ABSTRACT

ROBERTS, CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH. Understanding Historical Empathy Through the Dialogue of Elementary School Students: A Qualitative Research Study (Under the direction of Dr. Meghan Manfra).

This qualitative case study examined how second and third grade students talked about and discussed their understandings of Japanese-American internment and historical empathy as a concept. This research took place in a public school located in the southeastern United States. Participants consisted of five second grade students and 11 third grade students. Data collection occurred over four weeks and consisted of three rounds of focus group interviews with three different focus groups and three individual semi-structured interviews. Data analysis included four cycles of coding which led to collapsing data into four overall themes. The first three themes focused on the three components of historical empathy—historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection. The final theme focused on the role of metacognitive strategies used by students to understand Japanese-American internment and the concept of historical empathy. The findings from this study align with Endacott and Brooks’s (2013) theoretical framework of historical empathy and assert that students who participated in this study relied on a linear understanding of the three components of historical empathy, as well as metacognitive strategies prior to understanding the interrelated workings of the concept. These findings indicate implications for students, teachers, teacher educators, the field of social studies education, and future research.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Background

Over thirty years ago researchers and educators acknowledged the significance of historical empathy and its place in social studies classrooms. Historical empathy represents a process involving cognitive and affective connection with historical agents to better understand their lived experiences, decisions, and actions with respect to historical context (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Throughout the past three decades many aspects of social studies curriculum remained intact, yet empathy—more specifically historical empathy—continues to emerge at the forefront of educators’ conversations to address the needs of students in today’s schools (e.g., Brooks, 2011; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; Huijgen, van Boxtel, van de Grift, & Holthuis, 2017). Since its inception in 1916, the field of social studies has encountered periods of discovery, flux, chaos, attacks, and survival. Social studies practices have moved from the memorization of dates, events, and actions, to analysis and inquiry, and the facilitation of students’ abilities to contemplate ideas exceedingly different from their own (Shemilt, 1984).

As the United States population becomes more diverse, people continue to encounter individuals and groups of people with ideas, values, and customs that diverge from their own. With these differences, a growing need to understand one another emerges as a necessity for individuals to exist in a pluralistic democratic society. Understanding similarities and differences among individuals starts at a young age, and today’s researchers, curriculum writers, educational institutions, administrators, and teachers continue to search for ways to foster empathy in our youth. Developing empathy involves looking at the perspectives of others, taking into account others’ circumstances, and considering affective connection, which enables learners to
understand the emotional worlds of historical agents. Attempting to fathom the lived experiences of people from the past provides students with opportunities to encounter empathy—more specifically, historical empathy. Many models for developing historical empathy exist (e.g., Endacott & Brooks, 2013; Foster, 2001; Shemilt, 1984).

According to Denis Shemilt (1984), this glimpse into another’s perspective and rationale represents the fifth of five stages of achievement toward developing historical empathy. The first stage presents historical events and agents without seeking explanations or motives. In this stage, historical agents’ reasons for acting in a specific manner remains neglected; therefore, they exist as intellectually or morally inferior, and we can only view them in patronizing ways. Rather than generating understanding, this creates a distancing effect. In stage two, learners of historical empathy assign motives to predecessors enabling them to consider historical agents’ capacity for thoughts and feelings as equal to their own. Stage three introduces the first attempt to empathize with people of the past through affective connection and perspective taking. By stage four learners recognize that the ability to empathize with their predecessors remains more difficult than the ability to empathize with contemporaries. Stage four requires them to step outside of modern world experiences to avoid presentism. Stage five involves the consideration of learners’ understanding the contexts in which predecessors acted, and how that shaped their decisions (Shemilt, 1984).

