1-1-1992

National History Day : an ethnohistorical case study.

Marilyn L. Page
University of Massachusetts Amherst

NATIONAL HISTORY DAY: AN ETHNOHISTORICAL CASE STUDY

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED

by

MARILYN L. PAGE

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

September 1992

School of Education

NATIONAL HISTORY DAY: AN ETHNOHISTORICAL CASE STUDY

A Dissertation Presented

by

MARILYN L. PAGE

Approved as to style and content by:

Patrick J. Sullivan, Chair

William Venman, Member

Jarice Hanson, Member

Bailey W. Jackson, Dean
School of Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my chairperson, Patrick Sullivan: for his constant support, for his genius in being able to make me feel terrific about having to improve my drafts, and for caring.

To my committee member, William Venman: for his to-the-point critiques, his ability to cut through the mire, his intolerance for wasting time, and his ability to keep me from taking myself too seriously.

To my committee member, Jarice Hanson: for her support, her organizational expertise, her lightening-quick analysis, her suggestions, and her assistance with personal questions.

To my committee members as a wh0le: for freely offering their diverse and often contradictory philosophies, opinions, and suggestions. The strength of their convictions gave me the confidence to develop and clarify my own.

To Robert Smith, Marsha Alibrandi, Susan Seigel, and Judy Miller: for their support, warmth, caring, and helpful suggestions.

To Kenneth Parker: for always being there, for providing me with the opportunity to work with student teachers, and for taking the time to attend my dissertation defense. Ken is a compassionate and understanding leader and an outstanding model.

To Robert Ferrell of Indiana University: for teaching me, for caring about me, for giving me direction, for always remembering me, and for helping me start and finish this awesome journey.

To John Scheib, a rare person: for caring about me and believing in me.

To John Milios: for showing me the possibilities, for making me laugh at myself and at life, for listening, and for understanding.

To Darlene Sanderson, a friend without equal: for her wit, support, understanding, and ability to make anything seem humorous.

To Joan Corke: for her understanding, support, and special friendship.

To my family, Dan, Dave, Phil, and Jeannie: for keeping the lights on.

To my son, Dave: for always, always asking how it was going, for encouraging me to continue, and for caring. The world will soon know his genius.

To my son, Phil: for using his subtle humor to make the darkest times seem light, for caring enough to organize a celebration, for saving Christmas, and for making anything seem possible.

To my daughter, Jeannie: for her sensitivity and tolerance, for helping me to keep things in perspective, and most of all for caring.

To all my children: for accepting a mother who hasn't always been quite like the others and for caring about each other so much.

To my parents, Mabel and Norman Monks: for always supporting my decisions and encouraging my independence, for making me believe I could do anything, and for setting examples. Norman is 83 years old and still has not "retired." Mabel graduated from Clark University with high honors at age 71. With parents like these, how could I not succeed?

To all who asked why: for giving me the added motivation and drive to continue and finish.

Finally, to the participants in this study: for giving me their time, their stories, and their support. There are not words to express my thanks adequately. I hope I have recorded their experiences accurately and apologize here for my errors. To Terri in particular I owe a deep gratitude for the following:

> Adam and I spent one Friday night in the library until 10 o'clock. We were talking about people in school and [calling] them nerds. Then I said, "Adam, we are the nerds. It's 10 o'clock and we're in the _____ Senior High School library on a Friday night." We left 5 minutes later.

Likewise. . . .

ABSTRACT

NATIONAL HISTORY DAY: AN ETHNOHISTORICAL CASE STUDY

SEPTEMBER, 1992

MARILYN L. PAGE, B.A., BOSTON UNIVERSITY

M.Ed, BOSTON STATE COLLEGE

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Directed by: Professor Patrick J. Sullivan

The purpose of this study was to obtain a realistic portrait of National History Day (NHD)--a secondary school, history related program in which students research and develop presentations on a topic related to an annual theme. My goal was to determine: whether the positive claims for NHD were realistic; why and how the program grew from a local program with 129 students in 1974 to over 500,000 students in 48 states in 1991; and what implications there were for educational processes.

For this ethnohistorical case study, which combined ethnographic and historiographic methods, I collected historical data through documentary material and interviews; perspectives of teachers and students through interviews and observations; and supplementary and validating data through interviews with state coordinators and former students. The study participants were the "founding fathers" and Executive and Associate Directors of NHD, 13 students and 4 teachers from 3 schools in different states, and 3 state coordinators

and 6 former NHD students from corresponding states and schools.

The data support the claims of superior cognitive, affective, and skill development through student participation in NHD. The data also show that the teachers and students in this study participated mainly because NHD provided opportunities for self-determination, self-comparison, close student-teacher relationships, community contribution, receiving recognition, and having fun. Furthermore, results indicate that these motivational dynamics account, at least in part, for the program's phenomenal growth. Additionally, findings suggest that for these participants competition was the driving force behind the level of involvement and calibre of work. While all study participants claimed major benefits and few drawbacks to the competition format, most considered the judging process to be inconsistent and a weakness in the program.

Implications for educational practice revolve around how to incorporate the motivational components of the NHD process into the curriculum. The implications for the teaching and learning of history relate to methodology. The participants indicated that through the NHD process students gained a deeper comprehension of historical content and concepts and a greater ability to think critically and to develop their own knowledge than was possible in a traditional, teacher-dominated classroom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

> I don't do a lot in school. . . . I don't like any of the high school classes really. You just sit there and they tell you something and they give you a test and you tell it right back to them. Everybody has the same answer on the test if you do it right. . . . I'd rather do this [NHD]. . . . You get to go out. . . and you can just do it however you want. . . . You can come up with your own ideas. (Clark, 1990)

> The fact is they [students] have an ownership on this. . . . It's really theirs, because they've invested so much in it. This represents what they are all about. (McCray, 1990)

Attesting to its strength, approximately 500,000 secondary students nationwide participated in the National History Day program (hereafter referred to as NHD) during the 1990/91 school year. These numbers are remarkable considering that the national office staff consists only of the Executive and Associate Directors who are assisted by predominantly volunteer state and district coordinators and who work with an erratic and tenuous budget.

Undergirding the NHD program is an educational process which proposes to promote student competency and interest in carrying out original research in history while improving student achievement and critical thinking skills. In this program, students in grades 6 through 12 are required to: select a topic related to an annual theme; find, analyze, interpret and organize data; relate the data to an historical context; and develop a presentation on that topic

in one of four areas--historical paper, group (not more than five) or individual table top project, group or individual media, or group or individual performance (see Appendix A for further explanation). Students also must prepare an annotated bibliography of primary and secondary sources and write a one to two page description of how they researched and developed their presentation and of how their topic relates to the theme. Depending on how successful the students are at district and state competitions, the program lasts from 6 to 9 months and culminates in state winners competing at the national level in June at the University of Maryland. Historians, educators and experienced professionals in related fields judge the entries.

My involvement in the NHD program began 8 years ago when I[1] introduced the program to my history classes in a last ditch attempt to alleviate boredom in the classroom. Two years later several of the students listed "National History Day" in their senior yearbooks as the "Most Memorable Event" of their high school years. This

---

[1]Note: Throughout this dissertation, I use the personal pronoun "I" rather than using "the researcher" or reconstructuring sentences into the weak passive voice. I posit that this is a stronger statement of responsibility for the dissertation contents and I reject the notion that "I" is less academic. In addition, the use of "I" is more indicative of a researcher's role in qualitative research as the primary research tool and as the interpreter of the findings. Not only does a researcher's presence as the primary research tool necessarily have some effect on the outcomes, but a researcher's background and prior experiences (in phenomenological terms), influences, if only minimally, interpretation of data.

surprising response, added to the dramatic cognitive and affective results I witnessed in the program, led me to doctoral work and to this study of the dynamics of NHD.

A literature review showed that all of the published reports, testimonials, and descriptions of NHD and associated cognitive and affective results were positive and in sharp contrast to the dismal reports and descriptions of traditional, contemporary schooling which analysts portray as boring, uninspired, inadequate, ineffective, and backwards. This discrepancy between the accounts of NHD and those concerning contemporary education intrigued me and at the same time raised questions about the validity of the claims for, and descriptions of, NHD.

A student and teacher involved in a pilot study (see Appendix B) confirmed both the published reports on NHD and the analysts' descriptions of contemporary high school education. The student described her high school classes as "boring" but NHD as "fun" and as allowing students to "learn. . . the most about things." The teacher denounced the traditional history curriculum and methodology as superficial and leading to students' lack of understanding. On the other hand, she claimed that students in NHD invested more, refined their work more, learned more, showed "growth in a lot of different areas" and had "an ownership" on their work.

Since its inception as Cleveland History Day in 1974, there has never been a comprehensive study of the History Day program. My goal was to fill that vacuum with this critical case study of NHD. At the same time, I wanted to determine: whether the claims for NHD were realistic and founded; why and how the program grew from a local program with 129 students in 1974 to over 500,000 students in 48 states in 1991; and what implications there were for educational processes and concerns. This case study, which is hypothesis generating rather than hypothesis testing, focuses on obtaining a "rich, thick description" (Merriam, 1988, p. 11) of the NHD program.

To obtain as realistic and complete a portrait of NHD as possible, I conducted an ethnohistorical case study. The model for my research approach was Puckett's (1986, 1989) educational ethnohistorical case study of Foxfire--a program which Eliot Wigginton began in the late 1960s in an Appalachian high school and which involves students in producing magazines, books, radio shows, records, and video-tapes on local culture. The ethnohistorical approach, which combines ethnographic and historiographic methods, allowed me to study, determine, and describe not only the historical foundations and the contemporary processes and dynamics of NHD, but also the relationship between the two elements. Using a combination of both methods I was able to obtain a more complete picture than I could have using either method

alone. (Details of methodology are explained in Chapter III).

The first part of this research concentrated on the history of NHD. In October 1990 (see Appendix C for complete timetable of events) I traveled to NHD national headquarters at Case Western Reserve University and interviewed the two "founding fathers" and the Associate and Executive Director of NHD. (For explanation of all interviewing techniques, see Chapter III). I also collected what written materials the office had on NHD and its history, processes, and organizational structure. These materials included financial reports, testimonial letters, annual reports, published articles, an introductory video-tape, theme fliers, contest guides, and classroom supplements (see Appendix A for extended description).

The ethnographic part of this study involved in-depth interviews of teachers and students in 3 schools. In January and February of 1991 I traveled to the 3 schools--one in the Southwest and 2 in different states of the Northeast--and conducted the first set of interviews. In each school I interviewed the teacher or teachers who conducted the NHD program and students representing (at each school) one group and one individual entry. During this first visit, I also researched the historical, cultural, and economic context of the school and community and collected written materials concerning the school's NHD program. At

two of the schools, projects and presentations of former students were available for viewing.

In April 1991, after the students had been involved in district and/or regional competition, I traveled again to the schools and conducted the second set of interviews. In June I attended the national competition at the University of Maryland where I was able to be a participant observer and to conduct the third set of student interviews. (I talked a third time informally to the teachers by phone after the national competition.) All of the students involved in this study, except for one who dropped out of the program in March, received first or second place at their state finals and consequently went to Maryland for the National competition. This was a part of the research I could not have foreseen; it was probably the most vibrant part of the study for me because I was able to observe teachers and students acting in, and reacting to, an atmosphere of excitement, anticipation, and pressure while actually "doing" one part of NHD.

The students at two of the schools agreed to keep a journal of their NHD activities and related feelings and reactions. While this process was not a total success, the journal data that was available augmented the interview data and served as a check on the internal validity of that data. As further checks on the internal validity of the data from administrators, teachers, students, and documentary

material, and to fill gaps in the data, I conducted telephone interviews with 3 state coordinators and 6 former NHD students who represented the states and schools in this study.

My hope is that this study yields a realistic portrait of NHD. While this study confirms and in fact provides additional data in support of the claims of cognitive and affective results of student participation in NHD, it also reveals issues and concerns about certain aspects of the program's processes and policies. Practically, then, this study provides the NHD staff and committees with a basis for considering whether, and/or what, modifications or new directions for the program are warranted and appropriate. In addition, the results allow, and lead to, implications about issues beyond the program itself:

1. This study adds to the research base on the teaching and learning of history and provides suggestions and conclusions concerning the same.
2. The students' and teachers' perspectives yield insight into the relationship between the concept of motivation and concerns involving curriculum, methodology, the constraints of educational systems, and educational reform.
3. This study adds to the research base on competition and active learning by providing a qualitative case

study perspective rather than yet another quantitative, experimental, contrived study on the same.

Following this introduction, Chapter II presents a review of the literature on NHD, on teaching and learning of history, and on theories of active learning, competition, and motivation. The literature review provides the basis for analyzing how this study adds to, confirms, and/or contradicts existing research data. Chapter III discusses the research methodology. Discussion includes expanded definition of the ethnohistorical method and an explanation of how this study contributes to the development of this genre of research. Also included are descriptions/ explanations of the sample, the interviewing techniques, data collection, data analysis, and means of establishing reliability and validity.

Chapter IV explores the history of NHD and provides the historical context for analyzing, interpreting, and discussing the participants' perspectives which are examined in Chapter V and VI. Chapter VIII interprets the study's findings in relation to previous research on motivation, competition, and active learning and also presents implications for contemporary educational processes nd for the teaching and learning of history. Chapter VIII presents conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In a hypothetical-deductive study, the researcher ties the content of the literature review to the study's theoretical framework. However, in an inductive, exploratory study, such as this study of NHD, the literature fields, except for those related to the study's initial focus or problem, are generated as the researcher collects and analyzes the data (Glaser, 1978; Lincoln & Guga, 1985; Merriam, 1988). Only as concepts, categories, and issues emerge through the data analysis, can the researcher conduct a complete and pertinent literature survey.

The beginning focus of this literature review is the NHD program; and since NHD involves the teaching and learning of history, and since one of the purposes of this study is to determine implications for those processes, the review presents that topic next. The third section in this review discusses literature on the concept of active learning. Not only do most of the published reports on NHD refer to this concept as a vital part of the program, but several of the participants' descriptions and comments focused on the importance of this component.

The fourth topic of this review is competition. Before beginning this study, I had focused my attention and questions on the cognitive and affective results of participation in NHD. However, it became apparent during

the study, as participants often initiated discussions about competition and/or competition events, that determining the importance of the competitive aspects of NHD was not only integral to the understanding of the program's processes and results and to the development of a complete picture of NHD, but also to the analysis and understanding of the participants' perspectives.

Another issue which emerged during the data collection and analysis was that of motivation. As the participants described their ongoing and prior experiences in NHD, it became clear that at least for these teachers and students there was an extraordinary degree of involvement, commitment, time, and work. This led to questions concerning, and a review of the literature on, motivation.

In this study, then, the review of literature on the program itself, on the teaching and learning of history, on the concept of active learning and on the theories of competition and motivation provides a context for, and has in part been determined by, the analysis of the data.

National History Day

All of the published reports and descriptions of the NHD program and its results are positive. Articles (Briggs, 1986; Haas, Donnohue, & Jennings, 1985; Keller, 1987) claim that NHD promotes higher level learning, builds student interest in history and social studies, leads to creative behavior, increases student research and analytical skills,

gives students a more critical perspective of their class work and textbooks, and increases students' self-confidence. These descriptions and claims are based on the author's personal experiences with NHD.

Adams and Pasch (1987), however, conducted a qualitative study of NHD. Based on examination of entries at the national contest in 1984, and on student responses to open-ended questionnaires about the educational and personal significance of having participated in NHD, these researchers came to the same conclusions as the authors above and argue that NHD is a "stimulating intellectual experience" (p. 179) as well as an active learning adventure which leads to historical and global understanding.

It is not remarkable that Adams and Pasch found the positive results that they did. While their report does not make clear when during the year they conducted this study or who the students were, several factors indicate that the respondents in the study were the national finalists and that Adams and Pasch conducted the study at the national competition which concluded the year's program. If the study participants were the national finalists, this would mean that they had already won competitions at the district and/or regional and state levels. It is not surprising, then, that their responses would be positive about the program. Also, it would be reasonable to assume, if these were the national finalists, that they were more motivated,

interested, determined, and perhaps more creative than contestants who did not qualify for the national competition.

The Adams and Pasch study leaves questions about: a) what the students' perspectives would have been if Adams and Pasch had conducted the study while the students were involved in the research and before they had reached the national finals; and b) what the perceptions of other participating NHD students, who might not have been as motivated, creative, or as able as the national finalists, would have been. Did Adams and Pasch capture what it means to participate in NHD or did they capture what it means to the one percent or less of the participants who compete at the national level?

Briggs (1986), a teacher of gifted students, argues that participation in NHD can be especially valuable for gifted students as it provides multiple opportunities for gifted behavior to emerge and emphasizes student involvement with and investigation of real problems. Briggs claims that the students become "autonomous learners, independent seekers of knowledge, the practicing professionals of their field" (p. 90). While Briggs sees these effects as appropriate and desired for gifted students, these results should be what educators want for every student. It is unclear, however, from this and the other descriptive and prescriptive reports, as well as from the Adams and Pasch

study, where and how students of other ability levels fit into the NHD program.

Although Hoffman (1987), a teacher in an inner-city magnet program, observed favorable results of NHD participation for his students, in his descriptive report he does not elaborate on the ability level of the students either. However, he addresses another aspect of NHD which has received little attention. Unlike the other program supporters and Adams and Pasch, who ignore the issue of effects of the competition, Hoffman claims that it was the pull of the competition and desire to win that improved the calibre of his students' written work:

> All of this contest activity generated considerable attention from the students as the year progressed. . . No one would have won anything, however, without first developing the ability to do the research and the writing. (p. 201)

While there are no other studies or descriptive reports of NHD of which I am aware (besides the explanatory and descriptive reports from the NHD staff), there is a description of a similar program in Germany. In the Pupils' Competition for the Federal President's German History Prize (Von Borries, 1989), students develop individual or group projects--in the form of books, collages, exhibitions, and media presentations--related to an annual theme. This contest, as with NHD, emphasizes the use of primary source research (often including interviewing and on-site research) and learning by discovery and provides for a jury to judge

the entries. While the goals and organizational structure of the German context differ from those of NHD, the claims about the program's effects, which state that the contest encourages and requires a high level of student autonomy and helps to develop historical skills and understanding, are strikingly similar to those of NHD. Some teachers in Germany believe the cognitive and affective results of the program to be so strong that they, the teachers, have replaced the official curriculum with this competition.

As a whole, the literature on NHD leaves questions about how the entrants' profiles and motivation, the competition format, the program processes,and the cognitive and affective results of NHD fit together. In addition, the literature sheds no light on if, how, or why teachers in the United States incorporate NHD into their curricula. Should NHD or its approach to teaching history be incorporated into the secondary history curriculum (Adams & Pasch 1987; Keller, 1990)? Could NHD serve as a model to replace the "dull, routinized, and passive" (Keller, 1987, p. 84) way in which history is taught and learned in most schools? How do the processes of NHD relate to the history and goals of the teaching and learning of history?

Teaching and Learning of History

The following sections review the literature on the history and status of history in the schools, methods of teaching history, contemporary history/social studies

frameworks, and student ability to learn and comprehend history and historical concepts. The purpose is to lay the foundation for analyzing NHD's place in the teaching and learning of history.

History and Status of History in Schools

> History has a quality unique among school subjects. There is a fateful correspondence between the role of history in the education of citizens, and its role in the maturation of the individual. The public face of history turns outward toward the students' roles in society; the private face looks inward to their unfolding mental powers. In no other school subject is there such an extraordinary relationship between the imperatives of society, subject and individual growth. (Hertzberg, 1989, p. 40)

An historical perspective on the content, purpose, and place of history in the high school curriculum allows for a more complete understanding of the same in today's curriculum and provides a context for exploring NHD's relationship to the curriculum. This section, then, presents the history and status of history in the curriculum since the late 1800s.

History was a part of the public school curriculum before the Civil War, but it did not become well established until the lat 1800s (Ravitch, 1988). At that time, as the high school population grew in size and diversity, the discussion over the place and purpose of history in the curriculum became part of a broader confusion and disagreement over the content and purpose of the high school curriculum (Hertzberg, 1989; Jenness, 1990). In 1893 the

Committee of Ten (a subgroup of the national commission which the National Education Association sponsored to study the question of curriculum and schooling goals) proposed a history curriculum that would start in grade five, emphasize the use and development of critical thinking and responsible citizenship skills, and analyze primary sources (Jenness, 1990). It was German-trained historians, most of whom had been secondary school teachers, who not only promoted this "scientific" or "new" history, but in 1884 had founded the American Historical Association (AHA) the purpose of which was to promote the study of history in public schools (Hertzberg, 1988; Jenness, 1990).

The AHA Committee of Seven, which convened in 1896 to address the still unsettled question of the relationship of high school history curriculum to college entrance requirements, extended the previous recommendations and again stressed the teaching of history through primary and secondary sources for citizenship and development of critical thinking skills. The committee members saw history as the unifying subject of the curriculum (Hertzberg, 1988; Project Span, 1982; Ravitch, 1988). It was this Committee of Seven who determined the Eurocentrically based (ancient, European and American history) high school history curriculum, which spread quickly and was virtually universal by 1916 (Jenness, 1990). Furthermore, (except for changes in course titles and rearrangement and consolidation of

content) this has remained the core of the high school history curriculum in the United States and has become part of the heated debate over multicultural vs. Eurocentric curricula (Armour-Thomas & Proefriedt, 1991).

The 1916 NEA Committee on the Social Studies initiated a precedent and conflict that also has lasted until the present. This was the first time the term "social studies" was used for the field formerly known as "history and the allied subjects" (Hertzberg, 1988; Jenness, 1990). The Committee's recommendation shifted the curriculum emphasis from the study of history to the study of societal issues and recommended reducing the required history courses while adding courses involving current events and society's problems (Jenness, 1990). These recommendations reflected the new progressivism, the changing student body (which included more male, more working class and more immigrant students) and the growth in the fields of sociology, anthropology, and economics (Hertzberg, 1988; Jenness, 1990; Ravitch, 1988). Since that time there has been an ongoing antagonism and debate between historians and social studies advocates as to the place of their disciplines in the curriculum and as to the relationship of their discipline/field to the other (Jenness, 1990; Keller, 1987;).

From 1916 to the 1960s, the content of the history/social studies curriculum remained essentially the

same--variations on the 1896 and 1916 Committee recommendations. (Hertzberg, 1988; Jenness, 1990;). In the early 1960s, the New Social Studies Movement, which was part of American Academics' response to Sputnik and an apparent need to revamp American education, attempted to change the methodology and content of the history and social studies curricula. What resulted is a matter of interpretation. Historians saw and recorded it as an unfortunate and undesirable fragmentation of the history courses into narrow case studies (Keller, 1987; Ravitch, 1975). Social studies advocates applauded the new curriculum for emphasizing inquiry, discovery, and decision making skills and allowing students to study social problems in depth (Barr, R.D., Barth, J.L., & Shermis, S.S., 1977; Engle, S.H., 1963; Massialas, B.G. & Cox, C.B., 1966). In any case, most teachers never adopted the new curriculum (Weiss, 1977).

What did have an effect on the history/social studies curriculum, according to the literature (Grant, 1988; Jenness, 1990; Keller, 1987; Powell, 1988; Ravitch, 1983), were the series of national crises in the 1960s (including the Civil Rights Movement; assassinations of President Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy, and Martin Luther King; America's involvement in Vietnam; and youth rebellions against the Establishment). The student and political activists cried for relevancy and attention to social and political issues in the school curricula. In response,

according to the same literature, the history/social studies curriculum was sliced into minicourses which tried to address histories of ethnicities, race and gender.

During this time there was again a heightening of the antagonisms between the historians and social studies advocates. There were proposals to eliminate history from the curriculum (Wesley, 1967) because it was seen to be irrelevant to students' needs; at the same time there were declarations that history was in danger of being displaced by social studies (Kirkendall, 1975) and repeats of Bestor's (1953) argument that social studies should be abolished because it trivialized the study of history.

Looking back from the 1980s, Keller (1987) argued that the 1960s and 1970s curricular changes pushed history away from its central place in the curriculum, and Ravitch (1985) concluded that by the mid 1970s the social studies and history curriculum was in a state of curriculum anarchy. Downey (1985) submitted that by the mid-1980s, while history maintained its hegemony in the social studies curriculum, there had been a constant erosion of courses related to world history (Adler & Downey, 1985).

While there may be some relevance in or truth to all of these arguments, it is difficult to determine what the history curricula throughout the United States have been and are, since there is no central recording of this information (Downey, 1985). In addition, the literature reflects the

beliefs and positions of authors most of whom are or were college professors and not of the classroom teachers who have had to deal with the curriculum. I submit that the majority of schools have had (even during the 1960s and 1970s) and still have a history/social studies curriculum based on the recommendations of the committees of 1896 and 1916.

The 1980s back-to-basics movement--which followed declining achievement scores of the 1970s--and the emerging, developing, and continuing debate about the need for a multicultural curriculum have once again intensified the discussions that have been ongoing for over 100 years concerning the place, purpose and content of history in the history/social studies and larger school curricula. Of these three components--place, purpose, and content--it is the purpose of teaching and learning history that is the most important yet often the most elusive, unclear, or forgotten component.

The Committees of 1893 and 1896 stressed that the goal of teaching history should be to develop in students critical thinking skills which would allow them to become responsible citizens. While these goals should be those of an education in general, it is the discipline of history, of all the disciplines it seems, that this is the best fitted to accomplishing these goals. When history teaches, that is, when students learn from their study of history, how to

discern causes and effects of events; analyze and interpret the interrelatedness of, and similarities among and differences between, aspects of societies and of parts of the world; develop and understand historical perspective; and discover how and why different peoples and societies got to where they are, it enables the students to understand what is happening currently in the global world and to make appropriate, founded, grounded, and intelligent judgments and decisions about societal issues. The study of history has the potential to develop these kinds of critical thinking skills in students. Whether or not students develop the skills is determined by how history is taught and learned.

Teaching History

> The improvement of history teaching in the schools is not just desirable, it is a national necessity. (Hertzberg, 1989, p. 40)

> The value of history in the development of good citizens is taken for granted. Few have ever asked how facts learned from the exposition and memorization of history are used by citizens in their daily life or, for that matter, if they are used at all. (Engle, 1990, p. 431)

It is clear that the dominant teaching method, regardless of what committees or commissions have recommended, is and has been one involving a textbook and transmission of facts (Cuban, 1991; Elliott & Kennedy, 1979; Hertzberg, 1982, 1985; Jenness, 1990). Ravitch (1985) argues that by 1980 history's place in the curriculum had been weakened not only by the events of the 1960s and 1970s

but also by ineffective teaching. Yet, there has been an emphasis on active learning methods in history ever since the 1880s. The Committees of 1893, 1896, and 1916 recommended the same methods as reformers now advocate--active student participation, student investigation, observation, use of primary materials and on-site research, rather than teacher talk (Hertzberg, 1989). The problem is that in most cases this hasn't happened and doesn't happen (Hertzberg, 1989).

Cuban's (1991) study of the teaching of history and social studies is the most extensive and concludes that a teacher-dominated methodology has been prominent for the last century. In a study of 80 years ago (Stevens, 1912), researchers observed 100 teachers and found that the main method was rapid-fire questioning which gave students little time to think. In another study (Hughes & Melby, 1930), trained observers documented all activity of 116 teachers an found little evidence of student-centered teaching. Cuban (1991) found that from the 1940s to the 1980s most articles on history and social studies teaching methods were either descriptive self-reports or prescriptive articles; what surveys and studies exist from that time period and up to the present reveal that a lecture/questioning/worksheet technique has been the most common method of instruction at the high school level (Cuban, 1991; Goodlad, 1984;

Hertzberg, 1982, 1989; Jenness, 1990; Kaufman, 1982; Morrissett et al, 1980; Weiss, 1977).

Weiss (1977) reviewed the National Foundation of Science studies of the "new social studies," which preached student involvement, and found that most teachers never adopted the content, materials, or method. Project Span (Social Studies Priorities, Practices, and Needs) found that 50 percent of teachers in that study used one text, 90 percent of the homework came from the text, and that the dominant style of instruction was lecture and recitation (Morrissett et al, 1980). Hertzberg (1989) sarcastically called the duplicating machine the most used technology in the teaching of history; Goodlad (1984), in his 8 year study of schooling, found that the preponderance of activity in history classrooms was "listening, reading textbooks, completing workbooks and worksheets and taking quizzes" (p. 213); and (Kaufman 1982) concluded that teacher-made tests stressed factual recall rather than critical thinking skills or comprehension.

These are dismal commentaries on the teaching of history. According to this literature, students in most history classes "learn" or have learned or, more accurately are and have been fed, whatever information the teacher deems or has deemed to be important. There are several possible reasons why the teacher-dominated method has been so persistent--there is so much to cover; teachers lack

disciplinary knowledge (Shulman, 1987) and need to rely on textbooks; teachers adopt a practical pedagogy that allows them to survive in the classroom (Cuban, 1991); the school lacks resources (Barr & Dreeben, 1983); the apparent ability of the students affects how the teacher teaches (Goodlad, 1984); and teachers like to tell the "truth" rather than to help students find their own truth (Sizer, 1983). All of these factors probably influence the teaching of history, but I argue that the two most important factors in determining methodology are the need or requirement to cover the material and the lack of teacher preparation and disciplinary knowledge.

Covering the Material. Traditionally most teachers do not question the curriculum, and even if the teachers develop the curriculum, the questions are usually about what can and should be covered and when. While there may be discussion on goals in terms of cognitive and skill learning results, there is rarely if ever a question about how the intended and desired results can be reached if a teacher is trying to cover a mass of information or in fact about what method of teaching could accommodate covering the large amounts of material involved in typical history courses. School policy, pressure from the local administration, and lack of confidence can lead to a teacher's need to cover the material, but poor teacher preparation is probably a larger part of the problem.

Teacher Preparation. As Shulman (1987) suggests, when teachers lack disciplinary knowledge they need to rely slavishly on the textbook. Brodkey (1991) is not optimistic about seeing improvement in this area:

> Poor teachers will continue to rely on the materials and texts that are most readily available. They will move in a lockstep fashion through a curriculum that many students find to be deadly boring and irrelevant. (p. 26)

Teacher preparation in history is at best inconsistent and at worst a joke. There are programs in which students get certified in social studies without ever having a history course; yet these teachers teach history. State certification standards, teacher preparation programs, and the ambiguous definition of social studies are all parts of the problem. Being certified in social studies in many states will allow teachers to teach history, economics, sociology, psychology, law, geography, etc. with little or no course work in that particular subject area (Jenness, 1990; Keller, 1987).

The lack of connection between the education departments and the history departments at colleges and universities is another major concern (Goodlad, 1990; Jenness, 1990; Keller, 1987;) and manifests itself in the lack of appropriate curriculum development in teacher education programs in history. Some colleges or universities do not offer courses in the subject that most student-teachers have to teach; or they offer courses in a

format that is inappropriate for teacher preparation (Goodlad, 1990; Jenness, 1990; Keller, 1987) and consequently student-teachers or new teachers are unable "to make connections between their undergraduate subject-matter and the high school curriculum" (Goodlad, 1990, p. 242) they are required to teach.

Yet how well history teachers teach depends on how well they know and understand their subject. In a study of expert and novice teachers in the Stanford University Teacher Assessment Project and Knowledge Growth in a Profession Project, researchers (Wineberg & Wilson in Downey & Levstik, 1991) found that expert history teachers had a vision of history, a large store of information, and a perception of the discipline as a puzzle needing to be solved. The novice teachers who were history majors tended to perceive the discipline in a way similar to the expert teachers. The non-majors however did not necessarily become better history teachers by acquiring more "factual" knowledge.

These results would indicate that there is a method and structure to the discipline of history that is different from that in other disciplines or fields. Unless the teacher has taken part actively in discovering that structure and method, which is one of research and inquiry, she/he probably will rely on her/his own schooling experience, which most likely involved a teacher-dominated

system (Smith, 1991), or on what allows her/him to survive in the classroom (Cuban, 1991) in determining methodology.

Little has been done up to this point to restructure history teacher education programs or to address the methodology/curriculum content issue. However, in the last 4 years there has been a concerted, though disconnected effort, to shore up, define, and expand the place of history in the history/social studies and large school curricula. What are these new frameworks and will they make a difference in the teaching and learning of history?

Contemporary Frameworks

> It [the story told by the Bradley Commission, California's History-Social Science Framework and the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools] begins with statements about critical citizenship and participatory democracy; the rest of the story, however, is about the warehousing of historical and social scientific knowledge. (Parker, 1991, p. 27-28)

Several national and state commissions have developed new history/social studies frameworks in an attempt to: answer the questions of place, purpose, and content of the history/social studies curriculum; secure and expand history's place in that curriculum; and at least in part respond to the 1980s reform movements which called for addressing curriculum deficiencies. The three most prominent contemporary frameworks are: the California History-Social Science Framework of 1988; Charting a Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century, the report of the

National Commission for Social Studies in the Schools (1989); and Building a History Curriculum: Guidelines for Teaching History in Schools, from the Bradley Commission on History in Schools (1988).

There are several common elements in these frameworks:

1. The goals of the curricula represented in these frameworks/policy statements are the same as those expressed by the Committees of 1893, 1896, and 1916--to develop in students (through active learning) critical thinking and responsible citizenship skills.

2. Each of the reports places history as the core of the social studies curriculum while emphasizing its integration with all other disciplines and subject.

3. Each recommends depth of coverage rather than a superficial skimming of large amounts of materials.

4. In reflection of recent debates, and in differing degrees, each stresses the necessity of a multicultural perspective.

5. Each proposes that students learn when possible through analyzing primary sources.

6. Each emphasizes the need for all students to understand the past in order to make informed judgements in an ever more complex world.

Goal/Content Contradiction. While the content/sequence of each proposed curriculum differs, each plan has the same flaw in terms of secondary education--although emphasis is

on in-depth study, each proposal adds more content in the form of traditional history courses, reminiscent of the late 1800s, and recommends adding and addressing the perspectives of all histories of the world. The California plan calls for 6 years of American and world history from grades 7 to 12. The Bradley Commission, which was the first national commission to devote its attention exclusively to history in the schools, recommends and provides four alternative sequencing patterns through which all students can achieve 4 years of history, including American, western and world, from grade 7 to grade 12.

The National Commission for Social Studies, which was the first national panel to examine the field of social studies in nearly 50 years, presents the most innovative proposal but it too contains the in-depth study/expanded content contradiction. Nevertheless, the plan probably holds the most promise of the three in that it recommends that world and American History be combined for a three-year sequence in grades 9 through 11. Not only does this proposal recognize there needs to be a continual rather than an interrupted or alternate sequence of courses, but in combining American with world history demonstrates the importance of studying the interrelatedness of the history of our global world and provides a new approach to the impossible task of teaching from "Adam to Atom" (O'Reilly, 1991, p. 298) in one year.

Once again the problem is the contradiction between the goal of in-depth study and the proposal to expand the curriculum content. The National Commission of Social Studies and the Bradley Commission attempted to address this inherent conflict by suggesting a thematic approach. While these two plans at least recognize the contradiction/ conflict, I submit that a thematic approach is difficult not only for the students, who need to keep track of where they are, but difficult if not impossible for most teachers, particularly those with weak background or preparation in history.

Teaching Method and Curriculum Content. The greatest deficiency in these plans is manifested in an extension of the deeper study/expanded content contradiction described above. It is the lack of attention to how the goal of developing critical thinking skills through an active learning methodology can be met in an expanded curriculum content. In fact, these plans not only do not address the issue of teaching method (except superficially) but perpetuate and increase the problem of covering massive amounts of materials.

While the Bradley plan acknowledges omission of teaching method, it is the belief that curriculum can be determined separately from discussion of method that leads to the overload of material and to a teacher-directed and teacher-dominated method through which the teacher attempts

to cover the material. Moreover, the Bradley Commission confuses the issue of method further--in its explanation of how history can and needs to nurture critical thinking skills developed through active learning--when it states: "History must illuminate vital themes and significant questions, including but reaching beyond the acquisition of useful facts" (p. 9).

There are two problems here in regard to teaching method. First, it isn't history that illuminates; it is how the students organize, analyze, and interpret historical data that allows for discovery, understanding, and application of ideas, themes and theories--that is, the use of critical thinking in decision making. Second, the Bradley Commission uses the term "facts" often in its report and does not elaborate on whose or what facts these are or how they have been obtained or the connection, or lack of, to active learning. Facts are not fixed truths but interpretations; if the students are doing the interpreting, it is active learning; if the students are receiving these facts ready-made, it is not active learning.

The California plan supports a variety of teaching methods "that engage students actively in the learning process" (California State Department of Education, 1988, p. 22); the plan describes activities such as debating, role-playing, and simulating historical events as types of active learning, but doesn't explain how these activities represent

or involve active learning. The National Commission of Social Studies suggests these activities also but provides a clearer connection between the activities, the definition of active learning, and the development and use of critical thinking skills in at least two ways--the report recognizes that knowledge is not something fixed, but rather is human made and requires student involvement and production; and it stresses the need for students to learn how to evaluate all sources of information and to be aware of how media select, shape, and constrain information. I argue that when students practice and apply these critical skills in producing the activities mentioned in the California and the NCSS plans, it becomes active learning.

The National Commission's report goes beyond these pronouncements to a recommendation of what I posit is one of the most comprehensive forms of active learning; the Commission proposes that in the seventh grade, the students and teachers develop their own teaching materials on local history. This kind of activity requires that students research, organize, analyze, and interpret data--that is, use critical thinking skills in order to develop presentable teaching materials.

The question is: Why aren't teachers and students on every level involved in developing at least some of their own materials (Brodkey, 1991)? This is especially important if we recognize that knowledge is constructed and

interpreted individually and that students need this kind of active involvement, research, organization, and production to develop and expand their own knowledge and to develop and practice using critical thinking skills. A student does not learn to think critically--that is, to discriminate between the relevant and irrelevant; to recognize bias, propaganda, and stereotypes; to interpret and analyze written and visual data; and to make intelligent decisions--unless she/he has practice using these skills.

Having these three recent history/social studies frameworks helped with the issues and problems in the teaching and learning of history if they barely touch upon methodology in relation to content? While there are some descriptive reports written by secondary school teachers about their special methods and projects involving participatory learning (Braggs & McWilliams, 1989; Cuban, 1991; Ferguson, 1989; Trotter, 1989), what you would see if you observed most history and social studies classrooms today, I argue, would be a teacher lecturing and students listening, or appearing to listen, and/or taking notes. If this is so, then Wesley (1967) was right--history was (and is) meeting no "needs that pupils can appreciate" (p. 3). To carry that further, taught in this passive way history does not and will not meet the needs of the citizens of the 21st century.

The teaching of history is only one part of this puzzle and framework; the learning of history is the other. What do the literature and research say about the learning of history and how are issues of methodology reflected in the students' attitudes towards the study of history?

Learning History

> Among students, there is widespread dislike and indifference to the social studies. . . . Students seem to see little relevance between what we are teaching. . . and the problems of the real world they know or they know about. They find the . . . exposition of history . . . extremely resistant to learning, easily forgotten, and of no consequence in any case. (Engle, 1990, p. 431)

Goodlad (1984) found that students rated history as one of their least favorite and one of the least interesting courses. Likewise, in a random selection/interview-based study (Schug, Todd, & Berry, 1984), students in grades 6-12 in two different schools in the Mid-West called history boring and mindless. Other research, though, shows that this negative attitude and lack of interest is more a reflection of teaching method than of subject matter. Shemilt (1980) in a study of secondary history students found a relationship between method and attitude. Results showed that students in an in-depth, primary source-based course in history in Great Britain, while judging history to be more difficult than math, were less likely to find history boring than the students in the traditional classes. Newmann (in Jenness, 1990) agrees with Shemilt that attitude

has more to do with the method than subject matter. He observed social studies teachers "over a fairly sustained period, in a few demographically diverse schools" (p. 380) and concluded that the more difficult and more engaged classes had fewer students who perceived classes as boring or mindless. He describes engaged classes as involving "sustained examination of a few topics rather than superficial coverage of many" (in Jenness, 1990), p. 380-381).

This issue of attitude and method is related to the persistent question of student ability to comprehend historical concepts. The belief that early adolescence is a watershed in terms of development of historical thought (Adelson, 1971) was supported by studies (Hallam, 1967, 1972) investigating the connection of Piagetian stages of development to the development of historical understanding. The studies involved asking students age 11 to 16 to answer questions about short historical narratives, and results showed that concrete operational thinking began at about age 12 to 13 for these students as compared with ages 7 and 8 of Piaget's math and science students; formal operational thinking began at about 16 as compared to 11 and 12 for Piaget. The conclusion was that adolescents find it more difficult to think hypothetically and deductively in history than in science and math.

There were and are many criticisms of this research because of its narrow definition of historical thinking. Booth (1984) argues that the logic of historical thought is not primarily deductive; that history is an interpretive, inductive, affective exercise. The fact that the researcher used narrative texts to the exclusion of other kinds of historical materials is also a weakness. If Hallam's findings in fact were valid, students could not grasp history in any meaningful way until the last years of high school.

The issue is once again one of approach. While students develop different cognitive skills at different times, this does not mean that adolescents, or younger students, can not develop historical understanding or learn how to think critically at some level. It is what the students do with the history that makes the difference not only in attitude but in comprehension. If students are receiving someone else's knowledge, it is doubtful they will understand or appreciate historical concepts at any age. Furthermore, I propose that students can learn how (or improve their ability) to reason abstractly while simultaneously developing historical understanding and critical thinking skills when they are allowed and helped to do their own investigating and interpreting. The main issue is one of methodology in relation to discipline structure, not cognitive development stage.

There is support for this position from the findings of several studies. In a two-year study of secondary world history students, Booth (1980) found that students made significant gains in their abstract thinking abilities and concluded that the improvement was the result of teaching method (including investigation and interpretation of primary sources), not innate student development. Additionally, in an evaluation of the British Schools Council History 13-16 Project, a three-year primary source-based history curriculum, Shemilt (1980) found that compared to the control group in traditional history classes, the students could develop explanations, ideas, and theories more readily. His conclusion (similar to Booth's) was that students can develop and refine understanding of history to a considerable degree through analyzing and interpreting exercises.

In another study showing the connection between teaching method and development of cognitive skills, Blake (1981) used documentary sources as primary instruction materials for a group of 9-11 year olds. He found that the instruction produced a "striking qualitative difference in the way they thought about the past" (p. 403). He also concluded that the use of primary source material made high school students more sensitive to the interpretative nature of history. Downey & Levstik (1991) concluded from their review--the largest and most recent--of what astoundingly

little research exists on this issue, that in-depth study allows historical understanding where broad surveys may not. They submit that courses which stress coverage and memorization are probably not useful for development of hypothetical thinking or historical reasoning.

I suspect Downey and Levstik would agree with Commager (1980) that survey courses involving memorization and recitation are "almost guaranteed to rot the brain" (p. 34). They suggest that students need to see how information fits into the larger context of historical knowledge and need historical topics "rich enough to support sustained study" (p. 407). Their most important conclusion is that linking content, process, and experience is necessary to facilitate the learner's construction of meaning or schemata. This proposition leads to the question of how the cognitive paradigm and active learning theories relate to or address the methodology of the teaching and learning of history.

Active Learning Theory

> There is no such thing as genuine knowledge and fruitful understanding except as the offspring of doing. (Dewey, 1916, p. 321)

> I tell you one thing, if you learn it by yourself, if you have to get down and dig for it, it never leaves you. It stays there as long as you live because you had to dig it out of the mud before you learned it. (Norton in Wigginton, 1985, intro.)

In his version of the cognitive paradigm, Wittrock (in Mackenzie & White, 1982) proposes that students need to

generate new meaning or new information by relating learning experiences to prior knowledge, that students need to be active in processing new material, and that the more active the student is in processing his own material, the more effective and permanent the learning will be. In other words, what the student learns and comprehends is what she herself constructs.

The cognitive paradigm provides the foundation for active learning theory. This paradigm supposes a reciprocal interaction between the student and environment in which the student's schemata (mental structures--ways of perceiving and understanding) affect the student's perceptions of the environment (experience) and consequent actions; this experience in turn changes the student's schemata which in turn influence future learning and actions on the environment. In a traditional classroom, students sit, listen, and sometimes absorb information, but rarely make observations, investigate or solve problems for themselves. The changes in the student's mental structures, i.e. learning, in this kind of environment are much smaller than changes in a student's schemata when the student is active in or on his environment (Page, 1990a).

While the proponents of active learning do not necessarily use the terms "cognitive paradigm" or "schemata" in their theories, they express the same concept (Bruner, 1961, 1971; Dewey, 1931/1970; Freire, 1981; Pestalozzi,

1801/1898; Piaget in Labinowicz, 1980; Rousseau, 1762/1957; Sharan & Sharan, 1976; Wigginton, 1989). These theories, based on the cognitive paradigm, revolve around several propositions: that students learn more by doing--by being actively engaged in their own learning; that by investigating and discovering for themselves, by creating and re-creating, students construct their own knowledge structures; that learning actively leads to an ability to think critically and to solve problems; and that through an active learning method students learn content and the process at the same time (Page, 1990a).

Past and contemporary results on the use of active learning methods are overwhelmingly positive. The most extensive research study began in 1933 and was conducted by the Progressive Education Association. The Eight Year Study involved 30 high schools which implemented progressive innovations. All schools used activities and methods based on the active learning tenets discussed above. Later research based on these students' college records, instructors' reports, written work, and student questionnaires and interviews concluded that graduates of the progressive schools were more successful than their matches in academic achievement, were more resourceful, and had more worldly concerns (Aiken, 1942; Greene, 1942; Walten & Travers, 1963). Results of other older studies were

similar (Geyer, 1936; Greene, 1942; Tyler, 1975; Washburn & Rath, 1927).

In more recent research, Phillips and Faris (1977) in a comparative study of two learning methods concluded that students will probably learn more if given the chance to do so in nontraditional ways. In their study of 2 groups of senior government students (same teacher), one group learned in the traditional lecture, discussion mode while the other group used innovative techniques including independent study and internships. The active learning students tested higher in most of the tests during the school year and surpassed the traditional students in achievement after the first few weeks.

In a study of retention abilities of eighth and ninth graders after a geography field trip, Mackenzie and White (1982) found that students who had processed their own information on the field trip showed marked superiority in retention of knowledge over the field-trip students who were given information by the teacher. Other recent research has shown results of active learning methods to be gains in creativity and intelligence (Bredderman, 1983; Massialas & Zevin, 1967), greater comprehension (Kinzer, 1984), and increased motivation and self-direction (DeCharms, 1976; Gray and Chanoff, 1986,).

Cooperative Learning/Active Learning

There are dozens of cooperative learning methods, some of which provide a great deal of structure, extrinsic motivation for learning, predetermined, teacher-defined learning objectives and basically involve a teacher-dominated method (Slavin, 1989). Examples of these forms of cooperative learning include the STAD, TGT, TAI, and CIRC methods of Slavin, the Learning Together variations of Johnson and Johnson, and the Jigsaw methods of Aronson and Slavin (Slavin, 1991). In these forms of cooperative learning teaching is mostly expository. While it is often one student teaching another, teachers do most of the planning; and the objective is usually the learning of basic skills involving right and wrong answers, basically variations of drill.

On the other hand, Sharan's (Sharan et al, 1985) Group Investigation method (hereafter referred to as GI) and Kagan's (1985) Co-op, Co-op method, although also concerned with academic achievement, have the learning process and the development of higher level thinking skills as their primary emphasis. The objective is to get the students actively involved in their own learning and for the students to learn a critical thinking process; students control the goals, learning is student-directed, and the rewards are intrinsic. In the GI model, in a process similar to that in NHD, students work in small groups and gather, analyze, and

evaluate data and draw conclusions on a topic of their choosing. They then prepare a report and presentation for the class. Peers and teachers evaluate the work (Sharan & Sharan, 1976, 1989/1990). Like GI, kagan's (1985) Co-op, Co-op method involves group research and presentation.

In five large scale comparative studies of the GI method, Sharan and Sharan (1989/1990) found that GI students in elementary and secondary schools had a higher level of academic achievement than the students in traditional classes. The GI students also did better on questions assessing higher level learning although sometimes only just as well on acquiring information. On tests of social interaction the traditional teaching methods stimulated a great deal of competition among students while the GI method promoted cooperation and mutual assistance and social interaction among classmates from different ethnic groups.

Kagan's (1985) study of his Co-op, Co-op method with university students showed similar findings in increased learning and improved social relations; while an evaluation of a high school study (Kagan, 1985) revealed that some students would not cooperate, some refused to participate at all, and some were absent often, these problems were probably more of a reflection of the inner-city school culture than of Kagan's method.

Problems and Gaps in Active Learning Research

In the earlier research on active learning, the lack of independent variable control presents a challenge for the interpreter; the studies did not address the effect of such variables as student motivation and attitude, activity novelty, teacher involvement, teacher attitude or time on task (Page, 1990). Researchers in this earlier researcher also lacked effective tools to measure desired cognitive outcomes (such as the ability to think critically, apply knowledge, and to problem solve) and affective outcomes (such as cooperative attitudes, motivation and attitudes of social responsibility).

These weaknesses, in view of the fact that both the older and newer research have the same predominantly positive results, are not the most serious problems. What constitutes a larger problem is the lack of research at a secondary level and lack of qualitative investigations of existing active learning programs. Most of the research that exists on active learning methods involves elementary school students and comparative, controlled studies. Research needs not only to investigate the purpose, goals and outcomes of existing secondary school models in terms of academic achievement and student growth and development, but in addition it needs to focus on how, and with what effects and difficulties, secondary schools and teachers implement active learning models.

To address these issues and to help solve the question of why teacher-dominated instruction has reigned for 100 years, research needs to ask the following questions:

1. Who uses active learning methods and why?
2. How are the secondary school teachers who use these methods different in behavior, attitude and/or motivation from those teachers who do not?
3. What problems are inherent in the methods given today's secondary school organization?
4. What do the answers to these questions have to say about secondary school teacher education programs, teacher recruitment, teacher inservice, school restructuring, and in particular about the teaching and learning of history?

The studies of cooperative learning that involve active learning also leave a gap. They tie positive results to the cooperative learning involved. What is needed is investigation of the relationship of the processes involved in the researching, developing and presentation of a project--that is, the active learning process--to outcomes.

Active Learning and the Teaching and Learning of History

There is nothing new about the concept or promotion of active learning in the teaching and learning of history. Not only did the early Committees propose an active learning method, but it has been the common, though dormant, thread of history/social studies curricula for the last 100 years.

Dewey (1931) in the early part of the century and Project Span (Hendrikson, 1984) in the early 1980s both recommended that history/social studies teachers provide students with a long term project--such as a group research project--which would allow students to raise new questions and produce new ideas. More recently Hertzberg (1989) claimed:

> If history is to have deep and lasting meaning to students, they must make it their own. This requires participatory learning, not the passive. . . acquisition of names and dates. (Hertzberg, 1989, p. 36)

But while history/social studies commissions and committees continue to propose the active learning methods which they believe will accomplish their goal of developing critical thinking skills in students, literature and everyday practice continue to show that the methodology in history is predominantly a teacher-dominated one and that covering the curriculum and surviving are the goals for most teachers.

In comparative, controlled studies results show predominantly positive cognitive and affective outcomes of active learning methods. Now, qualitative study and analysis of existing active learning history programs is needed in order to determine how and with what results these programs operate. Teachers need to be aware and convinced of program benefits before they will consider changing their teaching patterns. They need to know what factors have to be in place to make this kind of a program work, what the

components of such a program are, and what is involved for them.

Theories and Philosophies of Competition

> Structural competition has the practiced effect of making people suspicious of and hostile towards one another and thus of actively discouraging cooperation. (Kohn, 1986, p. 61)

> Competition. . . is inevitable for anyone who wants to perform well at anything since the notion of performing well is relative to other performers, all of whom ar out to satisfy certain standards. (Wilson, 1989, p. 28)

At first I paid little attention to the competition component of NHD. The study participants, however, initiated talk about competition and competition events many times during the interviews. It was the dramatic change in their facial expressions and the animated behavior that occurred when they did discuss competition that made it clear a review of the literature on competition was necessary in order to provide a framework for analyzing and discussing the importance and relevance of this component to the program and to the participants.

According to Sendor (1982), the "meteoric rise" (p. 17) in academic competitions in the early 1980s coincided with a national back-to-basics movement which followed a time of declining achievement scores. Sendor claims that the goal of these competitions was and is to motivate students through "public recognition of their achievements" (p. 17). However, while there are testimonial, descriptive, and how-

to reports on these academic contests, empirical studies are lacking (Keller, 1990).

On competition in general there are voluminous amounts of material. Much of the literature which supports competition is in the form of philosophizing. Griffin (1988) admits that some kinds of competitions are "dehumanizing and destructive" (p. 52) but also that there is "competition that is uplifting" (p. 52). Wilson (1989) agrees that there are different forms and degrees of competition and that students need to learn that competition is not an end in itself. The solution, he claims, is not to protect students from competition but to immerse them in it and teach them to take it in a more light hearted manner. He advocates that competition be conducted with "sportsmanship, enthusiasm. . . and with the clear message. . . that the winners are not thereby proved better. . . nor losers worse" (p. 29). He continues:

> We do not serve students well to overprotect them so they cannot cope with competition at all nor if we use it as an end in itself. (p. 29)

Not surprisingly, sports enthusiasts (Edwards, 1973; Ryan, 1981) claim that competition is healthy and that while students may become "bitter, morose" (Ryan, 1981, p. 205) and unpleasant when they lose, it is all temporary. Edwards (1973) takes the argument to the extreme when he proposes that if a country doesn't value competition, there will be zero productivity and anarchy.

Kohn (1986), on the other hand, appears to be America's spokesperson for a non-competitive society; his theories and propositions speak for other anti-competition advocates. Kohn argues that competition: leads to low self-esteem and anxiety; requires that a person work towards a goal "in such a way as to prevent others from reaching their goals" (p. 46); leads people to become "cautious, obedient people" (p. 131) because they don't want to risk losing; creates distrust, envy, and contempt of others; and engenders cheating because of the desire to beat others at all cost.

For classroom teachers and principals, the responses to the idea of competition are mixed, though emotionally charged. It appears in general that elementary teachers and principals (Damon, 1991) oppose or prefer to downplay competition and that secondary teachers and principals (Casey, 1989; Lilien, 1988; Zirkes & Penna, 1984) see it as a way to motivate students. This is not a surprising finding since it is at the secondary level where the intrinsic motivational level drops drastically and teachers tend to try whatever methods help them to survive and whatever helps to make teaching and learning more effective (Cuban, 1991; Wigginton, 1989).

