and Khan pointing out that Clark was a “double minority.” Harriet had a slightly different viewpoint seeing the exhibit as positive on gender “because it shows how a woman can be courageous in a time where she is being oppressed.” However, rather than focusing on the positive aspect that a black woman was being honored, she interpreted the exhibit “negatively to race because the reasons she had to exemplify fortitude is because many whites didn’t believe African Americans were worthy of being equal.” These students obviously understood how to interpret an exhibit in terms of race and gender/sex.

Race and gender/sex in the State House monuments. In their HTM-less analysis of a State House monument, students illustrated how they had progressed in considering race and gender/sex. However, they still needed to be attentive to both aspects at the same time. The racial aspect of the African American Monument was obvious so Harriet, Larry, LeBron, and Mary easily addressed it, but despite women being featured on its bronze panels, not a word was written about Black women. The students were so overwhelmed with its racial message, they did not consider this relevant element of its story. Rachel, Sima, and Taylor did the same with race in their analyses of
the Confederate Women’s Monument. In fact, at no point in their discussions did the words “race” and “African American” even appear. They did not discuss how these women supported the South, which was fighting to preserve slavery. Their focus was so much on gender/sex that they did not even challenge the assumed whiteness. This even applied to Sima who is an Asian American female. The eight students analyzing the Strom Thurmond and Wade Hampton Monuments addressed how they related to race. However, while Frank mentioned that Thurmond had a daughter named Essie Mae, Khan was the only one of the four students examining the monument, to actually explain that she was “his African American daughter revealing her relation after his death.” Even Khan did not discuss this topic in terms of Thurmond’s strong segregationist views earlier in his career despite preparation reading that did so. Frank, Khan, Ranjit, and Watson missed an opportunity to connect the Thurmond Monument to issues of race and gender. Considering that in their Bill of Rights and You exhibit only four students had clearly addressed race or gender/sex and in their State House monuments all discussed at least one, the students clearly had made progress. However, excluding the Hampton Monument that did not have a clear connection to race, none of the others addressed both when they should have. Progress had been made, but there was room for growth.

**Factual content in the Bill of Rights and You exhibit.** When the word “content” is mentioned, most people think in terms of information. Prompt #19 of the HTM instructed students to take notes on information they had not written down. To see if students were inclined to do so on their own without the assistance of the HTM, the students’ analyses of the Bill of Rights and You were examined. Fourteen of the 15 students included factual content in their analyses. In contrast, Frank’s analysis consisted
of general observations such as “detailed facts with specific numbers and dates” but failed to include the actual information. No student took detailed notes on all of the information, but this may be because I may have discouraged it when asked if they should do so. Only two of them (LeBron and Sid) limited their written analysis to facts. Four (Carl, Khan, Larry, and Nehru) included factual information with opinions. Six of them (Harriet, Indira, Ranjit, Sima, Taylor, and Watson) wrote down facts, opinions, and questions while Rachel followed suit but failed to include a question per se, although she did state that that the exhibit “could go more in depth, I want to know more.” Many of the students’ questions were factual in nature such as Indira, Ranjit, Taylor, and Watson’s curiosity about the two proposed amendments the states did not originally ratify. While there was room for growth in addressing content, students showed some skill in this area.

**Factual content in the Hagler monument.** The first activity in which students the students used the HTM without constant teacher guidance was their analysis of the Chief Hagler monument. My field journal recorded instances during the analysis of the Hagler statue that I reminded students to limit their note-taking in answering this prompt to the information the exhibit itself and not the preparation materials provided. Furthermore, because students were told not to write down notes on information they had already recorded in the analysis preceding this prompt, the following statistics are based on information they wrote down prior to and including this prompt.

There were two major sources where the students could have found this information. First, the engraved text provided nine facts (see Facts #1-9 on Table 4.1). Second, the sculpture itself implied the last five facts (see Facts #10-14 on Table 4.1). The least covered facts were Hagler’s lifespan dates (Fact #2), the dates he ruled as chief
(Fact #4), and his membership in the South Carolina Hall of Fame (Fact #8). Neglecting to include this last fact may have been because the students already knew it from reading his online exhibit in their preparation work. The information most common in their notes was the mention of Catawba pottery (Fact #13), his reputation as a “peacemaker” (Fact #7), his position as chief of the Catawba (Fact #3), and his feathered hair accessory (Fact #12).

As far as note-takers, the most thorough was Khan (12 out of 14 facts) followed by Nehru (11 out of 14 facts), and Frank, Sid, and Sima (10 out of 14 facts). Carl, Mary, and Larry took the fewest notes with five, five, and three facts, respectively. On average, students took notes on 57.6% of the information the exhibit covered. One more comment about their notes needs to be made, and this observation applied beyond the Hagler analysis. Sometimes students just summarized information rather write the specific information. For example, Ranjit wrote, “How long Hagler was alive and chief,” rather than the actual years (c. 1700-1763 and 1750-1763). The students’ answers showed that there was room for improvement when it concerned taking notes on information a historical site provided.

Factual content in the Washington, DC exhibits. Taking notes on the different sites the students visited in Washington, DC was unevenly done among the students. For example, Sima took very detailed notes on her exhibit at the Holocaust Museum, but Larry, Rachel, and Ranjit did not do so. In fact, Ranjit described his exhibit as “just facts and information,” but rather than write at least some of them down, he vaguely wrote that “the additional information that this exhibit provides is all of it.” Larry and Rachel did better with the latter writing that her exhibit “held information on how the people in the
Warsaw ghetto took record of all the members of the ghetto through the documents from the milk can . . . the Warsaw ghetto was relatively well organized.” However, she would have done well to include details such as its organizer Emanuel Ringelblum and more information from the exhibit. While the Martin Luther King, Jr. and Lincoln Memorials did not provide Nehru, Taylor, Watson, and Carl with many factual details on which to take notes, the Vietnam Women’s Memorial, the National Museum of African American History and Culture, and Mount Vernon’s The Dilemma of Slavery had enough information to warrant their students doing so. Harriet, Indira, and Khan took sufficiently detailed notes, but Frank’s notes on the Mount Vernon exhibit neglected to include information on the specific slaves whose lives were discussed on the far right side of the exhibit, and Sid’s notes on the same exhibit lacked detail as well. LeBron’s notes on the Africans in the Chesapeake simply summarized the information in general terms (e.g., “It talks about how the slaves got to the Chesapeake”) with the one exception being his listing of the “hoe, scythe, and sickle” as tools used in the cultivation of tobacco. Finally, Mary wrote very few notes, but in her analysis paper, she did write three sentences discussing the Ku Klux Klan’s actions in general terms. For example, she wrote that the organization “used to try to scare away the African Americans from doing anything . . . they did not want any Black people in the world and they wanted to [sic] whites to dominate the world.” However, she wrote nothing about when and where the KKK was founded, how they harassed Republicans, or any of the details about the artifacts. In fact, all she jotted down in her HTM notes was “the costumes the KKK wore.” It was clear that students needed to become more detail oriented when taking notes.
Factual content in *A Woman’s War* exhibit. The next exhibit students took notes on was the Smithsonian’s *A Woman’s War*. With the amount of information in the exhibit, it would be difficult to quantify the information for purposes of analysis, but five types of content notes appeared in this activity: sufficiently-detailed, incomplete, plagiarized to a degree, complete sentences, and general summary statements. First, five students (Carl, Frank, Harriet, Khan, and Mary) took adequate notes covering most of the details. Second, other students left out important details. For example, Watson’s notes on Taylor only include that she escaped when she was 14 years old and helped the Union army at the front. He wrote nothing about how she escaped with her uncle, surreptitiously attended school in Savannah, served as laundress, and helped nurses attending to African American troops. Third, some students’ notes were too similar or worded exactly like the text they were reading. For example, Taylor’s notes were very detailed, but many of them were verbatim with the original text. One example, with the differences in bold, will suffice:

**Text:** Harriet Tubman and Susie King Taylor nursed patients after surgeries on the battlefield and in hospitals.

**Taylor:** Harriet Tubman & Susie King Taylor nursed patients after surgeries on battlefields & in hospitals.

It is important to remember that Taylor was a very conscientious student, and she was not alone in thinking that a few changes prevent plagiarism. However, her notes followed this pattern throughout her analysis. Fourth, most students thought paraphrasing in complete sentences was note-taking. In fact, five of the 14 students wrote their notes in sentence format while the remaining nine students correctly included just phrases or a
mix of sentences and phrases. Fifth, rather than write down details, sometimes students wrote summary sentences. For example, rather than write down factual information, Larry just summarized the exhibit: “It provides the diaries and logs of them and their personal thoughts, their tools that they used and their possessions they would take with them each day.” After reading these notes, one has learned nothing about the topic just that the exhibit includes diaries and tools when in fact it had one diary and the medical kit had been removed. In sum, the students continued to show that they needed to improve in taking notes on the factual content of the exhibit.

**Factual content in the faithful slaves monument.** In their analyses of “To the Faithful Slaves” monument, two problems were evident. First, students continued to neglect important information even in an exhibit that did not have a plethora of it. Even though the monument actually singles out ten slaves who were viewed as faithful, only five students (Khan, Nehru, Sid, Sima, and Taylor) included these names somewhere in their HTM analyses. Second, students were not always accurate. Five students (Carl, Khan, Mary, Nehru, and Watson) believed that slaves fought for the Confederacy. For example, Watson wrote in his notes that “the faithful slaves fought for and defended the south,” and Khan queried “Why would the slaves fight for Confederates if the Confederacy was the one enslaving them?” However, slaves did not formally fight on the side of the South, and students read about this in their preparation work (Levin, 2017, August 17; Smith, n.d.). Perhaps the few exceptions Smith (n.d.) mentioned and the fact that the monument itself said that slaves “TOILED [not fought] FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE ARMY” led these students to the erroneous conclusion that slaves fought for the Confederacy. It is clear that I will need to emphasize in the preparation work that slaves
did not fight for the Confederacy and clarify what the word “toil” means on the monument itself.

**Factual content in the Tillman, Smalls, and Clark exhibits.** When it came to pulling content from the Benjamin Tillman Monument and the Robert Smalls and Septima Clark exhibits at the South Carolina Hall of Fame, the familiar theme of lack of detail appeared. Tillman’s monument contained ten important facts about him – his birth and death dates, his wife, his positions as governor and U.S. senator, the years he served in both, his service on the Senate Committee of Naval Affairs, and his involvement with Clemson and Winthrop. Eight students (Carl, Frank, Indira, Khan, Nehru, Sid, Taylor, and Watson) included more than half of these facts in their HTM notes with six of them (excluding Carl and Sid) having eight or more of the facts. In fact, Khan and Nehru wrote down all ten facts. Six students (Harriet, Larry, LeBron, Mary, Ranjit, and Sima) had less than five facts with Mary only writing down that Tillman was involved with Clemson. On average, students wrote down six of the ten facts. The Robert Smalls exhibit provided 13 important details including his birthplace and date, his famous escape on the *Planter*, his service as a captain in the U.S. Navy, his role in creating the state’s Republican Party, attendance at the 1868 state constitutional convention, time in the state House of Representatives and Senate, tenure in the U.S. House of Representatives, his service as a delegate to Tillman’s 1895 state constitutional convention, his rank as a Major General in the state’s militia, his job collecting taxes at the port of Beaufort, and his death date. Reading over the student notes revealed their tendency to shortchange the details. Only Nehru (12), Carl (9), and Sid (7) included at least half of the facts; LeBron and Sima were close with notes addressing six of the topics; and Mary and Larry wrote
down four and two facts, respectively. On average, students wrote half of the important facts. One bright spot, though, was that those who took notes on the Septima Clark exhibit fared much better. The exhibit provided nine important facts: her birth in Charleston in 1898; her 1916 graduation from the Avery Normal Institute; her first education job on Johns Island; her literacy and citizenship sessions; her nicknames as the “Queen Mother,” “Grandmother of the Civil Rights Movement,” and “the Mother of the Movement;” her teaching sessions at Highlander Folk School; the Southern Christian Leadership Conference using her sessions in creating their Citizen Education Program; and Rosa Parks being a student prior to the Bus Boycott. Every student except for Watson at least touched in some way on at least five facts: Frank and Khan (8), Taylor (7), Harriet and Indira (5), and Watson (2). However, overall the students needed to take more detailed notes.

Furthermore, the tendency to write notes using the exact words of the source presented itself again. For example, three of the four points that LeBron wrote down were exactly worded as the exhibit without quotation marks. In other words, he plagiarized. While I did not compare every student’s notes to the exhibit, he was not alone. Carl quoted whole sentences or would change ever so slightly the wording. For example, he changed the word “later” to “after” but kept the wording the same in the following quote: “After, President Lincoln received Smalls in Washington and rewarded him and his crew for their valor.” Students needed to work on how to take notes in their own words.

Factual content in the State House monuments. The students’ final opportunity to take notes on an exhibit was in their analyses of the State House
monuments during which they were not given the HTM. In examining their work, the Confederate Women’s Monument will not be considered because its text mainly consist of laudatory and verbose lines of what women had done. For example, it credited women for “THEIR UNCONQUERABLE SPIRIT [which] STRENGTHENED THE THIN LINES OF GRAY,” meaning the women had supported the Confederate army. These passages did not provide the students with many facts on which to take notes.

Overall, the students showed once again that they needed to remember to take detailed notes on information the exhibit provided. When examining the African American Monument, one might first think that there is not enough textual elements from which to write notes. While the students might need to research to clarify what the words mean, there was a lot of factual information provided: Africans came from the Congo, Ghana, Senegal, and Sierra Leone; they arrived in Charleston; slaves helped in the cultivation of rice and cotton; and they fought in the Civil War. In addition, the following text appeared: Emancipation, The Black Vote – 1868, 15th amendment, Freedmen’s Bureau, Land Grants to Ex-Slaves, 14th Amendment, Forty Acres and a Mule, Jim-Crow Law, Black Codes, Sharecropping, Segregation, Lynching, Plessy vs. Ferguson, Convict Labor System, Abridgement, Equal Justice Under Law, Briggs vs. Elliott, and Brown vs. Board of Education. If one were to count the African countries, rice, and cotton separately and then add this list, there would be 26 facts. Allowing for students to write these specific ideas in their own words (e.g., Harriet wrote “be separate” for segregation), the students were not very detailed in their note-taking: Harriet (6/26 facts or 23%), Larry (1/26 facts or 4%), LeBron (8/26 facts or 31%), and Mary (2/26 facts or 8%). Now, sometimes they described or summarized the bronzed panels and in
doing so had more information. However, they still did not get as much from the text as they should have.

The other two groups who analyzed the Strom Thurmond and Wade Hampton Monuments were more thorough in their note-taking on the content. Frank, Khan, Ranjit, and Watson analyzed the Strom Thurmond Monument, but their attention to detail was quite varied. Both Frank and Khan included very comprehensive information about Thurmond’s career while Ranjit mentioned he was a senator, and Watson wrote down none of the details about his career, awards, or family. In fact, the only detail he noted was that Thurmond “was racist.” In contrast, all four students (Carl, Indira, Nehru, and Sid) did well taking notes on the information the Wade Hampton Monument provided. They noted he was a governor and U. S. senator with three of them (Carl, Indira, and Nehru) including the dates. The same three wrote down his birth and death dates, and Carl, Nehru, and Sid acknowledged he was a Confederate general with the first two mentioning the Hampton Legion. Only Carl wrote down the specific battles in which he participated, and he only wrote down five of the eight. However, these students were fairly detailed in what they did write down. It is difficult to compare the students’ note-taking performances on the *Bill of Rights and You* and the State House monuments, but suffice it to say that students needed to be more detailed when gleaning important details from an exhibit.

**Questioning the *Bill of Rights and You* exhibit.** The final prompt in the content section of the HTM (prompt #21) was meant to get students to express curiosity. They were told to write open-ended questions, raised by the exhibit and which could be answered through research. In their baseline analysis of the *Bill of Rights and You,*
students were quite adept in writing questions about topics they did not understand. However, this may have been large part due to my directions for them to write whatever thoughts and questions crossed their minds. Seven students (Harriet, Indira, Mary, Ranjit, Sima, Taylor, and Watson) wrote 31 questions, six of which were written to elicit a yes or no answer. With nine students writing no questions, there was room to improve. **Questioning the Hagler monument.** In their first analysis where they used the HTM more on their own, students questioned the Hagler monument. In total, fourteen students posed 31 questions with Larry not proposing any. In examining these questions, there were three aspects to consider – content, format, and answerability. The content of these questions varied greatly, but a few topics did show up several times because students worked together. For example, Mary, Nehru, and Rachel wondered what was in the bags Kershaw is holding. Harriet, Indira, and Taylor inquired about Catawba fashion – its symbolism, its typicality among the Native Americans, and if it was special because of his position. Sometimes students asked a question which they should have known the answer. For example, Mary inquired about how Hagler and Kershaw died, when the preparation work answered her query concerning the Catawba chief. One would think formatting a question would be straightforward, but of the 31 questions, seven of them required a simple yes or no answer. For example, Sid asked, “Was king Hagler rich?” when he should have written it to elicit a longer answer such as “How do we know whether Hagler was a wealthy chief or not?” Finally, the questions were researchable except for Sima’s inquiry: “How would they interact at this time being subject to modern technology and problems?” Her question was not answerable because it would require these men be resurrected to live in today’s world or a time machine to bring them back to
today. She needed to write a question that left them in their historical context and did not call for baseless speculation. However, overall students adequately questioned the content they wanted to know more on.

**Questioning the Washington, DC exhibits.** In their analyses of the Washington, DC sites, 14 of the 15 students (minus LeBron) asked a total of 28 questions. However, Mary’s questions were difficult to categorize because of her awkward writing. At any rate, only five of these 28 questions would result in a yes or no answer, and all were researchable. For example, in her analysis of the Holocaust Museum’s exhibit on how Germans used gassing to execute Jews, Sima wondered, “How was the atmosphere inside of the gas chamber?” Carl’s examination of the Lincoln Memorial led him to ask, “Why was Lincoln our first president to stand up to slavery? Also why it didn’t include more information about President Lincoln’s life and his family.” Harriet is African American so it was not surprising that she queried, “Other than skin color, why’d people think AA [African Americans] weren’t capable of the same skills as white people.” It is still a question that leaves most people shaking their heads. However, three students (Larry, Sid, and Taylor) asked questions that were answered by the exhibit or their preparation work. For example, Larry wanted to know: “What was your purpose of making this? Do you believe it does a good job in informing the person who looks at it?” However, the first question was answered in prompt #5 of the HTM itself, and the second one just shows that Larry put little thought into his response. Sid’s question about how Washington emancipated his slaves was answered in both the preparation work and exhibit itself. Overall, the students did well in asking questions.
**Questioning *A Woman’s War* exhibit.** In their analyses of *A Woman’s War*, students continued to ask an exhibit questions. Twelve students (excluding Larry and Watson) generated 21 relevant questions allowing for the splitting of Frank’s two part question into separate queries and counting Khan’s question (“Did the underground railroad continue during the Civil War? Why or why not?) as one question. Watson’s question (“What exhibit is not at the museum”) did not make sense, and Larry simply stated that the exhibit “answers all of my question [sic] I had.” The content of the questions varied, but there was some overlap. For example, both Indira and Sima wondered if there were legal restrictions on “black women abolitionists” (Indira) or on “women (all races) from working or participating in movements” (Sima). For those that did, both students questioned what had “inspired” them to do so? Excluding Watson’s question, 13 of the 21 questions asked for more than a yes or no answer. For example Indira asked, “Were there any laws that restricted black women abolitionists?” While she obviously meant for the question to be explanatory in scope, her formatting of the question did not encourage such a response. One positive observation was that all 21 questions could be researched.

**Questioning the faithful slaves and Tillman monuments.** Overall, the students did well in asking questions of the “To the Faithful Slaves” and the Benjamin Tillman monuments. In the case of the former, they wrote 20 researchable questions, only three of which were formatted to elicit a yes or no answer. For the latter, students asked 17 questions requiring more than a yes or no answer, and three that did so. All of the questions were answerable except for one by Larry whose writing was illegible, and the question’s answerability could not be determined. One problem with the questions,
though, was that some students asked for information they should have already known from their preparation work or the monument itself. For example, Mary queried, “Why Democrats build and put up this statue.” However, she had already answered prompt #5, which concerned the purpose of the exhibit. Sima wrote three questions:

How did Tillman react to blacks and what were his actions toward them?

What did Tillman think about women’s suffrage?

What specific service and achievements did Tillman offer to South Carolina, furthermore?

All three questions were answered either by the monument’s text or preparation work (“Benjamin Ryan Tillman, n.d.). Inexplicably, Carl asked whether “Tillman was public about his racist viewpoints” despite reading an excerpt of a speech Tillman had given in which he said, “We of the South have never recognized the right of the negro to govern white men, and we never will” (“Their own hotheadedness,” n.d.). In addition, Indira and Sid decided to write NA for this prompt and not put forth the effort to think of a question. While nine of the students did not fall in either group described above, five of them did. With over a third of the students having issues with writing questions, there was cause for concern.

**Questioning the Smalls and Clark museum exhibits.** In their final HTM analyses of the Smalls and Clark exhibits at the South Carolina Hall of Fame, students were successful but also showed some of the same issues mentioned previously. There were a total of 28 researchable questions, nine of which asked for a yes or no response and another three by Larry that were not written in an interrogative format. He wrote, “Well, Smalls’ later life is never addressed too much, neither is his cause of death or
where he went after serving in the senate.” Concerning content, four of the students (Frank, Harriet, Khan, and Taylor) wanted to know about whites’ reactions to Clark herself. For example Harriet wondered if she had been “hurt by the Police” or had “any encounters with the KKK,” and Taylor queried, “How was she viewed in society as a whole?” However, as seen before, some of their questions had been answered in the exhibit or in their preparation work. For example, Sima asked, “Specifically, what did Robert Smalls do to get the Planter past the heavily armed defenses that protected the Charleston harbor?” Of all the events covered, the escape on the Planter was addressed in great detail, yet Sima still wrote that as a question that “this exhibit raise[s] in your mind but does not answer” (prompt #21). The students were adept in writing questions with depth, but they needed to work on formatting them and make sure they were not answered in the preparation work or exhibit.

Questioning the State House monuments. The students’ final opportunity to show how well they could question a historical site was their analyses of the State House monuments. Only three students (Frank, LeBron, and Sima) of the 15 actually wrote questions. For example, Frank wondered why Thurmond chose to enter politics, and Sima asked, “How was the relationship between the women of the Confederacy and the women of the Union?” However, sometimes these questions had been answered in their preparation work. Frank inquired about why Thurmond never retired from the U.S. Senate, but he did (Cohodas, 2016, August 16). LeBron asked, “Why are real African Americans not shown?” However, the preparation work explained that the Monument Commission made this decision (Botsch, 2002, July 1). Perhaps LeBron was wondering why the commission did so, but he should have worded the question to make his intention
It appeared that students were so focused on what they needed to get from the monuments that they overlooked questioning them. In fact, compared to their performance in their baseline analysis of the *Bill of Rights and You*, the students had regressed. In that initial activity, seven students wrote questions, and Sima was the only one to do so both times.

### 4.7 Findings and Interpretation of the Connection Data

The next component of historical thinking addressed in the HTM was students’ connection to the topics of historical sites and exhibits. First, they began by comparing their own viewpoints with the exhibit’s (prompt #22). Next they considered how their opinions were influenced by family, religion, and culture (prompt #23). Then they discussed any emotions or thoughts they experienced while examining an exhibit (prompt #24). Finally, they related the exhibit’s topic or big idea to contemporary society (prompt #25) and contemplated what they might do in response (prompt #26).

Students had difficulty with connection. It required them to look at broader themes than just the exhibit’s topic, analyze themselves and society, and determine what they could do to impact the world around them. My field journal confirms that students wrestled with this component of historical thinking. Students liked to read a prompt, examine a text to find the answer, and write it down. For connection, they needed to consider the big ideas and then read themselves and determine why they thought that way.

**Connecting with the *Bill of Rights and You* exhibit.** In their baseline analysis of the *Bill of Rights and You*, eleven (Carl, Harriet, Indira, Khan, Larry, Nehru, Rachel, Ranjit, Sima, Taylor, and Watson) of the 15 students in the sample connected in some
way to the exhibit in their analyses. Some of the connections were rather superficial like Ranjit wondering about “our current amount of ammendments [sic]” or Watson’s observation that “we have a lot of rights. Most of the rights exercised is the 1st one.”

While Nehru agreed with Watson’s sentiment, he went further and applied it to what it meant to be an American: the “1st Amendment is most important . . . America stands for its 1st Amendment; it’s [sic] freedoms.” Some students related the Bill of Rights to contemporary issues. For example, Khan alluded to the current debate over the meaning of the second amendment when he observed that “a lot of people argue against [sic] or for the right to bear arms.” Sima viewed the exhibit in terms of racial progress - “the African-American discrimination stopped because of the first law [amendment]. – Blacks are now [emphasis added] judged as Whites!” However, Taylor best exemplified this type of historical thinking. First, she placed herself in the shoes of the founding generation stating that “if I were a state leader, I don’t know if I would have ratified the constitution if my people did not have rights dealing w/ government.” Second, she also showed frustration with gender inequality when she wondered why it took so long for women to get the right to vote considering “we [emphasis added] are equally as important.” Finally, like Khan and Sima, she also related the exhibit to contemporary issues. In a somewhat confusing observation, Taylor stated:

I believe there should be a right/law that talks about discriminating our nation.

You can disagree but you shall not publicly protest & cause harm to others. Ex: rallies [sic] about something against nation & person gets killed. Ex:

Discriminating our national anthem.
She was clearly struggling with the idea of free speech on the one hand and violence that can result at such events. In a member check, she revealed that she felt free speech should not include someone’s death. One need only to turn on the evening news to hear of such occurrences.

**Connecting with the Hagler monument.** The students first applied the HTM in their analysis of connection in their examination of Chief Hagler’s monument. In their examination of Hagler’s monument, all of the students recognized the similarity of their views and the exhibit’s positive bias toward the Catawba chief (prompt #21). Students used the word “admire” (Carl, Frank, Taylor, and Watson), “like” (Mary, Rachel), “support” (Khan), and “respect” (Ranjit). In fact, Rachel said, “I like Hagler, he was a cool guy.” They certainly approved of him and his attempts to secure peace between the Native and white peoples. However, most students interpreted prompt #22 differently than I intended. It asked for students to explain what influences in their lives had made them appreciate this peace-loving Native American. While I wanted to know what personally made them value peace, ten students (Carl, Frank, Harriet, Larry, LeBron, Mary, Rachel, Ranjit, Sid, and Watson) were narrower in their answers citing Hagler himself, knowledge they had already learned, and the preparation work they had done. Indira and Taylor explained that “peacekeeping was difficult” (the former) or “hard” (the latter). However, Khan, Nehru, and Sima approached this prompt more deeply than the others. Khan credited his belief in “peace and compromise rather than war” to “being in a society where every one [sic] has equal rights,” and felt that “the Native Americans had every right to own and keep their land as the Europeans.” Nehru attributed his positive opinion of Hagler’s accomplishments to his academic experience: “Throughout school, I
have learned that fighting for things peacefully is the best way.” He specifically referenced Martin Luther King, Jr. and Gandhi as examples from his education. Overall, only Khan and Nehru addressed the intention of the prompt for students to consider why they hold the beliefs they do.

Students were then asked to explain their emotions or thoughts about the exhibit and what specifically prompted them. Six students (Indira, Khan, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, and Taylor) described themselves as “happy” or experiencing “happiness” (Mary) while Carl and Frank expressed a similar sentiment – “heartwarming.” Four students expressed other positive feelings toward Hagler – “respect” (Harriet), “respectful” (Indira), “proud” (Sid), and “admiration” (Watson). When it came to explaining what about the exhibit evoked their reactions, eleven students credited information they had learned but only Nehru actually discussed how a design feature affected him. He credited Hagler’s “smile and face expression,” explaining that the Catawba chief “presents his face this way negotiating.” For the most part, the students did address this prompt well, although discussion of its design features would have shown more thought.

The final two prompts (#24 and #25) asked for students to connect the exhibit in some way to a contemporary issue or topic and contemplate what they could do about it. My field journal and the students HTM notes revealed that these were not easy prompts to answer. Six students (Carl, Frank, Indira, Mary, Sima, and Watson) kept their focus on Native Americans, and their call to action was to simply “keep peace with them as we grow up” (Carl and Frank), Mary had no idea what she could do to help and wrote “nothing.” Of the six, Sima’s answer was the most involved and personal. She discussed how “a friend . . . appears white, but we all know he has Native American blood . . . so
we accept him for who he is. It is not his fault, nor anyone else’s fault!” Of course, her last statement gives one pause, especially when one considers that Sima is an Asian Indian student. Furthermore, Sima believed that her best course of action was to “continue to support Native Americans and maybe interview some when I get older, so everyone can know about their achievements.” These students did not see beyond Native Americans in general, and only Sima contemplated the prompts in a personal way.

