

Active Learning in History Survey Courses: The Value of *In-Class* Peer Mentoring

Carole Srole, Christopher Endy, and Birte Pflieger
California State University, Los Angeles

IT IS THE FIRST DAY of a large lower-division history survey, and everybody in the room wishes they were somewhere else. The students sit impatiently, eager to advance to courses in their major. They just need the class to meet a curricular requirement, and they dread having to memorize useless facts like they did in their high school history classes.¹ The professor expects another large class filled with underprepared students who have little interest in history. A small upper-level seminar would be more rewarding. The teaching assistants, if there are any, wonder if they are ready for the task ahead. Leading seminar-style discussion requires skill and poise, and these apprentice teachers are about to spend the next several months running discussions with minimal guidance. While not every history survey course is quite so bleak, all too often, professors, students, and teaching assistants view the class as an unpleasant necessity. Surely, historians can provide a better way.

At California State University at Los Angeles, three U.S. history faculty have developed an alternative model for the history survey. In this course, students sit in groups of four or five for most of each class session. A small team of history M.A. students or advanced

history majors serve in the classroom as “facilitators.” Working alongside the professor, these peer mentors help student groups analyze primary sources and work through active-learning exercises. Occasionally, the professor calls for everyone’s attention, and a short lecture breaks out. Lower-division students, particularly those still working to acquire college-level skills, need active learning the most, but frequently end up with it the least. Our survey model, we argue, offers lower-division students the personal attention and interaction with other students that scholarship insists they need and deserve. Our model also helps advanced history students develop into better teachers and leaders by working closely with faculty in their major. Not least, for historians who care about the future of face-to-face learning, our model of in-class peer mentoring makes a stronger case for brick-and-mortar classrooms than the prevailing lecture-driven survey course does, and it can work even in large-enrollment classes.²

Scholarship on teaching and learning shows how active learning and small-group learning communities help students engage with course content and develop higher-order academic skills.³ Universities and colleges have instituted a number of programs to achieve these benefits, including first-year experience, freshmen success seminars, and Supplemental Instruction.⁴ These programs, however, usually benefit only a small proportion of the lower-division students. Meanwhile, most lower-division students experience history classes in relatively large classrooms that discourage active learning.⁵ A common model for the large history survey relies on one faculty member trying to teach 50 to 100 or more students. Even in relatively smaller classes of 50 students, faculty who incorporate active learning in small groups cannot engage with each group in any meaningful way. Another common model for the survey assigns 100 to 500 students to one faculty member, and then hires graduate teaching assistants to lead discussion sections. In both models, students do not receive a rich experience of active learning with faculty guidance. In the very large classes, faculty usually lecture to disseminate information and rely on teaching assistants for student engagement with the course content. Despite the teaching assistants’ academic career goals, their discussion sessions share similarities with the many outside-the-classroom peer mentoring programs, like Supplemental Instruction (SI). As with SI, the teaching assistant

model means that active learning takes place mostly outside the professor's purview, with inexperienced teachers designing the exercises.⁶ Our model of in-class peer mentoring allows professors to maintain greater control of class content and teaching strategies, which is especially important when designing a class to promote student academic skills through scaffolded exercises and projects.

Elements of the In-Class Peer Mentoring Model

In these survey courses, our primary goal is to teach students to understand history as interpretation and argument. To enable students to put into practice this core component of historical thinking, we worked on improving their writing, reading, and note-taking skills, as well as their ability to gather evidence and figure out meaning. To achieve these secondary objectives, we developed these key elements in our model:

1. Streamlining or "Uncoverage"

In traditional history surveys, many students get lost in a sea of disconnected events and details, a problem made worse by textbooks.⁷ In lieu of the "coverage" model, we selected one central theme for the entire course and replaced the textbook with interesting primary sources and history journal articles all centered on that theme.⁸ For two of us, our theme focused on Americans' changing attitudes on the role of government. Once we selected our theme, we were ready to plan class sessions focused on small-group active learning. Rather than start with our existing lecture topics and pare them down (a painful prospect), we began with a blank slate and asked ourselves what topics students needed to construct their own "big picture" answer to the central theme. For example, we narrowed our session on the New Deal to Americans' general approval of an expanded role for the federal government. We also wanted students to see how existing racial and gender assumptions shaped new government policies, even as notions of race were becoming more ambiguous. Then, we took stock of the primary sources and activities we already had available for each topic and sought ways to convert lectures to active learning. For instance, classroom-tested primary sources on 1930s Mexican-American deportation

evolved from lecture and visuals into a brief small-group analysis activity. We still lectured, but only for fifteen to twenty percent of each class session. Lecture topics mostly served to set up active-learning projects, and with limited time, each lecture modeled for students how to make a concise historical argument on our central theme. Of course, we “covered” less content than we would have if we had primarily lectured. We then incorporated our list of skills that we believed students needed to learn to achieve our academic goals into the appropriate places.⁹

