

# NEW POSSIBILITIES FOR THE PAST

## Shaping History Education in Canada

Edited by Penney Clark



Sample Material © 2011 UBC Press

# Contents

---

Acknowledgments / ix

Introduction / 1

*Penney Clark*

## **Part 1: History Education: Contested Terrain**

**1** A Brief Survey of Canadian Historiography / 33

*Margaret Conrad*

**2** Teaching Canadian History: A Century of Debate / 55

*Ken Osborne*

**3** The Debate on History Education in Quebec / 81

*Jocelyn Létourneau*

**4** Teaching History from an Indigenous Perspective:  
Four Winding Paths up the Mountain / 97

*Michael Marker*

## **Part 2: Orientations toward Historical Thinking**

- 5** What It Means to Think Historically / 115  
*Stéphane Lévesque*
- 6** Assessment of Historical Thinking / 139  
*Peter Seixas*
- 7** History Education as a Disciplined “Ethic of Truths” / 154  
*Kent den Heyer*

## **Part 3: Classroom Contexts for Historical Thinking**

- 8** Historical Thinking in Elementary Education:  
A Review of Research / 175  
*Amy von Heyking*
- 9** Historical Thinking in Secondary Schools:  
Zones and Gardens / 195  
*Tom Morton*
- 10** The Shape of Historical Thinking in a Canadian History  
Survey Course in University / 210  
*Gerald Friesen*
- 11** History Is a Verb: Teaching Historical Practice to  
Teacher Education Students / 224  
*Ruth Sandwell*

## **Part 4: Other Contexts for Historical Thinking**

- 12** Historical Thinking in the Museum: Open to  
Interpretation / 245  
*Viviane Gosselin*
- 13** Creating and Using Virtual Environments to Promote  
Historical Thinking / 264  
*Kevin Kee and Nicki Darbyson*

- 14** Obsolete Icons and the Teaching of History / 282  
*Peter Seixas and Penney Clark*

**Part 5: Perspectives on Historical Thinking**

- 15** Ethnicity and Students' Historical Understandings / 305  
*Carla Peck*

- 16** Learning and Teaching History in Quebec:  
Assessment, Context, Outlook / 325  
*Marc-André Éthier and David Lefrançois*

- 17** Historical Thinking and Citizenship Education:  
It Is Time to End the War / 344  
*Alan Sears*

Contributors / 365

Index / 371

# Introduction

---

PENNEY CLARK

This collection explores and articulates the landscape of history education research and practice in Canada. It does this to help define and refine the research agenda in history teaching and practice, which at the present time take place against a backdrop of public concern about Canadians' abysmal knowledge of their own history and a perceived need for more, and then even more, Canadian history in schools. It is crucial that scholarly research be pursued thoughtfully and in a cohesive manner and that classroom practice be informed by the findings of this research.

## Debates

History is contentious in Canada, as it is in most countries. The debates today are not new. They disappear only to reappear over the way. History has been contentious in the public arena, among academics, and in classrooms at every level. The ways we interpret the past to create official (and unofficial) narratives, how we use those narratives and for what purposes, and the place of history in the school curriculum have all sparked debate in Canada time and again.

Recent examples of debate in the forum of public opinion abound. The cancellation of plans to mark the 250th anniversary of the Battle of the Plains of Abraham in Quebec City by re-enacting the event comes quickly to mind; as does the two-year (2005-7) storm of criticism over the representation of the Allied bombings of Germany during the Second World War at

the Canadian War Museum; and the 2001 controversy around the depiction of the colonization of British Columbia in murals located in the provincial legislature building.<sup>1</sup>

Academic history is also contentious. Canada has had its own version of the “history wars” that have taken place in the United States and Australia.<sup>2</sup> From the 1960s through the 1990s, new subjects were introduced to the historical canon, in the process challenging traditional assumptions about what was worth investigating and what was worth knowing. First women, gender, race, class, and regionalism, then other subjects such as sexuality, masculinity, youth, the family, and the environment joined the list; with the result that the unified, politically based historical narrative was, according to some, “sundered” beyond repair.<sup>3</sup>

In a groundbreaking 2000 article, historian Ian McKay proposed a “third paradigm,” one that would replace the traditional national and socio-cultural history narratives with what he called a liberal order framework, which would involve not a synthesis but a “reconnaissance” of history. By this McKay meant that the study of Canada should be about the expansion of liberalism rather than “an essence we must defend or an empty homogeneous space we must possess.”<sup>4</sup> This paradigm, which McKay first proposed in the *Canadian Historical Review Forum*, has met with an extensive and diverse response.<sup>5</sup>

Christopher Dummitt and Michael Dawson, in their 2009 edited volume *Contesting Clío's Craft: New Directions and Debates in Canadian History*, suggest that the questions that dominate debate among academic Canadian historians in the first decade of the twenty-first century include these: Why is the public so ignorant about Canadian history? And who is to blame? Is Canadian history “dead”? If so, who killed it? Are we naively clinging to empirical ideas about truth and a knowable past in the face of post-structuralism, discourse analysis, and our postmodern condition? Such questions have generated vigorous debate, but Dummitt and Dawson argue that they are overused and even stale because they have not changed over the past twenty years. They suggest that other debates are beginning to take their place, some of which are tackled in their collection.<sup>6</sup> For example, Dummitt argues in his chapter that the clarion call of social history for an ever more inclusive history has lost its intellectual originality and that it is time to move on.<sup>7</sup> Adele Perry disagrees, arguing that the task is to rethink “the past through the categories of race, ethnicity, class, gender, region, sexuality and colonization.”<sup>8</sup> Magda Fahrni asks how we can explain the increasing reluctance of English Canadian scholars to study Quebec and what

the place of Quebec ought to be in current historical writing on Canada.<sup>9</sup> Andrew Smith investigates the link between Canada's imperial past and the fact that this country is seen internationally as a success story.<sup>10</sup> Michael Dawson and Catherine Gidney probe the dilemma of how the decisions we make around periodization shape our version of the past. Finally, Dummitt and Dawson ask whether the very notion of Canadian history is now passé.<sup>11</sup> Such questions are intriguing and provide a glimpse of possible future directions.

If history is contentious, history in schools is a battleground. Canadians are asking: Are we historically illiterate as a nation? Why aren't history teachers more effective? What academic preparation should history teachers have? Why must we have a separate and different history curriculum in every province? Should we have a national curriculum for Canadian history? How can we best teach national history in a nation that is culturally and ethnically divided? Why are history textbooks so boring? How should we assess students' historical literacy? Why do our children seem to know so little about Canadian history? Are we teaching them enough about their past to enable them to make informed judgments about the best course for their futures? How should schools be using new technologies to teach history?

Notwithstanding what appears to be an acute current crisis, three issues emerge as perennial sources of contention: inadequate or inaccurate representations of the past in authorized textbooks; the stature and place of history as a school subject; and its purposes and pedagogy.