Embracing historical empathy remains increasingly important to researchers. Educators recognize the responsibility of teaching students to understand different ideas, beliefs, and values within which historical agents made sense of opportunities and constraints that formed the context of their lives and decisions. Historical empathy includes the active process of considering past institutions, social practices, and actions as well as making sense of why people saw things
in the ways that they did and using that knowledge to make sense of the past, while also considering how it relates to the present. This process requires analysis of human actions, events, interpretations of the past, and the construction of conclusions crafted by others (Blake, 1998). In past and current society, one must empathize with ideas one might oppose, despite the unlikely event that the same ideas or situations will reappear in the present (Shemilt, 1984). Even though researchers continue to study historical empathy and theorize about its place in social studies classrooms, little consensus exists on the exact meaning of the term. Therefore, educators must continue the work of exposing students to historical events, their antecedents, and the words and actions of historical agents that influence the teaching of history, how students perceive history, and how it shapes the future (Brooks, 2009).

Contemporary social studies classrooms engage students in historical empathy through both cognitive and affective approaches (Endacott, 2010). As cognitive and affective engagement serve as cornerstones to teaching historical empathy, researchers continue to question how students develop understandings, appreciations, and sensitivities to the complexities of human decisions. Jason Endacott’s research (2014) suggested that the sharing of human experiences, affective connection, and historical thinking allowed students to learn about cause and consequence, continuity and change, historical significance, and judgement. The process of developing historical empathy necessitates further research on exposing students to history and its actors while also facilitating their analysis and engagement with the material.

Studies in Secondary Education

As the study of historical empathy in social studies classrooms developed across the nation, researchers focused on secondary students and gave little attention to elementary classrooms. Some scholars in the field question whether or not younger students possess the
ability to develop an understanding of historical empathy and move beyond mere perspective taking (Brooks, 2011; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; Manfra, 2017; McBee, 1996; Riley, 1998). Knowing that various perspectives existed during a historical period or in relation to an event falls short of engaging the process to develop historical empathy; therefore, researchers must continue to push beyond historical perspective taking and facilitate students’ development of historical empathy through deeper analysis and connections to history (Manfra, 2017). Across the literature on historical empathy, researchers attempt to decipher the appropriateness of teaching historical thinking, historical empathy, and the understanding of historical time.

In addition to the need for further study of historical empathy in elementary schools, extant gaps in research demands scholars’ attention in determining the most effective methods, approaches, and materials to teaching historical empathy to elementary and secondary students. Meghan Manfra (2017) specifically examined trends and influences in a variety of studies aimed at supporting students in their development of historical empathy. To create instructional units, researchers must promote the process of engaging in historical empathy while carefully selecting resources and methods, which include lectures, primary sources, secondary sources, source analysis, and discussions (Brooks, 2011). Lectures remain necessary to probe through content specific questions, build core knowledge, and draw attention to significant perspectives and circumstances. Direct work with primary and secondary sources exists as a vital avenue that requires students to interact with essays, films, drawings, articles, journals, images, and statistical records. Individual, small group, and whole group discussions around these sources, in cooperation with the other instructional methods mentioned, aid students in the process of developing historical empathy through a holistic and comprehensive approach (Brooks, 2011).
In a study by Frans Doppen (2000), secondary students learned about the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan during World War II. The high schoolers either experienced the history lesson through reading textbooks or engaging with multiple sources including narratives that incorporated multiple perspectives. Doppen’s study initially focused on expanding research regarding historical empathy and investigating how historical empathy might provide students with a richer understanding of the past when guided by intentional questions and discussions (2000). During think-aloud sessions with the teacher as a facilitator, the researcher concluded that students analyzed and understood historical sources on deeper levels, developed historical empathy, focused on content and facts of historical materials, and generated multiple perspectives to create their own positions without the influence of emotions. In a separate investigation into the Holocaust, secondary students examined antecedents including voices, words, actions, and intentions of ordinary people and considered how those choices collectively contributed to the course of history (Riley, 1998). In yet another instance where the teacher acted as a facilitator, selectively choosing appropriate historical tools, the guidance and scaffolding of the teacher enabled students to examine the Holocaust from German, Polish, and Lithuanian perspectives by minimizing judgement of the individuals who personally experienced these events (Riley, 1998). Similarly, Karen Riley and Samuel Totten (2002) continued the examination of Holocaust curricula and further hypothesized key components necessary in the teaching of historical empathy. These include an introduction to and analysis of a critical event including context, chronology, evidence, and a narrative framework; the detection of bias, examination of conflicting accounts, and the ambiguous state of historical conclusions; and the study of attitudes, perspectives, and varying evidence and awareness of presentism.
The body of research that considers the development of historical empathy on secondary students continues to grow, as does the less common, yet essential study of historical empathy with students in middle school grades. By using seventh grade world history curriculum, one inquiry observed students engaging in historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection around the lives of Ancient Athenians. After being provided with knowledge of life in ancient Athens, middle schoolers moved through phases of learning, via introduction to the material, investigation, and reflection, which included seminars, discussions, and cooperative learning groups with the teacher as a facilitator. Participants unpacked historical nuances and developed contextual understandings that resulted in their making connections, making key decisions, and engaging in reflective discussions (Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015).