2. Scaffolding Academic Skills in Small Groups

We used the newly available class time for small-group active-learning exercises to build content knowledge, academic skills, and a social support system. We designed our classroom activities to allow student groups to practice key skills together, including note-taking and writing paragraphs with strong evidence and topic sentences. We also helped students build skills through regular low-stakes homework that together accounted for a large share of the course grade. With this kind of scaffolding, we prepared students to analyze complex sources and to write an eight- to ten-page final paper, which for many was the longest piece of writing they attempted in their lives. Crucially, these homework assignments and in-class activities performed a social function, creating student buy-in and community. Because each class session required students to share their homework with each other, completion of the homework became a peer-to-peer social obligation, not simply an academic assignment.

3. Peer Mentors and Community Building

The advanced students serving as “facilitators” contributed to this social cohesion by helping the professor supervise small-group activities. They also provided a “near-peer” resource for the lower-division students. Each facilitator took responsibility for four groups of four to five students. Facilitators guided group discussions, answered student questions in class, took attendance, contacted students who missed class, and participated in limited grading.¹⁰ Despite performing some of the grading, facilitators still seemed much more like peers than faculty. First, they sat among the students

and led ice-breaking activities with them. Second, we professors still graded students' writing. Most importantly, our presence in the room made the facilitators seem less professorial. They were never the main authority figure in the room, in contrast to the typical TA who leads a separate discussion group and grades students' major work. Facilitators' general responsibilities included building a learning community and explaining or modeling historical thinking and skills. This meant that they helped students do more than get the "right answers." Facilitators also monitored their students, allowing the faculty member to spot-check groups, rather than try (in vain) to visit every group for every discussion. If certain groups were having difficulty, the faculty member and facilitator could coordinate to spend more time with those groups. The facilitators also kept track of the less-engaged students, making sure they did not fall behind. These facilitators in our pilot program received university funding, similar to wages for teaching assistants or graduate assistants. Subsequent versions of the course at our campus have removed the wages and the light grading duties and instead give the facilitators class credit as part of a paired teaching practicum course. Both models have their advantages. The teaching practicum model offers a more robust intellectual opportunity for the facilitators, whereas the stipend or payment model offers a more streamlined experience that facilitators can repeat multiple times.¹¹

Variations

These general principles in the facilitator model still allow for considerable faculty freedom and choice, such as using different themes, readings, in-class assignments, skill-building exercises, and exams. Birte Pflieger organized her course on the first half of the U.S. survey around the themes of race, class, and gender, along with the skills of reading and argument summarizing. Every primary and secondary source dealt with those content themes. For skill building, students summarized each secondary source into fifty-word statements, writing at home, revising in groups during class, and then sometimes revising at home again. Facilitators gave feedback to every student in their group for each argument summary. Pflieger also edited students' work by randomly choosing a group to visit during small-group discussions. Her focus on peer editing meant that every

student received at least two layers of feedback—from either the facilitator or the instructor, and from his/her group. Occasionally, Pflieger asked groups to edit and assign a grade for argument summaries completed by students in a prior term. This often led to lively debates about the merits of the content and composition of the summaries. Overall, students' writing improved so much that their end results matched those of Pflieger's Honors College students.