In contrast, the other eight students extended the exhibit’s contemporary relevance beyond modern day Native Americans but typically suggested action in general terms. For example, Harriet observed that “a lot of people having conflict . . . leaders have risen and worked hard to keep peace between them” so she encouraged people to work with peace crusaders and “start our own campaigns to begin making more peace.” Ranjit commented that “women back then were treated badly and unfair, while today we treat women unfairly in some areas,” but his suggestion “to achieve equality by trying to first get everyone aware of the fact” left one wondering what concrete steps he could take to do so. Finally, Nehru considered how Native Americans and Muslims have been discriminated against: “Muslim people are all treated differently even if they are innocent or nice people, just like the Native Americans were treated by the colonists.” His solution was to “bring awareness that everyone is not the same even if they are the same race or gender . . . and everyone should be treated equally” but how he might fight stereotyping and discrimination was not a topic he addressed. It was obvious that students were not comfortable thinking about a historical site in these terms.

**Connecting with the Holocaust exhibits.** The students’ next opportunity to examine connection with a historical site was during their Washington, DC field study
where they analyzed one of five exhibits. Larry, Rachel, Ranjit, and Sima selected four different exhibits in the Holocaust Museum.

Larry’s discussion of connection in his exhibit From Citizens to Outcasts lacked specificity. He agreed with the exhibit’s view saying that “it hits the nail on the head” and credited his own view to the fact that “Hitler was awful & so was genocide.” However, he did not discuss what has helped shape his own sense of morality. Nor did he discuss any emotions or thoughts only writing that they were “pretty much what is said before,” which was not very illuminating either. The topic he did respond to with some elaboration was the exhibit’s connection to today. He discussed parallels between the early beginnings of the Holocaust and the white supremacy movement: “Some in our society today are trying to do the same with white supremacy, trying to say that people who aren’t white deserve fewer rights and fewer respect.” However, his suggestions to “discuss it, or try to fix it” lacked specificity. Larry’s analysis was too brief and general to show a strong connection with the exhibit.

Rachel connected profoundly with the exhibit Documenting Life and Death in the Warsaw Ghetto. In my field journal, I wrote that “she could barely talk – very hoarse b/c of crying she said.” She herself wrote: “I deeply hate what happened.” She observed that “the fact that I’m Jewish, it really gets to me.” She also cited the contemporary discriminatory practices against Muslim immigrants while qualifying that it did not come close to the Holocaust and believed she could take action by protesting against racial profiling. However, she could have been more specific on what concrete action she could take. Rachel’s emotional connection to the exhibit was illustrative of how empathy can make history more relevant to a student.
Ranjit’s connection with the exhibit on the Lodz ghetto was rather brief with him agreeing with its negative viewpoint. When considering what influences had led him to abhor the ghetto, he did not consider his personal sense of morality, but rather the reading he had done to prepare for his analysis. His feelings of “hatred for the Nazis” were because this German group “persecuted and killed innocent people for no good reason,” but he did not specify what in the exhibit prompted this emotion. He connected what the Nazis did to modern racial and religious persecution and suggested that he could “raise awareness for other religions and that they should be accepted.” However, like others, he did not explain any specific ways he could do this. While Ranjit connected with the exhibit, his discussion lacked depth and practicality.

Finally, Sima analysis of the connection component was characteristically thorough. She shared the exhibit’s anti-Nazi viewpoint. While conceding “that the Nazis were cruel and inhumane,” she differed, though, in her view toward Jews. The exhibit portrayed them as “helpless,” but she remembered that there were Jews who resisted through word and action against the Nazi’s efforts to end the Jewish race referencing what she had already learned and the Diary of Anne Frank. In addition, she discussed how Nazi “prejudice caused several killings, inspired medical experiments, and broke bonds” and found American slavery to be comparable. She described her emotions as “sorrow and shock” but admitted that she was “intrigued by what pesticides and gases were used on Jews, what chemicals were involved, and how they were harmful.” She explained how the repetition of certain words such as “murder” and “killing” led to her sorrow but failed to discuss the specific design elements that piqued her scientific curiosity although one would assume the artifacts and text did so. She also connected
Nazi discrimination to today’s racism. However, she then linked Nazi actions with the North Korean nuclear program when a better comparison would have been Kim Jong-un’s political camps. Sima’s suggested course of action was to use social media to create a group whose goal would be to fight racial bullying in schools and influence the government’s North Korean policies. Sima’s analysis is quite thorough although her understanding of North Korea could benefit from some extra reading.

**Connecting with the King Memorial.** Three students – Nehru, Taylor, and Watson – examined connection with the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial. Not surprisingly, they very much agreed with the exhibit’s viewpoint of the civil rights leader and credited others for influencing this perspective. Nehru felt King was “a great and important man because he fought in a peaceful manner for everyone to be equal” and pointed to the influence of his parents and school. The former instructed him to “fight peacefully using words” in relating to his brother and “that all races and genders should be treated equally” while the latter had exposed him to the successes of King and Gandhi and how blacks fought for their rights and women for the right to vote. The students’ emotional reactions toward the memorial involved anger about the existence of inequality (Nehru) and “admiration . . . because he risked his life and family for a cause he believed in” (Watson). Taylor’s feelings were a mix of Nehru’s negative and Watson’s positive emotions. She was “inspired and happy” because of King’s career and example, but she also felt “upset and disgraceful” about our nation’s segregated past. Furthermore, all three students explained how the exhibit prompted these emotions. Both Nehru and Watson identified the quotes as catalysts for their feelings with the former specifically referencing that “if we are to have peace on Earth . . . we must develop a world
prespective [sic].” In contrast, Taylor pointed to the centerpiece of the exhibit – King himself, which she interpreted as being “placed proudly on a mountain” while the designers meant it as a reference to his famous “I Have a Dream” speech in which he said, “With this faith, we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope.” Finally, both Taylor and Watson had difficulty with connecting the memorial to contemporary society and suggesting how they might act in response. Watson observed that speakers can still acquire fame for their addresses and acknowledged that “there are also civil rights leaders, even if they aren’t in america.” However, he did not consider that the U.S. still had people continuing Dr. King’s mission, failed to name specific foreign human rights crusaders, and only suggested to “support people in doing what they believe, if you believe in it too.” Similarly, Taylor’s analysis lacked specificity when she said that “presidents & citizens” showed determination in fighting for causes and that she could “believe & support what is right – stay true to my beliefs – Raise awareness – Participate in votes & history.” Other than voting, which she was at least five years from being able to do, Taylor did not offer specific actions she could take. In contrast, Nehru cited a specific example in the LGBTQ movement and offered the actionable suggestion of “participating in their rallies, peaceful protests, and fundraisers.” Overall, their connection analysis was solid.

Connecting with the Lincoln and Vietnam Women’s Memorials. Both Carl and Indira were successful in connecting to the Lincoln Memorial and Vietnam Women’s Memorial, respectively. Agreeing with the site’s respect for Lincoln, Carl asserted his beliefs “in human rights for all people and [I] feel it was very important to stand up to slavery.” He credited “the society that I live in and the family I have grown up with” as
the key sources of his moral compass concerning these issues. Another strong component of Carl’s analysis was his discussion of emotions and how the exhibit evoked them. The memorial’s physical scale led to his amazement and patriotic pride although his contention that “all Americans began to accept the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments” showed his incomplete knowledge of our nation’s history, particularly the latter quarter of the nineteenth century, which we had yet to cover in class. His connection of the memorial to contemporary society was a general observation that “there are still present day challenges with inequalities,” while true, would have benefitted from specific examples. Finally, his personal solution to “always treat those I meet equally and with respect regardless of their race or background” was an admirable one that others should follow. Indira agreed with the Vietnam Women’s Memorial that women serving during the conflict should “be honored because they helped save so many lives.” Knowing that women have historically had less rights than men and “women soldiers [sic] & nurses” were the key influences of Indira’s opinion about this memorial. She was quite thorough in explaining her emotions and what in the exhibit prompted them:

> When I look at this memorial, I feel very inspired, because the statues are portrayed as very strong and brave women. The looks on some of the women’s faces are hopeful, which also caused me to feel this way. However, the look of pain on the face of the women tending to the soldier is full of sadness and pain, which makes me feel very sorry for all of those who served and were killed.

However, Indira’s thoughts and emotions did not remain fixated on the past. The memorial made her think about Saudi Arabian women of today who have begun to achieve some rights. At first glance, it appeared that her analysis fell short because she
just made the general suggestion that “people should continue to push for more rights for women in Saudi Arabia,” but she continued with a more specific recommendation that “people that can’t help physically can learn more about the situation there.” Perhaps her teenage contribution could involve becoming more educated about gender oppression in this conservative Middle Eastern nation. Considering this was the second time that Carl and Indira had independently reflected on connection to a historical site, they did well.

**Connecting with the African American Museum exhibits.** In the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and Culture, Harriet, LeBron, and Mary analyzed their connection to three different exhibits. *Jim Crow Laws*, an exhibit on Africans in the Chesapeake, and *The Rise of the Ku Klux Klan*.

Harriet agreed with the exhibit’s viewpoint against the Jim Crow laws. At first, the exhibit seems to be factual about segregation policies, but “because it is placed in a museum that honors black people” Harriet inferred that it did not support these policies with which she strongly concurred: “I do not think that these laws were fair to the black people, along with that, black people were not able to be free.” She credited her viewpoint to years of learning about the civil rights movement and how “everyone of MY race had to struggle [which] seems really crazy & unfair.” Consequently, she was “furious” because she did not understand why different racial groups “would not spend the time to learn about and work with each other.” Elsewhere in her analysis paper, she used the words “hatred . . . discouraged and sad” to describe her emotional reaction and specifically referenced the exhibit’s pictures, of which there is only one. Her contemporary connection was that Jim Crow was gone and therefore no action on her part was needed. In fact, she claimed that “although there are still more racists, it is known
that there will always be ignorance and the United States have come a long way.” With her racial background, she could have shown more insight into society’s racial issues and thought more about what to do in response.

LeBron’s connection with the Chesapeake exhibit was different than his two peers in that he correctly believed that the museum had not included any type of opinion in the exhibit itself. He was clear that “the slaves shouldn’t have had to deal with this oppression for being an ‘inferior race’ even though they aren’t” and then discussed how Africa’s gold had been “stolen” and its people “enslave[d].” He credited his “parents, school, and research” for his strong opinions. Unsurprisingly, he experienced a plethora of emotions – “anger, frustration, and some sadness because of . . . everything about slavery.” Interestingly, LeBron’s strong emotions become even more evident in his contemporary connection:

Rich white men still rule America, and now we’re all slaves, not just blacks. We obey what we’re told to do, and if we decide to question and protest it, they try to shut us down any way possible. If we all band together and stand up to the corruption in the government, then we could achieve something. Because they don’t want a population that’s smart enough to see what’s wrong with the system and get everyone else to see it. They want a population that’s smart enough to pay taxes and get distracted by the irrelevant news on TV.

While he did not offer specifics on how to “stand up” against the government, LeBron’s written outburst was a clarion call against white privilege and for a united assault upon racism and classism. He obviously felt a strong connection to the exhibit. Mary’s expressed strong opinions in her connection to the exhibit entitled The Rise of the Ku
Klux Klan. She believed her being an African American meant that she agreed with this museum’s viewpoint toward the Ku Klux Klan and credited family “stories . . . that the KKK were very bad people doing horrific things to African Americans” for her strong bias against this group. It was understandable that she felt “hatred towards . . . the KKK or people who supported the acts” while experiencing “sadness” for her “family [who] feared these awful people.” However, one would have liked for her to share some of these stories. Her analysis would have been stronger had she discussed specific aspects of the exhibit that prompted these emotions such as the depiction of an African American as a gorilla on the cover of Charles Carroll’s book or *Le Journal Illustró’s* sobering cover picture of four African American men being lynched. Her determination to “show them [modern racists] them that African Americans can do all the same things that any other race can do” was admirable but lacked specificity. It was clear that Mary connected with this exhibit, but her analysis could have used more elaboration.

Connecting with Mount Vernon’s slavery exhibit. Frank, Khan, and Sid opted to analyze their connection with Mount Vernon’s *The Dilemma of Slavery* exhibit. Each of them was troubled with Washington’s ownership of slaves. Frank interpreted the exhibit as saying Washington “was wrong for owning slaves, but then seeing the good in him when they were free.” Khan agreed that slavery was wrong, but he took issue with the exhibit’s positive portrayal of Washington. He commented that “it paints George Washington as a good person. However, I am not so sure that Washington freed his slaves out of goodwill or to protect his reputation.” Similarly, Sid was perplexed with the heroic view of Washington as president and a general contrasting with the fact that he
owned slaves. In reality, the exhibit itself tried to picture Washington as well as it could but acknowledged that he was a contradiction, hence the word “dilemma” in its title.

When asked to discuss what had influenced their opinions, only Khan considered the bigger picture. He commented that “the world I live in has influenced me to believe that slavery is evil.” Then, rather than exploring society’s influence in more depth, he joined Frank in mentioning what he had already read. He specified articles while Frank referenced his “prior knowledge,” which must have included the preparation articles as well, and what the exhibit itself taught him about the slaves’ treatment. Sid commented “that many people for a long time told me that he was the first president, so that he was a good person without any flaws.” He also shared the fact that as president, Washington “never talked about the topic of slavery, so many people were not exposed to his view of slavery.” Most of the students’ focus was on what influenced their opinions on the immediate subject rather than the bigger issue of slavery itself.

However, it was this larger social issue that students found troublesome. In fact, my field journal contained notes of how I used questions to help Sid realize that “we still struggle w/ these 2 sides of GW [George Washington] . . . 2 sides of people A side we like & admire & a side we don’t.” The students certainly had emotional reactions to the exhibit because it contradicted their morality on how others should be treated. Frank felt “sorry for the slaves” as did Khan while Sid expressed that he was “surprised.” All three cited the exhibit’s display of how much clothing and food the slaves were allocated. However, Sid felt an even stronger emotion – “betrayal.” He still seemed to be struggling with this new side of a heroic figure “because after all the good things that he has done, he used his own slaves to work on his plantations, so that he got money.”
students’ connection with this aspect of the exhibit was powerful and showed deeper thinking.

Relating this exhibit on Washington and slavery to the present day and their specific lives was one that Frank and Khan did well on, but that Sid struggled with it. Both Frank and Khan commented that the plight of African Americans is different today. Slavery has been abolished. “The way African Americans are treated has changed over time” (Khan), “but there sometimes is still racism, even it is just implied” (Frank). In contrast, Sid’s connection was rather confusing. He explained how “some people did struggled [sic] to believe that George Washington owned slaves because they had the perspective that he was a good man and could not do anything as dreadful as owning slaves.” I found it surprising that he did not know that Washington was a slave owner and am unsure that most Americans are likewise uninformed. However, Sid then believed that this ignorance was similar to someone who agreed with President Trump’s North Korean policy but disagreed with his travel and immigration policies. In his struggle to find a modern day connection, it appeared that Sid found two very different situations to be similar when context would dictate otherwise. He also did not explain what he could do in response to this connection, while Frank and Khan attempted to do so. The former was too general in his plan: “I can end racism by promoting that racism is bad, and by not being a racist.” These are noble sentiments, but he needed to provide specific examples of how a teenager could begin this crusade against racism. Khan was less general and suggested that he “could participate in protests, marches, or become an advocate for the civil rights of everyone.” While both Frank and Khan examined
connection more effectively than Sid, all three of them had room to improve in this type of historical thinking.

**Connecting with *A Woman’s War* exhibit.** The next site students examined connection was *A Woman’s War* at the National Museum of African American History and Culture. All 14 students agreed with the museum’s positive view of African American women who helped the Union during the Civil War. For example, Mary said that the exhibit’s creators “support African Americans and woman’s empowerment and I believe that woman [sic] could do all the things men can do.” Similarly, Nehru argued that Charlotte Forten Grimké, Harriet Tubman, Susie King Taylor, and others were “great people . . . because even though they were put down by society and everyone else, being African American women, they still continued to help in a major way.” Like the creators of the exhibit, the students admired these women, and they were clear in expressing their high regard.

These students were not born with these perspectives on race and gender. They learned them from somewhere. Six students (Harriet, Larry, Mary, Nehru, Rachel, and Watson) recognized the influence of their parents with Harriet, Rachel, and Mary crediting only their mothers. Harriet observed that she was “a strong Black girl w/ a strong Black mother who has always raised me to be strong & I can do whatever I put my mind to.” Another six students (Carl, Indira, Khan, Sid, Sima, and Taylor) mentioned or implied the role of society. For example, Indira and Sima traced their views from “knowing many powerful & respected Af. Am. [African American] Women who have helped me (teachers, coaches, etc.)” (Indira). By this stage of working with the HTM,
students understood that this prompt wanted them to think about why they had certain racial and gender views.

In discussing their thoughts and feelings about the exhibit (prompt #24), students mentioned either their reactions to the black women’s oppressive plights, their crusade against it, or both. Words such as “sad” (Frank and Nehru), “sorry” (Larry), “mad” (Nehru), “dissapointed [sic]” (Rachel), and “upset” (Taylor) were used concerning the difficulties these women faced. On the other hand, students also expressed optimistic feelings about the women’s actions despite obstacles – “happy” (Harriet), “respect” (Indira and Sima), “proud” (Khan and Rachel), “happy and excited” (Nehru), and “inspired & proud” (Taylor). It is worth noting that all 14 students explained their answers, and Indira and Sima even explained how the exhibit’s use of “strong word choice (bravely, struggled, justice) has a positive connotation that gives the view insight on the women’s struggles & how they impacted society” (Indira). The students definitely reacted to the exhibit’s message.

Students next turned their attention to contemplating how the exhibit could relate to contemporary society and what they might do in reaction (prompts #25-26). My field journal notes indicated that some students had difficulty with these topics. Specifically, I had to help Indira, LeBron, and Sima with one or both. Concerning how the exhibit could relate to today, students focused on minority groups continuing to face discrimination (Carl, Frank, Larry, Nehru, and Rachel) and that women were fighting even today (Frank, Mary, Nehru, and Sid). For example, Larry commented that “some people still believe women and blacks should be treated as second class citizens. That they are subhuman to other people.” Rachel also observed that “nowadays women still
struggle to reach positions of power.” However, “women’s empowerment is very prominent just like it was then and women are are [sic] starting to stand up” (Mary). Harriet, Indira, Sima, and Taylor were optimistic with Harriet observing that female military personnel were “now a normal occurrence [sic].” Indira and Sima explained that “women continue to be figures of respect & role models to young girls even today. African American [sic] are also becoming more prominent in politics & culture. Ex. Obama family, Oprah” (Indira). These students certainly connected the past to the present.

Their discussions of what they could do about these connections, however, lacked the specificity to impact change. Most students wrote in general terms. For example, Sima’s suggestion was to “make people more aware of women in minority groups . . . by supporting them,” and Taylor proclaimed, “I am going to stand up for womens [sic] rights.” In contrast, four students (Frank, Khan, Nehru, and Watson) were quite specific in what they could do to promote social justice. For example, Khan claimed he “might expand on this by starting a blog or protesting in support of LGBT rights.” Similarly, Nehru suggested that he “go and participate in their rallies and events . . . even participate, talking about what should be done in modern society.” These two examples, notwithstanding, students needed to move from general suggestions to ones that advocated concrete steps.

**Connecting with the faithful slave monument.** The next exhibit students examined for connection was the “To the Faithful Slaves” monument in Fort Mill, South Carolina. It is an example of the Lost Cause ideology that downplayed the significance of slavery in the outbreak of the Civil War and lauded slaves who had stayed faithful to
their white masters during the Confederate’s noble cause. The students believed in the equality of African Americans and Whites so they explained their views toward the monument differently. For example, Frank and Indira disagreed with the exhibit’s belief “that the Confed. [Confederates] were good & honorable” and agreed with Ranjit and Taylor that these slaves, praised for their faithfulness, “weren’t that loyal & good as portrayed” (Taylor) and “were forced to help” (Ranjit). Similarly, LeBron did not “agree with what the southerners fought for was noble,” and Khan and Sid believed that the Civil War was about slavery despite the claims of the Lost Cause. In contrast, Carl agreed with the monument’s positive view of the slaves because he viewed “black people as equal with white people.” Nehru’s response was interesting because in his effort to emphasize his belief in equal rights, he contradicted himself. He thought both Confederate and Union African Americans “should be honored . . . I am against the religion Lost Cause and believe the African slaves did what they could for the Confederate cause. I agree with the bias.” In fact, he went on to say that he believed that slaves should have been allowed to fight for the southern cause. While there was variety, the equality of African Americans was at the heart of students’ views.

The sources of what led students to their opinions toward slavery varied. Nehru, Sid, Sima, and Watson cited school while others credited something they had heard, read, or seen, perhaps at school. Students referenced “prior knowledge and learning about slavery” (Frank), “things that I have read and seen” (LeBron), “hearing stories about slavery . . . they should’ve left” (Mary), “learning about slavery” (Ranjit), and “research . . . providing factual information about slaves” (Taylor). Other students mentioned society in some form – “me and my culture” (Carl), “the time period and country that I
live in” (Khan), “everyone free and living their life” (Sima), and “society” (Watson). In addition, Nehru mentioned his parents, and Indira was influenced by “knowing many young Af. Am. [African Americans] who are passionate abt. [about] Black rights.” Rachel looked within herself and became quite vulnerable in her admission of “living with a lot of discriminatory [sic] messages and mental pain that I would never wish on anyone, much less the tolls of slavery.” Students recognized that their moral compasses were socially constructed to a great degree.

Students experienced a variety of thoughts and emotions in reaction to the monument and sometimes even specifically explained what in the design itself led to their reactions. Some students felt empathy for the slaves – “sorry” (Frank and Indira), “sadness and sympathy” (Sima), and “somewhat feel bad” (Nehru). Taylor was “happy” because “there is a monuement [sic] for slaves,” and Mary wanted to “honor the Af Am [African Americans] that stayed loyal and faithful because they didn’t have to stay and fight for them,” an odd sentiment from an African American herself. Watson was “confused because the slaves are fighting for the people that enslaved them, instead of helping the people who might set them free.” However, three students were angered over the monument and were critical of the Lost Cause. Ranjit noted that its creators were “trying to tell us that slaves wanted to help the South and they are trying to prove slavery just.” While Indira had “great dislike for the Confed. [Confederates] . . . b/c [because] they portray themselves as honorable & great even though they were unable to take their loss,” Rachel unreservedly makes her opinion clear: “All I feel is anger, and I’m sure it shows through my writing.” Five students (Frank, Khan, Nehru, Sima, and Sid) actually mentioned a feature in the exhibit’s design in their explanations. Khan, Sima, and Sid
referenced the relief of the slave woman holding a white baby, and Frank cited “the images showing the slaves at their work” while Nehru commented that “the carved pictures . . . [evoked] the lonely and gloomy tone” (Nehru). The students were clearly sympathetic toward the slaves and held the Lost Cause southerners in disdain.

It therefore came as no surprise that students connected this monument to contemporary racism. They pointed out that “there is still racism” (Frank); “our society still struggles w/ inequality, & racism even today” (Indira); and “there are still people who believe in this reasoning” (LeBron). Nehru argued that “just like how back then people were mistreated due to their appearance or thinking, it is still happening today” and referenced Black Lives Matter and the LGBTQ movement. Khan, Sid, and Sima mentioned that the Lost Cause ideology of this monument could still be found in textbooks (Little, 2017, August 14). Racism was an easy connection for students to make between the late 19th and early 21st centuries.

Students suggested other ways these two periods could be related. Rather than consider the topic of the monument, Watson just observed that people still put up new monuments. Ranjit turned to the workplace and found a similarity between slaves being honored in Fort Mill and “many employees [who] are forced to do things that are wrong just to keep their job.” However, Rachel contemplated something more personal. Her parents’ separation resulting in the two siblings living with their mother made her observation particularly poignant. She observed that “the repeated indoctrination, kindness [sic] vs. hate is painfully similar to domestic abuse problems we see today.” It appeared that her connection was personal rather than abstract like Watson and Ranjit’s examples.
When students were asked what they could do to address these problems, once again they could be categorized into two groups – those who spoke in generalities versus those who suggested specific steps they could take. The former group wrote that “we should be accepting of all races” (Indira) or “get them to understand that this will never be possible again” (LeBron). In contrast, Khan, Sid, and Sima believed they could counter “the false views of the Lost Cause” through the written word such as an article (Khan and Sima) or blog (Sima). Nehru advocated attending “LGBTQ rights or Black Lives matter rallies . . . I can help them campaign, spread the word, raise attention, and raise money. I can participate in the movements.” In light of what we learned about Rachel’s home situation and her comment about domestic abuse, her suggestion would take courage on her part: “pointing things like this out is one of the biggest I can take.” While six students were quite specific on what they could do, the other seven students confirmed that students still needed to make progress in answering this prompt.

**Connecting with the Tillman Monument.** Next, students turned once again to the Benjamin R. Tillman statue on the State House grounds and examined their connection to it. Overwhelmingly, students took issue with its bias toward the former governor and U.S. senator. Indira understandably accused him of being “an unfair politician who cared more about punishing his enemies than helping his own supporters and wanted to rid African Americans of their political rights, and also justified killing them.” In typical fashion, Larry succinctly characterized Tillman as “a huge jerk.” Four other students (Frank, Harriet, Nehru, and Ranjit) were more balanced in their appraisal. They recognized some of his positive accomplishments for farmers and education (e.g., Clemson University), but they also were troubled by his racism. Consequently, Nehru
had “a mix feeling toward Benjamin Tillman.” The students clearly did not think Tillman was the great man the memorial made him out to be.

When they were asked why they had such strong opinions about Tillman, students offered several reasons. Some students (Carl, Frank, and LeBron, Nehru, and Ranjit) were more literal in answering this question and said that reading and learning about Tillman had obviously influenced their views. Others pointed to their parents – “an anti-racist [sic] household” (Larry), “from a young age . . . my parents” (Nehru), and “my parents taught me to treat others with respect & do good things not bad” (Taylor). Nehru and Watson credited society, and Indira agreed but elaborated that “knowing of racist whites and also knowing very strong and influential African American[s] has influenced my viewpoint.” Similarly, Mary referenced Black political leaders. Khan, Nehru, and Sima felt school was an important factor in fostering racial views with Khan acknowledging “the people around me at school have influenced me to think negatively about racism” and Sima the history curriculum. Harriet, though, looked no further than herself “being a black person and knowing that racism isn’t ok.” While some students needed to think more deeply about their personal views, others showed intrapersonal adeptness in their responses.

Students’ feelings and thoughts about this exhibit were predominantly negative. Six students felt very strongly against Tillman – “anger” (Harriet), “great dislike” (Indira), “disgusted” (Khan), “angered” (Larry), “hatred” (Mary), and “mad” (Taylor). Watson could not “understand how someone can be so heartless toward someone who is just like him.” In contrast, Frank and Ranjit chose to focus on what the memorial itself had to say and felt “good” (Frank) and recognized “that people liked him for his
achievements” (Ranjit). However, it was clear in their other responses they disagreed with his racism. Sima’s answer was quite curious. Like Frank and Ranjit, she felt “proud” about what the memorial had to say, but “amusement” toward his militant racism. It was obvious that she did not quite understand the term “amuse” because she characterized Tillman as “a terrible person to blacks.” As in their previous analyses, most students explained their feelings to some degree. However, nearly half of them actually referenced aspects of the memorial itself. For Harriet, it angered her “that the democrats thought it was ok for him to be racist and still honor him,” obviously referencing the plaque that said the Democratic Party had co-sponsored the memorial. Similarly, Frank, Sima, Indira, and Ranjit credited the bronze plaques while Khan was actually angry that “the statue . . . makes him look heroic, when he doesn’t deserve it.” The students emotionally responded to Tillman’s monument, and almost half actually explained what in the exhibit itself contributed to those feelings.

Student responses about the exhibit’s contemporary connection focused on a variety of topics, and their suggestions about what they could do in reaction should have been more immediate and practical. Five students (Harriet, Indira, LeBron, Nehru, and Taylor) cited that Tillman’s racism remains a problem today. For example, Nehru wrote that “there are still people like Benjamin Tillman who support the lynching of African Americans (recent police shootings) . . . in the same way due to their race.” Khan, Ranjit, and Sid mentioned the controversy of whether Tillman’s statue should remain or be removed. Concerning what they could do about their connections, students once again tended to write in general, or in this case, futuristic terms. Carl’s connection that Clemson University “is still a collage [sic]” prompted him to write that he may end up
going there after high school. As a future career, Harriet decided that she would enter politics to combat racism, and Mary, while lacking details, said she could “encourage young adults to be able to run for office and defeat the odds.” Similarly, Indira spoke even more generally when she wrote that “to fix this, we have to keep trying to get people to come together and join as one instead of being separated [sic].” Only Khan and Nehru offered more immediate practical solutions with the former suggesting that he “write an article stating my opinion on the topic - whether or not it should be taken down” and the latter that he could “join their [e.g. Black Lives Matter] protests, donate some money, and help them move forward.” Students still needed to improve on relating exhibits to the present and consider how they as teenagers could act on these connections.