Although we cannot assume that the content of a prescribed textbook neatly encapsulates what teachers teach and students learn, the textbook has been central to history instruction and until mid-twentieth century served as *de facto* curriculum. Textbooks have often been located at the centre of controversy.<sup>12</sup> In January 1920, for example, historian W.L. Grant's *History of Canada* was abruptly removed from British Columbia classrooms and teachers were directed to teach civics for the remainder of the year because no alternative history textbook was available. Criticism centred on two issues. The first stemmed from the divide between anglophones and francophones. There were objections to Grant's tolerant treatment of the actions of the Métis during the 1869 and 1885 armed resistances against the Canadian government. He was also criticized for not being sufficiently laudatory about British actions during the First World War, nor sufficiently critical of the Germans. Overall, he was accused of being anti-British, anti-Protestant, pro-German, and pro-French Catholic. This occurred despite his

impeccable credentials as a historian, his having been decorated for his wartime service, and his position as head of the prestigious – and very British – Upper Canada College in Toronto. A somewhat similar controversy took place in New Brunswick around Myers's *General History Textbook*.<sup>13</sup>

There has been major concern about the very different depictions of Canadian history in the textbooks used by francophone students in Quebec and those used by anglophone students in the rest of Canada.<sup>14</sup> In a 1970 study sponsored by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Marcel Trudel and Genevieve Jain commented that after 1760 the texts “do not even seem to be talking about the same country! The English-speaking authors do their best to give an overall history of Canada, while the French authors ... hardly talk about anything but the history of Quebec and its expansion beyond its borders.”<sup>15</sup> This “socialization into discord” was corroborated by later studies conducted by Paul Lamy, J.P. Richert, and Marshal Conley and Kenneth Osborne.<sup>16</sup>

During the 1970s and 1980s, attention turned to the depictions of Aboriginal peoples, women, and ethnic groups other than English and French. A 1971 study sponsored by the Ontario Ministry of Education and the Ontario Human Rights Commission examined 143 history textbooks authorized in Ontario. In their report, *Teaching Prejudice*, the authors, Garnet McDiarmid and David Pratt of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), concluded that “we are most likely to encounter in textbooks devoted Christians, great Jews, hardworking immigrants, infidel Moslems, primitive Negroes, and savage Indians.”<sup>17</sup> This study was followed by others, many of them carried out by provincial human rights commissions.<sup>18</sup> As a result of these studies, some textbooks were removed from provincially authorized lists and textbook selection criteria were mandated in every province. Such criteria continue to be used by authors and publishers during the textbook development process, as well as by provincial textbook selection committees when textbooks to support the curriculum are being authorized.

The second perennial source of contention in the schools concerns the stature of history in the curriculum and its presumed demise, its place assumed by social studies. Canada's ten provinces and three territories have control over their own school curricula, and most have chosen the interdisciplinary subject of social studies over the discipline of history.<sup>19</sup> Social studies encompasses history but also embraces elements of geography, sociology, anthropology, and other social science disciplines. In some provinces, at particular times, it has taken an issues or values approach, incorporating

history only as it is relevant to the consideration of contemporary problems of public or personal concern. Social studies became increasingly prominent in the 1930s, at a time when progressive education influences were coming to the fore. Its interdisciplinary nature placed it at the core of “enterprise” or activity-oriented project-based curricula in elementary schools, especially in Alberta, British Columbia, and Ontario.

Opposition to the place of social studies in the curriculum was eloquently expressed by historian Hilda Neatby in *So Little for the Mind* (1953), which achieved bestseller status. Famously condemning social studies as “the truly typical part of the progressive curriculum with its obsession for indoctrination,” Neatby noted that it was “taught not only without the classic distinctions between geography, history and politics, but also without the logical arrangement of place, time, and causation ordinarily considered to be inherent in these disciplines.”<sup>20</sup> More recently, a 1996 issue of *Canadian Social Studies: The History and Social Science Teacher* examined the state of history and social studies in Canada. Ken Osborne, an eminent history educator and historian of history education, concluded his article in that issue with this dramatic statement: “The downgrading of history ... is neither an aberration nor an accident. It is part of a wider move to sweep the very idea of democratic citizenship aside.”<sup>21</sup>

Perhaps the strongest expression of the presumed demise of history was historian J.L. Granatstein’s *Who Killed Canadian History?* (1998; 2nd ed. 2007).<sup>22</sup> This bestselling polemic blamed the end of history as a school subject on a range of lethal causes, including these: the interdisciplinary subject of social studies, which had resulted in a diluted version of history in many provinces; the limited research focus of many historians; an overemphasis on teaching skills rather than content; and the success of determined interest groups in getting their narrow agendas into the curriculum, which had resulted in a fragmentation of the national narrative and an overemphasis on negative aspects of our history. Granatstein’s most potent vitriol, though, was heaped on social studies. Response to his book was swift and heated on both sides of the debate.<sup>23</sup>

Over the past decade, the Dominion Institute, a charitable organization formed in 1997 with the purpose of helping “Canadians connect in meaningful ways with the country’s history, shared citizenship and democratic institutions and values,”<sup>24</sup> has administered tests of Canadians’ knowledge about people and events in our past. People have performed poorly. In 2009 the institute assessed provincial history and social studies curricula and found their history content wanting. Its Report Card, which assessed the

amount – and to some extent the quality – of Canadian history in the curriculum in each of Canada’s provinces and territories, awarded marks ranging from B+ to an F.<sup>25</sup> The institute has been skilful in handling the media, and announcements of the knowledge surveys and the Report Card have garnered a great deal of attention, resulting in much wringing of hands over Canadians’ lack of knowledge of their history.<sup>26</sup>

The third perennial debate is centred on the purposes of history as a school subject and how it should be taught. The assumption underlying the Dominion Institute quizzes is that the more knowledge people possess about events, people, and places in Canada’s past, the stronger their sense of identity with their nation. The implied purpose for the teaching of history, then, is to build a strong sense of national identity. There are two problems with this reasoning. The first is that we do not *know* that more information leads to a stronger sense of identity. A recent study by Jack Jedwab, President of the Association for Canadian Studies, indicates the opposite.<sup>27</sup> Second, there is no agreement that a sense of national identity should be the *raison d’être* for teaching history in schools. Many teacher education faculty members, provincial curriculum developers, historians, teachers, and students would disagree with such a goal. History educator Peter Seixas, for example, has argued for a “critical disciplinary history” – that is, a history that challenges students to ask questions about historical evidence and the construction of historical accounts.

To date, there is not a great deal of empirical data about what actually happens in history (or social studies) classrooms, though there are anecdotal accounts, such as the following:

Mr. Norris Belton taught social studies. A man with a grey brushcut, who wore glasses that magnified his eyes, rumpled blue blazers and grey flannels, his teaching style was to have the class underline important phrases in the social studies textbook. His classes consisted of forty minutes of his reading a few pages, and stopping every few words so kids could underline an important phrase. What happened of course was that you became an expert underliner. You’d underline some phrases with single lines and some with double lines, and quickly got the knack of whipping out your ruler and drawing perfect lines. What the lines were under didn’t sink in very far.<sup>28</sup>

*What Culture? What Heritage?* published in 1968, is still the only pan-Canadian investigation of history (and civics) education as it is taught in

schools ever conducted in Canada. This study criticized classroom history as a “bland, consensus story, told without the controversy that is an inherent part of history ... a dry-as-dust account of uninterrupted political and economic progress,” and history pedagogy as a matter of consigning students to the role of “bench bound listeners.”<sup>29</sup> It is doubtful whether this pedagogical approach would achieve either national identity goals or the goals of a critical disciplinary history. The report sparked debate in at least one provincial legislature, was widely covered in the media, and as with *So Little for the Mind*, achieved bestseller status.<sup>30</sup>

### A Way Forward

Since 1996, a remarkable confluence of events has created an agenda for history education research. That year, Peter Seixas of the University of British Columbia published “Conceptualizing Growth in Historical Understanding” in *The Handbook of Education and Human Development: New Models of Learning, Teaching, and Schooling*. In this groundbreaking article, Seixas articulated a framework for the field of history education, mapping out six concepts of historical thinking: significance, epistemology and evidence, continuity and change, progress and decline, empathy (perspective taking) and moral judgment, and agency.<sup>31</sup> This article, which built on and reinterpreted work by Peter Lee, Rosalyn Ashby, Christopher Portal, and others in the United Kingdom, established a research agenda for Canadian scholars.<sup>32</sup>

The next event of central importance was the “Giving the Past a Future” Conference, sponsored by the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada in January 1999. Touted as the largest Canadian conference ever on the teaching and learning of history, it had 750 people in attendance. This conference marked the beginning of what is now a decade-long biennial series of national conferences on history education sponsored by the Association for Canadian Studies, often in conjunction with provincial history and social studies teachers’ associations.

Perhaps the most unique aspect of this conference was the remarkable array of people and organizations it brought together. These included historians; history education scholars; provincial Department of Education curriculum officials; public historians, including museum educators and curators; some schoolteachers; and representatives of a variety of organizations, including the National Film Board of Canada, Veterans Affairs Canada, and the Bronfmann Foundation, producer of the popular *Heritage*

*Minutes*. Another organization present at the conference was Canada's National History Society, now called Canada's History, established in 1994 with the aim of popularizing Canadian history. This organization has become increasingly influential in history education. It now publishes not only *Canada's History* (formerly *The Beaver: Canada's History Magazine*) but also *Kayak: Canada's History Magazine for Kids*; and it recognizes six teachers each year with the Governor General's Awards for history teaching. In the autumn of 2009, it published its first special education version of *The Beaver*.