Achievement and Affective Results Related to Competition

Kohn's (1986) position is crystal clear--there is no good in competition. One of his main theories is that competition decreases performance and academic achievement.

Among others, Kohn cites Clifford (1972), Adams (1973) and Helmreich (in Kohn, 1986) in support of this theory. Clifford found in a competitive learning game with fifth graders that competition did not improve performance or retention although it did create interest among the winners; and Adams (1973) found that competition hampered creative problem solving in undergraduates. Helmreich conducted four studies using ranking sheets and questionnaires to determine how competitive traits related to achievement. In all of the studies he found a negative correlation between competitiveness and achievement. These and other studies Kohn cites, however, are mainly contrived, controlled studies which have little connection to what goes on in real classrooms.

On the other hand, most of the proponents report in cases of competitive activity in actual school settings. These proponents, in opposition to Kohn, theorize that competition motivates students to work harder and therefore achieve more. Lilien (1988) conducted an experiment with his world cultures ninth grade class. He led students to believe they would be competing in an All East Coast Academic tournament. They held intraclass and interschool competitions in which adults posing as monitors came to the school and asked individual students questions. Scores were compared, the students believed, with other schools. At least seven students in the class which was heterogeneously

grouped, were problem students, and at the beginning of the "competition," the class had a 25 percent failure rate. Results of the competition showed greatly increased attendance, improved grades, and only two failures. Lilien concluded that the competition did not increase tension but also excitement and attention. He admits the history learning was not of a high level, but was greater than what was occurring without the competition.

There are other positive reports concerning competition on a secondary level; these reports are descriptive and do not involve systematic research. Casey (1989) claims that the intramurals instituted at his high school in Texas resulted in higher academic achievement, community involvement, and student motivation. In addition, Von Borries (1989) reports that the results of the annual German History competition, in which students develop individual or group projects and submit them for judging by a jury, show that the competition helps to develop historical skills and understanding. Except for Lilien's study, these positive reports do not describe the effects of the competition on the students who do not win.

Competition and Cooperative Learning Research

Much of the research on competition is part of the large body of research on cooperative learning. This research compares results of learning in cooperative goal structures with results attained in competitive and

individualistic instructional systems. Johnson and Johnson, who are responsible for much of this research, define a competitive situation as one in which "students' goal achievements are negatively correlated--that is, when one student achieves her or his goal, all others with whom she or he is competitively linked fail to achieve their goals" (Johnson, Johnson & Stanne, 1985, p. 669).

Johnson et al (in Kohn, 1986) performed a meta-analysis of 122 studies from 1924-1980 which "included every North American study they could find that considered achievement or performance data in competitive, cooperative and/or individualistic structures" (in Kohn, p. 47-48). Sixty-five studies found that cooperation promoted higher achievement than competition, 8 found the reverse, and 36 found "no statistically significant difference" (in Kohn, p. 48). It is interesting that the same meta-analysis found that "cooperation promoted higher achievement than the independent structure in 108 studies. . ." (in kohn, p. 48). Assuming that some of the studies compared all three structures, one can infer that in some cases the competitive structure produced better results than the independent structure. Johnson et al also concluded that competition may produce better results but only if the task is a simple one such as rote learning.

There are several weaknesses in these studies. They revolve around narrow definitions of instructional goal

structures, the exact form of which would probably never be found in a classroom for a sustained period of time; most of the studies involve elementary school students; and the research does not speak to how the teachers preparation of students for, or direction of students in, competitive and cooperative approaches affects results. The greatest weakness concerns the claims of greater learning results from the cooperative than from competitive goal systems. The problem here is that in many forms and techniques of cooperative learning there is some kind of competition or reward system involved (Slavin, 1991). It is unclear in the above studies whether positive learning results relate to the cooperative nature of the learning system or to the competition involved. Slavin (1991) asserts that 2 decades of research show that attaining positive effects on student achievement through cooperative learning depends on the use of group rewards or competition.

Cooperation/Intergroup Competition

I reviewed the following studies because the learning techniques include both cooperative and competitive components. While for the most part these techniques involve processes and goals which are different from those in the NHD program, the cooperative/competitive elements exist in at least part of the NHD program.

Slavin (1978, 1980, 1991) conducted many comparative studies of his three intragroup cooperation/intergroup

competition team learning techniques. In the TGT (Teams-Games-Tournaments) technique, team members study and then complete worksheets; representatives of each team then meet in tournaments which focus on the learned skills and content. In the STAD (Student Teams-Achievement Divisions) method, the work is the same as in TGT, however, the students take quizzes individually. Each score is compared to scores of other students of comparable ability and points are awarded on the basis of relative performance. The team scores are added. In Slavin's Jigsaw II, each member of a team learns a specific part of an assignment or topic with one member from each of the other teams. Students return to their original teams and teach their team members. The sum of individual quiz scores determine team scores.

In each of these techniques, teams earn certificates or other rewards. In an ongoing discussion with Kohn in Educational leadership, Slavin (1991) defends these rewards and competition as necessary to motivate students. While studies of TGT, STAD and Jigsaw II have been consistently positive (Devries & Slavin, 1978) in terms of academic achievement, increased self-esteem and intergroup relations, since these programs stress drill and recitation, these results say little about how these methods would affect higher level learning.

There were mixed results in other studies of intragroup cooperation/intragroup competition. Sherman (1988)

conducted a pre-test/post-test, comparative study, involving higher level thinking skills, with college introductory educational psychology classes. One class used an intragroup cooperation/intergroup competition method, two used cooperative group learning techniques without the intergroup competition, one was taught using an individually competitive structure and two used Sharan's Group Investigation (See Active learning) method. Results showed all groups had significantly higher post-test achievement scores, with the highest scores in the Group Investigation classes and the lowest in the intergroup competition class. It is unclear here, however, whether it was the cooperative nature of the Group Investigation method, or the investigative process involved (which are similar to the processes of NHD) which affected the scores.

Deutsch (1985) and Pepitone (1980), in their studies of intergroup competition, found that there were performance benefits from the cooperative conditions whether they involved additional intergroup competition or not; further, Dunn & Goldman (1966) and Sherif (1976) concluded that in some cases the intergroup competition diminished the productivity and led subjects to view other groups negatively.

These studies on cooperation/competition techniques leave questions concerning the kind and length of activity involved, teacher effect, and student familiarity with

method. The literature on competition, as a whole, leaves many gaps. First, there is a lack of systematic, empirical studies on academic contests (Keller, 1990). Second, the semantics involved in the terms "cooperative learning structure" and "competitive learning structure" make interpreting research results difficult. Third, there is a dearth of material on effects of competition on secondary school students. Finally, most existing studies on competition involve controlled environments unrepresentative of classroom or school situations.

Theories of Motivation

> Kids are born with a desire to learn. . . They have it right through the third grade. . . but [such eagerness] is diminished in the fourth grade. By the seventh grade, I see a bunch of tired kids. (Rich in Rothman, 1990, p. 12)

> The knowledge that one can act upon the world and change it is enormously exhilarating, just as its antithesis is depressing. This feeling of activity, efficacy, and competence is another 'product' of exploratory learning, of the intrinsic pattern. (White, 1959, p. 297)

It became apparent while conducting the research for this case study of NHD that the participants were enthusiastically committing large amounts of time and effort to the program. The contrast between the dreary picture of today's schools, concluding the lack of motivation found among students and teachers (Rothman, 1990), and what I was seeing and hearing from these participants led to the question of how and what theories of motivation could

account for the differences. This review of the literature on motivation concentrates on the research related to four theories--reward, cognitive evaluation, self-efficacy, and social comparison theory--which seemed most pertinent to the context of the NHD program.

Reward Theory

As with the issue of competition, there are two positions about rewards: rewards motivate; rewards undermine motivation. Kohn, (1991) in disagreement with Slavin (1991), argues that rewards are not necessary for students to learn and in fact undermine creativity, motivation, interest, and performance in the task. He argues that intrinsic motivation is weakened when people work for a reward because they feel controlled by it and this loss of autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 1985) interferes with creativity.

There is research (Amibile & Gitomer, 1984; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Harachiewicz et al, 1984; Nichols, 1989) to support Kohn's theory. In the study by Amibilie & Gitomer (1984) undergraduates who expected to receive a prize for making collages or telling stories proved to be less imaginative at both tasks than those who received nothing. Nichols (1989) found that rewards encouraged ego involvement over task involvement which is more predictive of achievement; and Harachiewicz et al (1984) found that

expecting to be evaluated (a reward system and ego involving) distracted students from the task.

Others, however, (Boggiano et al, 1982; Lepper & Greene, 1978; Slavin, 1991; Vasta et al, 1978), who seem to be more in touch with the realities of school cultures, argue that rewards can and do enhance intrinsic motivation. Slavin (1991) and Lepper & Greene (1978) propose that this is especially noticeable when the task is one students wouldn't do without rewards and when a sustained effort is needed:

> Students are unlikely to exert the sustained systematic effort needed to truly master a subject without some kind of reward, such as praise, grades, or recognition." (Slavin, 1991, p. 90)

And Boggiano et al (1982) found that rewards enhance intrinsic motivation if they give information about one's performance relative to another's. McGraw (1978) takes the middle road and suggests that the effect of rewards depends on the task and prior relationship between a person's interests and abilities and the difficulty level of the task.

Cognitive Evaluation Theory

Ryan, Connell, and Deci (1985), who believe there is a need for both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, theorize that feelings of competence and control are fundamental to the development of intrinsic motivation and suggest that the school environment and certain kinds of rewards can make the difference:

> When the academic milieu supplies challenges that interest children, and through which they can derive a sense of competence within a context of felt autonomy, then intrinsic motivation will flourish. (p. 15)

Their cognitive evaluation theory focuses on the motivational factors which lead to different degrees of cognitive engagement. They (1985) propose that extrinsic rewards that increase people's sense of competence and control should increase their intrinsic motivation and cognitive engagement and that rewards or events which control or put pressure on the student in some way will decrease intrinsic motivation and weaken cognitive engagement.

Research supports the need for feeling competent and in control. Ryan, Mims & Koestner (1983) found that students who received verbal controlling rewards showed a marked decrease in intrinsic motivation and those receiving informational rewards which increased their sense of competence showed an increase in motivation. Perlmutter & Monty (1977) found that student choice/control improved learning. When students were told what to learn, even if it was the same material they would have chosen, lack of choice tended to impair learning.

Research (Benware & Deci, 1984) also shows that students will be more active in learning when expected (i.e. thought competent) to use it in some way other than just to be tested. Two groups of college students were asked to

learn material from an unfamiliar passage on neurophysiology. One group was told it would be teaching the material to other students. One group was told it would be tested on the material. Results showed that those who thought they would be teaching showed greater conceptual learning. Coleman (in Lepper & Greene, 1978) summarizes the student's needs for autonomy and feeling competent:

> Intrinsically motivated learning will involve trial and error, following one's curiosity, feeling free to learn what interests one, developing one's potential as one experiences it. (p. 198)
>
> It is clear that regardless of what techniques of instruction we develop for schools they should not detract from these feelings of control and mastery. (p. 189)

There is a strong connection between cognitive evaluation theory and active learning theory since active learning theory supposes students do their own learning, that is, are thought competent enough to have at least some control. DeCharms (1976) conducted an experiment on active education in an urban school system. Teachers were trained to be supportive of children's autonomy and to develop instructional materials to promote active learning. Results showed that students exposed to the experimentally trained teachers showed increase in motivation and achievement compared to students in the traditional classrooms. Ryan, Connell, & Deci (1985) agree that "research argues in favor of the educational practices that are congruent with the active-education philosophy" (p. 31).

Teachers also need autonomy. In interviews, teachers claimed that curricula pressures, standardized testing, and obsession with achievement have stripped them of their autonomy, creativity, and motivation (Deci & Ryan in Ryan, Connell, & Deci, 1985). The bureaucratic regulations that bury, control, and discourage teachers are evident to anyone who has contact with schools and teachers. For teachers as well as students "autonomous behavior--that which is self-determined, freely chosen, and personally controlled--elicits high task interest, creativity, cognitive flexibility, positive emotion, and persistence" (Clifford, 1990, p. 23). the larger institutional problem is how to allow for teachers and students to have autonomy simultaneously in a highly controlled environment.

Self-Efficacy Theory

Self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986) is a person's perception of her/his ability to succeed at a given task. With feelings of high self-efficacy, i.e. belief in ability to achieve at a given task, a person is motivated to work towards mastery of that task. A person with low self-efficacy, on the other hand, will avoid the task; if required to complete a task, the person with low self-efficacy will perform at a lower level than a person of equal ability with high self-efficacy. The question in terms of motivating students, then, is how to help students develop a positive self-efficacy.

Aston (1985) proposes that students' feelings of efficacy and therefore their motivational levels are reciprocally tied to the teacher's sense of efficacy. The teacher's behavior, which is a reflection of her/his efficacy, affects student achievement; reciprocally, student achievement affects the perceived efficacy of both student and teacher. Interviews with middle and high school teachers (Aston, 1985), however, indicate that students have a greater effect on the teacher's sense of self-efficacy than vice versa. The interviewed teachers felt powerless to change the lack of student motivation. While Aston concludes that a teacher's sense of efficacy is fragile and negotiated on a daily basis through and as a result of interaction with students, parents, peers, and administration, her reciprocal theory is too simple; it not only neglects or shows lack of understanding of the inertia of today's "lethargic, bored" (Shanker in Rothman, 1990, p. 12) student body, but also could be construed to place blame (unwittingly and indirectly) for student lack of motivation on a teacher's level of self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy theory, as with cognitive evaluation theory, neglects the issue of effect on contemporary school structure and curricula and the constraints of federal and local governments, school boards, and administrative policy on teacher and student motivation (Clifford, 1990). Is it, in fact, possible for teachers and students to attain and

maintain a high sense of self-efficacy and motivation within the contemporary institutional system?

Social Comparison Theory

The last theory in this review is the social comparison theory. One version of this theory of motivation (Johnson & Johnson, 1985) submits that the interpersonal processes of the learning situation determine student motivation to learn; different patterns of interaction create different motivational systems which affect student achievement and self esteem in different ways:

> The more classmates encourage and support one's efforts to achieve, and the more they facilitate one's efforts to achieve, the greater the motivation to achieve. (p. 259)

Johnson and Johnson (1985) claim that cooperative learning techniques and class structures engender greater motivation than the competitive or individual class structures. They define the cooperative structure as one in which an individual can obtain a goal only if others can obtain theirs. In the competitive structure, the student can obtain a goal only if others cannot; and the individualistic learning situation is one in which there is no correlation among goal attainment. Inherent in these definitions are the same restrictive, semantic problems as explained earlier (see Theories of Competition). There are no classes which would or could maintain these exact structures indefinitely. In addition, most of the cooperative learning technques involve some form of

competition or reward structure, so it is difficult to arrive at a clear interpretation of the findings.

With these limitations in mind, the research (Johnson & Johnson, 1985) shows that cooperative learning experiences result in more motivation to "do school work, to learn interesting things, because it is fun, and because they like to" (p. 260) while in competition, "students place more value on winning than on performing a task well" (p. 261). Johnson & Johnson (1985) argue that competition decreases motivation to learn because when the students lose, "they will . . . avoid . . . the learning tasks in the future . . . to avoid . . . the failure" (p. 261).

The Johnsons assume that students encourage and support each other's efforts only in cooperative strctures. Is this so? Are there not competitive systems in which students also support and encourage each other? In addition, by claiming that cooperative learning is fun, the Johnsons infer that for students competitive ventures are not fun. In contrast, Clifford maintains that, while learning experiences should not be so difficult that students have no hope of success, moderate risk taking--including competition--"increases performance, persistence, perceived competence, self-knowledge, pride, and satisfaction" (Clifford, 1990, p. 24) if certain factors, including a sense of control and competence are present.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has reviewed the literature on NHD, the teaching and learning of history, active learning theory, and the theories of competition and motivation.

NHD

While the existing literature on NHD is positive in terms of cognitive and affective outcomes, there has been no critical, systematic study of the program since its inception as Cleveland History Day in 1974. Additionally, there is an unexplained and substantial discrepancy between the positive reports on NHD and the dreary picture of the teaching and learning of history in general.

The Teaching and Learning of History

The literature on the teaching and learning of history shows that: a textbook drive, teacher controlled methodology has predominated for the past century; the goals of the teaching and learning of history, which as stated and proposed by national commissions and committees and most school curricula are the development of critical thinking and responsible citizenship skills, are more often than not forgotten and/or unmet; there is a dearth of research on the teaching and learning of history, particularly in terms of in-depth, descriptive, exploratory research on existing history programs which do meet the stated goals; and there is little being done to correct the deficiencies in history/social studies teacher preparation programs.

Active Learning

While research results on the use of active learning methods are mainly positive, there are problems relating to the research. These problems, particularly in the earlier research, include independent variable control and lack of effective tools to measure desired cognitive and affective outcomes. In addition, most of the studies are comparative, controlled studies involving elementary students. Missing are qualitative, systematic, in-depth studies of existing active learning programs. Qualitative, descriptive studies are necessary in order to determine how, why, and with what results these programs are implemented. Teachers need to be aware of how these programs work, what the components of the programs are, how the components interrelate, and what benefits, if any, the programs hold for teachers and students.

Competition

While the number of academic competitions multiplied rapidly in the 1980s, most reported program results are in the form of testimonial or descriptive, how-to articles. Besides a general lack of research on these contests, there is no research which compares recall type academic contests to those such as NHD which stress the development of higher level thinking skills. The literature on competition, in general, is difficulty to interpret because: moralizing accompanies much of it; most of the existing studies are

contrived, comparative studies which take place in environments unrepresentative of actual classroom or school situations; and conclusions of the studies which compare learning in cooperative and competitive systems do not allow for the fact that many of the cooperative learning techniques involve forms of competition. As with the literature on the teaching and learning of history and active learning theory, there is a lack of, and need for, research involving scholarly description and analysis of contemporary, existing programs which involve competition.

Motivation

Much of the research on motivation, particularly that relating to issues of students' and teachers' sense of control, competence, and self-efficacy seems to make sense. However, there is an unresolved conflict between what the theories propose will motivate students and teachers and what is available and possible in a typical educational setting, given the controlled structure of educational systems.

The Significance of this Study

This ethnohistorical case study of NHD can help to fill at least a small research void in all of the above areas. First, it is the study of an existing, secondary school program which involves the teaching and learning of history, active learning methods (according to NHD literature and the participants), and the group work and competition, and

therefore has potential implications for the schooling of secondary students in relation to all of these areas. Furthermore, it provides a view from the participants' perspectives of what can and does motivate teachers and students to be involved in an extra or co-curricula academic activity which requires extraordinary amounts of time, effort and commitment; this view can shed light on what changes would be necessary in traditional educational policies and strategies in order to attain the same level of motivation. Finally, this study can help to determine if this kind of a program has merit in terms of meeting the goals of the teaching and learning of history and, if so, whether or not it can and should be incorporated into the curriculum, provide the basis for a new curriculum, and/or become the foundation for modifications in history teacher preparation programs.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

> The parallels between historicism and modern ideas about qualitative research are particularly striking: there is the same emphasis on diverse cultures valid in their own terms, the same distrust of abstraction and preference for detailed descriptions, the same reliance on Verstehen rather than external description of behavior, the same appreciative stance (Hammersley, 1989, p. 28)

The Qualitative Method

Qualitative research, which includes many approaches and methods, is based on phenomenological paradigm that assumes human behavior and human experiences are understood best through the participants' perspectives within a given context rather than through quantitative measurement and statistical analysis (Fetterman, 1988; Hammersley, 1989). The philosophical foundations of the phenomenological paradigm and argument predate the scientific discoveries of the 17th century and the subsequent development of natural science or quantitative methods of research. However, the questions and debate over the value and validity of the methods involved in, and the conceptual framework of, qualitative research (Hammersley, 1989; Smith, 1983), and the differences and relationship between the social and natural sciences, reached heightened proportions in the late 18th and early 19th centuries (Hammersley, 1989). At that time, there was a rebirth and growth of the study of history

in Germany. The German historicists, in reaction and opposition to the philosophy and methods of the natural scientists, argued that human phenomena were unique and could only be interpreted and analyzed on their own terms in a cultural context. They rejected the scientific notion that there were universal laws of human nature that could be measured statistically. (Hammersley, 1989; Smith, 1983)

Case Study Approach

One of the most important sources of qualitative method in general, and of case study approach in particular, was the "Chicago Sociology" of the 1920s and 1930s (Hammersley, 1989, p. 2), which emerged and developed partly out of the historicists' philosophy. To that philosophy, sociologists and anthropologists at the University of Chicago added exploratory, investigative, and interpretative approaches to the study of human experience. The "Chicago" case studies involved a collection and presentation of "detailed, relatively unstructured information from a range of sources about a particular individual, group, or institution, usually including the accounts of subjects themselves" (Hammersley, 1989, p. 93). While the Chicago approach stressed the importance of observing human experiences in their natural setting, the research relied more heavily on documentary evidence such as public records, published accounts, diaries, and life history documents provided by participants than on the participant observation and

interviewing techniques which are the predominant features of qualitative research today (Hammersley, 1989).

The Ethnohistorical Approach

Despite the on-going qualitative/quantitative debate, or perhaps because of it, the use of qualitative research has mushroomed over the last 30 years (Hammersley, 1989). One of the newest, and probably least familiar, qualitative approaches in educational research is the ethnohistorical approach which combines traditional ethnographic (anthropological) procedures, such as participant observation and interviewing, with traditional historiographic methods such as library, documentary, and primary source research (Puckett, 1989). One could look at this approach, at least in part, as a synthesis of the Chicago case study method and contemporary ethnographic procedures. What this approach provides is a time-depth perspective and historical foundation from which to view the contemporary processes and a more complete description and account than either the ethnographic or historiographic method alone can do (Precourt, 1982; Puckett, 1989).

The pioneers in the ethnohistorical approach were the cultural anthropologists who in the 1940s and 1950s, as expert witnesses in the Native American land claims cases, were required to find historical, documentary materials to support their cases. While increasingly historians in the United States have started to discover and to use the method

in studying groups of people other than Native Americans (Axtell, 1979), and while ethnography is one of the most commonly used qualitative approaches in education today (Fetterman, 1984), educational research practice has yet to discover use, expand, and refine this particular ethnographic approach.

What is the difference between an educational ethnohistory, an ethnography with an historical introduction and/or an historical case study? The line is blurry, but the goal of an ethnohistorical study is not simply to relay the history of a program, institution, or phenomenon but also to analyze how the current educational phenomena are embedded in and have evolved through "a broader historical complex of cultural problems and processes" (Precourt, 1982, p. 442). It is a conscious effort to use history as a tool for explaining current behavior and involves interpreting how external and internal influences have led to change in an institution, program or culture (Puckett, 1989). According to Puckett (1989), an educational ethnohistory includes: ethnographic research of the present through extended interviews and/or observation; a "time-depth perspective" (p. 78) on factors that have influenced changes in the school's or program's processes, goals and/or functions; and an interpretation of the present phenomenon in relation to the historical perspectives.

There are three reasons why I chose to conduct an ethnohistorical case study of NHD. First, I believe strongly in the appropriateness and effectiveness of qualitative method in the study of human behavior and experience. Additionally, I believe just as strongly in the necessity of historical grounding in order to analyze and interpret contemporary processes and behavior. Finally, I have a background in sociology, history, and education, and this approach allowed me to use the skills I have developed in each of those fields. Like Puckett (1989), however, I feel very much like a pioneer in using this methodological approach; aside from Puckett's (1986) ethnohistorical study of Foxfire, there are not many examples of educational ethnohistories.[1]

I conducted this ethnohistorical case study to: obtain a "rich, thick description" (Merriam, 1988, p. 11) of NHD; illuminate the dynamics, issues, and effects of NHD over the course of its history; investigate the relationship of contemporary processes, goals and results to historical perspectives; and provide a context from which to discern

---

[1]Precourt (1982) conducted an ethnohistorical study of a Kentucky settlement school. Grant (1988), in his study of "Hamilton High," uses historical perspectives of social and political events and of the community and school culture to understand, analyze, and describe the evolution of the school system, culture, policies, and goals. Grant calls this an historical case study. Smith et al (in Puckett, 1989) describe their study of Kensington elementary school system as an ethnographic case study with "an historical chronicle and interpretation of the process of change." (p. 6).

implications for the teaching and learning of history, specifically, and or educational practice in general. To these ends, this study involves description and analysis of the program through the integration of data from in-person or telephone interviews with key participants, student journals, and historical, documentary materials. (Time-table of research events is listed in Appendix C.)

Sample

Purposeful sampling, the most appropriate sampling strategy for qualitative case studies (Merriam, 1988), is "based on the assumption that one wants to discover, understand, gain insight; therefore one needs to select a sample from which one can learn the most" (p. 48). I purposefully (Merriam, 1988; Seidman, 1991) as opposed to randomly selected the sample schools/NHD programs based on the following:

1. information and suggestions from NHD Headquarters;
2. what the schools could reveal about NHD in terms of producing a rich, thick description of the program and an interpretation of processes relevant to educational theory and practice;
3. descriptions of programs by state coordinators;
4. differences in schools, programs, students and teachers, and areas--rural, inner city, and suburban;
5. winning and losing records of states (to avoid bias toward one kind of story);

6. the willingness of schools and students and teachers to participate;

7. restrictions connected to travel requirements and money.

My goal was to choose schools which would give me the "maximum variation" (Seidman, p. 42); Seidman (1991) claims this technique allows the "widest possibility for readers of the study to connect to what they are reading" (p. 42-43). Glaser & Strauss (in Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983) also recommend "maximizing the difference between cases in order to increase the density of the properties relating to case categories, to integrate categories and delimit the scope of the theory" (p. 44). It makes sense that the more variation you have in terms of sites, programs, and participants, the greater the degree of which you can generalize about common findings. Based then on purposeful sampling which involved maximum variation, I selected the following schools:

1. in a racially, ethnically, and economically mixed urban area of the Southwest, a high school which at the time of the study had a student population of almost 3,000, was involved in a strong state program, and had had more national NHD winners than any other school in the United States;

2. in an affluent suburban area of the Northeast, a high school which had approximately 400 students and was involved in a weak state program;

3. in a working class community of a different Northeastern state, a high school which had a student population of about 500 and was involved in a strong state program.

I had little control over the selection of the 4 female teachers who participated in this study. In one of the schools, the teacher who participated in this study was that school's only teacher involved in NHD. In another school, the only NHD participants--and consequently chosen as study participants--were a teacher and a librarian (whom I will refer to as teacher) who worked as a team. In the third school, the teacher selected for this study was the school's NHD coordinator and had more NHD experience than any of the other teachers in her school

At each school, the teacher(s) helped to identify students for the study--one student representing an individual entry and one group of students representing a group entry. The teachers described entrants to me and together we made the final selection using as two of the main criteria the student's ability to articulate and her/his interest in being part of this study. I established these criteria after problems with interviewing a teenager in a pilot study (see Appendix B) and also after reading of problems experienced by Puckett (1986):

> My major intent in collecting data from students who had low levels of involvement in Foxfire activities was to determine if there were any systematic biases discouraging some students from

> taking additional Foxfire courses. After drawing the samples, I obtained permission from the teachers to talk briefly with their students during class time. Given that most of the students were not interested in the research, the emergent data were colorless and of marginal interest. . . The time and energy to collect this information was poorly spent. (p. 461)

Merriam (1988) agrees with the importance of selecting able participants:

> Unlike survey research where the number and representativeness of the sample are major considerations, in this type of research the crucial factor is not the number of respondents but rather the potential of each person to contribute to the development of insight and understanding of the phenomenon. (p. 77)

And she concurs with anthropologists who describe a good informant as "one who can express thoughts, feelings, opinions, his or her perspective, on the topic being studied" (p. 76).

I also tried to balance the NHD categories represented by the students. The final student selection (7 males and 7 females) included 3 individual entrants--one performance, one media, and one table top contestant--and 3 group media entrants. At the time of the study, 7 students were seniors, 6 were juniors and one a freshman. Four were in designated honors or gifted and talented curricula; the others were considered above average.

The state coordinators in this study, 2 males and 1 female, were chosen because they represented the states of the selected schools. With several years of NHD experience, each was able to provide a description and historical

perspective of her/his state program in which the participating schools, teachers, and students were involved as well as historical perspectives on the national program's process. Selection of former students was mainly a reflection of availability. Each teacher in the study provided names and telephone numbers of former NHD participants. Of the former students (4 males and 2 females) in this study, 4 were college students, one was a college graduate, and one was a high school student.

The names of all participants in the ethnographic portion of the study and the names of their schools and states have been kept anonymous as agreed to in the consent forms (See Appendix H). Drs. Ubbelodhe, Van Tassel, Scharf, and Gorn are primary sources for the history of NHD and are identified in the study.

Data Collection

In-Depth Interviews

Speaking from a phenomenological perspective, Seidman (1991) argues that a primary and powerful way to investigate an educational organization "is through the experience of the individual people" (p. 4) and that in-depth interviewing allows the researcher to involve the participants actively in reconstructing those experiences within the "context of their lives or of the lives around them" (p. 10). Seidman's version of in-depth interviewing consists of three 90 minute interviews with each participant. The first interview deals

with the participant's background up to the time of involvement in the topic; this provides the context for the participant's experiences. The second interview asks the participants to "reconstruct" (p. 11) their experiences in detail; and the third interview asks the participants to reflect on the meaning of their experiences. In the ethnographic part of this study of NHD, I used a modified version of Seidman's framework to interview students and teachers involved in the program. Having participants tell me their stories seemed the best way to understand the dynamics, issues, and effects of the NHD program.

For several reasons I modified the interview structure for the students. First, in a pilot study (see Appendix B) in which I had used Seidman's interviewing method, 90 minutes seemed too long for a single interview for the participating teenager. Secondly, in the current study, the school schedules restricted the participants' availability to me (See Appendix D) and 90 minute interviews were not always possible. Furthermore, I interviewed the students who were involved in group categories in NHD as a group. I had not interviewed a group previously and had to adjust the time involved to complement and fit with the dynamics of the group. (I examine the contribution of this study to the technique of in-depth interviewing in Appendix G.) The main issue, though, was how many times I could and would return to the schools. The consent form clearly indicated that I

would conduct a minimum of two interviews--the first one as close to the participant's initial involvement in NHD as possible and a follow-up interview after the district competition, whether the students had won or not. If after that, the student(s) were no longer involved in the program, there would be no other interview(s). If students were still in the program, I would interview them again after each competition.

Consequently, because of the restrictions of school scheduling and the structure of the NHD program itself, I had to merge or re-arrange the three separate interviews of Seidman's (1991) framework, as necessary, taking into consideration the time available, whether I was interviewing a group or individual, and how many interviews there would be. While this appears rather complicated, it worked out well. Only one student did not continue the entire length of the program. All other students won at all intermediary contests and were eligible for, and competed at, the national competition in June. Except for the student who dropped out, I interviewed each student or groups of students three times--before the district competition, after the district competition, and at the national competition.

Because of the considerations explained above, although there were three interviews for the students, the focus of each interview was not the same as in Seidman's framework. The first interview focused on the students' educational

backgrounds up to involvement in NHD, their previous experiences in NHD (all but two had participated before), what they planned for the current year, and what it had been like up to that time to be involved in NHD. During the second interview, the students reconstructed their NHD experiences including experiences at intervening competition(s) since the previous interview and explained what it meant to them to be in NHD. During the third interview at the University of Maryland, students described experiences (including those at state competition) since the second interview and their experiences, and meaning of such, at the national competition. The interviews lasted from 1 to 2 hours.

For the teachers, there were two interviews which coincided with the first and second interviews for the students. The two interviews covered the three areas of focus in Seidman's framework. The first interviews focused on the teachers' backgrounds and teaching experiences prior to involvement in NHD and what it was like for them to be involved in NHD; the second interview continued with the teachers describing what it was like to be involved in NHD, with particular reference to where they were in the program at that particular time, and what it meant for them to be involved in the program. During the summer following the national competition, I talked informally to the teachers by

phone. They described their own and their students' reactions to the events at the national competition.

Besides the questions which were related to the above frameworks or generated by students' and teachers' responses, I did ask specific questions. I asked both students and teachers what they perceived the strengths and weaknesses of the program to be, whether or not they thought the program should be required for all students and how they would respond to educators who thought competition was harmful to students. In addition, I asked the students how much time and money they had spent and how their parents and teachers were involved in their projects. All of these questions fit and flowed easily within the interview. Also, after each interview, in an on-going analysis of the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988), I constructed a chart of issues imbedded in the responses. If there were issues which some students and teachers did not address and others did, I asked for responses to those issues in the subsequent interview.

Semistructured Interviews

Merriam (1988) defines a semistructured interview as: one which is "guided by a list of questions or issues to be explored" (p. 74) but for which "neither exact wording nor order is determined ahead of time" (p. 74); and one in which there is the understanding that the interviewer may explore other areas if appropriate to the interview. I used

semistructured, in-person interviews with the founders and Associate and Executive Directors of NHD and semistructured, telephone interviews with state coordinators and former students. The questions revolved around the issues of personal background and involvement in NHD, perceived strengths and weaknesses of the program, and personal meaning of involvement in NHD (see Appendix E for specific issues). The interviews lasted from 1 to 2 hours and questions were predominantly open-ended.

Participant Observation

While one of the most popular ethnographic methods involves participating and observing (Puckett, 1986; Spradley, 1980), the original proposal for this study did not include participant observation. Because of the time, travel, and cost involved in doing research at three different sites, because much of the work for NHD is completed outside of school, and because NHD is not necessarily a daily activity and may involve a sporadic schedule or in fact no schedule at all, sustained observation was unrealistic.

However, since all the student participants succeeded at district (and/or regional) and state level competitions, they entered the national competition at the University of Maryland and this gave me the opportunity to include participant observation in this study. Attending the national competition for 5 days (from June 9-13, 1991)

allowed me to be with the students and teachers in the dorms, at the student presentations, and at the final award ceremony. I was able to observe the interactions among the students, between the students and teachers, and between the students and judges and able to observe preparation and reaction, both physical and emotional, of the students and teachers. I was also able to observe what it requires of a teacher to accompany several students to a 5 day event such as this.

Journals

As explained in the student consent form (See Appendix H), I asked that the students keep journals (Merriam, 1988) of their NHD activities and associated feelings, reactions, and responses. This part of the research was only marginally successful. About half of the students kept journals; one of the schools felt it was too much extra work for the students, and in another school most of the students forgot about it. Those students who did keep a journal, I suspect, did it mostly after the fact and thought of it more as a homework assignment.

Documentary Materials

The written documentary materials relating to NHD included the financial reports, testimonial letters, annual reports, published articles, theme fliers, contest guides, and classroom supplements collected at NHD headquarters (see Appendix A for further explanation). Documentary materials

for the schools included school brochures, school schedules, school yearbooks, school and local newspapers and materials the schools had developed for their NHD program. In addition, school staff helped to locate information about the school's and community's history, current demographics, socio-economic make-up and culture.

Informal/Supplementary Data Collection

While researchers may criticize ethnography methodology in terms of lacking scientific rigor, I agree with Puckett (1986) that it is foolish "to overlook key informants who have useful and reliable information to provide" (p. 458) or to overlook data which could as well provide the researcher with information about the program and the people who are involved in it. In two of the schools, faculty members involved in some way in the NHD process participated in interviews; data from these interviews shed light on how the different schools handled related aspects of NHD. Also, two of the schools made previously developed media presentations and projects available for viewing.

Data Analysis

My first job was to analyze, summarize, compare, interrelate and integrate the data from the documentary materials and transcribed interviews from the historiographic part of this study. This historical synthesis became the context for the ethnographic study. For the ethnographic component of the study, I analyzed

interview data as the research was progressing. Constructing charts on issues the participants raised or discussed allowed me to compare content across the participants' responses, find discrepancies and to wedge those issues into future interviews for participants who had not introduced or discussed the issue.

Once I had completed the interviews and transcribed the tapes, I identified categories of issues, concerns, and experiences (Merriam, 1988). I followed this procedure/system separately for the teachers and students and then compared, contrasted, related, and integrated the two sets of findings. Similarly with the interviews of the state coordinators and the former students, I looked for themes and patterns and then used these to confirm, supplement, or question the findings of the students and teachers. Finally, I integrated the findings of the historiographic data with the findings of the ethnographic data.

Reliability

Unlike quantitative or experimental research which "focuses on discovering causal relationships among variables" (Merriam, 1988, p. 170) and in which reliability is a measure of the study's replicability, qualitative research does not try to isolate or define laws of human behavior. Rather, it "seeks to describe and explain the world as those in the world interpret it" (Merriam, p. 170).

Therefore reliability in the traditional sense is not the same as reliability in a qualitative study.

> Because what is being studied in education is assumed to be in flux, multifaceted, and highly contextual, because information gathered is a function of who gives it and how skilled the researcher is at getting it, and because the emergent design of a qualitative case study precludes a priori controls, achieving reliability in the traditional sense is not only fanciful but impossible. (Merriam, p. 171)

One way of looking at reliability in qualitative studies is to consider the consistency and dependability of the results (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), that is, given the data collected that the results make sense. To accomplish this, I have documented each step of the study; I have described the methods of data collection, the types of documents included in the study, the participants and how I chose them, the settings and conditions under which I collected the data, and method of data analysis.

Verbatim accounts provide raw data for the reader and thus further enhance reliability (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982; Merriam, 1988; Puckett, 1986). Since major portions of Chapters IV, V, and VI are the words of the participants, readers can determine their own conclusions by reviewing this primary data in relation to my methods of data collection and processing. Reliability is also linked to internal validity checks (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988). If a study has internal validity, then it also has reliability. The technique of triangulation--using multiple

methods and/or sources--which I have used, strengthens reliability, then, as well as internal validity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988).

Validity

External validity, which refers to the generalization of the findings to a larger population, does not apply to this qualitative research. NHD is not a random program nor did I select schools or participants randomly. Patton (1980) argues that qualitative research should:

> provide perspective rather than truth, empirical assessment of local decision makers' theories of action rather than generation and verification of universal theories, and context-bound information rather than generalization. (p. 283)

In determining the internal validity of this study, the question to answer is whether or not the analysis and description rings true. One strategy for ensuring internal validity (Denzin, 1970; Merriam, 1988; Puckett, 1989) is triangulation--using multiple sources or methods of collecting data. The rationale is that using multiple sources and/or methods provides cross validation. In this study I have used both multiple sources and multiple methods. I have collected data from students, teachers, NHD administrators, state coordinators, the founding professors, and former participants. The interviews with state coordinators and former participants provided supplementary data to, as well as determined validity (credibility) of, data from the main study participants. In addition, this

study involves interviewing, observation, historiographical research, and journal keeping techniques, again allowing the collection of supplementary data while providing validity checks.

I argue that this study has high internal validity on several other counts. First, because the main participants--the teachers and students--were involved in three interviews, it is possible to determine the internal consistency and validity of their responses (Seidman, 1991). Also it is possible to judge truthfulness in the interviews through "syntax, pauses, . . . self-effacing laughter" (Seidman, p. 18). Other checks of validity in this study include: gathering the data over time--the study involved interviews for the teachers and students from January 1991 to September 1991; having dissertation committee members and peers review analyses; and asking the participants to review interpretations (Merriam, 1988).

Limitations

Researcher Bias

I entered this study having been a teacher whose students participated in the NHD program for 3 years--1984-1987--and were winners at the district and state level. I have been a judge for the program at the district, state, and national levels. While I entered the doctoral program because of the positive academic and affective efforts on my students, my effort truly was to remain neutral and to

obtain a realistic picture of what happens in NHD. In some ways, my experience in the program may even have allowed me to obtain data that I otherwise might not have been able to obtain. By triangulating my data sources and viewing NHD from an ethnohistorical perspective, I have lessened the effects of my own experiences. Observations and interview data quickly illuminated the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

Selection Bias

As explained in my description of sample selection, this was not a random procedure. Missing from the sample is a non-winning school--one which has been involved and never gotten to national level of competition; missing is a true "inner-city" school; missing is a rural school. Moreover, the students involved in the study would be considered above average students; some were from gifted and talented and honors classes. I did include students who were required and students who were not required to be in NHD, students who were in the teachers' classes and those who were not, however, I would like to have included students of average and lower ability and special needs students. Teachers referred the former students to me and that choice probably reflected teacher bias.

Research Effects

Because an outsider researcher can influence the lives and responses of the participants (Merriam, 1988), it is

possible that my presence affected some of the processes of this study. No matter how hard a researcher works to minimize the effects the interviewer and the interviewing situation have on how the participants reconstruct their experience, "the fact is that interviewers are a part of the interviewing picture" (Seidman, 1991, p. 16).

> They ask questions, respond to the participant, and at times even share their own experiences. Moreover, interviewers work with the material, select from it, interpret, describe, and analyze it. (p. 16)

The most powerful checks on researcher effects in this study are the triangulation techniques described above and the length of the study which allowed my presence to become more of a regular occurrence. Additionally, Appendix F provides student responses as to how they thought my presence affected their experiences in NHD.

Contribution to the Educational Ethnohistorical Approach

Educational research practice apparently has not taken advantage of the ethnohistorical approach to qualitative research; only a few educational ethnohistories exist (Grant, 1988; Precourt, 1972; Puckett, 1986; Smith et al, 1987). This ethnohistorical case study of NHD adds another study to the genre and perhaps will encourage other researchers to consider the benefits of this approach. Furthermore, in the studies which exist, the authors deal with the descriptions and analysis of one school, or in the case of Foxfire (Puckett, 1986), one program in one school.

In this study of NHD, I have stretched this research process. I have dealt with a program, NHD, that began in a university out of a combination of internal and external political, economic, and social factors. This program, which is overseen and conducted from that university, has a history of almost 20 years. However, the program takes place in thousands of secondary schools, all with different histories of their own.

This study, then, involves an educational ethnohistorical approach on a multi-dimensional level. The description/analysis of the contemporary NHD program and its processes, strengths, and weaknesses as seen at and through the 3 high schools in this study involves and is imbedded not only in the historical perspective of the administrative part of the program at Case Western Reserve University but also in the historical perspectives and influences at the individual high school and in the history of NHD in that high school.

If the value of qualitative research is in obtaining a rich, thick description and analysis of human behavior, the method cannot ignore historical perspective or the relationship between the historical perspectives and the contemporary happenings and processes. Interpreting contemporary behavior without relationship to historical perspective is like having a puzzle without all the pieces--you never have the complete picture.

CHAPTER IV

HISTORICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL ASPECTS OF NHD

> Dave Van Tassel and Carl Ubbelodhe were concerned about the devalued nature of humanities teaching in the schools. . . . They were interested in doing something about exciting students about the study of history, exciting teachers, giving them an innovative teaching tool for the classroom. . . . It was also a way to get students to see the campus and maybe increase the enrollment in history majors. (Gorn, Associate Director of NHD)

> . . . and necessity is the mother of invention. (Franck in Bartlett, 1980)

This chapter presents an historical and organizational portrait of NHD based on the words of the program founders and administrators and on documentary data. The purpose is not only to record the history of NHD but to provide the historical perspective from which to view and analyze the contemporary processes and organization of NHD and the contemporary experiences of NHD participants.

Historical Framework

History Day, as the program was originally called, was born of a specific set of circumstances affecting the History Department at Case Western Reserve University (hereafter referred to as CWR) in Cleveland in the early 1970s. These circumstances were reflections of, or caused by, external and internal political, social, and economic factors. External to the University were a series of national crises (in the 1960s) including the Civil Rights Movement; the assassinations of President Kennedy, Robert F.

Kennedy, and Martin Luther King; America's involvement in Vietnam; and youth rebellions against the Establishment. Out of these tumultuous times came the 1970 Kent State shootings, a reflection or culmination of the authority-establishment/student anti-war and civil rights confrontations. Kent State was close enough to CWR, according to Dr. Ubbelodhe (one of NHD's founders), that there were repercussions at CWR in the form of declining enrollments.

> We suffered a terrible circumstance in the late Spring of 1970. That was the time of the Kent State shooting. Kent State is. . . very, very close--only 30 miles--so we got a lot of backwash. . . our campus was already in a pretty rocky situation.

Declining enrollments, specifically in the CWR History Department, were related to another major external factor--the deteriorating status of the discipline of history. College history enrollments nationally declined drastically (by 76,000 students between 1971 and 1974, Mehaffy, 1982, p. 804). Dr. Van Tassel, another of the founders and now President of NHD, Inc., recalled that by the late 1960s, "history, along with several other academic disciplines. . ., was seen as irrelevant, and had been under attack. . . since the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley."

One of the internal factors which led to the founding of History Day, and which also was connected to the issue of declining enrollment, was the dissolution of the Education Department at CWR. As Ubbelodhe explained, once that

department was gone, the History Department began to lose contact with the secondary school teachers who could influence college choice in their students:

> We were looking ahead and saying the days were going to come when we weren't going to know any of the secondary teachers and [we weren't] going to be able to advise their students that we would be a good university to come to.

Other internal factors included the need for the History Department to prepare for the Bicentennial celebration of 1976, and Van Tassel's discovery of what he called the startling statistics "that 80% of high school students who showed up on a campus applied to that university." Van Tassel had been a member of a committee investigating admissions issues when he made this discovery and began to consider ways of getting students onto the campus in hopes of increasing university enrollment.

Ubbelodhe, who was Chairperson of the History Department in 1973, recalled conversations with Van Tassel about these issues--about what could be done to make connections with secondary school teachers, to involve and interest secondary students in history, to improve recruiting, to prepare for the Bicentennial, and to bring pride to the Department. Added to these conversations and Van Tassel's discovery about student college choice, was the desire of Van Tassel and Ubbelodhe (who had been friends since graduate school) to collaborate on a project; as Van

Tassel explained, everything came together and History Day was born:

> I thought if we could bring high school, junior high school students onto campus in connection with some kind of history project, we would have a built in connection with high school, junior high school teachers, we might re-interest or interest students in history and it might be useful to teachers as well.

That the History Day program should be created as an answer to problems in the History Department at CWR and/or as a result of colleague collaboration, does not seem unusual. I suspect many university and school programs are developed out of necessity, as a practical way of solving immediate problems, and/or as a result of peer collaboration. What is intriguing is that a similar program had been initiated in Germany a year earlier. There, the Annual Pupil's Competition for the Federal President's Prize (Von Borries, 1989) had been the brain child of a private benefactor named Korber, whose idea was that students should actively explore the history of their own localities. This program was initiated, similarly to History Day, after a series of student revolts (called the "Cultural Revolution") in the late 1960s, which had been a factor in discussions to abandon history as a school course in Germany.

The German contest, sponsored jointly by the benefactor and Germany' President Heinemann, was partly an effort to direct students to democratic traditions and partly an effort to find a different approach to the teaching and

learning of history. The new approach involved an exploratory learning in which students conducted historical research on a topic related to an annual theme. The students conducted oral interviews, analyzed and interpreted data, and wrote and presented the analysis and conclusions mainly in the form of books. Academics, teachers, and historians judged the entries. I do not know whether this model was familiar to Van Tassel and Ubbelodhe as they deliberated about how to get high school students onto the CWR campus; however, there were other contest models which were.

In determining the form History Day would take, Van Tassel and Ubbelodhe both thought about the Science Fair. Ubbelodhe remembered his daughter having a "spectacular experience" at the Science Fair at the Kent State Campus. On the other hand, Van Tassel remembered attending the Fair at Kent State and thinking the model didn't seem quite appropriate to history, that there needed to be something more:

> In the first place, students were doing independent experiments and what I wanted to do was to get those students interested in history who were not likely to be. . . . The students who participated in science fairs were somehow already interested in science. . . . I liked the idea of doing table top displays and doing the primary sources, but it seemed to me it would be useful to have students participate as a group, and couldn't they do more than just write a paper of just do tabletop displays? If you could release the creative energies through a skit or performance. . . so basically I came up with the format that we have today. It was a much cruder version, but the

> idea was there and that it should be tied to a theme so that you had some form of focus, and you had some sort of standard for judging the work and quality of analysis.

Prior to coming to CWR, Van Tassel had been teaching at the University of Texas and had had contact with Walter Prescott Webb, the founder of the Junior Historian program in which secondary school students were involved in researching and developing presentations on local history. While Van Tassel asserted that he had never seen the Junior Historians as a group, nor paid much attention to the organization because of its emphasis on local history, his knowledge of the program may have had some influence on the original form of History Day. In any case, as History Day began to expand nationally and moved into Junior Historian states, there were interactions, not always favorable, between the two programs and their advocates.

The First History Day and Program Expansion

Whatever the influence of these models, the form the program took was that of a contest which actively involved secondary school students in researching a topic related to an annual theme. The students could write a paper individually or enter the group or individual categories in performance or table-top projects. The first History Day involved students from the greater Cleveland area. Van Tassel explained that it was called History Day because "that was the day of the contest and the day that the students brought their project. . . onto [the CWR] campus."

Getting the first History Day contest together, however, was an overwhelming experience for both Van Tassel and Ubbelodhe. There were more students than expected (129), the judging raised unexpected issues, and the finances were a worry. Ubbelodhe described what it was like:

> There was not a media [category] and I have no memory . . . the first year of performances. . . . There was a chaoticness to . . . the entrance and competition.
>
> Here we were in the Bicentennial era . . . there was a young man who was a military buff who came dressed in a Civil War uniform . . . and he just wowed the audience. He just stood there next to the project and . . . I'm sure I hadn't thought and I doubt if David [Van Tassel] had or anyone else had thought about the matter of how you judge things like that and how you get good judging going. We had been so beleaguered trying to figure out the finances for it. It couldn't have been all that expensive, but we had printing to pay for and postage to pay for and I suppose some prizes that we were giving away and we had expected help which didn't ever really materialize in the city of Cleveland.
>
> We didn't have to mortgage our houses, but it was a little odd that first year and part of what made it scary was that neither David nor I were accustomed as we both now are to the vagaries of the University accounting system and it was pretty obvious that had we gone and talked to the Dean or had we gone and talked maybe even to the President, they would have set up an account and we could have drawn against that and repaid it . . . but we were both very naive . . . neither of us had had much experience in that part of the working of the University so we worried a great deal--I mean an enormous amount of worry about the money and I think that continued for . . . the early years.

Lack of understanding of secondary school procedures and processes (or the lack of attention to them) on the part of Van Tassel and Ubbelodhe presented further problems. For

example, for the first History Day in 1974 the theme was "Ohio and the Revolution." The assumption was that since there was a state requirement that Ohio history be taught somewhere in the secondary level, students would be familiar enough with that topic to be able to find local research material. However, as Van Tassel explained, that wasn't the case:

> It turned out that that was a great misapprehension because although Ohio history was required by the state, no teacher was required to take Ohio history in order to get certified or to teach it. Consequently what was taught in Ohio history was everything but history--current events or whatever the teacher could come up with. We found this out through the program. Nobody would really admit this and so neither the teachers nor students knew anything about Ohio history.

This lack of knowledge about, or attention to, how school systems function also presented a problem in terms of getting schools and teachers involved in the program. Ubbelodhe explained that it took [them] awhile to discover that going to superintendents didn't mean a thing and mailing just generally . . . to the school didn't mean a thing either." Van Tassel eventually discovered that direct contact with the social studies departments, teachers, and classes was necessary to ensure involvement in the program. One successful line of contact turned out to be with teachers whom Ubbelodhe described as "probably having done their M.A.'s at CWR in the History Department" and who somehow felt loyalty. This kind of networking was important

not only in the start-up of the History Day program but in its expansion.

Ubbelodhe had "no imperialist" thoughts about History Day expanding out of the Cleveland area, particularly since the program had been designed for a unique set of problems connected to CWR. However, Van Tassel did encourage and work to promote expansion of the program by planning grants from the national Endowment for the Humanities (hereafter referred to as NEH). As the program expanded, Ubbelodhe's role became less active and more advisory and Van Tassel, with the help of administrators once the program became national, became the driving force in History Day's growth and continuance.

History Day became a state-wide program in 1976 when the state Bicentennial Commission adopted History Day as its secondary school project. And again, as Van Tassel explained, networking became effective and instrumental in the growth of History Day:

> David Twining [of the Western Reserve Historical Society], who was the Executive Director of the [Bicentennial] Commission . . . divided the state . . . into districts . . . and contacted different people who would host the contest and set up committees, and we got together in Columbus. So 1976 . . . and 1977 it was statewide.

With a planning grant from NEH, History Day became a regional program by 1978--Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio joined the program. The following year Iowa participated. More NEH money in 1979 allowed Van Tassel to

hire his former PhD student Lois Scharf to expand History Day nationally. The growth in the program from its first national contest in 1980 to 1991 was phenomenal. The first NHD competition was held in Washington, DC in 1980; nineteen states participated. In 1984, 44 states were involved, and by 1991, 48 states participated.

Much of Scharf's initial work in expanding History Day nationally involved writing planning grants and making contacts with non-participating states. Scharf concentrated on contacting historical societies, Junior Historian programs, and academic friends or acquaintances. In reference to the Junior Historian programs, Scharf recalled that a "number of them were willing to either initiate a History Day along with their Junior Historian program or to incorporate History Day within their . . . program." According to state coordinators, however, there were several Junior Historian organizations which resisted and/or resented what they considered to be the intrusion or invasion of National History Day into their territory. This resistance and the fact that a program similar to History Day already existed makes the expansion of History Day even more remarkable.

There were other factors involved in the national expansion. Scharf submitted articles about NHD to history association newsletters and periodicals and received related response. Additionally there was "a carrot at the end of

the stick," according to Scharf, in the form of re-grant money:

> In the beginning, I could regrant a program . . . $10,000 to insure $5,000 the following year; and then . . . the third year they were . . . on their own . . . it was a good base for starting up. We supplied them with materials, we standardized material and designed materials.

While the numbers cited above explain how successful the national expansion was, they do not tell the whole story because they do not reveal the explosion in the number of students involved--from 19,000 nation-wide in 1980, to 150,000 in 1984, to over 500,000 in 1991. Data from the interviews of Van Tassel, Ubbelodhe, Gorn, and Scharf and from the NHD documentary materials indicate that Scharf--and after 1984, Scharf and Gorn (Associate Director of NHD)--were largely responsible for the national expansion of History Day in terms of the states' involvement. This same data, however, provide no clear explanation for the ever increasing participation of students and teachers in a secondary program which was started to solve problems in a university in Cleveland.