**Connecting with the Smalls and Clark museum exhibits.** The final site that students analyzed for connection was located at the South Carolina Hall of Fame, and students chose between Robert Smalls and Septima Poinsette Clark. Carl, Larry, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, Sid, and Sima chose the former. They agreed with the exhibit’s view that Smalls was “very important” (LeBron), “intelligent” (Nehru and Sima), “brave” (Nehru and Mary), “courageous” (Sima), “heroic” (Nehru), and “very determined” (Sima). Carl felt “respect” for Smalls, and Sid believed “that African-Americans should fight for their freedom and should do whatever it take [sic] to achieve that because it should be their god given right.” In addition, they attributed their opinions to several influences. LeBron and Carl did not think beyond the immediate topic and credited what they had learned from the readings while the remaining five students cited society (Sid and Sima), school (Nehru and Sima), and parents (Larry, Mary, and Nehru). Sima probably belonged with the last group as well because she credited “trusted adults,” by which she
might have meant school, parents, or both. The students were clear in their views and influences.

The students described their reactions to the exhibit differently. While Larry and LeBron claimed they had no emotions, they both made it clear in their HTM notes that they had positive opinions about Smalls. Mary was “upset” that Smalls and his family were slaves and that he “had to sail away on a boat just to have him freedom.” Sid felt “shock” at Smalls’s “bold” action, and both Nehru and Sima described their emotions as ones of “bravery and heroism.” However, while five students, excluding Carl and LeBron, explained their reactions, only Nehru and Sima discussed the text in the exhibit itself that prompted these reactions.

This group of students had a mixed record in relating the exhibit to today and suggesting what they could do in response. In fact, LeBron did not “see any possible connection,” and Larry agreed: “I do not know.” The other students at least made an attempt with Nehru and Sima viewing Black Lives Matter as having “a very similar goal: fight until African Americans are treated equally to whites” (Nehru). Sid actually related Smalls’s “bold action” to similar ones Syrians were taking in their own civil war “to gain their freedom and stop the war.” When it concerned what the students themselves could do, Larry, LeBron, and Sid failed to provide an answer, and Carl just offered that he would “continue to honor the people who were discriminated against, but still achieved a lot of positive things.” Only Mary, Nehru, and Sima explained what they could do personally. Mary, an African American female herself, was determined to “continue to live my life showing those people . . . I am equal to a white 13 year old girl.” Once again, Nehru turned his attention to helping Black Lives Matter “by joining their protests,
donating money, and participating in their parades . . . [and] help them sign petitions.” In
addition to mentioning Black Lives Matter, Sima felt her contribution could be writing a
Robert Smalls biography and “a blog for the various problems our world has. This way,
people . . . become inspired to solve them.” While some students succeeded in relating
the exhibit to problems of today and suggested what they could do, it was obvious that
others needed to grow in this area of empathetic thinking.

The remaining six students examined their connection to the South Carolina Hall
of Fame’s exhibit on Septima Clark. Frank, Harriet, Indira, Khan, Taylor, and Watson
agreed with the exhibit’s positive viewpoint of Clark because of what she contributed to
the civil rights movement. While Frank and Watson agreed that “learning about
everything that happened to African Americans during that time” (Watson) led to their
bias for Clark, the remaining four students considered the bigger question of why they
thought equality was preferable. Khan credited “the environment and society,” and
Harriet and Indira agreed with the former observing that she was “surrounded by many
different people which means that I can appreciate different people’s cultures” and the
latter recognizing “the influence of strong women in my life . . . as well as knowing of
many powerful African American leaders.” Taylor felt her involvement in the Girl
Scouts had taught her “that girls can do anything.” Both Khan and Harriet also viewed
their families as important influences. The students were very clear on their bias toward
Clark and what led them to seeing her positively.

The students’ emotional reactions were both positive and negative. Frank, Khan,
and Indira felt a sense of pride. Khan made it personal: “I feel pride and gratitude for
Clark because all of her efforts paid off and have influenced today’s [sic] and my beliefs
to what they are.” While Watson did not characterize his reaction as an emotion, he expressed admiration toward Clark by asking “why was she so strongly motivated, even though society tried to beat her down.” Harriet, Indira, and Taylor, however, also discussed their negative feelings toward the society that made Clark’s career even necessary. They used the words “upset” (Harriet and Taylor) and “angry” (Indira). Taylor summed it up well that she was “upset to know that people had to fight and cause a commotion just to make an effort for everyone to be equal.” All six students explained their reactions, and three of them specified that it was the exhibit (Frank and Harriet) or video (Khan) that made them feel this way. The students’ explanation of their feelings and thoughts showed they had given some thought in answering this prompt on the HTM.

Similarly, students did well in considering the exhibit’s contemporary connection and what they could do about it. Three students (Harriet, Khan, and Taylor) credited Clark’s work with the current racial situation where “many blacks vote every year, go to school with many differently raced people, and have laws that are supposed to keep them equal” (Harriet). Frank’s response just summarized Clark’s work that “helped Af Am [African Americans] gain equal rights, and end segregation.” Indira and Watson focused on how the civil rights movement continues with the former referencing Black Lives Matter and that “African Americans have also been able to have all the rights of whites due to these movements, closing the gap between races.” When it concerned what they could do about these connections, Indira and Watson illustrated students’ tendency to answer in general terms: “We can keep supporting African Americans and continue to try to end discrimination against them” (Indira). Similarly, Watson just wrote that he “could try to raise support for an organization,” but what could he do to raise money or
encourage others and which organization did he have in mind? Both Frank and Taylor believed their personal actions could make a difference – “treat everyone equal, no matter the race” (Frank), and “accept everyone as they are” (Taylor). Harriet agreed that she could “love others around me,” but she also believed that she should “convince others to do so, then, we can accept and appreciate each others [sic] differences.” Finally, Khan thought he could write a blog to educate others about the importance of Clark herself in the fight for civil rights. Overall, the students were able to relate the exhibit to today and suggest ways that they could translate the exhibit’s point of view into action.

**Connecting with the State House monuments.** In their State House monument analyses, students continued to connect with their exhibits. In fact, excluding Watson, every student at least implied their opinion about the exhibit. Even in Watson’s case, he recognized that Thurmond was a “racist,” and the word itself carries a negative connotation. One example of a very well-explained viewpoint was Nehru’s discussion about Wade Hampton:

Because he was a Southerner, he fought for the Confederate cause; therefore, because he was part of the Confederacy does not really matter to me, it doesn’t really affect my viewpoint of him. Wade Hampton was similar to a typical white person of that time period; he was moderately racist and believed that whites should be a little superior to African Americans. However, when compared to people like Ben Tillman, he is not really a white supremacist or a racist. He simply believed what all white southerners during that time believed.
While one may not agree with Nehur’s opinion, his response reveals the depth of his contextualized thinking. Students did well in recognizing their own viewpoints even if some needed to state them more clearly.

The students had a less than impressive record concerning the other aspects of connection. In fact, ten students did not write more than their opinion. Nehru, Rachel, Sima, Taylor, and Watson proved to be the exceptions. The additional four elements of thinking about connection and who did so were: addressing the personal influences that contributed to students having their particular racial and gender views (Sima and Taylor), the emotions they felt (Nehru, Rachel, Sima, and Taylor), identifying modern connections to the exhibit’s topic (Sima, Taylor, and Watson), and explaining what they could do about this connection (Sima and Watson). For example, in her examination of the Confederate Women’s Monument, Taylor credited Girl Scouts with her belief that females “can do anything they put their mind for.” Rachel commented that the same monument “evokes certain emotions in me, usually pride and a bit of joy” because women were being positively recognized, and in his analysis of the Wade Hampton Monument, Nehru commented that the South Carolinian “looks very brave which somewhat motivates me to be the same.” Both Sima and Watson were led to think of a contemporary connection with the former, who examined the Confederate Women’s Monument, commenting that “the women in 1865 took chances and proved to others that they could do the same things as men . . . Today, many women are extremely important in our society since they keep it running.” Finally, Sima and Watson were also the only students who suggested what they could do about the contemporary issues they had identified. In the case of the latter, he wrote that he could follow the lead of “other
controversial statues on state house grounds, such as Ben Tillman . . . by starting a petition to remove a statue or argue against removing it,” although he is unclear about which statue he would target. While these five students did well on some or all of these components of connection, the fact that two-thirds of the sample failed to address them revealed that there was substantial room for growth in this type of historical thinking. That said, the fact that every student at least touched upon some element of connection favorably contrasted with only eleven doing so in their analyses of the *Bill of Rights and You*. Their training using the HTM had resulted in some progress.

### 4.8 Findings and Interpretation of the Corroboration Data

The students’ next type of historical thinking focused on corroboration or determining the reliability of an exhibit. This component involved students discussing discrepancies between the sources they had read before analyzing the exhibit (prompt #27 and #28) and their general impression of the exhibit’s reliability considering its subjectivity, selectivity of information and perspective, and handling of race and gender (prompt #29).

**Corroborating the *Bill of Rights and You* exhibit.** In their initial analysis of the *Bill of Rights and You*, corroboration did not even appear to cross the students’ minds during their analyses. None of the students pointed out how their preparation work confirmed the exhibit’s information. While a preparation handout I provided clearly listed five rights in the Fifth Amendment and seven in the Sixth Amendment (see Appendix B), the exhibit left a number of these out in its summary of the amendments. However, none of the students in their written analyses mentioned the incomplete nature of the exhibit’s summaries. In fact, Khan just commented that the Fifth through Tenth
Amendments were “reasonable rights;” Carl observed that “the bill of rights . . . also prevents [sic] the government from being unfair if a person is on trial;” and Ranjit just asked “how come a lot of the amendments [sic] have to do with punishment and the jury?” It was obvious that students needed to develop a more critical eye when it came to the reliability or completeness of information in an exhibit.

**Corroborating the Hagler monument.** When analyzing the reliability of the Hagler monument, the students used an earlier version of the HTM that had them consider just the discrepancies in corroborating the exhibit. The students discussed only two minor differences and concluded that the monument was a credible source. Four students (Harriet, Indira, Mary, and Taylor) cited that Hagler’s name was spelled differently, and six students (Carl, Frank, Larry, Ranjit, Sima, and Watson) noticed that the length of Hagler’s rule as chief was different on the monument (13 years) versus their understanding of the background reading (12 or 14 years). In truth, the Catawba chief’s name can be spelled as Hagler or Haigler, and while only one source says he ruled for 14 years (Cahn, 2009, February 20), the *South Carolina Encyclopedia* says he assumed this leadership role in 1750 or 1751 accounting for the 12 years versus 13 years of the exhibit (McCulloch, 2017, August 1). Moving onto the overall reliability of the monument, Khan wrote that “it’s [sic] information agrees with other sources,” while Ranjit concurred in its reliability but would have liked to see more information. However, both Nehru and Sima tempered their enthusiasm with the former believing its positive view of Hagler might have led to “a chance some facts are not mentioned or some are twisted,” but he did not elaborate. Sima felt the visual of Hagler was accurate, but the paucity of facts made it inadequate as a source of information. Interestingly, the background preparation
work made it clear that historians do not know what Hagler looked like, and only Khan pointed this out. Carl was convinced of the monument’s reliability but did not explain why, and Watson just observed: “NOT really any info. Its [sic] a statue.” However, overall the students’ attention to detail and the monument’s accuracy were successfully displayed.

**Corroborating the Washington, DC exhibits.** The students’ second opportunity to use the HTM in corroborating a historical site was one they visited during our field study to Washington, DC. It must be remembered that this was only the second time the students themselves had corroborated a historical site or museum exhibit. Furthermore, the HTM only asked them to consider factual disagreements. Beginning with the next exhibit *A Woman’s War*, the HTM was revised to ask them to consider bias, information, missing points of view, race, and gender. Consequently, if an exhibit such as the Martin Luther King, Jr. and Lincoln Memorials had little factual content or appeared accurate (e.g., Vietnam Women’s Memorial), students’ analyses were short in length and shallow in depth.

Students’ HTM notes and analysis papers summarizing their critical examination revealed two extremes in the level of effort they put forth to verify facts of the exhibit. Larry did not even attempt to discuss whether the Holocaust Museum’s exhibit *From Citizens to Outcasts* was reliable or not. On the other end of the corroboronation spectrum were Nehru and Sima. The former even looked up three quotes on the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial to verify their accuracy and discussed how the site used commas whereas the website employed semicolons. Nehru then studied photographs of Dr. King and concluded the sculptor had accurately created him in stone. Sima compared and
contrasted the Holocaust Museum’s exhibit on how the Nazis used gas to kill Jews to four websites, three of which I believe were associated with the museum. For example, she found that the exhibit and sources offered different dates – 1939, 1940, and 1941 – for when Germans started to gas Jews and other ethnicities in large numbers. She and Nehru were diligent on corroborating the facts of their exhibits while the remaining 12 students were in the middle. For example, Frank and Sid discussed how Mount Vernon’s The Dilemma of Slavery exhibit was off by one in its discussion of Washington’s number of slaves, and Indira’s conclusion was that the Vietnam Women’s Memorial and other sources “do not disagree on any information or details” meaning “this exhibit is very reliable & provides good info on women during the war.” How well students could move beyond just facts to corroborate an exhibit and consider its bias had to wait until the next HTM activity when the instrument was revised.

**Corroborating A Woman’s War museum exhibit.** After their Washington, DC trip, the students’ next corroboration activity using the HTM took place with A Woman’s War, an exhibit at the National Museum of African American History and Culture. Most students did not identify any discrepancies between their preparatory sources and the exhibit itself. Frank, Harriet, Khan, LeBron, Nehru, Rachel, Sima, and Taylor recognized that “the sources include some information that the exhibit did not” (Khan). Sima specifically noticed that the exhibit did not discuss Charlotte Forten Grimké’s career as “a famous writer and poet.” Harriet believed one reason that information was omitted from the exhibit was because it wanted to portray its subject favorably. She mentioned in class and alluded to it elsewhere in her HTM analysis of an incident when some slaves wanted to give up their escape, and pointing a gun, Tubman “threatened to kill them if
they threatened her freedom.” Sid commented on the reverse that “some facts on the display were not in the other sources.” Other students like Indira, Sima, and Watson took issue with facts in the exhibit, but upon closer examination neither of their points were valid. For example, Watson erroneously claimed that one of the preparatory sources contradicted the age Susie King Taylor escaped to freedom. In general, students corroborated the exhibit, but they needed to provide examples that supported their observations. Of the eight students who said that the sources they had read had more or different details, only Khan and Sima provided at least one example. Nehru did provide examples of details they agreed on, but did not provide any for his assertion that the sources had more information than the exhibit. The students needed to pay more heed to details in their analyses.

They overwhelmingly evaluated the exhibit as reliable and at least attempted to explain their reasoning. Two observations warrant further discussion. First, three students (LeBron, Nehru, and Taylor) considered the fact that the exhibit was in the Smithsonian justified its reliability. While Taylor claimed the exhibit was “a reliable source because it is in a museum so, it has to contain correct information,” LeBron cited both a comparison to other sources and the fact that “this is in a museum bases [sic] on Black history, so if it wasn’t reliable then that wouldn’t make any sense.” Second, students understood that a source can be biased about its topic yet still be reliable. Five of them (Carl, Frank, Khan, Taylor, and Watson) directly addressed this subject. Frank argued that the exhibit being “biased for the women . . . does not change the information,” and Khan developed this idea further: “Its bias does not affect its reliability because it does not seem to be exaggerating any of the achievements that the women
made at the time.” Rachel, though, maintained a healthy skepticism stating that the exhibit “seems like a good starting source, but more reasearch [sic] should be conducted.” A number of students recognized that bias and reliability were related and that the former did not necessarily preclude the latter.

**Corroborating the faithful slaves monument.** In their analyses of the reliability of “To the Faithful Slaves” monument in Fort Mill’s Confederate Park, most students pointed to discrepancies between the historical site itself and the texts they had read in preparation for this activity. Ten students (Frank, Indira, Khan, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, Ranjit, Sid, Sima, and Taylor) believed there was a major difference between the monument and the sources they had read in that the former portrayed slaves as supportive of the Confederacy without acknowledging there were slaves who were not. Taylor wrote that “the other sources not only talk about the faithful slaves but also the slaves that left their owners for independence,” while Sid was critical of the monument’s neglect to depict “the real truth of what the slaves did.” Sima characterized the monument’s failure to consider fugitives to the Union as “false information,” and its chief value was to learn the tenets of the Lost Cause. Mary and Ranjit also pointed out that unlike the monument’s emphasis on loyal slaves, the texts they had read discussed slaves who had escaped from bondage, and Khan stated that the monument “ignores the countless slaves that left the Confed. [Confederacy] for the Union and instead focuses on those who were forced into submission with fear.” These students interpreted incongruity between the monument’s Lost Cause message and the facts of history.

However, their opinions on the exhibit’s reliability initially appeared to be more divided. Eight students (Carl, Frank, Indira, Khan, LeBron, Ranjit, Sid, and Sima) felt
the exhibit was unreliable. For example, Indira argued that the monument “is extremely bias[ed] for the confed. [Confederacy] & does not talk about the slaves being forced to stay,” and Khan agreed pointing out that “it ignores the countless slaves that left the Confed. [Confederacy] for the Union.” The other five students (Mary, Nehru, Rachel, Taylor, and Watson) appeared to believe the site reliable but then qualified their explanations to recognize its problems. For example, Taylor acknowledged that the monument was a “reliable [sic] source because it is a primary source but also talks about slaves that stayed loyal but did not mention the ones that left,” and Mary’s assertion of its reliability was tempered with an admission that “the slave owner could have twisted the truth to make the slaves look way better.” Interestingly, Sima did feel that the monument was a reliable source on one topic – the Lost Cause. In general, most students understandably questioned the source’s reliability.

**Corroborating the Tillman Monument.** When it came to analyzing Benjamin Tillman’s statue on the State House grounds, the students acknowledged that it depicted the former governor and U. S. senator very differently than the sources they had read in preparation for its analysis. Five students (Harriet, Khan, Nehru, Ranjit, and Sima) specifically mentioned that the monument failed to include Tillman’s racism. Sima observed that “the monument absolutely shows nothing about blacks and Tillman, making it seem as if Tillman was a flawless and perfect man.” Carl, Frank, Indira, Larry, LeBron, Mary, Sid, and Taylor agreed with their peers that Tillman’s negative attributes and actions were missing from the monument, but they did not specifically mention racism by name. For example, Larry observed that Tillman was “portrayed as this correct & amazing person when in reality he wasn’t.” My field journal recounts that even at this
late stage of using the HTM, Watson still did not “know that disagreement could mean if the monument left out something – in this case BT’s [Ben Tillman’s] racism.” In general, the students noticed that the monument neglected to provide its visitors with the full story on Tillman’s legacy.

Not surprisingly, students did not find Tillman’s monument to be a reliable source of information. In fact, Frank, Indira, Larry, LeBron, Taylor, and Watson agreed with Carl’s observation that “the exhibit is not very reliable because it is very biased for him.” Others were more inclined to qualify their responses crediting the monument for its correct information. They found the monument to be “somewhat reliable” (Harriet and Nehru) or “PARTIALLY reliable” (Sima) because “it does not state any facts that go against Ben Tillman. On the other hand, the facts that are for Ben Tillman are reliable” (Sid). The general consensus was that Tillman’s monument was at least not a completely trustworthy source of information on him.

**Corroborating the Smalls and Clark museum exhibits.** The final historical sites students used the HTM to corroborate was the Robert Smalls or Septima Poinsette Clark exhibits at the South Carolina Hall of Fame. Carl, Larry, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, Sid, and Sima decided to corroborate the Robert Smalls exhibit. An examination of the sources reveals some discrepancies. First, the exhibit lists Smalls’s date of death as February 22, 1916, but two other sources identify it as 1915 (Miller, 2016, October 31; Gates, n.d.). Second, the number of people who escaped aboard the *Planter* varies among the sources: the exhibit claims “a crew of 12” while Gates (n.d.) says 17 people, and both Linberry (2017, June 13) and the *New York Herald* account in Appendix N (“Hilton Head, SC,” 1862, May 18) state 16 people. Third, while the exhibit’s video
implies that daylight had arrived when Smalls began his escape and the *New York Herald* article states that it was “broad daylight when they passed Fort Sumter, the other sources make it clear that it was around 4:15 a.m. when the *Planter* successfully journeyed past Fort Sumter (Gates, n.d.; Linberry, 2017, June 13). Finally, there is disagreement over when Smalls picked up the non-crewmembers such as his family. Both Linberry (2017, June 13) and Gates (n.d.) stated that he had to sail the ship to get them. The *New York Herald* says that the family went on board and then Smalls started the ship’s steam engines (“Hilton Head, SC.” 1862, May 18), and the exhibit itself seems to telescope the leaving of the *Planter* and the embarkation of other passengers with the placard stating that “Smalls smuggled his wife and three children aboard the Planter” and the video concurring that he “loaded his family aboard the vessel and, along with other members of the enslaved crew, sailed it past the heavily armed defenses protecting the harbor.”

Unlike other exhibits, the one on Robert Smalls provided students with a rigorous test of how well they paid attention to details in their preparation work and examination of the exhibit itself.

While all seven students deemed the exhibit as reliable, they did not do well in noticing the discrepancies described above. In fact, Carl, Larry, LeBron, and Mary did not discuss a single example of disagreement among the sources and argue otherwise - “these sources agree on most of the information” (Carl), “they agree on all points” (Larry), and “all of these sources say the same things just in more detail” (Mary). Only Nehru, Sid, and Sima examined the sources more thoroughly. Sid and Sima noticed the discrepancy concerning the number of people aboard the *Planter*, and Nehru and Sima discussed the different dates of Smalls’s death and when the *Planter* made its escape.
relative to the morning light. No one noticed the different accounts of when Smalls got
his family on the ship. Even Sima, who noticed three of the four issues discussed above,
said that “other sources” confirmed the exhibit’s details, but she did not elaborate. She
either found other sources or did not examine the ones provided sufficiently. In addition,
four of the seven students (Carl, Nehru, Sid, and Sima) do at least mention that the
exhibit has a favorable perspective of Smalls, but they still felt it was at least “pretty
reliable” (Nehru). Larry and LeBron did not comment on its bias in their response to its
reliability, and Mary felt that “the bias is hard to find and there are only facts.” The
students showed that they needed to work on their corroboration skills.

Frank, Harriet, Indira, Khan, Taylor, and Watson found very little variation
between the Hall of Fame’s exhibit on Septima Poinsette Clark and their preparatory
reading and felt it was an accurate tribute to her. Overall, they agreed that the exhibit
was more limited in its details. However, Indira pointed out that only the exhibit
acknowledged “how male activists did not appreciate Septima’s work.” Similarly, while
her peers felt the exhibit was reliable, Indira described it as “mostly reliable.” For some
reason, she believed that the closure of Highlander Folk School for its non-segregation
policy and its non-licensed beer sales reflected negatively on Clark. She recognized its
“strong bias” for Clark, and Khan even admitted that he found the “exhibit reliable
because it has the same bias as me,” but he went on to stress that he had cross-checked
and verified its information. Watson’s logic, however, was troubling for the teacher who
wants his students to critically corroborate a source. He was inclined to give the South
Carolina Hall of Fame the benefit of the doubt for “this entire organizations [sic] cause is
to find out and record information about the famous people.” This last opportunity to use
the HTM’s corroboration component to discuss a site’s reliability revealed that students could do this type of historical thinking but that there was still room for improvement.

**Corroborating the State House monuments.** In their final analyses of State House monuments, students showed they had made some progress in corroboration. Thirteen of the 15 students (minus Larry and LeBron) at least touch upon corroboration. Seven students (Carl, Frank, Harriet, Khan, Nehru, Ranjit, and Sima) commented that they had checked factual information with at least one other source or considered the monument in light of their preparation work. For example, Carl wrote that “the knowledge about Wade Hampton’s negative actions while he was alive, dampened my viewpoint about this grandiose exhibit. I acquired this information through background research prior to analyzing this exhibit.” Six students (Indira, Mary, Rachel, Sid, Taylor, and Watson) touch upon corroboration but not sufficiently. Mary, Rachel, and Taylor claim that their monuments were reliable, but none of them offered any evidence. Mary’s evaluation of the African American Monument’s reliability was that “instead of stating claims and opinions it only states facts or from First person view and nothing is inferred or implied.” Rachel wrote that the Confederate Women’s Monument “holds a lot bias” followed by “the supportive nature of the statue is one I agree with.” At least Taylor offered a bit more: “This is a reliable source. It helps us better understand what the women did and the emotions felt during this time. It is also reliable because there is not additional information, to make it unreliable.” Nonetheless, these three students did not discuss how they verified these facts (Mary) or whether the viewpoint of what Confederate women did was justified (Rachel and Taylor). Watson just referenced the
State House website and Sid three other sources, but neither explained what they did with them.

Seven students (Carl, Frank, Indira, Khan, Nehru, Ranjit, and Sid) also observed that the monuments excluded information so the viewer did not see the full picture. For example, Frank recognized that the Strom Thurmond Monument “only mentions his accomplishments that make him look good, not both the good and the bad.” Interestingly, three of the students (Frank, Khan, and Ranjit) did not feel this made their monuments less reliable. For example, Frank acknowledged that the Thurmond Monument did not include “both the good and the bad,” yet he concluded that it “should still be considered a reliable source since it gives a good overview of his accomplishments, and all of the information on the monument is correct.” What seemed to be more important was that the details were correct not whether the source was biased. Nehru’s explanation was much more nuanced for he recognized that that the Wade Hampton Monument was “misleading” for “it does not include any negative facts that would help the reader understand that Hampton was also a human who made some mistakes, and had his own opinions.” Nevertheless, Nehru concluded that it “does a great job explaining the topic of Wade Hampton.” While Carl made no definitive statements about reliability, Indira was adamant that Wade Hampton’s Monument was unreliable because it neglected “Hampton’s views and achievements. It also does not acknowledge other groups’ viewpoints.” While it did list his achievements of being a Civil War general, governor, and U. S. senator, her conclusion was still valid concerning the other points and perhaps she meant they left out what he did while serving in government. Sima brought up an important point concerning reliability. In my field journal notes, I
wrote that she asked me: “Do we have to have completely reliable or unreliable or can it be both? I confirmed there are degrees of reliability.” Consequently, in her analysis notes, she explained how it was neither for “it portrays the ‘angels’ of the Civil War and explains how they contributed to it and . . . it is too biased towards the CSA [Confederate States of America] women and does not give any specific examples of what they did.” While this final analysis activity revealed that students needed to discuss in more detail the consideration of factual accuracy and bias when evaluating reliability, it must be remembered that in their initial analysis of the Bill of Rights and You, corroboration did not even appear to cross the students’ minds. None of the students pointed out how their preparation work confirmed the exhibit’s information. Furthermore, they also did not really address how the exhibit was biased toward the Bill of Rights itself. At most, five of the 15 students may have implied the exhibit’s bias. In conclusion, this final activity showed that students had made progress but still could improve in this area.

4.9 Findings and Interpretation of the Criticism Data

The final component of the HTM involved students criticizing the positive and negative features of the historical site or museum exhibit (prompts #30 and 31) and making suggestions for improvement (prompt #32).

**Criticizing the Bill of Rights and You exhibit.** In their baseline analysis of the Bill of Rights and You, only four of the 15 students – Frank, Indira, Rachel, and Ranjit – attempted to criticize the exhibit in varying degrees. Frank’s analysis as a whole focused on how the exhibit presented the information. For example, he observed that the exhibit’s first panel was “easy on eye to look at” and had “good explanations but also not a ton of words.” His comments were general and did not elaborate through specific
examples. Indira’s evaluations were limited to overall thoughts about each of the four panels followed by examples of content that appeared to support her opinions. For example, she observed that panel one was “very thorough, specific” and proceeded to jot down notes such as “voting system to amend, is much more peaceful than war or violence,” an important point of the exhibit. However, while she characterized the amendment process as “very thorough,” she failed to include the exhibit’s specific explanation that it takes “two-thirds of both houses of Congress and three-fourths of the states.” For panel three, she commented that the exhibit “explains all rights in great detail,” but the only right she specifically mentioned of the detailed list was privacy. However, to her credit, her evaluation that the fourth panel “gives good ex. [examples] of amendments in action” was supported by her inclusion of three examples – protesting, petitioning, and the press. While she failed to mention two of the five rights in the first amendment, the right of assembly could be implied in protesting. The remaining freedom of religion was clearly not addressed at all in her analysis although the exhibit did examine it. The one exception to her evaluative comments on each panel could have been the second one, where she observed that the exhibit offered “good reasons” on why the Bill of Rights was created, which could mean either the Founders had good reasons or that the exhibit chose good ones to include, probably the former. While Frank made more observations on how well the exhibit presented its information, Indira’s observations included more specific examples.

Rachel and Ranjit’s critiques of the exhibit itself could also use more elaboration. Rachel’s observations were general and vague. For example, she characterized the exhibit as “well designed, caught my eye” and “well written and good use of space”
without providing examples. Ranjit’s comments about the exhibit itself, as opposed to the Bill of Rights overall, were limited as well. He critiqued the exhibit’s first panel for failing to mention other rights than the first amendment: “Tell[s] us there are ten amendments [sic] but only tells us about the 1st amendment [sic] and not the others.” His only other comment on the exhibit per se was to question the inclusion of the fourteenth amendment: “But why is the 14th still included in this poster even if it is important?” However, he then realized that it was included because of the idea of incorporation, so he added “Nevermind.” The rest of his analysis was focused on the content of the Bill of Rights rather than how the exhibit presented the information. Most of the students showed they needed to address this element of critical thinking and those who did so needed to be more detailed in their critiques.