The 1999 conference also marked the beginning of *Historica*, which, until its merger with the Dominion Institute in 2009, sponsored summer institutes for secondary school teachers and Heritage Fairs for upper elementary and middle school students; and produced the *Canadian Encyclopedia Online* as well as *Historica Minutes*, an iteration of the Bronfmann Foundation's *Heritage Minutes*. In 2006, *Historica* provided support for the launching of the Benchmarks of Historical Thinking Project under the auspices of the Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness. The purpose of this project was articulated as

to have a more clearly articulated conception of the qualities of historical knowledge and thinking that *Historica* – and organizations and institutions, including ministries of education, with similar goals – are actually trying to promote. Of immediate and direct benefit to *Historica* will be a basis for assessing the impact of existing programs as well as providing criteria for making decisions about future programs. Furthermore, such benchmarks could provide the basis for the revision and supplement of provincial (as well as local and school-based) curriculum materials, assessment, and professional development.<sup>33</sup>

The Benchmarks project involves research and practice sites across the country, where secondary school teachers and history educators explore the challenges of teaching a critical disciplinary history using concepts of historical understanding. This approach has already begun to influence textbooks, curriculum development, and teacher education programs. (See Seixas, Chapter 6, and Morton, Chapter 9.)

The first decade of the new millennium has been marked by four key publications that, together, have begun to move the research agenda forward. The first of these was *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives* (2000), edited by Peter Stearns, Peter

Seixas, and Sam Wineburg. The second, *Theorizing Historical Consciousness* (2004), edited by Seixas, was an outcome of the presentation of theoretical papers by Canadian and international scholars at an inaugural symposium marking the establishment of the Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness at the University of British Columbia, under Seixas as director. *To the Past: History Education, Public Memory, and Citizenship in Canada* (2006), edited by Ruth Sandwell, serves as concrete recognition of increased public interest in history, since, except for one chapter, it represents public lectures by academics, broadcast as part of the CBC's *Ideas* series. The final publication in this remarkable list is *Thinking Historically: Educating Students for the 21st Century* (2008) by Stéphane Lévesque, a former graduate student of Seixas. This book provides a rich exploration and explanation of historical thinking concepts.<sup>34</sup>

These collections decidedly do *not* call for the dissemination of more historical information through the school social studies or history curriculum, as the Dominion Institute does. Nor do they call for greater reliance on stirring narratives to engage children in the “story” of history, as Mark Starowicz, producer of the CBC film series *Canada: A People's History* has done.<sup>35</sup> Taken together, these collections are an investigation of – and ultimately a call for – what Peter Seixas calls a “critical disciplinary” history education. This approach has been criticized as too dry and “academic.” In fact it is not, as the present book will show.

A significant increase in research funding offered through the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and other granting agencies has helped move the research agenda forward. For example, Quebec scholar Jocelyn Létourneau's Canadian University Research Alliance (CURA) grant “Canadians and Their Pasts” (2006-2011) has enabled him and his team of seven academic researchers and nineteen collaborators to complete a pan-Canadian survey designed to probe the historical consciousness of Canadians. They ask these questions: What role does the past play in the everyday lives of Canadians? How does history help define individual and collective identities? Is history dead, or does it shape Canada's future?<sup>36</sup> This survey will facilitate comparisons with similar projects undertaken in Europe, the United States, and Australia. “Simulating History,” another SSHRC-funded research project, this one at the Centre for Digital Humanities, Brock University, and led by historian Kevin Kee, investigates the “best potential” for educational computer simulations (sometimes called computer “serious games”) to teach Canadian history.

The History Education Network/Histoire et éducation en réseau (THEN/HiER) is a SSHRC-funded project that has a significant funding commitment over a seven-year period (2008-15). The aims of this project are to encourage new research about history teaching and learning and to mobilize and disseminate existing research among the various constituencies involved in history education in Canada, including academic historians; history education scholars in faculties of education; public historians in universities, museums, archives, and historic sites; practising teachers; and curriculum developers and policy makers. The goal is teaching informed by research – not only in classrooms at every level, but also in museums and other venues where history education takes place formally or informally – as well as research informed by teaching.

The network began in 2005, under the direction of Ruth Sandwell, OISE/University of Toronto; John Lutz, University of Victoria; and Peter Gossage, Université de Sherbrooke. These historians recognized the need for researchers and practitioners to speak to one another across the divides separating them. As Ruth Sandwell has so aptly put it: “From the vantage point of elementary and secondary school history teachers, the work of professional historians in the post-1960 period has been increasingly ‘academic’ in the worst sense of the word: irrelevant, pretentious, and frequently unreadable. For historians, the work of history teachers has been seen as, at best, facile and irrelevant, and at its worst a more or less benign form of government propaganda.”<sup>37</sup>

Representatives of the various constituencies involved in history education were invited to a first meeting of the network in January 2005 at OISE/University of Toronto. This was followed by a second meeting at the University of British Columbia in April 2006 and by a third at the University of Saskatchewan in 2007.

In 2008 the project gained significant momentum with the award of a SSHRC Strategic Clusters Grant of \$2.1 million to pursue its goals over a seven-year period, under the direction of Penney Clark of the Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy, University of British Columbia.<sup>38</sup> In a very early meeting following receipt of the grant, it was agreed that a first major project would be the development of an edited volume that would document the state of history education research in Canada as a baseline for future work. This is that book.

Knowledge mobilization travels in both directions. The motto of the History Education Network is “practice-informed research and research-

informed practice.” As Alex and David Bennet point out, knowledge mobilization is “situated within the paradigms of theory, praxis and action. It combines knowledge gained from research, the accumulated knowledge and experience of researchers, the specialty knowledge of change agents and organizational or community development specialists, and the knowledge acquired from the lived experience of community leaders and citizens.”<sup>39</sup>

### The Collection

This collection, the first in a series to be developed by THEN/HiER, represents the state of history education research and practice in Canada ten years into the new millennium. History education is experiencing a revival in this country. It is said that alcoholics have to hit bottom before they can begin to heal. Perhaps that is what has happened with history education in Canada, given that little more than a decade ago there was pervasive despair about its very existence as a school subject, inside or outside social studies.

Since concepts of historical thinking are becoming so central to history education in Canada, and since they have such a significant place in the pages of this book, I will take space here to describe them as they are currently defined by Peter Seixas. Note that Seixas has modified his conceptual framework since first proposing it.<sup>40</sup> Such frameworks are mutable. They will vary over time as well as from one theorist to another. It is interesting that both in his own book and in Chapter 5 of this volume, Stéphane Lévesque has chosen to elucidate the original framework offered by Seixas in 1996.

Seixas highlights these concepts: historical significance, primary source evidence, continuity and change, cause and consequence, historical perspective taking, and the ethical dimension. Historical *significance* refers to what is considered worth including in accounts of the past and the criteria for choosing one event, trend, issue, or person over an infinite number of others. The simplest criterion relates to the extent of the impact. More complex cases involve the place of the event, issue, or person in a larger narrative constructed by a historian. As Seixas notes, “historical significance does not inhere in the past itself, but rather, is created out of the relationship between the historian and the past.”<sup>41</sup> *Primary source evidence* is comprised of the traces used by the historian to create an account or argument about life in the past. Again, the relationship between the historian and the past is central. What becomes evidence is determined by the questions the historian asks of the traces of the past. *Continuity and change* is about what has

changed and what has remained the same over time. There is a value dimension here that involves consideration of which changes involve progress and which decline, and from whose perspective in each case. (Note that in Seixas's original framework, progress and decline were treated separately from continuity and change.) *Cause and consequence* involves isolating those events that most closely and crucially precipitated or followed from other events in which the historian is interested. Causes and consequences can be both long term (economic, social, political) and immediate. A particular event can have many causes and many consequences. The historian asks this question: Which are most crucial to the account being created? *Historical perspective taking* involves a recognition that people of the past operated in a milieu different from the one in which we function today. Their expectations of themselves and others were different, and so were their values and their ways of experiencing the world. Therefore, we should not expect people of the past to behave as we might. As Seixas notes: "It is not just that they didn't dress in our styles of clothing or that they did not have our electronic gadgets: their whole way of experiencing the world, their whole way of thinking, and perhaps even feeling, were different in ways that are a challenge for us to imagine."<sup>42</sup> The *ethical dimension* concerns how we judge people's actions in the past. Historians must exercise a great deal of caution in this regard; they must try to avoid judging from contemporary ways of viewing the world.<sup>43</sup> However, we do expect our understanding of past events to help us understand and make decisions about contemporary dilemmas.