The founders and administrators were aware of the explosion in student and teacher participation in NHD, but seemed not to understand why it had happened and were very humble about their role in this growth. Ubbelodhe's reflections and questions about this growth mimicked those of the others:

> I'm amazed at the faithfulness with which the teachers pursue . . . the activities and the enterprise . . . the rewards surely must be very minimal for the investment. . . . I look at the numbers involved which is really quite staggering. . . . You have to ask yourself, well if there wasn't History Day, what would there be. . . . Are we thinking about a vacuum with none of this at all happening? . . . I can't help but think that History Day is a good thing.

Scharf could not explain this growth either:

> It is definitely a program for the active, not the passive; the creative, not the traditional teacher. It's demanding, but those who use it in one form or another are as fully excited about it, so it must do something for them.

Underlying Assumptions and Goals

Discussions of educational theories were not a part of, nor generated by, the circumstances out of which History Day was born. However, that doesn't mean that the form History Day took came out of thin air. In fact, while Van Tassel, Ubbelodhe, Scharf, and Gorn all claimed that educational theory was not and had not been an issue, it was apparent that there was and is a philosophical basis for the process involved in the History Day program. Ubbelodhe explained that the philosophy revolves around the concept of "doing" history--around students being actively involved in original historical research:

> At the beginning the assumption was you could "do" history. You could illustrate an historical past in writing or in a table top exhibit. That was a given. . . . One thing I'm very proud about . . . is that [History Day] has stayed really close to this idea that students do research. It is not a contest of memory or a contest of factual recall or anything like that at all. . . . Students not only are involved in the process [of

> research and doing history], but know they're involved and can talk about their involvement.

Van Tassel also stressed the importance of active student involvement and defined this as student use of primary source material:

> I was not particularly grounded in . . . formal educational theory, but I certainly was convinced that students would . . . learn more once they were excited by engagement with the past--that the most effective way was . . . dealing with documents that people . . . produced--letters, diaries or periodicals of a particular time--photographs, artifacts--or of the more recent past--oral interviews of people who were there.

Although Scharf admitted that there had never been discussions on educational theories (or on how the research process of NHD related to educational theory) since she had been with the program, she did in fact have a reason as to why the process worked:

> I'm convinced it [the NHD research process] works, but I don't have a theoretical rationale for you except I think that most of us agree that self-direction along with some kind of motivating factor is an incredibly positive experience.

Gorn, who like Scharf, had had the benefit of seeing the process after it was already in place, expressed a philosophy of teaching and learning history that meshed with, and elaborated upon, the philosophical underpinnings of NHD and Ubbelodhe's and Van Tassel's definitions of active involvement:

> Studying history is not memorizing names and dates. That's a very important element in NHD, something we feel strongly about. It's a process. . . . Kids don't memorize names and dates and they don't just do time lines on a blackboard either.

> They have to . . . understand research techniques, understand what an annotated bibliography is, what primary sources are. We want to teach children how to be historians, how to do history the way historians do it and . . . to make history come alive for them, make it more interesting, get them into archives and see a primary source. . . . That's a lot more fun than reading history out of a textbook in a classroom. . . . We want to create thinking individuals. . . . The purpose of doing a project or a performance or a media presentation not just a paper is really two fold. It's one, to give kinds a creative outlet for the research, make it a lot more fun and interesting and exciting, but also not all kids can write very well. They can't express themselves that way, so for students who can't do that, we give them another opportunity and that's worked well. We've had many, many, many students who are described by their teachers as underachievers or below average students do very, very well with NHD which they probably wouldn't be doing if they had to sit in school and write a term paper.

The purpose and mission of History Day and NHD have been the same since 1974 and sound remarkably like the goals promoted by the history education committees of the late 1800s and early 1900s as well as of the goals of the history/social studies frameworks of the late 1980s (see Literature Review). NHD's goal is to improve academic achievement and critical thinking skills while promoting student competency and interest in carrying out original research in history. The purpose of having varied formats is to allow for and to foster "creativity and imagination in the presentations," and the process is meant to help "students understand history as process and change and cause and effect" and to "create educated, motivated citizens" (NHD, 1990).

Whether NHD has accomplished and is still accomplishing these goals any better than secondary schools and if so whether there is any correlation with (and indeed what can account for) the growth in student and teacher participation in NHD are only two of the questions which emerged from this review of the historical framework. Before elaborating on these and related questions, however, it is necessary (to provide a complete context for these questions and to determine additional questions) to examine the organizational framework of NHD.

Organizational Framework

NHD National Office

Before History Day became a national program, Van Tassel and Ubbelodhe directed it as Cleveland History Day; as the program expanded to a state and then regional program, state coordinators, some of whom were connected to historical societies and educational institutions and made the position part of their educational outreach, ran their own programs. Since 1980 when History Day became a national program (NHD), the national administrative office has been housed in CWR space, rent-free. Scharf has been Executive Director since 1980 when her main assignment was to expand History Day nationally. Associate Director Gorn started working for Ohio History Day in 1982 while a graduate student at CWR. She "fell in love with the program" and decided that she wanted to work for NHD. She became

Assistant Director in 1984 and then Associate Director in 1990. While the jobs of Scharf and Gorn have often overlapped, Scharf's main role has been to write grant proposals and to take care of the finances. She has kept the books, made the payroll deposits, filed the reports, and overseen the running of the program. Gorn explained that she has done the "nitty, gritty implementation" which included preparing curriculum material, the bibliography and topic suggestions, and the classroom booklet, preparing for the national competition, contacting state coordinators, and traveling to states which needed help. Both agreed the work has been a collaboration. Only since 1990 has there been a full-time public relations person and a part-time office assistant.

State and Local Level

Each NHD state program is self-sufficient. Up to the time of this research, the three biggest problems for the states were raising money, turn-over in personnel caused by burn-out or re-location, and the time commitment required of the volunteers. According to Scharf (and as explained above) in the early years many of the state coordinators were connected to historical societies or educational institutions which provided some money for the program, but in more recent years, historical societies and educational institutions had lost funding and this had affected the

availability of coordinators and financial status of some programs.

Gorn claimed that the states in which the coordinator's position is part of a paid position in an established institution or agency have the strongest programs. Money is more readily available and the coordinator directs the state program, including the state contest, as part of a full-time, paid position. This gives the coordinator the time and often telephone, printing, and mailing provisions with which to conduct the program. In the states in which coordinators' positions are voluntary (non-paying), the coordinator might be a college professor, a classroom teacher, a museum employee, or a graduate student. These volunteers have to raise the money and find the time aside from their regular positions to administer the program; in these states the status of the program is very person-dependent.

There are also district and regional coordinators who conduct local contests. The local coordinators in the larger districts are often social studies coordinators; but many in the smaller districts, as with the volunteer state coordinators, are classroom teachers, college professors, and museum people, most of whom are strapped for time. Some state programs provide materials for the local competitions; others do not. In some states where there is small participation, there is only a state contest.

Because each state and district/region manages its own program, there is a lack of uniformity in the kinds of materials available, the type of judging, the amount of resources in terms of money and supplies, and in the strength of the programs. As Scharf explained, there are "very strong programs and some very rocky, weak programs." According to Ubbelodhe, this lack of consistency leads to a "constant rise and declining . . . states come in, are vigorous, and then drop off . . . there's always change going on." As with any national program there are also inherent differences in the programs because of the differences in populations, geography and demography of the states.

Governing Boards

Board of Trustees. The system of boards for the national program seems rather vague as to the form, members, and purposes. Van Tassel is the president of National History Day, Inc. and his role has been primarily to chair the Board of Trustees. The original Board members came from national corporations with headquarters in Cleveland, but more recently there have been representatives from all of the national professional organizations dealing with history including the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians. Represented educational organizations include the American Federation of Teachers, National Educational Association and the

educational division of AFL-CIO. Additionally, the President and Dean of CWR are members as are representatives from Houghton Mifflin and Aetna Insurance Company. According to the annual reports, there were 19 Board members in 1980 and 27 in 1990. While the number of members varied during the intervening 10 years, classroom teachers were noticeably missing from the Board (with the exception that there was one secondary school teacher on the Board in 1990). In a program designed for secondary school teachers and students, this is a glaring void.

The Board meets three times a year and reviews an agenda set by Van Tassel, Scharf, and Gorn. According to Van Tassel the Board determines:

> everything from publicity to . . . fund raising, which is a very important part of the Board's responsibility, and determining our logo and budget for the year and various policy matters. There is a publicity committee and finance committee and the committee on the speaker for the Washington contest.

Advisory and Executive Councils. There has been an Advisory Council since 1983. Scharf described their function as one primarily of name recognition: "They do not meet and they do not vote and they do not control nor are they ultimately responsible." As of 1990 there were 16 members of this Council including Diane Ravitch of Columbia University and Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers.

There also has been an Executive Council of state coordinators since the early 1980s. This was formed, according to state coordinators, when Scharf planned to tax the states according to the number of student entrants. Since this would have been a hardship for the larger states, the coordinators organized, fought the tax, and established the Executive Council which could and would address and review policy issues. State coordinators elect seven representatives for the Council annually, and Scharf appoints two representatives at large. Representatives of the Executive Council also serve on the Board of Trustees.

Organizational Issues

Except for the administrators at national headquarters and those coordinators who conduct their programs as part of another paid position, NHD is a volunteer program; because of this, communication in the network is a problem. Gorn worried over the links in the communication system:

> We can communicate by memos to our state coordinators, but we always worry about the extent to which they're communicating with their district coordinators, particularly when you ask the state coordinators for information and only half of them answer which is par for the course. . . . We're not paying people and even the good ones sometimes don't answer our memos, but I can't say, well I'm not going to send you your paycheck if you don't answer my memo.

Connected to this concern of communication is the major issue of funding. According to Scharf, in the early years "virtually all funding came from NEH." However, as the NEH

grants decreased--from $187,000 in 1984, to $40,000 in 1986, to $30,000 in 1987 and 1988, and to nothing in 1989--the money regranted to states diminished greatly also--from approximately $46,000 in 1984, to $13,000 in 1986 to $6,000 in 1989 (NHD Annual Reports, 1984-1991; there are no available annual reports from 1980-1983). Because the NEH grant money had decreased, in 1984 NHD instituted an annual state membership fee based on the number of years the state had been in the program. According to Scharf, "It's provided a good solid base of fixed income that one can count on." Several of the state coordinators, however, objected and are still objecting to this fee and feel that the money should be flowing in the other direction--from NHD to the states.

The state membership fee is not the major source of funding, however; the major sources are corporations and foundations primarily Cleveland based (and whose representatives sit on the Board of Trustees) and a "sizeable," as Scharf called it, reserve fund of CD's and U.S. Treasury notes which recently has generated about $50,000 annually. Because most of the annual funding is "soft" money, each year the program's future is tentative. Ubbelodhe worried about relying on outside money such as the NEH grant NHD received (in 1990 and 1991) to conduct teacher workshops. His concern was that the program's mission and

goals would change if the program became dependent on this kind of money:

> There is a danger if you start depending upon overhead monies coming out of such activities that you're going to be jerked away from your central mission. . . . It's no different from what happens with funded research on a college or university campus. You sometimes have to go for the money available even though you would not normally have chosen to go in that direction. I think that's a problem. . . . One of these days I guess there will be an endowment or reserve fund large enough so that independence is possible.

The funding issue affects the communication network not only by limiting the number of communications from NHD to the state coordinators, but also by limiting the materials that NHD has been able to develop, publish, and distribute. Insufficient funding forces the states to publish much of their own materials and consequently forms and materials from state to state have not been uniform.

Program Controversies

Competition

The contest format of History Day has been a topic of discussion since the program's inception. The Board of Trustees discusses it annually and continues to agree that it is the best way to encourage quality. The Founders and administrators agreed. For Van Tassel competition is necessary to ensure the high level of involvement:

> If there's something at stake, even the judges will enforce the standards. If there is nothing--simply displaying handicrafts and a blue ribbon is awarded or something like that--it's not quite the same thing and I don't think you'd get the level

> of involvement that we do. I think that it helps reinforce the standard of quality and performance.

Ubbelodhe recalled the original debates over the effects of competition and remembered after much deliberation concluding that competition was not harmful and in fact helped acquaint young people with a process of our society:

> We're talking mid-seventies when there was a lot of concern whether competition was something we wanted to emphasize with young people . . . I think it took some of us quite a while to get to the place where we felt comfortable with the intensity of the competition. . . . I suppose to some extent if you think about what life is really like--I'm a competitor and I like to win, and I don't denigrate myself because I compete nor do I think necessarily that you injure a young person by saying enter a competition. It seems to me that that's part of a process in which a person becomes a part of society.

The founders and administrators described the main problem connected to the competition as the "Little League" behavior of the adults--the parents, teachers, and state coordinators. Van Tassel submitted that the parents put too much stress on winning and not enough on what the students had learned from the research process:

> Some people get too involved in the contest aspect of it . . . particularly parents who watch the judging with an eagle eye and seize upon any infraction as an excuse to push their child's project forward instead of making the point with their child that . . . they have learned something from it--that this is the way the world operates. . . If you enter a competition, you have to submit to conditions of the competition.

Ubbelodhe felt unsettled by what the Little League atmosphere could induce in students but, as with Van tassel,

placed the parents, not the competition, at the root of the problem:

> All you need to do is see one child in tears and you wonder, my God, what have I induced, and it can be very harrowing and like Little League baseball. Parents can become terribly, terribly competitive and you realize that given the nature of the program as it's set up you've allowed opportunities for these kind of unfortunate aspects to occur.

Like Van Tassel and Ubbelodhe, Gorn blamed the parents:

> Most kids, once they get to national, they don't care about winning. Their parents--the Little League coaches who come along with them--do.

Scharf, on the other hand, claimed it was not only the parents but also the teachers and coordinators who got out of control:

> I've always said that History Day brings out the best in the students and the worst in the adults and that goes for the teachers, too. Oh yes, oh yes, the first adult I ever say throw a first class temper tantrum was a teacher and I also see my state coordinators at the national contest looking over the judges' shoulders . . . we are an incredibly competitive people and we take our rewards any way we can get them and life has some very, very unpleasant experiences.

Judging

While the founders and administrators contended that the competition is necessary to ensure quality work and that it is the adults accompanying the students who cause ill effects, they (the founders and administrators) did not seem to see or admit to any connection between the attitudes and the reactions of the adults and the on-going problem of consistency in judging. This lack of consistency in judging

(among the states and between the judging at state competitions and the national contest) is partly the result of states having to provide their own materials, including judging sheets. In addition, while it is recommended that the states hold orientation workshops for the judges, according to Gorn, some states do, others do not. In the states that hold the orientations, it is usually a volunteer conducting the orientation. That person may or may not have understood the rules of the contest and the procedures of the judging. It seems plausible that this inconsistency in judging could be a factor in the perceived Little League reaction from adults.

In any case, Scharf was not optimistic about finding a solution:

> Consistency of judging is a problem and we keep addressing it and keep addressing it and I'm . . . not too sanguine about the whole thing. There's always going to be a problem. When I first came to work here, the first person I called was the woman who runs the Science Fair, and by that time it was 30 years old and . . . she told me that judging was always a problem . . . and I live with the fact that you absolutely get these professional adults and you orient them not only in terms of what they are to look for concretely in the entries of their judging, but you orient them in how they really should behave vis-a-vis the very exciting and very nervous young people, and there are always disasters. Every year there are disasters . . . let me put it this way--we're going to try our best to solve this, but I don't see any way of controlling hundreds and hundreds.

Gorn proposed that if there were enough money, it would ensure that all coordinators had the materials to help make

judging consistent. But policing what each state did in terms of judging preparation, she claimed, was impossible:

> Some district coordinators are conscientious enough to hold a judges' orientation, like they're supposed to, to get the materials into the hands of the judges, to make sure the judges read the rules. Sometimes they don't do that and that's so hard for us to police all this and to insist that they did it.
>
> If we had more money, we could make sure that every district and state coordinator could have the judging forms, and enough of them, and judges' handbooks and rule booklets to make sure that the judging is more consistent. . . . As it is, not only do they [the states] have to raise money to run their own programs, they have to buy their materials from us--judging score sheets and other kinds of things . . . some are using their own forms, so you have a consistency problem.

These commentaries by the founders and administrators on the negative aspects of competition and judging seemed rather hopeless in terms of solutions and/or change. To shed additional light on these and preceding issues, the following section presents and examines perspectives of three state coordinators.

State Coordinators

Interviewing state coordinators was part of the strategy of triangulation--using multiple sources--to determine internal validity of (and to supplement) the primary data. The interview data from three state coordinators pertain not only to the teachers' perspectives discussed in the following chapter but to the historical and organizational aspects of NHD presented in this chapter.

The following sections of this chapter present profiles of the coordinators and their perspectives of the history of NHD in their states and of the strengths and weaknesses of NHD on a state and national level.

Dr. Landers (State A) held Master's and Ph.D. degrees in American history and had taught at a large university. In the late 1970s the State A Historical Association hired him to coordinate the Junior Historian organization (described earlier in this chapter) and then in 1981 the state History Day program. His introduction to NHD was not pleasant, and he presented a different tone to NHD's beginnings than did Scharf. He recalled that at a national meeting of the Junior Historians in 1979 the common perception among the meeting participants was that the NHD organization was trying to move into the Junior Historian member states and upstage the Junior Historian associations. Even though Landers did not want NHD moving in on "his turf," he met with Scharf (NHD's Executive Director) and reluctantly agreed to build toward the NHD program. His state became involved in the national contest in 1980.

The early growth of NHD in State A was not so much a result of Scharf's persuasive powers as it was the result of revisions in the state educational framework which left the relationship between the Junior Historian clubs and schools' curricula unclear. Confused by the educational policy changes, many social studies teachers decided to participate

in History day which (under the new regulations) appeared to entail fewer restrictions than the Junior Historian program. In any case, the growth of NHD in State A was explosive. The program expanded from 100 students during the first year to about 900 during the 1990/91 school year. Landers directed the entire state program which was divided into 20 regions. He chose the regional and district coordinators through various contacts; some coordinators were "academics, some museum people, some social studies coordinators and some . . . [rotated] every year." The State A Historical Association, besides paying Landers' salary, provided some additional funding, but the state History Day program also raised money by selling t-shirts and soliciting donations.

Dr. Tanner (State B) came to the coordinator's position with a background in secondary school and college teaching. After working in public schools for 15 years as a teacher, guidance counselor, audio-visual director and vice-principal, he had been a college professor for 26 years; at the time of this research he was retired and an adjunct professor of history and geography. State B was one of the first states to join the NHD program; the education director at a state historical agency had been instrumental in the start-up of the State B program in 1979. At that time there were three regions and Tanner served as a regional coordinator. However, 6 or 7 years ago the historical society's new director, in a move which represented (and is

still representing) a common problem to NHD organizers, decided "to wipe out the National History [Day] program. . . . He wanted to get rid of everything to do with schools."

At Tanner's request, the President of the college where Tanner was teaching agreed to pick up sponsorship of the program and Tanner became the state coordinator. The President and college provided the student center, lunches, equipment for the contests as well as office space and mailing and telephone service for Tanner's use. But this had changed in the last 2 years and had left the State B program without a permanent home and in a weakened condition. Since 1990 there had been two regions (north and south) and the state competitions had taken place at different colleges. The lack of sponsorship and lack of funding for the state program caused Tanner to worry about the future of NHD in his state.

Besides being state coordinator, Tanner was also Regional Director for the north region. As with Landers (State A Coordinator) and Scharf (Executive Director) and their recruitment of volunteer participants, Tanner's selection of directors for the southern regional and of judges was based on "an elaborate old person network--it [was] on a personal basis." He asked college professors, teachers and members of other disciplines to be judges. The state program also had an executive committee consisting of eight people, chosen by Tanner, who met two or three times a

year. According to Tanner, they were "a democratic committee"--they "[talked] things over" and "[had] never had a vote." They "[decided] what [was] best" for the state program. This alludes to the lack of input to the state program by other participants including teachers.

Ms. Greene (State C) also brought to the coordinator's position a background of public school and college teaching. She had an undergraduate degree in secondary education and history and a Master's degree and extensive post-Master's work in history. In State C, a state historical agency had instituted NHD as part of their program and in 1982 hired Greene specifically to administer History Day. She had been state coordinator since that time. It had not been smooth sailing however. About 4 years ago, the agency hired a new director who came from a state where the Junior Historian organization was strong and who was not supportive of the NHD program. This was yet another example of the antagonism between the Junior Historian groups and NHD. After continued squabbling with the director, in January of 1991 Greene moved to a new position in the State C State Department of Education. As consistent with the union policy, the NHD program moved to the new position.

Greene's commitment to NHD was strong: "There's nothing else for social studies; no other national program gives kids the opportunity to do historical research or work on projects. Other work is all memorized." Greene found

most district coordinators through university networks or historical societies because, she argued, NHD needed "academic orientation to continue credibility."

Since the State A and State C programs were connected to an agency or institution which funded the coordinator's position as part of a larger job description, these programs had more resources. Additionally, since the coordinators in these states had built-in job time to devote to the coordinating, they were able to do more with the NHD program than was Tanner, State B coordinator, who administered the program on his own time and with no funding. This fit with Scharf's (Executive Director) description of State B as one of the weakest in NHD and with Gorn's (Associate Director) position that the states which had volunteer coordinators were the weakest and had the greatest struggle. Conversely, Scharf and Gorn considered State A and State C strong programs.

Strengths of NHD

Landers (State A) described the strength of the national program as the same as that for his state program--that NHD encouraged top level research and rewarded good students and teachers. This description supports the claims of the founders and administrators. Tanner (State B) and Greene (State C) submitted that the strengths of the national program were the leadership and the communication between the national office and the state coordinators. As

for their state programs, collectively the coordinators saw the commitments of the participating teachers, schools, and universities as the major strength. On an individual basis, Landers described the competitive spirit of his state and the fact that in NHD students in his state did graduate level work as strengths. Tanner and Greene contended that their state judging systems were strengths.

Weaknesses of/Complaints about NHD

National Program. Together, the three coordinators described funding, parental interference, elitism, and unfair judging as their main concerns with the national program. Greene (State C) questioned the financial framework of NHD. She argued that the program should not survive off of its endowment, but that NHD should become a foundation and work at attracting corporate funding. She also submitted that money should go to the states from the national office and not the other way around. Her perception was that the NHD staff salaries were commensurate with full time jobs, but that the jobs were not full time. Additionally, Greene got aggravated because the staff allegedly ignored state coordinators' suggestions about funding:

> I have talked to the Executive Committee about this [funding problem]. The response is lots of turmoil. Basically they say go out and raise more money. They never are willing to give us detailed financial statements.

While administrators recognized and described the funding problems, theirs was a different perspective in that they felt they were doing everything they could to keep the program intact.

For Tanner (State B) the main problems with the national program were the Little League atmosphere of the competition and questions of authorship:

> I've been told kids who win at state competition [in another state] go to the university and get coached by the drama department. We try to stress this is the kids' projects. Keep adult involvement minimal. I tell the judges to ask the kids, "Did you do this?"

This issue of adult interference was addressed by Van Tassel and Ubbelodhe (founders) as well as by Scharf and Gorn (Executive and Associate Directors). They too expressed annoyance and exasperation at adult interference, but offered no solutions and little hope for improvement. Rumors, such as the one Tanner refers to here that certain students get coached at a university, were common at the national competition and mainly carried by parents, teachers, and state coordinators. Tanner's complaints supported Scharf's contention that her problems concerning competition and judging were not with the students but with the adults.

Landers (State A) and Greene (State C) described problems with elitism both at the national office and at colleges and universities (in their relations with NHD) in their states. Greene thought it was critical to have more

historians involved in NHD and for them to stop considering it beneath their dignity to be involved. Landers felt the same way:

> They [NHD] will run workshops at Maryland [for teachers] with subjects like "The Law" and "The Constitution of Japan." My teachers participated once--never again. They need to have more practical, how-to sessions. It would be more valuable to have teachers talking about research skills. They need artists, media people talking about how to produce programs.
>
> It goes back to elitism--[the Organization of American Historians] wanting respectability. One professor calls [NHD] a carnival. He is no longer with the program. He was an academic. "It wouldn't have gotten me tenure." I have a great deal of respect for teachers. My respect for academics has declined. They [NHD] staff] have this elitism. . . . I don't feel they [at the national office] care about the kids/students. That bothers me. They can be rude. The feeling. . . is that they don't care.

I did not get any sense of lack of caring about the students when I interviewed the founders and administrators. In fact, my impression was the opposite--that they cared deeply about the students. However, they did reveal a lack of knowledge and understanding about secondary school policies and problems and Scharf in particular (but Van Tassel and Ubbelodhe as well) admitted they knew little about teaching on a secondary level or about educational theory. That lack of knowledge could be interpreted by some as not caring.

While the founders and administrators found the judging process to be one of their main concerns, among these state coordinators only Landers suggested there was a problem with

judging at the national competition. He described one experience to support his contention:

> Judging how it goes at nationals, complaints [of judging] are legitimate. . . . I was in the judging room and overheard judges commenting. {I heard] "Where is that performance from--[name of state]?" and then, "Don't let them win."

The issue presented here by Landers, however, suggests deliberate manipulation of scores by judges. This is different from the theme of lack of consistency presented by the founders and administrators.

State Programs. At the state level, coordinators' concerns included emphasis on competition, quality of judging, funding, and NHD's relation to the curriculum. Landers' concerns about his state program differed from those of Greene and Tanner. Even though Landers appreciated the competitive nature of his state, he argued there was too much emphasis on competition in his state History Day program. He claimed that "those who [won were] upbeat, but others [were] depressed and discouraged." To downplay the competition, Landers wanted to introduce other activities at the competition events. His other concern, as with his concern about the national program, involved the quality of judging. He submitted that he received more complaints about judging in his state History day Program than he ever did while involved in Junior Historian activities. Landers' criticisms of the quality of judging and over-emphasis on

competition were a reflection of his determination to ensure the well-being of students.

Again relating to state programs, both Greene (State C) and Tanner (State B) worried about how the lack of funding affected communication and publicity for their state programs. Tanner was particularly concerned about his state program in that he feared many schools would be dropping out of NHD because of budget problems. Greene's main concern, though, was the separation of the NHD program from a school's main curriculum:

> I strongly recommend that it has to be part of the curriculum program or it [NHD] will die. In about 50% of the programs, NHD is in the gifted and talented classes. . . . In the regular classes, it is part of the curriculum or extra credit. . . . The Executive Director . . . made a mistake to let NHD be identified with gifted and talented classes. My goal is to move it into the classrooms. Gifted and talented programs are going down the tubes. If History Day is going to survive, this needs to be addressed.

Greene's comments have merit. While some of the NHD booklets include excellent and detailed suggestions for incorporating NHD into classrooms and into curriculum, at the time of this research encouraging this integration did not seem to be a major priority at NHD headquarters. Greene's remarks also raise the question: What kinds of students <u>do</u> participate in NHD? The administrators had no hard information on this issue, but Scharf suggested there was probably a heavy involvement of students in gifted and talented programs. The NHD staff and founders had, however,

made efforts to involve inner-city students who might not readily have had the opportunity to participate.

Pilot Projects and New Directions

As Ubbelodhe suggested, when a program accepts money from organizations, that acceptance can bring changes in the policy and procedures of the program. These changes can advance the mission and goals of the program or they can divert the program from its original path. From 1988 to 1991 there were two new areas of concentration for NHD. The first involved work with inner-city schools and students and the second involved summer teacher workshops.

Inner-city Schools

Initially, in 1973, Van Tassel had tried to involve the inner-city schools in Cleveland in the History Day program. When this proved to be a problem, he concluded that History Day themes and processes lacked relevancy to inner-city students:

> I was always asked, "What's in this . . . for my students?" . . . How would you get students in that kind of atmosphere [inner-city] involved in something so abstract as the Revolution that happened 200 years ago and that didn't involve their ancestors or anyone with whom they can identify?

As Van Tassel described the continuing struggle to involve inner-city students, he proposed another, and I argue, more accurate diagnosis of the problem--teacher burn-out:

> We do have a much greater involvement. . . . We've done what we can with what funds we have to encourage inner-city participants, but I don't

> think the lack of participation is because of lack of money. I think it is because of . . . teacher burn-out . . . and partly because teachers don't know how to get students involved.

To address the issue of inner-city involvement, NHD staff worked with two Cleveland public schools in 1985. This project was successful enough that NHD received a grant for 1988 and 1989 from the Martha Holden Jennings Foundation in Ohio to implement the program in several inner-city schools. During the first year of the grant, a retired teacher worked on a monthly basis with the teachers and students in six schools; there also were inservice workshops with teachers. During the second year, eight schools participated and Scharf and Gorn collaborated with interdisciplinary teams representing social studies, science, and media. The result of the program, according to Scharf, was that inner-city students took part in greater numbers and produced higher quality work than they had before. While the most recent proposal to continue this program was not funded, Gorn's pride in involving inner-city students in NHD reflected not only her (and Scharf's) efforts to involve inner-city students, but also the commitment to the basic goals of NHD--the development of research and critical thinking skills--and to the growth of students:

> We had a kid in 1985, the theme was "Triumph and Tragedy" and a little girl from an inner-city school wanted to do her project on Ghandi and that was the year that the movie came out and . . . she wanted to see the movie. So the teacher told her

she'd meet her downtown and take her to the movie, but the kid didn't know how to get downtown so she had to learn how to use the rapid transit and the bus. She had never done it before, had never been out of her own block, so she overcame that fear.

The kids last year in an inner-city middle school in Cleveland wanted to do roller coasters--the technology of roller coasters--and they won third place at the state contest. . . . It was wonderful, they just went wild with it and ran around and did a little archeological dig in this old amusement part by the lake and they interviewed people and they got really excited about what they were doing.

This young man, again from an inner-city school, won at district level and then he won at state level with a project and went on to national. He didn't win anything at national, but participated. . . . He did all the wonderful things that you do at the national contest--see the congressmen and the Smithsonian and meet kids and all that kind of stuff--so when he came back, I asked him what he learned by participating in History Day and . . . I expected him to say something about meeting other kids from other schools and in other states and seeing his Congressman and he very simply in one sentence said, "I learned that other students in other states are thinking too." That's it, that sums up History Day.

Summer Teacher Workshops

Without the Jennings money, NHD could no longer support the inner-city programs. The staff took NHD in a different direction, however, for the next two years with money available from NEH for teacher workshops. In the summer of 1990 NHD held its first teacher workshops in Washington, DC. There were 92 applicants for 50 slots. Those selected were social studies teachers and media specialists. The idea was to prepare one person from each state to be able to conduct some workshops for her/his state. During the summer of

1991, the second workshops were held in four different parts of the country. At the time of this writing, both summer programs were considered to be successful by NHD in terms of teacher preparation and interest. Ubbelodhe (reiterating and expanding upon his earlier comments about the controlling power of outside money) described these teacher workshops as a whole new direction for NHD:

> You're talking here about substantive enrichment for teachers and if that were to be thought of as an ongoing activity that was appropriate to History Day . . . then . . . that says . . . they're going to have to scramble to continue to get money, but it also changes . . . what NHD is. I think when most people think of NHD now they think in terms of the students who are the competitors and that's the total center of attention; but if you're going to get into this kind of activity, what you're really talking about is relationships with classroom teachers and being a . . . help and encouragement and . . . making certain that . . . intellectual experience of high quality is provided for some selected teachers.

While recognizing that NHD might add other new components to its base program (depending on available funds), the founders, administrators, and state coordinators stressed the need for NHD to retain the original goals of improving students' academic achievement and critical thinking skills.

The Historical Context and Study Framework

This chapter has presented and discussed the historical and organizational aspects of NHD along with related perspectives of state coordinators. This material provides the context from which to view and interpret the

perspectives of the participating teachers and students. It also is the source of several questions which form the framework and focus for the main part of this study:

1. Have the founders of History Day captured in their philosophy the structure of the discipline of history? The founders and administrators together built a secondary school program which they claimed has as its core an active learning component through which students themselves can learn to do the work of historians--that is, to do research, analyze and interpret data, and draw conclusions. Did their academic backgrounds allow them or force them to discern the nature and structure of history as research and inquiry?
2. How have the founders and administrators been able to involve students and teachers in a program which promotes a teaching and learning of history that differs from what happens (and has happened) in the traditional classrooms? The philosophy of the founders and administrators about how secondary school students learn history best seemed so obvious to them, yet none of them has ever taught on a secondary school level and only one of them (in the late 1940s) studied education formally. Has a naivete about the realities of the constraints of secondary school systems

actually helped them to develop and sustain this program?

3. Do secondary school teachers in general have the same philosophy as the founders and administrators of History Day? If so, why do most teach in a traditional, teacher-dominated way. Are they too overwhelmed or trapped by requirements of their systems to pursue the teaching of history in any way but what they do?

4. If secondary school teachers do not understand the structure of history as a discipline and/or they do not have this NHD philosophy about how students learn best, why not? Do history teacher education programs prevent, discourage, or avoid this "knowing" of the structure of history and instead treat history as a collection of information to be relayed to students?

5. Do university professors and secondary school teachers start off from different bases? If so, how and why has this NHD university/secondary school collaboration been sustained?

6. What does this program do for teachers and students? Why do teachers participate in NHD year after year, and why do students want to participate more than once, given the

extraordinary commitment of time and effort that appears to be required?

7. Has NHD accomplished the goals of improving academic achievement and critical thinking skills and if so is there any correlation with the growth in student and teacher participation?

8. How do the communication and funding problems of the national program affect participants?

9. In what way does the emphasis on competition affect the goals of NHD and the participants?

The following chapters attempt to address these questions.

Chapter Summary

History Day was founded as an answer to specific concerns at CWR University in Cleveland in the early 1970s. The program became National History Day in 1980, and since then, while the program format and goal have stayed remarkably stable, the growth has been phenomenal and new directions appear imminent. The program has been run out of three cramped rooms in one of the older buildings on the CWR campus basically by two people, Scharf and Gorn.

There are inherent weaknesses in the voluntary nature of the organizational framework. Communication is not always certain, turn-over among coordinators is a problem, and judging is inconsistent. Funding is a major worry on a yearly basis; NHD relies heavily on outside money and consequently the program's future is always tentative. With

these kinds of problems, as well as the fact that there was already a history program in place in several states when History Day started to expand, the kind of growth that NHD has experienced is remarkable.

This chapter on historical and organizational aspects of NHD provides the context, connections, and questions from and with which to analyze the participants' stories in the next chapters in the attempt to obtain as complete and realistic a portrait of NHD as possible and to discern implications for educational processes.

C H A P T E R V

TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES/ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS AND ISSUES

A powerful way to learn about the dynamics of a program is through the experiences of the participants (Seidman, 1991). Chapters V and VI, then, based respectively on the participating teachers' and students' reconstructions of their NHD experiences, describe the NHD processes and present and examine related effects and issues. To provide a sense of the cultural context within which these teachers and students participated in NHD, this chapter begins with a brief description of the involved schools and communities and an explanation of the NHD program in each of the schools. Subsequent sections of the chapter include profiles of the teachers, description of their NHD experiences, and discussion of motivating factors, effects and issues of competition, unresolved issues, effects and issues in the larger school culture, and NHD as a model for teaching history.

School and Community Context

School A, the largest school in this study, was located in a residential area at the edge of a Southwestern industrial and manufacturing city with an ethnically and racially diverse population of over three million. Technically School A was an "inner-city" school in that it was in a large city, but it would not by most definitions, including

those of the students and staff, be considered an inner-city school. To separate themselves figuratively from the city, the school system and community used an address for the school that while legally acceptable made no reference to the city itself. Additionally, in contrast to most inner-city schools, there was a strong parental and community involvement and support as well as a healthy and supported budget. Furthermore, again in contrast to most inner-city schools, School A had been the recipient of many academic and athletic awards including a national award for educational excellence in 1989/90 (School A Independent School District, 1990) and in 1992 was listed as one of the top 140 schools in the United States (Weiss, 1992).

In the previous 5 years, the high school had changed from a predominantly white middle class school to a predominantly minority school; large numbers of students came from low socio-economic backgrounds. According to Bender--School A's NHD coordinator--the school had the "entire spectrum" of students. This included students from a "very low economic area that [was] predominantly black" to "those who [drove] Ferraris." In 1990 the school population was 40% Afro-American, 33% Anglo-American, 16% Hispanic-American, and 11% Asian-American.

The student population had increased from 2000 in 1985 to approximately 3000 in 1990. The school was so large that it employed seven vice principals and seven guidance

counselors; it also contained a large library which provided several computer data bases--a valuable resource for NHD participants. At the time of my visits the interior was clean, bright, and cheerful; students and teachers moved about with purpose; and there were motivational signs everywhere. The school's mission statement, "Academic Excellence: Dignity in Diversity," jumped from one banner. Another banner beamed, "The Best Kids Deserve the Best School." A large sign shouted, "One Purpose, One Commitment: Educational Excellence." "You Must Believe to Achieve" greeted anyone entering the cafeteria. A new school flag would soon say, "Come in to Learn, Leave to Serve." What stood out about this school besides the size, diversity, and positive atmosphere was the high morale of the teachers. This was evident in conversations in the teachers' room, the office, the halls, and the classrooms and was reinforced by Bender's enthusiasm as she described the introduction of NHD to School A.

The school district's Social Studies Coordinator had introduced NHD to the district first as a pilot program in the 1979/80 school year at the state level only and then during the 1980/81 school year at the national level as well. When School A first participated, it was a requirement that all students in social studies classes had to develop NHD research projects of some kind; however, after and since the implementation of the gifted and

talented (hereafter referred to as GT) and honors programs--in the last 2 to 3 years--only GT and honors social studies students were and had been required to participate. Several teachers in the school, though, in other level social studies classes were still requiring their students to participate. Additionally, according to Bender, there were students who were not even in a social studies class who "[did] the projects again and again simply for the love of it." During the school year 1990/91 (the year of this research) approximately 400 students and 7 teachers participated. Bender alone had 120 students involved.

The requirements at School A to develop an NHD project did not include a requirement to compete. As NHD had consistently functioned at School A, during the Fall semester the students completed a required research project and received a semester grade for that project. Competition, if the students chose to continue with NHD, followed in the next semester. At School A the students had to be successful at four levels of competition between January and May in order to compete at the national competition in June. At the school History Fair (as the School A students called their NHD program) and at the district level, students in the 9th grade competed against other 9th graders, 10th graders competed against other 10th graders etcetera in each of the competition categories. At the regional and state competitions, students competed in

either the junior high (grades 6-8) or senior high (grades 9-12) division. The top two in each category and division advanced to the next level.

Reflecting the control each state has over its NHD program, there was another way to enter the state contest in this state. Students who had been eliminated at regional competition and who were involved in the Junior Historian organization (see Chapter IV) could compete again through that organization for the opportunity to enter the state NHD contest. From the state competition, which was held at a large university, the top two in each category in each division entered the national competition at the University of Maryland in June. This competition event lasted for 5 days.

Even though participation in NHD continued to be required for GT and honors students, and regardless of how important Bender considered the NHD program to be, she wanted it made clear that in School A NHD work did not interfere with the school's curriculum and that it was a supplement to, rather than a part of, that curriculum. Most NHD work was done outside of class time. Bender estimated a total of 2 1/2 to 3 weeks of non-consecutive classroom days during the Fall semester was devoted to NHD. The classes took "a day here and a day there" either for library work, student presentations, or pertinent discussion and instruction. Whatever the process, it had been working in

terms of competition success; the students from School A had won more NHD awards than students from any other school in the United States.

School B was located in a small rural-suburban, well-endowed bedroom community in a small Northeastern state. The population of the community had increased 12% over the last 5 years to approximately 8500 in 1990 and was mainly at a high middle and upper socio-economic level. The community was less than 20 minutes from an industrial/technical area and from a large academic community. The residents of the community were mainly professionals and business executives (School B Township Schools, 1990).

In stark contrast to School A, School B had a small, mostly homogeneous population of approximately 600 students in grades 7-12. The student body was largely Anglo-American although there was a small Asian-American population. Students and teachers referred to this as an academic school; 85% to 90% of the graduates continued their education, and the school placed a strong emphasis on students being accepted to top colleges and universities. This emphasis was reflected not only in the absence of a football team and in the advanced level course offerings, but also in the other half of Ms. White's position. White, NHD teacher from School B, taught for part of the day and during the other half worked on school and academic

publicity, wrote recommendations for students, and gathered and made available scholarship information.

While the school (at the time of my visits) was clear and bright and the atmosphere friendly and supportive, apparently this was different from the atmosphere that had existed during the previous administration. White recalled a male dominated, heavily controlled system in which men had titles (but "no one was ever sure what their jobs entailed") and were always the department chairpersons. Although White's initial involvement in NHD was successful, this "male system" had a negative effect on her subsequent participation. White had become involved in NHD accidentally during the 1981/82 school year when she found a book marker advertising a contest in which a trip to Greece was the price. The student and teacher interviews in this study confirmed that White's first experience in NHD was indicative of the collaborative student/teacher detective work, persistence, research, and ingenuity involved in developing and in solving problems in NHD. she tells the story:

> I said, "Can you give me some information on this contest?" The man on the other end of the line said, "Yes, it's . . . 'Trade and Industry in the Byzantine Empire.'" I had a student in my class who was a really bright ninth grader and I said, "You won't believe the boring contest that someone is running. You can win a trip to Greece."
>
> I said to the kid, "Go down [to the library] and see what you can find . . . related to sea trade and the Byzantine Empire." . . . lo and behold, he comes back--this kid's only a freshman--and he

> says, "There's only been one Byzantine ship excavated and the name of it is the Yassi Ada and the man who did it was George Bass."
>
> Well I had never heard of George Bass. . . . He's the father of nautical archeology out of Texas A & M . . . we had the nerve to get on the pone and call the man up and . . . he sent us the [report of the] underwater expedition. . . . He put us in touch with a man by the name of Richard Steffie, who's the ship builder for the Institute of Nautical Archeology, and we did a running correspondence with him.
>
> We just had this little tete a tete going with the greatest experts on Byzantine archeology in the world, but we didn't know how to do the rigging . . . and they didn't know how to do it because the rigging had disintegrated, but just like a needle in a haystack, we just looked at mosaics until we found one of these boats in the mosaic that had the mast up, so that we knew what the mast looked like and what the cross piece looked like. . . . We had a girl in our school who was . . . a national sailing champion and we asked her how the rigging could be constructed. . . . She said there was only one possible way that it could be constructed if the ship was going to sail . . . she showed us how to do it. . . . Matt did it and we sent it back to Dr. Steffie and he sent us a letter saying, "If you say so, it must be right, because at this point, you know as much as we do." and of course we could use the letter in the competition.

Even though the student won the context and the trip to Greece for himself and White, because the school administration was so negative about the whole experience and refused financial support for the trip to the national competition in Washington, White did not get involved again until the 1986/87 year after the school administration had changed. This experience not only describes the NHD processes, but is a commentary on how important school culture is to implementation of a program like NHD.

Based on the number of students involved in NHD at School B and on the number of district and state winners coming from this school in the last 3 years (NHD Annual Reports, 1988, 1989, 1990), it appeared that School B had one of the strongest NHD programs in its state. That NHD Executive Director Scharf considered this state one of the weakest in the NHD program speaks to the importance of the individual teacher in the program. While White was the only social studies teacher involved in NHD at School B, several other staff members, including the librarian, English tutors, and the audio/visual (hereafter referred to as AV) instructor, assisted her. Student participation was voluntary and anyone in the school could enter. In her own classes, White gave the students a choice of participation in NHD or of writing a research report for each marking period. During this school year of 1990/91, 34 students participated in the program.

As with School A, NHD in School B was supplemental to the main curriculum. Unlike Bender however, White did not defend this arrangement. She would have preferred NHD as the main history curriculum. Regardless of the differences in emphasis on the importance of the standard curricula, the end result was almost identical. Approximately one week a marking period, the students who were in White's classes, worked on their NHD projects in school. Students did the rest of the NHD work outside of class and school time.

Students in this school participated in a district competition held in a local high school in April. From there the top two in each category went to the state finals which were held at a college or university in May. The top two in each category at the state competition advanced to the national competition in June at the University of Maryland.

School C was located in a blue-collar industrial community consisting of 4 square miles in a large state of the Northeast. The town was founded on, and planned around, the iron industry. At the time of this study, the population of the town was about 24,000, down from 27,000 in the late 1970s when several industries closed or relocated. The ethnic/racial make-up of the town's and school's population had remained fairly stable for the previous 15 years. In 1990 the population of the high school was approximately 700. Of that number 72% were Anglo-American; 22% were Afro-American; 4% were Hispanic-American; and 2% were Asian-American. Thirty-five to 40% of the students went on to further education.

Like School A and School B, the school and grounds were well kept and clean. There was a difference, however, in the atmosphere of School C. The school was quieter and seemed more controlled than the other two. Additionally, there appeared to be a morale problem among the staff as reflected and detected through conversations in the

teachers' room and cafeteria about work loads, pay, and day-to-day survival. Unlike the students and teachers in School A and B (where the school images were positive and upbeat), the students and teachers at School C referred often to the poor reputation they perceived the school to have. They claimed this to be the result of poor, unfair, or nonexistent press coverage of academic events at the school. This negative image seemed to be not only a cross to bear but a motivator for the study's participants who worked extraordinarily hard, I submit, to prove the image incorrect. While the staff of School C were extremely cooperative and helpful in this research effort, there was an initial reluctance or caution to allow the school to be involved in the study. This, too, could have been the result of prior negative press coverage.

School C had entered NHD in the 1984/85 school year after Ms. Watson, social studies teacher, had seen another school's media projects from a previous year's competition. Two years later, Ms. Martin, the librarian, joined Watson, and since that time they had worked as a team on NHD; however, they did not participate in NHD during the 1989/90 school year because of dissatisfaction with the judging (which Martin called incompetent and biased) at the state competition the previous year. Unlike at School B, the school administration had been consistently supportive of involvement in NHD.

Student participation in School C was voluntary. Anyone who was interested could participate. During the 1990/91 school year, 12 students--all of them seniors--were involved; most were students in Watson's government class. As in White's classes (School B), students in Watson's classes had the option of doing a traditional term research paper on participating in NHD. Students who chose the NHD option were required to sign a contract with history and English teachers and to present and explain their projects to the class. In School C, as in School A and B, NHD was supplemental to the main curriculum. As with Bender in School A, and in contrast to White in School B, Watson wanted it clear that regardless of how important she believed the program to be, participation in NHD did not interfere with the school curriculum. All NHD meetings were held, and all NHD work was done, during study halls, homeroom, or before or after school. When possible, students did NHD work in the library where Martin was able to monitor and assist.

Teacher Profiles

Ms. Bender: School A

Bender, a bouncy, bubbly person of limitless energy and drive, had been interested in and enthusiastic about academic contests ever since she was a student herself. Growing up in a small, "very poor community" in "a very, very prejudiced area of the country," where there was "a

hamburger joint, . . . two grocery stores and a gas station and that was it," she attended a high school which had only "30 or 40 kids," and even though there were not extra-curricula activities other than sports, there were various writing contests in which Bender participated. She "had always wanted to be a teacher" and attended a small college where she majored in journalism and minored in history. She had been at School A for 11 years--since her college graduation--and for 8 of those years had had her students involved in history, journalism, and other academic competitions. She had taught world history, American history, newspaper production, and journalism, and at the time of this study was teaching honors and GT American history and advanced social studies problems. Reflective of her main interest, she received a Master's degree in GT education in 1990. Her comments about the school, job, and students were overwhelmingly positive.

Ms. White: School B

It would be as impossible to miss White's strong personality, as it would be to miss how much as a student herself she disliked school and desired to be independent. She could remember only two or three good teachers in all the time she went to school; her happiest school memory, a precursor of methods she would adopt as a teacher, was one of designing and drawing murals for social studies units in the sixth grade. She admitted she had no talent for math

and couldn't spell, but working on the murals after school gave her the opportunity "to really shine."

White's independent spirit helped her through her high school freshman year when she contracted polio and had to keep up with her school work on her own. Most of the time in school though White was "bored and restless" and almost didn't finish college because for her it was "pretty much the pits." To her it seemed that the further along she got in school, "the more they managed to stifle creativity." Although she wanted to be a lawyer (an unusual goal for a woman in the 1950s), she was anxious (and impatient) to be independent and becoming a teacher allowed her to do that. She taught English her first year, but then switched to history because for her "teaching people the difference between 'their' and 'there' was not where it was at." White's prior boredom and restlessness with school were reflected not only in this response to teaching English but in her reaction to the standard curriculum and traditional teaching methods.

Getting involved in NHD was a natural extension of White's teaching. She submitted that her style was one of actively involving the students in their own learning. When one of her students was working on a report of Wallenberg (a Swedish businessman credited with saving thousands of Jews in Budapest at the end of World War II), she (the student) couldn't find his name in any encyclopedias, so White

encouraged her to find out why and to rectify the situation. This investigation led to students producing a 10 minute video on Wallenberg--the video is now part of the New York Holocaust Memorial; "Wallenberg" is now in encyclopedias.

With a no-nonsense yet feisty and devilish personality, White (at the time of this study) had taught for over 30 years, most of it in School B. She had been the Department Chairperson for 2 years and was getting ready, somewhat reluctantly, to retire--reluctantly, because her students were and had been a part of her life both in and out of school. White was responsible for the implementation, growth, and continuance of the NHD program at School B; what would happen to the NHD program when she retired remained to be seen.

Ms. Martin and Ms. Watson: School C

Martin's background, as with White from School B, reflected boredom with school and a rebellious streak. She described herself as a fidgety child who never behaved in elementary school and who would get up and leave a classroom and roam around until she found a room where she wanted to listen. In high school, she was involved in scholastic competitions such as the inter-school College Bowl and Science Fair; true to her rebellious nature, she was also involved in class protests and sit-downs which resulted in the school administration taking away her class' driving privileges and class trip.

In her bid for independence, she angered her parents when she turned down a senatorial scholarship for a pre-law program at the state university. What she really wanted was to be either a beautician or a librarian and since she wanted to go to college, she decided to become a librarian. Martin held a Master's degree in library science, and at the time of this study had been the librarian at School C for 23 years. Her demeanor left no question that she was in charge of the library and that there were rules to follow there.

Watson, Chairperson of the Social Studies Department, described a background and appreciation for schooling in some ways similar to those of Bender from School A. She also came from a small town (although from a different part of the country) and attended a very small school for grades one to 11. As a 12th grader she went to a larger, jointure system. In high school she was involved in cheerleading, "a lot of sports," the music program, the school newspaper, and the yearbook. Like Bender, and unlike White and Martin, for as long as she could remember she had wanted to be a teacher. She majored in history and English at college and got her first job teaching English in the School C district. In the course of her teaching career, she had taught all of the social studies courses and had taught in the district for over 30 years. It became evident during this research that Watson depended heavily on Martin's assistance with NHD

and she herself claimed that if Martin did not work with her on NHD, she would not participate.

The Composite

The three communities differed in size, ethnic, and socio-economic composition and the schools reflected those differences. However, in the NHD program in these three schools, there were several common threads; NHD was supplemental to the traditional curriculum; students and teachers did the majority of NHD work outside of class time; there were students in each of the schools who, though not enrolled in social studies classes, participated in NHD; the teachers were the driving force behind the schools' NHD programs; and none of the teachers were or had been paid extra for their NHD involvement.

This portrait of supplementary work again raises the question of why and which teachers get involved in this program. There were several similarities in the teacher profiles. As students themselves, these teachers had been involved in school activities and all had been involved in competitions. All of the teachers had worked in their current school systems either since, or close to, beginning their careers as teachers. All had large amounts of energy and devoted extraordinary amounts of time to their work. None of them liked to be idle. There were also differences, however. As students, Martin and White had disliked school and its restrictions and had become teachers by default.

Watson and Bender, who had attended very small school systems and who had always wanted to be teachers, seemed more conservative than Martin and White.

In terms of school culture (rather than individual profile), for Martin and Watson (School C) there was a constant struggle to keep up with their required work and with NHD. While Bender and White (School A and B) also had extraordinary amounts of work connected to NHD, Martin and Watson had more responsibilities in their day to day school work; in addition, they were constantly fighting an uphill battle against what they perceived to be the negative image of their school.

In spite of the differences in the community and school cultures, in how and with what administrative support the teachers had implemented NHD in the schools, and in the teachers' profiles, what became apparent through the interviews was that the teachers' experiences in NHD were and had been much more similar than different. To allow appreciation of the importance of these experiences and to determine their relevance to implications for educational processes, the next section looks at what it was and had been like for these teachers to participate in, or to "do" NHD.

The NHD Experience: The Teachers' Perspectives

> It's insanity, it's insanity! . . . There's nothing to beat the joy of being on a school bus with teenagers for 7 hours to go to History Fair.

. . . It's frustrating, it's wonderful . . . it's everything. (Bender)

We should be sainted for it [being involved in NHD]. . . . They [the students] push us into the position of [working with them] every free period and after school and every night. (White)

We . . . carry such heavy schedules. . . . I'm the only librarian and I do all the AV. . . . I'm also the supervising librarian for the District, so I have three jobs . . . and Ms. Watson is Department Chairman; she's also a full-time teacher . . . so in order for us to run this [NHD] in addition to what our obligations are, we have had to become more organized. (Martin)

In his study of Foxfire, Puckett (1986) concluded:

Wigginton brings to Foxfire a remarkable energy and goal, as well as an enormous capacity for sustained productivity, which has not diminished over the past twenty years despite the strains and abrasions of administering Foxfire, constantly working with students and teaching as many as five classes per quarter or semester. (p. 206)

The four teachers involved in this research brought to NHD the same remarkable dedication, energy, motivation, and continued productivity despite the fact that participation in NHD required that they spend much work time, including before and after school, evenings, weekends, and summers, out of the classroom and that they play varied roles. The following describes what Bender (School A) did this past year and had done previously in NHD.

As both a teacher with students in the NHD program and building coordinator for NHD, Bender had two roles. Her work included: organizing and dispensing materials; scheduling competition events, rooms, and judges; directing and helping students; and grading submissions. This work

was in addition to teaching five classes daily. In her spare time, to help organize the program and clarify the requirements, she had assembled a 60 page NHD handbook for the students.

The Fall semester involved explaining the program, helping students with research, collecting and grading research materials, and providing critiques for student presentations:

> In the classroom . . . around the first week of school, we introduce History Fair. . . . We give the kids the basic requirements. This is the number of sources you have to have to meet the minimum. This is your choice of the different categories . . . we just follow the schedule . . . in the requirement sheet . . . we take the kids through that. . . . You have to get the kids into the library. . . . Some of them have no idea what a primary resource is, so we have to give them the basics. . . . We have the different research checks to be sure that the kids are in the right direction, that they are not having any major problems with finding sources.
>
> It takes time . . . to grade all these things [research findings]. That's really my least favorite part of it. . . . Then we start gearing up for actually turning in these projects. . . . It takes about a week or more of presentation in class; the kids critique and I critique and we discuss what works and what doesn't. . . . The first submission . . . is the most time consuming . . . after school, meeting sometimes with kids who are having trouble. . . . We finish it for the first semester and that takes care of the class requirement.