Studies in Elementary Education

Current researchers and educators face challenges with understanding the development of historical empathy in elementary aged students. The continuum of understanding perspectives, interpersonal communication, age appropriateness of controversial topics, and conceptualization of historical time make research with young children more difficult, yet also indicate a needed area for further research (McBee, 1996). Conversations that teach conflict resolution, tolerance for diverse perspectives, and critical thinking represent essential skills required of primary aged students to introduce them to controversial topics and the early stages of developing historical empathy. A small body of research exists that examines elementary children’s comprehension of historical time. Keith Barton and Linda Levstik (1996) conducted a study aimed at understanding students’ decision-making processes when placing images in chronological order. More often than not, primary grade students placed images into categories of old versus new, whereas students in third and fourth grade developed more detailed categories and referenced some
knowledge of historical time. The majority of students in grades five and six cited specific decades for images and explained why they chose to organize images according to the identified decades. This study suggested the need for further research in the field of historical thinking, historical time, historical significance, perspective taking, and historical agency in elementary aged students (Barton & Levstik, 1996).

Different schools of thought exist on the appropriateness of teaching history to elementary aged students. Concerns revolve around the amount of time given to social studies instruction and the content of social studies topics. Scholars continue to call for an increase in the amount of instructional time allocated to social studies, and some suggest that integrating social studies and literacy creates a viable path forward for the field (e.g., Alleman & Brophy, 1993; Fitchett, Heafner, & Lambert, 2014; Holloway & Chiodo, 2009). In depth studies on historical agents require sufficient amounts of time to combat significant omissions or misconceptions in understanding history (Barton, 1997). Barton’s research found that teachers’ assumptions regarding appropriateness of content, not empirical evidence, typically determined the history content taught to students. Educators reported believing that students’ neurological and cognitive readiness prohibits early exposure to historical time and perspective taking (Barton, 2002). When students learn the historical contextualization influencing people who lived in the past, the development of preconceived notions of right or wrong occurs less often, and students develop empathy for understanding the actions and decisions of those historical figures. The same researcher later studied students in the United States and Northern Ireland in order to develop a comparison of children’s historical thinking. Using cultural tools with students, the interviewer asked subjects aged six to twelve to arrange pictures in chronological order and explain their rationale for the placement of each image. One conclusion drawn from the data collected
indicated that American students learn history as a narrative that teaches a linear progression; therefore, more American students associated historical change with progress and success (Barton, 2001). Barton suggested that teachers in the United States must teach “analysis and interpretation of evidence rather than recounting prescribed national narratives” (p. 907) if they expect students to view history through a critical lens and develop a deeper understanding of historical continuity, change, and contingency (2001). For students to understand history, teachers must scaffold and intentionally facilitate students’ abilities to sequence events, comprehend long-term trends, and obtain historical knowledge at an early age as opposed to waiting for a predetermined developmental level (Barton, 2002).