These concepts are becoming increasingly central to the ways in which curriculum documents, textbooks, pedagogical handbooks, and classroom instruction are being framed. Hence, they are central to the discussions in this book, which examines the state of history education in Canada today. As of early 2011, the Benchmarks of Historical Thinking Project has held three national meetings (the last two sponsored by THEN/HiER) that have involved many history education stakeholders, including teachers, textbook publishers, academic historians, history education scholars, public historians, and representatives of provincial education ministries. The purpose of these meetings is to discuss strategies for incorporating historical thinking concepts into provincial history and social studies curricula, authorized textbooks, and classroom practice.

This volume builds on the important work that has appeared since 2000; but it also takes a significant leap beyond that work. Representing collaboration among leading Canadian researchers and theorists in the field, it opens

up discussions that will set new parameters for research, theory, policy, and practice in history education. It addresses the questions that Canadians are asking about history and history education. It brings together a diverse group of authors who represent the constituencies listed above. Each is a passionate and influential history educator who has worked tirelessly toward the betterment of history education in Canada. Together, they have sought to accomplish this in a range of ways in both academe and the broader community: conducting research and disseminating findings; teaching graduate, undergraduate, and elementary/high school history courses and courses in teacher education programs; contributing to provincial curriculum development; creating teaching materials, including traditional textbooks and Web-based resources; contributing to teacher professional development activities; designing museum exhibitions; speaking in public forums; and making their voices heard in public media.

This book speaks across several great divides. As with any setting where groups develop their own cultures in pockets, different dialects develop. Instead of assuming that the meanings of the labels we have chosen to describe different groups will be immediately clear to every reader, I will define them here.

We refer to history teachers, history educators, and historians. *History teachers* includes those who teach in an elementary or secondary school setting. *History educators* refers to those academics who teach and conduct research in a teacher education or graduate education program. *Historians*, in this volume, means academic researchers who teach history at the university undergraduate or graduate level. *Public historians*, in this volume, refers to those who work in universities, museums, archives, or historic sites.

We also need to distinguish between history, historiography, and history education. *History* is the study of the past. The past is not history. The past is everything that has happened, whereas history is composed of accounts constructed by historians using the remains of the past. *Historiography* describes the efforts at understanding the enterprise of producing history. Historians shape our memory of the past according to theories and methods of historical inquiry that are subject to change. Most professional historians now recognize that their interpretations, like those of their predecessors, are shaped by present-day biases and interests. As a result, they are more modest in their claims to objectivity. Good historians now strive to examine their own motivations, take pains to understand the context of earlier efforts to write the history of their topic, and concede that exploring the past from a variety of perspectives is the closest they can come to the ideal of

objectivity. In other words, they are both historiographers *and* historians. Finally, *history education* is about teaching and learning history. It involves investigating ways that history teachers and other educators can make history understandable and usable for their students.

The third distinction is the one between citizenship and civics education. While these terms can be used interchangeably, *citizenship* is often used in a broader sense. Ken Osborne defines it as including the following: “First, a sense of identity with some wider community, usually defined as the nation; second, a set of rights and entitlements, such as the right to vote and to be represented; and, third, a corresponding set of obligations, such as obedience to the law.”<sup>44</sup> *Civics* often has a narrower focus and involves the teaching of politics, law, and government. It is worthwhile noting, however, that history is used as a vehicle for achieving both civics and citizenship goals. For example, Alan Sears in Chapter 17 points to the work of American researchers Keith Barton and Linda Levstik, who contend that teaching history can contribute to building democracies that are “participatory, pluralist, and deliberative.” They also argue that “it is possible to teach history in a way that both develops a sense of national identity and explores the contested and complex nature of that identity; and that opens discussions of difference, exclusion, and inclusion” (in Sears, Chapter 17, p. 355). Ken Osborne, in “The Teaching of History and Democratic Citizenship,” posits ten understandings about Canada and eight about the world that students should know by the end of their years in school (including one concerning the characteristics of Canada’s parliamentary democracy), in order to acquire abilities necessary to engage in democratic citizenship. He suggests that the task of acquiring these understandings should be approached through history: “Perhaps the most important reason for approaching this task through history is that it is a powerful way of helping students to see themselves as part of a tradition, connected to those who have gone before them and to those who will come after.”<sup>45</sup> History, citizenship, and civics, he argues, are inextricably connected.

### **History Education: Contested Terrain**

In the first chapter of Part 1, Margaret Conrad explores interpretations of the purposes of history and historiography in Canada from the perspectives of historians and in public discourse. Ken Osborne and Jocelyn Létourneau continue the discussion, applying it to the school curriculum. Osborne looks at influences on provincial curricula, tracing trends over time; Létourneau considers the relatively new and controversial history

and citizenship curriculum in Quebec. In the final chapter in Part 1, Michael Marker explores history, historiography, and history education from an Aboriginal perspective.

Margaret Conrad offers a history of Canadian historiography, sketching the broader intellectual terrain in which school history has been conceptualized and taught. She surveys the distinct historiographic traditions of First Nations; the differing narratives of English and French Canadians; the movement from political to social history; the parallel roads taken by amateur and professional historians; and the impact of region, as well as cultural factors such as class, ethnicity, gender, race, and religion, on the writing of history. She concludes her chapter by pointing to the possibilities presented by the recent work of two Canadian historians, Gerald Friesen and Ian McKay, who have offered new and thought-provoking frameworks for addressing questions about Canada as a historical enterprise in a globalizing world.

Ken Osborne continues the discussion with a focus on the formal curriculum and the teaching of Canadian history in schools. He shows how the political and military history that Conrad described found its way into a “nation-building” narrative evident in school curriculum and textbooks through to the 1960s. Echoing Conrad’s discussion of the new emphasis on social history beginning in the 1960s, he describes curriculum projects in Canada and the United States which have reflected that emphasis. He notes the perilous place of history in the 1980s, which resulted in a lively debate in the 1990s over why and how history should be taught. Finally, he identifies two new approaches that emerged in the 1990s: one that views history as part of education for democratic citizenship, and another that teaches students to think historically.

Jocelyn Létourneau examines the controversial reshaping of Quebec’s national history curriculum into a history and citizenship course in 2006. He describes an intensely political process, situating the curriculum shift in the tensions and ambiguities experienced by the broader Quebec society as it attempts to reconcile its ancient founding myths with new myths that are jockeying for a place in the public space. He ends with a provocative question: “What kind of history does the future of Quebec hold – and for whom, and created with what aim and what collective meaning?”

Michael Marker discusses indigenous perspectives on the teaching of history, elaborating on “four themes of indigenous historical consciousness that travel outside of ways that history courses are constructed and taught.” The first theme is a circular concept of time versus a linear one, a view that

contradicts the Eurocentric sense of progression of people and ideas in time. The second is a view of plants and animals as being unsegmented from humans. This differs from the economic context in which they are presented in Canadian history textbooks – a context that presents them as economic commodities in resource industries such as the fur trade. The third highlights indigenous attention to local concerns and the relationship between these concerns and concepts of protection of traditional territory and land claims. The fourth theme concerns colonization, including misunderstandings that stemmed from different world views. Indigenous people responded to colonization in ways that the colonizers did not always clearly understand. For example, many amalgamated Christianity into traditional spiritual beliefs, which were confusing for missionaries but which functioned effectively for indigenous people in their efforts to cope with the complex realities of colonization. Marker concludes by urging that indigenous perspectives be included in history courses and textbooks.