As busy as the Fall semester was and had been in the past for Bender, it was calmer than the semester which followed and which included preparation for, and participation in, the competitions:

> [In January as the first competition approached] everything hit me as the coordinator of the Fair. . . . I didn't have any time to do it. . . . I had to . . . get entry forms out to the different teachers. . . . I had to get judges for each different category. . . . We had to pull kids out of . . . classes. . . . That meant I had to write passes for the kids. . . . I've judged at three different junior highs this year.

Additionally, it would be an understatement to say that for Bender there was work involved in tallying and releasing results. She left no avenue, no medium untouched when it came to dispensing information about the students' participation and success in NHD:

> I make up news releases. . . . I make sure that each teacher who's involved has a list of all the winners so that . . . they can post this in their room. . . . I get news releases to the office so that they can send it out to the community papers, to our . . . school newspaper. We have . . . a digital sign in the cafeteria and I make sure that they always get up there . . . so that's another release . . . and . . . I always make sure that the Channel One people . . . have a list . . . so they can announce it on the air.
>
> I get all of that done, chase the kids down to get addresses and phone numbers . . . for entries and make sure that they are prepared to go on. . . . I separate the judges' scores from the judges' critiques and get those out to the kids so that they'll have that feedback for district [competition] and type everything into the computer and I'm finished [laughed].

The work from that point on involved helping the students with further research, helping students to improve their projects and presentations, and preparing for and attending competitions. This on-going work included helping the students to conducted telephone interviews:

> The teleconferencing line is in my room so if students wish to use it, they make appointments with me . . . after school or . . . before school or . . . during a study lab. . . . Amosh was in my room yesterday making phone calls until about 4:30. . . . That's generally just about every day that someone comes in. It may only be for one phone call and they're out by 3 o'clock or it may be 5 o'clock.

Furthermore, there were meetings:

> I have History Fair meetings . . . for everyone going to district competition. . . . I'll have a gang meeting . . . then I'll have a special meeting of just the people who have papers . . . another one for projects . . . another one for media . . . another for performances.

There was outside library work:

> We encourage the kids to get out to the university libraries to become familiar with them. . . . We . . . will meet on a Saturday at school and we'll all car pool. . . . When I was a student, I was doing research of my own, so I'd say, "Hey, I'm going to the library Saturday, do you want to come?"

And there were the competitions where Bender played judge, coach, monitor, caretaker, and caterer:

> I judge at district [competition]. . . . [also] I'll be there to represent the kids when the media and the performances are actually performing. I have to make sure they have equipment they need, that it doesn't get stolen, folded, mutilated or whatever and make sure the kids have transportation, make sure they all get there, that they know when they're supposed to perform.
>
> [For regional competition] I do basically the same thing except I don't usually judge because at that point we . . . have kids represented in every category. . . . I usually go . . . to state [competition] and chaperon the kids, you know protect their chastity and that sort of thing--make sure they uphold the school rules . . . because that is an overnight trip. . . . We usually leave on a Friday morning. [This school] is the west most point in the district so everyone

> . . . converges here which adds another whole list of responsibilities. . . . Elaine Brown [Social Studies Coordinator] calls and says, "I'm having 250 lunches made by your cafeteria. Would you please be sure that they're ready to be put on the buses when we all get there at 9 a.m. and I'm also ordering six cases of canned drinks for the kids, so could you please be sure that those are iced down. Could you find the five ice chests . . . and get the ice," . . . all of that plus making sure the kids' permission slips are ready.
>
> At state [competition], the main thing is just helping the kids be sure that they have the equipment they need. . . . We sit down and we make checklists. I've had students who have forgotten description papers. I've had students who have forgotten . . . to xerox--we have to hunt up a place to xerox three copies of this paper. . . . It's a comedy of errors sometimes.

Accompanying students to Washington, DC for the national competition for 5 days in June was another and magnified kind of responsibility. As with the other competitions, there was the need to get equipment, permission slips, and students ready. Once in Washington, Bender had to coordinate the students' scheduled presentation times with the available equipment, attend as many presentations as possible, and keep track of the students when they were not presenting. For School A, the preparation for Washington was easier than for School B and C because School A finished the school year before the national competition, whereas School B and C were in the middle of final exams and graduation exercises at that time.

While much of the NHD work was the same for the other teachers in this study, there were differences depending on internal procedures at the school, on whether or not

participating students were in the teacher's class, and on the teacher's methods and personality. This past year, as in previous years, White's (School B) work for NHD started in the summer when she collected newspaper and magazine articles appropriate to the upcoming year's theme. She had trouble, unlike Bender however, in getting the NHD students to work on their projects during the Fall semester. This was partly, she submitted, because some of the students were not in her class, partly because she did not use a system of deadlines, and partly because the district competition in this state did not occur until April.

Once the students started their projects, though, White had help from other staff members. The English teachers who were assigned each period in the library as tutors evaluated and edited the written requirements such as the scripts and the one to two page paper each NHD student was required to write explaining how she/he conducted the research and how the topic related to the year's theme. In addition, the librarian put together the bibliography form for the students. Baker, the AV instructor, worked collaboratively with White on students' video-tape productions, and he did keep his AV students who were involved in NHD to a schedule. Even with this assistance, and regardless of whether or not the participating students were in her class, White always kept track of what each student was doing and where in the research that student

was. Nevertheless, student procrastination was and had been in the past the biggest problem for White and she saw the results of this just before the competitions as students started to hound her and Baker at lunch, during their free periods, and at home. She described what happened this year (1990/91):

> They almost drove Dave Baker out of his mind last week. Everybody wanted to get on that [AV] equipment and yet everybody [had] known about this since October. . . . Dave and I had stiff necks and he had a problem with his teeth. I think it was from clenching his jaws before this competition.

Students were on their own in getting to the competitions. White gave them the directions and schedule and instructed them to be there on time and to dress professionally. At the district and state competitions, as with Bender, White's role was a supportive one; she wandered from place to place and bolstered "their egos by taking pictures of them." In between competitions, White helped students to improve their presentations. Like Bender, White used every opportunity and medium to spread the word about the students' involvement and success in NHD.

As with Bender, attending the national competition with several students was a major chaperoning responsibility. This year--as in the past--before even getting to the University of Maryland, White had to make special arrangements for students who would miss final exams and parts of the graduating ceremonies. And then at the

competition, White had her share of problems. One group of students forgot their spotlight and began to fight among themselves; White had to take one students to the hospital in the middle of the night--the student was dehydrated; and for a third student White had to find a dorm room with a bathtub and then had to make certain the student was soaking in the tub three times a day because he had just had surgery. The 5 students who participated in this research had forgotten to amend their title page and had to scurry around to find a typewriter and copying machine.

In School C, where Martin and Watson worked as a team, as in the past, most of the students' work during the year was completed at school in the library. Students worked on projects before and after school and during study and lunch periods. According to Martin, there were two reasons for this policy. First, many of the students at School C worked at part-time jobs after school and on weekends and would not have had the time to develop projects away from school. Martin explained that there were students who "[had] to work . . . for college expenses" and " somehow [worked] to get money to help out at home." Second, Martin and Watson wanted to be able to monitor and assist the students and to assure that the students, not parents, were doing the work. Martin checked resources students had chosen and made sure they were all useable and that the students were using them; in addition she suggested other resource materials. She

also taught the necessary media technical skills. The students had to meet periodic deadlines--for research notecards and project readiness--as outlined in the student handbook which Watson and Martin had written.

The work for Watson and Martin, as with Bender and White, increased after the beginning of the year and as the competitions approached. If Bender and White found this an especially busy and chaotic time, Watson and Martin discovered it to be doubly so mainly because most of the work was competed within the school. Watson described the intense assisting that occurred this year before the district competition:

> We came in and helped . . . with running the computers, printing up information. . . . It was . . . a number of odds and ends of things that we did, anywhere from . . . helping to proof-read the paper, . . . checking spelling errors and . . . punctuation and . . . looking to see . . . is this really a source that we should be using there. . . . The last couple of weeks I was coming down most of . . . [my] prep periods . . . we would spend time here in the evening, at least . . . 4 hours a day I would say I was spending and she [Martin] was spending more because she doesn't have the classes.

Martin described the same period as a frenzied time:

> We went crazy. It was awful [laughed]. It was absolutely awful. They had these tables [pointed] filled, they had these tables filled, they had that table filled, they had the table down there filled, the entire room was filled with slides back there. My office was piled. The only places where kids could sit were in the study carrels and at the computers. The janitor stopped cleaning. He couldn't get around. It was terrible. The kids . . . were here at 7 o'clock in the morning and they worked an hour before school . . . they worked over their lunch periods. They'd sit and

> eat and then come back and work. . . . I'd be here until . . . 9:30 at night [laughed].

Part of the work, as Martin elaborates here, involved trouble-shooting:

> He [Jake] grabbed a swimming pool paint . . . and mixed it with a latex paint. . . . When some of the stuff was glued down, it all bubbled up--there was some kind of chemical reaction. . . . It looked like it had warts all over it. It was terrible. It was expensive paper and it all had to be pulled up and thrown out. I bet he wasted . . . about 15 dollars in paper.

At the competitions, Watson and Martin, as with Bender and White, supported and assisted the students and made sure they were where they should be and had what they should have. Watson explained:

> I just kind of flit from one to another. For instance . . . I go with them [table-top displays] and try to see that they have the things they need. . . . we had a problem with the hinges . . . we had some difficulty lining things up. . . . Kids will come and ask you questions like, "What are the depths of my boards?" or, "The plug doesn't work," or "I don't have an adapter." . . . We try to be there when each one is presenting. . . . Ms. martin goes . . . with the media people because this is her area. . . . She is there as a standby if they have mechanical problems.

The preparations for attending the national competition this past year were most complicated for the teachers at School C. The students had to attend their high school graduation ceremonies the night before they were to present their projects at the national competition. Consequently, they did not arrive at the University of Maryland until about 2 a.m. of the day of their presentations. The teachers accompanied Jake (one of the students) when he set up his

table top project at 8 a.m. that morning. This schedule took its toll on both the students and teachers (see chapter VI).

Martin and Watson were well aware of the context in which they had to conduct the NHD program; it was their belief in the program's benefits that propelled them to continue. They did not get assistance from other staff members in the way that Bender and White did and were constantly fighting the school's negative image. Additionally, while the administration was very supportive of their participation, Martin and Watson were not able to get the press coverage for their work, the students, and the program that Bender and White could. Furthermore, their teaching work loads were much greater than those of Bender or White.

Their struggle was the day-to-day struggle of most teachers who continue to work in schools which do not have adequate funding or strong community support and whose students have to work after school and have to fight (or do not bother to try) to balance their school and outside work requirements. Martin and Watson knew from the beginning of each year that participation in NHD would entail not only a great deal of extra work but the ability to sustain ambition and motivation in spite of the often negative and depressing aspects of the school and community culture.

While there were differences at the three schools in the internal procedures and policies of NHD and in the cultural context within which the NHD program operated, there was no doubt that for these teachers, NHD was an extraordinary commitment of time, energy, and personal involvement. It was also clear that this involvement had been an extra-school, unpaid commitment. It is only in light of this kind of dedication, that the question of why these teachers continued to participate in NHD takes on the meaning that it does. To answer this question and to illuminate further the dynamics of NHD, the following sections (based on interview data) present and examine: motivating factors, effects and issues of competition, unresolved issues, effects and issues in the larger school culture, and NHD as a model for teaching history. Each of the following segments offer quotations representative of the responses/thoughts about that particular topic.

Motivating Factors

The interviews revealed that these four teachers were willing to put this extraordinary effort and extra-school time into a program, for which there had been no additional pay and for which most work had been in addition to requiring teaching duties, because participating in NHD allowed them to accomplish what they could not in the traditional classroom. Together, the emergent motivating factors revolved around four inter-related needs of the

teachers: the need to connect with their students; the need to provide exciting experiences for themselves and their students; the need to feel competent about their teaching ability and teaching results; and the need to have recognition for, and feedback about, their work. Also important were the opportunities to see students grow, to participate themselves in competition, to allow students to use their strengths, to involve students in group work, and for students to be creative and develop self-identity. Based on the teachers' words, it was clear that the freedom, control, and self-determination these teachers experienced through NHD had allowed them to fulfill these needs.

Relationship with Students

All of the teachers talked about NHD giving them the chance to be close to the students, or to have a rapport with the students, to a degree not possible in regular classroom teaching. Bender (School A) reflected the thoughts of the other teachers:

> It is . . . my best opportunity to work with students on a one to one basis. I see them in a group of 30 in the classroom or I see them as 130 a day. . . . [In NHD] you get a tremendous amount of one to one communication, and a lot of these kids . . . are as close to me as if I had children of my own . . . they fulfill that sort of a need also. . . . I have made lifelong relations with some of the students and I wouldn't have done it just through the classroom. . . . When you're working with students after school or after hours and spending weekends with them, . . . you get to be very close to them.

Most teachers, I propose, want to and expect to have close relationships with students; it is one of the reasons a person becomes a teacher. However, the increasing number of students per class (28 to 30 in Watson's classes) and the limited amount of time the traditional high school schedule allows a teacher to have with each class preclude this kind of teacher/student connection. Through NHD these teachers, however, had discovered a way to develop this close relationship.

Change from Daily Routine

A second factor that all the teachers mentioned related to having fun, having a change in routine, getting excited, and avoiding boredom. All of the teachers talked about the monotony and lack of challenge to teaching the same thing every day. Here White (School B) captures these teachers' frustrations with the "day to day grind" (Bender), "lack of daily challenge" (Martin), and "lack of spark" (Watson):

> I get bored frankly with the vocabulary from Living World History. . . . It's a part of the curriculum and you have to teach it, but I don't know how some people do it day in and day out and day in and day out. . . . I've been teaching for 32 years. . . . I get . . . very, very bored. We use the same text book . . . so I sort of go on automatic pilot . . . if this is the fourth marking period, we are in the post World War II period, and frankly that gets quite boring . . . we give a uniform exam so that we teach the vocabulary from Living World History. We teach the geography from Living World History. We teach the people, we teach the concepts and the only creative part of the course is the research and library work. . . . They can do their research related to each unit . . . or they can do an extended project such as this [NHD] which helps to

> save my sanity . . . getting involved with these projects and getting into depth instead of going over the same stuff day after day in the classroom . . . gives me sort of a reason for existence.

Either because of administrative pressure (imagined or real) or because of lack of knowledge of the discipline or of alternative teaching strategies, many teachers become dependent on a textbook and a teacher-dominated teaching method. This dependency leads to boredom (see Teaching History in Chapter II) for the student and teacher. Teacher preparation programs perpetuate this text and teacher-dominated system by neglecting to offer alternative techniques and by neglecting to encourage discussion about the ultimate purpose of teaching history. These teachers claimed that through NHD not only had they found excitement but also a chance to apply different teaching methods and to discuss and study different topics without upsetting the school's curriculum requirements and without antagonizing administrators. This speaks to the need of teachers to have control over their curriculum and method and the lengths to which they will go to attain autonomy.

Positive Learning Results/Effectiveness in Teaching History

The four teachers also discussed having the opportunity to teach and for students to learn, transferable and lifelong skills--something which they claimed did not happen very often in the classroom. Compositely, the teachers argued that the students in NHD learned communication, study, research, group, interviewing, thinking, technical,

decision-making, writing, condensing, and synthesizing skills. White's (School B) summary cuts to the core of the necessity of students learning how to learn rather than soaking up delivered information:

> [With] the traditional education we're doing, people remember . . . 10% of what they learn. . . . They don't remember anything after the final exam anyway so what you're doing [in NHD] . . . is . . . giving kids the opportunity to develop a method of studying anything they want to know and for working together with other people for an outcome. . . . Hopefully, [they will have] a lifelong desire to continue to learn. . .. It's a multi-dimensional [learning] because so much of it is finding sources, finding people, setting up interviews [and] collaborative working. . . . They learn that if they're on the wrong track to drop it, to get back on the right track, to go through the whole thinking process. It's unlike most conventional methods of teaching or learning . . . it's very cooperative. . . . You can suggest to kids and you can help them find a method or technique of dealing with problems, but it certainly is different from standing up in front of the black board [and saying], "Here are the 10 vocabulary words from Chapter 15, look them up as homework and then we'll go over them tomorrow."

The other teachers were equally emphatic about the multi-faceted, transferable nature of the NHD learning experience. Martin (School C) described Adam's new knowledge of photography, of how to gain permission from a copyright holder, of how to interview, and of how to analyze data. Bender (School A) discussed the learning experience students encountered through interaction with the judges, and Watson (School C) stressed the students' mastery of research skills--knowing the difference between primary and secondary courses and being able to analyze and interpret

data. Additionally, White argued that NHD not only allowed students to learn, but also let them apply skills:

> I think all you have to do to our students is say "research skills" and they turn green. They have been researched skills to death. . . . What they need is something, a reason to apply the research skills and that they have here [in NHD].

These teachers contended that the transferable skills the students gained from participation through NHD were superior to the skills students learned in traditional classroom settings.

Furthermore, Bender, Watson, and White submitted that NHD provided a better opportunity than, or a supplementary opportunity to, traditional classroom work in meeting the goals of teaching history. Bender believed that through NHD the students learned the skills required by state regulations:

> We're building historians and we're teaching them the skills that they need to be historians and to critically look at history and evaluate what they see in the text books. . . . One of the reasons we adopted History Fair . . . is that through this program we really do meet almost every state requirement for the skills that they want taught.

Watson agreed that it was an effective way to teach history:

> It just gets into the nitty gritty . . . of historical research much more than a child that is just coming into the classroom and working with an occasional source outside of the textbook. . . . I think it . . . is a wonderful motivation for them [students] to love and appreciate history.

White was so confident of the value of the NHD program that she recommended it as a model for teaching and learning

history; however, she felt that it would be difficult for a novice teacher to handle the material in this way:

> This is the way I would like to teach. It would be so much easier to teach only this way. . . . I've got this going on top of a regular program. . . . I'm sure I couldn't teach both ways if I weren't an experienced teacher. . . . I have . . . to have the other program--"Feudalism is a system of government based on the absence of a strong controlling power in the center of the state"--in my head in order to be able to think about all these other things that are going on at the same time. . . . Frankly, I'm bored out of my gourd with it [traditional classroom history], but this is the way I earn my living and history competition is where I have my fun. . . . The essence of history is the reading and research and application and what we've turned it into in the public schools is memory.

White's reservations concerning a teacher's ability to teach or have students learn in this active way are well taken and relate to the issues of inadequate teacher preparation programs, the rigid system and curriculum requirements of most secondary schools, and the teacher's knowledge of the structure of the discipline, all of which are examined elsewhere in this dissertation (see Chapters II and IV) and raise the question of whether or not teachers can learn how to teach in this way.

Feedback/Recognition

Receiving positive feedback and recognition from students, peers, parents, and the community also motivated the four teachers. Former students had returned from college and relayed how important their NHD experiences were in preparing them for, and in leading to their success in,

college (see Chapter VI). To have a college senior claim, "The only thing that I did in high school that helped me through college was History Fair," sold Bender (School A) on NHD. The other teachers had had similar responses from their former students. Additionally, continued support and recognition from peers, administrators, parents and the community increased the teachers' motivational levels, Watson described how this recognition snowballed:

> We've received a lot of nice recognition from other teachers and administrators in the district. . . . We have been asked to have the groups . . . present their projects to Kiwanis or to Rotary. . . . That has been a very positive aspect because people in the community get to see some of the very positive things that are coming out of the school. . . . It's . . . nice that there are a number of academic things that . . . are being acknowledged.

While getting recognition from peers, one's school, and one's community is a rare occurrence for most teachers, for these teachers it was common. For Watson and Martin (School C), I propose, it was especially significant considering the struggle they had to get positive press for their NHD activities.

Student Growth

Participation in NHD allowed these teachers to see students grow and that was another important motivator for continued involvement. Bender had the greatest opportunity to see the students' on-going development since School A required the honors and GT students to participate yearly in NHD:

> You get to see them grow so much from the 9th to the 12th grade. . . . By the time they're a senior, they can go out and talk to former President Jimmy Carter, which students have done. . . . It's just great, it's really inspiring to me. . . . The thing that I enjoy the most is I get to work with them for 4 years. I see them when they come in--they're babies, they're freshmen. They don't know anything, they don't know anybody. . . . "I want to get a copy of the Constitution of the United States, M. Bender, where do I get that?"--that sort of thing--to the time when they're seniors and they're talking to people anywhere about anything and getting the information they want. . . . That's amazing.

And for White (School B), student growth was as important, if not more so, than an end product:

> I'm not particularly upset that he didn't pull that all together. . . . He learned how to do that [computer] program. Well that is something that he learned that will serve him forever. I think that teachers have a funny definition of success. . . . You have to change the definition of success and really think about the creative process as opposed to the end product.

Martin (School C) fondly remembered two girls in particular:

> You see them grow. The girls who won first place in nationals [during a previous year's competition] . . . but were from single parent homes, one lived with a father, one lived with the mother . . . not very much guidance, very bright girls but low self-esteem. . . . As they got into their projects it just gave them something that they could look at and say they did. . . . As they progressed farther and farther into it, when they finally won . . . they sat and cried all the way home from Washington.

Again, it would be a rare teacher who would not hope to see growth, both academic and social, in her/his students; it would be just as rare to find a high school curriculum and schedule which would allow teachers to see students progress on any sustained basis.

Competing

Additionally, NHD provided these teachers with the opportunity to compete. They had enjoyed competition themselves as students and agreed that the competition in NHD not only added excitement to the NHD process and to their own and students' lives but also was the reason for the high quality of work. Bender (School A) reflected the feelings of the other teachers as she described the excitement and inspiration involved in seeing students win:

> I'm very competitive . . . I like to win. . . . I like to see the kids achieve. That's probably the greatest thrill . . . to see them when their name is called or see them up there on the stage or see their photograph in the [journal] that goes all across the state. We've had so many students who have published papers that have come out of this. That's wonderful. . . . It's just amazing to me sometimes what the kids achieve and I like to be a part of that too.

It would be foolish to assume that being involved in competition had no affect on one's ego. While it was the students who actually competed in NHD, the teachers' self-images were involved as well, since the teachers played such a large role in preparing the students for the competition. However, through all of the interviews it became clear that when their students lost in a competition, if the loss was considered valid, it acted as a motivator for both teacher and students to try harder the next time. Further discussion about effects of competition follows in the next section of this chapter.

Use of Students' Strengths

Another reason that Bender (School A) and White (School B) continued to participate in the NHD program was that it allowed students to draw on their strengths. As Bender explained, students did not have to write a paper. They [could] "present something visually; they [could] work with slides; they [could] do photography." And White, caringly and emotionally, remembered Evan, who because of a physical impediment could not speak, but who, through NHD, wrote "the words that somebody else was going to speak." As with several other issues in this section, this speaks to the rigid nature of most high school curricula and teaching methods. The push to cover a certain amount of material in a certain amount of time (common practice in most history programs) does not allow students the luxury of developing and exploring their strengths and talents. These teachers found that NHD did allow that luxury.

Group Work

For White (School B) and Watson (School C), the opportunity the program provided for students to work together was also a motivator. White claimed it was a way for students to complement each other's skills:

> There's a boy in my class who's at a learning center. . . . The kid's a genius with computers and he's got some sort of a program. . . . He's so disorganized that everything is always here, there, and everywhere . . . so I hooked him up with a 16 year old senior from India who wants to be a doctor. They're doing Indian women's rights in America. . . . He could never research

> something like this . . . but no one in the whole school has his skills in the hypermedia lab, so with one pushing and one pulling, they're probably going to come up with something that's going to be very unusual.

Watson viewed participation in NHD as an opportunity for students to learn socialization skills as well:

> If they do a project with other students, there's a lot of socialization skills that are needed as far as working together and they kind of have to complement one another. . . . Their talents have to be in different areas.

The four teachers in this study had had students involved in cooperative learning ventures through NHD for several years, while other teachers were just beginning to ask what cooperative learning was, how it worked, and how to incorporate it into the classrooms. Furthermore, these teachers found cooperative methods easier to use through the NHD process than in large contained classes where size almost certainly predicted failure.

Creativity and Self-Identity

For White, the opportunity for students to be creative was one of the strongest motivators:

> When I have my choice between monotony and creativity, I'll take creativity every time and for the most part so will kids. . . . It's [NHD] creative learning and . . . the kids are having a lot of fun. I think . . . kids know the basics in the humanities by the sixth grade . . . so why not just let them go this way. . . . I think we teach them too much for the tests, for the PSATs. . . . Our whole educational system is geared too much around a number 2 pencil. . . . I just wish our culminations, instead of something like the PSATs . . . would be the judging of a masterpiece at the end of the senior year.

(Students add their own thoughts on creativity in the next chapter.) White argued that in addition to allowing students to be creative NHD gave students the opportunity to gain self-knowledge and self-identity unattainable in the regular classroom. This year (1990/91), this was particularly apparent for White with her Asian-American students who produced a video-tape about Tiananmen Square and rights in China. Her perceptions of the group bonding and the students' new found sense of identity were confirmed by the students in their own interviews. White described what she saw happening:

> A lot of Chinese students have spoken to me about identity and Lanie [one of the students] says that they are Twinkies--that's the oriental version of . . . the oreo cookie--yellow on the outside, white on the inside. . . . They have . . . this ethnic confusion . . . these kids have found something in each other and they've found a common cause [through their NHD project] and they've found a way of identifying with something that's not in an antique shop. . . . It gives them the opportunity to talk about it and focus on it.
>
> These kids are juniors and [in the traditional class] they'd be taking American history and maybe towards the end of the second year chronologically, the course [would] get up to Tiananmen Square or maybe they would have the opportunity of doing library work on a subject of their choice . . . but I think it's [NHD] giving them a sense of mission. . . . It gives a whole new dimension to what they're doing.
>
> There's a real bonding process going on [with this group] and it's almost a healing type of process. . . . In the beginning . . . everybody was pretty much afraid of . . . what was going to happen to this girl [Lian, who left China after the events of Tiananmen Square], that maybe we were intruding on her privacy, that maybe she didn't want to talk about it, that maybe she wanted to get away from

> it . . . [but] it's been . . . a catharsis and I think it's helped these students also deal with their identities as Chinese-Americans and getting to meet the Chinese intellectuals . . . using their skills in Chinese . . . this is the first time they've really gotten a chance to use it as an educational tool. I think it was something they had in their culture, but I don't think it was part of their education up until now.

In my interviews with the students, I witnessed the same bonding and awareness White has described here. The students themselves seemed awe-struck by discoveries of their roots and by attaining a sense of belonging. On several occasions, there were tears in the students' eyes and a numbing silence when they were too choked up to speak. Not only were these students able to learn about their heritage through participation in NHD but NHD provided the forum through which they could share this heritage with others (see Chapter VI for further discussion).

In concluding this section on motivating factors, it is important to note that regardless of which school, which area of the country, or which students the teachers in this study represented, the motivating factors they discussed were almost identical. All of these factors revolved around fulfilling needs and having opportunities to accomplish what the teachers argued could not be or had not been achieved in the traditional classroom. I submit it was the freedom these teachers experienced through NHD that allowed them to fulfill these needs and reach goals otherwise unattainable.

Effects and Issues of Competition

While NHD is an academic program, it is also a contest. These four teachers supported the argument of the founding fathers, the NHD Directors, and the state coordinators (see Chapter IV) that the caliber of work in NHD would decrease without the competition format. Although they recognized negative aspects to competition, these teachers claimed (or rationalized) that the benefits of this competition outweighed the problems. In interpreting the following excerpts it is necessary to keep in mind that these teachers had enjoyed competition themselves and part of their motivation to participate in NHD came from the chance to take part in competition. It is also important to note that secondary teachers are constantly searching for ways to develop and increase student motivation and for these teachers, competition helped to serve that purpose.

Bender (School A)

Bender described the competition as the "driving force" behind the program and submitted that because students and teachers at School A were involved in many academic competitions, they were able to put winning and losing in perspective:

> When I was the newspaper sponsor, we had four . . . events . . . feature writing, news writing, headline writing, and editorial writing. . . . They also have spelling . . . science . . . calculator . . . number sense and all these different competitions . . . The Art Department has its own competition. The Science Department

> has its own competition. The English Department is always doing essay contests . . . so the kids are involved in almost every area of curriculum in something and we're fortunate here to do pretty well in most of it.

Nevertheless, Bender (who seemed able to evaluate the negative side of competition more objectively than the other teachers) considered the competition one of the weaknesses of NHD in that it "[tended] to hone the killer instinct" and in that "students tended to lose sight of the value of the work." Bender admitted, though, that while the Social Studies Department "[had] many philosophical discussions about the issue of competition," the members were not able to find a way to replace it and still be assured of quality work.

Bender proposed that there was too much emphasis on winning, but at the same time she estimated that less than 1% of her students had been adversely affected--that is, had lost motivation in their work--because of competition. In fact she contended that losing had motivated most of the students. In support of the argument, she described what happened with a group who had lost in the NHD competition in the eighth grade:

> I have a group of sophomores and when they were in the eighth grade they did an absolutely fabulous project that went to the state level. It was on the Chocolate Bomber. . . . He was a pilot who during the Berlin airlift would fly food and . . . Hershey Bars over. . . . They tracked this man down. They interviewed him. He was from Podunk, Iowa or something like that . . . out of communication completely . . . they did a fabulous project and everyone thought that they should have

> gone on, progressed to the national level . . . they didn't. . . . I have no idea why . . . and that could have really beaten those kids down.
>
> They went back to state [competition] last year and didn't place and they're going back to state this year. . . . We'll see how they do . . . this year. They're very typical. They say, "We can do this, we've learned from it and we're going to pick ourselves back up and go back in next year tougher."

Bender told about another student who had lost at the junior high level and when required to participate again in the ninth grade would not do the work. However, Bender recalled that as soon as the student found a topic which excited her and she could work on something of her own choosing, she forgot about her junior high experience. Her topic was "Legislated Celibacy in the Roman Catholic Priesthood." The student's interest arose from the fact that her father was a former priest and her mother a former nun. Bender's description which follows reflects the importance of student interest to the calibre of work as well as to change of attitude about losing:

> She did . . . one of the best papers I have ever seen at the ninth grade level . . . and her research has recently been cited in a book on legislated celibacy . . . she was published in . . . a magazine . . . then a man in Ireland was writing a book on legislated celibacy and ran across her article and . . . interviewed her and used her research in his book. . . . She turned around completely.

I suspect that Bender's calming effect on the students along with her stress on the importance and value of each student and her/his work (regardless of outcome of the competition)

was as important a factor in students participating again after losing as was their interest in a topic.

White (School B)

White argued that if any competition was harmful to students, it was the everyday school competition over grades. She suggested that school grades and exams such as the PSATs and SATs were contrived competitions and unnecessary:

> I would say then let's do away with grades and let's do away with PSATs and SATs and all the other stuff because it's all . . . a contrived competition . . . a lot of it is to sell tests. . . . . I think you have to get back to that intuitiveness that you can look at the expression on these kids' faces and talk to them and be able to tell their IQ without an IQ test and be able to tell what scores they're going to get on the college boards without giving them college boards . . . the whole thing is artificial.

As for the NHD competition, White defended it as beneficial in getting students into colleges and in getting them scholarships and national awards. As explained previously, part of White's job was to help students obtain college scholarships, and she noted that student participation in the NHD competition had been an important factor in accomplishing that. About competition she remarked, "It didn't do them [the students] any harm in getting where they [were] going." White had not seen permanent adverse effects to losing in NHD. She reported that three of her students involved in NHD this year (none of them students in this study) "were in tears" when they lost at a competition, but

"got over it." She made sure that all students received trophies for participation and was confident that they would participate again.

Watson and Martin (School C)

Watson submitted that the students gained benefits, including feelings of self-worth and camaraderie, from the NHD competition. While not all of her students had taken losing graciously, Watson claimed that no one had ever said it wasn't worth it. She believed this was because there was a lot more to NHD than the competition:

> All we have to do is go to one competition and have some kids that win and just the looks on their faces make you feel like it's really worth it. . . . I have seen students who were very upset with not winning. I can't say that all of ours have taken it graciously, but . . . I have not had any student who has said to me . . . "If I knew this, I would have never competed," . . . it's a growing experience. I don't see how they could say . . . this . . . hasn't been worthwhile or I haven't learned something from it. I think success is achieved in that they have a better feeling of self-worth through doing this. . . . It isn't necessarily whether they have gotten the top prize that they can say, "I did the best I could." . . . There's camaraderie among those kids who participate.

Martin proposed that competition was good for students even when they lost. She argued that losing could be beneficial to students in that it taught them they couldn't always win in life. She suggested that the important thing for them to learn was that they should try their best. Nevertheless losing wasn't easy for either Martin or her students. Jane

was one of Martin's students who lost at district competition this year. Martin described the reaction:

> [Jane] was upset, she was really upset. . . . She did a research paper . . . there was a whole load of research papers against her. Hers was good, but . . . she did women's rights and I think the choice of topic [was a problem]. . . . They called off the names . . . and she just sat there and . . . you could see her shoulders drop and that's the hardest part for me . . . to see them when they don't win and they're unhappy or upset.

Martin explained that the reaction was only temporary and that Jane was all right the following Monday morning. Another student, who did not lose but who did not place first, had an even stronger reaction. He became angry and then upset the other students by claiming that they had had more help than he had received and by subsequently pulling apart his project. He too, however, settled down and went on to the next level of competition. Martin, herself, had strong reactions to the students' losing at the national competition. This is discussed further in Chapter VII, but is necessary to reflect here that as this research progressed, it became increasingly evident that the students and teachers at School C had, or thought they had, more at stake when it came to winning and losing. My interpretation is that they were determined to overcome and prove inaccurate the negative image of the school and that this mission was tied up with their own feelings of self-worth.

It is not surprising that teachers involved in a competition would support competition. They all had enjoyed

competing themselves as students and, although they had seen students have negative reactions to losing, they agreed that losing could have positive ramifications--it motivated students to work harder and it taught them a lesson about life. The teachers' perceptions in general supported the propositions (addressed in Chapter II) that competition motivates; that competition leads to quality production, performance and achievement; and that negative reactions to losing are normal and temporary. Bender's account of students who had lost and subsequently turned in mediocre work, however, would support Kohn's (1986) proposition that losing can lead to loss of motivation.

The teachers' comments about competition were made for the most part either before the students in this study actually competed or after they had competed and won first or second place. The reactions I witnessed when students did not win at the national competition were not necessarily in concert with the philosophical stances relayed here. This discrepancy was particularly noticeable with the School C participants and I propose was related to the way they internalized and personalized their mission and perceived their responsibility in relation to improving school image and also to the separate issue of competency and consistency in judging. Chapters VI and VII examine these reactions further.

Unresolved Issues

While the teachers supported the competition format of NHD, they all agreed that the judging which occurred at the different levels of competition was the greatest problem in the program. Their other concerns, which were connected to the national office, the district and state coordinators, the yearly theme, and the dates for the national competition, were minor.

Judging

The teachers submitted that the judging had not always been fair, competent, or thorough. Compositely they determined the problems to be time constraints, insensitivity, incompetency, favoritism and bias, and inconsistency. Bender's (School A) main complaint related to the lack of time for judging. She asserted that this had been a particular problem in judging the written papers at all levels of the competition and contended that judges needed more time to review papers thoroughly. In addition, she noted that the time constraint in general had resulted in an overload for judges at the national competition. She described her personal experience with this time problem:

> The last time I judged group projects [at national competition], we had something like 27 or 28 group projects to do--all day for about 14 hours. . . . I haven't judged group projects since [laughed]. . . . There was a gentleman judging with me and he literally was on his knees going from project to project by the end of the day and then when we came in, they said, "OK, anybody want to judge

> call-backs [projects which make it to the finals]?" No, I don't think so [laughed].

The second concern Bender had with the judging involved lack of sensitivity on the part of some judges. She argued that it (lack of sensitivity) could discourage students from participating again and explained that Linda's (a student in this study) experience (described in Chapter VI) this year at regional competition was upsetting, had an immediate negative impact on her [Linda], and "could easily have changed her direction in this." Bender was referring to the situation when judges berated Linda for using certain "unacceptable" and "offensive" words in her slide presentation on censorship.

Like Bender, White (School B) also discussed judges' insensitivity. She described what had happened two years earlier when Jessie (one of her students) had completed a performance on Anne Frank:

> When she [Jessie] did that performance, she hadn't gotten out of the role when the judge threw the first question out and I knew that she [Jessie] was not yet there in that room . . . she just blew the interview terribly. . . . You should have more sensitivity when somebody is into a dramatic role to give them a chance to lift their head up, open their eyes, and see where they are, but that didn't happen.

White recalled another instance during a different competition when judges misread Helen's (one of this year's Asian-American students) quiet demeanor in answering questions as indication that Helen had not created her slides herself. The judges' accusatory tones had left Helen

feeling defeated. Additionally, White suggested that some judges were incompetent, were not as intelligent as the students, and did not understand what NHD was all about:

> This is an academic high school and these kids are very, very bright. . . . A lot of the judges are traditional teachers who teach the words out of the end of the chapter and they don't know what they're looking at.

She contended that many judges had never had students of their own involved in NHD and furthermore that some judges had no sense of and could not recognize historical context on which 60% of a student's score rests.

Martin, (School C) supported White's assertion that some judges were incompetent and argued that the judges often did not know what made a good NHD project. She (and Watson) submitted that some of the judges did not understand the difference between "history" projects and those concentrating on current events or sociological issues and, as White claimed, failed to note the lack of historical context:

> A project on the laser made it and yet . . . historically, what is it? It's new. They made a model of the laser and judges were so taken with this demonstration that the history aspect of it got lost.

According to Martin, this problem of definition of historical vs. sociological had been on-going since the beginning of her involvement in NHD. She argued that when a sociological entry scored higher than an historical one, the teacher had a difficult time explaining the scores to the

students. In addition to the laser project mentioned above, Martin recalled a project on Superman. Not only did she question the lack of historical context but claimed the project was a copy of a Smithsonian exhibit.

Martin was the most vocal about judges who allegedly had been prejudiced or had showed favoritism. She became very emotional as she described one particular incident:

> They [the judges] went with a project that was done by boys and because _____ [unclear], they fell in the sympathy vote and . . . our kids were really upset . . . we had people coming up to us and saying they couldn't understand we didn't make run-offs with this. These kids [from School C] had gone and they had interviewed all these people and they had all this documentation . . . people and judges at states [competition] came up and said they could not believe that this was not in the run-offs.

She strongly suggested that the students who had won that competition had not done their own work: "These kids [the ones who won] got drunk on beer that night. . . . They were in our dorm and started babbling . . . about how their teacher did their project." Martin claimed also that there had been competitions at which judges had judged their own students. Furthermore, she recalled one competition at which a judge deducted points for the color of a student's dress. The judge had written, "Dress for success, not the classroom--minus 10," on the score sheet. Finally, both Martin and Watson had become frustrated over the lack of consistency they perceived judges demonstrated in interpreting and enforcing the rules. They claimed that:

1. some judges deducted points if students omitted the name of the bibliography manual they had used, and other judges did not;
2. some insisted the bibliography manual be listed as a primary source, others did not;
3. there was confusion over the number of words allowed on the table top projects--some judges counted quotes and others did not;
4. some judges deducted points if papers were not typed; others did not.

Even taking into consideration that judging and one's perception of it are necessarily subjective, the fact that all of these teachers claimed judging to be the main weakness of the NHD program indicates a problem. Since so much time, energy, and work is involved in this program, it is predictable that teachers would get upset if they construed the judging to be unfair, inconsistent, and/or incompetent. While Bender had for the most part been pleased "with the calibre of the judges," White, Martin, and Watson argued that there needed to be a more thorough and intensive orientation for the judges, with special emphasis on rules and sensitivity.

Minor Concerns/Complaints

I discuss several minor issues (relating to the national office, the state and district coordinators, the NHD themes, and NHD scheduling) here to provide as complete

a picture of NHD as possible. However, compared to the urgency of the complaints about judging, these concerns seemed more like "asides" or helpful suggestions for improvement. Two of the teachers (the teachers preferred that their names, even pseudonyms, not be used in this and the next sections) described weaknesses at the national level of the program. These weaknesses centered on five concerns--lack of communication, lack of funding, lack of leadership, lack of teacher input, and lack of knowledge about secondary school concerns. For one teacher the communication and funding problems were connected:

> The only problems we've had with the national office is a lack of communication. That I think really springs from their funding problems. . . . A former teacher here, a friend of mine and I were doing a presentation on next year's theme at the state History Day this year and we were trying to touch base with the national office to see if we were on the right track. . . . We worked up these sample topics and a little explanation of the theme . . . and . . . called up and they said they had information, they had materials, but had no money to print them. They're trying to find a grant to pint all of these things for across the country and . . . they haven't been able to find any funds yet so they're way behind schedule at this point.

The other teacher submitted that the leadership had been weak:

> I don't think the national office gives the kind of leadership that they should. There's not enough strong leadership and no offense against [the Executive Director], but I think the program is basically done to perpetuate her image. I really do and it's run like a board of directors of a corporation. The decisions that are being made are not ones that actually work in the field. . . . There's not . . . strong enough direction.

> The rule changes are not workable in some cases and they don't really respond to the needs of the teacher, working with the student. I think too much of that is left to the district coordinator. If you happen to have a good district coordinator, you're fine. If you have a good state coordinator, you're fine. If not, there's no one to fall back on.

In an apparent contradiction, the same teacher argued that the Executive Director needed to let teachers have more input:

> I think she's [the Executive Director] got to let go of the program more and let teachers become more active in it as far as the running of it and listening to suggestions. . . . There are problems with the rules for media and I think that they've got to be more responsive to the criticism [from the] teachers. They ought to send out perhaps a detailed survey form, evaluation form--What would you change, what wouldn't you change about History day?

This same teacher argued that the lack of secondary school knowledge on the part of the national office personnel had resulted in rules and policies that did not always make sense for secondary school students:

> They [National Office] don't know what is going on [in secondary teaching] . . . teaching on the college level is far different from teaching in a sixth grade class or a high school class . . . there should be some kind of representation as far as the average teacher is concerned. . . . I think she's got to . . . somewhere along the line, have more involvement with teachers.

As an example of the lack of knowledge on the part of the national office about secondary schools, this teacher cited the requirement that the students use a bibliography form (Turabian) seldom used on a secondary level.

There were no serious problems or concerns for these teachers with their state coordinators. In fact three of the teachers were quick to praise their state coordinators as supportive, helpful, and accessible. These teachers' comments in general reflected the advantages to having a state coordinator who conducted the state History Day program as part of another paid position (see chapter IV). Only one teacher, whose state coordinator was a volunteer, commented on a problem and that involved a lack of contact:

> I don't interact with him. I told the district coordinator I wanted to be involved in the state planning but I guess she never told him. . . . I think he [the state coordinator] got stuck with it [the position].

Two teachers, however, noted a weakness at the district level of the NHD structure. One teacher argued that her district coordinator had not cooperated in trying to develop and improve the program:

> [The district coordinator] is weird. I thought it was a paid position . . . but she's head of a [high school] history department. [As coordinator] she's terrible. One of her students won at states [competition] but the [school] district wouldn't let them go to nationals because they don't support the program. We made a tape of the state finals and asked her if she would show it at this year's finals while students were waiting for the awards, but she said she hadn't had a chance to look at it.

The other teacher complained that her district coordinator had not done what he said he would do and had been difficult to contact:

> I don't think our district coordinator goes out and sells the program and he claims that he

> contacts . . . all the schools in the different counties to encourage participation, but when we got to districts [competition], on the high school level, I thought the quality of the projects was very, very poor. . . . There were only four . . . high schools in the senior programs. He's . . . at the local University. . . . To get in contact with him you have to call--maybe you'll get somebody in the department to answer the phone when you call--maybe there's nobody in the office. If you happen to get somebody, you have to leave a message, then hope within the next 4 to 5 days you'll get a call back between 7 and 7:30 in the morning.

Two of the teachers submitted that NHD could select more appropriate themes (see Appendix A for explanation of themes). One described the themes as too difficult for the junior high division and explained that the theme titles had been confusing:

> I think the themes could be picked in a better manner . . . they're very idealistic. . . . There have been some topics which I find sixth graders would have difficulty handling and I think there's got to be a . . . more careful selection of the topic. It's fine to have a general topic and it's fine to tie it in with the Bill of Rights and to tie it in with the Constitution, but "Rights in History" is so broad, I know these kids are having difficulty dealing with it. . . . The "Individual in History" was fine. You could relate that directly. . . . But then they say "Triumphs and/or Tragedies," "Conflicts and/or Compromises," well let's make it "Conflict and Compromise" and "Triumph and Tragedy."

The other expressed regret that the committees had to choose certain themes in order to get funding:

> I don't know what you do about the fact that the program has to fly economically. The theme is obviously selected for economic reasons. . . . [As with] the "Science and Technology," obviously they can get more sponsors.

(It should be noted here that it is the state coordinators who suggest and decide upon the yearly themes.)

The strongest of these minor complaints, though, involved the scheduling of the national competition in June. The conflict with the students' schedules for final exams and/or graduation exercises had been an unpleasant aggravation for one of the teachers in a Northeastern state:

> We'll have to move the exams up a week . . . and that's the week of all the senior activities--the senior dinner, the senior awards. I'm the Scholarship Chairperson. I never get to give out the scholarships and frequently I have kids who are scholarship recipients who are at the national competition with me when the scholarships ar given out.

Another teacher called it "callous disregard" on the part of the Executive Director:

> She's [the Executive Director] got it in her head that she wants History Day the same week in June every year. Well this hits graduation week for a lot of kids. All our kids are seniors, but she refuses to change it. . . . I was there . . . when . . . the gentleman approached her about it and she said, "Well, they have to make a choice of what's more important in their life," and that to me was a very cavalier attitude to take.

These complaints about the national competition dates, as well as the problems with the national office, state and district coordinators, and the yearly themes--typical of concerns and disagreements in any large organization--were rooted in lack of communication and consequent lack of understanding.

Effects and Issues: The Larger School Culture

While the complaints discussed above could probably have been predicted in this research, there were effects and issues related to the teachers' participation in NHD which stood out in this study, which were not expected, and pertained to the larger school culture rather than to the NHD organization itself. This section discusses these issues--teacher rivalry/jealousy and teacher/peer collaboration.

Teacher Rivalry/Jealousy

The literature offers little about teacher jealousy and rivalry. Shulman (1986) found that teachers who were not involved in a mentor program became hostile and teased and joked about the participating teachers. Two Australian studies, one of school innovation (Fraser & Nash, 1981a) and one of a school transition project (Lake & Williamson, 1986) revealed that jealousy and resentment among non-participating teachers were common. In his study of Foxfire, Puckett (1986) found that some of the teaching staff perceived the Foxfire staff as "unfairly privileged" (p. 142). In addition, some teachers resented having to compete for student enrollments with Foxfire teachers and having students leave their classes to go on Foxfire fieldtrips. The teachers in this study also experienced jealousy, resentment, hostility and/or alienation on the part of non-participating staff. However, the degree to

which this manifested itself differed from school to school. This phenomenon had been the least problematic for Bender at School A.

School A had consistently had its students involved in many competitions; just about every area of the curriculum sponsored one on a yearly basis. For this reason, the staff may have been more used to the interruptions and the real or perceived privileges, rewards, and attention associated with this kind of involvement. While Bender described a friendly rivalry between the History Fair and Science Fair teachers as far as who won what, she submitted that the main problem emanated from the disruptions caused when students were taken out of class or when one activity's schedule conflicted with another. In order to avoid alienation and jealousy, Bender proposed (because "teachers do guard their instructional time very closely") that it was necessary to communicate often and clearly with other staff members about the NHD program.

The problem seemed more involved for White at School B where NHD participation and success, as in School A, was publicized heavily. White believed that the teachers who were antagonistic towards her and the program had determined that she was involved in NHD for three reasons: "One [was] to make them look bad; two [was] to disrupt the entire school, disrupt the schedule, . . . and the third [reason

was] to ingratiate myself to the administration for personal gain."

As with Bender, White tried to communicate but explained that it had not been very helpful:

> I go down there and tell them how cooperative they are and how much I appreciate their cooperation. . . . I know who the people are--they're these rigid people who are bothered so much. I . . . say you should judge yourself by your enemies and I've got some dousies [laughed]. Now for example, next year when we have the Martin Luther King assembly program, I have all these projects and videos and stuff on "Rights in History" that I'll use in that program. The program will probably run over and these same people will complain.

While White admitted that disruptions had probably caused some of these antagonisms, she also argued that the rivalry had resulted from teachers trying to "win" students. Many of the students she had worked with in NHD had been the math and science stars of the school:

> If Robert gets the Presidential Scholar thing, the howl that is going to go up from the faculty because of him naming me as his mentor when he has a perfect score in math and science . . . you have all these math, science teachers there, plus the fact that I haven't taught him for 2 years. . . . They fail to understand that there's a real joy in the freedom of learning what you want to learn in the way you want to learn it. . . . Robert would have gotten an 800 in the college boards whether or not those people had kept him a captive audience for 45 minutes for 5 periods a day. He would have done it. All they had to do was give him the textbook.

In a way, White relished the teachers' reactions and their name-calling and suggested that their antagonisms and jealousies came from their own inadequacies:

> To be honest with you, I think I enjoy it. I . . . have fun doing what I'm doing, but it's even more fun to see their reaction. . . . They must want it to get back to me because it does. They tell the kids and the kids come back and . . . tell me and I laugh. Alice [the Principal] calls me her "impresario extraordinaire". . . a lot of teachers call me the "glitz wizard". . . if they think stuff like . . . that is glitz, I would suggest that they try it. . . . The reason that they don't try it is they don't have the imagination . . . they don't have the creativity, they don't have the brains.

There were many factors involved in this hostility at School B. It was not clear how much of it resulted and was left over from administrative changes which had occurred in the previous five years. With these changes some men had lost titles and positions, and women (including White) had gained both. White not only was friendly with the new Principal but became her (the Principal's) assistant in academic matters. Additionally, the schedule disruptions related to White's work in NHD obviously had irritated some teachers. Furthermore, School B had many high ability students from high powered and influential families. If White "won" these students (and consequently the support from their parents) through NHD, other teachers may have experienced the loss of this kind of parental support. Lastly, White had boundless amounts of energy and was able to balance her dual jobs--teaching and assisting the Principal--with NHD involvement. Other teachers probably resented not only that White was able to do this but that she received accompanying recognition that they did not.

There was an even greater antagonism to, and rivalry with, NHD teachers at School C. Watson submitted that some teachers felt she was motivated by desire for personal gain, some resented the disruptions to their classes, and some argued that her effort could have been better spent in other ways. She explained:

> I think . . . they feel . . . it's done for PR purposes and that it's done to enhance our situation; Ms. Martin and I have done a number of programs where we have put in all kinds of hours . . and I vowed . . . that I would never, ever do it again because . . . I had people who went to the Principal and said, "I don't want anybody coming into my classes, I don't want to give up the time," and I thought all this work, why? . . . It was as if we were trying to elevate ourselves to the Principal.
>
> We do find that there is some antagonism because they know that we put in a lot of time with these kids. . . . I know there are . . . four of us in the department and it seems like every time you turn around, we're losing somebody else in our department . . . what they do is just load up the classes. . . . There are two people in my department who have six classes a day . . . which is certainly too many classes to have and I know they kind of feel, "Why don't you work on something that will help us, why are you working with the top students who excel, would excel anyway?" . . . There is antagonism there because they kind of feel like . . . we're working with the cream of the crop and that our efforts would better be seen with helping kids who need . . . more help than what these kids need.

This commentary suggests a lack of understanding on the part of other teachers at School C about the goals of the NHD program but also reflects, as does much of the commentary about School C, the results of the overload of teaching

responsibilities with which the teachers at School C had to deal.

Martin's perceptions of incompetent or lazy teachers not wanting to look inferior were almost identical to White's. She proposed that such teachers were the most threatened by her and Watson's work in NHD:

> Some of those people are lazy. They're doing the least they can. They walk home without a book in their hands. . . . I think they feel insecure and resent when someone else does extra work . . . it shows up their own shortcomings . . . it's the same type of personality that . . . are the complainers. . . . I think that . . . they feel guilty because they don't do or they're too lazy to do it.

Also involved at School C (according to Martin) was the issue of how much a teacher should be doing without pay:

> I've had things said to me . . . "Don't do that unless you get paid for it." "Why do you take them on weekends?" "Why do you stay after school?" You're not getting paid for that--it makes us all look back if you do this." It was terrible. We'd walk up the hall and they'd yell stuff at us and it was, "You're doing this and you're not getting paid for it and . . . they're going to expect all of us to do this." . . . That was a basic thing, not that they objected to the program or participation in it, but we were doing it for free.

These responses, as with Watson's, were indicative of a school staff which was overworked, underpaid, frazzled, and running hard just to stay in place.

Together, the teachers perceived the reasons for the antagonism to be: annoyance with class disruptions; perceptions of NHD teachers receiving special privileges or being motivated by desire for personal gain; perceptions

that non-NHD teachers would look bad, lazy, inadequate or would be expected to do as much; and loss of favored students to NHD. These descriptions paint an unflattering picture of a school phenomenon which is probably more common than not. What it suggests, in differing degrees, about these three schools (and probably others) is that there was a tug-of-war over students rather than a collaborative, school-wide effort to see students achieve; that there was an isolation (at least on a communication level) of various disciplines and departments in terms of what their goals and needs were. In any case, these antagonisms, rivalries, jealousies, and name-callings were not enough to deter these teachers from participating in NHD, again attesting to the motivating force of the program and raising the issue of implications of these motivating dynamics of NHD for educational practice.

Staff Collaboration

While participation in NHD can apparently engender alienation, antagonism, and jealousy from other staff members, it seemingly can have a positive effect as well. A bonus to being involved in this program for these three schools was the development of staff collaboration. At School A, this collaboration was both a result and a part of a concerted attempt to alleviate problems and jealousies caused by impositions of NHD teachers on other teachers' schedules, to improve the presentations of students, to

obtain as many "expert" opinions as possible, and to make other teachers feel involved. Bender explained how it worked:

> One thing . . . we try to do is get as many people involved as we can . . . for example, . . . I have asked a couple of the art teachers to take a look at our projects and see what they can help us with . . . they have such artistic ability. . . . Last year, it [the theme] was "Science and Technology," and I was just like this [crossed her fingers] with the head of the science department. We really worked together on that. . . I try to get as many teachers involved so they can see the extent of the work that the kids are doing . . . it really does carry over.