Carole Srole and Christopher Endy prepared the second half of the U.S. survey together for their separate classes. Asking students to assess the changing role of government in U.S. society, they focused on preparing students to write an eight- to ten-page take-home cumulative final essay. To equip students for a long paper, Srole and Endy required them to practice writing paragraphs with topic sentence arguments (TSAs).¹² In class, students read each other's homework using feedback rubrics that emphasized TSAs, the amount and quality of evidence, and connections between supporting evidence. Srole and Endy divided post-1865 U.S. history into seven chronological sections. After completing each era, students worked in groups to fill in summary charts in which they analyzed the period in terms of themes necessary for their papers. Since we wanted students to understand that history revolves around interpretation, both the midterm and final essays required students to make a decision about the extent of change between each time period in our theme of government. Essays also needed to discuss and resolve conflicting evidence.¹³ Each of the charts summarizing an era forced students to gather conflicting evidence on continuity and change of the theme. Students also reviewed each other's class notes, again using a peer feedback rubric that emphasized the importance of recording ideas and supporting evidence and not just copying terms the professor posted on PowerPoint.¹⁴ Lectures and reading assignments emphasized the importance of identifying the thesis, supporting arguments, and evidence—another means to support our goal of teaching students to see history as interpretation. Throughout the course, students learned about the relationship between details and meaning, along with other skills necessary for historical thinking. Still, the courses differed with each professor. Srole and Endy each delivered their own lectures and spent varied amounts of time on topics. For example, Endy devoted an additional session to a role-playing exercise on the Civil Rights Movement,

while Srole allocated extra time for summarizing each chronological era. Compared to prior versions of their survey courses, Srole and Endy spent somewhat more time with assessment, while Pflieger did not. However, increased use of grading rubrics by Endy in subsequent sections helped to reduce assessment time.

Results

This model of teaching with in-class peer mentors succeeded in reducing our numbers of repeatable grades (Ds, Fs, and Ws), a result that pleased ourselves, our students, and university administrators. Endy's and Srole's DFW rates plummeted in contrast to their own previous versions of the class. Endy's fell in half, and Srole's dropped two-thirds.¹⁵ Pflieger's repeatable grades dropped less dramatically compared to her previous versions of the same course, probably because she ran her pilot section while we were still developing the program and thus had less time to adopt all of our new practices.¹⁶ Part of the decline in repeatable grades came from the facilitators' role in communicating with students who were struggling. They contacted students who missed more than two classes and encouraged those having personal difficulties. Also, Endy and Srole counted homework assignments as a relatively high proportion of the course grade. Since students could earn a 3 (C) for completing the assignment, even with flaws, and a 4 or a 5 for better quality work, this helped the overall grade of some of the less-skilled students. Moreover, scaffolded assignments enabled students to see the relevance of the course assignments, and group camaraderie kept some students from drifting away.

We were not satisfied with just passing more students. Fundamentally, we wanted them to develop historical thinking, especially learning to view history as interpretation. We also wanted to improve academic skills that would enable them to achieve this goal and would transfer to other classes. To measure students' own ideas about their skills and historical thinking, Endy and Srole conducted anonymous student surveys on the first and last days of the term. Pflieger conducted a survey on the first day and a limited one midway through the course. For most questions, students chose from five categories: "strongly agree," "agree," "neither agree nor disagree," "disagree," and "strongly disagree."¹⁷

Based on our data, the community building element of the courses succeeded exceptionally well. In all three classes, students singled out their appreciation of the groups and facilitators midway or at the end of the course. In an open-ended question on the most “useful or enjoyable” part of the class, 69% of those who answered named group work and/or facilitators. Students also revised their assessment of how and where they learned. On the first day of Endy’s and Srole’s courses, 43% of students claimed that they worked best on their own, with only 12% preferring to work with others. By the end of the course, those who insisted that they learned better on their own dropped to 31%, and the percentage admitting to learning well with others more than doubled to 28%. We attribute these favorable student responses to our sustained efforts at building learning communities. Each faculty member integrated group building exercises in the beginning of their course, such as telling a story about their name or work experiences. Some of the facilitators added even more. One asked his students to answer a question on his roll sheet each day, such as what song represented their current mood. Students gathered in groups to start every session, not just as an occasional change of pace. With regularity comes mutual dependence and appreciation. Moreover, the opportunity to meet classmates reinforced an important goal for lower-level college students, bringing the social component of college life into the classroom. Lastly, peer facilitators bolstered student motivation by giving them personal attention and furthering community building.¹⁸ The groups succeeded in all three sections despite differences in how the three faculty grouped their students. Pflieger let students choose their groups. In his first section, Endy allowed students to form affinity groups based on what federal government agency that they would like to run, but he has since adopted the “spreading assets and liabilities” approach advocated by Larry K. Michaelsen.¹⁹ Srole divided students by their past academic performance, but did not have enough “A” students for each group.²⁰ Our experiences with different methods of group formation does not clearly support one approach over another, although we have moved away from allowing students to select groups on their own.