Several major themes emerge in Part 1. There is the tension – continuing into the present – between a scientific approach to history and history education and nation-building narratives intended to promote national identity. There is the tension between interdisciplinary social studies and history as a distinct discipline in the schools. There are tensions around pedagogy, with perennial debates over whether the teacher should deliver the content directly rather than having students actively engage with historical sources. Finally, there are tensions between indigenous and Eurocentric world views that make Aboriginal students' participation in history courses difficult.

All four authors end their contributions with a future-oriented stance by pointing to the crucial place of the discipline of history with regard to citizenship education and informed citizenship. The differences among them lie in the breadth of their conceptions. Conrad points to a more global citizenship; Osborne, to a “national” one in the context of the country of Canada; and Létourneau, to a “national” one in terms of the province of Quebec. Marker points out that Aboriginal people are often concerned with the local, but his discussion also has implications for national identity and global ecology. Conrad stresses the centrality of history as a means to help us understand the place of human beings in the world and as an aid in identifying, interpreting, and sharing “the values on which civil society depends.” Osborne points out that “the exercise of citizenship depends in part on our understanding of the state and society of which we are citizens.” Létourneau's focus is on identity; he asks which version of the past is most

fitting to transmit to the students of the present, given the recent transformation of Quebec society. Marker calls for the inclusion of indigenous world views in school history – a move that may help “reconfigure our relationships to the ecologies of our communities and revise our thinking about how to live sustainably in the future.”

### **Orientations toward Historical Thinking**

In Part 2, we have two authors who are in substantial agreement and one who offers a different perspective. In terms of Ken Osborne’s categories, the chapters by Stéphane Lévesque and Peter Seixas are concerned with teaching students to think historically and to make reasoned judgments; whereas the chapter by Kent den Heyer is concerned more explicitly with concepts of ethics and social action.

The section begins with a chapter by Stéphane Lévesque, who provides a nuanced analysis of what it means to think historically. He takes five historical thinking concepts and dissects each one; for example, he asks which criteria are used to determine whether an event is significant. He suggests that those criteria are as follows: how deeply people are affected by an event; the number of people affected; the event’s durability (i.e., its legacy); its relevance to today; its relevance to personal vantage point; its symbolic significance; and its usefulness as a lesson. Lévesque’s other concepts are as follows: continuity and change; progress and decline; evidence; and historical empathy. He cautions that if students are not taught how to apply a critical lens to history, they will be left with a naive acceptance of whatever is presented to them by authorities, be they political leaders, movie producers, parents, or teachers. He points to the urgent need for a theory of progression in historical learning. “We know what experts do and how they do it, but we need a clearer scaffolded vision of what it is to progressively develop expertise, in both substantive and procedural knowledge of history, with realistic attainable targets.”

Peter Seixas examines the assessment of historical thinking, building on the work of his Benchmarks of Historical Thinking Project.<sup>46</sup> He outlines how four components are applicable to the assessment of historical thinking. The first, which is implicit in all assessment, is the assumption that it is measuring progress toward particular goals. The goals of historical thinking that he articulates here were outlined earlier in this discussion. The second involves a model of cognition and learning. He defines this as “the ideas we have about how students confront problems that are central to the discipline

of history, and the multiple paths by which they learn more sophisticated ways to do so.” The third and fourth involve, respectively, assumptions about tasks that will elicit demonstration of that cognition and assumptions about how to interpret the evidence drawn from those demonstrations. Using one historical thinking concept – historical perspective taking – he explores the developmental approach to assessment that he is positing, laying out what this concept would look like at the basic, intermediate, and advanced levels.

In the final chapter of Part 2, Kent den Heyer points to several shortcomings he sees in what he calls the “disciplinarian” approach to history education, an approach exemplified in the work of Seixas and Lévesque. His central concern is that their approach is not equipped to achieve democratic purposes because it fails to place ethics and social action at its core. He also criticizes their approach for its rationality, arguing that using “reasoned judgments” is only one way to engage with the past. In his view, their “best practices” ignore people’s “subjective relationships to their doing of history.” He suggests that “disciplinarians” fail to “judge the social-political context” and students’ own positionalities: “It is as if the historical concepts were extracted in labs from people without histories, hopes, fantasies, or racialized, gendered, classed, and desiring bodies and without political intelligence.” He argues that their approach is based on a deficit model that perceives young people as in need of disciplinary treatments rather than an active engagement with history. He calls for a more affirmative model that would incorporate a more explicit acknowledgment that certain interpretations of the past are privileged while others are marginalized.

In this section, we have moved from the broad sweep of history and history education over time, in order to focus on a particular approach to history education in the present. Lévesque provides a detailed account of historical thinking concepts; Seixas demonstrates how we can assess students’ abilities to use these competencies as well as measure their progress; and den Heyer rejects their approach out of hand, calling it “disciplinarian” in a pejorative sense.

### **Classroom Contexts for Historical Thinking**

In Part 3, Amy von Heyking, Tom Morton, Gerald Friesen, and Ruth Sandwell explore the teaching and learning of historical thinking in four classroom settings: elementary and secondary schools; undergraduate Canadian history survey courses; and a pre-service teacher education course. These four chapters capture the authors’ personal perspectives. Von Heyking introduces her review and analysis of the literature on historical thinking with a

description of her own experiences as a researcher observing elementary school children as they interacted with primary source materials. The three chapters that follow hers are highly personal accounts of the authors' own experiences as they have faced the challenges of "walking the walk" of putting historical thinking into action in the instructional settings in which they work.

Researchers have long rejected the idea that elementary school children cannot grasp historical concepts. In her chapter, von Heyking provides an overview of history topics and requirements in Canadian elementary school curricula, reviews research into the nature of children's historical thinking, and considers implications of that research for teaching and learning in Canadian classrooms. She emphasizes that students' progress in their historical understandings is not necessarily related to age and that the quality of teaching is crucial. She points out here that children need breadth and depth of instruction, including opportunities to examine a range of primary and secondary resources, in order to become more sophisticated thinkers. She notes that students have their own personal or family historical narratives, which teachers can use as reference points to encourage engagement with history. (This is in keeping with Carla Peck's point that students' ethnic identities influence their ascriptions of historical significance; see Chapter 15.) Finally, echoing Jocelyn Létourneau's earlier comments about history education in Quebec (see Chapter 3), she observes that thinking historically means "seeing oneself in time, as both an inheritor of the legacies of the past and as a maker of the future."

Tom Morton takes the theoretical discussions of historical thinking concepts offered by Lévesque and Seixas into the high school classroom. He cautions that we must establish a complex alignment of institutions, politics, research, official curriculum, and assessment toward common goals if we are to successfully connect research with practice. He describes the challenges of teaching history using this approach, given the exigencies of a high school setting, which includes heavy curriculum content, externally imposed student assessment, and a school culture that does not encourage teacher collegiality. He uses the image of "craft knowledge" to examine teachers' knowledge of history, knowledge of ways to teach it, and knowledge of how students learn it. He turns to the metaphor of "victory gardens" – that is, the backyard vegetable gardens cultivated during the Second World War – to highlight various sites in Canada where teachers are working on projects incorporating historical thinking concepts as part of the Benchmarks of Historical Thinking Project. He also addresses what he calls "zones of

uncertainty,” or areas of challenge. For an example, he uses his own work with grade eleven students on a project that involved creating videos on the historical significance of the First World War, outlining his aims, procedures, use of resources, and challenges.

