

Social Studies Teachers' Use of Classroom-Based and Web-Based Historical Primary Sources

David Hicks & Peter Doolittle
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

John K. Lee
Georgia State University

Abstract

A limited body of research examines the extent to which social studies teachers are actually utilizing primary sources that are accessible in traditional classroom-based formats versus web-based formats. This paper initiates an exploration of this gap in the literature by reporting on the result of a survey of secondary social studies teachers, all members of the National Council for the Social Studies, that examines the extent to which these social studies teachers are using classroom and web-based primary sources. In particular we ask: To what extent has the availability of web-based primary sources impacted social studies teachers' use of primary sources in the classroom? In order to investigate the above question successfully, we examine the following supporting questions: How are social studies teachers using classroom-based primary sources? How are social studies teachers using web-based primary sources? While the study reveals teachers' understandings of the potential for using primary sources to support historical inquiry and the potential of the web for providing access to previously inaccessible primary sources, the teachers' actual use of both classroom-based and web-based primary sources seems limited.

Introduction

The recent themed issue of *Social Education* (2003) entitled *Teaching U.S. History with Primary Sources* continues to add to the growing research and practitioner-based literature advocating the use of primary sources to (a) prepare students to learn to think historically through doing historical inquiry and (b) develop young citizens who

are capable of informed deliberative criticism (Bain, 2000; Holt, 1995; Kobrin, 1996; Wineburg, 2001; VanSledright, 2002). Teaching students to engage in the doing of historical inquiry, Levstik (1996) suggests, involves a "shift from an emphasis on a 'story well told' (or the story as told in the textbook), to an emphasis on 'sources well scrutinized' ... [Students] pose questions, collect and analyze sources, struggle with issues of significance, and ultimately build their own historical interpretations" (p. 394). Support for the use of primary sources, as one form of data to facilitate inquiry within the social studies classroom, can also be found in the benchmarks and standards of the American Historical Association (AHA, 2003), the National Center for History in the Schools (NCHS, 1996), and the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS, 1994). In the recently released *Benchmarks for Professional Development*, the AHA, working alongside the Organization of American Historians (OAH) and the NCSS, clearly stresses the need for teacher professional development initiatives "to focus on the use of primary sources. Presenters need to formulate activities that engage participants in primary source evaluation, using both traditional paper methods and web-based primary source materials" (AHA, 2003). This distinction between traditional classroom-based primary sources and web-based primary sources acknowledges the extent to which traditional archives, classroom-based social studies textbooks, and "stand alone" primary source collections, along with web-based digital history resource centers, provide teachers as never before with a vast array of primary sources to engage their students in the doing of history (Cantu & Wilson, 2003; Graves & Parr, 2003; Gray & Owen, 2003; Mason & Hicks, 2002; Potter, 2003).

The emergence of freely available web-based primary sources may well serve as a key ingredient for the revitalization and transformation of the social studies. Specifically, this transformation may move from what Whelan (1997a) describes as "the all-too-common pattern of teacher-centered, textbook-driven instructional practices in which students are required merely to memorize and periodically regurgitate selected sets of factual information" (p. 507), toward what the current literature on teaching and learning social studies advocates as "best practice" in terms of engaging students in the doing of historical inquiry (Hartzler-Miller, 2001).

Currently, only limited research examines the extent to which social studies teachers are actually utilizing (or not utilizing) primary sources that are accessible in both traditional classroom-based and web-based formats. This paper seeks to initiate an exploration of this gap in the literature by reporting the results of a survey of secondary social studies teachers, all members of the National Council for the Social Studies, that examines the extent to which these social studies teachers are using classroom and web-based primary sources.

Because of our research interests in the potential of current and emerging interactive technologies to improve social studies education, we specifically sought to develop a survey to serve as an entry point through which to examine the question: To what extent has the availability of web-based primary sources impacted social studies teachers' use of primary sources in the classroom? In order to investigate the above question successfully, we examined the following supporting questions:

- How are social studies teachers using classroom-based primary sources?
- How are social studies teachers using web-based primary sources?

Before discussing the methods and presenting the findings and research implications, we consider the literature on (a) "best practice" in the teaching and learning of history, and (b) current efforts to integrate technology into the social studies. Two clarifying points seem appropriate. First, the word "technology" is used within the present context to mean electronic and digital devices and media, specifically, computers and the Internet, and not a broader anthropological meaning, which would include language, as well as cognitive strategies and tools. Second, debate continues as to the nature and role of the discipline of history within the social studies. While recognizing the importance of all the subjects that form the discipline of social studies, we view history as the backbone of the social studies curriculum (see Whelan, 1997b). This perspective is reflected throughout this paper, in that we recognize the "multiple, overlapping, simultaneous, and even conflicting purposes" for which historical thinking can and is used within the social studies classroom (Levstik & Barton, 2001b, p. 122). And while our own orientations/stances toward the purpose of history reflect what Levstik and Barton (2001b) refer to as "a rationalistic stance," as well as a blend of what Seixas (2000) describes as a disciplinary knowledge and postmodern approach, we recognize that the study of history only becomes relevant and worthwhile when its purpose is to invigorate a "more pluralist and participatory form of citizenship" (Levstik & Barton, 2001, p. 124).

Best Practice in the Teaching and Learning of History

Research in classrooms where history is taught indicates that the primary concern there is with consuming and reproducing events and details mostly found in books, as though interpretive practices, be they engaged in by historians, teachers, or students, simply did not exist... The standard textbooks, combined with lectures delivered by teachers, are considered

definitive. Tests measure the results. The obsession appears to be with the products of historical study, not with the practice of doing it (VanSledright, 2002, p. 1091).

Students typically experience the social studies classroom as a place where they passively listen to lectures, read textbooks and biographies, work independently, and engage in lower-order, fact-based assessments. Rarely do students of social studies engage in historical inquiry based on primary sources and collaboration where the end product is an original piece of student writing (see Ravitch & Finn, 1987). A growing body of literature has brought into question the utility and purpose of teaching a genre of history and social studies that appears oriented to what Seixas (2000) describes as enhancing "collective memory" (see Goodlad, 1985; Lee, 1998; Spencer & Barth, 1992; VanSledright, 1995). Similarly, Levstik and Barton (2001b) recognize this common and problematic approach to the teaching of history as originating from what they term an *identification* stance:

In this stance the purpose of history is to anchor our present lives in the past through three interrelated acts: (1) Celebrating historical origins as a means of establishing "who we are"; (2) Extolling the virtues of past members of a community as a way of providing examples for those in the present; and (3) Using the past as a "charter" or justification for present actions or societal arrangements (Levstik & Barton, 2001b, p.128).

While Seixas (2000) suggests that learning the 'best' version of history/heritage may well help shape group identity and provide a compelling moral framework, the problem remains that historical knowledge "appears as something fixed by authority rather than subject to investigation, debate, and its own system of warrants" (p. 23). He notes that within such a framework, limited attention is given to the disciplinary processes of knowing and learning history in terms of asking historical questions, critically investigating accounts within the context in which they were developed, and corroborating various pieces of evidence in order to develop historical interpretations. VanSledright (2002) contends that the provenance for questioning established practices in terms of teaching common knowledge in the social studies classroom can be found within (a) the initial concerns arising from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) test results that suggest students struggle with tasks requiring historical interpretation; (b) the emergence of the standards movement in history and social studies that emphasizes the importance of engaging primary sources in order to prepare students to learn to think

historically; (c) the growing body of research literature on teaching and learning history that stresses the importance of providing students with the time to engage in the process of historical inquiry and interpretation; and (d) the ongoing studies examining the cognitive processes required for the development of students' abilities to think historically in terms of chronological thinking, historical empathy, historical significance, analysis of evidence, and the status and structure of historical accounts.

While the importance of allowing students to work with primary sources in the history curriculum is far from new (see Holt, 1995; Osborne, 2003), the current literature relating to what Hartzler-Miller (2001) calls "best practice" in the history classroom strongly advocates the use of primary sources as one key resource to support historical inquiry. That is, skilled and knowledgeable teachers help students pose historical questions, collect and analyze historical sources in context, work with various forms of evidence to corroborate sources, and identify issues of significance in order to develop their own historical interpretations (Hartzler-Miller, 2001; Levstik, 1996; Levstik & Barton, 2001a). Seixas (2000) categorizes such an orientation as teaching history for "disciplinary knowledge." The disciplinary knowledge approach, Seixas (2000) contends, "should help [students] develop the ability and the disposition to arrive independently at reasonable, informed opinions. This orientation ... provides students with active exercise in building historical knowledge and criticizing others' historical accounts" (p. 24-25).