The Social Studies Coordinator and Principal acted as members of the team; even other competition groups were willing to assist.

> Our [Social Studies] Coordinator is phenomenal. . . . She is involved in everything. . . . From the first day, she has been working to build this program with the backing of not just the local administrators but the central office people. . . . Mr. Swanson [the Principal], for example, . . . judges our Fair . . . and attends all of our competitions.
>
> Sometimes we work in conjunction with different activities. Our Decathalon and Octathalon kids took a field trip to the Museum of Fine Arts so I decided one year that we were going to tag along . . . I took my GT kids and a few others that we could fit in on the field trip with them . . . they were able to get some contacts and some information as well.

This strong feeling of collaboration and common mission evident at School A may have had to do with the many competitive ventures undertaken by the school staff. The teachers seemed to understand each other's needs and

appeared to be more ready to help each other than was apparent at School B or School C.

At School B, the team work was particularly noticeable between AV instructor Baker and White. With the video-tape projects, White provided the content focus and direction and Baker provided the technical and artistic expertise. As explained in the beginning of this chapter, the team work at School B also involved the English tutors who saved White much of the editing work on the written segments such as the scripts, the bibliographies, and the required two page description papers. Additionally, the librarian prepared the bibliography form for the students. White proposed that this, and not "contrived team-teaching," was what collaboration was all about:

> It [working together] really brings out the interaction and the creativity and it gets everyone ego-involved--faculty and students. Somehow [what] they call team teaching [is when] they get four people who don't want to be team teachers and they throw them in a room for common meeting . . . they don't really team teach. But this type of thing is the essence of team teaching and joy of it [is] you never know what direction it's going in.

While this NHD team apparently worked well together at School B, the team did not extend much beyond this select group of staff members.

In School C, Martin and Watson were a team out of necessity. Watson was teaching five classes and was also Department Chairperson, while martin had three different positions relating to library service in the school

district. Watson explained she would not be able to participate in NHD without help from Martin:

> With the schedule that I have, unless I had somebody like Margaret . . . she has a tremendous mind. . . . You say, "I think I remember that title partially," and she'll tell you what it is. . . . I couldn't ask for anybody who has been more helpful than she has been. She's good in directing kids and in being able to help them with finding the information . . . and that is so necessary because I think that the type of student we have--most of them truthfully would not finish unless there would be . . . constantly . . . checking. . . . I come down here usually eighth period and spend it talking. . . . Many times I don't see the actual kids, but many times Margaret and I will sit down and talk with one another. . . . "What do you think of this paper" or "How did you think it could be improved?"

The administrators in the School C district also were part of the team; they asked the students questions in preparation for the competitions. When appropriate, the drafting department also lent a hand with design, and English teachers assisted by editing written material.

The staff collaboration which developed in each of the schools did so largely through the efforts of these teachers. That they were able to involve other staff members, including administrators, is testimony that: the teachers' believed strongly in the benefits of participation in NHD; that other members of the staff viewed the results of teacher and student participation in NHD positively; and that involvement in NHD required such an enormous amount of time and effort that, especially for the School C teachers who had a heavier schedule than the teachers from School A

or School B, collaboration was necessary in order to make participation possible.

NHD as a Model for Teaching History

Not surprisingly, these history teachers stressed the importance of teaching history in the secondary schools. Compositely, they argued that the study of history was essential to learning thinking and self-preservation skills, to avoiding past mistakes, and to understanding world cultures and global interaction. As they talked about the traditional classroom activities and curriculum, the teachers became more serious, stiffer, less animated, and less excited than when they talked about NHD.

Bender (School A) and Watson (School C) expressed the more traditional reasons for studying history. For Bender, students needed to "learn to separate fact from opinion . . . how political or social influences affect . . . written records . . . cause and effect . . . chronological order." Watson stressed the need for citizens to learn from past events. She asserted that what was learned from the Vietnam War (in terms of the country's lack of support for long involvement in a foreign conflict) affected how the Persian Gulf War was conducted. She also argued that the global and cultural understanding which media coverage of world wide events necessitated could be obtained through the study of history:

> I've heard people say that . . . as far as the aftermath of the [Persian Gulf] war is concerned . . . it is so difficult for us because we don't understand many of the values of the Arab people and . . . the only way we're going to have . . . an understanding is through . . . history courses.

White (School B) agreed that it was important to learn from the past, but put a different twist on the rationale:

> We have scientists who created and dropped atom bombs on each other . . . I'm sure they never read a book about the results of the bombings. The reason for studying history is self preservation. . . . I come from a long line of draft dodgers, deserters, people who got out just before the Holocaust or the tragedy . . . I think a lot of it was probably that they were students of history and very aware of history. . . . History is a life tool and . . . reading and research is a life tool . . . what we've (educators) turned it into in the public schools is memory. As bad as it's traditionally taught, it's still better than nothing.

The three teachers also emphasized the need for teaching methods which allowed students to learn actively. Bender (School A) described her teaching method as an active learning, interdisciplinary, primary source approach which her state required:

> The emphasis [on teaching history and social studies in this state] is on student participation. They're really trying to get the teacher to get the student involved in the information and get student production and . . . participation. . . . I take an interdisciplinary approach. We do a lot of art and architecture and music. . . . I don't think that you can separate history from any other part of the curriculum. . . . I think all of these different disciplines are intertwined and all rely on each other.
>
> I like to . . . focus on primary sources . . . and have the kids look at them and read them and [get a] feel for them. . . . I think they get a better idea of what history is. . . . Sometimes it's just

> strictly inquiry, question and answer; other times for our gifted and talented program especially we try to incorporate a lot of simulations, a lot of analysis. . . . the students are . . . not just sitting answering questions out of the book . . . they're problem solving, they're critical thinking. . . . We try to incorporate the different learning styles so that we use AV as well as printed material . . . we do to some extent lecture, not a lot. . . . I'm sure that there's more of the book work and that sort of thing in the regular classes . . . I know that there is in the basic classes.

White (School B) deplored the traditional methods of teaching history and, like Bender, stressed the need for an active, interdisciplinary teaching:

> I must say I do not like reading history textbooks. Most of them are very poorly written, they are boring, boring [sing,song emphasis] as the kids would say. I agree with them. They're boring. . . . They could put all the history books in one big pile and burn them and probably they wouldn't be missed . . . maybe that's why [there is] such anti-history sentiment. . . . I would say the place of history in the curriculum is to be integrated with the English program, even the science program . . .

Watson (School B) deplored the traditional methods of teaching history and, like Bender, stressed the need for an active, interdisciplinary teaching:

> [Today], there's a tremendous emphasis on team learning and on the use of critical thinking skills . . . we need far more of that in our curriculum. . . . One of the biggest problems is . . . that . . . we have a lot of really large sections . . . my two American government classes, one has 28 and the other has 30 students . . . I find that I'm really inhibited in what I can do because of the sheer number of kids.
>
> I . . . feel that with a lot of the team approaches and critical thinking skills that it gets kids far more involved and you just hear from kids that you normally don't hear from. . . . I

> think we all, including myself, . . . talk too much . . . we put too much of the burden on ourselves instead of having the kids do it . . . this takes a lot of retraining. . . . I have college prep kids who will say to me, "Well, this is a cheap way of getting out of teaching." . . . A couple of kids . . . will say to me . . . "I want you to tell me what the important points are. . . . They want you to do their work.
>
> I just think that we need much more involvement than what we have at this point . . . because there has to be that interaction there or it's just no good. . . . If you just say, "Hey, we're going to see the domestic policies of Teddy Roosevelt, I might as well say--goodnight everybody."

NHD in Place of the Traditional History Curriculum

While it would appear that participation in NHD would fit these teachers' requirements for teaching history--it involves active participation, interdisciplinary, and, in the group categories, a cooperative learning approach--Bender and Watson were quick and perhaps defensive in defining their first priority as the school curriculum. Bender (School A) explained that she had worked hard to make sure the regular curriculum was "covered":

> We take a day here and a day there [for NHD] . . . it makes it tremendously hard to fit everything in. . . . I have . . . at least 2 1/2 to 3 weeks less subject matter time than . . . the regular teachers, but we all have the same scope and sequence, so I'm responsible for covering the same material, but in about . . . 3 weeks less. . . . We don't want their subject matter to suffer because they have to do a project.

Bender submitted that teaching history solely through NHD participation, that is, through the development of projects and presentations, would not be sufficient and stressed that

teachers at her school worked very hard to be sure that the "curriculum [did] not suffer because of this work."

Watson (School C), like Bender, was clearly aware of and responsive to school curriculum requirements and argued that having students participate only in NHD as a history program "[would be] too narrow."

> I would just think it [NHD] has to be used in conjunction with other history courses. I would like to see it be an elective where it doesn't take away from any of the courses that they have. I would like to see it offered in conjunction with . . . a current events course. We've even talked about that here--maybe having them work on the History Day research three days out of the week.

Bender and Watson admitted that the need (pressure) to cover certain amounts of prescribed curriculum material conflicted with their desire to see students involved in time consuming, active learning. This is the same problem inherent in the new history/social studies frameworks described in Chapter II. Teachers cannot allow students to actively discover and create their own knowledge while they (the teachers) are trying to cover large amounts of historical data.

White (School B), in her independent and rebellious (or was it visionary?) way, approached things differently. She covered the curriculum in ways that excited her and the students and not necessarily in the ways the school system had in mind.

> I had a marvelous course that had an English book attached to each unit. For example, when we did

> World War I, we read All Quiet on the Western Front; when we did the Russian Revolution, we read Nicholas and Alexandra; when we did the depression, we read the Grapes of Wrath. The administration said to me, "Do you want to be an English teacher or do you want to be a history teacher?" and I said, "I have a degree in English and history and I'd . . . really like to combine them." They said I would have to choose and I thought to myself, you are such fools, I can't believe it.

White did recognize the power and controlling force of the school curriculum, but found ways to work around this. She laughed at the idea of covering the curriculum and related it to putting a lid on a pot. When being observed, she was always "covering the curriculum," and "when they [walked] out of the room . . . the curriculum [was] always covered, but . . . [in] a variety of ways." She proposed that teachers could teach as much by having students do NHD projects as by following a set curriculum, and in response to educators who would suggest that allowing students to work on one project in depth to the exclusion of other topics would be detrimental she would answer:

> I don't think it would matter in the least because with the traditional education we're doing, they say people remember 10% of what they learn . . . or less. They don't remember anything after the final exam anyway so what you're doing [in NHD] really is . . . giving kids the opportunity to develop a method of studying anything they want to know and working together with other people for an outcome and . . . a lifelong desire to continue.
>
> I don't know how many kids are going to pick up history text books as adults and read them, but I know I'm the first one to the mailbox when National Geographic comes . . . and continue to read novels based on historical themes. . . . It's an on-going type of thing whereas [with the

> traditional method] they develop an anti-history attitude. They hated history books and now they don't have to do it anymore and that's the end of it, thank you.
>
> What is that song? "When I think back on all that crap [useless information] I learned in high school, it's a wonder that I can think at all."

Martin (School C) though not as confidently as White, submitted that NHD might be enough by itself if students were all researching different topics and there was interaction:

> If one child is doing a project alone in an isolated situation, [then it wouldn't be enough], but if you have a whole group doing them and there's interaction and they see what the others are doing, there will be transfer of learning.

The comments by White and Martin raise the crucial issue of what obstacles, besides class size, prevent teachers from moving beyond a rigid adherence to curriculum requirements to a broader purpose of teaching and learning history which stresses development of critical thinking skills (students finding and analyzing data and developing their own perspectives and knowledge) more than it stresses covering required curriculum material. While Bender and Watson emphatically maintained that it was important to complete the required curriculum, they both spent hours of time and effort beyond the school day working with students involved in NHD so that they could accomplish more than was possible through, and what was different from, the required curriculum.

Integrating NHD into the Traditional Curriculum

All of the teachers were convinced that NHD was a powerful way for students to learn content, comprehension, and lifelong skills (see Motivating Factors in this chapter), but only White (School B) argued that she could teach as much, if not more, solely through NHD participation than through the traditional curriculum methods. However, even the teachers' reactions to integrating NHD into the existing curriculum were mixed. Bender (School A) envisioned problems with requiring NHD for everybody and suggested that teachers wouldn't necessarily have to adopt this particular program to have similar results:

> I think the major problems come in the classroom whenever students are required to do this research and they really have no interest in it at all. . . . I think all students benefit from the research and from the writing skills . . . [and] the interpersonal, communication skills . . . that is something that helps them no matter what they are going into. I don't think you would necessarily have to adopt that particular program.

She explained, however, that when NHD was required in all of the social studies classes in School A (up until 1987), it was very successful. That was about the time the population of the school started changing and GT and honors classes in history were established. Since that time at her school NHD had been required only in the GT and honors social studies classes.

White (School B) expressed great faith in the ability of all students to do this kind of work; however, while she

pictured NHD as a model for the best way to teach history, she questioned the ability of most teachers to teach in this way.

> It takes a certain amount of intelligence and IQ to deal with things on this level and frankly, I don't think that too many of the teachers have it. That's sad. . . . it's a model for how to do it [teach]. It's right there. . . . There are so many ways to get through to every kid in what they like to do. . . . There's a model of how to teach and it certainly does wind up a finished product and even if it's not a finished product, it's a lesson in trying to get to a finished product.
>
> I would say it's the perfect solution, but . . . the problem is that there would be people who would be afraid to do it, people who just plain couldn't do it, wouldn't do it . . . it's sort of an intuitive type of teaching and learning. . . . There is no set formula, it's not safe. . . . You need the intuition, the creativity and the artistry, but you also need . . . a certain sense of orderliness to remember what everybody is doing. . . . I can't even get teachers in my own school to get involved. They're afraid of it.

She admitted that requiring NHD as part of the history curriculum probably would require more deadlines for the students than she had used in the past. Also if she required it for all students, she would want it to be a team effort:

> One of the things I'd be a little leary about if I did this . . . is that they would do nothing for a long time until just before the deadline. . . . I'm working with the best of them and they're volunteering to do this. . . . If you had them for an extended period of time, you could say that they would have due the first marking period x number of pages of reading on the subject and discuss it with you, so that by the time they started whatever they were going to do, they had that completed. . . . It would have to be . . . addressed.

> I would like to do it. I'd have to do it with another teacher. It would have to be team taught, because I . . . couldn't do the art myself. I couldn't do the video. I couldn't do the drama. . . . It would be much easier to teach . . . this way. I mean, I've got this going on top of a regular program.

Again, White argued that every student could (would have the ability to) participate in History Day at some level, if it were part of the curriculum. This included special education students. (It should be noted that for most of her teaching career White had taught the highest ability students.)

> I don't want to put myself on a limb, because I don't know anything about special education, so as somebody who has been working for a lifetime with top students. . . . I'm not an authority, but I would say if it works with them [top level students], it probably would work on a different level with special education kids.
>
> My office is part of a double office . . . they have a special education class in there . . . there are three kids in it . One is Lian [the emigre from China], who's working on a totally different level. Two other kids are discipline problems but the teacher puts on [the board] 10 vocabulary words and the kids look them up and they discuss them. Hey, I could teach that. There can be 25 special education kids, you don't need to give me 3, and I don't need a degree in special education to do that. So . . . if I took that class and I tried this [NHD] and it flopped I wouldn't consider it any more of a flop than what's already going on--plus the kids are bored.
>
> And for Lian to be sitting there, trying to get into college, reading the type of literature that she's reading, for her to be studying words that the teacher's picking out arbitrarily, when every day she's reading books with words in it that she doesn't know that she looks up. I think . . . she must be thinking the same kinds of things that I'm thinking. I think that this project [NHD]--her motivation to tell her story has probably

> taught her more English than sitting in that class looking up words that the teacher is picking out of a hat.

Martin (School C) acknowledged the possibility of having NHD as part of the curriculum but thought of it more in terms of the competition than in terms of a learning process:

> A lot of times science projects are required of all students . . . so you require them and then you have a History Fair in your school and you pick out your best. . . . If we did it, the History Fair would be maybe in December or January at the latest so that if you have some that are particularly good you can help them refine their projects to get them to districts [competition].

Watson (School C), like Bender however, submitted that requiring NHD as part of the curriculum would not work because (according to her) students would lack the motivation and discipline to do the projects:

> This type of thing is certainly not for every student. It's for the very dedicated student who has strong motivation, who enjoys history and enjoys extending themselves in this way. I do have a couple of people, who . . . are involved in the program, who I wouldn't call super history students, but they kind of blossomed on this in that it was something that they were really, really interested in and therefore they put forth the effort. But it takes a rare student to want to do something like this because no matter how you look at it if you want to compete and you want to do a really good job, it just requires a tremendous amount of time.
>
> Most kids are not cut out for this type of work. You've got to have someone who really can budget their time . . . no matter how early you start . . . you still have many kids who don't come through with the deadlines. You have to have a lot of drive. . . . It's something that they have to work on practically a whole school year.

There seemed to be something missing or unspoken, in particular in Watson's cautionary responses, to integrating NHD into the required curriculum. Given the low level of motivation and discipline among secondary students towards school work in general, was it really a question for her (and in some ways for the others) of whether students would or would not be motivated or disciplined enough to do NHD? Consciously or unconsciously, did Watson mean (and this would not be surprising considering the overload of work she faced) that it would be too much work, or even impossible, to have students of different ability levels participate in NHD? Did she suspect that if all students were involved in NHD, her own positive NHD experiences would change? While I could guess at the answers, it would be more productive to pose a new question, one which I should have developed and asked during the research: Given the positive results (claimed by all of these teachers) of student participation in NHD, what would have to change or happen in secondary schooling for all students to have the opportunity to learn in this way and at the same time for the teachers to receive the positive, fulfilling, and motivating rewards that these four teachers had come to expect in NHD?

Chapter Summary

It became clear that the teachers in this study participated in NHD to fulfill needs and to accomplish what they claimed could not be achieved in a traditional

classroom. They were able to develop a closeness with students, to attain more autonomy than in the classroom, to receive feedback which indicated they had been proficient at teaching and at the same time to have fun. And while they had complaints about the judging system and had minor concerns about teacher rivalry and about organizational aspects of NHD, they all submitted: that participation in NHD was a valuable and more effective way than traditional methods for students to learn content and to develop comprehension and critical thinking skills; that the competition had more positive than negative effects; and that staff collaboration was an added benefit to involvement.

The need to adhere to the required history curriculum and the belief that students would not have the interest, discipline, or motivation to do acceptable work if required to participate in NHD appeared to prevent Bender (School A) and Watson (School C) from supporting NHD as the sole curriculum or as a required part of the existing curriculum. While Martin (School C) and White (School B)--the two teachers who had rebelled against the traditional curriculum and/or system as students themselves--had positive responses to the idea of NHD as the sole or partial curriculum, Martin argued that success of NHD as the curriculum would depend on the range of topics involved in a class and on student interaction; White submitted that all students could gain

from participation in NHD but doubted the ability of most teachers to teach in this way.

NATIONAL HISTORY DAY: AN ETHNOHISTORICAL CASE STUDY

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED

by

MARILYN L. PAGE

Volume 2

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

September 1992

School of Education

C H A P T E R VI

THE STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES/ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS AND ISSUES

> I had a dream the other night that Amosh tried to develop a roll of film and then he . . . threw away our film with all our pictures on it. I was ready to kill him. It's on our minds all the time. (Jim)

> We went crazy. We had so many pictures to take. We had to revise the script. . . . About two days before [the competition], . . we put the impulses on the tape for the dissolve unit. . . . Adam . . . was screaming . . . going, "YES", and jumping around. (Terri)

> It's harder than most people think to find all that information you need to know. . . . You have to look in . . . books, talk to people--anything under the sun. . . . It's like being a liberal arts major. You don't know enough to get a job, but you know enough to annoy your friends. (Jake)

> When we actually showed our video, it was . . . overwhelming to see what we actually did accomplish. (Steve)

> This project makes me feel I found myself. I'm still . . . very caring of all things happening in China and when I watch the tape, I feel very painful. (Lian)

> It was the first time for me to be in a group like that . . . and gosh it felt great. (Judy)

Following a description of student profiles and of the students' experiences in NHD prior to and during the 1990/91 school year, this chapter explores the dynamics of NHD from the students' perspectives through the following topics: motivating factors, learning results, effects of competition, project authorship/cost, unresolved issues, NHD as the required curriculum, and students' perceptions of the teachers.

Student Profiles

In each school I interviewed one student who was entered in an individual category of the NHD competition and one group of students participating in a group category (see Appendix A for further explanation of categories). At school A the individual entrant participating in this study was Linda, an attractive, serious, and somewhat nervous junior, who seemed very independent, capable, and focused. Her intent and belief in her ability to excel in NHD was obvious from the first interview. She produced a dual projector, slide/tape presentation on the issue of censorship in schools. (The theme for the 1990/91 school year was "Rights in History.")

Originally the School A group entrants involved in this research were Jim, Ed, and Amosh. About one month after I had conducted the first interview with this group, Jim's sister Judy became a member. As a whole this group was charged with positive energy. They began each interview pumped up and became even more enthusiastic as each interview progressed. Jim was a confident senior who had already been accepted to the Naval Academy in Annapolis. Ed was a freshman who was thrilled to be working with upperclassmen and excited by what he believed he would learn from them. Amosh, a junior, was the group's photographer, loved working with media, and was willing to do whatever it took to make their project the best. Judy joined the group

to provide a female voice for the taped narration. She was initially rather intimidated by the other members and their superior past performances in NHD, however it didn't take long for her to become the taskmaster who made sure everyone was doing her/his part. This group developed a dual projector, slide/tape presentation on Native Americans and the issue of repatriation. All of the group members and Linda had participated in NHD since the sixth grade (a requirement at School A). They were active in extra-curricula activities including band and sports and were in honors or GT classes. Their attitudes and personalities seemed to fit the atmosphere of the school--upbeat and can-do.

At School B, Jessie was this study's individual entrant. She was a junior who had participated in NHD two years previously and had enjoyed the experience so much had decided to do it again. Jessie's quiet, unassuming, cooperative demeanor masked a driving ambition to be a successful professional actress. Her acting credits already included parts in major TV movies, and she was allowed to miss school whenever she needed to audition or when she was filming on location. Because of this interest in performing arts, Jessie was a share-time student at School B. This meant that she spent the mornings there and the afternoons at a vocational technical high school where she studied dance. For her NHD project she decided to work with three

other girls who were not from School B but who were also share-time students at the technical high school. Their project involved a dance interpretation of women's rights through history. I interviewed, and for the purpose of this research, considered Jessie an individual entrant partly because each of the girls in the group was responsible for her own part of the performance and partly because Jessie was the only student of this group from School B.

The group entrants from School B were five Asian-American students. Lian, a senior, had emigrated from China after the Tiananmen Square incidents. Her composure and sophistication did not always conceal the pain and sadness she felt when thinking about the events in her homeland. Lian's English skills and understanding of the NHD program and purpose were limited at the first interview, but by the time of the state competition in May, she had become the most vocal and most driven member of the group. Steve and John were seniors who appeared to be very laid-back but very confident group members. Lanie, also a senior, was the most serious member and became annoyed easily when others acted silly or did not seem to be pulling their weight. Helen, a junior, giggled easily at comments made by the others, but the giggling appeared to be more of a nervous reaction than a response to something funny. She was the most reserved member of the group. As a whole the group was calm and quiet. Their project was a video-tape production of the

rights and lack of such in China. Except for Lian, all had participated in NHD once before and were in advanced academic programs. All, including Jessie (the individual entrant) were voluntary participants; none were in White's classes.

At School C, Jake came to the interview with a broad smile on his face; his large frame made him appear older than high school age. He was eager, friendly, and despite a nervous laugh, seemed delighted to talk about his NHD experiences. His conversations gave the impression he procrastinated with and/or was overwhelmed by his school and NHD work. He was a senior and an individual project entrant. His table-top display depicted an analysis of religious rights in his state in the late 1800s.

Adam and Terri, the School C group entrants for this study, were both ambitious, determined, serious, focused, and conscientious seniors. Their project was a dual projector, slide/tape presentation on veteran's rights. Adam and Terri worked well together and required little assistance. Adam was so exuberant in the interviews that at one point I was compelled to ask him, "Are you always this positive?" To which he responded (predictably) positively. He and Jake had participated in NHD two years previously, but for Terri it was the first time and consequently she was somewhat apprehensive and unclear about the calibre of work expected. Jake, Adam, and Terri were all involved in extra-

curricula activities at the school and all were "doing" NHD in place of a research paper.

The Composite

Except for Lian and Terri, all of the students in this study had participated in NHD before. They were all involved in extra-curricula activities and 10 of the 14 (13 before Judy became involved) were in advanced programs of study. While there was not a large difference in ability level among the students (and that is one of the limitations of the study), the students represented different grade levels, different ages, different gender, and different ethnic backgrounds (Anglo-American, Asian-American, and Indian-American). What other differences there were among the students seemed to be reflections of the school and community culture.

While the students from School A and School B were almost always positive and confident, they also appeared to be advantaged students--that is, they came from upper middle class professional families and from schools which provided specialized programs for them. The students from School C, while also mainly positive-see comments about Adam above--seemed not only to have more of a struggle in NHD in terms of finding time and in balancing NHD with required school and outside work, but also appeared to represent the majority of students in this country who do not have the advantages just described. They came from working or middle

class families and their school had no advanced programs except in science; perhaps because of this they indicated a greater awareness of other people's struggles and of the realities of life in general than did the students from School A or School B.

However, they also revealed unresolved, dark attitudes and undertones about their school climate which are important to present here in order to allow complete comprehension and analysis of what it was like for, and what it meant to, Adam, Terri, and Jake to participate in NHD. These School C students (as with the School C teachers--see Chapter V) were disturbed by what they perceived to be an unfair negative image of their school and the student body. Two of the students on separate occasions relayed, and claimed to be appalled themselves by, what appeared to be a standard joke about School C students: "If she is black, pregnant, and ugly, she must be from School C." I propose that these students (and teachers) at School C felt responsible for proving the school's image, and their connections to this image, false; and that they believed they could do this through success in NHD. This issue is examined further in this chapter but as a preliminary to that discussion, I posit that the NHD experiences for the School C students, while basically similar in substance to those of the School A and School B students, were different

in terms of how the students weighed the significance of or defined success.

Regardless of the students' backgrounds or of their school and community culture, what is of particular interest is that all except two of the students were more interested in science than history and most did not like or were indifferent to history as a school subject. Why, then, would all of these students want to participate in a history-related program? The answer to this question has to hold implications for the teaching and learning of history and for educational processes. Before this chapter explores motivating factors, however, the following section describes what it was like for these students to participate in NHD during the school year and to participate in the national competition in June.

The NHD Experience: The Students' Perspectives

As with the teachers, participation for these students required an extraordinary, out-of-class, time and work commitment. Twelve of the 14 students had participated previously and while not all former experiences were positive, the students had chosen to participate again. The students from School A recalled their first NHD experiences in the sixth grade as not necessarily pleasant. Linda remembered "everybody's eyes" bulging "at having to find 20 sources." The other School A students recalled similar feelings and all agreed that if NHD had not been required

after sixth grade, they never would have participated again. However, several factors, including the opportunity to see winning projects and presentations, experiencing competition, learning how to research, and changing to the media category, changed their motivation and degree of involvement.

Ed recalled that once he learned how to research "it came a lot easier," and after seeing all the projects at the district competition one year, he was determined to "do better [the] next year." Amosh also became motivated after seeing other projects and enjoyed working with media because "all the taping, pictures, [and] dissolve unit [were] a mixture of technical [science] and history." Jim and Linda had a lot of fun working on group media presentations and that became a part of their motivation for continuing. All participants from School A liked the excitement of competing.

The students from School B and School C had similar stories. While students at School B were not required to participate in NHD, the School B participants in this study, except for Lian who participated this year for the first time, also had chosen to get involved again. They knew all of the work would be on their own time since they were not in White's classes, but they remembered the fun and excitement from past competitions. Two years earlier, Jake and Adam from School C had vowed never to participate again

because of perceived judging inconsistencies. However, when they heard the theme for this year's (1990/91) program and remembered the fun they had had, they jumped in again.

What is it like for students "to do" History Day? For all of these students, participating in NHD meant most or all of the following: searching for data at libraries, obtaining original primary source material through interviews, telephoning nationally known figures, organizing and interpreting the data, relating material to historical context, writing and rewriting a script, photographing and re-photographing, creating original visuals, video-taping, editing, and developing and fine-tuning a presentation which could be a media show, a dramatic enactment, a written paper or a table top display. Following are the students' perspectives of their 1990/91 NHD experiences.

School A

After four months of work, Jim, Ed, and Amosh--the group entrants from School A--found themselves in January having to begin again. They had completed research during the Fall semester with students who decided not to progress to the NHD competition. Not letting that stop them, they decided to join together and develop a new project, even through they knew they would be behind other participants and that they would have to have a presentation ready for the school competition by the end of the month. Their first

task, as for all NHD participants, was to find a focus. Jim described the stress:

> There's a lot of research, a lot of work. . . . Right now we're going through a very stressful period with our topic . . . we're having trouble narrowing it down. We started with Indian religious rights . . . and then we were going to take payote--that was going to be our main topic. Then we said the judges might think we're doing a drug project. . . . The head of Junior Historians mentioned . . . artifacts and burial grounds and . . . I guess we're doing it. . . . It's very stressful because we have less than a month until district [competition] and . . . we're still doing preliminary research.

And he explained the issues:

> We've talked to two [museum] curators . . . to see what controversy they've had with the law and the government and with the Indians as far as having to return sacred items. Many Indians feel that it's not right to have Grandma sitting on display--having the old bones. . . . They feel that it's a disgrace and it's degrading to them [Indians].
>
> A couple of hundred years ago when anthropologists and archaeologists were digging up special artifacts, they didn't take into consideration that they [the artifacts] could still be used today. . . . The Indians still view them as tools . . . they don't think it's right for the government to be possessing them when it's something that's very strong in their culture and their religion.

As the group members continued to talk about their topic, they became more excited. Amosh picked up where Jim left off:

> They [the Indians] don't have a place to go to worship. They have their land and that's about all they have--land and artifacts are the . . . things that represent . . . the Great Spirit to them. . . . We're trying to make a parallel of the other religions like Mecca and Jerusalem and their . . . Holy Lands. Indians have the same situation, but they're not as much protected.

And Ed made his contribution:

> All the artifacts were taken. . . . There's this one field where the people went in . . . and dug. I read it in the National Geographic. . . . They dug . . . illegally and took the bones and . . . the artifacts and many Indians got offended because . . . in that state it's legal to dig for artifacts but not for bones . . . you have to report that to the government . . . and they didn't. All those things are not in their proper places any more.

After deciding on the topic of Native Americans and repatriation, they began the work in earnest. Amosh described their quest's beginning:

> We went to the library . . . and found some magazines and books on repatriation . . . then we looked through lots of National Geographics . . . we went back to the people [including museum curators, a lawyer for Native Americans, and members of the Inter-Tribal Council] we interviewed for the first project--on religious rights--and asked them about . . . repatriation. . . . They led us to other sources--gave us a lot of information and that's when we started putting our project back together.

Aside from Amosh's role as a photographer, other roles were not defined. The group relied mainly on a loose system of cooperation, self-knowledge, and trust. Whoever thought he could do the best job, did. They each conducted separate research and then, as Amosh explained, would "come together on a weekend, sit in front of a computer type it up, and do a script." Once they had a preliminary script they would look at each sentence and determine which photograph fit. For technical parts of the project, according to Jim, they got help at a local church:

> We tape our script at my church. We have a sound system with microphones and . . . there's a man . . . who helps us do our taping and monitors us. . . . On Wednesday night, they have choir rehearsal, so we always try to catch him on a Wednesday night when he's already at the church.

During the same time period, the work was similar for Linda the individual entrant. However, by January she had already completed a lot of the research on her topic of censorship. She had interviewed Betty Miles, author of children's books. Her account of how she contacted Betty Miles is an example of the perseverance and ingenuity students in this study used in conducting research and reflects also what she and the others had learned about primary source researching from past competitions:

> I called Mark West . . . an author of a book on censorship. . . . In one of his books he had interviewed authors, publishers, and other people about the censorship . . . they had experienced and I asked him if he could give me the names of some people to contact. . . . He said . . . to try to find Betty Miles because he said she's really good to talk to and she's done some lectures.
>
> I . . . went upstairs and found her book on my shelf. . . . I looked at the title page and it said Betty Miles lives in such and such a place . . . then I found a more recent book and it gave her address and a new city. . . . I was going to call the publisher and see if I could find her and then I said, "No, I know how to find information." . . . Her number was listed so I . . . called her home . . . and she said she'd talk to me.

Linda had conducted at least 10 other interviews but was having no luck at reaching Mel and Norma Gabler, tireless advocates of textbook censorship. She knew from experiences at past competitions that if she didn't interview them, she

would "probably have no chance of going on because everyone who [was] in education . . . [had] . . . heard of them."

These School A students competed successfully in district and regional competitions between January and April. Their work during that time involved a combination of correcting problems the judges cited, rewriting the script, re-taking photos and getting new ones, conducting more interviews, and finding and integrating new information and material. The work, the pressure, and the tension (as it had for the teachers) intensified just before the competitions.

The group added a new member, Jim's sister Judy, after the district competition. Together the group altered the time length of the slide/tape presentation, analyzed the issue of repatriation further, re-wrote the script, and contacted several more people. Besides calling the Department of the Interior and talking to people from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, they interviewed the President-Elect of the state's Archeological Society and several people at the Smithsonian Institute. While this may seem like unusual work for high school students, Jim described it as if it were an everyday experience: "We call someone at least a couple of times a week."

Linda, the individual entrant, was successful in contacting Mel Gabler but found it difficult to incorporate material from the interview because "he contradicted himself

. . . and said he wanted students to be exposed to free ideas . . . but not [to] question . . . those ideas." She also took more photos, conducted "about 12 more interviews," re-wrote her script and re-recorded her tape for her slide presentation:

> I worked with Ms. Bender every . . . day for a week . . . during my study lab. . . . My script was completely changed . . . the basic ideas were there but . . . at district [competition] they told me I needed to be a little less biased. . . . I knew that I tried and tried and I made it comparatively . . . unbiased.

The students (the group entrants and Linda) worked on more revisions after winning at the regional competition in April, then participated and placed first at the state competition in May and revised the presentations again. The group's revisions between April and May included re-writing the script, taking more photographs, updating the bibliography, and re-doing the audio tape. After the state competition, they presented their project to a university archeological class which included undergraduate and graduate students and archaeologists. Amosh described it as a scary, but enlightening experience:

> We presented in there [and] I think a lot of the archaeologists were kind of offended by our project. It was packed . . . all these graduate students . . . one was working on his doctoral thesis. He was a Native American. . . . We talked to this lady who was a Native American and also an archeologist who's kind of caught in between.

Linda had a lot to deal with after the regional competition. The experience had unsettled her and she was not sure if she

would continue in the program. The judges had expressed annoyance and offense at her use of several words in her presentation. They were words Linda thought were making a point. Her conflict revolved around removing words from a presentation on censorship or leaving them in the presentation and risking the same response from the state judges. She received help from Ms. Bender and compromised:

> I had all my pages xeroxed . . . and then I had Ms. Bender--since she's older--decide which words were the most offensive. . . . She went with a black pen and marked out 11 words. . . . She had a little stamp pad . . . and I made little words such as "censored" and stamped them over the words . . . then took pictures from that. . . . In a way I wanted to keep the words but I kind of liked it better and I was calmer because I knew the words would not be jumping out from the screen.

After winning at the state contest in May, Linda conducted more interviews and integrated opposing viewpoints into the presentation.

At the national competition in June, the students had to deliver their presentations at a pre-scheduled time and then respond to three judges' questions. Jim, Ed, Amosh, and Judy (the group entrants) were ready, dressed professionally, and in the presentation room with their equipment at least 2 hours early. They wanted to view the other contestants' projects while they waited. When a scheduled group did not arrive on time, the group from School A agreed to present their slide show ahead of time. They responded confidently to the judges' questions until one of the judges asked about their bibliography form and the

students could not remember which form they had used. While annoyed with themselves over this glitch, they were ecstatic that night when they discovered they had made the run-offs.

Consistent with NHD policy, only 10 presentations in each category advanced to the final judging which took place on the following night. At these run-offs, again the group appeared confident, but as Jim and Ed controlled the tape player and Amosh and Judy manually worked the slide projector and dissolve unit, the tape and slides got out of sync and the group had to re-start the presentation. Half way through the show the sound disappeared but was quickly "found" again. At the end of the presentation the group was visibly shaken and annoyed with themselves that it had not been perfect.

Linda's national presentation occurred at the scheduled time but she had to contend with one of the strangest interruptions I have seen at the NHD competitions. About half way through the slide/tape presentation, a woman burst into the darkened room from the back, ran up to Linda who was running the slide projector and dissolve unit and insisted that Linda stop the show and allow her (the woman) to retrieve material from the back of the stage. The judges, whose backs were to Linda and this woman, didn't seem to notice the interruption. Linda calmly continued her show while parents grabbed the woman and took her out of the room. While Linda was sure the interruption meant that she

would not be in the finals, she not only was in the finals but placed fourth in the nation in her category. Linda was angry that she had placed fourth, however, because she "was this close to placing third and going up on stage to receive a medal and financial award."

School B

The account given by the School B group entrants of their work during the Fall semester confirmed White's (the teacher) argument that students (particularly those not in her class) waited until the first competition was imminent before beginning intense research. From September to January, this group had collected some articles, had conducted one interview with a Chinese expatriate, and had written a preliminary script for their video-tape production on rights in China. Working outside of a class sponsorship, they lacked both a defined leader and a clear plan. However they did have a cause which, although originating with Lian, they all adopted with growing fervor as the year and work progressed. Lian, who had left China in 1989 following the Tiananmen Square incidents, explained her group's initial hope for the project and at the same time confirmed that the Chinese scholars were anxious to have input into the project regardless of the danger to themselves and their families:

> I think from this project, maybe the American kids, can understand what they have in their hands and they can understand what we [the Chinese] don't have . . . maybe they [American kids] don't know what democracy is at all. . . . They [the Chinese scholars] are wanted by Chinese police and

> they all have families in China who can't get out . . . [but] they want to help us to do this project.

As explained earlier, Jessie, this study's School B individual entrant, planned to work with three other students from different high schools in creating a dance interpretation of women's rights through history. From September to January however, Jessie and the other students, who like the group entrants were not in any of White's classes, did not complete any research and had developed no specific plan other than for each girl to choose a woman to research. By March Jessie had dropped out of the program. She had decided her part of the performance would be about Rosa Parks. She had read a book about Parks and had viewed a video-tape about women's rights, but after meeting with the other girls three or four times, had decided not to continue because of scheduling conflicts.

The continuing work for the group entrants between January and the district competition in April, as with the students from School A, involved finding, analyzing, organizing, and synthesizing material. While they rewrote parts of the script, conducted other interviews, developed and edited the video-tape, their effort remained scattered and only loosely focused. They made several edit changes in their video-tape between the district competition in April (where they placed first) and the state competition in May. It was after placing first at the state competition and

subsequently entering the video-tape in a teen video competition that they made more substantial changes in the script, audio, and footage. The major change involved showing more of, and hearing more from, Lian in the video-tape.

Regardless of their lack of organization, these students' growing sense of connection to, and internalization of, the cause for rights for Chinese people provided the basis for more dramatic and visible cognitive and affective results than were apparent with the other study participants. As White explained, there was no other way for these students to have been this involved in studying their heritage anywhere else in their secondary schooling. Additionally, these results (explored further in this chapter) speak not only to the need for multi-cultural perspectives in social studies courses and the need for students to be interested in what they are doing, but also provide a look at how NHD can address these needs.

At the national competition the group members were composed as they waited to show their video-tape to the judges. While their presentation did not advance to the finals, their biggest disappointment was not in not winning, but that only a small audience saw and heard their message about democracy and the need for such in China. This disappointment was compounded on the day following the competition when Lian and her teacher, White, took the

video-tape to the Chinese Embassy in Washington, DC to try to have it included in their educational materials. According to White, the officials quickly ushered her and Lian out of the Embassy and sent them to a different building dealing with educational matters. There Lian became even more upset than she already was. She claimed the officials spoke to her in Chinese and berated her for being a traitor, while in English they thanked White for her efforts. The officials did not accept the tape, instead they gave Lian and White a propaganda tape of their own. Later that night the group members attended the run-offs to view the presentations which had won in the preliminary round. In the large room (it was actually a ballroom), there was standing room only. Lian stood next to me and with tears streaming down her cheeks, in a broken voice, said, "All of these people could have seen our tape."

School C

Terri and Adam had become partners part way through the Fall semester when plans with original partners had collapsed. Both chose to do a History Day project instead of a term paper for Watson's government class. They agreed to develop a dual projector, slide/tape presentation on veteran's rights. Their plan was much more concrete than the plans of the other students in this study probably because there were just the two of them and because they worked together daily during their ninth period study hall.

By January they had written to and received information from the Veterans' Administration, gotten permission to use copyrighted music, interviewed veterans, and written a partial script. Adam, who called history his forte, explained the importance of primary sources:

> Mostly in History Day, what everybody's concerned with are the primary sources you have. They look for that . . . that's how effective your research is going to be. . . . We interviewed this old man who was in the Bonus March of '32 in Washington, DC--90 years old and . . . very bitter. He had nothing good to say abut the government.

Terri confirmed Adam's belief that by interviewing people they were "meeting history in the making": "You can't just go by what you read in books. You have to talk to the people who lived it and who have experienced everything." Adam's descriptions throughout the interviews reflected the intensity of purpose and mission I referred to in Chapter V and in this chapter when discussing the School C culture. Adam always spoke quickly, unhesitatingly, and seemingly with the need to not waste a minute:

> We're always doing research . . . we started working . . . back in December. . . . We just go back and fourth . . . what can you give me here and what information can you get here. . . . I'll do this or I'll do that. . . . She's (Terri) been asking her Dad a lot of the information and typing . . . on the computer. . . . I'm just trying to gather as much [information] as I can. I've been writing to Veteran's Administrations and at the same time, she's been going to meetings . . . we just collaborate.
>
> We need music for the presentation so . . . we write to various artists. I decided . . . an effective sound track would be the movie <u>Glory</u>. . . . I've written to the . . . Mormon Tabernacle

> Choir. . . . We're using three sound tracks. One is Glory, one is from the Civil War series. It was on PBS--Ken Burns. I got a letter from Burns, which is really nice . . . and the people at Glory were very courteous. I'm waiting to hear from the Mormon Tabernacle Choir.

Jake, the School C individual entrant, was creating a table-top project which would depict and analyze the violation of religious rights in the late 1800s in a small town in his state. By January he had obtained a printed history of the town's religious conflict from a local bank, an authentic letter written by a woman parishioner of one of the involved churches, and another person's diary. His plan was to search for and study other religious rights violations for comparison purposes and to enlarge some slides from a previous project on a similar subject. While on the surface Jake initially appeared more complacent than Adam and Terri, as my research progressed, it became apparent through his comments that Jake wanted and needed to succeed as much as did Terri and Adam.

Between January and the district competition in April Terri and Adam interviewed the elderly veteran again, synthesized their information, wrote and re-wrote their script, produced their sound tape, interviewed other veterans, and took and re-took slide photos from books and original visuals. As with the students from Schools A and B, the frustration and intensity involved in their work increased just before the competition in April. However, this intensity, as with the teachers from School C, took on

greater and more emotional dimensions than it did for the participants in the other schools. Adam described how difficult it was to prepare the audio tape:

> The last 2 weeks in March . . . we'd be here for . . . 4 hours every night. . . . If we messed up once, we had to . . . do it all over again. . . . Once we got the speaking part done, then we did the music . . . in the background. We mixed it together on a machine and that took . . . a lot of time. . . . It was very tense.

Terri confirmed that it was a busy, crazy time:

> We . . . went crazy. We had so many pictures to take. We had to revise the script. Each time we revised the script, we had one of the English Department heads look at it. . . . Each time he hacked it apart . . . it got very frustrating. . . . Then we had to delete some to make it fit the 10 minute limit. . . . We interviewed a lot more people . . . we spent about 2 weeks on the music. It was pretty tough mixing it.

Between the district competition (which they won) in April and the state competition in May, Terri and Adam did more interviewing and revising. Adam interviewed the Editor of VFW magazine and an administrator from the Veteran's Administration in Washington, DC. They re-took some slides and rewrote the bibliography. After the state competition, where they also placed first, because of a judge's comment about the quality of their audio-tape, they went to the community TV station and re-made the tape.

From January until the district competition, Jake (the individual entrant) interviewed more people, finished enlarging his photos, revised his two page descriptive paper, obtained information through a computer data base

from a national religious archive in Washington, and created his visual display on three large, connected boards. Because he had to be away from school for a week with the school band and because he had not had time to finish gluing the materials onto his display boards, he left a coded diagram with Martin (the teacher) and asked her to do it for him. This situation led to another student complaining about Jake getting an unfair amount of help. (I examine this issue further in this chapter under the topic of Student Authorship/Cost.) For the most part Jake considered his work complete after the district competition in which he placed first. He made only minor changes and corrections in the visual display and placed second in his category at the state competition.

As explained in Chapter V, because of graduation exercises the students and teachers from School C did not arrive at the national competition until 2:00 a.m. of the day of their scheduled presentations. Jake and the teachers had to be at the display room by 8 o'clock that same morning so that Jake could set up his project. Before the judging started, with only a few hours of sleep, Jake and his father intently reviewed the material, but because of space restrictions there were no observers at the judging of the table-top displays. Jake's account of the judging was positive; however, he did wonder why the judges had questioned the size of his display boards. As it turned out

later, the judges had deducted points for Jake having an oversized project. Jake's teachers had previously measured the project, and according to them, it fell within the acceptable range. This was one of the judging issues which gravely upset the students and teachers from School C. (This is discussed further in this Chapter and in Chapter VII.)

For Terri and Adam the presentation and judging at the national competition were disasters. As they were waiting in the hall for their presentation time, an oblivious young person jaunted down the hall swinging a gym bag. The bag caught the corner of the cart on which the two slide projectors were seated. The cart and the projectors tipped over; the slides (representing 9 months of work) flew in all directions and landed all over the floor. It would be difficult to describe completely the look of shock, disbelief, and horror on the faces of Terri, Adam, and the teachers, Martin and Watson. Terri and Adam requested an extension on their presentation time from the judges and silently and limply put the slides back into the carousel. They were so shaken that they never regained their original composure. Later Terri revealed that she went back to the dorm and cried for a long time. Neither of the School C presentations advanced to the finals. Terri felt drained and defeated. Adam and Jake were angry--they both claimed the judging had been unfair.

While there were differences among the student entrants as to the development and concreteness of research and project plans, all of the students put in many hours of extra-class and extra-school time and effort to prepare their presentations. Their work, depending on the category, involved many/all of the following: searching for data--both primary and secondary sources; conducting in-person and telephone interviews; taking/enlarging photos; creating original visuals; organizing and analyzing material; writing a script and/or description paper; creating audio-tapes; coordinating visuals with sound; and re-doing and revising the visuals, scripts, audio-tapes, and written materials several times. And all of this was in addition to regular school work, extra-curricular activities, and--for some--outside jobs.

Never during the interviews did the students complain about this amount of extra work; they were exasperated occasionally, but, if anything they were very proud of the amount and calibre of their work. This expression of pride was particularly pronounced for the School C students and was probably in part a reflection of their belief that by working this hard and creating the projects that they did they were proving the school's negative reputation untrue. In any case, the willingness to work this hard raises the question, as it did with the teachers, as to why students would give this amount of time and effort to a year long

project. For Terri, Adam, and Jake from School C, the work was an alternative to a term paper, but they knew from the beginning that the investment would be much greater for History Day. Jake also "wanted to do History Day one more time" before he graduated. For Lian, Steve, John, Helen, and Lanie from School B, there was no class credit of any kind and while their group work was disconnected, their convictions about the project never were. For Jim, Ed, Amosh, Judy, and Linda from School A, there was credit during the Fall semester. For the rest of the year when a major portion of the work and revision occurred there was no credit. Why did these students participate in NHD?

Motivating Factors

These students, as with the teachers, participated this year and had participated in the past in NHD because participation allowed them to meet needs that could not be, had not been, or were not being met in the traditional classroom. The needs revolved around six issues: the desire and need to have fun while interacting with peers; the need to determine and feel good about who they were in relation to others; the need to receive recognition and feedback about the quality and usefulness of their work; the need to have choices concerning, and control over, their school work; the opportunity to be creative; and the opportunity to be actively involved in history. For this and the following sections in this chapter, I have selected

student quotations which represent the thoughts of all of the students who discussed a particular topic. Each student is identified by name and school.

Having Fun/Camaraderie

Based on the students' words, the prime motivator for these students was the opportunity to have fun and develop a sense of camaraderie, not only during the school year while working on the project, but particularly at the competition events. Eight of the students who had participated before recalled the fun involved in staying in college dorms, meeting people from other schools--and in the case of the national competition from other states--and sharing in a sense of camaraderie. Here Adam (School C) captures the feelings of the others:

> I wanted to keep doing it [NHD] because it's so much fun being with all the kids. . . . We go to . . . state [competition], up in the dorms we mess around. We just have fun . . . it's just the whole camaraderie. . . . My main goal [this year] before I even started working on it was probably to get to states [competition] because it is so much fun. You have parties up there and everything. It's great . . . now . . . I would like to go to Washington, DC.

John (School B) was more succinct but his message was the same:

> [Last year] we spent a week down in Washington and that was a lot of fun. Steve and I were roommates and we went insane. . . . It was interesting meeting other people from other states.

Jessie (School B) also commented on the opportunity to have fun while meeting other people:

> [Two years ago] it was really rewarding and we got to stay in dorms . . . it was fun. It was neat to leave school for 4 days . . . we got to go on a really neat bus . . . and the kids I went with were so great. I got to become better friends with them . . . we were really close for those 4 days. We all stuck together and we met people from all over . . . it was really great meeting people from all different states and seeing what they were doing.

For Ed (School A), who prior to this hadn't "made it past regional" competition, it was motivating just to think about the fun at the national competition: "I've seen what [the others] have done and I want to make it. They've talked about 'when I went to national' [competition] and I haven't done that and I'm jealous."

It should be re-emphasized here that it was the competition events--meeting people, staying in dorms, and having parties--and not the competition per se that motivated the students. The five students who did discuss wanting to win connected the winning to being able to get to other competitions where they could have more fun. That adolescents want to have fun and interact with peers will come as no surprise to anyone familiar with the fundamentals of adolescent development, but that students will put in hours of extra work for 9 months in hopes of 5 days of fun in Washington, DC reflects how powerful this need is.

Comparing Oneself to Others/Who Am I?

A second motivation had to do with the general need of adolescents to discover who they are. That requires comparing oneself to others in many ways. For these students,

the competition events provided the opportunity to compare their abilities with peers from many different places and consequently to set new goals for themselves. Linda (School A) liked competing because it allowed her to see "just how good . . . or not" she was "in relation to someone else." Likewise Ed and Amosh (School A) saw how they "matched up" and "fit in." The competition gave John (School B) "self-realization of where" he stood "among other groups." The comparisons gave Steve (School B), Adam (School C), and Jim (School A) ideas about projects and topics they might never have had and made them set new goals and work harder.

It follows that when students and teachers see only the work within their own schools, that work sets the standards. However when students and teachers have the opportunity to see superior work, as in NHD, done by similar ability students, they are able to and do establish different, higher expectations for themselves. Consequently the calibre of the work, their goal setting, and the clarity of their self-identity improve.

Recognition/Purpose/Final Product

Eleven students mentioned one or more of the three inter-related factors of receiving recognition, having purpose, and seeing a final product as motivation for participating in NHD. Ten of the students talked about the importance of receiving recognition from people other than the teacher--that is, fellow students, parents,

administrators and judges. Ed (School A) described how he felt after presenting:

> When I finally present the project and see the judges and people in the audience . . . that's the most exciting part to me because I see how they react to things and I see when they smile or they frown. I see how it affects their emotions and everything. It means a lot because I'm real proud. . . . I'm like smiling cheek to cheek, from ear to ear.

Amosh (School A) described similar reactions:

> When we went in there . . . we had all the teachers and parents and we had . . . our Principal and Vice Principal there. . . . We had . . . the whole room packed with people . . . that felt good . . . the room was . . . big, but it was packed. . . . You felt real good . . . everybody [said], "Great job." That has to be the most exciting part, sitting in that room and watching the faces and the audience and the clapping and . . . the comments from the judges.

Jim (School A) recalled how "neat" it was "to have articles published" and for John (School B) the recognition gave a boost in confidence. Terri (School C) was thrilled to be able to show her slide presentation to Kiwanis members. It was important to Lanie (School B) that the Chinese scholars involved in her group's research responded favorably to the group's final video-tape. But it was Jake (School C) who related this needed recognition to the lack of such in traditional school work:

> In regular school work, the only person who sees [your work] is the teacher and all you've got to do is impress the teacher for a grade. . . . {In NHD] it's not just one person sitting there on a Saturday night with a cup of coffee and half tired going over papers.

For six of the students, the opportunity to teach others something through their projects was motivating. Ed and Jim (School A) remembered being flattered when asked to present their project to other students, and Amosh (School A) was proud that his work could be of value to others:

> When you present [the project], you are teaching everything you learned in the last 6 months and you are teaching it . . . in 10 minutes to the audience. . . . Your siblings . . . your parents and all your friends are there and they are learning everything you learned in 10 minutes and that's a good deal--all the work we put in . . . a 10-minute run-down on everything--that's pretty neat.

For Lian (School B) it was especially important that she had the opportunity to "tell the American kids . . . about freedom in China." Steve (School B), who worked on the video-tape with Lian, explained what it meant to him to teach others:

> The responses of the people [were important]. We showed [the tape] to a lot of our friends who basically knew as much as we did when we first started out and I guess they gained a better understanding through the tape. . . . They could relate to the actual incidents [in Tiananmen Square] as to what happened. . . . That was really important to me. We . . . conveyed our message to the people through our video.

All of the 11 students (referred to in this section) described how motivating it was to put together and to see a final product; they also expressed surprise at the calibre and depth of what they had produced. For Linda (School A), NHD was more satisfying than Science Fair because she created something from scratch. Jessie (School B) in past

participation found it hard to believe she had accomplished what she had. For Steve (School B) the results were "overwhelming": "As you go along you don't really see . . . what you did and what you wrote. . . . When we actually showed our video, it was . . . overwhelming to see what we actually did accomplish."