A lack of research exists on historical time and perspective taking in elementary classrooms, and studies regarding elementary students’ engagement in the process of historical empathy makeup an even smaller body of research. One study concluded elementary school students’ empathy decreased with less attention to historical agents in the curriculum or content focus (Brophy, 1999). The children in this study learned social studies content focused on Native Americans through fifth grade; in this grade the content focus shifted to colonization, pioneers, and the development of a new nation. Over time the participants in the study developed views that deemed Native Americans as aggressive in the context of westward expansion (Brophy, 1999). This study serves as a catalyst for further investigation into the development of historical empathy in elementary aged students, and the need to expose students to multiple perspectives throughout historical periods to better prepare them in the analysis and understanding of what historical agents believed and why they acted as they did.
Statement of the Problem

With regard to today’s sociopolitical climate, one might conclude that a lack of empathy exists in society. Developing this through perspective taking, one component of historical empathy, starts at an early age. Understanding how elementary school children learn the process of historical empathy and how to aid students’ understandings of history continues to divide scholars and educators. In order to engage in the process of historical empathy, students must learn historical thinking skills to analyze critically historical figures and events. This study aimed to address the aforementioned issues facing researchers and social studies educators in elementary settings. A significant lack of research speaks to elementary students’ abilities to understand historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection, and warrants further investigation. This study employed focus groups and semi-structured interviews that aimed to uncover how elementary students talk about their understandings of historical empathy. Making sense of how they conceptualized historical empathy provided insight on how students understood agents of the past and connected to people in the present. Through a multiple case study design that employed qualitative methods, the researcher investigated contemporary children’s understandings and perspectives of historical agents through facilitated think-alouds and questioning as students sought to better comprehend, and relate to, events and people throughout history.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study served as an impetus to uncover how elementary school children understand historical empathy with regard to three components—historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection. To address the dilemma created by the relative dearth in the scholarship, the researcher conducted open-ended interviews and
focus groups with elementary school students in order to record their understandings of historical empathy, and employed a qualitative case study design to gain a more holistic representation. The initial aim of this study served as a way to unveil how students connect to the past through a lens of historical empathy. Developing historical empathy enables students to build connections to history, consider beliefs, values, and courses of action taken by historical agents. When learners develop and understand historical empathy, they obtain the ability to consider past actions or beliefs, as rational or irrational in the sense of being logical or conforming with evidence available at the time, and assess how thoughts, beliefs, and actions differ depending on historical contextualization (Lee & Shemilt, 2011).

Another aim of the study included consideration of how students engage in logical thinking associated with historical empathy. Research suggests the development of historical empathy might cultivate a posture of openness to beliefs, practices, and ideas of others. When provided with opportunities to utilize inferential skills and creativity to bridge what learners know about the past, students possess the potential to share their thinking, through think-alouds and discussions, about their interpretations or perspectives on historical agents and events (Brooks, 2009). The process of historical empathy involves a cognitive act that remains necessary for students to understand historical information; this act requires that they investigate historical agents and events prior to analyzing human actions. This study intended to provide students with background knowledge of events, including chronology and content, through a variety of primary and secondary sources and to measure and evaluate information gained from students on their interpretations or explanations of historical empathy.
Research Questions

To begin, the researcher asked, how do elementary school children talk about and discuss their understandings of Japanese-American internment and historical empathy as a concept? Furthermore, how do elementary school students apply historical contextualization to the content? How do elementary school students engage in perspective taking with regard to the content? Thinking about historical empathy, what discussions, if any, reflect students’ ideas about affective connection to the selected content material?