While history educators posit that such work allows students to actively engage in the doing of history, various issues explain why few teachers actually engage students in the doing of history. Specifically, these issues include the lack of teacher preparation and familiarity with the need to support historical inquiry and interpretation (McDiarmid & Vinten-Johansen 1993; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988); the concerns of the teacher in regard to limited class time to engage students in the doing of history (VanSledright, 2002); the influence of state standards that emphasize high stakes testing, which pays little attention to authentic historical inquiry (Grant, 2000; Grant et al. 2002; VanSledright, 1996, 2002); and the beliefs of teachers that the majority of students are neither willing nor able to engage deeply in historical primary source analysis (VanSledright, 2002). However, if the typical history classroom is to transform beyond a place of reductive "telling," it is important to recognize that a student's ability to comprehend history and think historically is based upon "a set of skills educators can nurture, not an ability whose development they must wait for or whose absence they must lament" (Barton, 1998, p. 80). The literature clearly indicates that given careful and appropriate instruction, students as young as seven can begin to engage critically

with historical sources as part of the process of historical inquiry (Ashby & Lee, 1997; Barton, 1997).

The realization that students are capable of engaging in the doing of history, in conjunction with the development of digital history resource centers that provide access to previously obscure primary sources, may well create a powerful opportunity for teachers to rethink and reform their approach to teaching the doing of history in the networked classroom of the 21st century (Mason and Hicks, 2002). However, Levstik and Barton (2001b) are correct in warning that such a *rationalistic* stance to teaching history will only be worthwhile if the curriculum addresses "questions of importance for society, and students ... play a role in developing those questions" (p. 134).

An exploration of the effects of web-based primary sources on teachers' use of and students' engagement in historical inquiry will benefit from an examination of teachers' current use of primary sources, either classroom-based or web-based. Currently, however, this use and engagement is unclear. Until we have such baseline data it will be very difficult to (a) evaluate the extent to which teachers are providing students with opportunities to engage in the doing of history utilizing primary sources, and (b) demonstrate the learning effects of using primary sources as part of the process of engaging in historical inquiry and analysis. Additional data are needed to determine if teachers are using classroom-based and/or web-based primary sources in their classrooms to engage in authentic historical inquiry.

Integrating Technology into the Social Studies

A number of social studies educators suggest that integrating Internet technology into the social studies classroom has the potential of transforming social studies education (see Berson, Cruz, Duplass, & Johnston, 2001; Braun & Risinger, 1999; Whitworth & Berson, 2003). Similarly, organizations such as the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) and the College and University Faculty Assembly (CUFA) have explicitly recognized the potential of technology for teaching and learning social studies (Mason et al., 2000; NCSS, 1994). Nationally, a technological infrastructure to support school and classroom Internet access is developing. Recently released data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2003) notes that the proportion of instructional rooms with Internet access increased from 50 percent in 1999 to 85 percent in 2001, and that about 99 percent of schools had access to the Internet in 2001. A recent survey by the National School Board Foundation (2002), examining computer use by teachers across the disciplines, reports that social studies teachers are the most common users of technology (76%), while math teachers

are the least common users (12%). Within the social studies literature, efforts to support the integration of technology into the social studies classroom are exemplified by a number of articles that provide practical and theoretical guidelines for the use of technology in social studies (Crocco, 2001; Doolittle & Hicks, 2003; Mason et al., 2000), examples of current practices (Milson, 2002; Saye & Brush, 1999), and "images of the possible" regarding integrating technology into the social studies (Berson, Lee, & Stuckart, 2001; Sherman & Hicks, 2000; Shiveley & VanFossen, 1999).

Nonetheless, care needs to be taken in assuming that teachers' use of computers actually transfers into the design and implementation of instruction where technology is used as a tool to develop students' inquiry and analytical skills. In fact, a body of literature reveals a "disconnect" between the idealism of the advocates for the use of technology in the classroom and the reality of integrating technology into today's classrooms (see Cuban, Kirkpatrick, & Peck, 2001; Martorella, 1998). Specifically, Cuban (2001) contends that little evidence exists to suggest that across all content areas technology has been seamlessly integrated into the classroom. Those who do use computers appear to use it to support existing classroom practices.

Cuban's findings mirror a number of reports that specifically detail technology integration within the social studies. Becker, Ravitz, and Wong (1999) note that while Internet use among social studies teachers has increased, only 30% of social studies teachers reported that their students used the Internet during class time, and only 14% reported frequent student use of the Internet in their classrooms. Becker et al. (1999) contend that when compared with colleagues in English, vocational and business studies, and the sciences, social studies teachers generally lag behind in the use of the Internet in their classrooms. In addition, VanFossen (2000) notes that 80% of his sample of social studies teachers indicated that they wanted to use the Internet more than they were doing. While many social studies teachers appear to hold positive views of the potential of Internet based technologies, the research literature continues to reveal that few social studies teachers - especially experienced secondary social studies teachers - appear to be willing and able to actually use computers within their classrooms (Berson, 1996; Ehman & Glen, 1991; VanFossen, 1999, 2000, 2001).

Furthermore, research on social studies teachers' use of the Internet indicates that many teachers have their students do little more than traditional information gathering (VanFossen, 2000, 2001). Whitworth and Berson's (2003) literature review of computer technology in the social studies indicates that "it appears that computerers continue to serve the primary function of facilitating students'

access to content and remain somewhat relegated to being an appendage to traditional classroom materials" (Conclusion section, para 1). A recent content analysis of Internet sessions presented at the NCSS annual conferences between 1995-2002 reveals a paucity of sessions designed to go beyond a basic content introduction of the Internet toward a more sophisticated application of Internet technologies within the social studies classroom. The dearth of professional development sessions at the NCSS annual meeting that encourage best practices in using technology as a tool to foster inquiry and analysis is disconcerting (VanFossen & Shiveley, 2003). Doolittle and Hicks (2003) point out that "if integrating technology means nothing more than enhancing the traditional delivery system of social studies content, where laptops replace notebooks, where PowerPoint slides replace handwritten overheads, where e-textbooks replace hard copy textbooks, then we will be no closer to the NCSS vision of transformative, powerful social studies teaching and learning" (p. 75).

A worthwhile question that arises from such studies is: To what extent are social studies teachers implementing technology as a tool for inquiry within the social studies classroom? This question certainly needs to be asked within a field that stresses the importance of engaging students in the process of inquiry and interpretation and where digital history resource centers have proliferated (Lee, 2002; Mason & Hicks, 2002; Rosenzweig, 2001). The sheer mass of resources and their ready availability on the web is the most important distinguishing characteristic of digital historical resources (Rosenzweig, 2001). By using such resources, teachers and students can avoid the complexities of access presented by physical archives (Schrum, 2000). Teachers and students can search digital historical collections using rational and teachable techniques (Johnson, 1997). Warren (2000) found that student-generated, web-based primary source collections are an invaluable means of injecting authenticity into high school history classrooms. Given the incomplete nature of the literature on web-based historical primary source use, data relating to the extent to which teachers are *using technology* to facilitate historical inquiry will be an important marker in gauging the extent to which historical inquiry is actually occurring within social studies classrooms.

Method

Sample Selection

The sampling frame for this study involved a random sample of National Council for the Social Studies members who were high school social studies teachers, grades 9 through 12. Of the 395 surveys

delivered via postal mail, 158 surveys were returned, a 40% response rate. The demographics for participants and the participants' schools are reported in Table 1.

As is demonstrated in Table 1 (see Appendix), the sample was equally divided by gender, though the sample was skewed in the direction of older participants ($M = 44.8$ years) with significant years of teaching experience ($M = 17.4$ years). The majority of participants taught in medium to large suburban schools, with predominantly middle class white students. In addition, while all respondents taught "social studies," the duties that comprised the teaching of social studies included teaching multiple subjects and grade levels (see Table 2 in Appendix).

Following an examination of the demographics, we necessarily return to the response rate for the present survey, which was 40%. In general terms, while there is no accepted cut-off for acceptable response rates, and while response rates for mail surveys often vary between 10 and 50 percent (see Neuman, 1997), the 40% response rate should be viewed as medium to low. This response rate is likely the result of a lack of survey follow-up; that is, there was no attempt made to remind potential participants to return their surveys, nor were surveys coded such that non-respondents could be readily contacted. While potential bias within a survey with a medium to low response rate cannot be determined for sure, there is substantial evidence that medium to low response rates bias the findings in direct relation to the topic under study:

One generalization that seems to hold up for most mail surveys is that people who have a particular interest in the subject matter or the research itself are more likely to return mail questionnaires than those who are less interested. This means that mail surveys with low response rates may be biased significantly in ways that are related directly to the purposes of the research (e.g., Filion, 1975; Heberlein & Baumgartner, 1978; Jobber, 1984) (Fowler, 2002, p. 42).