**Criticizing the Hagler statue.** In their analysis of the Hagler monument, students made two main observations. First, they were very impressed with details of the sculpture itself. Eleven students (Carl, Frank, Harriet, Indira, Khan, Larry, Mary, Nehru, Sima, Taylor, and Watson) commented on it. Indira observed “how detailed his clothes were & what he was holding, beautiful structure in all.” Nehru’s critique, though, was more precise for he found the “texture on Hagler’s skin, and even wrinkles on King Hagler clothing” to be very impressive. Second, eleven students (Carl, Frank, Harriet, Indira, Khan, Larry, Rachel, Ranjit, Sima, Taylor, and Watson) suggested for more information to be added so that visitors could understand Hagler more fully. For example, Harriet’s detailed list suggested “more detailed inscriptions, quotes from people that he ever came into contact with, and now what is the Catawba tribe doing in celebration of him.” Khan was even more specific believing that the creators omitted an
important fact from the chief’s life: “It would help if it mentioned the treaty [Treaty of Pine Tree Hill] because I think it was his greatest achievement, and the reason for why he is remembered.” Considering that the said treaty gave the Catawba a reservation upon which they still live today, Khan made a valid point. The students showed they were observant critics.

**Criticizing the Holocaust exhibits.** The next exhibit students critiqued using the HTM was located in the Washington, DC area. At the Holocaust Museum, Larry and Ranjit shortchanged their critiques, but Rachel and Sima responded with more thoughtful ones. Larry claimed that *From Citizens to Outcasts* was small and needed more visuals, when in truth, it was quite large with numerous anti-Semitic signs and a rolling video displaying a time line of the Nazis’ discriminatory policies. Ranjit was unimpressed with the four documents in the Lodz ghetto exhibit and thought that “if they put more important documents from the ghetto that it will be better.” However, his analysis paper never explained the content of the original documents leaving one to wonder why they should be replaced and what criteria should be used in selecting new ones. In contrast, Rachel’s positive critique recalled her emotional connection with the exhibit’s key artifact - a large milk can used to hide Jewish documents. She also recommended to include more documents such as those by children to make the exhibit even more emotional. Finally, Sima suggested the exhibit on gassing show what the inside of these chambers looked like, put the text in chronological order, and include leaders’ quotes and photographs of the locations. She was complimentary of the exhibit’s design such as the “black cage border . . . [that] allows the visitor to experience being trapped” and its
detailed but organized text. Unlike Larry and Ranjit, Rachel and Sima obviously took the time to think thoughtfully when writing their critiques.

**Criticizing the King Memorial.** Nehru, Taylor, and Watson critiqued the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial. Like their peers at the Holocaust Museum, their suggestions varied in quality, but each made valid points. Both Nehru and Watson felt that the site should include more factual information about the honoree and the latter was impressed with how King’s statue was created. In contrast to Watson, Nehru and Taylor were offered more criticism. The former observed that the statue’s height made quite an impression and “its natural surroundings . . . plays [sic] a major role in setting the mood.” Similarly, Taylor was also struck by the design. She complimented its size and commented that

the fountains are quite calming and are a nice touch to the exhibit. The details of the mountain really bring it to life and add to the grand total that makes you really feel inspired and empowered by Martin Luther King, Jr.

Finally, both Nehru and Taylor wanted addition statues. Taylor suggested that there should be more statues of King at different points of his life while Nehru recommended that “smaller statues of the other people [such as Rosa Parks] who helped the Civil Rights Movement should also be added.” It was clear that these three students understood how to critique a site, but Watson needed to do more of it.

**Criticizing the Lincoln and Vietnam War Memorials.** Carl and Indira critiqued the Lincoln Memorial and the Vietnam Women’s Memorial, respectively. The former was complimentary regarding the inclusion of the Gettysburg Address and the Second Inaugural Address and observed that “the detail and the beauty of the statue is
impressive.” However, he believed like his peers at the King Memorial that Lincoln’s could have provided more detailed information about his life. What he did not realize was that there is a museum about Lincoln in the memorial’s basement, which might have answered his criticism. One odd suggestion was that despite liking the statue he felt it “would stand out more if it was made out of a different material then [sic] the rest of the exhibit.” Within sight was Indira’s exhibit, the Vietnam Women’s Memorial. Her two key comments was her admiration for “how the sculptor was able to depict a variety of emotions on each women’s [sic] face” and a desire for the memorial to stand out by moving the trees to the statue’s background rather than around it. Both Carl and Indira showed they had put some thought into their critiques.

Criticizing the African American Museum exhibits. It will be recalled that Harriet, LeBron, and Mary examined Jim Crow Laws, an exhibit on slavery in the Chesapeake, and the Rise of the Ku Klux Klan, respectively, at the Smithsonian’s African American Museum. Harriet suggested that her exhibit would benefit from including both the view of a segregationist, how these laws were enforced, and “a more personal, first-hand account of segregation” from its victims. In contrast, LeBron found the exhibit on slaves in the Chesapeake “interesting” and “impressive” particularly noting that it showed the tools slaves used, but he had no suggestions on how to make better. Like Harriet, Mary did have suggestions to improve her exhibit. She felt the creators of the exhibit should have explained the contents of what she called “the journal.” In reality, she was referring to Charles Carroll’s 1900 book entitled The Negro A Beast or in the Image of God and an issue of Le Journal Illustró. While Harriet and Mary critiqued their exhibits, LeBron should have put some effort into providing a more detail discussion of
its positive features or in the development of recommendations to improve it for no exhibit is perfect.

**Criticizing Mount Vernon’s slavery exhibit.** Frank, Khan, and Sid critiqued *The Dilemma of Slavery* exhibit at Mount Vernon. Each of them was complimentary in their critiques and made suggestions for improvement. Khan and Sid agreed that the exhibit did well in its explanation of “Washington’s change of mind and his struggle with slavery” (Khan), but Khan wanted to know more “how the slaves played a vital role in the life at Mount Vernon.” This criticism was puzzling considering that the exhibit both discussed and showed slaves working. Frank faulted the exhibit for not having “enough information about how serious and bad slavery was, and the conditions the slaves suffered through.” Both Khan and Sid wanted further explanation of the tools on the far right side of the exhibit. Frank and Khan also noticed that the video and its control buttons were not correctly linked, and Khan was confused by the background audio which he had trouble hearing. It actually was a reading of the names of Mount Vernon slaves, and Khan’s suggestion to put up a placard explaining the audio shows he did not see the written explanation. However, it was obvious that these three students thoughtfully considered the positive and negative features of this exhibit.

**Criticizing A Woman’s War museum exhibit.** In critiquing the Smithsonian’s *A Woman’s War*, students made a number of comments. They complimented the exhibit’s information while at the same time recognizing that it could have included more. For example, Rachel commented that the exhibit “covers the topic well” but also recommended for its creators to “add more detail to the ladies’ placards,” and while Watson thought the exhibit “portrays every body [sic] fairly well and is not too biased,”
he still believed it could be improved by “adding more info.” The students also liked the artifacts and pictures. In fact, eleven of them (excluding Carl, LeBron, and Nehru) mentioned one or both. The students’ critiquing skills were evident in this component of the HTM.

Criticizing the faithful slaves monument. “To the Faithful Slaves” monument generated interesting criticism from the students. While five of them (Frank, Indira, Nehru, Ranjit, and Taylor) mentioned they found the engravings impressive, seven students (Frank, Indira, Khan, Ranjit, Sid, Sima, Taylor, and Watson) suggested that more information be added. For example, Watson continued to believe erroneously that there were Black Confederate soldiers and wanted them added while Khan felt that unfaithful slaves, those that ran away, should be mentioned. However, the exhibit itself was meant to reflect Lost Cause ideology. While a number of students faulted the exhibit for its Lost Cause emphasis, six of them (Carl, Mary, Nehru, Ranjit, Taylor, and Watson) credited it for accomplishing its intention: “built to honor the topic” (Carl); “it does a good job on addressing the topic because the topic is faithful [slaves]” (Mary); and “does do a good job, because it commemorates the African Americans for helping the confederacy, which was the goal of the monument” (Watson). Interestingly, both Khan and Sima were impressed with the successful pervasiveness of the Lost Cause: “Southerners would convince themselves and others (sometimes) to believe this interpretation. Plus, they were able to convince generations of people by integrating the belief into books and exhibits” (Sima). The students’ comments illustrated their skill in criticizing a historical site.
Criticizing the Tillman Memorial. The next site the students critiqued was Benjamin R. Tillman’s statue on the State House grounds. Considering Tillman’s racist legacy and its complete absence from the monument’s text, it came as no surprise that this was the most common criticism. Larry’s criticism was perhaps the most strongly worded:

If one wanted to look for FACT’S [sic], cold hard facts about Tillman, there are better places to search . . . Remove all Bias fo [sic] Tillman. Portray him like he was. Or better yet, tear down the monument. It honors someone who does not deserve the honor & glory.

In examining their essays on what they think should be done with Tillman’s statue, only Taylor recommended that it should remain on the State House grounds. Khan, Indira, Ranjit, and Sima wanted text to be added discussing his racism while Carl, Frank, Harriet, Larry, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, Rachel, Sid, and Watson wanted the statue taken down. Most suggested for it to be moved to Clemson, Winthrop, or a museum. LeBron and Rachel were silent about its fate once taken down, but Harriet left no doubt about her opinion – she wanted the statue to be “destroyed.” It was clear that criticism of the Tillman monument was an easy task for the students.

Criticizing the Smalls and Clark museum exhibits. The students’ final use of the HTM was at the South Carolina Hall of Fame’s virtual exhibits on Robert Smalls and Septima Poinsette Clark. The exhibits themselves were comprised of three components – a placard describing their lives and accomplishments, a photograph, and a short video of about two minutes in duration. Most students noted that the exhibits’ information was good, but many also made suggestions regarding it. Sima wanted to know about mistakes
Small had made; Sid wanted to know less about his escape and more on what he did afterward; Khan recommended more quotes from Clark to reveal “her personality and what she was like;” and Frank wanted to know more about Clark’s “childhood and explain how that led her to becoming who she was.” While Mary and Sima suggested more photographs, Harriet and Indira would not make any changes. The students showed once again they could critique exhibits.

Criticizing the State House monuments. In their final analysis of the State House monuments, eleven students made at least a passing comment or wrote a more substantial critique. Only Carl, Ranjit, Sid, and Watson did not. LeBron’s observation that the African American Monument “was designed in a very intricate manor [sic]” and Indira’s admiration of Wade Hampton’s horse as “majestic” and “very grand” were rather brief examples of praise. Some visitors to the African American Monument might have simply viewed the stones from Senegal, Sierra Leone, Ghana, and the Congo, but Larry saw more:

While this may seem simple, it helps show that the places they came from were simply land, just like we live on today, and how they were ripped from their land without permission, taken to an unfamiliar place, separated from their families and then forced to be worked to the bone.

Most students wanted the monuments to add more information like Sima who suggested that the Confederate Women’s Monument “add some examples of CSA [Confederate] women who positively contributed to the Civil War, and helped the men – for more specificity and emphasis.” Nehru suggested that that the designers of the Wade Hampton Monument “add 2 sentences of SC citizens describing what they think of Hampton; this
is included in the Benjamin Tillman monument. This way viewers would understand how people thought of him during that time.” Finally, some students recommended design changes like Nehru who felt “a water feature” would enhance the Hampton Monument and Khan who believed that Thurmond’s statue should show him “standing instead of being built mid-stride because it would look more regal and further show how influential of a person he was in SC.” When the students did their baseline analysis of the Bill of Rights and You exhibit, less than a third of them offered any critique and even those four students who did so could have provided more details. In contrast, eleven students at least touched upon criticism. The students had shown progress, but like the other components of the HTM, they still had room to improve.

4.10 Findings and Interpretation of the Student Interview Data

The final data point in this study was a written interview of three prompts. First, students were asked how the HTM had changed the way they analyzed a historical site or museum exhibit. Second, they discussed which of the HTM’s 32 prompts they found difficult. Third, students were encouraged to write any other thoughts they had about the HTM including recommendations to improve it as well as opinions on the sites we had analyzed or ones they thought should be done in the future.

All of the students agreed that the HTM had changed how they examined historical sites or exhibits. Sima observed that it made her “pay attention to what I am looking for.” Indira found the HTM prompts to be “so detailed, I had to really study the exhibit and understand the topic behind it in order to answer.” Students found that the HTM encouraged “a more thorough look” (Taylor) at a historical site or exhibit because they were examining them “in an organized manner” (Carl) and “notice[d] more details
and . . . more in depth when it comes to analyzing sources” (Rachel). Larry viewed the HTM as a “checklist [that] can be used to help me develop a deeper opinion about the site.” Finally, LeBron admitted that before the HTM he would “take notes on everything that was in the exhibit,” but this new tool led him “to look carefully at specific parts of the exhibit and explain these parts so that other people can understand my thinking.” Although the students had different levels of success in answering the HTM prompts, they obviously felt that it had helped them analyze better than they had before they began to use it.

Thirteen students (excluding Frank and LeBron) also mentioned by name or alluded to the six components in their descriptions of how it had changed their thinking. With each instance representative of one student, the six sections of the HTM were referenced as follows: creation (5 times), context (5 times), content (8 times), connection (6 times), corroboration (3 times), and criticism (1 time). While one would hope that all of the six C’s would be mentioned more often, it must be remembered that critical thinking is a skill measured in degrees rather than monolithically. The discussion in this chapter has shown that students improved in all of the six C’s. More specifically, the largest group, seven students, specifically mentioned understanding point of view or bias in an exhibit (content) as one way their thinking had changed. In fact, Khan credited the HTM’s strong influence on how he examined exhibits: “It makes me think of the bias behind everything.” Indira was concerned with missing viewpoints and the racial and gender aspects of exhibits. The second most cited area students felt their thinking was improved addressed connection. For example, Harriet felt connection was a significant part of analyzing an exhibit “because it can make you more interested and you can see
how your opinion differs.” One final area addressed was context. As will be seen in the
discussion below, students also found this a difficult topic to address. However, these
students understood its value. Sima appeared to be referencing the context of an exhibit’s
topic (prompt #12) when she wrote that the HTM taught her to “understand how different
events in history are linked with different causes,” and Khan recognized that “the context
of events have influenced the site’s bias and my bias” (prompt #13). It was clear from
the interview that the HTM had taught them the importance of understanding perspective
in content, looking for connections, and considering context.

The second interview prompt asked students to identify which prompts they found
most difficult to answer. Nineteen of the prompts were mentioned in the student
responses. However, two prompts received the most attention. First, prompt #13, which
had students consider the historical context of when the exhibit was created, was
identified six times. For example, Carl mentioned in his analysis of the Wade Hampton
Monument that it “would not have been created in the present day where African
Americans are considered completely equal.” He was acknowledging that racial attitudes
have changed since 1906 when the monument was erected. My field journal confirmed
that students often had difficulty with this question for it required students know their
history and consider what might be relevant to the exhibit they were analyzing. This
often required research on their part. Second, prompt #12, was identified three times. It
had students consider the historical context of the exhibit’s topic. For example, the
Women’s Vietnam Memorial would make little sense if one did not know about the
Vietnam War and society’s views toward women in the 1960s and 1970s. Exactly what
needs to be done to help students with these two prompts will be addressed in Chapter 5.
The third prompt on the interview asked for students to provide their thoughts about the HTM and sites we had visited or ones they recommended for the future. Revisions to the HTM will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5, but ten students suggested changes, and six of them (Frank, Harriet, Larry, Mary, Ranjit, and Watson) implied or advocated for it to be shortened. While Watson wanted prompt #16 on design deleted, the others felt the HTM was long and redundant. For example, Frank suggested to “change/take out some of the questions since some of the questions have the same answers,” and Mary observed that “the HTM is too many questions I feel as if some of the questions were repeated but they did not have to be.” Ranjit’s concern was slightly different: “it takes usually several days to finish one HTM Analysis, so it would be in best interest of time to shorten the questions and combine some of the questions.”

Concerning the selection of sites, student recommendations included exhibits on World War II, Thurgood Marshall, Rosa Parks, the slave trade, and George Washington as well as a 9/11 monument. The students’ comments on both the HTM and future exhibits to analyze will be considered and addressed in the next chapter.

4.11 Conclusions

The guiding Research Question of this action research study was as follows: How did the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) change eighth grade students into critical thinkers during field experiences at historical sites and museums? It was obvious that the HTM provided students a structured guide that required them to analyze exhibits and engage in the six C’s of historical thinking - creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism. The students showed they could address all of these types of historical thinking. Their one recurring weakness was the need to be more detailed in
their answers. The preceding analysis and student interview responses certainly support
the conclusion that students’ thinking did change.

Table 4.1: Content Note-Taking on Hagler Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fact #</th>
<th>Fact Description</th>
<th>Number of Students Who Addressed It</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>He was called King Hagler.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>His lifespan covered c1700-1763.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>He was the chief of the Catawba.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>His rule lasted from 1750-1753.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>He was known as the “Patron Saint of Camden.”</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>He was known as a “brave warrior.”</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>He was also known as a “peacemaker.”</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>He was inducted into the South Carolina Hall of Fame.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Camden is in Kershaw County.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Catawba clothing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Catawba jewelry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Catawba head feathers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Catawba pottery</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Catawba traded with the white colonists.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: How Students Performed Taking Notes on Content of Hagler Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Number of Facts in Notes</th>
<th>Percentage (out of 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehru</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank, Sid, and Sima</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indira, LeBron and Taylor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel and Ranjit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl and Mary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS, ACTION PLAN, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will first briefly summarize the problem of practice, purpose statement, research question, methodology, data collection plan, and coding scheme. Most of its emphasis will concern an overall summary of the study’s findings from Chapter 4, an action plan laying out the next cycle of this study, and suggestions for further research.

Problem of practice. One effective way to study history and get students more interested in it is to leave the school campus and visit places where the past took place and where effort is taken to remember it. This can be done one of two ways – physically traveling to the sites themselves or if logistics or finances are not conducive to use virtual means such as the internet or digital photographs. In the case of the former, I annually take 70 or so students each year to Washington, DC where we visited the expected sites – the Capitol, the National Archives, Ford’s Theatre, the Holocaust Museum, the various Smithsonian Museums, Mount Vernon, and numerous memorials. One challenge of this field study and those like it is how to use them in an academically responsible way. In other words, what should be done to prepare students for the trip; what should they do while visiting the sites; and what types of follow-up activities should be used? While I certainly want students to learn important content, the main problem of practice is how to use these actual and virtual trips to improve students’ historical thinking. They need to
understand and approach public displays of history as interpretations of the past (Marcus, 2007).

**Purpose statement.** This action research student had three important purposes. First, it used the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) guide (see Appendix A) to train students in how to think critically when examining an actual or virtual historical site. Second, it was hoped that it would aid students in their development as cognitive citizens who critically question and discuss issues rather than being ‘easy marks for snake-oil vendors of all persuasions” (p. 83). Finally, this study resulted in an action plan whereby I will help other teachers do the same with their students. I have already applied to present this action research study at a district in-service in August 2018 and at the annual conference of the South Carolina Council of the Social Studies in the fall 2018.

**Research question.** In order to help students become better critical thinkers on actual and virtual field trips to historical sites and museums, the following Research Question guided this study:

**RQ1:** How does the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) change eighth grade students into critical thinkers during field experiences at historical sites and museums?

In essence, this action research study described how students’ critical thinking changed because of their use of the HTM during their examination of historical sites and museums in person or virtually through the internet or digital photography.

**Methodology.** This action research study followed Mertler’s (2014) four step process of planning, acting, developing, and reflecting, which should not be conceived as linear, but iterative. This study consisted of two main cycles. “Cycle 1: Preparation”
lasted from spring 2016 through the summer 2017, during which I read the professional literature, developed the HTM, looked into potential sites for the students to analyze, and even had my students use an early version of the HTM on a virtual trip to a monument. “Cycle 2: Answering the Research Question” consisted of the 2017-2018 school year and is the focus of this dissertation. It consisted on nine activities, one to establish a baseline of the students’ historical thinking skills, another to introduce the Historical Thinking Method (HTM), six to provide practice using the HTM, and a final activity without the HTM to compare to their initial baseline analysis. For a more detailed description of the study and the exhibits themselves, consult Chapters 3 and 4, respectively.

Data collection and coding. The data collected in this study came from one class of 15 students, six females and nine males, whom I referred to using pseudonyms. The class exhibited racial diversity with three African Americans (Harriet, LeBron, and Mary), six Asian Americans (Indira, Khan, Nehru, Ranjit, Sid, and Sima), five Whites (Carl, Frank, Larry, Rachel, and Taylor), and one biracial student (Watson). The qualitative data itself consisted of teacher field notes, student analyses of the Bill of Rights exhibit and the monuments on the State House grounds, written responses on their Washington, DC sites and State House monuments, essays on the fate of the Benjamin Tillman State House statue, HTM responses for seven sites, final written interview answers, and their letters to a U.S. senator on whether one of South Carolina’s Capitol statues should be replaced. The data itself was coded according to the six historical concerns of the HTM – creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism.
5.2 Summary of the Study’s Findings

Now that the necessary background on the study has been provided, this discussion will turn to summarizing the study’s findings using the codes discussed above.

**Historical thinking involving sites’ creation.** Throughout the analysis of the different sites, students began to grow in their examination of its creation. Creation is most concerned with answering questions concerning who created an exhibit; when and why it was created; and the significance of its location. In their baseline *Bill of Rights and You* analysis, none of the students addressed any of these topics concerning the exhibit itself, but focused on its topic the Bill of Rights. In contrast, in their State House monuments, 13 students answered the who and why prompts; eight correctly identified the date; 12 wrote about the location; and 8 attempted to discuss the location’s significance. While they did a solid job, they needed to be more detailed in their answers. For example, when discussing an exhibit’s creators, they should have found out everyone who was involved in the process – the sponsors and the artists themselves. A date should include a month, day, and year if all three were provided. Finally, discussion of an exhibit’s location and why this particular place was significant needed more consistent and detailed attention.

**Historical thinking involving sites’ context.** The students were typically successful in discussing the context of an exhibit’s topic. However, sometimes they would only consider part of the context. For example, in their analysis of Robert Smalls’s exhibit, they recognized that the Civil War was the background of his story, but they did not include the Reconstruction and Gilded Age eras when he was politically active. At other times, they may have just wrote down a general topic and not explained
it. Early in the process, I may have told them listing the topics was okay, but I want them to do more so I will need to clarify the directions in the revised HTM, which I discuss below. Furthermore, they needed to improve in their discussion of the exhibit’s context. Often these exhibit addressed topics related to race, and students had this idea that race issues were better than the reality indicates. They needed a more thorough understanding of the modern racial context. When one compares their analyses of the Bill of Rights and You exhibit and the State House monuments, one finds that in the former 13 students addressed the topic’s historical context versus the 15 who did so at the end of the study. None of the students mentioned the context of the Bill of Rights exhibit, but seven did touch upon the context of the State House monuments. Once again, students had grown in this type of historical thinking, but needed further practice.

**Historical thinking involving sites’ content.** There are six major areas in the content section – 1) an exhibit’s bias with evidence, 2) how its design communicated its perspective, 3) missing viewpoints, 4) relationship to race and gender/sex, 5) factual note-taking, and 6) questions. Comparing how students did in their analyses of the Bill of Rights and You exhibit and the State House monuments reveals improvements in five of the six areas (see Table 5.1) with the greatest gain in recognizing an exhibit’s bias, although students needed to improve in explaining the evidence. The biggest decrease was developing questions. However, this may be misleading because students were instructed in the baseline activity to write down thoughts and questions as analyzed the exhibit. In addition, there were areas that needed to be improved such as limiting the missing viewpoints to those most important to the issue. They also needed to remember that the questions they wrote should have asked for what was not covered in the
preparation work and exhibit itself and should have been written in a way that required more than a yes or no answer. Identifying and explaining key text that revealed the creators’ main point could have been improved. In general, students needed to be more detailed in their answers and take notes in their own words. While they had made progress in analyzing content, there were still areas that could use improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Areas</th>
<th>Bill of Rights and You</th>
<th>State House Monument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An exhibit’s bias with evidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 (Bias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How its design communicated its perspective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing viewpoints</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to race and gender/sex</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factual note-taking</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historical thinking involving connection to sites.** Teenagers often have a tendency to have strong opinions so it was no surprise that students had their own views toward the topics of these exhibits. In fact, while only eleven students made some type of connection with the *Bill of Rights and You* exhibit, 14 students expressed their opinion about a State House monument. Ten students, however, did not venture further. The remaining five students did with two addressing what influenced their opinions, four discussing emotions, three relating their monument to the present, and two recommending an action they could take. Sima addressed all four of these topics followed by Taylor who included three. Students continued to struggle with relating an
exhibit’s topic to a contemporary one and deciding how they, at their age and in their situation, might act to effect change concerning this issue.

**Historical thinking involving corroboration of sites.** The students made great progress in addressing an exhibit’s reliability. In their *Bill of Rights and You* exhibit, none of them addressed corroboration at all. In their final analysis of the State House monument, 13 at least mentioned the topic, seven fact-checked with at least one source, and seven recognized that excluding information should be considered when determining reliability. Students had grown in this area and needed to continue to do so.

**Historical thinking involving criticism of sites.** The students made some good suggestions to improve the exhibits. For example, exhibits can always benefit from more primary source quotes, and while much thought goes into design, the public often has suggestions that would make a site a better experience. Khan made a valid suggestion to add more primary source quotes from Septima Clark to her South Carolina Hall of Fame exhibit so that viewers could see “her personality and what she was like.” When one considers that only four of the 15 students touched upon criticism in their *Bill of Rights and You* analysis while 11 students did so in their State House monument exercise, it easy to conclude that students had grown in this component of historical thinking.

### 5.3 Action Plan: Implications of the Study’s Findings

The second cycle of this action research study – “Answering the Research Question” - has been concluded, and in keeping with Mertler’s (2014) model, I moved from the acting stage into the development stage of the next cycle of this study as I reflected upon what I learned thus far. There are a number of steps that I will take for this upcoming school year.
Revising the Historical Thinking Method. First, the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) handout needed to be revised based on its use this past cycle. For the purposes of the following discussion, the version of the HTM used in this dissertation’s action research study will be referred to as HTM 1.0 and the newly-revised one HTM 2.0. At the top of the HTM 2.0’s first page, directions were added so students would understand what “explain” means. One of the recurring problems with HTM 1.0 was that students were not detailed enough in some of their answers. In the new version, they are instructed:

In the prompts below, you will often see the verb “EXPLAIN.” Keep in mind that it means more than a single statement. It means you should offer reasons, multiple examples, or details that help the reader understand why you wrote your initial statement.

It is hoped that this explanation will encourage students to write more complete answers. In addition, the word “explain” appears in bold capital letters and underlined each time it is used in HTM 2.0.

There are a number of revisions in the creation section of the HTM. Uncertain of the name of LeBron’s African American Museum exhibit led me to requesting that information in prompt #1. For the next prompt, students are told to consider what they read in preparation for the analysis and then to explain their personal opinion. In addition, because the verb “explain” is discussed at the top of HTM 2.0, the phrase “in detail” was eliminated. The text of prompt #3 was rearranged, the suggestion to draw a sketch deleted, and the use of cellphones to take photographs inserted. Students are also instructed to “make sure the images are focused, and you can read any text in the
photographs” based on the poor quality of images LeBron shared with me of his
Smithsonian exhibit. For prompt #4 on who created the exhibit, I added further
clarification based on what students left out in their analyses. They are told that the
creators of a monument usually includes “a group of people who sponsor or oversee it,
and then there are artist(s) who physically make it.” Prompts #5 and #6, which address
why and when an exhibit was created, were reversed because it appeared to be a more
logical order. In addition, students are told to “include a month, day, and year” because
the sample group sometimes did not do so. Prompt #7 on the significance of the exhibit’s
location and surroundings was split into two questions. The first one asks students to
identify where the exhibit is located followed by a second one that requests they discuss
“the significance of the exhibit’s location or immediate surroundings.” This change was
made because I realized that the original wording did not always encourage both
elements. Finally, prompts #9 through 11 were eliminated for several reasons. Students
did not have the artistic and architectural backgrounds to answer these questions; time
constraints make the effort to provide such background expendable; and any important
similarities the exhibit may share with other sites could be covered in prompt #14 of
HTM 2.0 that asks for students to consider how the design reinforces the viewpoint of the
creators. These were the major changes of the creation section of the HTM.