For Terri (School C), "placing it all together" was the most exciting part. And Helen (School B) agreed that "it was a good experience to be able to put one good project together."

Autonomy/Control/Interest in Topic

As with the teachers, one of the main motivators for the students was the opportunity to have choices in the control over their work. Rarely in a traditional school setting does a student have autonomy in connection with her/his work, yet having autonomy is one of the most important factors in developing self-identity. Additionally students rarely have the opportunity in school to be involved in work which interests them. These students, however, chose their own topics as well as the competition category and type of project they would develop and produce. Consequently they "owned" their projects. For the students from School B, all Asian-Americans, the interest in their topic--freedom and democracy for China--was especially strong. Lanie explained why it was important for students to have interest and choice in their work:

> I think that's an important thing--being interested in the subject. . . . The themes that they [NHD] have are really broad enough to take one part out and explore it . . . there's always going to be something that you're interested in. . . . John asked me the other day why he's more excited about this video than he was his last year's video. . . . I think it's because of the topic and because we all . . . care about it a lot. . . . It makes me really happy that we're doing something that you can participate in. . . . It's history that you're sharing with other people so it makes you feel good.

Steve's response indicated how involved this group's members became in their topic:

> I didn't pay attention to the events that happened in China. . . . I would see it on the news . . . but this project . . . brings me to a point that [he hesitated and Lanie asked if he were going to cry]--no, no. I'm just trying to find words to say. We can probably relate to these people because . . . they're Chinese and they're suffering and it's happening now.

Even Helen, the quietest member of the School B group had something to say about the importance of having interest in a subject: "I'm glad I'm doing the [NHD] competition this year because I especially like the topic and I don't think I would be involved in such an in-depth project otherwise." And Jim (School A) spoke for the others when he defined the motivating power of having an interest in something:

> History Fair really lets the student get involved with history simply because they get to pick their own topic to research--something that they are initially interested in. . . . That way they can learn more about it.

<u>Opportunity to be Creative</u>

For Linda (School A), Judy (School A) and Steve (School B), having control over their work and therefore the

opportunity to be creative was a motivating factor. Linda credited participating in NHD with changing her from "concrete cement" to a creative person. For Judy, involvement in NHD provided another opportunity to learn abut herself because she got to pursue her imagination and creativity. And Steve agreed that NHD "[made] you . . . be more creative."

Opportunity for Active Involvement in History

Although NHD is a history program, only three of the students thought of that as a motivating factor. And for them it wasn't so much that it was a history program, but that it presented an opportunity to learn history in a way not available in the traditional classroom. While Terri (School C), Jim (School A), and Adam (School C) explained that NHD allowed them to become actively involved in history, that was not the prime motivator for any of them including Adam who was without doubt the historian among the students: "I go back into historical times. I go back to the time of the Civil War or I go back to the time of the Revolutionary War. . . . I think of what the men . . . and women felt . . . it's great. . . . I love it. I love history." As much as Adam loved to interact with history, even his strongest motivation for participating in NHD was having fun and meeting other teenagers.

For all of the students, it was a combination of at least two of these factors which motivated them to

participate in NHD. Since these comments were not responses to direct questions, but rather were imbedded in the students' descriptions of past or present experiences in NHD and/or of the meaning of participation to them, these responses may not reflect all of the motivating factors for all of the students.

In general, on the surface, these students participated in NHD not because it was a history program, but because participating fulfilled adolescent needs that were not being addressed in the classroom. However, all of the students discovered and developed new dimensions to their identities (an adolescent need) not only through the competition activities, but coincidentally through researching their topics. This was especially so for the School B, Asian-American students who studied rights in China. They achieved an emerging awareness of their heritage, a new view of themselves in relation to others, and a closer connection to their parents and grandparents, which suggests that this kind of active study of history, especially when the topic is personally relevant, can help adolescents discover who they are and thus fulfill one of their most conspicuous needs.

Cognitive, Skill, and Affective Results

One of the factors that motivated the teachers in this study to continue participating in NHD was their perception that students learned transferable skills and comprehended

historical concepts and material through NHD as well as or better than they did in the traditional classroom setting. While the students did not discuss learning results as motivating factors, when I asked them specifically about what they learned by participating in NHD, there was no shortage of answers. The students perceived that in addition to learning and comprehending historical content, they learned group work, time management, research, communication, and technical skills. They also spoke of gaining confidence, self-pride, and self-esteem.

Content/Comprehension

It would be difficult after seeing what these students created and developed and after hearing them describe what they did this year and had done in the past in NHD not to believe that they had acquired a command of the historical content and comprehension in relation to their topics as well as a command of historiographic method. For Judy (School A) it was learning that did not happen when you were "just sitting in a class." To John (School B) it was almost a surprise that he learned; he hadn't set out to do that. He and his partners "were trying to have fun, but . . . ended up learning." Helen (School B) described her work as interdisciplinary learning. Last year, when her subject was nautical archeology, her "learning was part history, part media, part science." This year with the Tiananmen Square project, she described her work as part history, part

political science, and part media. Terri (School C) described how involvement in NHD affected her understanding about veterans' rights and in doing so spoke for the others as to the importance of this kind of in-depth work:

> I've learned a lot and I now understand a lot more . . . and it's touched me. . . . I always heard my father . . . his brother and my grandfather talking about being a veteran and about things that were denied to them . . . and things they had to fight for, but now I really understand what they were saying.

And Jim (School A) described how intricate the analysis in his group became:

> We had to define the conflict . . . who has the right to these remains? . . . There's . . . Indians, anthropologists, historians, archaeologists, government, scientists--a whole group of people with different ideas, with different views.

All of the students expressed a deeper awareness of issues involved in whatever topic they were researching. For the group from School B who studied rights in China, this learning was so intent that three of the members, Helen, Lanie, and Lian, planned to become involved in China's fight for democracy and freedom. If the goals of the teaching of history, and in fact of education in general, are to develop in students the ability to think and the desire and ability to reflect and act on those thoughts as responsible citizens, then these goals were met at School B with these students. This kind of awareness and commitment could and would not have occurred in a traditional course which might have touched upon the subject

of Tiananmen Square or rights in China for one class period or less.

What is equally, if not more, important is that the students described an understanding of a method of discovering and developing knowledge through research which included not only searching for and obtaining data in several different ways but looking at issues from different perspectives (i.e. critical thinking). According to White from School B, this kind of learning served the students better than if they simply sat and absorbed the data delivered by a teacher, and she argued that this was what the teaching and learning of history should be about. However, teachers Bender and Watson (from Schools A and C respectively), while agreeing that their students' knowledge of their NHD topics was superior and in-depth, argued that all students needed to learn more material in a history course than could be achieved through one NHD project.

Skills

Group Work/Time Management. All of the students claimed that they learned group skills and discovered the benefits and enjoyment of group work while working either in their own group or in the larger school NHD group. Linda (School A) considered this the most important skill she learned. Although working on her own this year, she had been involved in group work previously in NHD. While she decided it took more time working in a group because members

"horsed around" and "had conflicts," she concluded that group work was more fun and that she would rather "have conflicts . . . and have them with . . . friends than not have any conflicts and be bored all the time."

Within the context of group work, the students emphasized they had learned responsibility, cooperation, team work, sensitivity, and patience. Amosh (School A) discovered that there were some things "you [couldn't] expect everybody to do so you [had] to take the responsibility on yourself." Judy (School A) "learned cooperation from being in the group." "The most important thing" Ed (School A) learned "was team work." Helen (School B) believed there were "better results working in a group." Jim recognized the need to consider others: "You're not the only one doing this. You're working with a group and you have . . . to know their time schedules and work around them so it helps you to be not self-centered." Steve (School B) learned that it took sensitivity, understanding, tolerance and compromise to work as a team. He claimed that he "learned how to deal with people" through NHD. Lanie (School B) described how she became more patient:

> When people in the group wanted me to do something, in the beginning, I was . . . really frustrated . . . [but] I learned to be patient and it turned out right in the long run. . . . I guess [I learned] team work. . . . We all . . . communicated.

The students also talked about belonging to and enjoying the camaraderie of a group and learning time

management skills. Adam (School C) described how working with a partner this year made things easier and made him more open to group work:

> I was skeptical at the beginning of the year when I knew I would be working with somebody else. . . . I was like, "Oh, man." . . . Usually in the past, when I worked with a group, it was . . . me doing all the work, the whole thing, but . . . [Terri and I] worked so well and it opened my mind to that. . . . In the future, I think I'll be able to work well with people. . . . I learned the skill of working . . . other people.

And Terri (School C) described the advantages to working with the larger school NHD group:

> There were points when . . . Adam and I couldn't really do anything . . . we were waiting for pictures to come back . . . so . . . we'd help Rana . . . we did the menial jobs--"Here you put rubber cement on this and stick it to the board." We all helped out each other a lot . . . we are a good group. We all get along well. We've all grown up together. . . . We're all much better friends now.

For Judy (School A) working in NHD was not necessarily easy but was a way to learn self-discipline and time management skills. Judy described the conflicts involved:

> I learned . . . time management. . . . I had to work around myself to fit in with the group . . . after school. When we got out of school early, they'd call a meeting so we could meet Ms. Bender . . . instead of being with my friends, I had to be here working with them. . . . You really don't think it will be that hard until you have to make a decision of which one you want to go to and what's the most important.

All these descriptions suggest that the students' experiences of working in an NHD group for 9 months defined cooperative learning in it's most productive form and that

perhaps NHD could be a model for other cooperative learning ventures.

Research/Communication Skills. Half of the students discussed improvement in their research skills. Ed (School A) found research for NHD to be different from previous research he had done:

> I used encyclopedias on every report [before in school] and that's about it, but . . . with History Fair I used magazines, periodicals, and interviews and . . . without that [researching] you couldn't have a good project.

Helen (School B) learned how to contact experts when researching a previous NHD topic:

> I learned [about] sending out letters to people . . . it was a lot of work. . . . I had to write to this . . . Dr. Bass in Texas. . . . He's a really famous nautical archeologist. I learned a lot about how to put together a research project.

Adam (School C) was the most thorough in his description of research:

> The research is the most valuable thing of the whole project because you learn how to be an historian . . . to research and to research and research . . . to just keep reading and learning. . . . I figure that if you work on a History Day project, you're more informed than a person doing something on veteran's rights on a term paper because they have [only] so much time to do it. We get a lot more time and do a lot more research . . . at the end of this whole competition we know so much more than that person who did the term paper, a lot more and we know more people now because of doing interviews, looking at pictures, writing to . . . various record companies or various veterans' organizations. . . . You become well informed after awhile. . . . You know your topic very well . . . you almost become--I wouldn't want to say expert--but you become very proficient at what you're doing.

> In the libraries, there are books that tell us about the past but we felt that getting first hand accounts of [veterans] who were there, who fought the battles . . . was the most important thing in this whole project. . . . We had an interview with Josiah Adams, who was very bitter . . . rest his soul. He's now dead, but he was very helpful in terms of the interview because we got to see his outlook.

For Linda, Amosh, and Ed, learning communication skills went hand in hand with learning research skills. Linda (School A) gained confidence in talking on the phone; Amosh (School A) became better at interacting with people; Ed (School A) discovered how "you [could] make a difference" by calling "a government official." And Terri (School C) found that having to communicate with the judges helped her "communication skills a lot." It appeared from the students' remarks that the research and communication skills they had developed had already been transferred.

Technical Skills. Twelve of the students were working with media productions; some had prior experience with the equipment. For Ed, Judy and Adam, however, it was their first experience. Ed (School A) didn't even "know what a dissolve unit was" when his group began their research. He became proficient at using one and planned to teach others. Judy (School A) first had to learn how to put the lens in the projector and that sparked her interest in learning more about media equipment and use. Adam (School C) was thrilled that he had learned "how to do everything--how to mix

things, how to work with the audio and the sound mixers, and how to set up a slide projector with the music."

Affective Results

Perceived affective results included feelings of self-pride and self-esteem and a gain in self-confidence. Terri's (School C) comments about pride echoed those of the others:

> The other day I spent a lot of time down here working on the script . . . and . . . yesterday I just sat down and for about 10 minutes, I just stared and completely blanked out. I could not figure out what I was going to do. I kept looking through information--all our pamphlets and everything and . . . even when you just put in that next phrase, that next paragraph, it seems rewarding . . . it's not just a grade that we're working for, it's self-recognition and . . . being part of ourselves. . . . We're proud of what we did and proud of where we got.

Jim (School A) talked about his gain in self-confidence:

> When I first started doing media, I had a hard time . . . speaking, even though I was not speaking to anyone . . . on the tape. . . . I guess [I've learned] . . . public speaking in from of anyone and I learned . . . how to . . . express what I say an not to be so timid or shrink up on the tape.
>
> I was shy when I first started interviewing people. . . . [but now] I like calling all these different institutions and people around the world. . . . They're really big and just that you have the courage to call them and tell them what you're doing, it's really different.

Linda (School A) discovered she "could hold up to pressures" and that she could do "History Fair and still keep up with . . . other class work." Lian (School B) gained new confidence in herself and in China. And Adam spoke for the

others when he declared that knowing that he could do History Day, gave him the confidence that he would succeed in college: "I felt that I could do the [NHD] work. . . . I did it and [now] I know I can do . . . work in college and I feel that I have what it takes to become a good student in my further studies."

If having confidence in one's self is instrumental in a person succeeding at a task, then these students should be able to succeed in their college work or other pursuits. Would they have gained this confidence without participation in NHD? There is no way of answering that; however, all of the teachers submitted that many former NHD students had returned to the high school to tell them that it was NHD and only NHD that had prepared them for college. In the last section of this chapter, former students confirm that for them NHD was a major factor in their success after high school.

Compared to Learning in Traditional Classes

It was without prompting that 9 of the 13 students launched into discussions about how the learning effects from NHD were different from and more substantial than those in traditional classroom settings. Linda (School A) claimed it was through condensing and synthesizing the research for her NHD projects, not through work in her English classes, that she had learned to write. Amosh (School A) found that

NHD provided a way not only to learn skills, but to apply skills he learned in other classes:

> You . . . learn a lot of things. Each one of us will learn by the end of this History Fair . . . to do anything. . . . I would have to say that History Fair . . . is . . . probably the most involved thing for me. . . . [It gives you] application skills. . . . It . . . gives you a chance to apply what you've learned in other classes . . . you can apply your English skills to this. . . . There's . . . math involved . . . in the media. . . . Through band you just learn . . . what kind of music you need, where you need it, how to tone it down, and where to bring it in.

Jim (School A) argued that he had learned a lot more about doing research through NHD than "any English class could ever teach." Judy (School A) discovered that through NHD "you learn a tremendous amount of stuff that you wouldn't learn just sitting in a class . . . because you're active, more active. Jake (School C) confirmed Judy's perceptions and considered NHD to be "a lot more involved than most of the stuff at school":

> Most of the stuff at school is just day to day. . . . In school . . . I'll just sit there. I'll do my work and I'll half listen but I never knew I could . . . come up with this [topic and project] and actually learn something with it.

Ed (School A) claimed that he learned a lot through NHD that he "could've learned somewhere else, but . . . didn't." Steve, John, and Adam commented on the teamwork they had learned through NHD; they submitted that that wouldn't have happened and didn't happen in regular classes. Steve (School B) confirmed that in NHD the teamwork was different from group work in traditional classes:

> Going back to what John said, we learned what teamwork can do . . . in school, it's more on an individual basis. . . . There are some classes where you do work together, but this is like we really did work together . . . we had to understand each other, compromise . . . it just gave us the sense of what a real team was about.

And Adam (School C) claimed that without NHD he would not have had the opportunity to work with someone else on a project:

> If it weren't for History Day, I wouldn't have been able to work with Terri and we wouldn't have been able to accomplish something as great as our project here. . . . I would have been working by myself again. That's not good. You have to be exposed to all sides, working with people . . . and the team work. Working with Terri was very important . . . if it weren't for History Day I wouldn't have been able to do that.

While there was no shortage of responses once the students were asked about learning results, it is interesting that the students initiated very little discussion about learning without this prompt. My interpretation is that, like for most adolescents, learning for these students was not a primary need. The previously mentioned motivating factors and needs are much more important to developing adolescents. Perhaps there is a message here for educators that before adolescents will become emersed in academics their developing needs have to be addressed. Regardless of why the students did not initiate comments about learning results, one would have to conclude that their responses about learning confirmed the teachers' perceptions and claims and indicated that the

students' gains (through participation in NHD) in cognitive, skill, and affective areas were substantial and greater than could or would have been accomplished in a traditional classroom setting.

Effects and Issues of Competition

This section presents the students' thoughts about and reactions to competition and three associated effects--losing, worrying, and winning. It should come as no surprise that these students--who chose to participate in a competition--liked competition. Why they liked competition or what value they found in competition was initially not so clear. After the students had introduced the subject of competition often during the interviews, I asked them how they would respond to educators who claimed that competition was or could be harmful to students. The reader needs to keep in mind that in the following excerpts the students were responding to hypothetical educators who claimed competition was harmful; they were not responding to each other's answers. In this next part, concerning competition in general, I have separated the students by school because I found subtle differences in the responses.

School A

Linda distinguished between a positive and negative competitive spirit and between the competition in school and the NHD competition:

> Too much competition is bad . . . some of us . . . compete in everything we say and do, every grade we get, we're competing against each other and that's bad. We take it past the limit and there have been friendship breakups . . . because of competition. But at my regional [competition] . . . I didn't have any competition . . . and that . . . made me less motivated. . . . Competition is what keeps . . . kids motivated--keeps them working towards some goal. You need competition to see where you are going, to see what you have done so you can see if you can do something better. My favorite part of History Fair . . . is . . . the competition, competing to see how far you can get and seeing how well you can do.

Similarly, Ed compared individualistic competition in school to the competition in NHD and argued that competition was a strong motivator:

> Without competition I would not apply myself near as much as I do on this project. . . . There's always competition . . . even in some regular things at school you have competition for your grade. You want an A and there is competition for GPA . . . but at History Fair, . . . you've worked hard . . . and it makes you want to see who is the best. . . . Without competition, I don't think there would be as much work put into the projects.

Amosh admitted that wanting to be the best was important to him, but also submitted that competition was a motivator for everyone:

> It's human nature to have an ego. . . . So you . . . want to prove yourself and that you're better than other people. You don't want to be . . . mean about it. . . . You prove what you've done so far and how you can work as a team and how important this is to you. . . . Educators [may] think that competition is not good for . . . students, . . . [but] I don't think that the dedication or the hard work or even the motivation will . . . exist for students to . . . begin to compile a project like this.

> Too much competition is bad . . . some of us . . . compete in everything we say and do, every grade we get, we're competing against each other and that's bad. We take it past the limit and there have been friendship breakups . . . because of competition. But at my regional [competition] . . . I didn't have any competition . . . and that . . . made me less motivated. . . . Competition is what keeps . . . kids motivated--keeps them working towards some goal. You need competition to see where you are going, to see what you have done so you can see if you can do something better. My favorite part of History Fair . . . is . . . the competition, competing to see how far you can get and seeing how well you can do.

Similarly, Ed compared individualistic competition in school to the competition in NHD and argued that competition was a strong motivator:

> Without competition I would not apply myself near as much as I do on this project. . . . There's always competition . . . even in some regular things at school you have competition for your grade. You want an A and there is competition for GPA . . . but at History Fair, . . . you've worked hard . . . and it makes you want to see who is the best. . . . Without competition, I don't think there would be as much work put into the projects.

Amosh admitted that wanting to be the best was important to him, but also submitted that competition was a motivator for everyone:

> It's human nature to have an ego. . . . So you . . . want to prove yourself and that you're better than other people. You don't want to be . . . mean about it. . . . You prove what you've done so far and how you can work as a team and how important this is to you. . . . Educators [may] think that competition is not good for . . . students, . . . [but] I don't think that the dedication or the hard work or even the motivation will . . . exist for students to . . . begin to compile a project like this.

Jim suggested that without competition a person would not know his/her potential and that students could, would, and did learn from losing:

> I can see how competition can sometimes . . . be hard if you lose . . . [but] I think you have to take that as a learning experience as everything else and build upon it and learn from your mistakes. . . . I think competition is good because . . . it is a motive for doing something and . . . once you do it, you can . . . see in yourself that you could do it. . . . If you weren't motivated in the first place, you might not even put forth the effort.

And Judy agreed with the other School A students that competition was a necessary motivator:

> You're not going to put forth enough effort if there's not reward or competition behind it. . . . Even if there's not a reward, . . . just the fact of knowing you're better than somebody . . . is going to give your ego a boost.

The School A students were well schooled in competition experiences. As explained in Chapter V, School A sponsored competitions in almost every discipline. These particular students not only found value in competition and used it to measure and define themselves in relation to others but reflected an ability to put winning and losing and even participating in competition in perspective. These responses suggest that there has been on-going instruction at the school or at home in how to handle, and in the meaning of, competition. Their responses did not support Bender's (their teacher) fear that NHD competition "honed the killer instinct."

School B

Jessie's experience with auditioning for acting jobs had convinced her that competition was not harmful:

> It's not at all [harmful]. Because of . . . auditioning all the time, I'm always getting rejected. . . . I'm going to do my best, but if they don't like it, oh well. Competition is great. . . . It's something that you have a lot later on in life so you're going to have to live with it. . . . I think it's fun because it really pushes you to work harder and do your best and I think that's what counts, not the winning.

Lanie agreed with the motivating aspect of competition:

> [NHD] does a good job of using competition as an incentive. . . . I think it's the healthiest thing. . . . It think it's really fun and it's an incentive and it's a motivation . . . for the individual to work harder and work to the limit.

Steve suggested that the competition was the strength of the NHD program because it demanded higher self-expectation: "The strength of NHD [is that] it makes you be more competitive. It makes you want to work harder because you know that there are other people out there doing the same." The other students from School B had similar remarks about competition. While the students from School A seemed to use competition more as a measure of their ability, the School B students--especially Steve--stressed that not only did competition force a person to work harder but also was necessary to prepare a person to stay above, and not be beaten by, others.

School C

For Jake competition was not only a motivator, but a part of life in general:

> Competition is what makes everything better. I work at a supermarket. . . . Now that the Globe supermarket opened up in town . . . we have a competitor and we have to be better than they are and to be better than they are we have to strive for excellence. . . . It's the same way at school. . . . I'm going to try like heck for my project to be better than Josh's.

Terri too spoke of the existence and necessity of competition in everyday life:

> It's very, very important in everybody's lives. If there's nothing to compete . . . against . . . to do better than and to make . . . you excel, then . . . a lot of people just can't do it on their own. Basically our whole lives are competition.

Adam expressed the strongest conviction about the need for competition and its relation to personal development:

> Competition makes the individual. I believe that. If you're always constantly challenged, you're a lot better person . . . more well-rounded than the individual who never competes against anybody. . .. Competition is so important. If you're not challenged, you're really just the ordinary person on the street corner . . . the competition is what makes you. . . . I noticed . . . it encouraged me to practice [for band] more, to do better and at the same time learn more. . . . That's the biggest reward around--learning, at the same time competing . . . it makes you a better, more well-rounded person.

In general the School C students, as with students from School A and School B, claimed that competition made a person perform better. But for these three students (and for some of the School B students) there was more of an

emphasis on the need to learn how to compete in order to get anywhere in life. The tone for the School C students seemed most urgent and could have been a reflection of the harsher reality of their own and their families' everyday struggles and/or the emphasis put on competition by their teachers, parents, or peers. All of the above responses may be reflections of the way in which I posed the question. Had I simply asked for their beliefs about competition, the students' answers may have been different.

Losing

All of these students, except for Terri (School C) and Lian (School B) who had not participated previously, had lost at some level in an NHD competition. They argued that while losing might have made them angry or upset initially, it subsequently encouraged them to do better. Judy (School A) philosophized that while there would always be people in life "better than you at something . . . everybody [had] their strengths . . . and you [had] to know in yourself that you [were] better at . . . things than other people."

Losing in the eighth grade, while a shock, encouraged Jim (School A) to work harder and enabled him to make it to national competition the following year. Ed (School A), Amosh (School A), and Adam (School C) recalled feeling crushed and/or angry after losing in prior competition; they had decided not to enter the program again, but then had changed their minds. Amosh explained his turnabout:

> I think the first effect after you lose is, "OK, I'm never going to do this again; I'm never going to touch History Fair again," but then comes the next year and you hear all this type about "Rights in History" and blah, blah, blah and let's do it.

Losing two years earlier initially had caused Jake to have a temper tantrum but then had presented him with a challenge. He was determined to show he could do it:

> [Two years ago] I came in fourth . . . I missed it by two places. I was upset. I stomped around . . . for the next three days. I was very angry at first, very, very angry. I very rarely lose my temper . . . but I did that time. . . . I wanted to kill somebody. . . . I wanted to come back and show them this year.

The students' reactions to losing supported the perceptions of the teachers that losing was motivating. However, the participants in this research, and it appears that former NHD students of these teachers, were mainly above average students. Lower ability students may not have the same reaction to losing; if losing is defeating rather than motivating to less able students, then it would be a reasonable assumption that the NHD competition (if in fact it is the higher ability students who consistently win in NHD) would systematically, though inadvertently, eliminate lower ability students and exist as a program for the intellectually elite students.

Anxiety/Worry/Tension

Kohn (1986), who deplores competition of any kind, claims that the anxiety and worry it causes is counter-productive to learning and performance. However, while some

of the students in this study worried more than others, most of the worrying did not seem excessive or detrimental to performance or learning (see Cognitive, Skill and Affective Results). For all of the students, the most intensive work and accompanying tension and anxiety occurred two weeks before a competition. The students questioned whether or not they could and would finish in time and whether or not the project would be good enough. The other time of distress was at the competition event. There, students worried about the actual judging and what the other competition was--in other words, what they were up against.

While most of the students expressed some anxiety, both before and at the competitions, Adam, Terri, and Jake (all from School C) seemed to have worried most. Terri's least favorite parts of NHD were "those times at 10 o'clock . . . in the library when everybody was yelling. . . . It got really frustrating. I think Adam was about ready to hit me a couple of times." Adam admitted he overdid the worrying:

> My least favorite part has been the worrying--worrying about how you want to get it done . . . the last two weeks in March . . . it's just been pure hell . . . what's been going on . . . it was very tense. . . . It's a lot of worry--when we are going to be able to do this? Is this going to happen? Can we get this done? How is this going to sound? What are the other projects going to be like? . . . It's a lot of worry and anticipation . . . it eats away at you. . . . I know that I worry a lot . . . but I think I overdid it this time. I worried too much . . . I had thoughts of . . . us not making it. . . . I'd come home late at night and . . . I'd keep worrying about the project. . . . I lost sleep. . . . Worrying was one of the main problems.

Jake expressed the most anxiety as he described waiting to be judged at the national competition: "You don't know what they're thinking . . . I thought I was going to choke somebody or kill somebody by the end of the day. . . . I was so nervous."

As I have explained elsewhere in this dissertation (see Chapter V and Chapter VII), the students and teachers from School C appeared to react more intensely to the competition aspect of NHD. Reactions to winning and losing were deeper, more emotional than for students and teachers at School A or School B. I suspect the School C participants had more to prove to, and about, themselves particularly in relation to, or because of, the perceived negative reputation of their school. While participation in NHD seemed to lift the School C students and teachers out of their gloomy school ethos into the more acceptable, positive, "winning" culture of NHD, the students and teachers from School A and School B had the advantage of already being in a desirable school culture.

Winning

Kohn (1986) argues that not only does competition increase anxiety, but that winning also leads to feeling anxious and guilty (at winning at the expense of another) and threatens relationships. For the most part these students' reactions did not support his theory. However, the incident described in Chapter V concerning the School C

district competition did favor Kohn's theory. When Jake placed first in his category, another contestant became upset and accused Jake of having more help with his project. Jake nervously described his reaction to the incident:

> I was fairly upset afterwards at the groups' reaction. . . . Nobody would talk afterwards to me and I didn't have any help putting my boards away. . . . Everybody kind of left and I was quite peeved. I was mad.

Jake was so upset with the situation that he damaged part of a wall at work that night:

> I still have to pay for the damage at work. . . . I went into work [after the competition] and I . . . tipped over a [unclear] and cracked a wall. . . . It just kind of got to me right there. It was like all the stress had built up--a momentary lapse of reason. I'm still annoyed I had a momentary lapse of reason there.

Was Jake's reaction, as Kohn would suggest, a response to his feeling guilty over winning, or was it a result of the accumulated pressure of the project work? Did it have more to do with the other student's immaturity or was it connected to the loss of support from other students? His reaction was probably a combination of all of these factors plus one other. As discussed in the following section of this chapter, Jake's teachers had given him a considerable amount of help with his project. I suspect Jake felt embarrassed by, rather than guilty for, having received the help.

Aside from this one incident, which Jake's teachers claimed was an anomaly, all of the student's verbal

reactions to winning were upbeat. Even Jake, as did the students from School B, described winning as being exciting and as "a rush." Helen from School B did express feeling anxious after winning at her district competition, but it was not anxiety caused by winning, but anxiety induced by thinking about the next competition. Judy, Ed, and Linda from School A expressed feelings which reflected those of the other students. Here the three students describe the award ceremony at the state competition in May. Judy recalled how the excitement mounted:

> The award ceremony was funny because we, [laughed] honest, we didn't think we got first. I figured we'd place but we didn't think we had enough to go to Washington. . . . When they called out third and it was this really good project that we thought was going to beat us . . . Jim just let out this big scream. It was indescribable . . . we're like . . . "OK!"

Ed relayed the vision of excitement and togetherness at the ceremony:

> The entire time when they called group media, we . . . held hands . . . we were all sitting there in our seats going AHHH--really scared . . . then they said our names and we all jumped up in the air.

And for Linda, it was simply disbelief that she had won:

> I thought . . . I hadn't made it. . . . I knew that I was up against one person . . . who had made first at nationals last year, so I was really scared. . . . I didn't think that I would make first or second. I thought maybe third. . . . People kept telling me, you've got to go to the awards . . . and then when they were calling people--fourth, third, second . . . then I knew, but I really couldn't accept it until I heard my name.

All of the students testified that it was the competition that drove them. They all submitted that they probably would not have participated in NHD if the format had been one of a history fair in which students simply earned certificates marked excellent or superior. I have no way of knowing whether the students' strong beliefs about the benefits of competition came from their families and/or school systems, whether in fact the students came to these conclusions on their own through NHD participation and other competitive activities, or whether my initial question about educators believing competition to be harmful put them on the defensive. Their comments about competition, however, did complement, clarify, and support remarks about other aspects of the program. In particular, their responses reflected the fact that wanting to win was not the primary motivation for the students' participation in NHD and that the students distinguished between wanting to win as an aspect of competition and wanting to be part of the excitement and fun of competition (see Motivating Factors).

Student Authorship/Cost

One of the findings in Puckett's study of Foxfire was that the students involved in the program had not always authored the published articles or that Wigginton or his staff had given substantial editing or writing assistance. There have been similar accusations and complaints about the authorship of the students' work in NHD. These complaints

have come from students who did not win, parents, teachers, and state coordinators (including Tanner from State B). This study did find a difference in the kind and amount of parental and teacher help these students received. Whether that help was beyond the parameters of the program's guidelines is another issue. The NHD Contest Guide (NHD, 1986) requires:

> The final product that students submit for judging must be their own work. Adults may be asked to read written materials or to evaluate a project, performance, or media presentation. . . . Students may try out ideas on parents, teachers, and friends and may ask them for help in locating information, too. . . . Students, however, are responsible for all aspects of the development of their entries. Many written resources are also available that can help a student with the technical problems presented by the categories: for example, model building, exhibit design, set design, script writing, slide preparation, use of media, etcetera (p. 3).
>
> Students should also investigate local libraries, museums, and historical organizations for resources. Librarians, media center directors, museum personnel, teachers in the arts, arts specialists, and community people in appropriate fields are only a sampling of the human resources beyond the individual classroom waiting to be tapped. (p. 3).

Authorship: Parental Assistance

At School A, parents helped the students by giving emotional support, giving suggestions, reviewing scripts, typing papers, making phone calls, getting information,and driving the students to research sites. Ed recalled that his mother had assisted with every project since he had been in the sixth grade. Her help involved typing and giving

suggestions. For Amosh, parental help was of a verbal, supportive nature such as: "You can do this." Jim's mother got so involved this year that she took time off work and drove him and the others to resource centers. Jim credited his mother with teaching him how to do research in the sixth grade and since then with typing for him and actually doing some of his research if he "got stuck." Linda had received money in the past from her parents for supplies and recording equipment; this year (1990/91) her mother revised her "script hundreds of times" and delivered film and retrieved slides. These mothers had started helping their children with NHD in the sixth grade and it seemed to have been a natural kind of continued involvement.

At School B White had heard that others thought her school was cheating. She took this to mean that they, whoever "they" were, thought parents were doing the work. The School B students' comments did not substantiate this. At least for the students in this study, there was very little parental involvement beyond giving emotional support and having resources in their homes. In fact the students from School B seemed to have had the least extra help of any of the students in this study.

Jessie's mother was involved only to the extent that she drove Jessie back and forth to rehearsals. The involvement of the other parents was similarly small. For Lanie, her mother's emotional support was important.

Helen's parents were "very much for the cause" (freedom in China) and provided resources and some footage for the group's project. Lian's parents expressed concern because of the sensitive political nature of the group's project but did not interfere with the work. For Steve and John, there was no parental involvement. John's parents thought he "was still in the competition from last year."

Terri and Adam from School C received little parental help. Terri did obtain some pamphlets and contacts from her father who was connected to the VFW. Adam, an extremely self-sufficient and independent person, proudly declared: "My parents were not involved in any way. . . . They'd encourage but . . . they knew that I could take care of myself." Jake, however, did have more substantial assistance from family members:

> My Dad was a pretty good source of information. He helped me find the stuff in the church library. My mother got me in contact with several people from the . . . Historical Commission. . . . Other people in my family got involved. My uncle . . . helped me with the computer . . . that's his job--he works in computer maintenance and he . . . got me into . . . News Bank and Phone Bank . . . Copy Serve and all of that. . . . I think my Dad was the biggest help.

Authorship: Teacher Assistance

The kind and amount of aid from teachers also varied depending on the student or students and the complexity of the problem. In most cases, the help was in the form of resources, critique, advice, suggestion, direction, encouragement, support, coaching for the competition, and

editing written segments. Bender from School A spent a great deal of time with students after school either editing scripts or assisting with the telephone interviews. She became most involved with editing Linda's script after judges at the regional competition had complained about "offensive words." The students at School B had support and help from the teacher White as well as from the AV instructor, Dave Baker. However, these students were very clear in their own minds about what they wanted to do in their presentation and didn't necessarily follow White's or Baker's suggestions.

The School C students completed most of their work within the school building because, according to the teachers, they (the students) had so many outside responsibilities. Jake was working 40 hours a week in addition to going to school full time, participating in the school band, and participating in NHD. Both Martin and Watson were extra sensitive to the students' needs and worked collaboratively with them on their NHD projects. Jake received the most teacher assistance at School C. Perhaps this was because he was an individual entrant and had no partner(s) with whom to share the work. On the other hand, this assistance may have been a reflection of greater pedagogical need or the difficulty level of his project. His use of the pronoun "we" is indicative of the partnership

he felt with, or of the dependence he felt on, Martin. His description is self-explanatory:

> [Ms. Martin] helped me come up with the idea. She helped me fix stuff that looked silly. We'd sit there and . . . she helped me learn the history behind it . . . I was learning it myself, but she . . . grilled me on the questions. "Do you know this, do you know this, do you know this?" Yes, yes, no (laughed). . . she helped me with that.
>
> She helped me come up with the idea for the paint. . . . We went over my two page paper and . . . my first one was ripped apart pretty well. We sat down . . . and worked on that and it came together.

Since no two students require the same amount of attention and help from a teacher, it would be impossible, without knowing the pedagogical needs of these students, to determine if Martin's and Watson's help to Jake was excessive. However, Martin did give some assistance that seemed unnecessary. Jake explained that because he was running out of time before a competition he asked Martin to glue some of his materials onto his boards. For all practical purposes, this had no effect on the final product:

> It was about one or two weeks before. . . . We had a band trip and . . . I had given Ms. Martin the blueprints and the pictures [for the boards] . . . she started to paste stuff down for me because I was going to be away from a Tuesday to a Saturday in Florida with the band. . . . [When] I came back . . . the left board was done. . . I came in that week, the week before History Day . . . and I pasted down the rest.

Terri's (School C) comments, however, reflected those of most of the other students and described the independence that characterized most of the students' work:

> They more or less gave us advice. . . . We did have some things that they didn't agree with that we wanted so. . . . We kept them in anyway . . . we really had a fight with one of the quotes we wanted to leave in and they wanted to take out. . . . I read it anyway.

Authorship: Assistance with Media

All of the students involved in media presentations received at least some assistance from adults and/or professionals. This was an area of the NHD competition that seemed to engender a fair amount of confusion among participants and judges. Up to the time of this study, as consistent with policy, students in NHD had been allowed to purchase or have someone else create slides for a presentation as long as the work was given appropriate credit. However, the rules for video and sound taping were not as clear. Because the requirements were obscure, while the amount and kind of assistance received by these students varied with the students and the type of equipment and project, it is unclear whether or not this assistance would be considered excessive or even cheating.

Jim's (School A) group used the sound system at his church. There, a person helped with the taping and monitors. Somewhat defensively Jim explained: "It's not like we're going to a professional studio and paying someone $200 to tape this. I know some groups that do that in our district." John (School B) explained that how much help he and his group received with the equipment, differed depending on the year and their expertise:

> In comparison to last year's video project that Steve and I worked on I think that we did a lot more ourselves this time. . . . last year, it was our first year so we didn't know what to do, but this year, we did . . . most of the editing and everything. We put everything together--all the sound track--we did all of the editing. There are some sequences where we asked Mr. Baker to help us out because of the tricky translation . . . we had audio, video, and fade in and fade out and titles at the same time . . other than that we did everything ourselves.

And Adam and Terri (School C) received help from a professional TV station after judges had complained about their audio/tape at the state competition.

Whether or not these students received too much assistance from parents, teachers, and/or technical persons is difficult to determine. Whether the amount or kind of assistance was different from what other students in the program received is unknown. The teachers perceived themselves to be diligent about and insistent upon the students' doing their own work. What help they did provide, they saw as the kind of assistance a teacher would give any student who needed it. What is more important is that the students had similar perceptions and believed what they had accomplished was a result of their hard work and commitment to a project. Another perspective on this issue of student authorship/adult involvement was presented by a parent who wrote of her experiences:

> I appreciate . . . the quality time the preparation for History Day has given me with my children. We have traveled together going to libraries, visiting historical places and landmarks, and meeting fascinating people. . . . I

> would like to share what I have learned. I now know what are primary and secondary sources. I have realized that a historian must have the investigative skills of a detective. I have discovered the many different kinds of libraries that are available for research. . . . I have always been interested in history, but now it has become exciting for me. (Letter from parent, 1989).

Additionally, as Greene, the state coordinator from State C, would say, "If a parent or teacher gets involved with the production, then the kids get involved." A problem exists when the adults get involved beyond giving the students necessary help to the point of actually doing the work, and that kind of over-help can be easily detected by judges.

Cost

Another frequent complaint about the NHD program has been that students spend inordinate amounts of money on their projects/presentations. While these students did spend money, the amounts in this study were not excessive for the categories in which the students were working. the slide presentations and the table-top display which featured enlarged photos were the most expensive projects. In School A students paid for their own materials and developing, however the school provided photography equipment--camera, projector, dissolve unit, and sound mixer--and the conference telephone. In School B the students would normally have had to pay for their own materials, but this year White received a $1000 grant for the students' expenses. The school provided the video equipment. The

School C District paid for everything--materials, paper, boards, photos--and provided the equipment. The teachers explained that without this financial support the School C students would have been unable to participate. Jim (School A) guessed that his group had spent about $100 on slides. Linda's (School A) estimate for her individual slide/tape presentation was about $200. John's group from School B spent "exactly $17.11." They "bought a CD for the sound track." Jessie didn't spend anything. Terri and Adam from School C spent about $150, and Jake (School C) estimated his table top project cost the school about $200.

While the issue of authorship is very subjective and involves several variables including student ability, teacher assessment of student need, type of project, and technical expertise of students, it is much easier to determine the average cost of a typical project in any category. The cost of the same kinds of projects in these three schools was comparable and not out of line with what it would cost anyone to develop similar projects. Lack of money did not seem to be a problem for anyone wanting to participate in NHD. If a student had trouble with funds, the teacher found a way to compensate.

Unresolved Issues

The students had two major complaints about NHD. The first was identical to that of the teachers and involved the quality of the judging. The second involved finding the

personal values and opinions interfere with objectivity at the expense of the student(s) being judged:

> You're supposed to be questioned by the judges for maybe 5 or 10 minutes. . . . They're supposed to ask you questions about how you researched your project, what interviews helped you, how you did your slides . . . how it relates to the theme. . . . I think after 30 minutes . . . of having the judges talk to me after my presentation, they asked me one question at the very end. . . . I think the first word out of the judge's mouth . . . was a good comment. . . "I liked your sense of humor and the political cartoons. It made a hard subject a lot easier to handle." Then the second thing . . . from a judge was, "This is my opinion . . . the other judges may not follow, but I'm going to say it now . . . you were too biased. . . . I do not like the . . . slides you're using . . . [they] completely offended me." . . . From then on we talked about how I offended them, how I was biased, how I . . . showed some slides I shouldn't have shown.
>
> All they did was talk to me. . . . I wouldn't use the word talk--criticize. . . . It seemed like there was really only one slide that really got to them and it was a poem, "City to a Young Girl". . . . It . . . describes a 15 year old girl . . . being treated like a sex object by street men . . . it talks about, "The city as a hundred suckling pigs," and it goes on and uses the word "ass" and . . . uses "titty" but . . . that's the language in it . . . that's the worst language but it describes how she felt she was treated. . . . There's really nothing bad. My Mom's read it and she can't see anything bad about it. . . . [The poem has] been banned. I knew . . . it was controversial, but I didn't know it would cause so much trouble . . . it really offended them. [His suggestion was] "Take it out, remove all . . . those pictures." . . . I had . . . only three controversial slides . . . two of the slides I've talked about . . . the third one was . . . just a title, "Sex in a Can" . . . the title had to do with what I was talking about in my script.
>
> I was on the verge of just breaking down and when I left the room, I did start crying. . . . I can take other criticism, I can have them telling me my project was awful, but they said my project was

> good. They said, "You have a very good project, it's well researched . . . but you offended us." . . . One lady . . . implied . . . she didn't say it directly, but she said . . . you chose this topic . . . so that you could research the dirty words . . . she said that in another way, but she said that and . . . I couldn't handle that because . . . I didn't go into any books to find that stuff . . . I was centering around court cases. . . . If I wanted dirty words all I had to do was go in the hallways of my school or . . . go in the street.
>
> The next day my Mom went to the award ceremony . . . and my Mom said, "I think what you should do is get the critiques, put them at the very end of the presentation and say, 'Censorship is still alive . . . this has been censored by the regional judges.'
>
> At district [competition] . . . they [had] said, "[Using those slides] is necessary to prove your point; it's what makes your project strong." One of the judges [at regional competition] said, "I was almost . . . convinced of your opinion through your presentation . . . but I was completely stopped dead in my tracks when I saw the one slide . . . no . . . that cannot be viewed. Students can't be exposed to that type of language." My opinion is not that students should be exposed to extremely vulgar language . . . [but that] you should be exposed to controversial ideas.

Even though Linda placed first at the regional contest, for several days following the episode she did not know whether she would continue in the competition. Her dilemma was whether to stand firm on her convictions that the words in question were necessary to her analysis or whether to allow her presentation to be censored. The point here is that the judges were insensitive to Linda and could have dealt with this issue in a less damaging way. As difficult as this episode was for Linda, she came to feel that it was the most important thing that happened to her during

participation in NHD. According to her, it revealed her strength and after the initial shock wore off, left her with greater motivation to continue than she had had before.

For the students from School B, the main complaint concerned the lack of time judges spent with the students. Steve spoke about his previous experience in NHD:

> We go to Washington . . . we spend . . . 4 or 5 days there. We only spend 10 minutes of our time . . . to show the video . . . 5 minutes questioning. . . . I would just like to see more time involved . . . between the judges and the participants . . . to get . . . more understanding of why they [the students] did it. . . . I think the judges asked us, last year, two or three questions. . . . They were trying to rush the projects along.

Helen recalled feeling that the judges at a state competition the previous year had not questioned her enough to be able to come to conclusions:

> They asked me a lot about how I made the video and basically it was just . . . one long question. . . . They asked me a few more about . . . where I got the information . . . it was kind of hasty I think to make a decision.

Lanie, remembering a prior experience also, talked about the lack of time with the national judges and also recollected that things in Washington were disorganized: "They didn't have our names. They didn't know that we were going to be there and we had registered and everything. The judges weren't really expecting us. . . . It was like . . . just go ahead and do it." For the last few years the time allowed for judging media and performance presentations at the national competition has been 20 minutes which allowed 5

minutes for set-up, 10 minutes for the presentation and 5 minutes for questioning and take-down. This tight schedule was based on the number of judges and the total time available for judging.

Adam and Jake from School C spoke often and negatively of the judging experiences from the 1988/89 school year. Both claimed the judges had been unfair, biased, and incompetent. According to Adam, at that state competition the project that won first place did so because the student "charmed the judges." (This comment was identical to one of his teacher's comments.) Jake believed the judges had played favorites with certain schools and had ignored the projects and presentations from School C because they saw School C as having a bad reputation:

> Oh, you're from School C; you've automatically lost because your school has such a bad reputation." Like there are drug deals going on in the halls and there are fights everyday . . . it's like you get shot walking through the halls. . . . We have one of those images. It's not true [but] one thing that's bad about our school [is that] nobody really cares that much. . . . It filters over into History Day . . . that we're supposed to have this bad reputation.

Jake also commented on one incident from the same competition in which a judge allegedly deducted points from a student's score because the student was wearing a red dress. He contended also (as did his teacher Martin) that one of the winning projects had been copied from a Smithsonian exhibit "almost word for word." Jake claimed to have seen the Smithsonian exhibit of Superman a few weeks

before the competition. School C did not participate during the 1989/90 school year because they were so distressed over the previous year's judging.

However, this year (1990/91) Adam's opinion changed drastically when he was winning:

> Two years ago it was really bad . . . this year I wouldn't change anything about it, because we won first place. I can't say anything that's bad about it . . . the judging--that's the one thing I was worried about . . . maybe the judge had a bad piece of Danish or . . . he woke up on the wrong side of bed . . . but I didn't see any of that this year. . . . I have no complaints about History Day this year at all.

The students (and teachers) at School C were the most emotional and vehement in their criticisms of judging. Interestingly their state coordinator perceived the judging quality in the state to be excellent. The responses of the School C students and teachers raise the question as to whether the judging the students from School C experienced was that much worse than what the other students encountered or whether (and I suspect this to be so) the School C students were more sensitive to judges' comments because of their supposed school reputation and their need to rise above it or to prove it inaccurate.

Finding the Time to do NHD

Aside from the complaints about the judging, the students discussed how difficult it was to find time to work on NHD especially since it was supplementary work. Ed and Judy (School A) thought of the times they had wanted to be

with friends. Amosh (School A) recalled how hard it had been to get everybody together at the same time. Linda (School A) described how stressed she was feeling after the regional competition. This stress had resulted from her unpleasant experience at the competition combined with her backlog of school work and lack of time for other extra-curricula activities:

> I'm bogged down with . . . too much of school already. I'm just tired of working . . . I didn't do any homework last weekend and I was home all weekend. . . . I ended up doing it all last night. . . . I'm tired of re-doing [the project] and having to re-do it every single time by myself. . . . I don't have any time to work on it. . . . I have softball . . . after school . . . I missed so much softball because of History Fair . . . during the district/regional part that I . . . feel like I am being punished because I want an academic life. . . . Right after I started doing my History Fair stuff, I started sitting on the bench on varsity and now I'm playing J.V.

For Jake at School C finding time was a major problem. Working 40 hours a week outside of school did not help. For Terri (School C) lack of time meant having to choose between different activities: "You have to give up some things for it [NHD]. I'm President of the Key Club. . . . Our . . . convention falls the same time as the [state] History Day competition." Additionally, the majority of the NHD work at School A and School C had to be completed outside of the regular school time. The teachers at those schools stressed several times that NHD could not and would not interfere with the regular curriculum.

Other Issues

The School B students also scurried around trying to balance their schedules, but finding the time to do NHD was not one of their complaints. It was not that time was not a problem for them, but they recognized that their own procrastination created many of their troubles, and they discussed other issues that seemed more urgent to them. Helen, Lanie, and John had concerns about NHD in relation to their state program. Helen and Lanie felt that there was not enough publicity about NHD, that not enough "information got circulated around the schools," and that some "categories sometimes . . . [didn't] have any people in them." John lamented that his state was not unified in History Day:

> I noticed that when they were giving out awards [at nationals] . . . other states were really unified. You could tell really strong programs. [Our state] was . . . spread out all over the place. . . . I didn't even know who else from the state came down here . . . we looked across the auditorium and there was . . . Texas sitting there. . . . It's huge and they're all wearing the same color shirts.

John also hoped that in the future there would be more connections between students at the University of Maryland:

> If you saw someone walking down the street, you wouldn't know if they were a project, a media, so you don't know . . . who your competition is. . . . I think it would be better to have one day where . . . they weren't judging media [for example] and have all the media people meet in a room and talk about different things or just . . . meet each other.

In pointing out these matters, the students from School B have identified some of the major organizational weaknesses of NHD. These were addressed in Chapter IV and Chapter V, however, it should be noted here that these students have made some valuable suggestions. It would be a relatively simple undertaking for all students from a state to have the same shirts. And John's idea for a time and place at the national competition for students to meet and discuss their projects is yet another expression of the strength of an adolescent's need to interact and compare her/himself with peers.

Required Participation

Although the students argued that the benefits of the program outweighed the weaknesses and concerns and that they (the students) had learned more through NHD than they had or could in the traditional classroom, they had mixed reactions about requiring participation in NHD for all students. Half felt that all students should participate in order to have the same learning experience; the other half disagreed. Those disagreeing believed that some students would not have the ability, that some simply wouldn't care enough, and/or that requiring students to participate would lead to different, probably negative results.

All Students Should Participate

Based on her own experience, Judy (School A) argued strongly that all students should participate because, she

proposed, many students needed that extra push: "I think it should be required because being required is what gets the person going into it. . . . I know if it weren't required, I wouldn't do it." But her answer also reflected her perception of the different motivational levels related to different ability level classes:

> I think the people in honors and GT classes value education more, so they want to do stuff like that. . . . Usually the kids in regular classes . . . go to school . . . do their homework . . . get a grade . . . get their report card . . . graduate, and that's it . . . for them.

Amosh (School A) responded in a similar "we/them" tone in suggesting all students should be required to participate because they (other ability level students) needed the kind of motivation NHD could provide in order to learn:

> I think that this is the only way they can motivate students all across the United States. If you require regulars and basic students to do it, one way for them to learn is to put them in a group . . . that's already done it. They'll gain the experience. . . . I think that's the only way we can motivate them.

Ed (School A) agreed that sometimes you have to force students to do things "for their own good." However, he anticipated a problem with students who were required to participate:

> I think they should get it [NHD] because no matter how smart or stupid you are, you can learn something from History Fair. . . . Even if you are . . . Mr. Expert on Abraham Lincoln, you can still learn something about Abraham Lincoln if you do a project on it. . . . Everybody needs to learn in their own way and this helps you learn in what way is easiest for you. . . . The problem with History Day is that some people [who have changed levels

> to avoid participation in NHD] . . . would probably cause a problem if you made it where everyone did it. Some people are just lazy.

The School A students expressed a disturbing and condescending view of students in groupings different from their own. This was indicated in the use of labels such as "regulars," "basics," and "stupid" as well as their beliefs that "other students" did not have the same kinds of goals or motivation as they did and needed things done to them "for their own good." This dynamic of the school culture probably was unwittingly supported and encouraged by the school system in that the school required NHD for honors and GT students--that is, it compounded the already existing impression that the honors and GT students were different, better, and more able and therefore more special than other students.

The School B students who voted for requiring participation in NHD for all students looked at it more as giving all students the chance to have the same positive experience they had had and to learn more. School B had a highly homogeneous population in terms of ability which could account for the difference in tone between the School A and School B students. Steve felt it important for all to participate because "the experience [was] . . . outstanding . . . incredible." Lanie looked at requiring participation as a positive thing because, in her view, students--and she included herself--did not always know what was best for them

and because work on a long-term project allowed and/or forced students to acquire knowledge:

> I think it should be required because I'm not interested in science at all and when we do science projects and it's a topic that I have to research and do a project on, I get really into it . . . you learn it too because if you have to do some kind of project then you have to know your subject . . . somehow if you have to present it, you have to have knowledge of it and you keep that knowledge. . . . NHD is an extended effort so you learn even more . . . I think people can learn to become enthusiastic about their topic . . .

Not All Students Should Participate

The School A students who believed NHD should not be required also presented a "we/them" commentary. However, instead of suggesting that other students should participate in NHD because they needed to be motivated, Jim and Linda submitted that other students should not be required to participate because they wouldn't have the ability. Jim saw a problem for the teachers who would have to spend more time trying to develop students' skills:

> I don't think everyone should be required to do it because it takes a lot of upper level skills and some classes . . . some people just don't have those skills. . . . I guess if it were required . . . it would build those skills up . . . [but] it would take a lot more time by the teachers . . . and today a lot of teachers just don't have the time or just aren't willing to do that.

Linda posited that it would be too complicated for some students and that they would "probably drive themselves insane" trying to do it.

Jessie and John (School B) and Terri (School C) suggested that if students were required to participate they

would turn out inferior projects because they wouldn't have the interest. According to Jessie, "they would hate it" if they were "forced to do it." John argued that "you would get some pretty lousy projects." And Terri agreed that "if it were required . . . the quality would decrease because . . . it just wouldn't mean as much."

The comments from School A students reflected an elitism or understood hierarchy among students. The perceptions that some students, "regulars" and "basics" for instance, could not or would not benefit from participation in NHD because of lack of ability, or in fact should be required to participate "for their own good" to increase motivation or to improve their attitude represent typical stereotypes that higher ability students tend to have about students in different ability groupings. The comments do not speak as much to the issue of requiring NHD for all students as they do to the issues of school culture and the system of tracking. The School B students, coming from a more homogeneous population, addressed student interest and related attitude rather than student ability or a poor attitude about school in general. Similarly the students in School C discussed resultant attitude rather than pre-existing attitude or ability. School C also had a more homogeneous population in terms of ability/achievement level than in School A in that, according to Jake, there were only

two academic tracks--general and college level--with little difference between the two.