Therefore, given the social studies, technology, and primary source foci of the current research, it would be appropriate to assume that the results of the survey represent a pro-social studies, pro-technology, and pro-primary source use bias. This potential bias does not negate the current findings, but rather provides a framework within which the current findings should be viewed and interpreted.

Survey Structure and Design

Following an initial pilot survey examining the impact of online primary sources on the teaching of social studies in a large urban school

district, we refined the current survey in terms of length and the phrasing and structure of question and response categories (Lee & Hicks, 2002). Specifically, the survey was limited to three parts: demographic information, classroom-based historical primary source use, and web-based primary source use. Questions relating to use of classroom-based and web-based primary sources were designed to parallel each other. In designing the survey, we recognized the importance of initially ascertaining (a) teachers' perceptions of the purpose(s) of studying history and social studies (Table 3), (b) teachers' perceptions of why their students learn history and social studies (Table 4), and (c) teachers' perceptions of various pedagogies (Table 5). We saw these questions as intricately tied together, and, grounded within the social studies literature, they were designed to move from initially illuminating teachers' 'larger' philosophical views of the social studies and history (e.g. Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1977; Levstik & Barton, 2001b) to a more focused view of their perceptions of why their students should learn history (e.g. Evans, 1988, 1989, 1994; Seixas, 2000) and the general pedagogical methods that the respondents viewed as important for supporting student learning (e.g. AHA, 2003; Bain, 2000; Goodlad, 1985; Hartzler-Miller, 2001; NCSS, 1994; Levstik & Barton, 2001b). In addition, we developed two questions focusing specifically on teachers' philosophical stances regarding student uses of primary sources (Tables 6 and 7) in order to ascertain the extent to which teachers used primary sources for engaging in the *disciplinary knowledge*-based processes of sourcing, contextualizing (Bain, 2000; Seixas, 2000; Wineburg, 1991a, 1991b, 2001), and / or engaging in the *collective memory* approach through identifying key people, events, dates, and facts (Seixas, 2000).

In designing these questions, we sought to create a range of answer options that teachers could rank rather than choose one option over the other. However, we recognized an inherent limitation of survey research whereby teachers report what they value, or what they think others value - not necessarily what they actually do in class. Despite such a limitation that tends to be common to all surveys, our survey provides baseline data that can serve as an entry point for further research into teachers' purposes for and uses of classroom-based and web-based primary sources. In addition, we did not explicitly provide a definition of historical inquiry. Rather, we provided a range of statements within the survey designed to reveal the extent to which teachers' understandings and activities reflect the literature on historical inquiry.

Data Analysis

As noted above, the survey consisted of 84 questions distributed across three areas: demographic information, classroom-based historical primary source use, and web-based historical primary source use. The overall alpha reliability of the survey was .74. The analyses of these data

included descriptive statistical analyses (e.g., mean, standard deviation), and tests of significance (e.g., repeated measures analysis of variance). All analyses of variance (ANOVA) were corrected for sphericity using the Greenhouse-Geisser adjustment, and all mean comparisons were adjusted using the Bonferroni post hoc procedure. All Bonferroni post-hoc tests measured significance at $\alpha = .05$.

Results

The results of the survey focus on the purpose of teaching social studies, the use of classroom-based primary sources, and the use of web-based primary sources. Classroom-based primary sources are defined as primary sources originating from texts, ancillary text materials, and primary source packets. Web-based primary sources are defined as any sources that originate from the web, including downloaded historical pictures, texts, videos, or audio recordings.

The following analysis is divided into five sections: (a) the purpose of teaching and learning social studies, (b) the purpose of using primary sources, (c) a comparison of classroom-based and web-based historical primary source use, (d) a delineation of web-based historical primary source use, and (e) reasons why teachers do not use web-based primary sources. Within each of these five main sections, the original survey questions are assessed.

The Purpose of Teaching and Learning Social Studies

What is the purpose of studying history and social studies? The teachers indicated that encouraging individual growth, insuring an understanding of common historical and social knowledge, maintaining freedom and equality for all, and progressing toward a more equal society were all significant reasons for studying history and social studies. Specifically, each of these rationales was rated as *important* or *very important* by at least 80% of the teachers surveyed (see Table 3). Overall, these results indicate that the teachers have various reasons for engaging in social studies.

Why do your students learn history and social studies? Teachers indicated a variety of reasons for why their students should learn social studies, although the most common reason was clearly the desire to connect the past and the present. That is, 94.2% of the teachers rated connecting the past and the present as *important* or *very important*. Teachers also clearly supported the rationales of understanding the story of America and conducting historical inquiry (see Table 4). Statistically, least favored of the reasons for why one should learn social studies were acquiring knowledge of basic facts, developing a sense of time, and challenging accepted versions of history. These results support two overall conclusions. First, the teachers indicated that each reason

listed was at least important, if not very important, and second, that the most dominant reason for teaching social studies is to connect the past and the present.

What is the importance of the following teaching methods in the teaching of social studies: lecture, discussion, inquiry, and collaboration? Teachers responding to the survey clearly identified student inquiry and discussion as the most important teaching methods, of the four methods listed, with lecture as the least important method. It is important to note, however, that this low ranking of lecture did not mean that lecture was not valued, but rather that it was simply valued less than student inquiry, discussion, and collaboration (see Table 5). Overall, these results indicate that while the teachers valued discussion, student inquiry, collaboration, and lecture, they valued discussion and student inquiry significantly more than collaboration and lecture. These data contrast with the perception of social studies pedagogy as typically succumbing to "didactic forms of teaching" that are limited to the "non-critical chronicling" of the past (Evans, 1992, p. 313; see also Goodlad, 1985; McNeil, 1986). However, the extent to which the value placed on discussion and student inquiry manifests itself in the social studies classroom was unclear and requires further investigation.

The Purpose of Using Historical Primary Sources

Why should students read and analyze historical primary sources? Teachers indicated that four reasons for analyzing primary sources were paramount. These included providing a sense of the conditions of the period under study; creating a context for developing historical thinking skills; understanding the essential facts, concepts, and generalizations that underlie historical knowledge; and questioning historical truths and engaging in historical interpretation (see Table 6). The rationale that was least supported, statistically, was that of using primary sources to render information needed for success on standardized tests. These results indicate that primary sources are viewed as useful in providing historical relevance and developing historical thinking skills, but are not viewed as overly important in preparing students for standardized tests. This finding is interesting in light of the current focus on standardized tests, especially given the fact that the Advanced Placement exam and a number of state tests now use "document-based questions" as part of the test format in order to assess historical skills (Levstik & Barton, 2001b). Two important questions arise from these data: To what extent do teachers perceive standardized tests simply as distinct, content-driven assessments requiring students to demonstrate they have memorized a body of knowledge? And, to what extent are teachers re-orienting their classroom practice, in light of assessments that go beyond simple factual information and focus on students' abilities,

to engage in historical analysis?

How often do your students engage in historical primary source analysis activities? The teachers were fairly clear in the analysis activities they fostered with their students, favoring analysis of primary sources to identify key individuals, events, or ideas. Secondly, teachers had their students engage primary sources to compare and contrast details across multiple sources and detect and evaluate bias, distortion, or propaganda. However, fewer than half of the teachers indicated that they had students analyze primary sources to interrogate historical data based on the context in which a source was created or to assess a source's credibility, authority, or authenticity (see Table 7). These results indicate that their students were more likely to engage primary sources for the purpose of identifying, comparing, and evaluating historical knowledge than for contextualizing or authenticating that knowledge. The results stand in stark contrast to the teachers' stated emphasis on the importance of inquiry-based pedagogy (see Table 5). In addition, the idea that teachers use primary sources to reinforce key names, dates, terms, and facts falls short of the strategic dispositions and historical thinking processes highlighted within the disciplinary knowledge approach that advocates historical inquiry. Rather, the tendency to use primary sources to highlight the products of historical scholarship simply reinforces the common textbook-driven classroom practices so closely associated with Levstik and Barton's (2001b) identification stance and Seixas' (2000) collective memory approach.