The only significant change to the context section of the HTM was to add the
word “EXPLAIN” at the beginning of both prompts. From this point forward, prompt
numbers will refer to HTM 2.0 unless otherwise specified. It is hoped that students will
elaborate on how topics relate to the historical context of the topic and the exhibit itself.
The next section of the HTM addresses content, and a number of revisions were made. First, students are clearly told that viewpoint, perspective, and bias will be considered synonyms in the HTM 2.0 and that “these can be stated or implied.” Because students often did not discuss how an exhibit’s text illustrated bias and Watson thought a quote had to be words the historical figure actually said rather than any words on a monument, I changed the wording of prompt #12 to: “EXPLAIN the viewpoint, perspective, or bias of the exhibit. Try to include sample text to show the viewpoint, perspective, or bias of a source and EXPLAIN how the text communicates this viewpoint, perspective, or bias.” Furthermore, any time a prompt refers to bias it uses the phrase “viewpoint, perspective, or bias.” Prompt #15 asks for students to write what evidence or information the creators included in the exhibit to support their viewpoint, but students often answered with quotes, which was my fault because I was not consistent in my explanations. In order to assure that quotes are used in the previous prompt, students are instructed clearly “Do NOT write quotes.” Prompt #15 originally asked for “any key quote(s) that really capture the essence of what this exhibit is telling you.” With some exhibits such as the Wade Hampton Monument conveying their viewpoint with visual elements more so than text, I revised this prompt to allow for that possibility. I retained the direction to explain their answers but this directive was in underlined, bold capital letters. Prompt #16 continued to ask for missing viewpoints, and in response to Sima’s tendency to write a long list I added, “However, make sure that they are relevant and important to the exhibit’s topic. This should NOT be a long list and might be just a single group.” Prompt #18 on taking notes of the exhibit’s factual information was given an addendum: “Do NOT summarize or generalize. Write these in your own words in
note-format. This is important because later you will compare the information in these notes to the sources you read before analyzing this exhibit.” It is hoped that these new instructions will solve some of the issues the sample group had with taking notes.

Finally, prompt #19 on writing questions was further clarified in a number of ways:

- Do NOT dismiss this prompt. Keep thinking until you have at least one question.
- You do not know everything about the topic. What else could you learn about?
- These questions should be able to be answered through research. Also be sure to write these questions so they ask for more than a yes or no answer. For example, do not start a question with “did.” Finally, make sure that your question was not answered in the reading you did prior to this activity or in the exhibit itself.

It is hoped that students will write better questions and avoid the pitfalls of the sample group. These changes in HTM 2.0 addressed key issues noticed in the analysis of the data in this action research study.

The next section of the HTM is connection, and three of its prompts were revised. Prompt #22 no longer asks students to describe what “emotions and thoughts” they experienced in analyzing an exhibit. “Thoughts” was deleted because by the time they reach this prompt in the HTM, they have already been discussing them. Furthermore, unless one is examining a traumatic exhibit like those at the Holocaust Museum, most people do not experience strong emotions so the word “attitudes” was added in lieu of “thoughts.” It seemed to be the best word to describe reactions in between emotions and thoughts. The prompt also now emphasizes for students to “EXPLAIN what in the exhibit’s text, design, and/or artifacts prompts this reaction.” This clarification helps students know how to explain what it was in the exhibit that led to their reactions. Next,
students often had trouble answering the prompt #23 in which they connect it to the modern day. To help them along, some guidance was provided: “It might be a big idea like morality, racism, or sexism, or it could be a similar situation in the news.” Finally, to combat the tendency for students to become confused or make general suggestions of what they might do about this connection (prompt #24), they are instructed to “EXPLAIN specifically what you, as a teenager, might do about this connection. This may take some thought. That’s okay.” With these new revisions and clarifications, students will have a better opportunity of analyzing their connection to an exhibit more thoroughly.

_Corroboration_ in the HTM was the next section to be revised. Because students used the sources they were provided in the preparation assignment, it made little sense to have them list these sources, so prompt #27 of HTM 1.0 was deleted, and the next prompt (#25 of HTM 2.0) was rewritten for them to consult these background texts. In prompt #26, students are given a list of items to consider in deciding on whether an exhibit is reliable – the accuracy, exclusion, or inclusion of facts; perspective or bias; how well its viewpoint is supported; missing perspectives; and “its relationship to race and gender/sex.” Then students are given three guiding options to help them discuss an exhibit’s reliability: “This exhibit is NOT reliable because . . . This exhibit IS reliable, BUT . . . This exhibit IS reliable because . . .” HTM 2.0 now provides more scaffolding for students in their consideration of an exhibit’s reliability.

The final section of the HTM is _criticism_. There were some minor adjustments made to help students in their critiquing of an exhibit. The most substantial revision was made to the final prompt of the HTM. Originally, it asked for students to “explain any
changes that might make it better.” In an effort to help students think more deeply about their suggestions, it was changed to: “EXPLAIN any changes that might make it better. In other words, what would you tell the creator of the exhibit (i.e., content scholar, visual artist, landscape artist, and sculptor). Be as specific as possible.” By having them imagine such conversations, it is hoped they will be inclined to put more thought and details in their responses.

HTM 2.0 is now three questions shorter at 29, which the sample class of this action research study would most likely appreciate for a number of them suggested shortening it in their written interview responses. In addition, it has been reformatted from one large table to separate ones for each of the six C’s – creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism. Taylor recommended that there “be questions that help transition to next portions (Creation, Context, Content, Connection, Corroboration, and Criticism).” Perhaps the questions that had been vertically next to each section will serve as that needed transition between them now that they appear horizontally at the top of each table. HTM 2.0 will be unveiled in the 2018-2019 school year, but the reader can see it if he or she consults Appendix AA.

**Other issues needing to be addressed.** In addition to a revision of the HTM, a number of issues need to be addressed as the next cycle approaches. One of a teacher’s most important responsibilities is to monitor the progress of his or her students. In the preceding discussion, nothing was written about how student analyses were assessed. During cycle 1, most of the grading involved checking it off that they turned in the HTM. I also graded their Washington, DC analysis papers, Tillman Monument argumentative paragraphs, and how well they addressed contextualization and point of view in their
Robert Smalls and Septima Poinsette Clark HTM analyses. My magnet program uses a series of cognitive skill rubrics developed by a school system in northern California and Stanford University. For example, attention to detail is classified as “precision.” I have sometimes modified these rubrics for my class assignments, and I used some of them in the evaluation of this study’s assignments. What remains to be done is a more systematic way of evaluating student progress in using the HTM. Considering that the HTM is a rather lengthy tool, the 70 or so students I teach each year, and the finite amount of time available, one of the major goals in the next cycle of this action research study is to adjust the rubrics if needed and organize the logistics of evaluating students on a more regular basis. For example, it might involve grading a different one of the six C’s – creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism – each time students analyze a historical site or museum exhibit.

To help them improve their scores on connection, they are going to need to know more about what is going on in the state, nation, and world today. In other words, if students are going to find similarities between the past and the present, they need to better understand today’s issues. This means they need to be watching, listening, or reading about current events on a more regular basis. I am going to need to find some way to include this component in an already full curriculum. However, I have found modern examples an invaluable way to help students see the relevance of studying social studies. If students are going to improve in connection, room and time are going to have to be found to address current events.

Another adjustment to the curriculum is make exhibit analysis more authentic. Perhaps I could invite a museum curator to visit my classes and explain how exhibits are
designed and created. This would be an excellent way to prepare them for the many museums we will visit in Washington, DC. It is possible that I might be able to do the same with someone who has experience in the design of monuments. In addition, I could have students create their own museum exhibits (e.g. Marcus, Stoddard, & Woodward, 2012, p. 49) so they could learn firsthand that these representations of history are as subjective as the textbooks and documentaries with which they are familiar. In addition, I could also have them create monuments, an activity I have had them do in the past. Combined with the HTM activities, students would have a multi-faceted curriculum on historical sites and museums.

Finally, a familiar refrain throughout my analysis was that students had made progress but there was room for improvement. The students only had seven experiences with the HTM so perhaps I need use it more often in the curriculum. It might also be helpful to post an exemplary HTM with pictures of the exhibit it was used to analyze so that students could see what a quality analysis looks like. Similarly, I could implement a more systematic study that adheres to the Gradual Release Model, in which I clearly delineate the following steps:

I DO- where the teacher models the lesson objective in a focus lesson, WE DO-guided instruction with both input from the teacher and the students, YOU DO TOGETHER: Collaborative learning in small groups or partners and YOU DO ALONE- independent practice. (“Gradual Release Model, n.d.)

In addition, having students redo work that is not detailed enough at the beginning of the year might improve the quality of their answers. To combat the tendency to plagiarize notes, I will need to develop some lessons which remind them of how to take notes and
create short activities to reinforce this skill. It is hoped that next year’s group of students will benefit from wisdom gained in this action research study.

5.4 Suggestions for Future Research

There are several areas that merit further research and reading. On the HTM, there is a section where students address connection in an effort to make history more relevant and interesting. However, there is always a danger of presentism, where one forgets that the past is not the equivalent of the present. Barton and Levstik (2004) discuss the idea of empathy and the dangers of not including it in the teaching of the past. In addition, Endacott (2010) has written on this subject and a re-reading of his work and a search for others who have examined this topic in a fair and even-handed manner might provide more insight into how to develop empathy in my students without succumbing to presentism.

Next, the debate over how history is remembered in the naming of schools and streets as well as monuments is a topic that continues to appear in the news (Hauser, 2018, June 19). During this action research study, students addressed this issue when they wrote their arguments concerning the fate of the Tillman Monument. How can social justice and the remembering of an imperfect past be balanced? In other words, how do we publicly remember and honor the historical contributions of imperfect people who did good things but also held beliefs antithetical to modern social morality? Furthermore, how can the teacher guide students in addressing these controversial and perhaps volatile issues? Chapter 2’s literature review touched on this topic as has Hess (2009). Future stages of this ongoing action research study will need to involve more reading on this topic.
This action research study would also benefit from more exhibit options. It focused on 22 different sites – the National Archives and Records Administration’s *Bill or Rights and You*; Eliza Lucas Pinckney’s exhibit at the South Carolina Hall of Fame; Chief Hagler’s statue; three exhibits at the Holocaust Museum; the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial; the Lincoln Memorial; the Vietnam Women’s Memorial; three exhibits at the African American Museum; *The Dilemma of Slavery* at Mount Vernon; the Smithsonian’s *A Woman’s War*; “To the Faithful Slaves” monument in Fort Mill, South Carolina; the Benjamin Tillman Monument on the State House grounds; Robert Smalls and Septima Clark’s exhibit at the South Carolina Hall of Fame; and the African American, Confederate Women, Strom Thurmond, and Wade Hampton Monuments on the State House grounds. However, there are so many more sites, both actual and virtual. For example, the South Carolina Hall of Fame features exhibits on four African American women, eight African American men, and 15 white women. There are a plethora of other historical sites that provide opportunities for critical thinking because of their inaccuracies or socially unjust past (Loewen, 1999). Future research in the next cycles of this action research study may involve road trips and photography to provide students with options to analyze using future versions of the HTM.

Finally, I mentioned earlier that one of the purposes of this action research study was to share the HTM with other teachers so they could train their students to think critically about historical sites and museum exhibits. At first glance, it might be argued that the advanced reading ability of this study’s sample makes it applicability to other students questionable. After all, these 15 students were quite advanced in their reading skills. Their MAP reading percentiles ranged from 83% to 99% with an average of
94.2%. Three of them scored in the 80\textsuperscript{th} percentile while 12 were in the 90\textsuperscript{th} percentile (Frontline Education, 2016). With seven activities to learn the HTM, even these academically advanced students still showed areas needing improvement. The context and results of this action research study might give a teacher of average or below average readers pause when considering the use of the HTM and exhibits in his or her classroom.

What should be remembered, though, is that students need not be advanced readers to think critically. VanSledright (2002) experienced success with a diverse group of fifth graders. While he taught 23 students in the classroom, his data was collected from eight students who read below, at, and above grade level, including English Language Learners. As one might expect, the students varied in their success in thinking critically about primary and secondary sources. However, the point was that using an inquiry method to teach history proved to be worthwhile with these students. Teaching is about pushing students into Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development (Driscoll, 2000) so that they can grow cognitively. It is the teacher’s job to create lessons that do so. Claiming that students’ reading levels are too low and that critical thinking is beyond their cognitive abilities are self-fulfilling prophecies. The key is to provide the necessary support so that students can begin to move in the right direction. Every teacher knows best what his or her students need when it comes to scaffolding, but there are some steps that teachers can take to make the HTM and activities like those described in this dissertation more accessible to students of varying reading levels. For example, rather than overwhelming students with the revised HTM and its 29 questions at one time, a teacher could split the 6C’s (creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism) onto separate pieces of paper. When students successfully finished one part,
they could then get the next one from the teacher. Another method could have students focus on only a few of the C’s for an exhibit rather than address all six with every activity. To help students with challenging text, the teacher could also provide glossaries and go over the passages to make sure students understand what they are reading. For an example of using glossaries, the reader is encouraged to see the appendices (i.e., Appendix Q). The teacher also needs to be wise in the selection of exhibits. For example, if one looks at the texts of the Strom Thurmond versus the Confederate Women’s Monuments (Appendices Q and R, respectively), it is quite obvious that the former is more straightforward and easier to read and comprehend than the latter. However, learning to recognize bias and subjectivity can be done with either monument. Finally, the teacher must be active and mobile during these lessons. Walking around, listening attentively, and asking probing and guiding questions are key actions a teacher must take in inquiry activities. Using the HTM to analyze exhibits demands both student and teacher involvement. This pedagogy takes time and effort, but cognitive and citizenship growth make the expenditure a wise investment for both the student and our democratic society, which depends upon an educated and thinking citizenry.

Another concern in using the HTM to analyze historical sites and museum exhibits could be student motivation. The students in this study knew that their work was the data for my dissertation and truly wanted to help me out. I use students’ enjoyment of my class and relevancy to encourage motivation. It also helps that my students are typically motivated to achieve academically. However, this raises the same question addressed in the previous paragraph concerning how a teacher could use the HTM with students who might not be as motivated as the students in this research sample. Two
strategies that proved effective in this study involved choice and controversy. In the case of the former, students were allowed to choose exhibits to analyze on the Washington, DC field trip (actual) and the State House grounds (virtual). Providing students options gives them a sense of control and efficacy. Controversy came into play when students tackled whether the Benjamin Tillman Monument should be removed, allowed to stay as is, or stay but revised in some way. Teachers who want to understand how to better motivate students in using the HTM or just in general are encouraged to examine Keller’s (as cited in Driscoll, 2000, pp. 327-337) model – Attention, Relevance, Confidence, and Satisfaction (ARCS). An important fact to keep in mind is that every group of students is different and what it takes to motivate them to critically think about historical sites and museums might be different. ARCS is a useful approach to determine what a teacher might do to encourage students to do their part in the learning process.

5.5 Conclusion

In the beginning of this action research study, I faced a problem of practice. How could I be a responsible history teacher and use off campus field trips to teach students to think critically about society’s subjective exhibits on the past? Intense reading, a great deal of thought, and interaction with students led to the creation and development of the Historical Thinking Method and its use with actual and virtual historical sites and museums. Over the course of the 2017-2018 school year, the fifteen students in this sample group – Carl, Frank, Harriet, Indira, Khan, Larry, LeBron, Mary, Nehru, Rachel, Ranjit, Sid, Sima, Taylor, and Watson – engaged in a baseline activity, seven analyses using the HTM, and a final baseline activity. They showed growth in their historical thinking. They began to understand that historical sites and museums were subjective
sources that involved more than factual information. Along the way, they also began to think more about social justice issues. Mertler (2014) wrote that “a goal of every classroom teacher should be to improve her or his professional practice as well as student outcomes. Action research is an effective means by which this can be accomplished” (p. 13). This action research study has dramatically enhanced my understanding of historical thinking and improved my use of historical sites and museums, including the regular use of virtual ones. It will be exciting to see how next year’s group of students grow in their historical thinking and how the HTM and the sites we visit continue to evolve.
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APPENDIX A
THE HISTORICAL THINKING METHOD (HTM)
FOR HISTORICAL SITES AND MUSEUMS

On this handout, a historic site, museum display, monument, etc. will be referred to as an “exhibit.” Exhibits may include different components such as text, visual images (photographs or artwork), artifacts, sculpture, or architectural elements, which will be referred to as “items” in this handout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Concerns</th>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READ FIRST: Carefully examine the exhibit before answering any questions. Then, as you work through the guide, keep in mind that some questions may be inapplicable, be unanswerable, overlap, or require additional research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Creation | 1) What are you looking at (a historic site, museum display, monument, etc.)?  
2) Before you begin to analyze this exhibit, explain in detail your personal view of the exhibit’s topic.  
3) Describe this exhibit so that someone could close his/her eyes and visualize it based on your description. It might be helpful to draw a rough sketch, collect maps or pamphlets, or take photographs if allowed. Be sure to include text, visual images (photographs or artwork), artifacts, sculpture, or architectural elements in your description.  
4) Who (person or group) created this exhibit and its items?  
5) Why were the exhibit and items created?  
6) When were the exhibit and items created?  
7) What is the significance of the exhibit’s location or immediate surroundings?  
If this exhibit is a monument, memorial, or building, answer #8-11. If not, skip to #12.  
8) What is the story behind its creation?  
9) Does it remind you of other buildings, architecture, sculpture, art, or literature?  
10) If so, explain why YOU think it was designed this way.  
11) Explain if research connects the design of this exhibit to the influence of other buildings, architecture, sculpture, art, or literature. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Context</strong></th>
<th><strong>Content</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is this exhibit’s relation to history?</td>
<td>As you begin to answer these questions, pay attention to any characteristics that may emphasize something. For example, textual exhibits may use headings, bold print, large size font, etc. In other exhibits, architectural elements may play an important role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) What was going on in history that will help you understand the <strong>topic</strong> of this exhibit?</td>
<td>14) What point of view/perspective/claims (stated or implied) does this exhibit make? In other words, explain the bias of the exhibit. Remember, bias can be conveyed by words and tone as well as the inclusion or exclusion of certain facts. Include sample quote(s) if applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) What was going on in history at the time the <strong>exhibit</strong> was created or preserved that could help you understand it?</td>
<td>15) What evidence or information is offered in support of the point of view/perspective/claims (stated or implied)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) How do the design elements of the exhibit reinforce its point of view?</td>
<td>17) What viewpoints or perspectives are <strong>NOT</strong> addressed in this exhibit? These could include those of women, other minority groups, or other interpretations of the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) How does the exhibit relate positively or negatively to race or sex/gender?</td>
<td>19) What additional information does this exhibit provide? This is when you take <strong>DETAILED</strong> notes on <strong>ALL</strong> the information the exhibit provides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Write down any key quote(s) that really capture the essence of what this exhibit is telling you. Explain why you selected this/these quote(s).</td>
<td>21) What questions does this exhibit raise in your mind but does not answer? These questions should be able to be answered through research. Also be sure to write these questions in an open-ended way that would require an explanatory answer as opposed to a simple one word or yes/no one.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Connection | 22) How is the exhibit’s viewpoint or perspective similar to or different from your own?  
23) What personal influences have led you to having your viewpoint or perspective?  
24) What emotions and/or thoughts do you experience as you analyze what this exhibit tells you about the past? What in the exhibit prompts this reaction?  
25) Explain any connection you can make from this exhibit to the present day.  
26) Explain what you might do about this connection. |
|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Corroboration | 27) What other specific sources of information on this same topic could you examine? List these sources.  
28) Compare and contrast this exhibit with these other sources of information. What do they disagree on?  
29) Look back at #14-15, 17-19, and 28. Discuss the reliability of this exhibit. |
| Criticism | 30) Explain why you think the exhibit does or does not do a good job in addressing the topic.  
31) Explain what you find impressive about this exhibit and why.  
32) Explain any changes that might make it better. |
APPENDIX B
THE BILL OF RIGHTS PREPARATION ACTIVITY

Tomorrow, you are going to be examining an exhibit on the Bill of Rights developed by the National Archives. To prepare, you will need to consult and read some websites as well as the Bill of Rights itself. Ultimately, you will analyze and evaluate the exhibit, which can be accessed virtually online and seen in the lobby of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, located on Parklane Road, only a couple of miles down the street from Dent. What do I mean by analyze and evaluate? Well, let me provide the definitions of these two words (the first definition compliments of Google):

**Analyze**
“Examine methodically and in detail the constitution [the makeup or content] or structure of (something, especially information), typically for purposes of explanation and interpretation [explaining the meaning of something].”

**Evaluate**
Judge the quality of something.

The following sources as well as the attached copy of the Bill of Rights and a student friendly version will help you prepare for the analysis and evaluation of the exhibit. Read these sources carefully, taking whatever notes you need to help you understand the story of how and why these amendments were added and what they mean.

You will have this class period to prepare. If you need more time, finish this at home. As always, if there is something you don’t understand, please ask me to help you. That’s what I’m here for. I would recommend that you read through a source before writing anything down. You will receive a “Preparation” grade for your efforts on this assignment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Text</th>
<th>Where It Can Be Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill of Rights Student Handout</td>
<td>Scroll to the next two pages of this document. I will also provide a paper copy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The History Channel's article “The Bill of Rights.”</td>
<td><a href="http://www.history.com/topics/bill-of-rights">http://www.history.com/topics/bill-of-rights</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your First Amendment Rights</td>
<td><a href="http://judiciallearningcenter.org/your-1st-amendment-rights/">http://judiciallearningcenter.org/your-1st-amendment-rights/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the National Archives</td>
<td><a href="https://www.archives.gov/about">https://www.archives.gov/about</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bill of Rights Student Handout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Original Amendment</th>
<th>Kid-Friendly Version*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.</td>
<td>See <a href="http://quatr.us/northamerica/after1500/government/billofrights.htm">http://quatr.us/northamerica/after1500/government/billofrights.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing</td>
<td>Mr. Hicks’s Clarification: Then the judge will issue a warrant, which is a document that allows for the search. The rules for students at school are different. An administrator only has to have “reasonable suspicion” to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; no person shall be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hicks’s Clarification: This is not a Grand Jury, but a trial jury. If a Grand Jury thinks there is enough evidence to justify having a trial, it votes to charge you. Then there is a trial with another jury who will decide your innocence or guilt. If this second jury finds you “not guilty,” then the government CANNOT try you again because to do so puts you in danger of losing your life, freedom, or property again. This is called “double jeopardy” and is NOT allowed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hicks’s Clarification: Not saying “anything at your trial” is sometimes called “pleading the fifth.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hicks’s Clarification: The legal process – trial by jury – is often referred to as “due process.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 6 | In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; | conduct a search. They do NOT need a warrant. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Mr. Hicks’s Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.</td>
<td>A defendant can have the court order a witness to appear in court through a document called a “subpoena.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.</td>
<td>In other words, a lawsuit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.</td>
<td>Bail is money a defendant can pay to the court to be allowed to stay out of prison until his or her case is decided by trial as long as the defendant does not try to run away or not show up to the trial. If he or she does either, the court sends law enforcement officers to arrest him or her, and the defendant will then be imprisoned again and lose the money he or she paid to be temporarily free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.</td>
<td>If the Constitution doesn’t say the federal government can do it, then that power belongs to the states or people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First of all, take five minutes to review your preparation notes and “The Bill of Rights Student Handout” from yesterday. Next, I want you to access the Bill of Rights online exhibit that can be found at the following URL:

https://www.archives.gov/amending-america/visit/bill-of-rights-pop-up
As you examine and read over the exhibit, I want you to analyze and evaluate it. Remember what these two words mean.

**Analyze**
“Examine methodically and in detail the constitution [the makeup or content] or structure of (something, especially information), typically for purposes of explanation and interpretation [explaining the meaning of something].”

**Evaluate**
Judge the quality of something.

As you examine, read, analyze, and evaluate the exhibit, jot down any thoughts that enter your mind about it. These may be written in note format rather than in complete sentences. Just make it clear what you mean.

This assignment should be done independently with no communication with other students. As always, if you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to ask me. If you need more paper than the bottom section and back of this page, please feel free to continue your writing on another sheet of paper.
APPENDIX C
ELIZA LUCAS PINCKNEY MUSEUM EXHIBIT

Eliza Lucas Pinckney

Today and tomorrow we are going to analyze an exhibit on a colonial woman named Eliza Lucas Pinckney. This exhibit can be found at the South Carolina Hall of Fame located in Myrtle Beach. First, let’s begin by familiarizing ourselves with the South Carolina Hall of Fame (SCHOF). Access it at the following URL:

http://www.theofficialschalloffame.com/history.html

Look at the photograph of what the SCHOF looks like and then read the section entitled “History Of The South Carolina Hall Of Fame.”

Before we look at her exhibit, let’s read about Eliza Lucas Pinckney. Start with the biography from the South Carolina Encyclopedia, which was published in book form in 2006, but can be found online at:

https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/pinckney-eliza-lucas/

Note: At the end of the second paragraph, you will read the phrase “pr annum.”
That means “per annum” or “per year.”

Also read the brief article at the following site:

http://www.distinguishedwomen.com/biographies/pinckney.html

One of the accomplishments she is well known for helping make indigo a major crop of the colony. Read the following site paying close attention to the images.

https://www.ancestry.com/contextux/historicalinsights/indigo-south-carolina

Another site will help you understand how indigo was processed on the plantation. No need to read this whole article. Just scroll down to the section entitled “The Processing of Indigo” and read its four paragraphs.

http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/history-archaeology/indigo

Next, we are going to meet Eliza in her own words. Read through “Student Handout: Eliza in Her Own Words”

Now, let’s actually look at her exhibit at the SCHOF. While we are not going to board buses and head to Myrtle Beach, we can see her exhibit online. Click on the following link, watch the video, and read the text.
Finally, we are ready to analyze her exhibit using the handout entitled “The Historical Thinking Method” (HTM). You will notice it has a number of similarities with the Text Analysis Guide (TAG) we have been using to analyze documents.

Handout: Eliza in Her Own Words

An Average Day in the Pre-Married Life of Eliza Lucas (Spring 1742)
“... In general I rise at five o’Clock in the morning, read till Seven, then take a walk in the garden or field, see that the Servants are at their respective business [assigned jobs], then to breakfast. The first hour after breakfast is spent at my musick, the next is constantly employed in recollecting something I have learned least ... such as French and short hand. After that I devote the rest of the time till I dress for dinner to our little Polly and two black girls who I teach to read, and if I have my paps’s approbation (my Mamas I have got) I intend [them] for school mistres’s for the rest of the Negroe children [to be reading teachers of the other black children] ... But to proceed, the first hour after dinner as the first after breakfast at musick, the rest of the afternoon in Needle work till candle light, and from that time to bed time read or write. ... Mondays my musick master is here. Tuesdays my friend Mrs. Chardon (about 3 mile distant) and I are constantly engaged to each other, she at our house one Tuesday – I at hers the next and this is one of the happiest days I spend. ... Thursday the whole day except what the necessary affairs of the family take up is spent in writing, either on the business of the plantations, or letters to my friends. Every other Fryday, if no company, we go a vizeting [visiting] so that I go abroad [leave the plantation to visit others] once a week and no oftener.”

*Law #45 of the Slave Code of 1740 – “... That all and every person and persons whatsoever, who shall hereafter teach, or cause any slave or slaves to be taught, to write, or shall use or employ any slave as a scribe in any manner of writing whatsoever, hereafter taught to write, every such person and persons, shall, for every such offence, forfeit the sum of one hundred pounds. ...”

Eliza Lucas’ Christian Beliefs (June/July 1742)
In writing to her brother who had just joined the army, she was concerned he might pick up some immoral habits from his soldier friends including a tendency of making fun of religion. She writes:

“Stand firm and unshaken then in what is right in spite of infidelity [faithlessness] and ridicule. And you cant be at a loss to know what is right when The Devine goodness [God] had furnished you with reason, which is his natural revelation [the belief that God reveals himself through one’s mind], and his written word [the Christian Bible] supernaturally revealed and delivered to mankind by his son Jesus Christ.
Examin carefully and unprejudicedly [without prejudice or bias against Christianity], and I am persuaded you will have no doubts as to the truth of revelation. For my own part I am so happy in the belief of the Xtian [Christian] scheme. . . .”

Her feelings for Her Husband (May 1759)
After living in England for five years, Eliza and Charles Pinckney returned to South Carolina, but in less than two months after their arrival, Charles contracted malaria and died three weeks later in July 1758. His wife was devastated and was still in mourning ten months later in May 1759 when she wrote the following excerpt:
I had lived for more than 14 year in the most uninterrupted felicity [great happiness] with one of the most worthy and best of men that ever woman was blessed with; his mind and temper were the most unexceptionable I ever met with or heard of in a human being, and to me the most tender, partial and affectionate of husbands; nor had I ever an angry moment in that time, He was every thing that was amiable [friendly or pleasant] to me, nor had I – so uncommonly blessed was I in the 14 year I was his wife – an hours anxiety for my self in any shape. What affected him and his Children indeed was sensibly felt by me, but for my self I had not a petition to make to Heaven but for a continuance of the blessings I enjoy [enjoy].


APPENDIX D
KING HAGLER STATUE

King Hagler

Today and tomorrow we are going to analyze a memorial featuring a Catawba chief named “King” Hagler and an early settler Joseph Kershaw located in downtown Camden. Most of our attention will be focused on Hagler. Let’s first begin by reading some background on Hagler and Kershaw at the following sites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Carolina Hall of Fame exhibit (read the exhibit and watch the short video)</th>
<th><a href="http://www.theofficialschalloffame.com/inductees.html">http://www.theofficialschalloffame.com/inductees.html</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Encyclopedia Hagler article</td>
<td><a href="https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/hagler/">https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/hagler/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catawba Pottery</td>
<td><a href="http://catawba">http://catawba</a> indian.net/about-us/our-culture/catawba-pottery/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also Google “Catawba pottery images” to see what some looks like.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Encyclopedia Joseph Kershaw article</td>
<td><a href="https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/kershaw-joseph/">https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/kershaw-joseph/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicle Independent – February 20, 2009.</td>
<td>Handout #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagler in His Own Words</td>
<td>Handout #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before we actually analyze the statue, let’s read of its unveiling in the Town Green, which is located in the middle of downtown Camden (see the map). The following article is from the Chronicle-Independent, a local newspaper:

http://www.chronicle-independent.com/archives/18589/

Now, we are finally ready to begin analyzing the statue. We are going to use a tool similar to the Text Analysis Guide (TAG) we use to examine sources. This special analysis tool is named the Historical Thinking Method or HTM.
Handout #1

‘Patron Saint of Camden’

King Haiglar named to S.C. Hall of Fame

By MARTIN L. CAHN
C-I (Camden, S.C.) senior editor

Our weathervane depicts
King Haiglar,
A wise and noble Indian
chief,
Catawba Leader, peace
enabler.
He brought town settlers
great relief
Through statesmanship and
firm belief
That red and white man
both could live
In peace with balanced give
and take.
--from “The Mark of King Haiglar”
Clarence Mahoney, 2006

Kershaw County’s most famous Native American is being inducted into the South Carolina Hall of Fame.