Theoretical Framework

The proposed theoretical perspective for this study drew on an interpretive framework in constructivism and more specifically, social constructivism in order to seek how students understand their world. Constructivism involves both the nature of knowing and how one acquires knowledge (Fosnot, 1996; Fosnot, 2005; Vygotsky, 1978). Social constructivism considers the nature of knowing and acquisition while incorporating the construction of learning as a process that includes interactions with others and learning as sense-making from inside the learner (Oldfather, West, White, & Wilmarth, 1999). Within the theory of social constructivism, individuals direct meaning toward objects or things, and subjective meanings remain negotiated socially and historically. Therefore, students form meaning through interactions with others and through historical and cultural norms that operate in individuals’ lives (Gergen, 1995). Under the theory of social constructivism, individuals construct multiple realities through lived experiences (Fosnot, 2005). Operating within this framework allowed the researcher to use an inductive process to establish emergent themes obtained through methods such as interviewing, observing, and analyzing written text.
Historical empathy represents the conceptual framework for the study that fits within the context of social constructivism; historical empathy serves as a lens to narrow the theoretical perspective. Endacott and Sarah Brooks (2013) presented an updated theoretical model for promoting historical empathy, which includes a dual-dimensional conceptualization of historical empathy and differentiates it from an exclusively cognitive or affective mode of inquiry. The process of historical empathy aims to engage learners in both cognitive and affective process with historical figures in order to better understand how people from the past thought, felt, acted, made decisions, and faced consequences within a specific social and historical context (Blake, 1998; Endacott & Brooks, 2013; Foster, 2001; Lee & Shemilt, 2011). Historical contextualization, cognitive perspective taking, and affective connection serve as components to construct the instructional model for teaching historical empathy.

For the purpose of this study, the updated framework of historical empathy represents the researcher’s theoretical perspective of operation. To further operationalize the framework, Endacott and Brooks (2013) define historical contextualization as a temporal awareness of differences, which includes a deep understanding of political, social, and cultural norms of the time period under examination as well as knowledge of events happening concurrently. Perspective taking signifies an understanding of one’s prior lived experiences, values, attitudes, positions, and beliefs in order to understand how a person might perceive or think about the situation in question (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). The final component of historical empathy involves an affective connection, which considers the way in which historical figures’ lived experiences, circumstances, or actions possess the potential to elicit an affective response from learners by their connecting historical information to their personal lived experiences. When
learners lack the ability to understand historical agents fully, experiencing affective responses enables them to draw on similar yet different lived experiences (Endacott & Brooks, 2013).

**Scope of the Study**

This study focused on students in primary grades, kindergarten through second grade, and students in the intermediate grades, third through sixth. Second and third graders served as the selected population for this study for a few reasons. In the state where this study took place, standardized End of Grade (EOG) testing affects students in intermediate grades whereas, students in primary grades remain untested by EOG assessments. This potentially permitted flexible time allotments for each subject area—literacy, math, science, and social studies. Additionally, studying second and third graders’ views on historical empathy addressed an under researched population of students since the majority of studies on historical empathy focus on secondary education. Public education represented the setting for this study since the bulk of the nation’s children attend public schools, and for that reason students in private schools remained omitted from the study. By focusing on students in public education, the researcher aimed to obtain data from a more diverse sample that adequately represents the multiplicities of identity.

Focusing on qualitative methods rather than quantitative methods provided the researcher with an opportunity to draw on the narratives of how students understand and acquire knowledge as it relates to historical empathy. Choosing to implement focus groups and conduct one-on-one interviews with students allowed the researcher to gather perspectives from learners while further clarifying students’ understandings of historical empathy. The chosen curriculum and standards for this study centered around understanding how various primary and secondary sources provide information about the past. Selection of this content served as the researcher’s attempt to
foreground open-ended standards that provide more freedom when identifying a puzzling and/or paradoxical situation for students engaging in the process of historical empathy.

**Significance of the Study**

This study served as significant to the field of education since it shines light on the need to discover how students in elementary grades discuss their understandings of historical empathy. With respect to today’s sociopolitical climate, a perceived lack of empathy for people who identify as different from one another presents problems. Research in early childhood development and educational psychology suggests that elementary aged students continue to exist in egocentric perceptions of the world around them (Bruner, 1986; Piaget, 1985; Vygotsky, 1978); yet it remains necessary for well-trained facilitators to guide and scaffold students’ development of empathy through engaging in the process of historical empathy. Learning historical contextualization, engaging in perspective taking, and making affective connection at an early age possesses the potential to widen students’ perspectives and consider the thoughts, feelings, and rationales of others. As young students, elementary aged children stand to gain increased self-awareness, conflict management skills, productive communication skills, and an increased ability to become engaged citizens later in life (Brooks, 2009).