A Comparison of Classroom and Web-Based Historical Primary Source Use

How often do you use historical primary sources in your history or social studies class? This question was asked under two conditions: the use of classroom-based primary sources and the use of web-based primary sources. Almost two-thirds of teachers indicated that they used classroom-based primary sources in their courses at least once a week, while a quarter of the teachers indicated that they used classroom-based primary sources two or three times a month. These results compare favorably to teachers' web-based use of primary sources, where only a quarter of teachers indicated that they used web-based primary sources at least once a week and another quarter of the teachers used web-based primary sources two to three times a month. However, almost half of the teachers indicated that they used web-based primary sources less than twice a month (see Table 8). These results clearly demonstrate that teachers were using classroom-based primary sources more often than web-based primary sources.

How often do you use classroom-based and/or web-based historical texts, images, or audio/video recordings? Approximately two-thirds of

teachers reported frequent use of classroom-based and web-based historical texts and images, while over half of teachers reported infrequent use of classroom-based and web-based historical audio/video recordings (see Table 9). We analyzed the results from this question differently than the rest of the results because of the nature of the questions. Specifically, these results indicated that, overall, the teachers used classroom-based primary sources more than web-based primary sources, and that teachers used historical texts and images more than historical videos, regardless of where the sources originated (i.e., classroom-based or web-based). Subsequent to this analysis, we conducted a series of contrasts to investigate the possible mean differences between classroom-based and web-based historical texts, images, and videos. The results of these contrast analyses indicated that teachers used classroom-based historical texts, images and videos more often than web-based historical texts, images and videos. Overall, these findings show that the teachers tended to use historical texts and images more than audio/video recordings, and that the origin of these sources was more often classroom-based than web-based.

What are the differences between classroom and web-based historical primary sources? Clearly, teachers believed that web-based primary sources are more accessible than classroom-based sources. Interestingly, teachers were less enthusiastic about stating that web-based primary sources were easier to use, more flexible, more engaging, or more dynamic. Finally, more than half of the teachers did not support the notion that web-based primary sources are better organized than classroom-based sources (see Table 10).

A Delineation of Web-Based Historical Primary Source Use

Why, and how often, do you access web-based historical primary sources? Table 9 clearly indicates that teachers were only occasional users of the web for the acquisition of primary sources. Given this, however, over half of the teachers indicated that they access the web to locate hard-to-find historical sources, identify sites and primary sources for their use in class, conduct historical inquiry, identify sites and primary sources for student use in class, or enhance their general understanding of history (see Table 11). Overall, these results, coupled with the data in Table 8, indicate that teachers were engaged in a variety of web-based tasks, including locating historical resources and sites, conducting historical inquiry, and enhancing their general understanding of history, if only occasionally.

How often and for what reasons have you accessed specific history or social studies web sites? Teachers indicated that they were mostly unfamiliar with and therefore had never used several well-developed and notable digital resource centers (see Table 12). Specifically, half to three-quarters of teachers had never heard of, for example, the Library of Congress' *American Memory* site, the University of Virginia's *Valley of*

the Shadow site, or the University of North Carolina's *Documenting the American South* site. For those teachers who were aware of these sites, the Library of Congress' *American Memory* site was used the most often for historical analysis. The remaining sites were used for historical analysis by less than a third of teachers, and several sites were used by less than a fifth of the teachers. If teachers were not using such prominent sites as *American Memory*, *New Deal Network*, *Digital National Security Archive*, or *Oyez Project*, what sites were they using for accessing web-based primary sources? When asked to list what sites they used, teachers' top responses were: (a) *National Archives and Records Administration* (n = 28), (b) *Library of Congress* (n = 28), (c) *American Memory* (n = 16), and (d) *History Channel*, *Google*, or *PBS* (n = 12). Fewer than 10 teachers indicated that they used the following sites: *National Geographic*, *Avalon Project*, *Smithsonian*, *History Net*, *White House*, and *Census Bureau*. These findings indicate that many teachers were not using social studies websites for historical analysis, and, in addition, that there was no consensus among teachers as to which social studies sites are the most useful for historical analysis.

What are your overall perceptions of using web-based historical primary sources online? Over 90% of the teachers clearly indicated that the most significant effect of the web on historical primary source use is access to previously unattainable sources (see Table 13). Also prominent was the teachers' belief that access to videos or pictures is a good reason to use the web, although the data shows that few seemed to make use of this capacity. Another interesting finding was that teachers were equally divided over whether or not locating these web-based sources was frustrating. Finally, only about half of the teachers believed that teaching with web-based primary sources is different than teaching without them. Overall, these results indicate that teachers saw the web as providing greater access to primary sources (e.g., videos, pictures, and hypertext documents), and that they believed this access provides a rich historical experience, but also that the use of web-based primary sources increases their class preparation time.

Reasons Why Teachers Do Not Use Web-Based Historical Primary Sources

If you do not use web-based primary historical sources, or if your use is limited, why? The responses to this question must be evaluated in light of the fact that only 37.9% of the teachers responded to the question. This low response rate indicates that approximately a third of the teachers surveyed believed that they either did not use or used infrequently web-based primary sources. This response rate is lower than, but in partial agreement with, the results in Table 8, which indicates that 46.8% of the teachers used web-based primary sources only a couple of times a month or less.

Given this response rate, it seems clear that a lack of time to search for web-based primary sources was a significant reason for not using web-based sources (see Table 14). This was by far the most pervasive answer; a distant second in importance was that there were too many web sites to locate suitable primary sources. Equally as important as the reasons for not using web-based primary sources in class were the reasons that teachers indicated were *not important*. Responding *not important* to a question asking why one does *not* use web-based primary sources results in a mental double negative. Thus, two-thirds of teachers indicated that the notion that primary sources are *not appropriate* for their classroom was *not important*; the translation of the double negative is that two-thirds of the teachers indicated that the use of primary sources is appropriate for their classrooms. Similarly, two-thirds of the teachers indicated that *insufficient access* to the web in their classroom was *not important*; again, the translation is that two-thirds of the teachers indicated that they had sufficient access to the web in their classroom.

What changes would increase your use of web-based historical primary sources? The likelihood of these teachers using web-based primary sources would be improved by an increase in web-accessible computers in the classroom and increased time in the curriculum devoted to the study of historical documents. The issue of the need for web-accessible computers may be clarified by layering these data with the data in Table 14, which indicates that two-thirds of the teachers believed that school or classroom connectivity was not an issue. Coupling this with the finding that 82.7% of the teachers believed that they needed more computers with web access in the classroom results in the conclusion that teachers simply need more web-connected computers (see Table 15).

In addition, along with the desire for more time in the curriculum, two-thirds of the teachers indicated that fewer standards and standardized tests would increase the likelihood of using more web-based primary sources. Finally, fewer than half of the teachers indicated that more training on the use of primary sources, the location of primary sources, or the use of the web would increase their chances of using more web-based primary sources. These results support the conclusion that increases in connected computers and time to utilize these computers for historical study, and not more training, are paramount in increasing the teachers' likelihood of using web-based primary sources.

Discussion

A discussion of the conclusions to be drawn from this survey requires a brief contextualization. The respondents to this survey were high school social studies teachers who were current members of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). NCSS membership may imply a level of commitment and interest in the teaching of social stud-

ies that may not be present in the general population of social studies teachers. In addition, NCSS membership brings with it access to current research, theory, and practice in the teaching of social studies through the NCSS journals: *Social Education*, *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, and *Theory and Research in Social Education*. For example, *Social Education* is the NCSS flagship journal, and it focuses specifically on issues relating to secondary social studies education, including regular sections on both teaching with documents and with technology. Thus, findings in this survey should be considered within the context of the participants' membership in NCSS. Within this context, the results provide baseline data pertaining to secondary social studies teachers' purpose(s) for using and their actual use of classroom-based and web-based primary sources. On the surface, the data suggest a certain confidence among the respondents with regard to working with classroom-based primary sources to engage students in historical inquiry and using the web as a search tool for locating primary sources.

The Purpose of Using Historical Primary Sources

Generations of researchers and students have typically experienced and observed the social studies classroom as a place where students "listen to the teacher explain the day's lesson, use the textbook, and take tests. Sometimes they memorize information or read stories about events and people. They seldom work with other students, use original documents, write term papers, or discuss the significance of what they are studying" (Ravitch & Finn, 1987, p. 194). The results of this study, at first blush, appear to provide a more positive image of the teachers' pedagogical approaches.

Specifically, the results indicate that while the teachers valued lecture to some extent, they placed greater value on a wide range of methods and strategies, including engaging students in classroom discussion and facilitating student inquiry as part of the process of teaching and learning social studies. This finding, along with the teachers' dominant reason for why students should learn social studies – to connect the past and the present – emphasizes the importance that the teachers assigned to using primary sources as a way to provide historical relevance and develop historical thinking skills.