Gerald Friesen uses descriptions of their practice by two experienced university professors, as well as reflections on his own teaching practice, to define “the shape of historical thinking” as it would ideally appear in an undergraduate Canadian history survey course – and, by implication, in classrooms at other levels. He points to the importance of conveying content (the transmission of a body of data), developing particular skills, and nurturing good work habits; the latter broadly interpreted as respect for learning, openness to ideas, and accountability for the quality of one’s own work. He concludes by noting that the procedural concepts of historical thinking, such as “using primary sources, discussing historical context and historical significance, identifying decisive moments of change, debating evidence, uncovering uncertainty about meaning, considering morality and ethical choices will endure”; and he implies that they should do so. However, he issues two caveats. First, teachers have an obligation to inspire a sense of wonder in their students. Effective history education must be more than a series of sterile academic exercises. In this regard, he elaborates on the need to incite students’ imaginations and to “kindle an infectious delight in the classroom.” Second, it is important to avoid reifying historical thinking concepts: “The basic approach of historians changes over time and any attempt to crystallize the basic questions asked by ‘historians’ will probably be misleading within several decades.” These are cautions worth heeding.

Ruth Sandwell would no doubt welcome Gerald Friesen’s students into her history education course, given her lament that students view history as a static body of facts that is not subject to interpretation. She describes how her teacher education course evolved as she explored ways to construct a “catwalk across the great divide”<sup>47</sup> – that is, between history courses in departments of history and history education courses in faculties of education. She wants to provide her students with experiences that actually allow them to *be* historians instead of passive readers of the historical accounts that historians have produced. She emphasizes that this approach involves more than teaching content and skills in a more interesting way; it is based on a different understanding of what history actually *is*. She takes the reader carefully through the construction and reconstruction of this course, in the end offering what is essentially a blueprint for anyone who wishes to teach a history education course in a similar manner.

Each of these authors is committed to an approach to history education involving engagement with the raw materials of history. All of them desire to offer students opportunities to enter into the messy world of the historian, a world in which events are not already selected and organized into a sequential narrative tidily wrapped up with crisp beginnings and endings and carefully defined causes and effects. This approach requires some courage because it comes with challenges, as is clear from each author's account. Students are not always receptive, and it is not an "efficient" way to teach. The learning does not arrive in bite-sized chunks with key ideas in boldface defined in a glossary. But these authors view the approach as central to successful history education.

### **Other Contexts for Historical Thinking**

In Part 4, the authors venture beyond the classroom to examine historical thinking in museum exhibitions, virtual environments, and public institutional settings. In venturing out, these authors embrace the possibility of including a wide and democratic array of people within the scope of their examination. These are sites that anyone may enter.

Viviane Gosselin examines the potential of museum exhibitions to foster historical meaning making, as well as the limitations of this approach. She contends that this process is inhibited because, while museum exhibitions have adapted to show the influence of social history – and to some extent, critical history – they continue to base their narratives on substantive knowledge and provide few clues about the process used to construct the historical narratives they present. As a consequence, the public's belief is sustained that museums' interpretations are about uncovering a *truer* picture of the past. Gosselin contends that museums should provide "conceptual historical wayfinders" ("strategic elements in the exhibition that orient visitors spatially") in order to engage visitors more critically with historical accounts. For example, a wayfinder could provide different interpretations of the same objects to stimulate visitors to consider the interpretive nature of historical accounts. Gosselin calls for a research agenda that acknowledges the dialogical relationship between the museum and its audience and that recognizes the ways museum visitors' conceptions of history influence how they engage with exhibitions.

Kevin Kee and Nicki Darbyson explore the possibilities of virtual environments (VEs) for supporting the teaching and learning of historical thinking. These researchers point out that the concept of "learning games" is especially appealing for twenty-first-century youth, who are "digital natives," and

that VE games can be especially useful for students who perform poorly in other kinds of classroom activities. In this way, students experience history not as historians sifting through documents and examining artifacts (see the chapters in Part 3), or as readers of textbooks (as might be seen in many classrooms), but rather as people who are “present” in a historical environment that has been constructed for them. In such an environment, users “explore and play,” as Kee and Darbyson put it. In this way, students both gather historical information and engage in historical practices. For example, assuming the role of a historical character requires that a student take a historical perspective, seeing events through the eyes of that character. Students can also build historical environments. As an example, while constructing the environment for Kee’s undergraduate course on the War of 1812, students “encountered the high ratio of churches to residences, the segregation of new immigrants from established ethnic groups, and the possibilities, and limitations, of nineteenth-century travel. The act of creation requires that students determine how the environment, and the characters inside it, are different from the present.” VEs are not commonly used in elementary or secondary schools, or in university undergraduate history courses, for that matter. Nor has much research been done on their effectiveness. However, it is clear from this chapter that this is an important area for further investigation.

Peter Seixas and Penney Clark examine British Columbia secondary school students’ reasoning, recorded in a Canadian history competition, regarding solutions to a public history controversy. The controversy centred on four murals depicting the province’s colonial period, but painted in 1935, and located prominently in the rotunda of the BC legislature. The murals, titled *Justice, Enterprise, Labour, and Courage*, depicted Aboriginal and European people interacting in various ways. Students responded in writing to a question that asked them what should be done about the murals, given the objections that had been raised about their depictions of Aboriginal people. Seixas and Clark found that, while students understood the interpretive nature of the murals, and while most understood that historical representations can be controversial, they did not necessarily see the messages the murals, as monuments, were attempting to convey in light of the historical context in which those messages had been constructed. The authors end the chapter with a discussion of the pedagogical implications of their findings and by considering ways to make students’ reasoning richer and more sophisticated. They argue that history courses should not be limited to the recounting of mythic, foundational narratives, but should include

opportunities for students to participate in public debates, for such opportunities will help them learn to make reasoned judgments about contemporary moral dilemmas.

Each of these chapters ventures beyond the bounded walls of the classroom into unique and largely unexplored environments. Each is concerned with pedagogy and offers approaches to teaching history concepts and procedures in those places. Gosselin offers the possibility of wayfinders to help visitors see the interpretive nature of museum content; Kee and Darbyson explore the possibilities of artificially constructed historical environments; and Seixas and Clark examine a specific controversy and then explore the ways in which controversies like it can be used to teach a critical disciplinary history.

### **Perspectives on Historical Thinking**

The authors in Part 5 argue across a “great divide,” as Ruth Sandwell did in her earlier chapter, but this time the great divide is the one often seen as separating history education from citizenship education. These authors explore aspects of citizenship and citizenship education in terms of their relationship to history education. In the process, they consider the relationship between students’ ethnic identities and their historical understandings; the nature of the new history and civics curriculum in Quebec and the classroom contexts in which it is being implemented; and approaches to meeting the goals of both historical thinking and citizenship.

Carla Peck’s research provides a cautionary note with regard to generalized notions of “the student.” She explores how contemporary theorists employ the concepts of “ethnicity” and “ethnic identity”; she examines current research on the relationship between ethnic identity and students’ historical understandings; and she discusses her own research into how students ascribe significance to historical events in the Canadian context. This research goes beyond simply attempting to correlate ethnic identity with ascriptions of significance; it does so by asking students to reflect on how they believe their ethnic identity influences the ways they ascribe significance. She has found that students bring complex identity-related frameworks to their study of history, and she calls for recognition of these differences on the part of both researchers and educators who teach history and citizenship.

Marc-André Éthier and David Lefrançois examine the highly contentious 2006 history and civics curriculum in Quebec, analyzing its strengths and weaknesses as well as its challenges. They also examine the textbooks that support the curriculum; approaches to student assessment; teachers’

education and views on the reform; typical classroom practices and teaching conditions; and current research on Quebec students' abilities to think historically. They point out that the Programme de formation de l'école québécoise (Quebec Education Program) posits that the predominant mission of schools is to train autonomous individuals capable of acting as engaged, critical citizens and that this is largely what makes it so controversial.<sup>48</sup> They then analyze the curriculum for the conception of citizenship inherent in it. They conclude that the implicit expectation is that students should learn to base their opinions and civic consciousness on historical foundations, which should in turn help them become aware of their responsibilities as citizens. A danger of the curriculum is that it presents the institutions of the current Quebec parliamentary system in an unproblematic way, "almost as if they constituted the standard for liberal democracy." This chapter reveals that students' historical thinking is a rich area of research in Quebec. Researchers outside of Quebec have been largely unaware of this work because it is in French. It is imperative that we explore opportunities for its translation and dissemination.