King Haiglar – the Catawba chief whose image adorns the official seal of Kershaw County and stands atop Camden City Hall and the Camden Clock Tower as weathervanes – will be inducted with nationally acclaimed author Pat Conroy during a March 18 ceremony at the Myrtle Beach Convention Center.

Haiglar and Conroy were named as this year’s inductees by the Confederation of South Carolina Local Historical Societies (CSCLHS).

“I am extremely privileged to be able to honor both of these remarkable contributors to the state of South Carolina,” said CSCLHS Board of Trustees Chairman Leo Twiggs.

Clarence Mahoney, former chairman of the Camden Historic Landmarks Commission and a member of the Kershaw County Historical Society, wrote a seven-stanza poem about King Haiglar in 2006.

In it, Mahoney lists several facts about Haiglar’s life. He was elected to be the “king” of the Catawba Nation, ruling for 14 years. He was dubbed “King” by colonial South Carolina Gov. James Glen. Haiglar sided with the colonies in the French and Indian War. He called his friends “Beloved brothers.”

Despite Haiglar’s depiction on the city and the weathervanes, Mahoney said no one really knows what the Catawba chief looked like.

“We know he was tall and probably what his Indian dress looked like,” Mahoney said, showing off an 1899 photograph of Ben Harris in traditional Catawba
dress. “But no one really knows for sure what he looked like. There are no drawings or sketches of him.”

Mahoney said he thinks it’s possible there might be a drawing of Haiglar in Canada. The chief was sent there as part of negotiations leading to the signing of a temporary peace treaty with the Six Nations in Albany, N.Y.

That, according to the CSCLSH, was Haiglar’s first official act in 1751.

“Heigler had a reputation as a peacekeeper with other tribes and colonists,” the CSCLSH said.

There’s even some question regarding King Haiglar’s real first name. The CSCLSH referred to Haiglar as Arataswa; Mahoney calls him Nop-ke-he in his poem. Yet other references to King Haiglar give his first name as Oroloswa.

“We know he was born in Mecklenberg and took the name Haiglar from John Haiglar who was influential to him,” Mahoney said.

Mahoney’s poem opens with a reference to the Camden Clock Tower weathervane depicting Haiglar’s silhouette, a replica of the one made by J. B. Mathieu in 1826. The Mathieu weathervane is now housed at the Camden Archives and Museum. Another copy adorns the top of Camden City Hall.

According to information on the Smithsonian Institution’s American Art Museum Web site, the Haiglar weathervane atop the old opera house was sculpted by Mathieu from hand-cut gilded iron. The image depicts Haiglar in full-length standing profile silhouette wearing a headdress, taking aim with a bow and arrow, a quiver on his back and stag’s horns at his feet.

The Smithsonian said Mathieu gave the sculpture to the town of Pine Tree Hill, as Camden was called then, and placed atop the Market Steeple in 1826.

Mahoney said Mathieu was paid for his work.

“I’m pretty sure the weathervane was the first artwork dedicated to the image of a Native American in the United States. I can’t prove that, but I can’t dispute it, either. It was certainly the first time the government paid for (such an image) with public funds,” Mahoney said.

The Haiglar vane was moved with the steeple to Old Tower and Market streets in 1859 and was moved to the opera house in 1886 long before being placed in the Camden Archives.

“King Haiglar . . . was a well known and much loved figure who protected the town against Indian attacks between 1750 and 1763,” the Smithsonian wrote.

According to the CSCLSH, under Haiglar’s direction, the Catawba sent a contingent of soldiers to fight with then Col. George Washington in the French and Indian War in 1756 and 1757. A small contingent fought with Gen. John Forbes in Virginia in 1758

“However, the most important event during Haiglar’s reign was the Treaty of Pine Tree Hill, which he negotiated in July 1760. It ultimately provided a 15-square mile reservation on the border of North Carolina and South Carolina for the Catawba,” the CSCLSH said.

Mahoney said the treaty was signed at Pine Tree Hill, yesteryear’s Camden.

“The treaty was important. Haiglar could see that the Catawba couldn’t win by force, that they would have to learn the white man’s language and laws,” Mahoney said.
“The treaty basically said that the British would have to defend the Catawba’s rights as property owners. He was a sharp cookie.”

And it actually happened, Mahoney said; settlers tried to encroach on the Catawba lands and British troops had to push them out.

Mahoney said it was possible the treaty was signed at Pine Tree Hill because King Haiglar had come here to escape a smallpox epidemic. Mahoney produced photocopies of two letters dictated by Haiglar – who couldn’t write – and delivered to another South Carolina colonial governor, William Henry Lyttleton. The second of the two, from October 1759, is a Catawba report on the smallpox epidemic.

In it, Haiglar and the other Catawba signees express their regret that Cherokees – whom Mahoney said lived west of the Broad River – had “walked such a crooked path without the Light. We are determined always to walk a straight path with our father, the great King George and our Beloved brother and governor and the white people, his children while any of us is left.”

But, Haiglar reported, they were suffering from a “bad disorder,” smallpox, brought back by their warriors upon their return from Virginia. Once the sickness had passed, Haiglar promised, it would then be safe for Lyttleton to have a fort built on or near Catawba lands.

Mahoney said the first letter was important for its signatures.

“It details the numerous variety of names the Indians took. And, since he couldn’t write, shows the ‘H’ he used as his mark where someone else signed his name,” Mahoney said.

Haiglar was recognized not only by Glen, but the royal governors of North Carolina, Virginia and New York as leader of the Catawba Nation. The CSCLSH said his life was only documented from 1750 forward after he was elected “king” following his predecessor’s assassination.

Haiglar, in turn, was also assassinated.

Handout #2: Hagler in His Own Words

Introduction: In August 1754, an interpreter named Matthew Toole hosted North Carolina officials and Hagler to discuss problems the Native Americans and settlers were having. Earlier in the decade, it is believed that Hagler himself was brutally beaten while drunk and lost his sight “temporarily” (p. 229). The following excerpts are from this meeting:

Chief Hagler on the Drinking of Alcohol

Brothers here is One thing You Yourselves are to Blame very much in, That is You Rot Your grain in Tubs, out of which you take and make Strong Spirits you sell it to our young men and give it [to] them, many times; they get very Drunk with it [and] this is the Very Cause that they oftentimes Commit those Crimes that is offensive to You and us and all thro’ the Effect of that Drink it is also very bad for our people, for it Rots their guts and Causes our men to get very sick and many of our people has Lately Died by the Effects of that strong Drink, and I heartily wish You would do something to prevent Your People from Dareing to Sell or give them any of that Strong Drink, upon any Consideration whatever for that will be a great means of our being free from being accused of those Crimes that is Committed by our young men and will prevent many of the abuses that is done by them thro’ the Effects of that Strong Drink (p. 230).

Chief Hagler on the Catawba and the White Man

As to our Living on those Lands
we Expect to live on those Lands we now possess
During our Time here
for when the Great man above made us
he also made this Island
he also made our forefathers and of this Colour and Hue.
(Showing his hands & Breast)
he also fixed our forefathers and us here
to Inherit this Land and Ever since
we Lived after our manner and fashion
we in those Days, had no Instruments
To support our living
but Bows which we compleated with stones,
knives we had none,
and as it was our Custom in those days to Cut our hair . . .
we Did [this] by Burning it of[f]our heads and Bodies
with Coals of Fire,
our Axes we made of stone
we bled ourselves with fish Teeth
our Cloathing were Skins and Furr
instead of which we [now] Enjoy those Cloaths
which we got from the white people
and Ever since they first Came among us
we have Enjoyed all those things
that we were then destitute of
for which we thank the white people,
and to this Day
we have lived in a Brotherly Love & peace with them
and more Especially with these Three Governments
[South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia]
and it is our Earnest Desire
that Love and Friendship
which has so Long remain’d
should Ever continue.

The above speech is based on Matthew Toole’s interpretation and was put in this format
“to show its poetic qualities” (p. x). The first excerpt on alcohol is cited as coming from
“North Carolina Records, V, 143; Rights, p. 132” and the second excerpt can be found in
“the North Carolina Colonial Records.” They can be found on p. 230 and the first page
people of the river. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
APPENDIX E
THE UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM (USHMM)

One of the most evil periods in recent history took place during the Great Depression and World War II. While I am sure you know some details about the Holocaust, let’s begin your preparation by reading two articles on the Holocaust:

http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/an-introductory-history-of-the-holocaust

Any time you visit a museum, it is helpful to know some background about it. To learn more about the USHMM, read the following site:

https://www.ushmm.org/information/about-the-museum
https://www.ushmm.org/information/about-the-museum/mission-and-history

So exactly who is in charge of the museum and its exhibits?

https://www.ushmm.org/information/about-the-museum/council

The next article will tell you about the three people at the top of the group that is responsible for the museum. Click on each to read a brief biography.

https://www.ushmm.org/information/about-the-museum/executive-biographies

An important aspect of any museum is how is designed. Go to the following site to learn more about the USHMM’s architecture:

https://www.ushmm.org/information/about-the-museum/architecture-and-art

Now it is time to get a feel for how the museum is organized. Go to the following page, read over its contents, and be sure to click on the “Learn More About this Floor” button for each of the three floors. Based on what you read, identify which floor your topic (the one you mentioned you were interested in) should be addressed by an exhibit.

https://www.ushmm.org/information/exhibitions/museum-exhibitions/permanent

What was the Holocaust like? Only those who experienced it can answer that question. Access the following website, which contains brief 2-3 minute stories told by survivors. Listen to FIVE (5) of them.

Finally, each of you expressed an interest in a particular topic. Do an internet search and read **ONE** (1) non-Wikipedia website article about that topic. Be sure to write down the URL and website’s name in your preparation notes.
APPENDIX F
MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. MEMORIAL

One of the most influential reformers in U.S. history was the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Before we examine his memorial, it would be helpful to learn about the man himself and the time in which he lived. Read the following:

http://www.history.com/topics/black-history/martin-luther-king-jr
https://www.nps.gov/mlkm/learn/historyculture/people.htm

Of course, Dr. King is well-known for his eloquence in both writing and speaking. Read a famous letter he wrote while imprisoned in Birmingham, Alabama at the following website:


One of his most famous speeches was “I Have a Dream” given on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. Take time to watch this historic speech:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=smEqnnkIfYs

You are now ready to examine the memorial itself. The National Park Service has an excellent account of the memorial’s development, creation, and meaning:

https://www.nps.gov/mlkm/learn/building-the-memorial.htm

One important feature of the memorial is its frequent use of quotes by its eloquent honoree. Check out this website:

https://www.nps.gov/mlkm/learn/quotations.htm

Dr. King was assassinated in April 1968. As would be expected, his death was covered by the media. The following website is a video of Walter Cronkite’s CBS newscast announcing the tragic event. Keep in mind that the word “negro” was used in much the same way the term “African American” is used today.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cmOBbxgxKvo
APPENDIX G
THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL

One of the most popular destinations in Washington, DC is the Lincoln Memorial. Before we turn our attention to this architectural icon, it will prove helpful to learn about the man it honors. Few people in our nation’s history have inspired the number of books and articles like Lincoln has. Read the following article to learn about this important American:

http://www.history.com/topics/us-presidents/abraham-lincoln

Two of his best known speeches are the Gettysburg Address (1863) and his Second Inaugural Address (1865). They can be found at:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gettysburg Address</th>
<th><a href="http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/gettysburg.htm">http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/gettysburg.htm</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read the two introductory paragraphs and then the “Bliss Copy” of the Gettysburg Address.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Inaugural Address</th>
<th>Try reading a paragraph or two in Lincoln’s own handwriting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=mal&amp;fileName=mal3/436/4361300/malpage.db&amp;recNum=0">https://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=mal&amp;fileName=mal3/436/4361300/malpage.db&amp;recNum=0</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now read a transcript of this brief speech at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/lincoln2.asp">http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/lincoln2.asp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, we are ready to begin examining the Lincoln Memorial itself. First, read about its history in the first article and then explore more about the site at the URL’s listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Brief History of the Memorial</th>
<th><a href="http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/sites/memorial.htm">http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/sites/memorial.htm</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Virtual Tour</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nps.gov/featurecontent/ncr/linc/interactive/deploy/index.htm#introduction">https://www.nps.gov/featurecontent/ncr/linc/interactive/deploy/index.htm#introduction</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/statue.htm">https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/statue.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murals</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/murals.htm">https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/murals.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscriptions</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/inscriptions.htm">https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/inscriptions.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Features</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/memorial-features.htm">https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/memorial-features.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Landscaping</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/memorial-features.htm">https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/memorial-features.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scroll down to the bottom to “The Memorial Landscape.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Building of</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/lincoln-memorial-construction.htm">https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/lincoln-memorial-construction.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Memorial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Creators</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/lincoln-memorial-design-individuals.htm">https://www.nps.gov/linc/learn/historyculture/lincoln-memorial-design-individuals.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H
VIETNAM WOMEN’S MEMORIAL

The best place to start is with the Vietnam War itself. Complete books and documentaries have addressed this topic, so it is not easy to find a concise article that treats such a serious subject with the depth it deserves. Nonetheless, the following article is a good attempt.

http://www.history.com/topics/vietnam-war/vietnam-war-history

Now that you know the historical context or background of the war, let’s turn our attention to the Vietnam Women’s Memorial. Access the following site:

http://www.vietnamwomensmemorial.org/vwmf.php

Next, read the story of how the memorial came to be as told by Diane Carlson Evans, a nurse who served in the war herself. Read the following article (warning: it is quite long!).

http://www.vietnamwomensmemorial.org/case.php

Finally, it is time to read about what the sculptor and landscape architect had to say about their product:

http://www.vietnamwomensmemorial.org/memorial.php
APPENDIX I
NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

African American history is a long and multicultural story beginning in Africa itself. Let’s begin by examining the National Museum of African American History and Culture’s philosophy.

https://nmaahc.si.edu/about/museum

Next, read about the director Lonnie G. Bunch, III and notice who is on the Museum Council:

https://nmaahc.si.edu/about/leadership

Each of you selected a general topic you were interested in. Go to the following URL and click on the appropriate exhibit that most closely addresses your topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibitions</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slavery and Freedom</td>
<td>From their time in Africa through the Civil War and Reconstruction</td>
<td><a href="https://nmaahc.si.edu/slavery-and-freedom">https://nmaahc.si.edu/slavery-and-freedom</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defending Freedom, Defining Freedom</td>
<td>Segregation through the heart of the Civil Rights Movement, 1876-1968</td>
<td><a href="https://nmaahc.si.edu/defending-freedom-defining-freedom">https://nmaahc.si.edu/defending-freedom-defining-freedom</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Changing America: 1968 and Beyond</td>
<td>Examines the African American struggle to the present day</td>
<td><a href="https://nmaahc.si.edu/changing-america">https://nmaahc.si.edu/changing-america</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Victory: The African American Military Experience</td>
<td>See how African Americans have been involved in all of America’s wars from the Revolution to the contemporary one against terrorism.</td>
<td><a href="https://nmaahc.si.edu/double-victory">https://nmaahc.si.edu/double-victory</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports: Leveling the Playing Field</td>
<td>The role of black athletes and the many challenges they faced</td>
<td><a href="https://nmaahc.si.edu/sports">https://nmaahc.si.edu/sports</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Crossroads</td>
<td>See and hear how African Americans have played an integral role in the development of music.</td>
<td><a href="https://nmaahc.si.edu/musical-crossroads">https://nmaahc.si.edu/musical-crossroads</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking the Stage</td>
<td>African Americans on the big screen, small screen, and the stage</td>
<td><a href="https://nmaahc.si.edu/explore/exhibitions/taking-stage">https://nmaahc.si.edu/explore/exhibitions/taking-stage</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, each of you expressed an interest in a particular topic. Do an internet search and read **TWO** (2) non-Wikipedia website articles (secondary sources) about that topic. Then find **ONE** (1) site containing a solid primary source. For each of your **THREE** (3) websites, be sure to write down the URL and website’s name in your preparation notes.

When you are in the museum, you will need to select an exhibit that has substance. A simple artifact with little or no text will not be a good one to select. Nor do you have time to select a large exhibit that has more than you have time to read, analyze, and write about. You will need to select an exhibit with a definite point of view and you find interesting.
APPENDIX J
MOUNT VERNON’S EXHIBIT OF WASHINGTON AND HIS SLAVES

Mount Vernon was the beloved home of George and Martha Washington. Let’s begin by reading about George Washington’s life and career.

http://www.history.com/topics/us-presidents/george-washington

Now, look at what Mount Vernon’s website has to say about the life of George Washington:

http://www.mountvernon.org/george-washington/key-facts/

One of South Carolina’s own citizens is the reason Mount Vernon is still standing and available for people to visit. Read about Ann Pamela Cunningham:

http://www.mountvernon.org/digital-encyclopedia/article/ann-pamela-cunningham/

Next, let’s examine Mount Vernon and the people behind it:

http://www.mountvernon.org/about/

Let’s look at George Washington and slavery. Read the following websites:

http://www.mountvernon.org/george-washington/slavery/ten-facts-about-washington-slavery/

https://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/16/opinion/george-washington-slave-catcher.html


Finally, look at this website that includes an excerpt from a letter about his wish when it came to slavery:


The actual exhibit you will be analyzing and evaluating at Mount Vernon is The Dilemma of Slavery exhibit in the J. Hap and Geren Fauth Gallery. It is one of the final ones in the museum toward the end of the tour. You will need about 20 or 30 minutes to analyze this
exhibit so leave time to do so. To preview it, click on the following website and scroll down to the eleventh section.

http://www.mountvernon.org/the-estate-gardens/museum/galleries/education-center-galleries/
Often men receive most of the attention during the Civil War, and that is understandable considering their roles as political and military leaders as well as everyday soldiers. However, women also played important roles. Today and tomorrow, you will be analyzing one of the exhibits at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and Culture. Before looking at the exhibit itself, let’s learn more about the museum itself. Let’s start with the philosophy of the museum itself. Read the following website:

https://nmaahc.si.edu/about/museum

Now let’s learn about Lonnie G. Bunch, III, the museum’s director, and the Museum Council:

https://nmaahc.si.edu/about/leadership

Next, let’s read about what roles women contributed to both sides of the war.

https://www.history.com/topics/american-civil-war/women-in-the-civil-war

Two of the women mentioned in this exhibit – Charlotte Forte Grimké and Harriet Tubman – were involved with the Port Royal Relief Association. Here is an article on this important organization.

http://www.blackpast.org/aah/port-royal-experiment-1862-1865

Before you look at the three women featured in this exhibit, let’s begin with the author of the quote at the top of the exhibit:

http://www.harrietjacobs.org/bio.html

You are in groups of three. Each one of you is to become the expert on ONE of the following women – Charlotte Forten Grimké, Harriet Tubman, and Susie King Taylor.
Whoever’s birthday is closest to today moving forward is Grimké, the second Tubman, and the farthest Taylor. Read the articles for your person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Woman</th>
<th>Background Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.nps.gov/places/the-charlotte-forten-grimke-house.htm">https://www.nps.gov/places/the-charlotte-forten-grimke-house.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.pbs.org/onlyateacher/charlotte.html">http://www.pbs.org/onlyateacher/charlotte.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only read the first two sections – “Charlotte Forten (1837-1914)” and “In Her Own Words.” Also in the fourth paragraph in the second section, she refers to Toussaint. He was a black leader who led a successful slave revolt in Haiti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.biography.com/people/harriet-tubman-9511430">https://www.biography.com/people/harriet-tubman-9511430</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie King Taylor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/history-archaeology/susie-king-taylor-1848-1912">http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/history-archaeology/susie-king-taylor-1848-1912</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.civilwarwomenblog.com/susie-king-taylor/">https://www.civilwarwomenblog.com/susie-king-taylor/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAME OF STUDENT: ______________________________

Name of Historical Woman (Circle): Charlotte Forten Grimké
Harriet Tubman
Susie King Taylor

Background Notes on Above Person:

Now go back over what you have taken notes on. Select what you think are the ten (10) most important facts about your person and highlight them. Now share with your team members.
A Woman's War

In this envelope are sixteen (16) photographs showing the National Museum of African American History and Culture’s exhibit entitled *A Woman’s War*.

The first thing you need to do is to organize the pictures. Each photograph has a number written on the back of it. Organize the photographs according to the layout below. Once you have done so, answer Questions #1-2 of the Historical Thinking Method (HTM). Then use the transcripts and photographs to study the exhibit virtually. Make sure you look at each photograph and read all of the text *B E F O R E* you continue working on the Historical Thinking Method (HTM).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
2 & 7 \\
4 & 5 & 6 & 8 \\
10 & 12 \\
9 & 11 \\
13 & 3 & 15 \\
14 & 16 \\
1
\end{array}
\]
## Transcriptions of *A Woman's War* Photographs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Picture of Complete Exhibit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2       | **A Woman’s War**  
*To battle for freedom and justice of the slave,*  
*I go to the District of Columbia, where the shackles had just fallen.*  
HARRIET ANN JACOBS  1863 |
| 3       | **Women on the Front**  
Tens of thousands of women, both enslaved and free, traveled to the battlefront. Enslaved women journeyed toward Union lines to free themselves. Once there, they joined northern women who came south to provide much-needed assistance. Women worked for the Army as nurses; they built fortifications, and established schools. They also secured food, housing, employment, and medical care for themselves or for others. Many of the schools and hospitals they established still exist today. |
| 4-5     | [Photograph Caption]: **Charlotte Forten Grimké**  
*The New York Public Library*  
**Charlotte Forten Grimké, Black Abolitionist**  
At age 25, Charlotte Grimke (1837-1914) left Massachusetts to join the Port Royal Relief Association in South Carolina. Grimké grew up in an abolitionist household and was well schooled in equal rights. She believed in racial uplift; the idea that education and refinement proved black equality. However, southern African American communities were unfamiliar to her, and she struggled with the differences. |
| 6       | [Photograph Caption]: **Harriet Tubman**  
*Gift of Charles L. Blockson*  
**Harriet Tubman, Liberator**  
The Civil War enabled Harriet Tubman (ca 1822-1913) to extend the Underground Railroad into the Deep South. Joining the Port Royal Relief Association, Tubman worked as a nurse and cemented important relationships with local people. Using these connections, she became the commander of a spy network. She led many missions including the Combahee River Raid and freed hundreds of people. Tubman’s success was built on her ability to tap into local traditions of African American resistance. |
| 7-8 | [Photograph Caption]: **Susie King Taylor**  
*Library of Congress* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Susie King Taylor, Community Leader</strong></td>
<td>Susie King Taylor (1848-1912) bravely seized her freedom at age 14. Leaving her parents behind, she traveled with her uncle’s family and slipped into Union lines. Educated in a secret school while enslaved in Savannah, Georgia, Taylor had many skills to offer. Within days of arriving she was teaching, working as a laundress, and following the U.S. Colored Troops into battle to assist nurses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9-10 | **Charlotte Forten Grimké’s Diary**  
Grimké kept a diary recording her experience teaching and living in the Lowcountry.  
*On loan from the Francis Grimké Papers, Moorland-Springarn Research Center, Howard University* |
| 11-12 | **Field Medical Kit**  
Harriet Tubman and Susie King Taylor nursed patients after surgeries on the battlefield and in hospitals.  
*On loan from the National Museum of American History* |
| 13-14 | **Laundry Workers, 1863**  
The military placed some black women on the payroll as cooks and laundry workers.  
*National Archives and Records Administration* |
| 15-16 | **Relief Workers, 1865**  
Many African American men and women coming into Union lines found employment in relief work, assisting in hospitals and camps.  
*Library of Congress* |
APPENDIX L
“TO THE FAITHFUL SLAVES” MONUMENT

Today, we are going to examine a rather unique memorial in downtown Fort Mill, SC, located less than half an hour away from Carowinds. This monument was erected “To the Faithful Slaves” of the Civil War. The monument itself is one of four in Confederate Park. The others honor Catawba, soldiers, and women from this important war.

Read the following three articles to prepare for your analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lost Cause Religion</td>
<td><a href="https://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/arts-culture/lost-cause-religion">https://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/arts-culture/lost-cause-religion</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One typo is in the 8th paragraph last word “Less” should be “Lee” as in Robert E. Lee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Confederates: Truth and Legend</td>
<td><a href="https://www.civilwar.org/learn/articles/black-confederates">https://www.civilwar.org/learn/articles/black-confederates</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respond to the following prompt in complete sentences:

Discuss the basic beliefs of the “Lost Cause” including its view of the role of slaves during the Civil War.

Analyze the monument using the HTM guide. Complete prompts #1-26. Then read the following two articles:
The Pernicious Myth of the ‘Loyal Slave’ Lives on in Confederate Memorials


SC town has a Confederate monument to slaves. Black descendants want it to stay.


Transcription of Engraved Text on Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Side of Monument</th>
<th>Transcription of Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEDICATED TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE FAITHFUL SLAVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHO, LOYAL TO A SACRED TRUST,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOILED FOR THE SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OF THE ARMY, WITH MATCHLESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEVOTION, AND STERLING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIDELITY GUARDED OUR DEFENSELESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOMES, WOMEN AND CHILDREN, DURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE STRUGGLE FOR THE PRINCIPLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OF OUR “CONFEDERATE STATES OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMERICA.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East</strong></td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERECTED BY SAM’L E. WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN GRATEFUL MEMORY OF EARLIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAYS, WITH APPROVAL OF THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEFFERSON DAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMONG THE MANY FAITHFUL:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NELSON WHITE ANTHONY WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANDY WHITE JIM WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WARREN WHITE HENRY WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SILAS WHITE NATHAN SPRINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HANDY WHITE SOLOMON SPRATT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now finish your HTM analysis by answering prompts #27-32.
| **North** | An engraving that depicts a slave woman embracing a white child in front of the plantation mansion. |
| **South** | An engraving of a black field worker taking a break by sitting on a log shaded by the tree |

Online pictures can be seen at https://www.hmdb.org(marker=42188)

APPENDIX M
THE BENJAMIN RYAN TILLMAN MONUMENT ON THE STATE HOUSE GROUNDS

One of the most influential and controversial politicians in South Carolina’s history was former governor and U.S. senator Benjamin Ryan Tillman. In 1940, his statue was dedicated near the front steps of the Capitol building in Columbia. Before we examine and analyze this site, you need to familiarize yourself with Tillman’s life and career. Complete the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Benjamin Ryan Tillman”</td>
<td><a href="http://www.clemson.edu/about/history/bios/ben-tillman.html">http://www.clemson.edu/about/history/bios/ben-tillman.html</a></td>
<td>Read and take notes in a t-chart format. The two columns should be labeled “Positive Things About Tillman” and “Negative Things About Tillman.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Their Own Hotheadedness”: Senator Benjamin R. “Pitchfork Ben” Tillman Justifies Violence Against Southern Blacks</td>
<td><a href="http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/55">http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/55</a></td>
<td>Read only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, let’s examine where the Tillman statue is located and learn a little bit about its sculptor:
Now analyze the statue using the HTM. Once you have finished, write a full paragraph (not just a couple of sentences) in which you respond to the prompt below. Support your opinion with multiple facts.

What should be done with the Ben Tillman statue on the State House grounds?

**Front of Statue**

BENJAMIN RYAN TILLMAN

THIS MONUMENT ERECTED

BY THE LEGISLATURE,

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

AND

PRIVATE CITIZENS OF

SOUTH CAROLINA

DEDICATED MAY 1, 1940

**Right side if facing the statue or left side from statue’s perspective**

BENJAMIN RYAN TILLMAN

BORN AUGUST 11, 1847 – DIED JULY 3, 1918

MARRIED SALLIE STARKE JANUARY 8, 1868

PATRIOT STATESMAN

GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA 1890-1894

UNITED STATES SENATOR 1895-1918

IN THE WORLD WAR CHAIRMAN SENATE

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

A LIFE OF SERVICE AND ACHIEVEMENT.

**Back of statue**

IN THE HOME LOVING LOYAL TO THE STATE

STEADFAST TRUE FOR THE NATION

“THE COUNTRY BELONGS TO US ALL AND WE ALL BELONG TO IT. THE MEN OF THE NORTH, SOUTH, EAST AND WEST CARVED IT OUT OF THE WILDERNESS AND MADE IT GREAT. LET US SHARE IT WITH EACH OTHER THEN AND CONSERVE IT. GIVING IT THE BEST THAT
IS IN US OF BRAIN AND BRAWN AND HEART.”