In the pursuit of developing historical relevance and historical thinking skills, the teachers were most likely to use primary sources for the purposes of identifying, comparing, and evaluating historical knowledge. Interestingly, however, teachers did not view the use of primary sources as overly important in preparing students for standardized tests. This finding seems to indicate that, in spite of the trend to include document-based questions on social studies assessments, many of the teachers drew a distinction between their perceptions of what standardized tests are designed to measure and their rationale

and goals for using primary sources in the classroom. VanSledright's (2002) recent work captures this dilemma facing social studies teachers. He notes:

I worried about how my students would fare on such tests, because I fell short on covering all of the required historical events. I continue to worry about this. I want to imagine that many ambitious history teachers wrestle with these larger dilemmas of practice, these pedagogical and curricular double binds where their convictions about teaching a subject to benefit children's academic and civic development are challenged by educational policies that undermine that development (VanSledright, 2002, p. 108).

Further research could explore how teachers balance the contradictory pressures of preparing students for success on standardized tests while undertaking efforts to teach historical thinking.

The data from this study did not provide evidence that the teachers' use of primary sources reflected the disciplinary knowledge approach to learning history. Specifically, the teachers' inconsistency regarding their *philosophy* of using primary sources to promote an understanding of historical context and to develop historical thinking skills (see Table 6) contrasted with their responses on the importance of actually using primary sources to examine key individuals, events, and ideas (see Table 7). These contrasting responses call into question the extent to which the teachers understood the complex nature of working with historical sources as part of the disciplinary knowledge approach. Rather, it seemed that their use of primary sources to examine key individuals, events, and ideas more closely resembled the common *identification* stance that encourages the collective memory approach within social studies classrooms. It appeared that the teachers used the primary sources as an alternative resource to reinforce key names, dates, terms, and facts that are typically found within the textbook. Wineburg's (1991b) research on how students analyzed historical sources revealed their tendency to approach primary sources as they would any narrative and to simply accept the text at face value, or at best, to approach the primary source with the minimal goal of evaluating the source for bias, thus failing to consider the importance of the source's historical context. It also seemed that the students in his study had had no experience in school that would have facilitated a more nuanced and knowledgeable analysis of primary sources. In this study, in spite of the teachers' responses indicating that they needed no preparation to teach historical inquiry, questions remain about their understanding of how to use primary sources as part of the processes of teaching historical inquiry (see McDiarmid & Vinten-Johansen, 1993; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988).

Our findings also caused us to wonder whether sufficient efforts have been made in the history and social studies education literature to problematize and unpack such terms as *historical inquiry* and the *doing of history* that are so readily used by teachers and teacher educators. Barton (2002) notes:

There seems to be widespread agreement among history educators of all sorts...that analyzing primary sources is a good thing. There is less consensus as to why this should be so. In many cases, the practice of analyzing primary sources has been reified, as though it were an end in itself, or as though meaning could inhere in the historical sources themselves, rather than in the uses to which they are put (p. 16).

In summary, then, our survey results indicate that the teachers reported using primary sources within their classrooms to provide a sense of historical relevance and to develop students' historical thinking skills. However, how well they are using these sources to create opportunities to engage students in critical historical inquiry is open to question.

Teachers' Use of Web-Based Historical Primary Sources

While the teachers recognized the potential of the web as a powerful source for accessing hard-to-find primary sources, our results indicate that in contrast to the teachers' regular use of classroom-based primary sources, their use of web-based primary sources was relatively low. The data clearly show that while the respondents did occasionally use the web to locate primary sources and to develop their own content knowledge, they did not consider the web as an organized repository of primary sources that could quickly and efficiently be accessed and used within the classroom. This conclusion is supported by another, somewhat surprising finding that there appeared to be no consensus among teachers about which social studies web sites are the most useful for accessing and using primary sources.

While well-developed digital resource centers and libraries continue to be marketed as powerful resources for social studies teachers, many teachers in this study were unfamiliar with them. In addition, those teachers who were aware of such sites seemed reluctant to use them as part of the process of engaging students in the doing of history. One possible explanation may be that, despite their materials and information relevant to the K-12 curriculum, many digital resource centers are designed by researchers and librarians for researchers and librarians. Although educational materials such as lesson plans, activities, and teaching guides exist on such sites, they may have been developed as an afterthought and thus have not been fully integrated into the framework of the database in order to support the meaningful and ef-

efficient use of the website's content and resources. Additional research is needed to explore why such digital resource centers appear to be of limited use to teachers and what kinds of pedagogical enhancements would encourage teacher and student use.

Given that the teachers' use of such digital resource centers and web-based primary sources was low, what might encourage teachers to use these sources more often? Teachers clearly emphasized the need both for more connected computers and more time in the curriculum to work with primary sources. At the same time, teachers downplayed the need for additional professional development regarding the use of primary sources or the web as a factor that would increase their use of web-based primary sources. However, recent work by Cuban suggests that it is questionable whether merely an increase in the number of connected computers and the time to use them will provide the needed tipping point for teachers to use technology successfully as a tool to engage students in the doing of history (see Cuban, 2001; Cuban, Fitzpatrick & Peck, 2001). Ongoing support to facilitate teachers' understandings of effective and engaging practices in the history classroom, with or without the use of current and emerging technologies, must be seen as a key ingredient for evolving professional development. Providing resources, such as connected computers and time, is important, but it should be done within the context of facilitating teachers' knowledge and sophisticated strategy use.

Conclusion

Ultimately, the survey results reveal that these high school teachers understood the potential in using primary sources to support historical inquiry and the potential of the web to provide unprecedented access to primary sources. These responses provide a favorable contrast to the more negative image of social studies classrooms often presented in both research and the media. However, the teachers' actual use of both classroom-based and web-based primary sources was somewhat low. If we are to build on the present findings, we must provide a clearer and more multi-layered portrait of teachers' uses of primary sources to engage their students in the doing of history and social studies. This undertaking will require moving from general survey data toward richly detailed longitudinal case studies that illuminate the possibilities and challenges facing social studies educators who have successfully shifted from the collective memory approach toward what Seixas (2000) terms the disciplinary knowledge approach and/or the postmodern approach. Developing understandings about such teachers, however, is not enough if our goal as teacher educators/researchers is to have an impact on educational practices. What is required is "the evolution of a research culture that would provide the framework for coordinated,

long-term, programmatic design-related research [quantitative and qualitative] that could yield products with proven impacts on social studies outcomes" (Shaver, 2001, p. 248). Preparing teachers to engage their students in the process of historical inquiry in networked 21st century classrooms must begin with educational researchers working alongside teachers, academic historians, and technologists to create spaces and projects that bring to life both the knowledge and the designs for supporting historical inquiry in the social studies classroom.

APPENDIX

Table 1. *Demographics Related to Participants' High Schools (Self-Reported)*

Participant Demographics		High School Demographics	
Age (years)		Location	
21-30	26	Urban	34
31-40	25	Suburban	91
41-50	40	Rural	33
+50	67		
Gender		Size ^a	
Male	78	Small	36
Female	80	Medium	67
		Large	55
Education		Racial Composition	
Associates degree	1	White	105
Bachelors degree	32	Black	9
Masters degree	116	Hispanic	10
Doctoral degree	9	Multicultural	34
Teaching Experience (years)		Socio-Economic Status	
1-5	27	Low	34
6-10	33	Medium	74
11-15	18	High	27
16-20	9	Varied	23
+20	67		

^aSmall = <500 students; Medium = 500-1500 students; Large = > 1500 students

Table 2. *Courses and Grade Levels Taught by Participants^a*

Courses	Grade Level
American History	104 9
World History	70 10
Government/Civics	52 11
Geography	28 12
Economics	31
Psychology	24
Sociology	14

^aThe sum of the courses taught and grade levels taught exceeds the sample size of 156, as individual teachers may teach more than one subject area and/or grade level.

Table 3. *Teachers' Perceptions of the Purpose of Studying History and Social Studies*

Rate the importance of the following statements regarding the purpose of studying history and social studies.		Very Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important	
	Mean ^{a,b}						
Encourage individual growth	1.61 ^c	51.5	35.6	12.6	0.6		
Understand common knowledge	1.61 ^c	47.1	44.5	8.2	0.0		
Maintain freedom and equality for all	1.62 ^c	51.5	35.6	12.0	0.0		
Progress toward a more equal society	1.83 ^d	36.3	44.5	18.4	0.6		

Note. With the exception of the Mean column, all values reported are percentages.