Adolescents categorize each other in terms of many criteria. The make-up of the school population as well as parental, teacher, and community attitudes and the system of tracking students all affect students' perceptions of and attitudes towards each other. The comments of these participating students raise questions about a school's, and NHD's, role in creating and/or perpetuating beliefs about, and places for, different groups of students.

Student/Teacher Relationships

The interview data leave no doubts about how these students felt about their teachers and the relationships they formed with them through participation in NHD. The students talked about the teacher's ability, friendliness, devotion, caring, open-mindedness, enthusiasm, dedication, dependability, support and also about how active and involved the teacher was.

The students from School A described Bender as "an excellent teacher" (Ed), someone who "makes learning fun" (Jim), and someone who was "a lot friendlier [than other teachers]" (Amosh). Amosh reflected the comments of the others: "You can talk to her. . . . It's real comfortable . . . and . . . fun to be around her. She's a lot of fun." The students from School B effervesced when they talked about White. They especially appreciated that even though

they were not in any of her classes she still went out of her way to connect with them. Lanie explained what she appreciated about White:

> She really wants to help everyone out--not just the groups she thinks are going to win. She checks up on everyone. She checked up on us almost . . . everyday--asking us how we were doing. Every time we passed her in the hall, she asked me about it. . . . When the video was done, she brought the copy . . . out to me while I was at softball practice. She walked out to the field. . . . That's how devoted she is. . . . she's the pulling force for everything that goes on in the school.

John appreciated many attributes about White, especially her enthusiasm and independent spirit:

> She was really open-minded . . . in the NHD projects. I think that's what makes her different from the other teachers. . . . She really wants to win and she's always looking for . . . and focusing on the strengths of the group and the project . . . that really gives us confidence. . . . It's her enthusiasm that really empowers her and she . . . doesn't get bogged down in bureaucracy. If we needed the machine, she'd get it for us almost any period. We had testing one morning . . . she somehow pulled some strings and got us the editing machine and said that we could go and get the CD. . . . She took care of practically all of our problems.

Jessie remarked about White's total involvement with her students:

> She's very personable . . . she came to see my school show . . . over the weekend. . . . When I was in ninth grade, on cross country, she went to one of our meets. . . . She does a lot of things with the kids. . . . Everybody loves her and she's so good with these competitions. She works with you . . . if you need anything, she's right there for your. You can totally depend on her. . . . She keeps a really good relationship with her kids that she's had. . . . She's . . . active in everything.

For Jake (from School C) it was the approachability of Martin and Watson that endeared them to him. He perceived that "they . . . [understood] the students," that they "[did] not stand above them" and "[were] more likeable than other teachers." What impressed Adam was the teachers' dedication:

> They are very dedicated. . . . I've never seen such dedication. . . . It's funny because we call her [Martin] Mom. . . . They work with us so long and they've been with us . . . worrying and . . . giving advice. . . . They've put in long hours . . . staying up worrying with us, glorifying with us. . . . constructive criticism was excellent on their part, but their after school dedication and the dedication throughout the school day was unbelievable. . . . I'm going to miss them when I leave here. They're the ones I'm going to miss . . . when I leave here.

Terri, who wanted to become a science teacher, considered them as models for herself:

> They're both such opposites. Now that we've spent so much time with them . . . we know them better. . . . We realize they're just as strange as we are sometimes. They aren't just teachers, they do have personalities. . . . I want to become a teacher and I think I would want to be like one of those two, being active with the students. . . . Ms. Watson was . . . at our championship basketball game. . . . They're involved in the school. . . . some teachers just lecture and then . . . you don't see them at all until the next class. . . . Ms. Watson is a real trip. . . . She's very, very nice. She's funny. She's so great. She'll sit there and tell you awful jokes . . . at 10 o'clock in the library, get us laughing hysterically.

These comments provide a profile of what these students perceived a teacher should be--involved, independent, dedicated, intelligent, funny, real, enthusiastic,

dependable, supportive, active and, most of all, caring. The comments also suggest that these qualities had something to do with the students' motivation to participate in NHD, with their success in NHD, and with their perceptions of NHD.

Former Participants

> If you eliminate the competition, you won't eliminate the making of mistakes and having to learn from them. History Day provides a forum for everyone to learn from everyone's mistakes. I looked at other projects and would say, "I should have done this, or I should have done that." (Seth)

> I learned how hard it is to make a video and I learned a lot about black rights I didn't know before. It changed my viewpoints. . . . We interviewed two people who had been a part of the freedom fight. They were so great. They lived it. . . . I learned the most from doing that part. . . . It changed my attitude about prejudices. Before I wouldn't have said anything [if I heard a prejudiced comment] and now if I hear prejudiced comments, I will interrupt and defend the person they are talking about. (Lisa)

> My Mom would say, "How can you put yourself through this torture again," and I would say, "Oh, Mom, you don't understand." I learned so much. (Susan)

As a check on the internal validity of, and to supplement, the interview data from the students, I interviewed 6 former NHD participants (see Methodology). This section of the chapter presents the former participants' perspectives on motivating factors, learning results, effects of competition, concerns about the program, and ramifications of their involvement. At the time of this

research, Lisa was a high school student; Susan, Ken, and Jared were college students; Mike was in law school; and Seth was a college graduate working as a typesetter at a bank. They had participated in NHD at one of the three schools and with one of the teachers in this study. Their testimonials about the positive effects of participation in the NHD program were emphatic and dramatic.

Motivating Factors

These students participated initially either because they were required to do so at School A or because they chose participation as an alternative to a research paper at School B or School C. The motivating factors for subsequent participation were identical to those expressed by the students in this study. They talked about having fun and meeting other students, having freedom and choice in their work, having feedback and recognition, having the opportunity to be creative, the excitement in seeing a final product, and the opportunity to compare themselves with others. Mike captured several of these motivating factors in the following:

> Being in the Student Center at the University of Maryland was very exciting. Being around students from all over the country and professors walking around and asking questions--I was in awe. The projects were unbelievable. One was so good that NASA bought it and put it on display at their headquarters. The whole thing was exciting.

Learning Results

Perhaps with the advantage of a time perspective, these former participants were even more insistent upon the learning effects than the other participants in this study were. They, too, saw significant learning in content area and in-depth comprehension of topic, and also remarked about the organizational, research, communication, thinking, and technical skills they had learned. All of them stressed large gains in self-confidence and in their self-identity. Susan, a college student, gave a description which reflected those of the others:

> Research skills are so much easier now. Going to the library, I know where to go and what to do and look for. I'm not intimidated by doing research. It is so much easier to talk with people. The judging part built up my confidence--being questioned and thinking I could be right and being able to ask questions when I wanted to know something.
>
> You learn so much. It's amazing what you have to do. You teach yourself as you go along. I had never picked up a camera before and through trial and error I learned about shadows and lighting. It was more interesting to teach yourself than listening to someone. It built up my confidence so I could learn anything I wanted to.
>
> I learned content I would never have learned. I went in in my senior year to the [name of topic] project the least interested of anybody in the group. I came out so interested. I thought it was a boring topic. NHD opens new perspective to new things. I would never have learned those things anywhere else. I couldn't believe it--at summer school this past summer--on the first day we took a tour of the library and I thought [about the other students], "You should know how to use a library by now."

Effects of Competition

As with the other study participants, these former NHD students praised the competitive component of NHD. Seth looked at it as "a chance to stretch creatively, it made it fun, it was a risk," For the others, it was the driving force behind the quality work. Except for one of these former participants, all had lost at some point in the competition and none of them liked losing, but as the study's students and teachers argued, these former participants also submitted that losing was a motivation to continue and to work harder. All saw aspects of the competition, including losing, as preparation for the competition in life.

Concerns

Seth, a former student at School C, was the only former participant who mentioned or could think of any downside to the program. It was a familiar theme about how destructive judges could be. He was clear that it was not the act of judging that was a problem, but the incompetency of some of the judges. To him to have "students spend inordinate amounts of time and to have some judge trivialize it with foolish errors, [was] not right and [was] defeating." His comments about the judges and judging were as emotional as, and almost identical to, those of the School C students and teachers in the main part of this study. Whether it had to do with the school culture or attitudes of the staff or

parents, judging was most traumatic for the School C participants.

Ramifications of Participation

Except for Lisa who was still in high school, these former participants argued that the greatest benefit of participation in NHD for them was that it prepared them for college by providing the opportunity to develop research, thinking, organizational, and communication skills, and it gave them greater self-confidence and the feeling that they could do anything they set out to do. Additionally, it introduced Seth to the world of video production and focused him on that as his future career. For Lisa, the high school student, the greatest benefit was in gaining interviewing skills and new awareness about issues: "Teenagers don't notice anything any more. We're lazy. We just live for the future, but NHD changed my viewpoints. It made me pay more attention to the past. It changed my attitudes about prejudice." Jared's commentary on the value of participation in NHD was the most compelling:

> I think the program is unique in several ways. . . . First, it allows for group interaction. Finding friends whom you will spend 9 months working on a project with is difficult. Group dynamics, sharing the work load, being present at all the meetings, not arguing are all major factors of group interaction. Successful resolution of these factors leads to a stronger group and a better team. So [NHD] aids in developing peer relations.
>
> It also is strong in its academic aspect. I learned the most from my extra-curricular activities with [NHD] than from any sit-down course I will ever take. I learned how to stand

> in front of judges and explain to them our research, our quest, our commitment to the project. I learned my first interviewing skills in the ninth grade. I wonder how many high school students do interviews before they graduate. . . . I also learned research skills. I discovered so many ways of finding resources. In the ninth grade we had called people across the Atlantic for an interview, we had read hundreds of articles, books, letters. We visited the archives and the library [at the university]. Photographs, letters, pamphlets, transcripts, business documents, talking to congressmen, state senators, city officials--it all allowed us to connect personally with the person or subject we were researching. No other competition in secondary schools is comparable.

These former participants were selected by the participating teachers. While this represents a selection bias, the teachers made an effort at my request to find students who had not necessarily been the most successful students in NHD. All of these students, except for Mike who was the student who had won the trip to Greece in School B's first year of participation, had lost at some point in their NHD experience. Lisa had never won in an NHD competition.

Chapter Summary

The students in this study put extraordinary amounts of out-of-school time and effort into their NHD projects. Participation in NHD provided them an opportunity to fulfill needs not being met in a traditional classroom. They were able to have fun and develop camaraderie with peers; they received positive recognition for and feedback about the quality and usefulness of their work; they had choices about, control over, and creativity in their work; they were

able to compare themselves to peers and thus were more able to develop self-identity and new goals; and they were actively involved in reconstructing history.

The students claimed that they learned content and comprehension and transferable skills to a greater degree than possible in a traditional classroom and that they gained self-esteem and became more confident. Without exception, the students believed competition to be a positive and natural phenomenon without which no one would or could reach their potential. They described losing as a motivator, worrying as part of the package, and winning as exciting and as a "rush."

The subjective nature of the issue of authorship makes it difficult to relate to complaints about "too much assistance." The students were proud of their work and perceived their success to be the results of their own efforts in addition to supportive, editorial, and pedagogical assistance from teachers and parents. The costs of the projects among schools and students were comparable for the particular project.

The students complained about the quality of judging and about finding the time "to do" NHD. Their remarks about judging mimicked those of the teachers. They argued that some of the judging was incompetent, inconsistent, and unfair. The responses to the question of requiring NHD as part of a history/social studies curriculum unveiled

disturbing stereotypes expressed by School A students concerning characteristics (lack of ability, motivation, and appropriate goals) of students in ability groupings different from their own. Requiring NHD for the GT and honors students only at School A may have inadvertently strengthened these stereotypes. School B and School C students submitted that requiring NHD could or would lead to negative attitudes and consequently inferior products.

The perspectives of the former NHD students confirmed and expanded upon the positive effects claimed by the study participants. Their most remarkable claim (except for the former participant who was still in high school) was that NHD did more to prepare them for college than anything else. Their views on competition, winning, and losing and the reasons for their participation in NHD were almost identical to those of the students in the study. The one difference between the former and present participants had to do with views on judging. All of the participants this year complained about one or another aspect of judging. Only one of the former students did so. Either previous judging was more competent and fair or initial reactions to judging for the former participants were only temporary.

CHAPTER VII

DISCUSSION

Chapters IV, V, and VI, which have presented and examined the historical and organizational aspects of NHD and the perspectives of the study participants, provide the context, foundation, and data for this chapter's discussion. The first section of this chapter explores and interprets the study findings in relation to previous research on motivation, competition, and active learning. Additionally, it addresses one of the three original research objectives which was to determine why and how the program grew from a local program with 129 students in 1974 to over 500,000 students in 48 states in 1991. The second part of this chapter discusses implications of the findings for contemporary educational practices in general and for the teaching and learning of history in particular. Determining these implications was another of the primary research objectives. (The first of the study objectives which was to determine whether existing positive claims about NHD were realistic and founded has been explored and analyzed in the preceding three chapters.)

Findings/Contributions to Research

As explained above, this section presents and examines the major findings of this study in relation to existing research on motivation, competition, and active learning.

While the discussion concerning motivation relates to the issue of the program's growth, since Chapter IV described and explained how the local Cleveland History Day expanded into the National History Day program by 1980, here the discussion concentrates on the reasons for the program's growth and development between 1980 and 1991.

Teacher Motivation

While positive learning effects had been motivating factors for the teachers, there were other primary motivators without which these teachers would probably not have participated. These motivating factors not only explain why the national program (between 1980 and 1991) had such a phenomenal growth but also shed light on the school culture of the 1980s. The explosion in the number of participants in NHD, from its first national contest in 1980 to the present, happened during a decade when the country's educational system, in knee-jerk reaction to open education, excessive student and curricular freedoms, and falling SAT scores, swung back to a conservative, accountable, no-nonsense, back-to-basics, standardized curriculum philosophy (Glickman, 1990).

> A common core of knowledge was to be taught to all students, and uniform programs . . . were to be enforced by state officials. . . . At first, teachers and principals screamed about the strait jacket of standardization and top-down control. . . . Later these screams became whimpers. . . . Teachers and principals became passive workers following someone else's orders. Morale plummeted. . . . (Glickman, 1990, p. 9)

Did this growth in NHD from 19,000 to 500,000 students during the same decade occur because NHD was seen as a back-to-basics component? Hardly. I submit that while there were probably many reasons why teachers (and their students) became involved in NHD, most of the growth in NHD during the 1980s was a result of teachers' reactions to this shift to back-to-basics, conservative, test and textbook driven curriculum.

In State A, for example, in the early 1980s the educational system came under intense scrutiny and became the center of a political battle (Toch, 1991). The result was a restructuring, redefining, and tightening of state educational policies and procedures which led to a drop in teacher morale. While this is a simplistic explanation of a complicated situation, social studies teachers in State A became confused about the status of the Junior Historian program (in which many were involved) in relation to the new "no pass/no play" rule and "extra" vs. "co-curricula" labels and restrictions. It appeared that the new legislation would make participation in Junior Historian strictly extra-curricula and therefore no class/school time could be used for instruction/preparation for that program. Consequently many of the social studies teachers decided to try NHD--a co-curricula program which they believed could be addressed during school time and which would give them the autonomy they had experienced previously in the Junior Historian

program. The teachers in State A, along with the teachers in this study and many others, I propose, found a way, and were motivated by the opportunity, to maintain or gain freedom and control--i.e. through their participation in NHD.

Control. Deci and Ryan (in Ryan, Connell & Deci, 1985) found through teacher interviews that external pressures and loss of control defeated teachers' motivation:

> External pressures of standardized curricula, competency tests and obsession with achievement have robbed their autonomy and creativity in teaching and negatively affect their interest and effectiveness. (p. 46)

The corollary would be that a feeling of control would increase a teacher's motivation (Ryan, Connell & Deci, 1985). I argue that teachers in traditional classrooms are and have been in a vise. The school administration, school committee, parents, the community, the system itself, and even national agendas all have had a hand on the vise's tightening rod. But participation in NHD allowed these teachers to have a feeling of freedom and control that led them to use their creativity and talents. The teachers in this study were able to throw off the vise and needed only to pay attention to a few contest guidelines. The rest was under their control.

The teachers in this study continually talked about being able to do and accomplish things in NHD, including providing opportunities for students to be creative, to

apply skills, and to develop self-identity, not possible in the traditional classroom. Along with the sense of freedom, control, and accomplishment, or perhaps because of it, the teachers had fun, got excited, avoided boredom, and felt fulfilled. These are not things one hears from most classroom teachers. It was these rewards and feelings that the teachers experienced in relation to their efforts that, along with the sense of autonomy and control, increased their motivation to participate in, and their support for, the NHD program.

Feedback/Competency. Furthermore, through NHD the teachers received feedback about their competence. Whereas in a traditional classroom setting, a teacher's competence is more often questioned than not and where the teacher's efforts are rarely noticed or recognized by anyone, through NHD these teachers had their competency and efforts acknowledged in several ways:

1. Students returned from college and told them NHD was the only part of their education that prepared them for college work.
2. Their students were asked to share their presentations with other school classes, outside groups, community and national organizations.
3. Their students had their NHD work published.

4. The school district, parents, and the larger community gave support, recognition, and attention to these NHD teachers.

5. The teachers saw their students grow.

All of these results confirmed the teachers' competencies.

Ashton's (1985) self-efficacy theory proposes a reciprocal pattern of motivation and accomplishment: The teacher's sense of efficacy, when reflected in behavior, affects students achievement which in turn affects the perceived efficacy of both students and teacher. In NHD these teachers, with their sense of freedom, control and competence, were able to encourage, praise, and assist their students on an individual basis. This support and individual attention helped to motivate the students who performed beyond most classroom expectations. Graduate school level work on the part of the students combined with the feedback as described above confirmed the teachers' competence and increased their motivation.

Student Motivation

The students in this study agreed that the positive cognitive, skill, and affective results were much greater than would have been possible in a traditional classroom, but, as with the teachers, this was not the strongest motivator. For the students the primary motivating factors were similar to those of the teachers but prioritized differently. Two of the strongest and interrelated

motivators for the students were meeting other students and having fun.

Meeting Peers, Fun, and Self-Identity. These motivating factors (meeting peers and having fun) speak to Erikson's (1968) identity crisis stage which adolescents experience. Teenagers need and want to discover who they are, and part of this discovery process involves comparing themselves to others. The more teenagers they can meet, the more views they have of themselves. The NHD process allowed these students to compare themselves with others often, not only within their own schools, but with students from all over the country. This opportunity for these students to compare themselves with others while having fun was a strong motivating factor for all of them. It also gave them a sense of what else they could do, what goals they could set, and possibly what they could become. This supports Boggiano et al (1982) who found that rewards (here the competition events) enhanced intrinsic motivation if they gave information about one's performance relative to another's.

Having Control/Feeling Competent. These students worked harder and produced more than they would have in a regular classroom because like the teachers, I submit, having control gave them a sense of competence (Ryan, Connell & Deci, 1985). The students claimed that in NHD they had a greater sense of control and autonomy than anywhere else in school. In NHD students choose their own

topics, the category, and type of project they will develop. This freedom and control allowed these students to work with their own interests and consequently, they believed, this was why they produced superior work and learned more (Perlmutter & Monty, 1972). Coleman (in Lepper & Greene, 1978) would agree. He called student control the strongest factor in student performance because: "Intrinsically motivated learning will involve trial and error, following one's curiosity, feeling free to learn what interests one, developing one's potential as one experiences it" (p. 198). NHD allowed these students this freedom.

These students, as the teachers, received feedback that gave them a feeling of competence. The teacher assistance for these students was facilitating rather than controlling and this added to the students' sense of competence (Ryan, Mims & Koestner, 1983). Other feedback was connected to having an audience and receiving recognition, factors that the students claimed were strong motivators for participating in NHD. Their audiences were other students, parents, administrators, school committee members, judges, and members of local and national organizations for whom the students presented their projects and findings. This recognition and attention occurred at competitions as well as at other functions and not only told the students they were competent but added to their collection of views about who they were. Another strong motivator was the excitement

the students experienced when the project they had been researching and developing became a final product. This too gave the students feedback about competency and provided another way to compare themselves with others.

Purpose. Part of the motivation for having an audience was having a purpose for the project. The students liked the feeling of sharing their findings with teachers and members of the audience and in general contributing something to their community and school. These findings support Benware's & Deci's (1984) research that showed students were more active in learning when expected (i.e. thought competent) to use it in some way other than just to be tested. Students in traditional classrooms seldom get a chance to use anything they do or study in school in any way other than to be tested. Teachers grade and return papers and tests. No one else sees them. Students see little purpose or relevance in this kind of activity. Adolescents, the same as adults, need to see some purpose to their efforts that goes beyond receiving a grade. Through NHD, these students had a purpose--to show and teach others while at the same time demonstrating their ability and competence.

Competition as a Motivator

The students, teachers, state coordinators, former students, NHD founders, and NHD staff all argued, contrary to the findings or theories of Adams (1973), Clifford (1972), and Kohn (1986), that the competition motivated the

students and led to increased performances and greater academic achievement. This would support research results described by Lilien (1988), Casey (1989) and Von Borries (1989). Why are the results of these two sets of research on competition so divergent? One reason could be that the research cited and/or conducted by those who found competition was detrimental to motivation and learning represented contrived research situations. Those who reported positive effects of competition were dealing with actual events and situations in the classroom, school, or in an education-related contest. The NHD competition is a real circumstance and these students and teachers agreed that the competition motivated them.

The study participants also claimed positive learning results contrary to the results of the bulk of studies comparing competitive and cooperative instructional structures. Much of the confusion over the resulting benefits or problems connected to cooperative and competitive instructional structures, I argue, is the result of a very limited definition of the structures which are rarely mutually exclusive.

The competition in NHD this past year represented the culmination and interrelation of several different learning processes and motivational factors, including cooperative group work, and was only one component of the total package. Classrooms, I propose, also involve many instructional

processes (including cooperative and competitive dynamics) and motivational factors which are often overlapping and interrelating. Furthermore, the results of this study of NHD contradict the findings of Dunn and Goldman (1966) and Sherif (1976) that claimed an intragroup cooperation/intergroup competition method diminished productivity and led subjects to view other groups negatively. The opposite happened with students in this study. According to participants, productivity increased and the students viewed other groups empathetically because they knew how hard the other students were working.

I propose that this study's findings also refute Kohn's (1990) argument that competition undermines students' intrinsic motivation to learn. While intrinsic motivation is difficult if not impossible to measure, the students in this study expressed greater interest in learning more about their topic than they did initially--whether or not they lost or won the competition. They claimed that the deeper interest resulted from uncovering a multitude of issues during their research. Is this not intrinsic motivation? These results support findings by Slavin (1991), Boggiano et al (1982), Lepper & Greene (1978) and Vasta et al (1978) which concluded that competition enhanced intrinsic motivation. Additionally, the findings in this study contradict findings that showed that rewards through competition decreased motivation and led to a lower level of

creativity and performance (Amibile & Gitomer, 1984; Kohn, 1986). All of these NHD participants argued that the competition motivated them and gave them the chance to be more creative than otherwise would have been possible.

While the teachers and students described emotional reactions to the anticipation of competition and to the consequent winning or losing, they all agreed--again in contradiction to one of Kohn's (1986) theories that none of the reactions were permanent or harmful or resulted in feelings of low self-esteem and in fact were often part of the fun and excitement and future motivation. What did disturb the teachers and students, according to them, was not winning or losing per se but the incompetent, unfair judging connected to the winning or losing. The reactions of Martin and Watson (School C) to the judging at the national competition in June (they decided not to participate in the upcoming 1991/92 program because of alleged inaccuracies and unfairness in the judging of Terri's, Adam's and Jake's presentations) would support Wilson's (1989) contention that competitors need to be taught to take competition and winning and losing in a more light hearted manner. What Wilson did not consider is that it may be more difficult for some students because of their backgrounds, ability levels, school culture, involved effort, or other factors to accept losing whether it is considered valid or not. If competitors feel responsible

for accomplishing for others as well as for themselves, the pressure is enormous and therefore reactions more intense.

Active Learning

The sense of control and autonomy the students experienced in NHD relates to theories of active learning which propose that when students conduct their own learning, discover their own answers, and create their own interpretations, their learning is deeper, more comprehensive, and longer lasting. Proponents of active learning (Dewey, 1933; Freire, 1981; Kirkpatrick, 1918, 1929; Sharan & Sharan, 1989/90; Wigginton, 1989) submit that learning actively leads to an ability to think critically. The statements of the present and former students and of the teachers and state coordinators confirmed that this was what happened through the process of NHD. Students and former students claimed (and other study participants supported this claim) that through NHD they learned various research methods--how to conduct in-person and telephone interviews; where to look for and how to uncover primary sources such as original photos, diaries, and newspaper articles; and how to search through libraries, museums, and resource centers for additional primary and secondary documents--and that they learned how to analyze and interpret data and thus became more aware of the issues and different perspectives involved in their topics. These experiences, they argued, allowed them to develop their own conclusions, their own knowledge.

Studies of the Group Investigation (Sharan & Sharan, 1976, 1989/1990) and Co-op, Co-op (Kagan, 1985) methods of cooperative learning, which similarly to NHD promote and require group research and presentation and which I consider models of cooperative active learning, had findings similar to this study of NHD in terms not only of higher levels of academic achievement but also of increased cooperation and social interaction. However, even the students in NHD who participated in the individual categories confirmed positive results of social interaction and cooperation. This was probably because even the individual entrants became part of the larger school NHD group and helped other students by giving suggestions and editing. If the competition aspect of NHD, as opposed to non competition in the Group Investigation and Co-op, Co-op methods, made any difference in terms of the social interaction for these students, it was to increase this interaction within a school or state as the students formed a cohesive group as they competed against other schools and other states.

While all the study participants claimed that these students learned by actively researching, creating, and developing their own projects and presentations, there was a particular and novel emphasis on active learning in relation to student development of media presentations. To paraphrase Watson (School C), if a teacher tells students they are going to see a movie, video-tape, or filmstrip,

she/he might as well say, "Goodnight, everybody." However when these students in NHD worked with media, it was an active, creative development, not the typical passive absorption--or in most cases non absorption--associated with traditional classroom media use. What is more revealing is that students at School A claimed that when a student watched another student's media presentation, she/he was much more actively involved and attentive than when watching professionally developed media.

Jim thought this was so because students wanted to evaluate their own presentation in relation to other students' presentations. Ed and Amosh, however, argued that it had more to do with knowing how difficult developing a media presentation was and in having empathy for the student producer. Amosh also argued that adolescents were more trusting of other adolescents and would put more stock in a student's presentation than in a professionally developed one because "they're paid to do that and you kind of get this negative thing in your mind." I propose another possibility. Watching a student developed media presentation gives students another way of comparing themselves to others and of considering future possibilities and therefore of adding another piece to their puzzle of self-identity. They ask themselves, "If she/he can do that, can I?"

These students' perceptions and results of this study support the theories of Adams & Hamm (1989), Sless (1981), and Considine (1982) that propose that by researching, developing, and producing their own media material and presentations students will improve their understanding and interpretation of visual messages and make learning active. In addition, these findings add new dimensions to the issue of student-produced media and raise questions and lead to hypotheses as to why students will pay more attention to and hence learn more from student, than from professionally produced, media.

Bringing this discussion back to the topic of motivation, simply put, the program growth has been phenomenal because the students and teachers found a way to meet their needs (one of the strongest being their need for autonomy) which were not being met in the traditional classroom. If these needs were powerful enough to provoke teachers and students to participate in NHD more than once, given the enormous time and energy it requires, what then are the implications for educational processes?

Implications

Since the early 1980s, there has been an avalanche of literature on the need for reform and restructuring in secondary schools. Much of that rhetoric refers to the inappropriateness and ineffectiveness of a teacher-dominated teaching method in an age when torrents and explosions of

information require that students learn how to find, select, organize, and interpret that information in order to develop their own knowledge and conclusions from which to make decisions for themselves and their society. In this section, I present and explore implications of the study findings for contemporary educational policy in general and for the teaching and learning of history in particular.

Contemporary Education and NHD

In 1978 the National Science Foundation released a seven volume report on the status of math, science, and social studies education (Puckett, 1986) which found that the "dominant modes of instruction [continued] to be large group, teacher-controlled recitation and lecture, based primarily on the textbook" (Shaver, Davis & Helburn in Puckett, p. 390). Those results are basically the same as the results from three studies in the 1980s by Goodlad (1984), Boyer (1983), and Sizer (1984) that concluded that "classroom practice is largely devoid of student inquiry, discovery learning, and other innovative strategies" (Puckett, 1986, p. 389). When Cuban (1983) examined changes since 1870 in theory, curriculum, and resources in relation to classroom instruction, he found that while theories, philosophies, textbooks, and curricula had changed there was little evidence of change in teacher practice and that teacher-dominated instruction was remarkably stable at all

levels of schooling and basically the same as it had been in 1900.

Sizer (1984), Goodlad (1984), and Boyer (1983), who argue that we need to restructure our schools and change our methods of teaching, disagreed vehemently with the National Commission for Excellence (U.S. Department of Education, 1983) who prescribed more requirements, longer school days, and more homework. Sizer (1984), Goodlad (1984), Boyer (1983), and Hampel (1986) submit that more of what doesn't work doesn't make it work better.

> It was not clear why another required course would increase student investment in their course work, decrease their fascination with the curriculum of television, with its over stimulation and passivity, or rival the attraction of long hours spent at after school jobs. (Hampel, p 151)

Futurists (Benjamin, 1989; Toffler, 1970, 1974, 1980) posit that because society and knowledge are changing so rapidly, the traditional educational system in which the teacher dispenses packaged knowledge to the students is, to paraphrase McLuhan, looking through a rear view mirror; the teacher-dominated system is inadequate and inappropriate for the present and future needs of students. Willoughby (in Parker, 1983) claims the system produces students who are slightly better at skills that were "of questionable value in the nineteenth Century and will be of little value in the twenty-first Century (p. 2)."

Estimates are that within the next 10 years information will increase 100% every 24 months (Hartoonian, 1984) and

societal changes will also race far ahead of educational changes. There is no way that teachers can transmit either that volume of information or that kind of societal change. Naisbitt (1982) and these other futurists argue that our society requires a person who can analyze, evaluate, problem solve, and think critically. They advocate an active learning educational program in which students participate not only in determining their own learning tasks, but in discovering, constructing and/or creating their own learning and using it constructively in a societal context. Sarason (1982) agrees that innovative active learning approaches such as problem solving and discovery learning strategies are necessary and submits that these methods require changes in the student/teacher relationship and in classroom practice.

Boyer (1988) studied the impact of the Sizer (1984), Boyer (1983), and Goodlad (1984) research and of the sustained drive for school reform that followed and found some progress had been made, but suggested:

> The focus continues to be on memorization and recall. Textbooks still control curriculum in the nation's schools. . . . Also, there is great passivity in the classroom where often the most frequent question asked is: "Do we have to know this for the test?" (p. 5)

His prescription is as follows:

> If students are to excel, they must be engaged actively in learning. The mastery of subject matter is essential. But unless students are creative, independent thinkers, unless they acquire the tools and motivation to go on

> learning, prospects for excellence will be enormously diminished. (p. 5)

Cuban (1990), though, doesn't hold much hope for reform and summarized the usefulness of reform approaches in a comment by Gide: "Everything has been said before, but since nobody listens, we have to keep going back and begin again" (in Cuban, p. 3). Cuban explained that reformers have been fighting against teacher-dominated instruction since the middle 1850s with especially heavy attacks in the early 1900s, again in the 1960s, and more recently in the 1980s.

Van Tassel and Ubbelodhe, professors at Case Western Reserve University, were not thinking about educational reform or about the goals for education in the information age or the needs of students in the 21st century when they founded History Day in the early 1970s. They had their own set of problems which centered around declining enrollments, the declining status of history, losing connections with secondary school teachers, and planning for the Bicentennial celebration. Did they unwittingly discover or create the solution to a national education problem while searching for an answer to very different, situation-specific concerns? Is or can NHD be the penicillin of contemporary educational malaise? I submit that the processes inherent in the NHD program have the potential to be the catalyst or model for a new wave of school and teaching/learning reform. This study of NHD offers testimony regarding greater cognitive/skill/affective results through participation in NHD than

would have been achieved in the traditional classroom. According to all participants, the students learned content, developed in-depth comprehension, and learned to be creative, independent, and in-depth thinkers (as Boyer suggests is necessary) who looked at issues from several perspectives before drawing conclusions--i.e. learned to think critically. Additionally they learned life-long skills including communication, writing, group work, research and technical skills.

But there is much more involved here than these learning results. The participants in this study, probably unconsciously, learned something else. The key to what motivated these students and teachers is empowerment. While the traditional teacher-dominated classroom "cultivates passivity, conformity, obedience, acquiescence, and unquestioning acceptance of authority" (Kreisberg, 1992) and stifles students' creativity, participation in NHD encouraged and allowed these students to have autonomy, to control their own work, to be creative, to think independently, to attain mastery of a topic and presentation form, and therefore to feel competent, to gain confidence and self-esteem, and to feel useful to their school and community. That is empowering (Kreisberg, 1992). This kind of empowerment involves learning how, and being confident and able, to make one's own decisions and conclusions and to communicate effectively. While these are skills citizens in

a democracy must have if the democracy is to survive, they ar seldom developed or practiced sufficiently in a traditional classroom. If citizens cannot recognize propaganda, cannot interpret electronic and printed messages, cannot discriminate between the relevant and irrelevant--or as Postman and Weingartner (1969) would put it--cannot "detect crap" (p. 3), then they cannot make intelligent decisions for themselves or their society.

Participation in NHD empowered the teachers in this study as it did with the students. Even though teachers in a traditional classroom are figures of authority and are seen as controlling the classroom and the students, in the larger school and community system they are "remarkably isolated and often strikingly powerless" (Kreisberg, 1992, p. 9). Except for the students, they are on the lowest rung of the education power/hierarchy ladder. They have little control over who they teach, what they teach, how they teach, and when they teach. Through NHD, however, these teachers had control of their work, they had autonomy, they received feedback about their competence, they felt useful and productive, they enjoyed themselves, and they were able to use their expertise not only in, but to maintain, a collaborative teacher/student relationship rather than as a part of a dominate/be dominated system.

If we are to provide to all students an education which liberates and therefore empowers them, it has to be one

which teaches and allows them to think and reflect critically and allows them to produce knowledge. Knowledge is neither knowledge nor empowering when it is prepackaged and delivered; then it is just bits of information (Hartoonian, 1989; Toffler, 1991). It is through an active questioning, searching, discovering, interpreting, and reflecting that a student creates her/his own knowledge. In the traditional teacher-dominated classroom, the teacher manages, controls, and dispenses the information that she/he or the school considers the "right" information. This contemporary education is not only passive and controlling, but is dysfunctional in relation to the needs of a global, information-filled democratic society. What teachers can do, through an active learning model, is to allow and encourage students to find, interpret, and analyze data and to develop their own knowledge from which to make decisions and to act.

Hartoonian (1991) defines learning as "creating and expressing knowledge through discourse, performances, and producing items" (p. 23), and according to the study participants this is what these students did through NHD. NHD for these participants was a teacher/student collaborative system through which the students not only developed and created their own knowledge but learned how to present and defend it. According to all participants, in a year long process these students, through NHD, learned how

to research, analyze, organize, and synthesize data (i.e. to think critically) and how to develop a presentation, display, or performance which demonstrated these processes had occurred.

If it is true that teachers teach whatever they test, then secondary school tests will have to change if secondary school teaching is to change and meet the needs of students in the 21st century. Schools need to develop criteria for, and use forms of assessment such as, performances, exhibitions, and presentations (typical of NHD) that indicate and demonstrate the students' ability to think critically and to create their own knowledge (ASCD Mini-Conference Report, 1991). Moving in this new direction, the State of Pennsylvania, in a draft for new high school graduation requirements, shows that students will:

> complete a project in an area of concentrated study under the guidance and direction of the faculty. The purpose of the project, which may include research, writing, or some other appropriate form of demonstration, is to assure that the student is able to develop, evaluate, apply and communicate significant knowledge and understanding. Projects may be undertaken by individual students or groups of students (Pennsylvania State Board of Education, 1991).

As Sizer (in Richardson, 1991) says we don't need "stricter control tests on out-dated weaponry when an army is losing the war . . . we need . . . better weapons" (p. A17). The model is there in NHD.

The Teaching and Learning of History

If the processes of NHD provide a context in which students can produce knowledge and learn to use this knowledge in a critical way, and these are educational objectives, what would have to happen to integrate these processes into a history curriculum? When Bender (School A) and Watson (School C) discussed NHD in relation to the school's history curriculum, they made it clear that their primary responsibility was to cover the regular curriculum. They both felt that if NHD were to replace the curriculum, it would be too narrow a focus. White (School B) would like to have seen NHD as the main curriculum but had to find ways like the "subversive" teacher (Postman & Weingartner, 1969) to teach using the NHD processes and still cover the history curriculum. How can teachers provide students with the opportunity to produce knowledge on a continual basis without changing the traditional history curriculum, textbooks, and teaching methods? The answer is that they cannot.

The "Covered" vs. the "Uncovered" Curriculum. There has been confusion and disagreement over the purpose and content of history in the curriculum for over 100 years. One thing that has remained fairly stable, however, is the promotion of teaching methods which would encourage analysis of primary sources, on site research, and the development and use of critical thinking skills (Hertzberg, 1989). Just

as stable has been the entrenched, dominant teaching method which involves dispensing bits of information and relying on a textbook (Cuban, 1991; Goodlad, 1984; Hertzberg, 1985; Jenness, 1990). There are several possible explanations for the persistence of the teacher-dominated method but I argue that the need to cover the material and lack of disciplinary knowledge (which includes a lack of clear purpose for the teaching and learning of history) are the biggest factors.

Unfortunately, as discussed in Chapter II, most teachers don't question handed down and prepackaged curricula and curriculum sequences that "guarantee coverage of the same information" (Hartoonian, 1991, p. 22). Even if the teachers are asked or allowed to develop the curriculum, the questions are usually about what can and should be covered and when. While there may be discussion on goals in terms of cognitive and skill learning results, there is rarely if ever a question about what the larger purpose of teaching and learning history is and how that relates to covering a mass of information.

The deeper issue here is purpose. Teachers and schools have to reconsider, or in fact consider, their goals for teaching and learning of history. Surely their goal is not to bury the students in an avalanche of information, but this is often what happens. History books are so thick and heavy that students consistently leave them in school in their lockers. The books are too big to carry home. Most

teachers follow the text rigidly in an attempt to finish it before the school year ends. While this is more apparent for new teachers, even experienced teachers such as Bender, Watson, and White (Martin from School C was a librarian) in this study had a conflict and problem with balancing coverage of required curriculum with what they considered the more important goal of developing research, analyzing and critical thinking skills.

Even though several national commissions and states have developed new history and social studies frameworks in the last few years, the plans all have a similar flaw and present the same conflict with which these teachers struggled: The goal of developing critical thinking skills through active learning methods is at odds with the recommended curriculum which stresses content (Brodkey, 1991; Parker, 1990/91; Parker, 1991) and is really about "the warehousing of historical and social scientific knowledge" (Parker, 1991, p. 28). Furthermore, the recent debates over a multi-cultural vs. an Eurocentric view of history adds to this problem (Gunter, 1990; O'Neil, 1991). If a multi-cultural emphasis is emphasized and adopted (if all involved agree as to the meaning of multi-cultural) as outlined in the new frameworks, the required content will increase and teachers will feel an even greater need to deliver information in order to finish within a certain timeframe. Most likely it will mean teachers replacing one

parcel of information with another--"just different lists and without the coherence of any unifying themes" (Stearns, 1991, p. A32).

I argue that the goal of teaching history is to allow students to develop their own knowledge and perspective about the past and other cultures and in the process to develop critical thinking skills which allow them to be empowered and thus to make responsible decisions as citizens. Students do not develop their own knowledge or develop critical thinking skills or learn to make decisions by absorbing the teacher's delivered "facts" whether they be about one culture or another or have a multi-cultural or Eurocentric emphasis.

The problem is a methodological one (Stearns, 1991) and relates to the question: Whose fact or whose knowledge is it anyway (Apple, 1991; Sizer, 1984; Tucker, 1988)? If the student hasn't developed that knowledge, then it is not her/his own. It is someone else's truth. Most teachers do not make a purposeful effort to present a lopsided view of history; they make a concerted, usually unsuccessful, attempt to cover the curriculum. It is an impossible task. To add more requirements in the form of more content will lead to more teacher direction and domination and therefore less critical reflection and lack of critical thinking development. In addition, the student who passively

receives information has no notion of what it means to be a responsible citizen in a democratic society.

The implications of this study's findings to the teaching and learning of history relate to methodology. The present and former students in this study argued that they became much more aware of the issues and multitude of perspectives involved in understanding and drawing conclusions about their topics than they would have been had they "learned" about the topic through traditional teaching methods. The students additionally claimed that their independent study led to attitude changes about issues. For the students in School B the learning was so dramatic that three of the five group members decided to become involved in the fight to bring freedom and democracy to China. All of the teachers confirmed that an in-depth, critical learning occurred. Furthermore, it is clear that one of the reasons that these teachers continued to participate in NHD was that they had seen this happen consistently through the NHD process. Still for Bender and Watson the priority in the classroom was to cover the required curriculum.

I agree with Sizer (1984, 1989), the NHD state coordinators, and White from School B that less is more. Teachers need to allow students to "uncover" the curriculum in the classroom in the same way that these teachers did with their students through NHD. I propose it is more important in terms of encouraging and providing the

opportunity for students to develop critical thinking skills, to be empowered, and to be responsible citizens, to have a student work on one or a few topics in depth and to develop her/his own knowledge--to own it--than to have a teacher dispense someone else's knowledge about thousands of bits of information that the student won't remember anyway. To paraphrase Piaget (in Labinowicz, 1980), if it takes a student 3 years to discover and create her/his own knowledge about several topics and it takes a teacher only one month to deliver information on the same subjects, the teacher has just wasted one month.

The NHD process involves researching and developing a presentation on one topic. Like all active learning methods it is time consuming. However, all the participants in this study claimed that the knowledge and comprehension the students came away with was not only about the topic but also related to the historical contexts and analysis of such and involved as many different views of the same topic as the student could discover and uncover. That kind of creation and mastery gives students the self-confidence and knowledge that liberates them. The NHD processes, according to the participants, also taught these students how to think independently and reflectively--a skill that citizens in an information-filled democratic society need to have. The concern (of Bender, School A, and Watson, School C) that the NHD processes alone would represent too narrow a focus is a

natural one considering the experiences most of us have had as students as to what constitutes teaching and learning American, world, and any other history, but it does not consider the larger question of the purpose of learning history in a democratic society.

This is not to minimize the importance, need, and value of a chronological understanding and perspective of cause and effect in the study of history. But considering the positive cognitive, skills, and affective results as well as the empowering effects these students and teachers claimed to have gained from their involvement in the NHD program, it would seem that finding a way to incorporate NHD processes into the existing curriculum would be an appropriate and worthwhile goal. Before this will happen, the teachers will need to believe that it is more valuable and important to encourage and allow all students to uncover the curriculum (or as White would say "to take the lid off the pot") than it is for the teachers to cover it. Additionally curriculum requirements will have to change, classes will have to be smaller, and new or inexperienced teachers will need training in how to help students learn in this active way.

Chapter Summary

This study uncovered motivating factors so powerful as to provoke teachers and students to participate in NHD more than once regardless of the enormous time and energy participation required. Also, it would appear that these

motivating factors account for the phenomenal growth in the number of participants since NHD became a national program in 1980. Contributions of this study's findings to the research on motivation include confirmation of the motivating power (for students and teachers) of having control and autonomy, receiving feedback and feeling competent, and having purpose. Results also provide confirmation of the motivating force of the need for an adolescent to develop her/his self-identity.

The study findings support previous research results which found competition to motivate and to increase productivity and creativity. They, however, refute research results which determined that competition decreased cooperation and group cohesion and interaction. Additionally, this study confirms that through NHD students learned actively (produced their own knowledge) and supports previous research results which concluded that learning actively leads to the ability to think critically. Finally, results support existing theory that by producing their own media materials, students will improve their understanding and interpretation of media messages.

Implications for educational practice revolve around the question of how to incorporate the components of the NHD process (those components which allowed these teachers and students to maintain a high motivational level, to feel empowered, and to achieve desired learning results) into the

curriculum. The implications for the teaching and learning of history relate to methodology. The participants' perceptions indicated that through the NHD process the students gained a deeper comprehension of historical content and concepts and a greater ability to think critically and to develop their own knowledge than could have been achieved in a traditional, teacher-dominated classroom.

C H A P T E R VIII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

While results of a qualitative study such as this cannot be generalized to an entire population, the differences among the schools, communities, locations, teachers, and students combined with the similarities in the findings and with the corroborating data from state coordinators and former students suggest the following:

1. The processes of NHD provide a method of teaching and learning history that is superior to traditional methods.
2. Through participation in NHD students:
   a. learn content, develop in-depth comprehension and awareness of issues, and gain transferable, life-long skills;
   b. gain self-confidence and self-esteem;
   c. gain mastery and a feeling of competence;
   d. gain a sense of who they are in relation to others;
   e. learn the importance of group and team work and develop cooperative skills and a respect for a cooperative effort.
3. Through participation in NHD teachers:
   a. are able to develop close relationships with students;

b. are able to have fun and avoid boredom;

c. receive positive feedback about their teaching abilities.

4. Through participation in NHD students and teachers:

a. receive recognition for their efforts;

b. have autonomy and control of their own work i.e. are empowered;

c. are able to contribute to their communities;

d. feel good about themselves;

e. are able to work in collaboration.

5. Students and teachers will continue to participate in NHD as long as the feedback about their competencies is positive and they perceive they have control and autonomy.

6. The competition format of the NHD program is part of the driving force behind the level of involvement and high calibre of work.

7. Losing in NHD may temporarily result in anger or depression, however it ultimately may motivate the students to work harder.

8. The competition events--learning from other projects and presentations, meeting people at the events, and comparing oneself and one's work to others and their work--are greater motivators for the students than is wanting to win.

The findings in this study not only confirm what is written in the literature and testimonials about NHD but expand upon the positive claims. This study shows what dedicated, creative teachers can do when given control and autonomy. The extra-school work and time expended by the teachers and students in this study was immeasurable. To realize that it was given with little complaining but rather with an attitude of excitement and anticipation makes it all the more noteworthy and in great contrast to conventional educational practice and posture.

That the program has had such a phenomenal growth and has been able to join secondary school students and teachers in a collaborative, learning adventure and effort with university and college professors is amazing in itself and a testimony to all participants. Considering also that the program has been administered mainly by volunteers at the district and state levels, it is remarkable what the program has accomplished in terms of learning results, motivational effects, and expansion.

Results of the study indicate there are problems which need to be addressed by the program staff. The main complaint of the teachers and students revolved around judging inconsistencies. Findings show that these participants ignored or put up with the other inconveniences but when they concluded that inferior judging made a mockery of their work and effort, they no longer wanted to

participate. While the participants seemed to enjoy the judging on one level--the level of comparing oneself to another and of facing a challenge--they resented it when it stripped them of control.

While the participants argued that there were no long range effects of the losing, winning, and worrying associated with the competition, most recognized the danger of becoming obsessed with winning. This raises the larger issue of the relationship of competition to and in education and a democratic society. Is competition a necessary component of, or a contradiction to, a democratic education and democratic propositions and values? Is there a necessary competition/cooperation balance needed and if so, in what ways can and should the NHD program and the teachers address this issue?

NHD is at a turning point. The Executive Director has accomplished her goal of making the program national. Since each state sends two students per category to the national event in June, the size of that competition will remain essentially what it is now unless other categories are added. National headquarters now has the opportunity to focus its attention on other matters. I submit that NHD could make substantial and significant contributions to the American educational system, including work with inner-city systems, but it would require changes in the funding

framework, more secondary teacher input, and a greater understanding of secondary school processes.

In a new long range proposal, accepted in January 1992, NHD made a commitment to address most of the issues and concerns raised by the study's participants (see Epilogue--Appendix K). This commitment includes moving the headquarters to Washington, DC, creating a national communication network, creating a computer research network for schools, instituting outreach to inner-city schools, hiring a fund-raiser, expanding internationally, providing uniform materials for all participants, and creating an orientation and certification program for judges.

There are three issues which the new proposal does not address--the involvement of secondary school teachers on an advisory level, attention to the turnover and lack of availability of district coordinators, and integration of NHD into the curriculum. Unless attended to, these omissions will remain the weak links in the NHD program, and in the case of secondary school teacher issues, will prevent this university/secondary school collaboration from developing into a model for such partnership.

I conclude with two dilemmas:

1. Would it be more equitable and democratic for a school and those involved to incorporate NHD or similar processes into a required curriculum so that all (supposedly) could experience the same learning,

empowering effects as have the study's participants (if in fact requiring something would allow the effects to be the same) or to keep NHD as a voluntary program in which only those who want to, or who are at a certain ability level, participate and therefore only those become empowered?

2. If the processes of NHD, minus the competition, are incorporated into a school program, would the positive effects be the same as found in this study? If not, what would this say about the necessity of competition in relation to motivation and learning results? What would the implications be for the teaching and learning of history in terms of developing in students responsible citizenship skills through competition?

Recommendations

1. One of the limitations of this study is that it does not include more students of average or below average ability. Further research is suggested to compare effectiveness of NHD processes with students of differing achievement and ability levels.

2. Further research involving NHD programs which are the sole history curriculum or are a required component of the history curriculum is required to balance and corroborate these findings and to shed light on how these programs have been implemented and with what results.

3. Further research on the profile of NHD teachers could be valuable in terms of developing selection criteria for teacher candidates.

4. Research focused on the effects of student media production is needed to determine implications for the use of technology in schools in terms of developing visual literacy and cognitive skills.

5. Several questions raised in Chapter IV have not been answered sufficiently. Further study is recommended to determine:

   a. secondary history teachers' perceptions, understanding, and philosophies of the structure of the discipline of history;

   b. the role teacher education programs play in secondary teachers' understanding of the discipline;

   c. reasons for secondary teachers not seeing purpose beyond (or for equating the teaching of history with) covering the material.

APPENDIX A

DEFINITION OF NHD TERMS

DEFINITION OF NHD TERMS

Competition Categories (NHD, 1986)

1. Historical papers must be between 1500 and 2500 words excluding bibliography and footnotes.
2. Table top projects cannot be larger than 40 inches wide, 30 inches deep and 6 feet high. On the project, student-composed written material is limited to 500 words. There is no live student involvement. A media device which viewer can operate and is no longer than three minutes may be included if integral to project i.e. a tape recording of an oral interview.
3. A media presentation is limited to 10 minutes with an additional 5 minutes to set up and 5 minutes to remove equipment. There is no live student involvement allowed except for students to give their names and title of the entry.
4. A live performance is limited to 10 minutes with an additional 5 minutes to set up and 5 minutes to remove props. The live performance may include a form of media as supplement.

All forms of presentation must convey an analysis of a topic related to the annual theme and clearly show relationship to an historical context. All contestants must respond to judges' questions. At stake in this competition are college scholarships, and monetary, travel, book and miscellaneous awards.

Annual Themes (NHD, 1991)

1980 - The Individual in History
1981 - Work and Leisure in History
1982 - Trade and Industry in History
1983 - Turning Points in History
1984 - Family and Community in History
1985 - Triumphs and Tragedies in History
1986 - Conflicts and Compromises in History
1987 - Liberty, Rights and Responsibilities in History
1988 - Frontiers in History
1989 - The Individual in History
1990 - Science and Technology in History
1991 - Rights in History
1992 - Discovery, Encounter, Exchange in History: The Seeds of Change

NHD Documentary Materials

While most of the documentary material listed in the introduction should be self-explanatory, the following may not be:

1. Theme fliers, for students and teachers, are one page descriptions of the annual theme. These fliers explain the meaning of the year's theme and list and briefly examine suggested topics.
2. Contest guides describe the general NHD contest policies and rules specific to each category.
3. Classroom supplements (for teachers) are booklets which are published when funds are available. Each booklet is somewhat different but relates to that year's theme and may include any of the following: in-depth planning suggestions on how to incorporate NHD into the classroom curriculum, suggested topics, lesson plans, time lines relating to the theme, extensive

bibliography, lists of resource material, research techniques, and instructions on how to create projects in the different categories. NHD staff compile or edit most of the booklets. Supplement No. 7 on "Rights in History" was produced by the staff of the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution (Commission, 1990).

APPENDIX B

PILOT STUDIES

PILOT STUDIES

"A pilot study is a pilot study; its target is the practicality of proposed operations, not the creation of empirical truth" (Locke, 1987, p. 68). Prior to this dissertation research, I conducted two pilot studies. The first one took place in the spring of 1990. This was part of a seminar on in-depth interviewing. It gave me the opportunity to interview, using Seidman's (1991) three part framework of in-depth interviewing, to determine if this would be an appropriate method of studying the NHD program. There were two participants in the study. One was a student who was a first time NHD participant, the other was a teacher who had been in the program for several years and had had a national NHD winner. While I concentrated on the profiles of the participants in this study, the experience gave me the opportunity to see how interviewing teenagers might require adaptations of the procedure and allowed me to see weaknesses in my own interviewing skills (Page, 1990b).

The second pilot study was more formal. It involved developing a questionnaire which was distributed in teachers' packets at the National History Day competition at the University of Maryland in June of 1990. The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain information concerning the following: how long the teacher had been involved in NHD; grades of students involved; degree of difficulty in implementing History Day; relation of program to curriculum;

preference of categories; kinds of student learning teachers discerned; teaching styles; reason for involvement; and whether or not the teacher would be interested in being a part of my research. Of 500 questionnaires, approximately 60 were returned. While the responses did not subsequently prove to be extremely useful to me, they did raise questions about the relationship of NHD to the history/social studies curriculum.

APPENDIX C

TIMETABLE OF EVENTS

TIMETABLE OF EVENTS

October 1990:

Traveled to Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio to conduct interviews with Professors Van Tassel and Ubbelodhe and the Associate and Executive Director of NHD.

Collected documentary materials.

November 1990 - January 1991:

Through information from state coordinators and NHD Headquarters, investigated state and school programs and decided which schools, states and/or programs I wanted to include in the study.