**Left side if facing the statue or right side from statue’s perspective**

LOVING THEM HE WAS THE FRIEND
AND LEADER OF THE COMMON PEOPLE.
HE TAUGHT THEM THEIR POLITICAL
POWER AND MADE POSSIBLE FOR
THE EDUCATION OF THEIR SONS
AND DAUGHTERS CLEMSON
AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE WINTHROP
NORMAL AND INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE.

**Back of statue on one of the steps**

TILLMAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION
JOHN G. RICHARDS, CHAIRMAN
FRED D. MARSHALL, TREASURER
J. AUSTIN LATIMER, SECRETARY
JAMES M. BAKER   R.M. JEFFERIES
T.B. GRENEKER
MRS. MARGARET B. MARION, ASST. SEC’Y.

---

**Ben Tillman Monument Inscriptions**

| Front of Statue | BENJAMIN RYAN TILLMAN
|                 | THIS MONUMENT ERECTED
|                 | BY THE LEGISLATURE,
|                 | THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY
|                 | AND
|                 | PRIVATE CITIZENS OF
|                 | SOUTH CAROLINA
|                 | DEDICATED MAY 1, 1940 |

| Right side if | BENJAMIN RYAN TILLMAN
| facing the    | BORN AUGUST 11, 1847 – DIED JULY 3, 1918
| statue or     | MARRIED SALLIE STARKE JANUARY 8, 1868
| left side     | PATRIOT STATESMAN
| from statue’s | GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA 1890-1894
| perspective  | UNITED STATES SENATOR 1895-1918
|              | IN THE WORLD WAR CHAIRMAN SENATE
|              | COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.
|              | A LIFE OF SERVICE AND ACHIEVEMENT. |
| Back of Statue | IN THE HOME LOVING LOYAL TO THE STATE STEADFAST TRUE FOR THE NATION “THE COUNTRY BELongs TO US ALL AND WE ALL BELONG TO IT. THE MEN OF THE NORTH, SOUTH, EAST AND WEST CARVED IT OUT OF THE WILDERNESS AND MADE IT GREAT. LET US SHARE IT WITH EACH OTHER THEN AND CONSERVE IT. GIVING IT THE BEST THAT IS IN US OF BRAIN AND BRAWN AND HEART.” |
| Left side if facing the statue or right side from statue’s perspective | LOVING THEM HE WAS THE FRIEND AND LEADER OF THE COMMON PEOPLE. HE TAUGHT THEM THEIR POLITICAL POWER AND MADE POSSIBLE FOR THE EDUCATION OF THEIR SONS AND DAUGHTERS CLEMSON AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE WINTHROP NORMAL AND INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE. |
| Back of statue on one of the steps | TILLMAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION JOHN G. RICHARDS, CHAIRMAN FRED D. MARSHALL, TREASURER J. AUSTIN LATIMER, SECRETARY JAMES M. BAKER R.M. JEFFERIES T.B. GRENEKER MRS. MARGARET B. MARION, ASST. SEC’Y. |
APPENDIX N
THE ROBERT SMALLS MUSEUM EXHIBIT AT THE
SOUTH CAROLINA HALL OF FAME

Preparation
Before we examine the South Carolina Hall of Fame’s (SCHOF) exhibit on Robert Smalls, let’s refresh our memory about this museum. Look at the following site (but DON’T take notes):

http://www.theofficialschalloffame.com/history.html

Examine the photograph of the SCHOF and read “History Of The South Carolina Hall Of Fame.” Once again, DON’T take notes.

Next, let’s learn a little more about Robert Smalls. Read and TAKE notes from the following three articles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>New York Herald</em> article</td>
<td>See next page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Smalls, Robert”</td>
<td><a href="https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/smalls-robert/">https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/smalls-robert/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyzing the Exhibit
You are now ready to analyze the Robert Smalls exhibit. It can be accessed at:

http://www.theofficialschalloffame.com/inducteesn-s.html?action=Next&p=1

The inductees are organized alphabetically. Robert Smalls is on the second row, second from the left. Read the short paragraph and watch the video. A transcript of the video is provided in this packet. Both parts are considered the exhibit and should be used in your analysis. A copy of the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) is attached.
HILTON HEAD, S.C., May 14, 1862

Heroism of Nine Colored Men - They Seize a Rebel Gunboat and Run Out of Charleston Harbor - Their Important Services to the Government - How They Devised and Carried Out Their Scheme - They Bring Out Their Families - Recommendation to Call On the Government to Reward Them - The State of Affairs in Charleston, &c., &c.

One of the most daring and heroic adventures since the war commenced was undertaken and successfully accomplished by a party of negroes in Charleston on Monday night last. Nine colored men, comprising the pilot, engineers and crew of the rebel gunboat Planter, took the vessel under their exclusive control, passed the batteries and forts in Charleston harbor, hoisted a white flag, ran out to the blockading squadron, and thence to Port Royal, via St. Helena Sound and Broad River, reaching the flagship Wabash shortly after ten o'clock last evening. The following are the names of the black men who performed this gallant and perilous service: Robert Smalls, pilot; John Smalls and Alfred Gradine, engineers; Abraham Jackson, Gabriel Turno, William Morrison, Samuel Chisholm, Abraham Allston and David Jones. They brought with them the wife and three children of the pilot, and the wife, child and sister of the first engineer, John Smalls. The balance of the party were without families.

The Planter is a high-pressure, side-wheel steamer, one hundred and forty feet in length, and about fifty feet beam, and draws about five feet of water. She was built in Charleston, was formerly used as a cotton boat, and is capable of carrying about 1,400 bales. On the organization of the Confederate navy she was transformed into a gunboat, and was the most valuable war vessel the Confederates had at Charleston. Her armament consisted of one thirty-two-pound rifle gun forward, and a twenty-four pound howitzer aft. Besides, she had on when she came into the harbor one seven-inch rifled gun, one eight-inch columbiad, one eight-inch howitzer, one long thirty-two pounder, and about two hundred rounds of ammunition, which had been consigned to Fort Ripley, and which would have been delivered at that fortification on Tuesday had not the designs of the rebel authorities been frustrated. She was commanded by Captain Relay, of the Confederate Navy - all the other employees of the vessel, excepting the first and second mates, being persons of color.

Robert Smalls, with whom I had a brief interview at General Benham's headquarters this morning, is an intelligent negro, born in Charleston, and employed for many years as a pilot in and about that harbor. He entered upon his duties on board the Planter some six weeks since, and as he told me, adopted the idea of running the vessel to sea from a joke which one of his companions perpetrated. He immediately cautioned the crew against alluding to the matter in any way on board the boat, but asked them, if they wanted to talk it up in sober earnestness, to meet at his house, where they would devise and determine upon a plan to place themselves under the protection of the Stars and Stripes instead of the stars and bars. Various plans were proposed; but finally the whole arrangement of the escape was left to the discretion and sagacity of Robert, his companions promising to obey him and be ready at a moment's notice to accompany him. For three days he kept the provisions of the party - secreted in the hold, awaiting an opportunity to slip away. At
length, on Monday evening, the white officers of the vessel went on shore to spend the
night, intending to start on the following morning for Fort Ripley and to be absent from
the city for some days. The families of the contrabands were notified and came stealthily
on board. At about three o'clock the fires were lit under the boilers, and the vessel
steamed quietly away down the harbor. The tide was against her, and Fort Sumter was
not reached till broad daylight. However, the boat passed directly under its walls, giving
the usual signal two long pulls and a jerk at the whistle cord at she passed the sentinel.

Once out of range of the rebel guns, the white flag was raised, and the Planter steamed
directly for the blockading steamer Augusta. Captain Parrott, of the latter vessel, as you
may imagine, received them cordially, heard their report, placed Acting Master Watson,
of his ship, in charge of the Planter and sent the Confederate gunboat and crew forward to
Commodore Dupont. The families of the crew have been sent to Beaufort where General
Stevens will make suitable provision for them. The crew will be taken care of by
Commodore Dupont.

The Planter is just such a vessel as is needed to navigate the shallow waters between
Hilton Head and the adjacent islands, and will prove almost invaluable to the
government. It is proposed, I hear, by the Commodore to recommend an appropriation of
$20,000 as a reward to the plucky Africans who have distinguished themselves by this
gallant service - $5,000 to be given to the pilot and the remainder to be divided among his
companions.

The contrabands who came by the Planter represent that the feeling in Charleston
approaches nearer to a panic than at any time since the rebellion was inaugurated. The
women and children have been ordered out of the place, and have taken whatever of
value they could carry with them. The troops are in constant expectation of an attack, and
the remaining citizens are nightly holding meetings to devise further means of defense.
The steamers in the harbor are seven in number, but only one of them – the Marion – is
armed, and she is not capable of doing any damage or offering any resistance to an
attacking force. Provisions are terribly scarce and dear.


Robert Smalls
Hall of Fame Exhibit
Video Transcript

On the morning of May 13, 1862, Robert Smalls, an enslaved pilot on the crew of
the Confederate steamer Planter, decided the time was right to put an end to his life of
bondage. Taking a chance that the officers of the Planter would not be at their posts,
Smalls loaded his family aboard the vessel and, along with other members of the
enslaved crew, sailed it past the heavily armed defenses protecting the harbor of
Charleston, South Carolina.
Robert Smalls was born in 1839 in Beaufort, South Carolina. In 1851, Smalls was hired out by his owner as a laborer in Charleston. During those years, he held various jobs eventually leading to his position as a pilot aboard the *Planter*. His bold escape under the noses of the Confederates that day made headlines across the North.

Soon after Smalls escaped from Charleston harbor in the *Planter*, the vessel was put in the service of the United States Navy. Robert Smalls was commissioned as a pilot aboard the boat once again.

In the early years of Reconstruction, Robert Smalls returned to the state and looked forward to participating in the democratic process from which he and others like him were excluded for nearly 200 years. Smalls was a founding member of the Republican Party in South Carolina and was a delegate to the 1868 constitutional convention. It would be one of the most progressive constitutions ever adopted by South Carolina.

Smalls served in the state House of Representatives and state Senate in the capital of Columbia and was elected to the United States House of Representatives.

[During the above paragraph, a photograph of Smalls appears on the screen with the following words:] Robert Smalls eloquently defended the rights of African American citizens in 1895, when the 1868 state constitution was overhauled by Senator “Pitchfork Ben” Tillman.
APPENDIX O
THE SEPTIMA POINSETTE CLARK MUSEUM EXHIBIT
AT THE SOUTH CAROLINA HALL OF FAME

Preparation
This museum exhibit is from a site with which you are already familiar – the South Carolina Hall of Fame. If you need a refresher on this site, then access and read (DON’T take notes) the following website:

http://www.theofficialschalloffame.com/history.html

Next, since we will be examining their exhibit on Septima Clark, one of South Carolina’s civil rights leaders, let’s learn a bit more about her. Read and TAKE notes on her life and accomplishments from the following sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Clark, Septima Poinsette”</td>
<td><a href="https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/clark-septima-poinsette/">https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/clark-septima-poinsette/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Septima Clark, Civil Rights Pioneer, Dies”</td>
<td><a href="http://lcdl.library.cofc.edu/lcdl/catalog/lcdl:93360">http://lcdl.library.cofc.edu/lcdl/catalog/lcdl:93360</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the Charleston News and Courier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, read (but DON’T take notes) a couple of primary sources from her life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A personal letter from Septima Clark</td>
<td><a href="http://lcdl.library.cofc.edu/lcdl/?f%5Bcollection_titleInfo+title_facet%5D%5B%5D=Septima+P.+Clark+Papers%2C+ca.+1910-ca.+1990&amp;page=57">http://lcdl.library.cofc.edu/lcdl/?f%5Bcollection_titleInfo+title_facet%5D%5B%5D=Septima+P.+Clark+Papers%2C+ca.+1910-ca.+1990&amp;page=57</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then click on “565. Letter from Septima P. Clark to Carolyn L. Collins, November 6, 1985. In this letter, she asked for help in getting her pension money she had lost for joining the NAACP.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A letter from Septima Clark to a national leader in the Democratic Party, which controls the government of the state of Mississippi</td>
<td><a href="http://lcdl.library.cofc.edu/lcdl/catalog/lcdl:92719">http://lcdl.library.cofc.edu/lcdl/catalog/lcdl:92719</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then click on “591. Letter from Septima P. Clark to Louis Martin, undated.” In this letter, she discussed her work in Mississippi and the injustice of its voter registration law.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyzing the Exhibit
You are now ready to analyze the Septima Clark exhibit. It can be accessed at:

http://www.theofficialschalloffame.com/inducteesa-g.html

The inductees are organized alphabetically. Septima Clark is on the third row, fourth from the left. Read the short paragraph and watch the video. Both parts are considered the exhibit and should be used in your analysis. A copy of the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) is attached.

Septima Poinsette Clark
SC Hall of Fame Exhibit
Video Transcript

Septima Poinsette Clark was born in Charleston, South Carolina in 1898, the daughter of a laundry woman and an illiterate former slave. Septima Clark was a teacher. In 1916, she graduated from the Avery Normal Institute. Her first teaching assignment was a black school on Johns Island. Drawing Clark’s thirty plus years of teaching experience, she learned the value and role of education in the community.

In the 1950s, Clark was invited to lead summer workshops at the Highlander Folk School in Monteagle, Tennessee.

[Katherine Mellon Charron, an associate professor at North Carolina State University says:] “One of the things that made the Highlander Folk School unique, and also made it a target, is that it had integrated workshops with white and black people living and working together.”

Rosa Parks attended one of Clark’s seminars months before the Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1955.

Esau Jenkins was a Johns Island farmer and bus driver. Jenkins attended sessions at Highlander where Clark was developing the concept of citizenship schools designed to help African American adults pass the literacy tests required for voting.

When Highlander school closed, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference established the Citizenship Education Program modeled on Clark’s workshops.

[During the above paragraph, the video shows a historical marker sign that reads:] HIGHLANDER FOLK SCHOOL 1932-1962

Following a 1959-1960 trial in Grundy County, the State of Tennessee revoked the school’s charter. It was adjudged to have violated segregation laws, sold beer without a license, and conveyed property to Myles Horton for his home. When the sheriff padlocked the school, Horton proclaimed Highlander to be an idea rather than simply a group of buildings, adding:
“You can’t padlock an idea.” In a 1979 Ford Foundation Report, Highlander was singled out as the most notable American experiment in adult education for social change.

By 1970, two million African Americans had registered to vote.

[D. Michael Clark, Grand-nephew of Septima Poinsette Clark concludes the video saying:] “Without Septima Poinsette, you have no Martin Luther King; you have no Rosa Parks; you don’t have a President Obama.”
APPENDIX P
THE AFRICAN AMERICAN MONUMENT ON THE STATE HOUSE GROUNDS

You have been assigned to analyze the African American Monument on the South Carolina State House grounds. Before you look at the site itself, you need to remind yourself of the role African Americans have played in our state’s history.

**Preparation Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“African-American Monument – Columbia, South Carolina”</td>
<td><a href="https://www.sciway.net/sc-photos/richland-county/african-american-monument.html">https://www.sciway.net/sc-photos/richland-county/african-american-monument.html</a></td>
<td>READ the article and TAKE notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sculptor of this monument was Ed Dwight. These three links are about his life and career. The third one is a time line. You can click on the items on it to find out more information.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.eddwright.com/about/behind-scenes">http://www.eddwright.com/about/behind-scenes</a></td>
<td>READ the text but DON’T take notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.eddwright.com/ed-dwight-today">http://www.eddwright.com/ed-dwight-today</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.eddwright.com/ed-dwight-timeline">http://www.eddwright.com/ed-dwight-timeline</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, before you begin to examine this historical site, google “Middle Passage images” and look at those showing how closely African American prisoners were packed into the cargo holds of the slave ships.

**Analysis**

Now that you have done the preparation work, you are ready to analyze and evaluate the exhibit. For the past eight exhibits on Eliza Lucas Pinckney, Chief Hagler, a Washington, DC site, African American women in the Civil War, the Rock Hill slave monument, Ben Tillman, Robert Smalls, and Septima Clark, you have used the Historical Thinking Method to train you how to analyze and evaluate them. It is now time to see
what you can do on your own without looking at a series of questions. Remember what these key terms mean.

**Analyze** – Google definition - “Examine methodically and in detail the constitution [the makeup or content] or structure of (something, especially information), typically for purposes of explanation and interpretation [explaining the meaning of something].”

**Evaluate** – Judge the quality of something.

As you examine, read, analyze, and evaluate the exhibit, jot down any thoughts that enter your mind about it. These may be written down in note format rather than in complete sentences. Just make it clear what you mean.

Once you have finished, turn your notes into an extended response explanation of your analysis. In other words, you will write an “essay” but without the formal introduction or conclusion. You will turn in your notes and your extended response to be evaluated. It will be evaluated using the cognitive skill of precision.

**Setting Up the Monument Virtually**

In your envelope are 32 photographs of the African American Monument on the South Carolina State House grounds. They are numbered 1 to 32. Lay them out on a flat surface in following format:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9  10 11 21 22 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 14 15 16 25 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 29 30 31 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before you begin to examine the photographs carefully, look at where this monument is located by clicking on the following website:

https://www.scstatehouse.gov/studentpage/Explore/map_monuments.shtml

If you click on the different numbers, they will reveal what is located at that spot. For example click on the following:
To help you understand the monument, the following three tables are provided:

**Organization and Layout of the Monument**

*Note:* If photo #s are listed in the same cell, place them next to each other horizontally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Icon Number</th>
<th>Monument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>James Byrnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wade Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Confederate Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strom Thurmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Benjamin Ryan Tillman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>Panel #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>Panel #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of Left Side Panels</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Overview of right side panels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Slave Auction</td>
<td>9 10</td>
<td>Flat Top of Granite Island</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Slave Prisoners on Ship</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Granite Island Showing the Middle Passage to Charleston</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Jim Crow Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 14 15 16</td>
<td>Rocks from African Sources of Origin</td>
<td>25 26</td>
<td>R3-4</td>
<td>The Great Migration Civil Rights Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Rice Field Workers</td>
<td>17 13 14 15 16</td>
<td>Slave Ship Cargo Hold</td>
<td></td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Civil Rights Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>Planning a Slave Revolt</td>
<td>18 17</td>
<td>Plaque on Back Side of Obelisk Monument</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>African American Pioneers and Achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>The Civil War</td>
<td>19 18</td>
<td>Front View of African American Monument</td>
<td>29 30 31 32</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>African American Pioneers and Achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### African American Monument Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>GANG OF 25 SEA ISLAND COTTON AND RICE NEGROES, By LOUIS DE SAUSSURE. On THURSDAY, the 25th Sept., 1852, at 11 o’clock, A.M., will be sold at RYAN’S MART, in Chalmers Street, in the City of Charleston, A prime gang of 25 Negroes, accustomed to the culture of Sea Island Cotton and Rice. CONDITIONS. – One-half Cash, balance by Bond, bearing interest from day of sale, payable to one and two years, to be secured by a mortgage of the negroes and approved personal security. Purchasers to pay for papers. NEGROES for SALE, at AUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>1st Reg. South Carolina Vol. GOD GIVES LIBERTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>EMANCIPATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>THE BLACK VOTE – 1868 15th Amendment LAND GRANTS TO EX-SLAVES THE LEGISLATOR VOTE HERE FREEDMEN’S BUREAU 14th Amendment Forty Acres and a Mule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>JIM-CROW LAW Sharecropping Black Codes SEGREGATION Lynching Plessy vs. Ferguson Convict Labor System Abridgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW BRIGGS VS ELLIOTT BROWN VS BOARD OF EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Panel R5

Some of the words of these signs are not completely shown because only half of the figure and the sign are shown in the sculpture. Possible reconstructions of the text are shown in brackets [ ].

FREE [DOM]  W [E]  FRE [E or EDOM]  WE
NO [W]  D [EMAND]  &  DESERVE
JUS [TICE]  EQU [AL or ALITY]  EQUAL
N [OW]  &  DESERVE

Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Text</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond, bearing interest from day of sale, payable to one and two years,</td>
<td>A bond is a way to borrow money. In this case, the purchaser of the slaves would buy the slaves using a bond for the purchase price. The borrower would have one, two, or three years (depending on how one interprets “one and two years”) to pay off the bond. In the meantime, the loan accrues interest. In other words, the borrower has to pay a certain percentage of money each day the loan is not paid off. This is how the loaner makes a profit by loaning money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be secured by a mortgage of the negroes and approved personal security</td>
<td>When a person borrows money, one has to have collateral, some type of property that can be seized and sold if the loan is not paid off. In this case the newly purchased slaves and other property the borrower owns will be the collateral, which the author of the advertisement calls “a mortgage.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasers to pay for papers.</td>
<td>As with all buying and selling, there is paperwork to be completed. The person buying the slaves will be responsible for paying for the official legal paperwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abridgement</td>
<td>The reduction or limiting of black civil and political rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Q
THE CONFEDERATE WOMEN’S MONUMENT ON THE STATE HOUSE GROUNDS

You have been assigned to analyze the Confederate Women’s Monument on the grounds of the South Carolina State House. Before you look at the site itself, you need to read about the role white Southern women played in the Civil War and afterward as part of the Lost Cause.

**Preparation Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“34d. The Southern Homefront”</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ushistory.org/us/34d.asp">http://www.ushistory.org/us/34d.asp</a></td>
<td>READ the article and TAKE notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Snowden, Mary Amarinthia”</td>
<td><a href="http://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/snowden-mary-amarinthia/">http://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/snowden-mary-amarinthia/</a></td>
<td>READ the article and TAKE notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Chestnut, Mary Boykin Miller”</td>
<td><a href="http://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/chesnut-mary-boykin-miller/">http://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/chesnut-mary-boykin-miller/</a></td>
<td>READ the text but DON’T take notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about the sculptor Frederick Wellington Ruckstuhl.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bomsey-autographs.com/cgi-bin/shortList.pl?number=5970">http://www.bomsey-autographs.com/cgi-bin/shortList.pl?number=5970</a></td>
<td>READ the text but DON’T take notes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

Now that you have done the preparation work, you are ready to analyze and evaluate the exhibit. For the past eight exhibits on Eliza Lucas Pinckney, Chief Hagler, a Washington, DC site, African American women in the Civil War, the Rock Hill slave monument, Ben Tillman, Robert Smalls, and Septima Clark, you have used the Historical Thinking Method to train you how to analyze and evaluate them. It is now time to see what you can do on your own without looking at a series of questions. Remember what these key terms mean.
**Analyze** – Google definition - “Examine methodically and in detail the constitution [the makeup or content] or structure of (something, especially information), typically for purposes of explanation and interpretation [explaining the meaning of something].”

**Evaluate** – Judge the quality of something.

As you examine, read, analyze, and evaluate the exhibit, jot down any thoughts that enter your mind about it. These may be written down in note format rather than in complete sentences. Just make it clear what you mean.

Once you have finished, turn your notes into an extended response explanation of your analysis. In other words, you will write an “essay” but without the formal introduction or conclusion. You will turn in your notes and your extended response to be evaluated. It will be evaluated using the cognitive skill of precision.

**Setting Up the Monument Virtually**

In your envelope are fifteen (15) photographs of the Confederate Women’s Monument on the South Carolina State House grounds. They are numbered 1 to 15. Lay them out on a flat surface in following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before you begin to examine the photographs carefully, look at where this monument is located by clicking on the following website:


If you click on the different numbers, they will reveal what is located at that spot. For example click on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Icon Number</th>
<th>Monument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>James Byrnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wade Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Confederate Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strom Thurmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Benjamin Ryan Tillman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use the following table to help you read the text. All references to inscriptions’ locations are based on the statue’s perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front</th>
<th>TO THE SOUTHERN WOMEN OF THE CONFEDERACY 1861-65 -- REARED BY THE MEN OF THEIR STATE 1909-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back</td>
<td>AT CLOUDED DAWN OF PEACE THEY FACED THE FUTURE UNDISMAYED BY PROBLEMS AND FEARLESS OF TRIALS IN LOVING EFFORT TO HEAL THEIR COUNTRY’S WOUNDS AND WITH CONVICTION THAT FROM THE ASHES OF RUIN WOULD COME RESURRECTION OF TRUTH WITH GLORIOUS VINDICATION INSCRIPTIONS BY WILLIAM E. GONZALES.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[On the bronze base itself]: F. W. RUCKSTUHL. 1911.
| The Woman’s Right Side | WHEN REVERSES FOLLOWED VICTORIES  
| | WHEN WANT DISPLACED PLENTY  
| | WHEN MOURNING FOR THE FLOWER OF SOUTHERN MANHOOD  
| | DARKENED COUNTLESS HOMES  
| | WHEN GOVERNMENT TOTTERED AND CHAOS THREATENED  
| | THE WOMEN WERE STEADFAST AND UNAFRAID.  
| | THEY WERE  
| | UNCHANGED IN THEIR DEVOTION  
| | UNSHAKEN IN THEIR PATRIOTISM  
| | UNWEARIED IN MINISTRATIONS  
| | UNCOMPLAINING IN SACRIFICES.  
| | SPLENDID IN FORTITUDE  
| | THEY STROVE WHILE THEY WEPT.  
| | IN THE REBUILDING AFTER THE DESOLATION  
| | THEIR VIRTUES STOOD  
| | AS THE SUPREME CITADEL  
| | WITH STRONG TOWERS OF FAITH AND HOPE  
| | AROUND WHICH CIVILIZATION RALLIED  
| | AND TRIUMPHED.  

| On the Scroll Held by the Young Angel | ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
| | [To the left is a ribbon with the state seal on it]  

| Glossary |  
| --- | --- |  
| Word/phrase | Definition |  
| reared | raised |  
| sublime | excellent or admirable |  
| thin lines of gray | a row of soldiers is often called a “line,” and many southern soldiers wore gray uniforms. This phrase is referencing southern soldiers fighting in the Civil War. |  
| solace | Comfort |  
| stricken | those who were injured in battle |  
| reverence | a deep respect |  
| unfaltering | steady, consistent, unhesitating |  
| righteous cause | “The Lost Cause” of the Civil War; the belief the South was engaged in a noble fight for states’ rights against the tyranny and oppression of the northern federal government |  
| immolation | a sacrifice |  

350
| the agony of suspense | the emotional anxiety women had to endure while their men were off fighting; the constant wondering if their men would be injured or killed or if the South would win or lose |
| shock of disaster     | the South losing the Civil War |
| perpetual             | forever |
| clouded dawn of peace | the beginning of the period after the Civil War, also known as Reconstruction |
| undismayed            | didn’t allow problems to discourage them |
| vindication           | to be proven correct or true (for fighting the Civil War) |
| tottered              | rocked back and forth almost falling over |
| ministrations         | helping or taking care of someone |
| fortitude             | strength |
| strive                | tried |
| desolation            | destruction of the Civil War |
| supreme citadel       | the best or strongest fortress or place of safety |
APPENDIX R

THE STROM THURMOND MONUMENT ON THE STATE HOUSE GROUNDS

You have been assigned to analyze the Strom Thurmond Monument on the South Carolina State House grounds. Before you look at the site itself, you need to read again about Thurmond.

**Preparation Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Thurmond, James Strom”</td>
<td><a href="http://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/thurmond-james-strom/">http://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/thurmond-james-strom/</a></td>
<td>READ the article and TAKE notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about the sculptor William Behrends who made the Strom Thurmond monument from his Facebook page.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.facebook.com/William-Behrends-Sculpture-Inc-108943255811757/">https://www.facebook.com/William-Behrends-Sculpture-Inc-108943255811757/</a></td>
<td>READ the text but DON’T take notes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

Now that you have done the preparation work, you are ready to analyze and evaluate the exhibit. For the past eight exhibits on Eliza Lucas Pinckney, Chief Hagler, a Washington, DC site, African American women in the Civil War, the Rock Hill slave monument, Ben Tillman, Robert Smalls, and Septima Clark, you have used the Historical Thinking Method to train you how to analyze and evaluate them. It is now time to see what you
can do on your own without looking at a series of questions. Remember what these key terms mean.

**Analyze** – Google definition - “Examine methodically and in detail the constitution [the makeup or content] or structure of (something, especially information), typically for purposes of explanation and interpretation [explaining the meaning of something].”

**Evaluate** – Judge the quality of something.

As you examine, read, analyze, and evaluate the exhibit, jot down any thoughts that enter your mind about it. These may be written down in note format rather than in complete sentences. Just make it clear what you mean.

Once you have finished, turn your notes into an extended response explanation of your analysis. In other words, you will write an “essay” but without the formal introduction or conclusion. You will turn in your notes and your extended response to be evaluated. It will be evaluated using the cognitive skill of precision.