^a 1 = Very Important, 2 = Important, 3 = Somewhat Important, 4 = Not Important

^b Means with similar superscripts are statistically similar, means with dissimilar superscripts are statistically different, $F(3,468) = 4.532$, $MSE = .42$, $p < .05$.

Table 4. *Teachers' Perceptions of Why Students Should Learn History and Social Studies*

Rate the importance of the following statements regarding why students learn history and social studies.		Very Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important	
	Mean ^{a,b}						
Make connections of past and present	1.32 ^c	74.5	19.7	5.0	0.6		
Understand the story of America	1.76 ^d	43.2	38.0	16.7	1.9		
Conduct historical inquiry	1.91 ^d	35.6	41.4	17.7	5.0		
Acquire knowledge of basic facts	2.12 ^e	25.1	50.3	21.8	2.5		
Develop a sense of time	2.19 ^e	10.3	62.9	23.2	3.2		
Challenge accepted versions of history	2.20 ^e	22.7	38.3	35.0	3.8		

Note. With the exception of the Mean column, all values reported are percentages.

^a 1 = Very Important, 2 = Important, 3 = Somewhat Important, 4 = Not Important

^b Means with similar superscripts are statistically similar, means with dissimilar superscripts are statistically different, $F(5,745) = 18.69$, $MSE = 2.20$, $p < .05$.

Table 5. Teachers' Perceptions of the Importance of Various Pedagogies

Rate the importance of the following teaching methods? (n = 157)	Very Important				Somewhat Important		Not Important	
	Mean ^{a,b}	1.57 ^c	52.2	38.8	8.8	0.0	1.59 ^c	48.4
Student Inquiry	1.57 ^c	52.2	38.8	8.8	0.0		1.59 ^c	48.4
Discussion	1.59 ^c	48.4	45.2	5.7	0.6		1.88 ^d	35.0
Collaboration	1.88 ^d	35.0	42.0	22.9	0.0		2.23 ^e	17.1
Lecture	2.23 ^e	17.1	47.1	31.1	4.4		Note. With the exception of the Mean column, all values reported are percentages. * 1 = Very Important, 2 = Somewhat Important, 3 = Somewhat Important, 4 = Not Important b Means with similar superscripts are statistically similar, means with dissimilar superscripts are statistically different, F(3,468) = 32.25, MSE = .59, p < .05.	

Table 6. Teachers' Philosophy Regarding the Use of Historical Primary Sources

According to your philosophy, why should students read and analyze historical primary sources? (n = 154)	Very Important				Somewhat Important		Not Important	
	Mean ^{a,b}	1.38 ^c	66.8	29.8	3.8	0.0	1.45 ^c	60.3
To provide a sense of conditions relevant to the period studied	1.38 ^c	66.8	29.8	3.8	0.0		1.75 ^d	39.6
To create a context to develop historical thinking skills	1.45 ^c	60.3	35.0	5.1	0.0		1.83 ^d	42.2
To understand facts, concepts, and generalizations	1.75 ^d	39.6	46.1	14.1	0.0		2.73 ^e	7.1
To question historical truths and engage in interpretation	1.83 ^d	42.2	34.4	23.2	0.6			
To render information needed for success on standardized tests	2.73 ^e	7.1	28.5	47.9	16.2		Note. With the exception of the Mean column, all values reported are percentages. * 1 = Very Important, 2 = Somewhat Important, 3 = Somewhat Important, 4 = Not Important b Means with similar superscripts are statistically similar, means with dissimilar superscripts are statistically different, F(4,612) = 106.46, MSE = .47, p < .05.	

Table 7. Students' Frequency of Actions When Analyzing Historical Primary Sources

How often do your students engage in the following actions when analyzing historical primary sources? (n = 152)	Mean ^{a,b}	Very Often					Sometimes	Infrequently	Never
		1.77 ^c	44.0	38.8	13.0	3.9			
Examine source for key individuals, events, and ideas	1.77 ^c	44.0	38.8	13.0	3.9	0.0			
Compare and contrast details across multiple data sources	2.20 ^d	25.4	39.2	25.4	9.8	0.0			
Detect and evaluate bias, distortion, and propaganda	2.23 ^d	21.5	45.0	24.8	6.5	1.9			
Interrogate historical data given the context of the data's creation	2.59 ^e	14.4	34.2	34.2	12.5	4.5			
Assess a source's credibility, authority, or authenticity	2.91 ^e	9.1	24.1	39.2	22.2	5.2			

Note. With the exception of the Mean column, all values reported are percentages

^a 1 = Very Often, 2 = Often, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Infrequently, 5 = Never

^b Means with similar superscripts are statistically similar, means with dissimilar superscripts are statistically different, F(4,604) = 47.12, MSE = .67, p < .05.

Note. With the exception of the Mean column, all values reported are percentages

* 1 = Very Often, 2 = Often, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Infrequently, 5 = Never

b Means with similar superscripts are statistically similar, means with dissimilar superscripts are statistically different, F(4,604) = 47.12, MSE = .67, p < .05.

Table 8. Teachers' Frequency of Use of Classroom-based and Web-based Historical Primary Sources

Frequency of Use	Historical Primary Source Location			
	Classroom-based		Web-based	
More than once a week	63.5		26.4	
Two to three times a month	24.6		26.5	
Less than twice a month	12.8		46.8	

Note. All values reported are percentages.

Table 9. Teachers' Frequency of Use for Classroom and Web-based Historical Primary Sources

How often do you use the following types of historical primary sources? (n = 132)	Very Often					Never		
	Mean ^a	Often	Sometimes	Infrequently				
Historical Texts ^{b,c,d}								
Classroom-based	1.88	38.3	40.2	17.5	2.5			1.2
Web-based	2.22	18.9	48.4	25.7	5.3			1.5
Historical Images								
Classroom-based	2.10	31.8	35.0	26.6	4.5			1.9
Web-based	2.27	20.4	43.1	28.0	5.3			3.0
A/V Recordings								
Classroom-based	2.60	19.4	25.9	31.8	20.1			2.5
Web-based	2.90	9.0	34.8	27.2	14.3			14.3

Note. With the exception of the mean column, all values reported are percentages

^a 1 = Very Often, 2 = Often, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Infrequently, 5 = Never

^b Teacher reported using classroom-based primary sources more than web-based primary sources, $F(1,62) = 14.67$, $MSE = 13.71$, $p < .05$

^c Teachers reported using texts and images more than audio/video recordings, regardless of where the source originated, $F(2,124) = 14.75$, $MSE = 1.05$, $p < .05$.

^d Pairwise comparisons between classroom and web-based texts, images, and recordings yielded significant differences in each instance, $F(1,130) = 20.86$, $MSE = 1.10$, $p < .05$, $F(1,130) = 9.89$, $MSE = .93$, $p < .05$, and $F(1,130) = 8.16$, $MSE = 1.80$, $p < .05$, respectively.

Table 10. Teachers' Perceptions of Differences between Classroom and Web-based Historical Primary Sources

Web-based historical primary sources are <u>more</u> than classroom-based historical primary sources. (n = 124)	Very Often					Not True		
	Mean ^{a,b}	Often	Sometimes	Infrequently				
More accessible	1.69 ^c	55.6	23.3	20.0				1.6
Easier to use	2.23 ^d	27.4	27.4	40.2				4.8
More flexible	2.28 ^c	24.1	29.0	41.0				5.6
More engaging	2.34 ^d	20.9	33.8	35.4				9.6
More dynamic	2.44 ^d	15.3	33.8	41.8				8.8
Better organized	2.65 ^e	12.9	20.9	53.9				12.0

Note. With the exception of the Mean column, all values reported are percentages.

^a 1 = Very True, 2 = True, 3 = Somewhat True, 4 = Not True

^b Means with similar superscripts are statistically similar, means with dissimilar superscripts are statistically different $F(5,615) = 27.77$, $MSE = .69$, $p < .05$.

Table 11. Teachers' Frequency of Web-based Historical Primary Source Use for Specific Tasks

How often do you access web-based historical primary sources for each of the following tasks? (n = 131)	Very Often					Never		
	Mean ^{a,b}	Often	Sometimes	Infrequently				
Locate difficult to find historical resources	2.08 ^c	37.8	28.0	24.2	9.0			0.7
Identify sites and primary sources for my use in class	2.13 ^c	31.0	35.6	23.4	9.0			0.7
Conduct specific historical inquiry	2.20 ^c	28.7	36.3	22.7	12.1			0.7
Identify sites and primary sources for student use in class	2.25 ^c	23.4	38.6	28.7	9.8			0.0
Enhance my general understanding of history	2.31 ^c	26.5	31.0	30.3	9.0			3.0

Note. With the exception of the Mean column, all values reported are percentages

^a 1 = Very Often, 2 = Often, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Infrequently, 5 = Never

^b Means with similar superscripts are statistically similar, means with dissimilar superscripts are statistically different $F(4,520) = 1.90$, $MSE = .66$, $p < .05$.