In the final chapter of this volume, Alan Sears, a noted scholar of citizenship education, brings the discussion back to the goals of history education. He agrees with American history education researchers Keith Barton and Linda Levstik that some form of identification is necessary for democratic life. He argues that national identity should be acknowledged as a significant part of that identity, because democratic citizenship is most often lived out in a specific context that gives it both form and function and the nation state will provide that context for the foreseeable future. He then demonstrates how the fostering of agency, the development of understanding of the "Other," and the enhancement of public discourse are shared goals of both historical thinking and citizenship education. He notes that recent research into cognition has called for a truce between advocates for citizenship education – who work most often through the school subject of social studies – and advocates for history education. He contends that the fostering of civic competence is a key purpose of history education; and that, instead of engaging in fruitless turf battles, proponents in each field should join forces to achieve their common goal of a more vibrant education for citizenship.

These three final chapters venture into new territory. Carla Peck argues for granting students' identity-related frameworks a more central place in history education research – a change that, she contends, will benefit both students and the research itself. The other two chapters support Ken Osborne's argument favouring a central place for history in citizenship

education. Éthier and Lefrançois describe an actual curriculum that attempts to combine the goals of teaching for citizenship with those of history education. Sears suggests that these goals are already synchronized; speaking directly to civics educators, he argues that they need to take into account the goals of history education. Éthier and Lefrançois point to the rich research into historical thinking that is presently being carried out in Quebec.

John Lewis Gaddis talks about the landscape of history: “For if you think of the past as a landscape, then history is the way we represent it, and it’s that act of representation that lifts us above the familiar to let us experience vicariously what we can’t experience directly: a wider view.”<sup>49</sup> The current collection maps the landscape of history education research in Canada at the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century. This exercise in mental cartography has revealed questions that history education scholars have asked as well as the topics pursued, the books produced, and the understandings we have about how teachers teach and how students learn. We have seen where we have been, and we can see where we are at this time. We have also seen the new questions that are being raised and the directions in which they are pointing. For example, Amy von Heyking calls for more research – especially with elementary school children – into how students develop historical thinking abilities, so that we can better cultivate those abilities. Stéphane Lévesque takes this a step further, calling for investigations into progression – that is, how students progressively develop expertise in both substantive and procedural knowledge of history. Viviane Gosselin proposes a research agenda that explores the heuristic potential of a historical thinking framework with regard to museum exhibition production and reception. Highlighting the importance of museums as public institutions with a mandate to facilitate lifelong learning about the collective past, she points out that we know little about how this medium nurtures historical thinking or how visitors’ conceptions of history influence how they engage with museum exhibitions.

Ruth Sandwell points to a gap between how historians conduct research and how they approach the teaching of their undergraduate students. When they stand behind a lectern at the front of a lecture theatre, they seem to forget the painstaking gathering of evidence and the time spent authenticating it, developing different explanations and trying them on for size, and so on. To their own students, they deliver a polished, chronological, tidy, one-thing-leads-to-another kind of account. She asks why this is so, and she calls for a bridge across the divide between historians and history teachers. We

need to conduct research on the structural factors, such as post-secondary institutional promotion policies, that lead to this. We also need to find out more about the favoured teaching strategies of history professors. We have our own experiences, and we have anecdotal information, but what do we actually *know*? Is Gerald Friesen's approach an exception, or is it more typical than we realize? Why are there not more history education preparatory courses, such as the one taught by Ruth Sandwell?

All of the above are areas for fruitful research.

The endeavour of looking at history education in a historical context inevitably turns our gaze toward the future. As Gaddis reminds us: "Studying the past is no sure guide to predicting the future. What it does do, though, is to prepare you for the future by expanding experience, so that you can increase your skills, your stamina – and, if all goes well, your wisdom."<sup>50</sup> History education may not be on a trajectory toward becoming less contentious, but with a coherent research agenda, we will with time be equipped to take positions that are more informed in terms of what students understand and how they understand it, how we might reasonably expect them to progress, and how to best foster and assess that progress.

Over time, landscapes change; sometimes gradually, and at other times more dramatically, spurred by cataclysmic events. In the case of history education, change has been relatively gradual so far. Even so, if this book had been written ten years ago, the terrain would have been very different. Research will allow us to develop new insights into how students best learn history; and these, in turn, will lead to adaptations of classroom practices and resources. We cannot foresee what these new insights and changes in classroom practice will be, but we know they are coming because the momentum for change has become formidable. It is impossible to predict where we will be a decade hence.

## NOTES

- 1 See "Organizers Cancel Mock Battle of the Plains of Abraham," 17 February 2009, <http://www.cbc.ca/canada>; Victor Rabinovitch, "Narrating Public History and the Bomber Command Controversy (2005-07)," [http://www.cha-shc.ca/public\\_history](http://www.cha-shc.ca/public_history); Peter Seixas and Penney Clark, "Murals as Monuments: Students' Ideas about Depictions of Civilization in British Columbia," *American Journal of Education* 110, 2 (2004): 146-71 and Chapter 14 in this volume.
- 2 For the United States, see Edward T. Linenthal and Tom Engelhardt, eds., *History Wars: The Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past* (New York: Henry Holt, 1996); and Gary B. Nash, Charlotte Crabtree, and Ross E. Dunn, *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past* (New York: Vintage, 2000). For

- Australia, see Keith Windschuttle, *The Killing of History: How Literary Critics and Social Theorists Are Murdering Our Past* (Sydney: Macleay Press, 1994); and Stuart McIntyre and Anna Clark, *The History Wars* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2003).
- 3 Michael Bliss, "Privatizing the Mind: The Sundering of Canadian History, the Sundering of Canada," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 26, 4 (Winter 1991-92): 5-17. For responses to Bliss, see *Journal of Canadian Studies* 27, 2 (1992).
  - 4 Ian McKay, "The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History," *Canadian Historical Review* 81, 4 (December 2000): 617-45.
  - 5 See Jean-François Constant and Michel Ducharme, eds., *Liberalism and Hegemony: Debating the Canadian Liberal Revolution* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).
  - 6 Christopher Dummitt and Michael Dawson, eds., *Contesting Clio's Craft: New Directions and Debates in Canadian History* (London: University of London, Institute for the Study of the Americas, 2009).
  - 7 Christopher Dummitt, "After Inclusiveness: The Future of Canadian History," in *Contesting Clio's Craft*, 98-122.
  - 8 Adele Perry, "Nation, Empire, and the Writing of History in Canada," in *Contesting Clio's Craft*, 123-40.
  - 9 Magda Fahrni, "Reflections on the Place of Quebec in Historical Writing on Canada," in *Contesting Clio's Craft*, 1-20.
  - 10 Andrew Smith, "Canadian Progress and the British Connection: Why Canadian Historians Seeking the Middle Road Should Give 2½ Cheers for the British Empire," in *Contesting Clio's Craft*, 75-97.
  - 11 Michael Dawson and Catherine Gidney, "Persistence and Inheritance: Rethinking Periodisation and English Canada's 'Twentieth Century,'" in *Contesting Clio's Craft*, 47-74.
  - 12 For a more detailed discussion of textbook controversies in Canada, see Penney Clark, "'The Most Fundamental of All Learning Tools': An Historical Investigation of Textbook Controversies in English Canada," in *Auf der Suche nach der wahren Art von Textbüchern*, ed. Angelo Van Gorp and Marc Depaepe (Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt, 2009), 123-42.
  - 13 See Charles W. Humphries, "The Banning of a Book in British Columbia," *BC Studies* 58 (Winter 1968-69): 1-12; and Frances M. Helyar, "A Crisis in History Education: The Life Story of Myers' General History Textbook in New Brunswick Schools (1910-1949)," master's thesis, University of New Brunswick, 2003.
  - 14 Canada and Newfoundland Education Association, "Report of the Committee for the Study of Canadian History Textbooks," *Canadian Education* 1 (October 1945): 2-34; A.B. Hodgetts, *What Culture? What Heritage? A Study of Civic Education in Canada* (Toronto: OISE, 1968), 25, 45.
  - 15 Marcel Trudel and Genevieve Jain, *Canadian History Textbooks: A Comparative Study*, Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Staff Study No. 5 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970).
  - 16 Paul Lamy, "Political Socialization of French and English Canadian Youth: Socialization into Discord," in *Socialization and Values in Canadian Society*, vol. 1, ed. Elia