Students also became more confident with some, but not all, academic skills necessary for historical thinking. They especially came to believe that they could weigh competing ideas and write about them. In pre-surveys, 53% thought they could do this well,

compared with 69% in the post-survey. Students also grew somewhat more confident in their ability to understand complex readings with elaborate structures and syntax, subtle and dense meanings, sophisticated vocabulary, and minimal reading signposts. In the pre-survey, 51% claimed that they could understand complex readings, compared with 60% in the post-survey. Students increasingly recognized history courses as a place to learn academic skills. In the pre-survey, 34% of the students thought their high school history classes helped improve skills; in contrast, 68% in the post-survey agreed that their college-level history survey improved their skills. However, their confidence in writing essays remained static. The share of students claiming strong writing skills dropped, albeit a statistically insignificant amount, from 55% to 52%. This result surprised us, because students' mean grades on their scaffolded writing homework assignments steadily climbed in both sections surveyed. This lack of change could reflect that students took the post-survey on the last day of the course as their thoughts focused on the final essay. It might also suggest that students developed higher standards for "good" writing and recognition of the complexity of history during the course.²¹

Students also expanded their understanding of historical thinking and re-evaluated their views about history as memorization. Students often come to college history courses assuming that they will need to memorize names and dates, something the three faculty challenged with take-home essays and interpretative homework assignments.²² In the pre-surveys, 64% initially thought history relied on memorizing names and dates, and 30% specifically expressed concern about memorizing when answering an open-ended question on what they expected would be most challenging in the course. Yet in the post-survey, only 24% of respondents thought that history relied on memorization.²³

Students showed smaller yet still encouraging gains in other aspects of historical thinking. The percentage of students who claimed that historical documents need to be "true" to have value for historians fell from 22% in the pre-survey to 18% in the post-survey. More pronounced, the share of students who very strongly rejected the idea that historical learning could only come from "true" documents increased from 47% to 57%. The proportion of students who believed that historians might interpret the same material

differently also grew slightly from 66% to 74%. Interestingly, most students began the course with an understanding that historians might interpret materials differently, even though most also believed that history was about memorization. Students in humanities majors like arts, television, fashion, and English were much *less* likely to view history as interpretative than those in the sciences, business, and most social sciences. Yet students in these latter majors did not necessarily see history's interpretative nature as a positive trait. Rather, they may well have disapproved of history's lack of exactitude. Still, as students learned more about history as interpretation, they moved closer toward seeing knowledge as more than facts; that is, they drew nearer to understanding history in the ways professional historians do.

Ultimately, students found history more interesting and relevant than when they began the course. Initially, 29% thought their prior history courses were boring, but only 11% in the post-survey described their recent survey course as boring. Students also came to view history as more relevant to their lives. In the pre-survey, 24% agreed that history was relevant to their lives, a figure that climbed to 44% in the post-survey.

Preparing Future Teachers and Professors

The peer mentor model brings one last major benefit in its ability to help advanced history majors and graduate students develop as teachers and leaders. Facilitators learn about teaching through hands-on experience, team evaluations of class sessions, discussions of grading rubrics, and pedagogical dilemmas. They meet with faculty frequently to assess the strengths and weaknesses of in-class activities and homework assignments, learning the processes of evaluating and revising teaching. Facilitators also learn from each other, often meeting before class to share questions they might ask students, as well as to discuss grading criteria, group cohesion, or challenging students. This close collaboration with faculty and fellow facilitators is missing in most TA experiences and in most other peer mentoring programs such as Supplemental Instruction. Unlike TAs, who might passively watch their professor lecture before venturing into a room alone to lead a separate discussion, the facilitators teach alongside the professor and work in a tag-team fashion to help each group of students learn. Facilitators also receive more guidance than

most teaching assistants. In addition to a half-day training session before the course begins, faculty guide the facilitators through each day's active-learning teaching strategies. Unlike the typical discussion section designed primarily by the teaching assistant, here, the seasoned faculty member plans each class session and scaffolds assignments to build both content and skills. Facilitators receive direct teaching experience without the expectation that they have an overarching plan for a course that they are still working to master themselves. Faculty can reinforce facilitators' preparation for independent teaching through pedagogical readings and assignments, such as designing their own active learning projects.