Table 12. Accessing of Specific Web-based Historical Primary Sources to Conduct Historical Analysis

For what reasons have you accessed the following sites? (n = 125)	Mean ^{a,b}	Conduct Historical Analysis with Students	Conduct Historical Analysis without Students	Visited, Not Used for Historical Analysis	Heard of, Never Used	Never Heard of or Used
American Memory ^c	3.42 ⁱ	26.4	11.2	6.4	7.2	49.6
New Deal Network ^d	3.86 ⁱ	13.6	16.0	4.0	11.2	58.4
Avalon Project ^e	4.00 [*]	8.8	15.2	4.0	14.4	59.2
Oyez Project ^f	4.08 [*]	10.4	11.2	4.8	14.4	61.6
Valley of the Shadow ^g	4.31 [*]	7.2	9.6	2.4	9.6	73.6
Digital National Security Archive ^h	4.43 ⁱ	4.8	7.2	4.0	11.2	75.2
Documenting the American South ⁱ	4.49 ⁱ	5.6	5.6	2.4	10.4	78.4

Note. With the exception of the Mean column, all values reported are percentages
^a 1 = Used with students, 2 = Used for resources, 3 = Visited, not used, 4 = Heard of, never used, 5 = Never heard of or used
^b Means with similar superscripts are statistically similar, means with dissimilar superscripts are statistically different F(6,744) = 13.00, MSE = 1.53, p < .05.
^c <http://memory.loc.gov/>
^d <http://newdeal.feri.org/>
^e <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/avalon.htm>
^f <http://www.oyez.org/>
^g <http://www.iath.virginia.edu/vshadow2/>
^h <http://nsarchive.chadwyck.com/>
ⁱ <http://docsouth.unc.edu/>

Table 13. Teachers' Perceptions of Web-based Historical Primary Sources

To what extent do you agree with the following statements? (n = 150)	Mean ^{a,b}	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The web allows access to previously unattainable sources	1.56 ^c	52.9	40.6	5.1	0.6	1.2
Videos and pictures are a good reason for using the web	1.87 ^d	31.6	51.6	16.1	0.6	0.6
Hyper-text documents are a good reason for using the web	2.19 [*]	20.6	43.2	29.6	3.2	1.2
Web sources provide richer historical experiences	2.21 [*]	18.7	47.7	27.7	3.8	1.9
Using web sources increases class preparation time	2.31 [*]	23.2	41.2	21.2	9.0	4.5
Due to the web, I use more primary sources than previously	2.60 ⁱ	15.4	40.0	18.0	18.0	7.7
The web has changed how I use primary sources in class	2.61 ⁱ	14.1	36.7	27.7	11.6	9.0
It is frustrating locating useful sources on the web	3.03 ⁱ	10.9	25.8	24.5	25.8	11.6
There is no difference in teaching with or without web sources	3.55 ^g	3.2	9.0	32.9	39.3	15.4

Note. With the exception of the Mean column, all values reported are percentages.
^a 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree
^b Means with similar superscripts are statistically similar, means with dissimilar superscripts are statistically different, F(8,1192) = 59.69, MSE = 1.63, p < .05.

Table 14. Teachers' Perceptions of Why They Do Not Use Web-based Historical Primary Sources

<i>If you do not use historical primary sources from the web or your use is limited, indicate why.</i> (n = 60)	Mean ^{a,b}	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
No time to search the web for primary sources	1.82 ^c	45.0	48.3	18.3	5.0
Too many web sites to locate suitable primary sources	2.37 ^d	25.0	33.3	33.3	16.6
Inappropriate preparation to use the web in my class	3.03 ^e	5.0	25.0	31.6	38.3
Inappropriate preparation to use primary sources	3.25 ^e	5.0	8.3	43.3	43.3
Primary sources are not appropriate for my course	3.45 ^e	3.3	8.3	28.3	65.0
Insufficient access to the web in my school or classroom	3.47 ^e	15.0	8.3	18.3	68.3

Note. With the exception of the Mean column, all values reported are percentages.

^a 1 = Very Important, 2 = Important, 3 = Somewhat Important, 4 = Not Important

^b Means with similar superscripts are statistically similar, means with dissimilar superscripts are statistically different, $F(5,295) = 39.22$, $MSE = .99$, $p < .05$.

Table 15. Importance of Specific Changes in Schools or Classrooms That Would Increase Teachers' Likelihood of Using Web-based Historical Primary Sources

<i>What school or classroom changes would increase your likelihood of using web-based historical primary sources?</i> (n = 124)	Mean ^{a,b}	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
More computers with web access in the classroom	1.65 ^c	67.1	15.6	5.1	11.9
More time in the curriculum to study historical documents	1.73 ^c	52.9	31.6	10.2	5.1
Fewer standardized and standardized tests	2.10 ^d	42.1	23.3	22.5	12.0
More training on locating primary sources on the web	2.58 ^e	20.0	24.6	34.6	20.7
More training on using primary source documents	2.59 ^e	19.8	27.4	30.4	22.1
More training on using the web in my classroom	2.82 ^e	16.1	22.3	29.2	32.3

Note. With the exception of the Mean column, all values reported are percentages.

^a 1 = Very Important, 2 = Important, 3 = Somewhat Important, 4 = Not Important

^b Means with similar superscripts are statistically similar, means with dissimilar superscripts are statistically different, $F(5,615) = 40.09$, $MSE = .87$, $p < .05$.