- Zureik and Robert M. Pike (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975), 263-80; J.P. Richert, "The Impact of Ethnicity on the Perception of Heroes and Historical Symbols," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 8 (May 1974): 159-63; Marshal William Conley and Kenneth Osborne, "Political Education in Canadian Schools: An Assessment of Social Studies and Political Science Courses and Pedagogy," *International Journal of Political Education* 6 (1983): 65-85.
- 17 Garnet McDiarmid and David Pratt, *Teaching Prejudice: A Content Analysis of Social Studies Textbooks Authorized for Use in Ontario* (Toronto: OISE, 1971), 124.
  - 18 L. Paton and J. Deverell, *Prejudice in Social Studies Textbooks* (Saskatoon: Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, Modern Press, 1974); Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission, *Textbook Analysis – Nova Scotia* (Halifax: Queen's Printer, 1974); Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, *The Shocking Truth about Indians in Textbooks* (Winnipeg: Textbook Evaluation and Revision Committee of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, 1977).
  - 19 Most provinces have social studies courses or a combination of social studies, social science, history, geography, and Canadian studies courses. History is an important component of mandatory social studies curricula, and most provinces offer elective history courses, which may be taken in addition to the mandatory social studies program. For example, British Columbia offers an elective world history course and a First Nations history course. See <http://www.thenhier.ca> for curriculum links to all provinces and territories.
  - 20 Hilda Neatby, *So Little for the Mind* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1953), 162-63.
  - 21 Ken Osborne, "The Changing Status of Canadian History in Manitoba," *Canadian Social Studies* 31, 1 (1996): 30.
  - 22 J.L. Granatstein, *Who Killed Canadian History?* (Toronto: HarperCollins, 1998).
  - 23 A.B. McKillop, "Who Killed Canadian History: A View from the Trenches," *Canadian Historical Review* 80, 2 (June 1999): 269-99; Graham Carr, "Review Essay: Harsh Sentences: Appealing the Strange Verdict of *Who Killed Canadian History?*" *American Review of Canadian Studies* (Spring-Summer 1998): 167-76.
  - 24 Historica-Dominion Institute, <http://www.historica-dominion.ca/en/about>.
  - 25 "The Canadian History Report Card: Curriculum Analysis of High Schools in Canada," <http://www.newswire.ca/en/releases/archive>.
  - 26 Sahm Adrangi, "The Latest Canada Day Quiz Shows Many of Us Are in the Dark about War and Peace," *Globe and Mail*, 1 July 2003, A3; Shawn McCarthy, "Political History Not Our Forte," *Globe and Mail*, 11 January 2002, A4.
  - 27 Jack Jedwab, "Does Knowledge of Canadian History Reinforce National Identity?" *Knowing Ourselves: The Challenge of Teaching History in Canadian Official Minority Language Communities*, presentation to Association for Canadian Studies Conference, Moncton, 5 November 2009.
  - 28 Melinda McCracken, *Memories Are Made of This* (Toronto: James Lorimer, 1975), 79.
  - 29 Hodgetts, *What Culture?* 25, 45.
  - 30 See John N. Grant, "The Canada Studies Foundation: An Historical Overview," in *The Canada Studies Foundation*, ed. John N. Grant, Robert M. Anderson, and Peter L. McCreath (Toronto: 1986), 11.

- 31 Peter Seixas, "Conceptualizing the Growth of Historical Understanding," in *Handbook of Education and Human Development: New Models of Learning, Teaching, and Schooling*, ed. David Olson and Nancy Torrance, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 765-83; and refer to <http://www.historybenchmarks.ca>.
- 32 Alaric Dickinson, Peter Lee, and Peter Rogers, eds., *Learning History* (London: Heinemann, 1984); Christopher Portal, ed., *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (London: Falmer Press, 1987); Alaric Dickinson, Peter Gordon, Peter Lee, and J. Slater, eds., *International Yearbook of History Education 1* (London: Woburn Press, 1995).
- 33 "Benchmarks 2006 Symposium," proposal, Peter Seixas personal files.
- 34 Peter N. Stearns, Peter Seixas, and Sam Wineburg, eds., *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives* (New York: New York University Press, 2000); Peter Seixas, ed., *Theorizing Historical Consciousness* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004); Ruth W. Sandwell, ed., *To the Past: History Education, Public Memory, and Citizenship in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006); Stéphane Lévesque, *Thinking Historically: Educating Students for the 21st Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008).
- 35 Mark Starowicz, *Making History: The Remarkable Story behind Canada: A People's History* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2002); Penney Clark, "Engaging the Field: A Conversation with Mark Starowicz," *Canadian Social Studies* 36, 2 (2003). <http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca>.
- 36 <http://www.canadiansandtheirpasts.ca>.
- 37 Ruth W. Sandwell, "Introduction: History Education, Public Memory, and Citizenship in Canada," in *To the Past*, 3-10.
- 38 The principal applicant was Penney Clark, University of British Columbia. The co-applicants were Margaret Conrad, University of New Brunswick; Kevin Kee, Brock University; Jocelyn Létourneau, Université de Laval; Stéphane Lévesque, University of Ottawa; Ruth Sandwell, OISE/University of Toronto; Peter Seixas, University of British Columbia; and Amy von Heyking, University of Lethbridge.
- 39 Alex Bennet and David Bennet, *Knowledge Mobilization in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Moving from Research to Action* (Frost: MQI Press, 2007). Other books dealing with a similar theme are Etienne Wenger, *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1998); and Etienne Wenger, Richard McDermott, and William M. Snyder, *Cultivating Communities of Practice: A Guide to Managing Knowledge* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 2002).
- 40 These concepts have been defined many times. These particular definitions were based on those provided in Peter Seixas, "A Modest Proposal for Change in Canadian History Education," *Teaching History* 137 (December 2009): 26-30.
- 41 *Ibid*, 28.
- 42 *Ibid*, 29.
- 43 *Ibid*.
- 44 Ken Osborne, "The Teaching of History and Democratic Citizenship," in *The Canadian Anthology of Social Studies: Issues and Strategies for Teachers*, ed. Roland Case and Penney Clark (Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press, 1997), 30.

- 45 Ibid., 35.
- 46 Carla Peck and Peter Seixas, "Benchmarks of Historical Thinking: First Steps," *Canadian Journal of Education* 31, 4 (2008), <http://www.csse-scee.ca/CJE>.
- 47 G. Williamson McDiarmid and Peter Vinten-Johansen, "A Catwalk across the Great Divide: Redesigning the History Teaching Methods Course," in *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History*, 156.
- 48 MÈQ (Quebec Ministry of Education), *Programme de formation de l'école québécois Enseignement secondaire – 1<sup>er</sup> cycle* (Quebec: 2004), 4.
- 49 John Lewis Gaddis, *The Landscape of History: How Historians Map the Past* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 5.
- 50 Ibid., 11.

© UBC Press 2011

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher, or, in Canada, in the case of photocopying or other reprographic copying, a licence from Access Copyright, [www.accesscopyright.ca](http://www.accesscopyright.ca).

21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada on FSC-certified ancient-forest-free paper (100% post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free.

---

### Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

New possibilities for the past: shaping history education in Canada / edited by Penney Clark.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Also issued in electronic format.

ISBN 978-0-7748-2058-5

1. Canada – History – Study and teaching. 2. History – Study and teaching – Canada. I. Clark, Penney

FC155.N49 2011

971.0071

C2011-903545-6

---

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada (through the Canada Book Fund), the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Aid to Scholarly Publications Program, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

This volume is the first major publication of The History Education Network/Histoire et éducation en réseau (THEN/HiER).

the history education network  
**THEN HiER**  
histoire et éducation en réseau

UBC Press  
The University of British Columbia  
2029 West Mall  
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2  
[www.ubcpress.ca](http://www.ubcpress.ca)

Sample Material © 2011 UBC Press