For our first cohort of facilitators, their experience as peer mentors prepared them for careers in teaching. Of the nine facilitators in the three classes, two are currently enrolled in Ph.D. programs, three teach at community colleges, and two are completing teaching credential programs. One facilitator recently e-mailed his professor to thank her after he had completed his first semester teaching a similar course at a neighboring community college: "I really could not have done this without your assistance. I borrowed so many parts of History 202A and when I had to improvise I found myself thinking, 'What would Dr. Pfleger do?'"²⁴ Another former facilitator, currently a teaching assistant in a Ph.D. program, explained how he learned to ask questions "in a clear and open-ended manner" for "encouraging dialogue and therefore scaffolding critical thinking skills." His view of this course as a "model for how to run a skill-based and collaborate survey section" influenced how he taught his TA sections as a Ph.D. student.²⁵ Working with facilitators, faculty can feel confident in their training of prospective university and community college instructors and high school teachers, especially when it comes to their ability to teach history through active learning. The facilitator experience can also help diversify the ranks of future history teachers on campuses that serve large numbers of first-generation college students and students of color.

Conclusion

In-class peer mentors, combined with group-based learning, provide a method for expanding the use of active learning in otherwise unwieldy classes of fifty or more students. This model enables

faculty to prepare lower-division students to perform high-quality college-level work that facilitates learning how historians interpret the past. Moreover, it helps train future university, community college, and high school teachers. With the right strategies, those large classes that so many of us dread can turn into lively learning communities. On the last day of class, students leave with improved abilities to think, read, and write historically. They have developed intellectual friendships and have experienced sustained academic conversation and debate, all at a commuter college with limited resources. What more could we ask for a survey class of non-majors?

Notes

We thank the Chancellor's Office of the California State University system for funding our project in 2013-2014 as part of its Course Redesign with Technology program. We also thank Catherine Haras, director of CSULA's Center for Effective Teaching and Learning, for advice and encouragement. The CSULA Center for Effective Teaching and Learning also provided valuable writing support through its Scholarship of Teaching grants program.

1. For examples of the disconnect between high school and college, along with suggestions for closing the gap, see Elizabeth Belanger, "Bridging the Understanding Gap: An Approach to Teaching First-Year Students How to 'Do' History," *The History Teacher* 49, no. 1 (November 2015): 35-62, especially 38-44; Bette LaSere Erickson and Diane Weltner Strommer, *Teaching College Freshmen* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Higher Education, 1991).

2. For another in-class peer mentoring example without the learning community component, see Kate Lang, "Using Student Mentors in an Introductory World History Class," *The History Teacher* 34, no. 3 (May 2001): 361-371.

3. J. Patrick McCarthy and Liam Anderson, "Active Learning Techniques Versus Traditional Teaching Styles: Two Experiments from History and Political Science," *Innovative Higher Education* 24, no. 4 (Summer 2000): 279-294; Mary Dean Sorcinelli, "Research Findings on the Seven Principles," *New Directions in Teaching and Learning* (No. 47: Applying the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education) (Fall 1991): 13-25. On the effectiveness of active learning in STEM, including higher-order thinking, see Michael Prince, "Does Active Learning Work? A Review of the Research," *Journal of Engineering Education* 93, no. 3 (June 2004): 223-231; and Scott Freeman, Sarah L. Eddy, Miles McDonough, Michelle K. Smith, Nnadozie Okoroafor, Hannah Jordt, and Mary Pat Wenderoth, "Active Learning Increases Student Performance in Science,

Engineering, and Mathematics,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 111, no. 23 (June 2014): 8410-8415.

4. Colleen Janette Sullivan, “Academic Self-Regulation, Academic Performance, and College Adjustment: What is the First-Year Experience for College Students?” (Ph.D. Diss., University of Maryland, Baltimore, 2010); Mary Stuart Hunter and Kathleen A. Murray, “New Frontiers for Student Affairs Professionals: Teaching and the First-Year Experience,” *New Directions for Student Services*, no. 117 (Spring 2007): 25-34; and Minna Mahlab, “Who Benefits? Peer Mentors at Grinnell College,” *Council on Undergraduate Research Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (Winter 2010): 7-10.

5. For studies on economics courses, see Charles C. Bonwell and James A. Eison, *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom*, *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 1* (Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1991), 15.