January 1991:

Contacted the schools and teachers and made arrangements for conducting interviews.

January 1991 - February 1991:

Conducted interviews with teachers and students at the three schools

April 1991:

Returned to the schools and conducted second set of interviews with teachers and students.

May 1991:

Conducted telephone interviews with three state coordinators and six former NHD students.

June 1991:

Attended the five day NHD national competition at the University of Maryland and conducted third set of interviews with students.

Had informal conversations with teachers and students during the five days.

Attended students' presentations.

Transcribed interviews.

August 1991 - September 1991:

Talked informally with teachers by phone.

June 1991 - December 1991:

Analyzed data.

Sent copies of first draft to participants.

APPENDIX D

ETHNOGRAPHY AND SCHOOL SCHEDULES

ETHNOGRAPHY AND SCHOOL SCHEDULES

Sieber (1981) noted the difficulty in doing ethnographic research in schools in that class and school routine and scheduling do not allow a lot of flexibility or interruption. However, the teachers and the school systems in this study made my job remarkably easy. The participating teachers scheduled the interviews for me knowing that I was trying to allow 90 minutes for each interview. When an interview had to be split, I conducted half of the interview during one period and the other half during another.

Each school provided me with an appropriately private and quiet place to conduct the interviews. The teachers in each of the three schools checked on me periodically during the day to see if there was anything I needed to make sure everything was going smoothly. They also make sure the students were there for me when they were scheduled to be. The teachers gave up their planning and lunch times to allow me to interview them.

APPENDIX E

SEMISTRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

SEMISTRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

Professors

The questions for the professors revolved around the following issues/areas/items:

1. Background before involvement in NHD.
2. History of involvement/role.
3. History of NHD's theoretical underpinnings.
4. Perceived strengths of NHD.
5. Perceived weaknesses of NHD.
6. Process changes in NHD.
7. Inner-city involvement
8. Vision for future.
9. Personal meaning of involvement in NHD.

Administrators

The questions for the administrators involved the same issues with the addition of the following:

1. History of administrative structure of NHD.
2. Funding history of NHD.
3. Description of state models.

State Coordinators

The interviews for the state coordinators focused on the following issues:

1. Background before involvement in NHD.
2. History of involvement/role.
3. Perceived strengths and weaknesses of NHD.

4. Organization of state History Day program.
5. Perceived strengths and weaknesses of state History Day program.
6. Suggestions for improvement.
7. Funding of the state program.
8. NHD as a model for teaching history.
9. Replication possibilities.

Former Students

The interviews for the former students focused on the following concerns:

1. History of involvement.
2. Description of memorable experiences.
3. Perceptions of strengths and weaknesses of NHD.
4. Perception of types and degrees of learning through NHD.
5. Effects of NHD participation.
6. Suggestions for improvement.
7. NHD as a model for teaching and learning history.
8. Perceptions of the competitive aspect of NHD.

APPENDIX F

RESEARCHER EFFECTS

RESEARCHER EFFECTS

In qualitative method, the researcher is the primary research tool and as such becomes part of, and can affect, the participants' experiences or relating of such. At the conclusion of the students' third interviews, I asked them to describe how the interviewing process and my involvement in their lives had affected them and their work in NHD. The responses, I submit, tell as much if not more about contemporary schooling as they do about the effects of my role as researcher or the effects of the interviewing process. They (the responses) speak to the need of adolescents to have recognition for their work; to have the opportunity to think about objectives and goals of their work; and to know someone cares about what they are doing. Responses indicated that either my presence or the interviewing process:

1. helped students gain confidence.

   > When you were interviewing us, it gave us . . . a boost . . . like we really had a chance to knock them dead. (Adam)

2. helped provide a forum where group members were able to hear each other's suggestions and concerns and set goals.

   > It helped bring our ideas together; we hadn't really discussed it together. (Jim)

   > The best thing was having the chance to get ideas out in the open and it helped us to get organized. (Ed)

3. made students think about what they were getting out of NHD.

> [The interviews] really helped me sort out my thoughts and feeling on History Fair. No one before had made us sit down and think about the benefits and values of doing History Fair. (Amosh)

> It helped develop the thought process. (Judy)

4. helped to give the students an incentive to work harder.

> We wanted to come here and see you again. It gave us something to look forward to and gave us another drive. (Jim)

> We wanted to do our best. (Jake)

5. helped improve self-awareness.

> It made me aware of why I do the things I do. (Linda)

APPENDIX G

CONTRIBUTION TO TECHNIQUE OF IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWING

CONTRIBUTION TO TECHNIQUE OF IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWING

In-Depth Interviewing with Teenagers

The philosophical foundation of qualitative research argues that there is not one truth, but many truths relative to how a person perceives her/his experiences. In-depth interviewing, as a technique of qualitative method, effectively allows participants in a research study to tell their stories and what their experiences mean to them with a minimum of direction and interference from the researcher. However, based on my pilot study using in-depth interviewing (See Appendix B) and the experience with this study of NHD, I would argue that Seidman's version of in-depth interviewing needs certain modifications with adolescents.

I would suggest that 90 minutes is too long for an interview directed mainly by one question. First, adolescents are not used to being interviewed; secondly, adolescents are not used to being able to talk about themselves and their experiences for long periods of time without interruptions; thirdly, adolescents are used to "right" and "wrong" answers in school and constantly wonder if what they are saying is right; and fourthly, adolescents do not have a long enough history to talk about their background for 90 minutes unless that background has entailed enormous change and turmoil. In in-depth interviewing with adolescents, I would argue that: adolescents need to have the process thoroughly explained to

them; they need to be reassured there are no right or wrong answers; and the interviewer needs to have contributory and focusing questions ready to augment the interview experience.

In-Depth Interviewing with a Group

Given that the purpose of in-depth interviewing is to allow an individual to tell her/his stories and the meaning of such, conducting in-depth interviews with a group may seem like a contradiction in terms. However, in this study it not only worked well but had benefits in terms of helping to develop group unit.

Groups have dynamics all their own. The interviewer has to strive to have all members participate equally in order that each member is able to tell her/his individual story. At the same time, the interviewer has to "read" the group as a whole and be aware of: how the group functions, the reciprocal nature of group/individual effects, and the role of the individual members in the group, in order to interpret and analyze the reconstructions of their experiences.

I found that I was able to hear the individual stories if I asked for each member to respond at appropriate times. I also found that one of the advantages of interviewing teenagers in a group was that they were not as intimidated or unsure of themselves as the individual interviewees. In addition, often one of the members would speak about an

issue which would remind another member of something or cause another to react. Because of that interaction, the group interviews were lively and rich and thick with description and emotional involvement. At the end of the last interview session, members of all the groups related that the interviewing process had helped them to be more of a group, to understand each other, to set goals, and to have direction in their work.

APPENDIX H

CONSENT FORMS

CONSENT FORMS

Written Consent Form

Teachers

National History Day: An Ethnohistorical Case Study

I. I, Marilyn Page, am a graduate student in the School of Education, University of Massachusetts in Amherst, Massachusetts. My dissertation research will involve a case study of National History Day. The purposes are to obtain a realistic portrait of the NHD program and to analyze implications for educational theory and practice.

II. As part of this study, I will be interviewing students and teachers who represent, at each of three schools, one group and one individual NHD entry. Interviews will take place as close to the beginning of the teachers' and students' involvement as possible and again after district and state competitions, if applicable. The purpose of these interviews is to learn about the teachers' and students' experiences in the NHD and the meaning of those experiences for them.

I am asking you to participate in this interviewing process. The interview(s), depending on how far you have progressed in the Program, will focus on one or more of the following: a) your background before, and how you came to be involved in, NHD; b) what it is like for you to be involved in the Program; and c) what your experiences mean to you. During the interview(s), I may ask questions for further understanding or clarification, but mainly I will listen to you as you recreate, and describe the meaning of, your experiences.

III. My goal is to analyze the data from your interview(s) and to integrate this with data from documentary records and other participants' interviews to develop a realistic portrait of NHD.

IV. I will audio-tape and transcribe the interview(s). In all written materials and oral presentations in which I use material from your interview(s), I will use neither your name, names of people close to you, nor the location nor name of your school.

V. Besides presenting the interview material and analysis of such in my doctoral dissertation, I may use the material as part of any of the following: a) journal articles; b) presentations to professional groups; c) instructional

formats; or d) a book. If I wish to use the material in any other way, I will ask you for additional written consent.

VI. You may withdraw from the interview process at any time. Also, within thirty days of the end of the interview series, you may ask me to delete any passage.

VII. In signing this form you are agreeing to use the materials from your interview(s) as indicated in IV and V, and you are assuring me that you will make no financial claims on me for the use of the material from your interview(s).

I, _____, have read the above statement and agree to participate as an interviewee under the conditions stated above.

_____
Signature of Participant

_____
Date

_____
Interviewer

Written Consent Form

Students

National History Day:
An Ethnohistorical Case Study

I. I, Marilyn Page, am a graduate student in the School of Education, University of Massachusetts in Amherst, Massachusetts. My dissertation research will involve a case study of National History Day (NHD). The purposes are to obtain a realistic portrait of the NHD program and to analyze implications for educational theory and practice.

II. As a part of this study, I will be interviewing students and teachers who represent, at each of three schools, one group and one individual NHD entry. Interviews will take place as close to the beginning of the students' and teachers' involvement as possible and again after district and state competitions, if applicable. The purpose of these interviews is to learn about the students' and teachers' experiences in NHD and the meaning of those experiences for them.

I am asking you to participate in this interviewing process. The interview(s), depending on how far you have progressed in the Program, will focus on one or more of the following: a) your education before, and how you came to be involved in, NHD; b) what it is like for you to be involved in the Program; and c) what your experiences mean to you. During the interview(s), I may ask questions for further understanding or clarification, but mainly I will listen to you as you recreate, and describe the meaning of, your experiences.

To augment interview data, I also am asking you to keep a journal of NHD activities and related feelings and reactions.

III. My goal is to analyze the data from your interview(s) and journal and to integrate this with data from documentary records and other participants' interviews and journals to develop a realistic portrait of NHD.

IV. I will audio-tape and transcribe the interview(s). In all written materials and oral presentations in which I use material from your interview(s) or journal, I will use neither your name, names of people close to you, nor the location nor name of your school.

V. Besides presenting the interview and journal material and analysis of such in my doctoral dissertation, I may use the material as part of any of the following: a) journal articles; b) presentations to professional groups; c) instructional formats; or d) a book. If I wish to use the material in any other way, I will ask you for additional written consent.

VI. You may withdraw from the interview process at any time. Also, within thirty days of the end of the interview series, you may ask me to delete any passage from either the interview(s) or from the journal.

VII. In order to take part in this study, you must have the written consent of your parent or legal guardian. There is a space below for his or her signature. If your parent or guardian has any questions or would like further information about this project please ask him or her to call me at (508) 384-2090.

VIII. In signing this form you and your parent or guardian are agreeing to your taking part in this study under the conditions set forth above and you are assuring me that you will make no financial claims on me for the use of the material from your interview(s) or journal.

Thank you for considering being a part of my research. I look forward to working with you on this project.

I,_____, have read the above statement and agree to participate as an interviewee under the conditions stated above.

_____
Signature of Participant

_____
Date

I, _____, have read the statement above and agree to my son's or daughter's participation in the study under the conditions stated above.

_____
Signature of Parent or Guardian

_____
Date

_____
Signature of Interviewer

Written Consent Form

State Coordinators

National History Day:
An Ethnohistorical Case Study

I. I, Marilyn Page, am a graduate student in the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, Massachusetts. My dissertation research involves a case study of National History Day (NHD). The purposes are to obtain a realistic portrait of the NHD program and to analyze implications for educational theory and practice.

II. As a part of this study, I will be interviewing three State Coordinators of NHD. I am asking you to participate in one telephone interview and have attached an outline of areas I want to address in the interview. During the interview I may ask questions concerning other areas or issues, if needed, for clarification or for further understanding.

III. My goal is to analyze the data from your interview in relation to the data from documentary records and other participants' interviews to develop a realistic portrait of NHD.

IV. In all written materials and oral presentations in which I use material from your interview, I will use neither your name, names of people close to you, nor the name of your state.

V. Besides presenting the interview material and analysis of such in my doctoral dissertation, I may use the material as part of any of the following: a) journal articles; b) presentations to professional groups; c) instructional formats; or d) a book. If I wish to use the material in any other way, I will ask you for additional written consent.

VI. You may withdraw from the interview process at any time. Also, within thirty days of the interview, you may ask me to delete any passage.

VII. In signing this form you are agreeing to the use of the materials from your interview as indicated in IV and V, and you are assuring me that you will make no financial claims on me for the use of the material from your interview.

I, _____, have read the above statement and agree to participate as an interviewee under the conditions stated above.

_____
Signature of Participant

_____
Date

_____
Interviewer

Written Consent Form

Professors/Administrators

National History Day:
An Ethnohistorical Case Study

I. I, Marilyn Page, am a graduate student in the School of Education, University of Massachusetts in Amherst, Massachusetts. My dissertation research will involve a case study of National History Day. The purposes are to obtain a realistic portrait of the NHD program and to analyze implications for educational theory and practice.

II. As part of this study, I am asking you to participate in one interview, the focus of which will be your current and previous roles in the history and/or administration of NHD. My part will be to listen to you as you describe your experiences, related to the history of NHD, within the structure of the interview questions. I have attached an outline of areas I want to cover in the interview. During the interview I may ask questions concerning other areas or issues, if needed, for clarification or for further understanding. The interview will last from sixty to ninety minutes.

III. My goal is to analyze the materials from your interview and to integrate this with other available documentary data to recreate the history of NHD for the first part of my research. This will provide the foundation and context for the second part of the study--a qualitative study of students, teachers and schools involved in the program.

IV. I will audio-tape and transcribe the interview. Because I consider you a primary source, I am asking for your permission to use your name in all written materials and oral presentations.

V. Besides presenting the interview material and analysis of such in my doctoral dissertation, I may use the material as part of any of the following: a) journal articles; b) presentations to professional groups; c) instructional formats; or d) a book. If I wish to use the material in any other way, I will ask you for additional written consent.

VI. You may withdraw from the interview process at any time. Also, at the end of the interview, you may ask me to delete any passage.

VII. In signing this form you are agreeing to the use of the materials from your interview as indicated in IV and V, and you are assuring me that you will make no financial claims on me for the use of the material from your interview.

I, _____, have read the above statement and agree to participate as an interviewee under the conditions stated above.

_____
Signature of Participant

_____
Date

_____
Interviewer

Written Consent Form

Former Participants

National History Day: An Ethnohistorical Case Study

I. I, Marilyn Page, am a graduate student in the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, Massachusetts. My dissertation research involves a case study of National History Day (NHD). The purposes are to obtain a realistic portrait of the NHD program and to analyze implications for educational theory and practice.

II. As a part of this study, I will be interviewing six former participants of the National History Day program. I am asking you to participate in one telephone interview and have attached an outline of areas I want to address in the interview. During the interview I may ask questions concerning other areas or issues, if needed, for clarification or for further understanding.

III. My goal is to analyze the data from your interview in relation to the data from documentary records and other participants' interviews to develop a realistic portrait of NHD.

IV. In all written materials and oral presentations in which I use materials from your interview, I will use neither your name, names of people close to you, nor the name of your state.

V. Besides presenting the interview material and analysis of such in my doctoral dissertation, I may use the material as part of any of the following: a) journal articles; b) presentations to professional groups; c) instructional formats; or d) a book. If I wish to use the material in any other way, I will ask you for additional written consent.

VI. You may withdraw from the interview process at any time. Also, within thirty days of the interview, you may ask me to delete any passage.

VII. In signing this form your are agreeing to the use of the materials from your interview as indicated in IV and V, and you are assuring me that you will make no financial claims on me for the use of the material from your interview.

I, _____, have read the above statement and agree to participate as an interviewee under the conditions stated above.

_____
Signature of Participant

_____
Date

_____
Interviewer

APPENDIX I

HUMAN SUBJECTS ABSTRACT

HUMAN SUBJECTS ABSTRACT

1. Role of human participants.

During interviews, I will be asking the participants to describe their experiences, thoughts, and beliefs related to NHD. I also will ask the students and teachers to keep a log of activities, and related feelings and reactions, which occur during their involvement in NHD.

2. Rights of the participants.

The participants will be volunteers. I will give each participant a consent form which will define her/his rights in relation to the study. These rights will include the right to withdraw from the study at any time and to ask to have certain excerpts removed.

3. Providing information about research methods to participants.

Through the consent form and the proposal abstract, I will introduce myself and explain the research methods to all participants.

4. Obtaining consent.

For each participant there will be a consent form which will introduce me and explain the study and the part the participant will play in it. I will review the consent form with each participant (and in the case of a student, with her/his parent(s) and answer any questions the participant (parent(s)) may have.

5. Confidentiality.

The Administrators and Professors will not be anonymous. They are vital primary sources for the historical part of the research and therefore I need to identify them. In the consent form, there will be an explanation of the participant's right to have excerpts removed from transcripts.

I will use pseudonyms for the names of participating students, teachers and schools.

APPENDIX J

PROPOSAL ABSTRACT

PROPOSAL ABSTRACT

National History Day: An Ethnohistorical Case Study

Dramatic cognitive and affective results for my students involved in the National History Day (NHD) program led me to doctoral work which has involved investigating and analyzing theories of education which could account for this success.

While educational analysts describe contemporary education in general as inadequate, dull, uninspired, boring, teacher-dominated and teacher-dispensed, published reports and descriptions of NHD are positive and claim results similar to what my students experienced. These results include and included an increase in learning, comprehension, involvement, motivation and self-confidence. It is the dynamics of the NHD program, in which students do research and produce and present a program on a designated topic, that I want to continue to investigate and capture in my dissertation.

I am proposing an ethnohistorical case study (modeled after Puckett's case study of FOXFIRE, 1989) of NHD--a study of its history, theoretical underpinnings, program processes, and implications for educational theory and practice. This will be the first comprehensive, systematic study of the program in its ten year history.

The ethnohistorical method combines traditional ethnographic (qualitative) procedures with traditional historiographical methods (Puckett, 1989). The first part of the research will concentrate on the history of NHD and include: a) the study of written documents available at NHD Headquarters at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland; b) the study of published reports and descriptions of NHD; and c) interviews with the Director, Associate Director and two Professors instrumental in the program's creation.

The ethnographic (qualitative) part of the study will involve fieldwork at three purposefully selected schools. The fieldwork will include interviews with select students and teachers, representing, at each school, one group and one individual entry. Interviews will take place as close to the beginning of the students' involvement as possible and again after district and state competitions, if applicable. I also will ask students to keep a journal of their related activities (processes involved and associated feelings and reactions).

To supplement this documentary and qualitative data and to provide internal validity checks, I will conduct telephone interviews with three state coordinators, who have

been with the NHD program since 1980, and with former NHD students.

The main objectives of this study are: a) to develop a realistic portrait of NHD and b) to analyze implications for educational theory and practice.

APPENDIX K

EPILOGUE

EPILOGUE

> National History Day has come to an important juncture in its development. . . . (Van Tassel, 1991, Memo)

Mission

In January 1992, the Board of Directors of NHD accepted a five year plan of the Long Range Planning Committee. This plan will take effect in September 1992. The mission statement is as follows:

> National History Day promotes historical inquiry, knowledge and understanding among elementary and secondary students. Through an educational program culminating in nationwide competitions, National History Day encourages the development of research skills, analytical thinking, and creative expression.
>
> National History Day fosters high quality and innovative historical instruction by providing educators with opportunities and resource materials related to historical research and the development of teaching skills.
>
> National History Day programs are open to all students and teachers without regard to race, sex, religion, physical abilities, economic status, or sexual orientation. (Long Range Planning Committee, 1991, p. 1)

Goals

The five goals of the five year plan are to conduct an annual, "high quality National History Day program," "expand and enhance" NHD outreach, "strengthen the state organizational structure," "inform participants, educators, historians and the general public" about NHD, and "provide resources and management necessary to achieve the National

History Day mission and goals" (Long Range Planning Committee, 1991, p. 2). Through these goals and related objectives, the Long Range Plan addresses several of the issues and concerns raised by this study's participants.

Issues Addressed

According to the Long Range Plan, NHD will work to:

1. integrate the annual theme into the school curricula and to develop teachers' supplementary research material using terms which will mesh with state social studies requirements;

2. create and implement uniform judging standards by providing instructional videos, judging forms and instructions, and developing a system of certification and training for judges;

3. provide, through external funding, materials such as curriculum guides, rule books, judging forms and the annual report to all participants;

4. insure strong state organizations by drawing up a state charter, by requiring creation of state executive committees, and by providing on-site assistance;

5. improve communication within the NHD system through a newsletter and if possible, through electronic mail;

6. disseminate information about NHD by seeking endorsements of national organizations; by involving school districts' administrators and national secondary administration associations; by attending and presenting at conferences; by getting newspaper and TV publicity; by producing bumper stickers; and by involving senior citizens through the Elder Hostel;

7. investigate the committee structure of the Board of Trustees and recommend changes to include visible, national, business and media leaders;

8. define short and long range funding needs and hire a development director to develop a fund raising system.

New Directions

The Plan involves forward looking components which focus on expanding the use of technology in schools and in NHD, international participation, student access to state and national resources, inner-city and minority involvement, expansion of program to grades four and five, and moving the national headquarters to Washington, DC.

1. To address the changing conditions of education, NHD will "serve as a leader in the use of technology in schools to study history" (Long Range Planning Committee, p. 3). In addition, NHD will develop technology products, set up training programs and develop an access system to national resource centers such as the Library of Congress.

2. NHD will develop a policy and criteria for international participation.

3. NHD will develop and provide program resources through, and access to, national and state organizations and institutions.

4. NHD will provide fellowship funds, explore criteria for non-English entries, and provide resources and aids for handicapped students. by 1997, NHD will require that each state have a program in at least one major area with "a significant minority population" (p. 6) and will encourage involvement of minority teachers, judges and resource persons.

5. By 1997, NHD will have a program for 4th and 5th graders.

6. By September 1992, NHD headquarters will be in Washington, DC; a new Executive Director will be hired; and the process for implementing a computer and communication system to support fund-raising and networking will have begun.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, D. & Hamm, M. (1988). Changing gateway to knowledge: New media symbol systems. Tech Trends, January, 21-23.

Adams, D.W. & Pasch, M. (1987). The past as experience: A qualitative assessment of National History Day. The History Teacher, 20(2), 179-194.

Adams, J.D. Jr. (1973). Effects of competition and open receptivity on creative productivity. Catalogue of Selected Documents in Psychology, 3, 16-17.

Adelson, L. (1971). The political imagination of the young adolescent. Deadalus, 100, 1013-1050.

Aiken, W.M. (1942). The story of the Eight Year Study: Vol #1. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Alder, D.D. & Downey, M.T. (1985). Problem areas in the history curriculum. In M.T. Downey (Ed.). History in the Schools: Bulletin 74. National Council for Social Studies, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 254477).

Allen, W.H. & Van Sicke, R.L. (1984). Research in social studies education: Learning teams and low achievers. Social Education, January, 60-64.

Allport, B.W. (1961). Pattern and growth in personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Amabile, T.M. & Gitomer, J. (1984). Children's artistic creativity: Effects of choice in test materials. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 10, 209-215.

Ames, C. (1978). Children's achievement attributions and self reinforcement: Effects of self concept and competitive reward structure. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70, 345-355.

Ames, C. & Ames, R. (Eds.) (1985). Research on motivation in education, Vol #2: The classroom milieu. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Apple, M.W. (1991). The politics of curriculum and teaching. NASSP Bulletin, February, 39-49.

Armour, R.E. & Proefriedt, W.A. (1991, December 4). Cultural interdependence and learner-centrism: Multicultural perspectives. Education Week, pp. 36, 27.

ASCD Curriculum Update. (1990, September). Social studies revival of history and geography gains ground, ASCD Curriculum Update, p. 5.

ASCD Mini Conference Report. (1991, February). Alternative assessments drive change. Update, p. 5.

Aston, P. (1985). Motivation and the teacher's sense of efficacy. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.). Research on motivation in education: The classroom milieu (pp. 141-171). Orlando: Academic Press.

Ausubil, D.P. (1968). Educational psychology: A cognitive view. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.

Axtell, J. (1979). Ethnohistory: An historian's viewpoint. Ethnohistory, 26(1), 1-13.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barr, R.D., Barth, J.L., & Shermis, S.S. (1977). Defining the social studies. Virginia: National Council for Social Studies.

Barr, R. & Dreeben, R. (1983). How schools work. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bartlett, J. (1980). Familiar Quotations. Boston: Little Brown.

Benjamin, S. (1989). An ideascape for education: What futurists recommend. Educational Leadership, 47(1), 8-14.

Benware, C. & Deci, E.L. (1984). Quality of learning with an active versus passive motivational set. American Educational Research Journal, 21, 755-766.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol #3: Implementing and sustaining innovations, Rand Report R-1589 HEW. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Bestor, A.E. (1953). Educational wastelands. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Blake, D.W. (1981). Observing children learning history. The History Teacher, 14, 533-549.

Boggiano, A.K., Ruble, D.N., & Pittman, T.S. (1982). The mastery hypothesis and the overjustification effect. Social Cognition, 1, 38-49.

Booth, M. (1980). A modern world history course and the thinking of adolescent pupils. Education Review, 32, 245-257.

Booth, M. (1984). Skills, concepts and attitudes: The development of adolescent children's historical thinking. History and Theory, 22, 101-117.

Boyer, E.L. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Boyer, E.L. (1988). Report card on school reform. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bradley Commission on History in Schools (1988). Building a history curriculum: Guidelines for teaching history in schools. Washington, DC: The Educational Excellence Network.

Braggs, R.R. & McWilliams, M. (1989). Cultural exchange: A video pen pal program. Journal of Geography, July/August, 150-151.

Brandt, T.M. (1981). Public education under scrutiny. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Brandt, T. (1988). On changing secondary schools: A conversation with Ted Sizer. Educational Leadership, 45(5), 30-36.

Bredderman, T. (1983). Effects of activity-based elementary science on student outcomes: A quantitative synthesis. Review of Educational Research, 53(4), 449-518.

Briggs, C.A. (1986). Papers, presentations, projects, and performances: A History Day potpourri. Roeper Review, 87, 87-90.

Brodkey, J. (1991). Charting a course: Rewriting the familiar. Social Education, January, 26-27.

Bruner, J.S. (1961). The act of discovery. Harvard Educational Review, 31(1), 21-32.

Bruner, J.S. (1971). The relevance of education. New York: W.W. Norton.

California State Department of Education. (1988). History and Social Science Framework for California Public Schools kindergarten through grade twelve. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 293779).

Casey, A.C. (1989). Academic intramurals: The thrill of victory, the excitement of competition. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317473).

Clifford, M.M. (1972). Effects of competition as a motivational technique in the classroom. American Educational Research Journal, 9, 123-37.

Clifford, M.M. (1990). Students need challenges, not easy success. Educational Leadership, 48(1), 22-26.

Combs, A.W. (1979). Myths in education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Combs, A.W. (1988). New assumptions for educational reform. Educational Leadership, 88, 38-40.

Commager, H.S. (1980). The study and teaching of history. Ohio: C.E. Merrill.

Commission on the Bicentennial for the United States Constitution. (1990). National History Day, 1991: Rights in history. Cleveland, Ohio: National History Day.

Condry, J. & Chambers, J. (1978). Intrinsic motivation and the process of learning. In M.R. Lepper & D. Greene (Eds.). The hidden costs of reward: New perspectives on the psychology of human motivation. (pp. 61-81). New Jersey: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Considine, D.M. (1987). Visual literacy and the curriculum: More to it than meets the eye. Language Arts, October, 634-640.

Corno, L. & Rohrkemper, M.M. (1985). The intrinsic motivation to learn in the classrooms. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.). Research on motivation in education, Vol#2: The classroom milieu (pp. 53-90). Orlando: Academic Press.

Csikszentmikalyi, M. (1978). Intrinsic rewards: Emergent motivation. In M.R. Lepper & D. Greene (Eds.). The hidden costs of reward: New perspectives on the psychology of human motivation, (pp. 205-216). New Jersey: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Cuban, L. (1983). How did teachers teach, 1890-1980? Theory into Practice, 22(3), 159-165.

Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again and again. Educational Researcher, 19(1), 3-13.

Cuban, L. (1991). History of teaching in social studies. In J. Shaver (Ed.). Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning: NCSS (pp. 197-209). New York: Macmillan.

Damon, P. (1991). Competition doesn't belong in public schools. Principal, March, 14-15.

Dcharms, R. (1976). Enhancing motivation: Change in the classroom. New York: Irvington.

Deci, E.L. (1978). Applications of research on the effects of rewards. In M.R. Lepper (Eds.). The hidden costs of reward: New perspectives on the psychology of human motivation (pp. 193-203). New Jersey: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Deci, E.L., Getley, G., Kahel, J., Abrams, L., & Porac, J. (1981). When trying to win: Competition and intrinsic motivation. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 71, 79-83.

Deci, E.L., Neziek, J., & Sheinman, L. (1981). Characteristics of the rewardee and intrinsic motivation of the rewardee. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 1-10.

Deci, E.L. & Porac, J. (1978). Cognitive evaluation theory and the study of human motivation. In M.R. Lepper & D. Greene (Eds.). The hidden costs of reward: New perspectives on the psychology of human motivation (pp. 149-176). New Jersey: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self determination in human behavior. New York: Plenum Press.

DelBarco, M. (1990). History in the making. Hispanic, September, 15-18.

Denzin, N.K. (1970). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods. New York: McGraw Hill.

Deutsch, M. (1985). Distributive justice: A social, psychological perspective. New Haven: Yale University Press.

DeVries, D. & Slavin, R. (1978). Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT): Review of ten classroom experiments. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12(1), 28-38.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1931/1970). The way out of educational confusion. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think. Boston: D.C. Heath.

Downey, M.T. (1985). Status of history in the schools. In M.T. Downey (Ed.). Hisory in the Schools: Bulletin 74 (pp. 6-12). Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies.

Downey, M.T. & Levstik, L.S. (1991). Teaching and learning history. In J. Shaver (Ed.). Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning: NCSS (pp. 400-410). New York: Macmillan.

Dunn, R.E. & Goldman, M. (1966). Competition and noncompetition in relationship to satisfaction and feelings towards own group and nongroup members. Journal of Social Psychology, 68, 229-311.

Edwards, H. (1973). Sociology of sport. Illinois: Dorsey Press.

Elliot, M.J. & Kennedy, K.J. (1979). Australian impressions of social studies theory and practice in secondary schools in the United States. Social Education, April, 43.

Engle, S.H. (1963). Thoughts in regard to revision. Social Education, 27, 196.

Engle, S.H. (1990). The Commission report and citizenship education. Social Education, November/December, 431-433.

Erikson, E.H. (1980). Identity and the life cycle. New York: W.W. Norton.

Evans, R.W. (1989). Teacher conceptions of history. Research in Social Education, 17(3), 210-240.

Ferguson, J. (1989). Computing across the curriculum. The Social Studies, March/April, 69-72.

Fetterman, D. (1984). Ethnography in educational research: The dynamics of diffusion. In D.M. Fetterman (Ed.). Ethnography in Educational Evaluation (pp. 21-36). California: Sage.

Fetterman, D. (1988). Quality approach to evaluating education. Educational Research, November, 17-23.

Fraser, B.J. & Nash, R. (1981a). Evaluation of educational innovation. Sydney: Marquarrie University.

Fraser, B.J. & Nash, R. (1981b). The schools commission innovation program: Common problems encountered by innovators. Curriculum Perspectives, I(1), 39-42.

Freeman, D.E. & Freeman, Y.S. (1991). "Doing" social studies: Whole language lessons to promote social action. Social Education, January, 29.

Freire, P. (1981). Education for critical consciousness. New York: Continuum.

Geyer, D.L. (1936). The results of activity instruction: An interpretation of published findings. Journal of Educational Research, 30(3), 188-197.

Glaser, B.G. (1978). Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory. California: Sociology Press.

Glickman, C.D. (1990). Open accountability for the '90's: Between the pillars. Educational Leadership, April, 38-42.

Good, T.L. & Tom, D.Y.H. (1985). Self-regulation, efficacy, expectations, and social orientations: Teacher and classroom perspectives. In C. Ames and R. Ames (Eds.). Research on motivation in education: The classroom milieu (pp. 249-286). Orlando: Academic Press.

Goodlad, J.I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw Hill.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Gorn, C. (1985). Building interest in studying history. OAH: Magazine of History, April, 14-15.

Gorn, C. (1988). Choosing a topic for National History Day: History vs. current events. OAH: Magazine of History, Summer/Fall, 28-29.

Grant, G. (1988). The world we created at Hamilton High. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Graves, T. (1991). The controversy over group rewards in cooperative classrooms. Educational leadership, April, 77-79.

Gray, P. & Chanoff, D. (1986). Democratic schooling: What happens to young people who have charge of their own education? American Journal of Education, February, 182-213.

Greene, K.B. (1942). Activity education. Review of Educational Research, 12(3), 280-288.

Griffin, R. (1988). Cooperation, competition, individualism: Students need all three. In R.B. Shuman (Ed). Speaking Out, Clearinghouse, 62, 52.

Gross, R.E. (1977). The status of the social sciences in the public schools of the United States: Facts and impressions of a national survey. Social Education, 41, 194-200, 205.

Gunter, M.M. (1990, October 3). Students' response to the crises in Kuwait reflects a western-oriented parochialism. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 32.

Haas, M.E., Donnohue, S., & Jennings, S. (1985). Help your students to successful History Day entries. The Clearing House, 58, 395-398.

Hallam, R.N. (1967). Logical thinking in history. Educational Review, 19, 183-202.

Hallam, R.N. (1972). Thinking and learning in history. Teaching History, 2, 3370346.

Hammersley, M. (1989). The dilemma of qualitative method. New York: Routledge.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. Ethnography: Principles in practice. London: Ravistock Publications.

Hampel, R. (1986). The last little citadel: American high schools since 1940. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Harackiewicz, J.M., Manderlink, G., & Sansone, C. (1984). Rewarding pinball wizardry: Effects of evaluation and cue value on intrinsic interest. Journal of Personality and School Psychology, 47, 287-301.

Harter, S.C. (1978). Pleasure derived from challenge and the effects of receiving grades on children's difficulty level choices. Child Development, 49, 788-799.

Hartoonian, M. (1984). Computers and social knowledge: Opportunities and opportunity cost. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247202).

Hartoonian, M. (1989). Perception of knowledge and educational reform in a democratic republic. Social Education, February, 93-95.

Hartoonian, M. (1991). Good education is bad politics: Practices and principles of school reform. Social Education, January, 22-23, 65.

Hendrikson, L. (1984). Active learning: Eric Digest #17. Boulder, Colorado: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253468).

Hertzberg, H. (1981). Social studies reform, 1880-1980. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education consortium. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 211429).

Hertzberg, H.W. (1985). Students, methods and materials of instruction. In M.T. Downey (Ed.). History in the Schools: Bulletin 74. National Council for Social Studies, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 254477).

Hertzberg, H.W. (1988). Are method and content enemies? In B.R. Gifford (Ed.). History in the Schools: What Shall We Teach? (pp. 13-40). New York: Macmillan.

Hertzberg, H.W. (1989). History and progressivism: A century of reform proposals. In P. Gagnon (Ed.). Historical literacy: The case for history in American education (pp. 3-15). New York: Macmillan.

Hines, S. & Graves, D.L. (1989). Sports competition and its influence on self-esteem development. Adolescence, Winter, 861-69.

Hoffman, A. (1987). Going for the green: Contests as motivation for research papers. The History teacher, 20(2).

Horney, K. (1936/1976). Culture and neurosis. Philadelphia: Saunders.

Hughes, J. & Melby, E. (1930). Supervision of instruction in high schools. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.

Ingersoll, G.M. (1989). Adolescents. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Jackson, K.T. (1989). Introduction. In P. Gagnon (Ed.). Historical literacy: The case for history in American education. New York: Macmillan.

Jackson, K.T. & Jackson, B.B. (1989). Why the time is right to reform the history curriculum. In P. Gagnon (Ed.). Historical literacy: The case for history in American education (pp. 3-15). New York: Macmillan.

Jenness, D. (1990). Making sense of social studies. New York: Macmillan.

Jenness, D. & Metcalf, F.D. (1991). A response to the critics. Social Education, January, 24-26.

Johnson, D. (1979). Educational psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Johnson, D., Maruyama, G., Johnson, R., Nelson, D., & Skon, L. (1981). Effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures on achievement: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 89, 47-62.

Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., & Maruyama, G. (1983). Interdependence and interpersonal attraction among heterogeneous and homogeneous individuals: A theoretical foundation and a meta analysis of the research. Review of Educational Research, 53, 5-54.

Johnson, R.T., Johnson, D.W. & Slanne, M.B. (1985). Effects of cooperative, competitive and individualistic goal structure on computer-assisted instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 77(6), 668-677.

Jones, B.M. et al. (1985). Individualistic vs. competitive participation: The effect on intrinsic motivation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL, May 2-4. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 258092).

Kagan, S. (1985). Co-op, Co-op: A flexible cooperative learning technique. In R. Slaven, S. Sharan, S. Kagan, R. Hertz-Lazarowitz, C. Webb, & R. Schmuck (Eds.). Learning to Cooperate, Cooperating to Learn (pp. 437-462). New York: Plenum Press.

Kashatus, W.C. (1990). Forging a link with our past: The responsibility of teaching American history. The History Teacher, 24(1), 113-119.

Kaufman, R. (1982). Means and ends: Mediocrity is so easy to achieve. Educational Technology, 22, 34-36.

Keller, C.W. (1987). Improving high school history teaching. In C.E. Finn, Jr., D.Ravitch, & R.T. Fancher (Eds.). Against Mediocrity: The humanities in America's high schools, (pp. 79-91). New York: Holmes and Meier.

Keller, C.W. (1990). History Day: A teacher's first choice. The Iowa Council for the Social Studies Journal, 3(1), 21-25.

Kennedy, K.J. & Fraser, B.J. (1987). School change through transition education initiative. Paper presented at annual meeting of AERA, Washington, DC, April 19-24. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 282726).

Kilpatrick, W.H. (1918). The project method. Teachers College Record, 19, 319-351.

Kilpatrick, W.H. (1929). How we learn: The psychological basis of the project method. Calcutta: Association Press.

Kinzer, C.K. (1984). Different logo learning environments and mastery: Relationships between engagement and learning. Study at Vanderbilt University sponsored by the National Institute for Mental Health, Bethesda, MD. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262751).

Kirkendall, R. (1975). The status of history in the schools. The Journal of American History, 62, 557-570.

Kirmode, F. (1980). Secrets and narrative sequence. Critical Inquiry, 7(1), 83-101.

Kohn, A. (1986). No contest: The case against competition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kohn, A. (1990). Effects of rewards on prosocial behavior. Cooperative Learning, 10(3), 23-24.

Kohn, A. (1991a). Don't spoil the promise of cooperative learning. Educational Leadership, 48(5), 93-94.

Kohn, A. (1991b). Group grade grubbing versus cooperative learning. Educational Leadership, 48(5), 83-87.

Kreisberg, S. (1992). Transforming power: Domination, empowerment, and education. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kroll, W. & Peterson, K. (1965). Study of values tests and collegiate football team. Research Quarterly, 36, 441-447.

Labinowicz, E. (1980). The Piaget primer: Thinking, learning, teaching. California: Addison Wesley.

Lake, J. & Williamson, J. (1986). Pinten Enterprises, Pingelly: A case study. In B.J. Fraser (Ed.). School development through transition education. Perth: Education Department of Western Australia.

LeCompete, M. & Goetz, J. (1982). Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research. Review of Educational Research, 52(1), 44-50.

LeCompte, M. & Goetz, J. (1984). Ethnography data collection in evaluation research. In D.M. Fetterman (Ed.). Ethnography in Educational Evaluation, (pp. 37-82). California: Sage.

Lepper, M.R. & Greene, D., & Nisbitt, R.E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic rewards: A test of the "over justification" hypothesis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 28, 129-137.

Levstik, L.S. & Pappas, C.C. (1987). Exploring the development of historical understanding. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 21, 1-5.

Lilien, E. (1988). Competition experiment with world cultures class. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307202).

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. California: Sage.

Long Range Planning Committee. (1991). Five Year Plan: National History Day. Cleveland: Author.

Longstreet, W.S. (1989). Education for citizenship: New dimensions. Social Education, January, 41-45.

Lynd, A. (1953). Quackery in the public schools. Boston: Little Brown.

MacKenzie, A.A. & White, R.T. (1982). Fieldwork in geography and long term memory structures. American Educational Research Journal, 19(4), 623-632.

Massilas, B.G. & Cox, C.B. (1966). Inquiry in social studies. New York: McGraw Hill.

Massilas, B.G. & Zevin, J. (1967). Creative encounters in the classroom: Teaching and learning through discovery. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

McGraw, K. (1978). The detrimental effects of reward on performance: A literature review and a prediction model. In M.R. Lepper & D. Greene (Eds.). The hidden costs of reward: New prospects on the psychology on human motivation (pp. 33-60). New Jersey: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

McNeil, W.H., Kammen, M., & Craig, G.A., (1989). Why study history? In P. Gagnon (Ed.). Historical Literacy: The case for history in American education (pp. 103-118). New York: Macmillan.

Mehaffy, G.L. (1982). History as subject matter. In H.E. Mitzel (Ed.). Encyclopedia of educational research (fifth edition) (pp. 803-808). New York: Free Press.

Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Mink, L.O. (1966). The autonomy of historical understanding history and theory. Studies in the Philosophy of History, 15, 24-47.

Morrisett et al. (1980). Recommendations for improving social studies in the 1980s. Social Education, 44, 570-576.

Naisbitt, J. (1982). Ten directions transforming our lives. New York: Warner Books.

National Commission on Social Studies. (1989). Charting a course: Social studies for the 21st century: A report of the Curriculum Task Force of the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools. National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317450)

National History Day, Inc. (1986). National History Day contest guide. Cleveland: Author.

National History Day, Inc. (1990). National History Day (A pamphlet). Cleveland: Author.

National History Day, Inc. (1991). A decade of history: National History Day 1980-1990. Cleveland: Author.

Newmann, F.M. (1988). Higher order thinking in high school social studies: An analysis of classroom teachers, students and leadership. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 304352).

Nichols, J.G. (1989). The competitive ethos and democratic education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

O'Neil, J. (1991). Schools as battlegrounds in cultural "wars." ASCD Update, 33(7), pp. 1, 4-5.

O'Reilly, K. (1991). The Commission report and critical thinking: A defense. Social Education, September, 298-299.

Page, M. (1990a). Active learning: Historical and contemporary perspectives. Unpublished manuscript.

Page, M. (1990b). Active learning and National History Day in-depth interviews: A pilot study. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323150).

Parker, R. (1984). Small group cooperative learning in the classroom. OSSC Bulletin, 27 (7). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 242065).

Parker, W.C. (1990/1991). The newest reform proposals. Educational Leadership, December/January, 85.

Parker, W.C. (1991). A final response: Searching for the middle ground. Social Education, January, 27-28, 65.

Patton, M.Q. (1980). Qualitative Evaluation Methods. California: Sage.

Paulson, C.F. Jr. (1964). Slow learners, competition and programmed instruction. Oregon State system of higher education. Monmouth Teaching Research Division. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317582).

Pennsylvania State Board of Education. (1991). Draft regulations: Student learning outcomes. Pennsylvania: Author.

Pepitone, E.A. (1980). Children in cooperation and competition: Towards a developmental social psychology. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Perlmutter, L.C. & Monty, R.A. (1977). The importance of perceived control: Fact or fantasy? American Scientist, 65, 759-765.

Peskin, A. (1982). The researcher and subjectivity: Reflections on an ethnography of school and community. In G. Spindler (Ed.). Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action (pp. 20-48). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Pestalozzi, J.H. (1801/1898). How Gertrude teaches her children (L.E. Holland & F.C. Turner, Trans.). New York: C.E. Bardeen.

Phillips, B. & Faris, R. (1977). Learning as much in different ways at an action learning high school. Phi Delta Kappan, 59, 133.

Ponder, G. & Davis, O.L. Jr. (1982). Social studies education. In H.E. Mitzel (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Educational Research (fifth edition) (pp. 1723-1732). New York: Collier Macmillan.

Postman, N. (1982). The disappearance of childhood. New York: Delacorte Press.

Postman, N. & Weingartner, C. (1969). Teaching as a subversive activity. New York: Dell.

Powell, A.G., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D.K. (1985). The shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Precourt, W. (1982). Ethnohistorical analysis of an Appalachian settlement school. In G. Spindler (Ed.). Ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action (pp. 442-451). New York: Rinehart and Winston.

Project Span. (1982). The future of social studies: A report and summary of Project Span. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218200).

Puckett, J.L. (1986). Foxfire reconsidered: A critical ethnohistory of a twenty-year experiment in progressive education. Doctoral dissertation. University of North Carolina.

Puckett, J.L. (1989). Who wrote Foxfire?: A consideration of ethnohistorical method. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 22(3), 71-78.

Rainey, R.G (1965). The effects of directed vs. non-directed laboratory work on high school chemistry achievement. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 3, 286-292.

Ravitch, D. (1978). The revisionists revised: A critique of the radical attack on the schools. New York: Basic Books.

Ravitch, D. (1983). The troubled crusade: American education, 1945-1980. New York: Basic Books.

Ravitch, D. (1985). The precarious state of history. American Educator, Spring, 12-15.

Ravitch, D. (1989). The plight of history in American schools. In P. Gagnon (Ed.). Historical literacy: the case for history in American education (pp. 51-68). New York: Macmillan.

Ravitch, D. (1990). From history to social studies: Dilemmas and problems. In B.R. Gifford (Ed.). History in the schools: What shall we teach? (pp. 41-53). New York: Macmillan.

Ravitch, D. & Finn, C.E. Jr. (1988). No trivial pursuit. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(8), 559-564.

Ravitch, D. & Finn, C.E. Jr. (1989). What do our 17-year olds know? New York: Harper & Row.

Reigeluth, C.M. (1987). The search for meaningful reform: A third-wave educational system. Journal of Instructional Development, 10(4), 1-7.

Renzulli, J.S. (1977). The enrichment triad model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented. Mansfield, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Rich, D.K. (1990, November 7). Educators focus attention on ways to boost student motivation. Education Week, pp. 1, 12-13.

Richardson, J.H. (1991, March 31). Sizer on school reform: Let's rethink the basics. The Boston Sunday Globe, pp. A16-A17.

Robinson, P. (1985). Henry Johnson and the place of history in education for world peace. Social Education. February, 160-162.

Robinson, P. & Kerman, J.M. (1986). From monopoly to dominance. In S.P. Wronski & D.H. Bragaw (Eds.). Social studies and social sciences: A fifty year perspective (pp. 15-27). Washington: National Council for Social Studies.

Rothman, R. (1990, November 7). Educators focus attention on ways to boost student motivation. Education Week, pp. 1, 12-13.

Rousseau, J.J. (1762/1957). Emile (B. Foxley, Trans.). New York: E.P. Dutton.

Rubenstein, R.P. (1977). Changes in self-esteem and anxiety in competitive and noncompetitive camps. Journal of Social Psychology, 102, 155-157.

Ryan, F. (1981). Sports and psychology. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Ryan, R.M. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive evaluation theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 245-254.

Ryan, R.M., Connell, J.P., & Deci, E.L (1985). A motivational analysis of self determination and self regulation in education. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.). Research on motivation in education, Vol#1: The classroom milieu. Orlando: Academic Press.

Ryan, R.M., Mims, V. & Koestner, R. (1983). The relationship of reward contingency and interpersonal context to intrinsic motivation: A review and test using cognitive evaluation theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 736-750.

Santrock, J. W. (1990). Adolescence. Dubuque, IA: W.C. Brown.

Sarason, S.B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Scharf, L. & Gorn, C. (1989). Bridging the gap between the sciences and the humanities: National History Day, 1990. OAH: Magazine of History, 4(2). 58-59.

Scharf, L. & Gorn, C. (1989). Challenging young historians. History News, 44(6), 20-21.

Schug, N.C., Todd, R. J., & Berry, R. (1984). Why kids don't like social studies. Social Education, 48, 382-387.

Schunk, D.H. (1990). Perceptions of efficacy and classroom motivations. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317582).

Seidman, I.E. (1991). Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sender, E. (1982). Harness competition and hoopla to hook kids on academic excellence. The American School Board Journal, June, 17-21.

Sharan, S., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. & Ackerman, Z. (1985). Academic achievement of elementary school children in small group vs. whole class instruction. Journal of Experimental Education, 48, 125-129.

Sharan, S. & Shachar, H. (1988). Language and learning in the cooperative classroom. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Sharan, S., Kussell, P., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Bejarno, Y., Ravin, S., & Sharan, Y. (1985). Cooperative learning effects on ethnic relations and achievement in Israeli junior high school classrooms. In R. Slavin, S. Sharan, S. Kagan, R. Hertz-Lazarawitz, D. Webb & R. Schmuck (Eds.). Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn (pp. 313-344) New York: Plenum Press.

Sharan, S. & Sharan, Y. (1976). Small group teaching. New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications.

Sharan S. & Sharan, Y. (1989/1990). Group investigation expands cooperative learning. Educational Leadership, 47(4). 17-21.

Shaver, J. (Ed.). (1991). Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning: NCSS. New York: Macmillan.

Shaver, J.P., Davis, O.L. Jr., & Helburn, S.W. (1979). The status of social studies education: Impressions from three NSF studies. Social Education, 43, 51.

Shemilt, D. (1980). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15, 4-14.

Sherif, C. (1976). The social context of competition. In D.N. Landers (Ed.). Social problems in athletics: Essays in the sociology of sport (pp. 18-36). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Sherman, L.W. (1988). Cooperative strategies for undergraduate teaching: A comparative study. Paper presented at the Triennial convention of the international Association for the study of cooperation in Education, TelAviv, Israel, July 5-8. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299873).

Sherman, L. W. (1988). A comparative study of cooperative and competitive achievement in two secondary biology classrooms: The group investigation model versus an individually competitive goal structure. Journal of research in Science Teaching, 26(1), 55-61.

Shulman, J. (1986). Opportunities of a mentorship: The implementation of the California Mentor Teacher Program. Presented at annual meeting of AERA, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduciton Service No. ED 278650).

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 7(1), 1-22.

Sizer, T. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sizer, T. (1988). An interview with Ted Sizer. The Harvard Education Letter, July/August, 379.

Slavin, R. E. (1978). Student teams and achievement divisions. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12(1), 39-49.

Slavin, R.E. (1980). Using student team learning: The John Hopkins Team Inquiry Learning Project. Baltimore: John Hopkins University.

Slavin, R. (199). Cooperative learning and student achievement. In R. Slavin (Ed.). School and classroom organization. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Slavin, R.E. (1991a). Group rewards make group work. Educational Leadership, 48(5), 89-91.

Slavin, R.E. (1991b). Synthesis of research on cooperative learning. Educational Leadership, 48(5), 7-82.

Slepper, M. (1973). The uses of history in adolescence. Youth and Society, 4, 259-274.

Sless, D. (1981). Learning and visual communication. London: Croom Helm.

Smith, J.K. (1983). Quantitative vs. qualitative research: An attempt to clarify the issue. Educational Research, 12,(3), 6-13.

Smith, R. W. (1991). Obstacles to student teacher reflection: The role of prior school experience as a barrier to teacher development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Massachusetts.

Spradley, J.P. (1980). Participant observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stearns, P.N. (1985). New wine in historical bottles. Social Education, May, 360-362.

Stearns, P.N. (1991, August 7). History must be taught not as a set of facts but as an active analytical tool. In Point of View, Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A32.

Stevens, R. (1912). The question as a measure of efficiency in instruction. New York: Columbia Teachers college.

Synder, T. (1989/1990). Tom Snyder Productions: An educational software catalogue, Fall/Winter. Cambridge: Tom Snyder Productions.

Thelan, D. (1989, September). A new approach to understanding human memory offers a solution to the crisis in the study of history. Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 27.

Toffler, A. (1970). Future shock. New York: Random House.

Toffler, A. (1974). The psychology of the future. In A. Toffler (Ed.). Learning for tomorrow (pp. 3-18). New York: Random House.

Toffler, A. (1980). The third wave. New York: William Morrow.

Toffler, A. (1991). Powershift. New York: William Morrow.

Trotter, A. (1989). Schools gear up for "hypermedia": A quantum leap in electronic learning. The American School Board Journal, 176(3), 35-37.

Tucker, J. L. (1988). Social studies for the 21st Century. Social Education, March, 209-214.

Tyler, R. (1975). Educational benchmarks in retrospect: Educational change since 1915. Viewpoints, 51(2), 11-30.

U.S. Department of Education (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform by the National Commission on Excellence in Education. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vasta, R., Andrews, D.E., McLaughlin, A.M., Stergie, L.A., & Comfort, C. (1978). Reinforcement effects on intrinsic interest: A classroom analogy. Journal of School Psychology, 16, 161-166.

VonBorries, B. (1989). German history: A pupil's competition for the Federal President's Prize. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317473).

Walten, N.E. & Travers, R.M.W. (1964). Analysis and investigation of teaching methods. In N.L. Gage (Ed.). Handbook of research on teaching (1st edition) (pp. 448-505). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Washburn, C. & Raths, L. (1927). The high school achievement of children trained under the individual technique. Elementary School Journal, 28, 214-224.

Weiss, I. (1978). Report of the 1977 national survey of science, mathematics, and social studies education. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Weiss, M.J. (1992). America's best schools. Redbook, 178(6), 61-68.

Wesley, E. (1967). Let's abolish history courses. Phi Delta Kappan, September, 3.

White, R.W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review, 66, 297-333.

Wigginton, E.(1985). Sometimes a shining moment: The Foxfire experience. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Wigginton, E. (1989). Foxfire grows up. Harvard Educational Review, 59(1), 24-49.

Wilson, J. (1989). Competition. Journal of Moral Education, 18(1), 26-31.

Wittrock, M.C. (1985). Teaching learners generative strategies for enhancing reading comprehension. Theory into Practice, 24(2), 123-126.

Woolever, R.M. & Scott, K.P. (1987). Active learning in social studies: Promoting cognitive and social growth. Illinois: Scott Forsman.

Zerkes, M. & Penna, R. (1984). Academic competition--one way to improve school climate. NASSP Bulletin, December, 94-97.

Zuckerman, M., Porac, J., Lathin, D., Smith, R., & Deci, E.L. (1978). On the importance of self-determination for intrinsically motivated behavior. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin #4, 443-466.