References

- American Historical Association. (2003). *Benchmarks for professional development in teaching history as a discipline*. Retrieved June 20, 2002, from <http://www.theaha.org/teaching/benchmarks.htm>
- Ashby, R., Lee, P., & Dickinson, A. (1997). How children explain the "why" of history: The Chata research project on teaching history. *Social Education*, 61(1), 17-21.
- Bain, R. (2000). Into the breach: Using research and theory to shape history instruction. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: national and international perspectives*. (pp. 331-352). New York: New York University Press.
- Barr, R., Barth, J., & Shermitz. (1977). *Defining the social studies*. Washington DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Barton, K. (1997). "I just kinda know": Elementary students' ideas about historical evidence. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 25, 407-430.
- Barton, K. (1998, April). "That's a Tricky Piece": Children's understanding of historical time in Northern Ireland. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Barton, K. (2002 November). *Inquiry and the Book of James*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly, National Council for the Social Studies, Phoenix, AZ.
- Becker, H., Ravitz, J., & Wong, Y. (1999). *Teacher and teacher-directed student use of computers and software*. Retrieved June 20, 2003, from <http://www.crito.uci.edu/tic/findings/computeruse/>
- Berkhofer, R.F. (1995). *Beyond the great story: History as text and discourse*. Cambridge: Harvard/Belknap.
- Berson, M.J. (1996). Effectiveness of computer technology in social studies: A review of the literature. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 28(4), 486-499.
- Berson, M.J., Cruz, B. C., Duplass, J. A., & Johnston, J.H. (2001) *Social studies and the Internet*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Berson, M. J., Lee, J. K., & Stuckart, D. W. (2001). Promise and practice of computer technologies in the social studies: A critical analysis. In W. B. Stanley (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies research for the 21st century* (pp. 209-229). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Braun, J. A. & Risinger, C. F. (1999). *Surfing social studies: The Internet book*. Washington D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Cantu, D. A. & Warren, W. (2003). *Teaching history in the digital classroom*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Crocco, M. S. (2001). Leveraging constructivist learning in the social studies classroom. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 1(3), 386-394. Retrieved June 20, 2003 from <http://www.citejournal.org/vol1/iss3/currentissues/socialstudies/article2.htm>
- Cuban, L. (2001) *Oversold and underused: Computers in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cuban, L., Fitzpatrick, H., & Peck, C. (2001) High access and low use of technologies in high school classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 813-834.
- Doolittle, P. & Hicks, D. (2003). Constructivism as a theoretical foundation for the use of technology in social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 31(1), 72-104.
- Ehman, L. H., & Glenn, A. D. (1991). Interactive technology in the social studies. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 513-522). New York: Macmillan.
- Evans, R. (1988). Lessons from history: Teacher and student conceptions of the meaning of history. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 16(3), 203-225.
- Evans, R. (1989). Teachers' conceptions of history. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 17 (3), 210-40.
- Evans, R. (1992). Misunderstanding social studies: A rejoinder to Whelan. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 20(3), 313-317.
- Evans, R. (1994). Educational ideologies and the teaching of history. In G. Leinhardt, I. L. Beck, & C. Stainton (Eds.), *Teaching and learning in history* (pp. 171-207). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goodlad, J. (1985). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Grant, S.G. (2000). Teachers and tests: Exploring teachers' perceptions of changes in the New York state testing program. *Educational Policy Analysis Archive*, 8(14). Retrieved June 20, 2003, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n14.html>
- Grant, S. G., Gradwell, J., Lauricella, A. M., Pullano, L., & Tretzo, K. (2002). When increasing stakes need not mean increasing standards: The case of the New York state global history and geography exam. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30(4), 488-515.
- Graves, J. & Parr, M. (2003). Online resources from the Library of Congress. *Social Education* 67(7), 394-396.
- Gray, T. & Owens, S. (2003). From attics to graveyards: where to locate documents for your classroom. *Social Education* 67(7), 386-388.
- Hartzler-Miller, C. (2001). Making sense of "best practice" in teaching history. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 29(4), 672-695.
- Holt, T. (1995). *Thinking historically: Narrative, imagination, and understanding*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Hope, W. C. (1996). It's time to transform social studies teaching. *The Social Studies*, 87(4), 149-151.
- Johnson, R. (1997). Historical research online: A new ball game. In D. A. Trinkle (Ed.), *Writing, teaching, and researching history in the electronic age* (pp. 183-193). Armonk, New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Kobrin, D. (1996). *Beyond the textbook: teaching history using documents and primary sources*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Lee, J. K. (2002). Digital history in the history / social studies classroom. *The History Teacher*, 43(4), 503-518.
- Lee, J.K. & Hicks, D. (2002). Use of digital historical resources in a large urban school system. *Proceedings of the Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International Conference 2002*, [CD Edition] Nashville, TN; Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education.
- Lee, P. (1998). Making sense of historical accounts. *Canadian Social Studies*, 32(1), 52-54.
- Levstik, L. (1996). Negotiating the history landscape. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 24, 393-397.
- Levstik, L., & Barton, K. (2001a). *Doing history: Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Levstik, L. & Barton, K. (2001b). Committing acts of history: mediated action, humanistic education, and participatory democracy. In W.B. Stanley (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies research for the 21st century* (pp. 119-147). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Leinhardt, G., Stainton, C., Virji, S. M., & Odoroff, E. (1994). Learning to reason in history: Mindlessness to mindfulness. In M. Carretero & J. Voss (Eds.), *Cognition and instructional process in history and social sciences* (pp.131-158). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Loewen, J. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: New Press.
- Mason, C., Berson, M., Diem, R., Hicks, D., Lee, J., & Dralle, T. (2000). Guidelines for using technology to prepare social studies teachers. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 1(1), 107-116.
- Mason, C., & Hicks, D. (2002) Digital history as rich information: Access and analysis. In A Loveless and B. Dore (Eds.), *ICT in the Primary School*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Martorella, P. (1998) Technology and the social studies or which way to the sleeping giant? *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 25, 511-514.
- McDiarmid, W.G. & Vinten-Johansen, P. (1993). *The teaching and learning of history: From inside out*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

- VanFossen, P. (2001). Degree of Internet/WWW use- and barriers to use-among secondary social studies teachers. *International Journal of Instructional Media* 28(1), 57-74.
- VanFossen, P., & Shiveley, J. (2003). A content analysis of Internet sessions presented at the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Meeting, 1995-2002. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 31(4), 502-521.
- VanSledright, B. (1995). "I don't remember - the ideas are all jumbled in my head": Eighth graders' reconstructions of colonial American history. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 10(4), 317-345.
- VanSledright, B. (1996). Closing the gap between disciplinary and school history? Historian as high school history teacher. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in Research on Teaching: Vol 6* (pp. 257-289). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- VanSledright, B. (2002) Confronting history's interpretive paradox while teaching fifth graders to investigate the past. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(4), 1089-1115.
- Warren, W. J. (2000). Using the World Wide Web for primary source research in high school history classes. *Journal of the Association for History and Computing*, 29(2). Retrieved June 20, 2003, from <http://www.mcel.pacificu.edu/JAHC/JAHC12/ARTICLE12/warren/warren.html>.
- Whelan, M. (1997a). The historical subject matter that ultimately matters most. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 25, 506-509.
- Whelan, M. (1997b). History as the core of social studies education. In E. Wayne Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems and possibilities*. (pp.21-38). Albany, NY: SUNY press.
- Whitworth, S., & Berson, M. (2003). Computer technology in the social studies: An examination of the effectiveness literature (1996-2001). *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education* 2(4). Retrieved June 20, 2003, from <http://www.citejournal.org/vol2/iss4/socialstudies/article1.cfm>.
- Wilson, S. M., & Wineburg, S. S. (1988). Peering at history through different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in teaching history. *Teachers College Record*, 89(4), 525-539.
- Wineburg, S. (1991a). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 73-87.
- Wineburg, S. (1991b) On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28, 495-519
- Wineburg, S. (1996). The psychology of learning and teaching history. In D. C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology* (pp. 423-436). New York: Macmillan.
- Wineburg, S. (2001) *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- DAVID HICKS is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Teaching and Learning in the School of Education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- PETER DOOLITTLE is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Teaching and Learning in the School of Education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- JOHN K. LEE is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Middle/Secondary Education and Instructional Technology at Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, 30303.

Spring 2004

247

- McNeil, L. M. (1986). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Milson, A.J. (2002) The Internet and inquiry learning: Integrating medium and method in a sixth grade social studies classroom. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30(3), 330-353.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2003) *Digest of education statistics*, 2002. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Retrieved 30 July, 2003, from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/index.asp>.
- National Council for History in the Schools (1996). *National History Standards*. Los Angeles: Author.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (1994). *Expectations for excellence: Curriculum standards for social studies*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Osborne, K. (2003). Fred Morrow Flinn and the source-method of teaching history. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 31(4), 466-501.
- Potter, L. A. (2003). Online resources from the National Archives. *Social Education* 67(7), 390-393.
- Ravitch, D., & Finn, C.E. (1987). *What do our 17 year olds know? A Report on the First National Assessment of History and Literature*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Rehmel, S. (1998). That's a good quote -What's the source?: Integrating media technology research and presentation skills in a high school social studies class. *The Social Studies* 89(5), 223-226.
- Rosenzweig, R. (2001). The road to Xanadu: Public and private pathways on the history web. *Journal of American History*, 88(2), 548-579.
- Saye, J. W., & Brush, T. (1999). Student engagement with social issues in a multimedia-supported learning environment. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 27(4), 472-504
- Schrum, K. (2000). Making history on the web matter in the classroom. *The History Teacher*, 34(3), 327-338.
- Schick, J. B.M. (1990). *Teaching history with a computer: A complete guide for college professors*. Chicago: Lyceum.
- Seixas, P. (1998). Student teacher thinking historically. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 310-341
- Seixas, P. (2000). Schweigen! die kinder! or, does postmodern history have a place in the schools. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: national and international perspectives*. (pp. 19-37). New York: New York University Press.
- Shaver, J. (2001) The future of research on social studies - For what purpose? In W. B. Stanley (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies research for the 21st century* (pp. 231-252). Greenwich, CT: Information Age
- Sherman, G., & Hicks, D.(2000). Using a historic site to develop virtual reality-enhanced web-based instructional material: Learning to use technology as a partner in the classroom. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 1(2), 244-257. Retrieved June 20, 2003, from <http://www.citejournal.org/vol1/iss2/currentissues/socialstudies/article1.htm>.
- Shiveley, J., & VanFossen, P. (1999). Critical thinking and the Internet: Opportunities for the social studies classroom. *The Social Studies*, 90(1), 42-46.
- Spencer, J. M., & Barth, J. L. (1992). The deconstruction of history in the public school classroom. *Social Education*, 56(1), 13-14.
- VanFossen, P. (1999, November). *Teachers would have to be crazy not to use the Internet! A preliminary analysis of the use of the Internet/WWW by secondary social studies teachers in Indiana*. Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Orlando, FL.
- VanFossen, P. (2000). An analysis of the use of the Internet and the World Wide Web by secondary social studies teachers in Indiana. *International Journal of Social Education* 14(2), 87-109.

Spring 2004

246