6. Tania S. Smith, ed., *Undergraduate Curricular Peer Mentoring Programs: Perspectives on Innovation by Faculty, Staff, and Students* (Plymouth, United Kingdom: Lexington Books, 2013). While some faculty do prepare teaching assistants to understand their plan for each class session, few schools have institutionalized such training.

7. Sam Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future Of Teaching the Past* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2001), 68-69; Mark K. Harniss, Shirley V. Dickson, Diane Kinder, and Keith L. Hollenbeck, “Textual Problems and Instructional Solutions: Strategies for Enhancing Learning from Published History Textbooks,” *Reading and Writing Quarterly* 17, no. 2 (April 2001): 129-131; Diane Kinder, Bill Bursuck, and Michael Epstein, “An Evaluation of History Texts,” *The Journal of Special Education* 25, no. 4 (Winter 1992): 472-491.

8. Lendol Calder, “Uncoverage: Toward a Signature Pedagogy for the History Survey,” *The Journal of American History* 92, no. 4 (March 2006): 1358-1370; Joel M. Sipress and David J. Voelker, “The End of the History Survey Course: The Rise and Fall of the Coverage Model,” *The Journal of American History* 97, no. 4 (March 2011): 1050-1066.

9. Nitza Davidovitch, “Learning-Centered Teaching and Backward Course Design—From Transferring Knowledge To Teaching Skills,” *Journal of International Education Research* 9, no. 4 (2013): 329-338.

10. Many peer mentoring programs keep mentors from grading to enhance their “peer” status with the lower-division students. See Smith, ed., *Undergraduate Curricular Peer Mentoring Programs*, 8, 34-36.

11. For discussion on various uses of peer mentors, see Lang, “Using Student Mentors,” 361-371.

12. We prefer “topic sentence argument” over the more common phrase “topic sentence” because it reminds students that a topic sentence requires an argument for the paragraph, not just a topic.

13. On the importance of argumentation as a basic skill across disciplines, see Gerald Graff, *Clueless in Academe: How Schooling Obscures the Life of the Mind* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003).

14. Erickson and Strommer, *Teaching College Freshmen*, 101-102.
15. For more details, and for links to syllabi, see Christopher Endy, Carole Srole, and Birte Pflieger, "Changing Survey Course Culture: Using Learning Communities, Peer Mentoring, and Flipped Classrooms in the U.S. History Survey Course," <<https://contentbuilder.merlot.org/toolkit/html/snapshot.php?id=59493407848751>>.
16. Pflieger's homework assignments regularly required more difficult and time-consuming reading of secondary sources than the regular homework in the second half of the U.S. survey.
17. Eventually, we combined the results into three categories—"agree," "neither agree nor disagree," and "disagree"—to get more statistical significance.
18. Erickson and Strommer, *Teaching College Freshmen*, 31.
19. He left out some agencies to avoid having all-male military groups.
20. Srole's group formation strategy more closely resembled the pre-arrangement method described in Wayne A. Neu, "Social Cues of (Un)Trustworthy Team Members," *Journal of Marketing Education* 37, no. 1 (April 2015): 36-53. For details on forming groups by distributing assets and weaknesses, see Larry K. Michaelsen, "Getting Started with Team-Based Learning," and idem., "Appendix A: Frequently Asked Questions about Team-Based Learning," in *Team-Based Learning: A Transformative Use of Small Groups*, ed. Larry K. Michaelsen, Arletta Bauman Knight, and L. Dee Fink (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002), esp. pp. 28-29 and 221-222.
21. Belanger, "Bridging the Understanding Gap," 46.
22. For a discussion on how first-year students often equate learning with memorizing, see Erickson and Strommer, *Teaching College Freshmen*, 11, 47-50, 79-80, 110-111.
23. For examples on how students turn analytical questions into description, reinforcing their expectation of history as memorization, see Montserrat Martí Miller and Peter N. Stearns, "Applying Cognitive Learning Approaches in History Teaching: An Experiment in a World History Class," *The History Teacher* 28, no. 2 (February 1995): 187, 190. These answers changed even more dramatically than they did for students at the University of Indiana. See Arlene Diaz, Joan Middendorf, David Pace, and Leah Shopkow, "The History Department Learning Project: A Department 'Decodes' Its Students," *The Journal of American History* 94, no. 4 (March 2008): 1218.
24. Rafael Mazon, e-mail message to Birte Pflieger, June 14, 2015.
25. David De La Torre, e-mail to Carole Srole, June 22, 2015.