In this study, the researcher hoped to unveil how students in primary and intermediate grades develop historical empathy with regard to how people change over time, how the past differs from the present, and how students use history to draw connections to today’s society and world. This information represents value in the field as it intends to discover how students rationalize decisions made by historical agents with respect to the components of historical empathy. Data analysis and findings from this study serve as a framework for future research on understanding the continuum of development in perspective taking, historical context, and
affective connection. Through the facilitation of focus groups and individual semi-structured interviews, the researcher drew conclusions about primary students’ abilities to understand historical empathy without bias or egocentric influence.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

Historical thinking requires a deep understanding of historical context and the ability to navigate between the familiar and the strange. According to Wineburg (2001), at times historical thinking seems “unnatural” since difficulty might arise for students when they discover aspects of history that may startle them into reconsidering the intricacies and complexities of humans and their actions. Entering into historical thinking mandates more than a curiosity about the past; it necessitates an orientation to the past that remains informed by disciplinary based evidence and rules of argument (Wineburg, 2007). Students learn historical thinking by engaging in complex problems similar to ones confronted by citizens on a daily basis as a part of their social world. At this time, with respect to the current socio-political climate, historical thinking—more specifically, historical empathy—requires educators’ attention in order to spearhead and guide a deeper understanding of our past and how decisions made in the past affect lives today. This review of literature, on historical thinking and historical empathy, highlights appropriate source selection, inquiry, investigations, and intentional facilitation on the part of educators to guide students’ understandings of historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection. It discusses social studies educators’ efforts to teach historical thinking and historical empathy while providing students with opportunities to interpret and make sense of history without falling into the pitfalls of presentism.

Social Studies and Historical Thinking

The discipline of social studies, like other content areas, represents two ideas of thought—content knowledge and second order concepts. In the field of social studies, content
knowledge typically discusses: civics and government, history, culture, geography, and economics. Second order concepts in social studies occur within the realm of historical thinking, and include how those studying history conceptualize time, evidence, historical accounts, cause, change, and empathy (see Figure 2.1). According to Thomas Fallace (2017), historical knowledge “includes not only an understanding of what happened in the past, but also an appreciation for how that understanding is and was constructed” (p. 57). Furthermore, Fallace argues that historical thinking aims to equip “students with healthy skepticism toward unwarranted assertions, the tools to decide between or among conflicting assertions, and a sense of cultural humility about their own assumptions” (p.57) as well as the ability to transfer their understandings of the past to the present. Through historical thinking exercises, students learn skills to access the content that comprises the discipline of social studies, and by extension their own lives.

![Figure 2.1. Framework for Conceptualizing Social Studies.](image)

This framework represents the discipline of social studies broken into two parts—content knowledge and second order concepts.
Defining Historical Thinking

In order to engage in historical thinking, students need to know the discipline of history (Edwards, 1978; Lee, 2005; Levisohn, 2017). According to Peter Lee (2005), students do not come to learning empty-handed; rather, they need a firm foundation of knowledge ordered around key concepts of the discipline, and they need to understand the importance of metacognitive strategies. Students must discuss content within the discipline, communicate their understandings, and grasp the technical vocabulary of the discipline (Edwards, 1978; Levisohn, 2017). Historical thinking refers to students’ understandings of the discipline and recognizing that history builds on interpretations and inferences. Eyewitnesses did not exist for every event in history so for students to truly understand the discipline, they must ask questions of sources even when those sources may not provide answers (Lee, 2005). Furthermore, and as previously stated, historical thinking involves exercises where individuals continuously engage in concepts related to time, evidence, accounts, change, empathy, and cause.