**Setting Up the Monument Virtually**

In your envelope are eight (8) photographs of the Strom Thurmond Monument on the South Carolina State House grounds. They are numbered 1 to 8. Lay them out on a flat surface in following format:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before you begin to examine the photographs carefully, look at where this monument is located by clicking on the following website:


If you click on the different numbers, they will reveal what is located at that spot. For example click on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Icon Number</th>
<th>Monument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>James Byrnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wade Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Confederate Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strom Thurmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Benjamin Ryan Tillman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use the following table to help you read the text. All references to inscriptions’ locations are based on the statue’s perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front</th>
<th>STROM THURMOND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>STATESMAN - SOLDIER - EDUCATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHER AND ATHLETIC COACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CITY AND COUNTY ATTORNEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA SENATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAJOR GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY RESERVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNITED STATES SENATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHAIRMAN, SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHAIRMAN, SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE, UNITED STATES SENATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE FATHER OF FIVE CHILDREN:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NANCY MOOR – J. STROM, JR. – JULIANA GERTRUDE – PAUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REYNOLDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESSIE MAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALCOA MT HOLLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BELL SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BANK OF AMERICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back</td>
<td>STROM THURMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MONUMENT COMMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHAIRMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SENATOR JOHN COURSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SENATOR JOHN DRUMMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SENATOR KAY PATTERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REP. REBECCA DAVIS MEACHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REP. MICHAEL S. WHATLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REP. JOHN M. KNOTTS, JR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUDGE MARION H. KINON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES EGERTON BUTTOUGHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARTHA C. EDENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DR. WARREN H. ABERNATHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[On the bronze base of the statue itself]: W. BEHRENDS 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A CENTURY OF SERVICE
BORN DECEMBER 5, 1902 IN EDGEFIELD, SOUTH CAROLINA,
STROM THURMOND
PROVIDED NEARLY A CENTURY OF SERVICE TO THE PALMETTO
STATE AND TO THIS NATION.
HIGHLIGHTS OF HIS EXTRAORDINARY LIFE INCLUDE
PARTICIPATION IN THE D-DAY INVASION JUNE 6, 1944 (WORLD
WAR II),
FIVE BATTLE STARS AND EIGHTEEN MILITARY AWARDS AND
DECORATIONS.
THE ONLY PERSON IN AMERICAN HISTORY TO BE ELECTED TO
THE
UNITED STATES SENATE BY WRITE-IN VOTE – 1954.
THE LONGEST SERVING MEMBER AND THE OLDEST PERSON EVER
TO
SERVE ON THE UNITED STATES SENATE.
PRESIDENTIAL CITIZENS MEDAL PRESENTED BY PRESIDENT
RONALD W. REAGAN.
PRESIDENTIAL MEDAL OF FREEDOM PRESENTED BY PRESIDENT
GEORGE H. W. BUSH.
THE ORDER OF THE PALMETTO.

SCANA CORPORATION
SPRINGS INDUSTRIES
WACHOVIA BANK
THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>write-in vote</td>
<td>Rather than vote for the candidate(s) on the paper ballot, people wrote Strom Thurmond’s name on the ballot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Order of the Palmetto</td>
<td>a greatly respected award granted by the government of South Carolina to a civilian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX S**

THE WADE HAMPTON MONUMENT ON THE STATE HOUSE GROUNDS

You have been assigned to analyze the Wade Hampton Monument on the South Carolina State House grounds. Before you look at the site itself, you need to read again about Wade Hampton.

**Preparation Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Hampton, Wade III”</td>
<td><a href="https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/hampton-wade-iii/">https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/hampton-wade-iii/</a></td>
<td>READ the article and <strong>TAKE notes.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wade Hampton”</td>
<td><a href="https://www.history.com/topics/american-civil-war/wade-hampton">https://www.history.com/topics/american-civil-war/wade-hampton</a></td>
<td>READ the article and <strong>TAKE notes.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wade Hampton”</td>
<td><a href="https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lcn/sn84026900/1902-04-16/ed-1/seq-1/#date1=1902&amp;sort=relevance&amp;rows=20&amp;words=Hampton+Wade&amp;searchType=advanced&amp;sequence=0&amp;index=4&amp;state=South+Carolina&amp;date2=1902&amp;proxtext=Wade+Hampton&amp;year=5&amp;x=15&amp;dateFilterType=yearRange&amp;page=1">https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lcn/sn84026900/1902-04-16/ed-1/seq-1/#date1=1902&amp;sort=relevance&amp;rows=20&amp;words=Hampton+Wade&amp;searchType=advanced&amp;sequence=0&amp;index=4&amp;state=South+Carolina&amp;date2=1902&amp;proxtext=Wade+Hampton&amp;year=5&amp;x=15&amp;dateFilterType=yearRange&amp;page=1</a></td>
<td>READ the text but <strong>DON’T take notes.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Petition calls for dropping ‘racist’ name of SC high school”</td>
<td><a href="http://www.thestate.com/news/state/south-carolina/article150973757.html">http://www.thestate.com/news/state/south-carolina/article150973757.html</a></td>
<td>READ the text but <strong>DON’T take notes.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about the sculptor Frederick Wellington Ruckstuhl.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bomsey-autographs.com/cgi-bin/shortList.pl?number=5970">http://www.bomsey-autographs.com/cgi-bin/shortList.pl?number=5970</a></td>
<td>READ the text but <strong>DON’T take notes.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

Now that you have done the preparation work, you are ready to analyze and evaluate the exhibit. For the past eight exhibits on Eliza Lucas Pinckney, Chief Hagler, a Washington, DC site, African American women in the Civil War, the Rock Hill slave monument, Ben Tillman, Robert Smalls, and Septima Clark, you have used the Historical Thinking Method to train you how to analyze and evaluate them. It is now time to see what you can do on your own without looking at a series of questions. Remember what these key terms mean.
Analyze – Google definition - “Examine methodically and in detail the constitution [the makeup or content] or structure of (something, especially information), typically for purposes of explanation and interpretation [explaining the meaning of something].”

Evaluate – Judge the quality of something.

As you examine, read, analyze, and evaluate the exhibit, jot down any thoughts that enter your mind about it. These may be written down in note format rather than in complete sentences. Just make it clear what you mean.

Once you have finished, turn your notes into an extended response explanation of your analysis. In other words, you will write an “essay” but without the formal introduction or conclusion. You will turn in your notes and your extended response to be evaluated. It will be evaluated using the cognitive skill of precision.

Setting Up the Monument Virtually
In your envelope are sixteen (16) photographs of the Wade Hampton Monument on the South Carolina State House grounds. They are numbered 1 to 16. Lay them out on a flat surface in following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before you begin to examine the photographs carefully, look at where this monument is located by clicking on the following website:


If you click on the different numbers, they will reveal what is located at that spot. For example click on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Icon Number</th>
<th>Monument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>James Byrnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wade Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Confederate Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strom Thurmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Benjamin Ryan Tillman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use the following table to help you read the text. All references to inscriptions’ locations are based on the statue’s perspective.
| Right Side of Hampton | Commander of the Hampton Legion, Lieutenant General, C.S.A.  
Trevilian  
Seven Pines  
Burgess Mill  
First Manassas  
Gettysburg |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Front of Hampton      | Born  
March 28, 1818  
Died  
April 11, 1902  
To Wade Hampton |
| Left Side of Hampton  | Governor of South Carolina, 1876-1879  
United States Senator, 1879-1891  
Bentonville  
Brandy Station  
Sappony Church  
Cold Harbor  
Hawes Shop [
On bronze base of statue]: F. W. Ruckstuhl, SC. |
| Back of Hampton       | Erected by the State of South Carolina and its citizens  
Erected A.D. 1906 |
## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.S.A.</td>
<td>Confederate States of American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevilian</td>
<td>A Civil War battle fought in Virginia on June 11-12, 1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Pines</td>
<td>A Civil War battle fought in Virginia on May 31 – June 1, 1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess Mill</td>
<td>A Civil War battle fought in Virginia on October 27-28, 1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Manassas</td>
<td>A Civil War battle fought in Virginia on July 21, 1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg</td>
<td>A Civil War battle fought in Pennsylvania on July 1-3, 1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentonville</td>
<td>A Civil War battle fought in North Carolina on March 19-21, 1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Station</td>
<td>A Civil War battle fought in Virginia on June 9, 1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappony Church</td>
<td>A Civil War battle fought in Virginia on June 28, 1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Harbor</td>
<td>A Civil War battle fought in Virginia from May 31 to June 12, 1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawes Shop</td>
<td>A Civil War battle fought in Virginia on May 28, 1864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX T
STUDENTS’ CLOSING THOUGHTS ON THE HTM

To improve future use of the HTM with historical sites and museums, please answer the following three prompts on a Google Document. Once completed, please give me editing rights and share it with me electronically.

Prompt #1: Would you say that the HTM has changed how you analyze a historical site or museum exhibit? Explain with details.

Prompt #2: Read over the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) handout paying careful attention to each of its 32 prompts. Which prompts did you find most difficult? Why? Refer to them by their number and explain what made them difficult.

Prompt #3: Write any other thoughts on the HTM including suggestions on how to make it better. Please feel free to comment on sites that we analyzed or ones you wished we had examined.
APPENDIX U
DATA COLLECTION PLAN

Cycle 1: Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read professional literature. Continued development of the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) guide.</td>
<td>Spring 2016 through the 2016-17 school year and summer</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Notes and reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed instruction and data collection schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered Washington, DC, Columbia, South Carolina, and online exhibits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial trial of the HTM using photographs of the Benjamin Ryan Tillman statue on the State House grounds in Columbia, South Carolina.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cycle 2: Answering the Research Question Initial Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stage and Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalized the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) guide.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Teacher observations in field journal, memory, and HTM handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed selection of online, Washington, DC, and Columbia historical sites and exhibits used during the 2017-2018 school year.</td>
<td>Summer and Fall 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up calendar of these activities and trips.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bill of Rights Baseline Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stage and Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individually, students analyzed the National Archives and Records Administration online historical exhibit entitled <em>Bill of Rights and You</em>. I also showed them a picture of the actual exhibit on display at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History. They wrote their thoughts in a stream of consciousness style documenting their thinking process. This provided a baseline to compare to an activity at the end of the data collection period.</td>
<td>Acting Sep. 27-28, 2017</td>
<td>Student written analyses</td>
<td>Teacher observations in field journal Informal follow-up interviews or member checking if necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eliza Lucas Pinckney Museum Exhibit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stage and Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students did the preparation work (See Appendix H) on Monday, Oct. 23, 2017 for analyzing the Eliza Lucas Pinckney virtual exhibit at the South Carolina Hall of Fame. On Tuesday, Oct. 24, 2017, the teacher introduced the Historical Thinking Method (HTM) guide and walked students through it as they analyzed the Eliza Lucas Pinckney virtual exhibit at the South Carolina Hall of Fame. What was not finished students did on their own at home. On Wednesday, Oct. 25, 2017, the teacher and class quickly finished walking through the HTM. Most students know how to take informational notes from a source, so the teacher did not focus on #18 of the HTM.</td>
<td>Acting Oct. 23-25, 2017</td>
<td>Preparatory work Completed HTM guides</td>
<td>Teacher observations in field journal on Oct. 23-24, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chief Hagler’s Statue in the Town Green of Camden, South Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stage and Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students spent October 26 preparing to analyze the Hagler statue by reading websites, articles, and primary source excerpts (see Appendix I) and taking notes. On Oct. 27 and Nov. 1, working in pairs or as a trio, they analyzed the statue using their background materials (see Appendix I, especially the last article), eight photographs of the Chief Hagler/Joseph Kershaw monument located in Camden’s Town Green and the HTM.</td>
<td>Acting Oct. 26-27 and Nov. 1, 2017</td>
<td>Preparatory work Completed HTM guides</td>
<td>Teacher observations in field journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Washington, DC Site Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stage and Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students ranked their preferences for the following sites to analyze during their Washington, DC field study: the Lincoln Memorial, the Vietnam Women’s Memorial, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial, an exhibit of their choice at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and Culture, an exhibit of their choice at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, <em>The Dilemma of Slavery</em> exhibit in the J. Hap and Geren Fauth Gallery at Mount Vernon. The students were then assigned their analysis sites. The students prepared on Nov. 2-3, 2017 by reading the sites listed on their handouts and taking notes. What was not finished they did for homework during the weekend. During the actual trip from Nov. 6-10, 2017, they analyzed their sites using the HTM. The United States</td>
<td>Acting Nov. 2-10, 13-30 Dec. 1-4, 2017</td>
<td>Preparatory work Completed HTM guides Analysis Papers</td>
<td>Teacher observations in field journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holocaust Memorial Museum was visited on Tuesday, Nov. 7, 2017; the Martin Luther, King, Jr. Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, the Vietnam Women’s Memorial, and the National Museum of African American History and Culture were visited on Wednesday, Nov. 8, 2017; and The Dilemma of Slavery exhibit in the J. Hap and Geren Fauth Gallery at Mount Vernon was visited on Friday, Nov. 11, 2017.

Finally, from Nov. 13-30 and Dec. 1-4, 2017, the students finished their HTM analyses and wrote up their findings in a final paper.

---

**A Woman’s War Museum Exhibit Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stage and Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students examined <em>A Woman’s War</em> exhibit at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of African American History and Culture using photographs and transcripts of the display as well as the HTM.</td>
<td>Acting Feb. 2018</td>
<td>Preparatory work Student completed HTM guides</td>
<td>Teacher observations in field journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“To the Faithful Slaves” Monument Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stage and Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the HTM, students analyzed “To the Faithful Slaves” – a Civil War slave monument in Fort Mill, SC by examining photographs taken by the teacher. Online photographs and transcription of engraved text can be found at: <a href="http://www.hmdb.org/Marker.asp?Marker=42188">http://www.hmdb.org/Marker.asp?Marker=42188</a></td>
<td>Acting February 2018</td>
<td>Preparatory work Student completed HTM guides</td>
<td>Teacher observations in field journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Benjamin Ryan Tillman Statue on the State House Grounds, Columbia, South Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stage and Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students analyzed the Ben Tillman Statue at the South Carolina State House using photographs, transcripts of engraved text, and the HTM.</td>
<td>Acting March 2018</td>
<td>Preparatory work</td>
<td>Teacher observations in field journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student completed HTM guides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student written discussion on fate of Tillman statue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Septima Poinsette Clark or Robert Smalls Museum Exhibit Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stage and Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students analyzed either the Septima Poinsette Clark or Robert Smalls virtual exhibit at the South Carolina Hall of Fame using the HTM.</td>
<td>Acting April 2018</td>
<td>Preparatory work</td>
<td>Teacher observations in field journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student completed HTM guides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis of Monuments at the State House Grounds in Columbia, South Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stage and Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students toured the South Carolina State House and then used the HTM to analyze one of the following monuments: African American, Confederate Women, Strom Thurmond, and Wade Hampton.</td>
<td>Acting May 2018</td>
<td>Preparatory work Student notes of their analysis Student papers explaining their analysis in narrative format</td>
<td>Teacher observations in field journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Closing Thoughts on the HTM Written Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stage and Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students answer three prompts explaining their thoughts on how the HTM changed the way they analyze historical sites and museums, the difficulties they had with specific prompts, and what they thought about the sites they visited and if they had any further recommendations.</td>
<td>Acting May 21, 2018</td>
<td>Student interview responses</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What Comes Next?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stage and Date</th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decide what comes next. What needs to be revised for next school year? Shared with colleagues and prepared presentation for SCCSS and perhaps the NCSS.</td>
<td>Developing and Reflecting Summer 2018</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V
SAMPLE DRAFT OF PARENT CONSENT FORM
(modeled after Mertler, 2014, p. 110)

September 19, 2017

Dear Parent:

My name is Tim Hicks, and I am your student’s eighth grade Social Studies teacher in The Learning Collaborative (TLC).

I am excited about teaching your student about the history of our state and how its story fits within the larger narrative of our nation’s history. I believe the best way to teach history is to actively engage students in the analysis of primary and secondary sources, discussion of issues and events, and interaction with historic sites and museums, which we will visit this year during our field studies.

During the 2017-2018 school year, I will also be finishing my doctoral studies at the University of South Carolina. My dissertation is on student use of historical thinking when visiting both online and actual historical sites and museums. Basically, I am studying how to help students get the most out of trips to historical sites and museums by learning how to analyze, evaluate, and interpret what they are viewing and experiencing.

I am writing for permission to periodically video/audio-tape, survey, and interview students about their thoughts and experiences during our class activities and on our field study visits this year. I would also like to analyze and write about their written work in my dissertation.

While all students will participate in lessons and assignments as the normal part of the curriculum, their participation in video/audio-taping, surveys, or interviews, as well as the allowance of me using their written work is completely voluntary and any permission granted can be rescinded at any time without penalty. Their participation, withdrawal, or non-participation will have no influence on their grades.

All data collected will be kept confidential, and I will use only pseudonyms in my dissertation. In addition, any work or other documents containing their names will be destroyed within two years of my dissertation’s completion.

If my dissertation ends up being published or I present its findings at the school, district, state, or national levels, I will continue to maintain your confidentiality and only use pseudonyms. I will also be happy to discuss my findings with you if interested.
As always, I can be contacted via e-mail (thicks@richland2.org), phone (803-351-7274), or in person (Room B217 after school) if you need to discuss any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Timothy E. Hicks

_____ I have read this letter and give my student permission to participate as described above.

_____ I have read this letter and do NOT give my student permission to participate as described above. I understand that he or she will still participate in the curriculum, but I do not want him or her video or audio-taped, given surveys, or interviewed, nor have his or her work analyzed and included in the dissertation.

Student’s Name: _______________ Parent’s Name: ________________________________

Parent’s Signature: ________________________________
Dear Student:

My name is Tim Hicks, and I am your eighth grade Social Studies teacher in The Learning Collaborative (TLC).

I am excited about teaching you about the history of our state and how its story fits within the larger narrative of our nation’s history. I believe the best way to teach history is to have you actively engaged in analyzing primary sources and secondary sources, discussing issues and events, and interacting with historical sites and museums, which we will visit this year online and during our field studies.

During the 2017-2018 school year, I will also be finishing my doctoral studies at the University of South Carolina. My dissertation is on student use of the historical thinking method when they visit online and actual historical sites and museums. Basically, I am studying how to help students get the most out of places by learning how to analyze, evaluate, and interpret what they are viewing and experiencing.

I would like to periodically video/audio-tape, survey, and interview you about your thoughts and experiences during our class activities and field study visits this year. I would also like to analyze and write about your written work in my dissertation.

All students will participate in lessons and assignments as the normal part of the curriculum. However, your participation in video/audio-taping, surveys, or interviews as well as the allowance of me using your written work is completely voluntary, and any permission granted can be rescinded at any time without penalty. Your participation, withdrawal, or non-participation will have no influence on your grades.

All data collected will be kept confidential, and I will use only pseudonyms in my dissertation. In addition, any work or other documents containing your name will be destroyed within two years of my dissertation’s completion.

If my dissertation ends up being published or I present its findings at the school, district, state, or national levels, I will continue to maintain your confidentiality and only use pseudonyms. I will also be happy to discuss my findings with you if interested.
As always, I can be contacted via e-mail (thicks@richland2.org), phone (803-351-7274), or in person (Room B217 after school) if you need to discuss any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Timothy E. Hicks

| Timothy E. Hicks __ YES. I am willing to be video/audio-taped, surveyed, or interviewed during the 2017-2018 school year as part of Mr. Hicks’s dissertation research and give my permission for him to use this data and my written work in his dissertation and presentations. I know that I can change my mind later. | __ NO. I do not want to be video/audio-taped, surveyed, or interviewed, nor have my work used in Mr. Hicks’s dissertation or presentations. |

Student Name: __________________________

Signature: ____________________________
APPENDIX X
DC SITE ANALYSIS PAPERS

Now that you have completed the HTM, you are going to discuss your analysis in an in-class essay. Basically, you are to write a paragraph or two for each of the six C’s – creation, context, content, connection, corroboration, and criticism – in which you summarize your analysis (answers to the questions). The organization of your essay into eight (8) paragraphs and the content covered in each should be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Content Discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation, Part I</td>
<td>#1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation, Part II</td>
<td>#4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>#11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content, Part I</td>
<td>#13-17, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content, Part II</td>
<td>#18 and 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>#21-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corroboration</td>
<td>#26-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>#29-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your writing should be clear and your answers to the questions thoroughly explained. While this is an in-class paper and I do not expect conventions to be perfect, you have been writing long enough to be able to write a paper with limited errors or mistakes.

[Note: The rubrics I used for this paper have been removed. I plan to address how to grade these analyses in the next phase of this action research study, which I address in Chapter 5 of this dissertation.]
APPENDIX Y
A VIRTUAL TOUR OF THE STATE HOUSE AND GROUNDS

It was hoped that we would tour the South Carolina State House and then walk the grounds and analyze one of the statues/monuments, but there were no openings that would work with our schedule. Consequently, I have brought the statues/monuments to you in the form of photographs. However, before we begin our analysis, we need to familiarize ourselves with the state capitol building and grounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Name</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Directions</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tour Inside the State House       | https://www.scstatehouse.gov/studentpage/Explore/tour_inside.shtml | Click on and read the following sites:  
* The First Floor  
* The Main Lobby  
* The Stained Glass Windows  
* House Chamber Portraits  
* House Gallery Portraits  
* Senate Chamber Portraits  
* Senate Gallery Portraits  
* The Joint Legislative Conference Room (Library) | Jot down at least TWO (2) important facts from each of the 8 sites listed to the left for a total of at least 16 facts. |
| Tour Outside the State House      | https://www.scstatehouse.gov/studentpage/Explore/tour_outside.shtml | Click on and read the following sites:  
* The State House  
* The Dome  
* Architectural Features  
* Monuments and Markers  
* The Gressette Building  
* The Blatt Building  
When you visit the “Monuments and Markers” above click on the numbers on map. You will then see a picture of the site with some explanatory text. | Jot down at least TWO (2) important facts from each of the 6 sites listed to the left for a total of at least 12 facts. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Name</th>
<th>Facts Learned From Your Reading</th>
<th>Facts Learned From Your Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tour Inside the State House</strong></td>
<td>The First Floor</td>
<td>House Gallery Portraits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Main Lobby</td>
<td>Senate Chamber Portraits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Stained Glass Windows</td>
<td>Senate Gallery Portraits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House Chamber Portraits</td>
<td>The Joint Legislative Conference Room (Library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tour Outside the State House</strong></td>
<td>The State House</td>
<td>Monuments and Markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Dome</td>
<td>The Gressette Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architectural Features</td>
<td>The Blatt Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The State House History</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3)</td>
<td>13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4)</td>
<td>14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5)</td>
<td>15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6)</td>
<td>16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7)</td>
<td>17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8)</td>
<td>18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9)</td>
<td>19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10)</td>
<td>20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Z
THE TEXT ANALYSIS GUIDE (TAG)

A source may not answer every question. In that case, put NA for “Not Applicable” or “Not Answerable.” You will NOT have enough space to answer on this sheet so write on your own paper. You can answer these questions in note format as long as you are thorough and your thoughts can be understood fully by what you wrote.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CREATION (Origin)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 What are you looking at?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Who created the source? What do we know about this person or group? You may need to do a bit of research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 When was the source created?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Where was the source created?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Why was the source created?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT (Background)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Look at your answers to #3 and #4 above. What was happening in history at the time the source was created that might help you understand it better?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT (Opinions and Information)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 What opinions/claims of the creator are stated or implied in the source?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 How does the source’s word choice, imagery, or examples reveal the creator’s point of view or bias? Provide specific quotes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 What factual information/evidence is offered to support these opinions/claims?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 What viewpoints (if any) are NOT covered?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 What additional information (not included in #8) does this source provide? Do NOT provide a general description. Take DETAILED notes!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 What questions does this source raise in your mind? These could be about something you had difficulty understanding or something you wish the source explained but did not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORROBORATION (Reliability)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 How much time passed from when the event happened to when the source was created?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Who was the audience of this source?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 How might knowing the audience affect your opinion of the reliability of this source?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compare and contrast this document with another source. Does this second source contradict anything you read in the source you are analyzing in this TAG? Explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sometimes differences are not contradictions and can be resolved upon closer examination. Explain if this applies to the differences you identified in #16. If not, then consult a third source that might help clarify or solve the contradiction. Explain what you found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Overall, do you think the original source (the one you are analyzing in this TAG) is reliable? Why or why not? Remember, reliability does not have to be an all or nothing proposition. There are degrees of reliability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX AA
THE NEW HISTORICAL THINKING METHOD (HTM 2.0)
FOR HISTORICAL SITES AND MUSEUMS

Important Points to Read Before You Begin Your Analysis

On this handout, a historical site, museum display, monument, etc. will be referred to as an “exhibit.” Exhibits may include different components such as text, visual images (photographs or artwork), artifacts, sculpture, or architectural elements, which will be referred to as “items” in this handout. In the prompts below, you will often see the verb “EXPLAIN.” Keep in mind that it means more than a single statement. It means you should offer reasons, multiple examples, or details that help the reader understand why you wrote your initial statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal: What can I learn about the origin of this exhibit and its items?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) What are you looking at (a historical site, museum display, monument, etc.)? If it is a museum exhibit, what is its title?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) You have already done some background reading on this exhibit’s topic. Before you begin to analyze the exhibit, EXPLAIN your personal view of the exhibit’s topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Describe this exhibit so that someone could close his/her eyes and visualize it based on your description. Be sure to include text, visual images (photographs or artwork), artifacts, sculpture, or architectural elements in your description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It might also be helpful to collect maps or pamphlets or take photographs with your phone if allowed. Make sure the images are focused, and you can read any text in the photographs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Who (person or group) created this exhibit and its items? Remember, in the case of a monument or memorial, there is typically a group of people who sponsor or oversee it, and then there are artist(s) who physically make it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) When were the exhibit and items created? If possible, include a month, day, and year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Why were the exhibit and items created?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Where is this exhibit located? Be as specific as possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) What is the **significance** of the exhibit’s location or immediate surroundings?

   *If this exhibit is a monument, memorial, or building, answer #9.*
   *If not, skip to #10.*

9) What is the story behind its creation?

### Context

**Goal: What is this exhibit’s relation to history?**

10) **EXPLAIN** what was going on in history that will help you understand the **topic** of this exhibit?

11) **EXPLAIN** what was going on in history at the time the **exhibit** was created or preserved that could help you understand it?

### Content

**Goal: What does the exhibit tell me?**

Do **NOT** consider the sources you examined in the preparation activity. You are only examining what the **exhibit itself** reveals.

As you begin to answer these questions, pay attention to any characteristics that may emphasize something. For example, textual exhibits may use headings, bold print, large size font, etc. In other exhibits, architectural elements may play an important role.

Keep in mind the following points:

- viewpoint = perspective = bias
- These can be stated or implied.

12) **EXPLAIN** the viewpoint, perspective, or bias of the exhibit. Try to include sample text to show the viewpoint, perspective, or bias of a source and **EXPLAIN** how the text communicates this viewpoint, perspective, or bias.

13) What evidence or information is offered in support of this viewpoint, perspective, or bias? Do **NOT** write quotes.

14) How do the design elements of the exhibit reinforce its viewpoint, perspective, or bias?
15) Write down a key text from the exhibit that really captures the essence of what this exhibit is telling you. **EXPLAIN** why you selected this text. If there is little text, then you may select a design feature instead.

16) What viewpoints or perspectives are **NOT** addressed in this exhibit? These could include those of women, other minority groups, or other interpretations of the topic. However, make sure that they are relevant and important to the exhibit’s topic. This should **NOT** be a long list and might be just a single group.

17) How does the exhibit relate positively or negatively to race or sex/gender?

18) What additional information does this exhibit provide? This is when you take **DETAILED** notes on **ALL** the information the exhibit provides. Do **NOT** summarize or generalize. Write these in your own words in note-format. This is important because later you will compare the information in these notes to the sources you read before analyzing this exhibit.

19) What questions does this exhibit raise in your mind but does not answer? Do **NOT** dismiss this prompt. Keep thinking until you have **at least** one question. You do not know everything about the topic. What else could you learn about?

These questions should be able to be answered through research. Also be sure to write these questions so they ask for more than a yes or no answer. For example, do not start a question with “did.” Finally, make sure that your question was not answered in the reading you did prior to this activity or in the exhibit itself.

---

**Connection**

**Goal: Why should I care about this exhibit?**

20) How is the exhibit’s viewpoint, perspective, or bias similar to or different from your own?

21) What personal influences have led you to having your viewpoint, perspective, or bias?

22) What emotions or attitudes do you experience as you analyze what this exhibit tells you about the past? **EXPLAIN** what in the exhibit’s text, design, and/or artifacts prompts this reaction.

23) **EXPLAIN** any connection you can make from this exhibit to the present day. It might be a big idea like morality, racism, or sexism, or it could be a similar situation in the news.
24) **EXPLAIN** specifically what you, as a teenager, might do about this connection. This may take some thought. That’s okay.

### Corroboration

**Goal: Is the exhibit reliable?**

25) Compare and contrast this exhibit with the sources you read in your preparation work. What do they disagree on?

26) Discuss the reliability of this exhibit. You will need to consider:
   - Factual information – accuracy and what is included or excluded
   - Viewpoint, perspective, or bias – may or may not damage its reliability
   - How well it supports its viewpoint, perspective, or bias
   - Missing viewpoints
   - Relationship to race and gender/sex

Then make a decision and discuss it:
   - This exhibit is NOT reliable because __________
   - This exhibit IS reliable BUT ___________________
   - This exhibit IS reliable because ________________

### Criticism

**Goal: What do I like or dislike about the exhibit?**

27) **EXPLAIN** if you think the exhibit does/does not address the topic well.

28) **EXPLAIN** what you find impressive about this exhibit and why.

29) **EXPLAIN** any changes that might make it better. In other words, what would you tell the creators of the exhibit (i.e., content scholar, visual artist, landscape artist, and sculptor)? Be as specific as possible.