Analyzing Primary and Secondary Sources

To understand how students learn the discipline of history and historical thinking, many scholars agree that they must study how to analyze primary and secondary sources (Adler, 2008; Martin, 2012; Seixas, 2006; Tally & Goldenberg, 2005; Wineburg, 2001). Fostering historical thinking in children demands the use of multiple sources (Martin, 2012). Using primary source evidence requires students to find, select, contextualize, and interpret sources in order to build their own historical arguments (Seixas, 2006). Students need exposure to primary and secondary sources to build on what they know about historical context. Moving beyond basic procedural knowledge to more conceptual understanding entails an appropriate balance of teacher modeling and student practice (Zhang, Torney-Purta, & Barber, 2012). Historical thinking involves
recognizing ways the past exists as different from the present, and this way of thinking necessitates scaffolding and practice (Levisohn, 2017).

The discipline of history remains complex; teachers need time to teach the discipline, and students need time to learn (Martin, 2012). By engaging in source analysis, students begin to comprehend how to evaluate, analyze, and synthesize sources. For students, source analysis involves historical writing and inquiry (Adler, 2008). When teachers provide structured opportunities for students to engage with primary materials, they create opportunities to construct meanings and critically examine those meanings for students (Tally & Goldenberg, 2005). Analysis of primary and secondary sources can contribute to student content knowledge as well as affect their understandings of the past, including change, continuity, and contingency over time.

When faced with unfamiliar documents, historians analyze and infer meaning from them. They also pose new questions and identify gaps in knowledge that prevent or inhibit more in-depth understandings of historical moments. In order for students to develop similar expertise, they need opportunities to encounter primary and secondary sources and learn how to determine historical significance. This includes evaluating relationships among events and people of the past and how those relationships relate to the present (Seixas, 2006; Seixas & Peck, 2004).

Students learn document analysis from modeling (Foster, 2001; Levisohn, 2017; Tally & Goldenberg, 2005). This requires teachers to have a firm foundation in how to analyze documents. Claiming that exposure to sources and occasional use of sources prepares students to learn historical thinking implies a lack of sophistication for how students learn. Structured and systematic opportunities for students to engage in source analysis creates situations for students to demonstrate their ability to engage in complex and abstract ideas (Booth, 1987). A balance of
modeling on the part of the teacher remains crucial when constructing the scaffolding for students to engage in source analysis. As students do this, one may question whether or not they develop genuine habits of historical thinking in order to critically imagine the past, or if they are repeating a heuristic and formulaic routine (Tally & Goldenberg, 2005). Nonetheless, the possibility of learning historical thinking must start somewhere.

Moreover, the process of historical thinking involves a form of critical literacy where students learn to identify sources, consider who produced them, how, and for what purposes. Students can practice historical thinking by evaluating perspectives in a specific context, and considering an author’s social, cultural, and political positions (VanSledright, 2004). Learning to think historically remains complex, yet students need opportunities to engage in forms of critical literacy with primary and secondary sources.

Source analysis provides students with opportunities to think critically, pose questions, and build content knowledge. Meaningful historical empathy, through source analysis, requires teacher modeling and scaffolding that aims to encourage students to avoid taking sources at face value and ask more complex and thought-provoking questions (Bryant & Clark, 2006; Yilmaz, 2007). Primary and secondary source work promotes historical empathy when students collaborate in small groups or participate in whole class discussions. Facilitating informal discussions throughout lessons, during lectures, or during primary and secondary source analysis supports students in historical contextualization, perspective taking, and making affective connection (Brooks, 2011). Students must consider document type, determine trustworthiness and reliability of sources through corroboration, and analyze statistical information and emotional responses (Harris, Halvorsen, & Aponte-Martinez, 2016) in order to draw conclusions about historical situations and learn historical empathy.
Second Order Conceptual Knowledge

In addition to developing content knowledge, Lee (2005) believes students must also develop “second order concepts that give shape to the discipline of history” (p. 41). In order for young students to learn content knowledge, they must develop each of the second order concepts, identified by Lee, through a variety of pedagogical approaches. Some of these pedagogical approaches include inquiry and source analysis. Lee (2005) specifically denotes second order concepts as time, change, empathy, cause, evidence, and historical accounts. Lee believes these second order concepts serve as a foundation for students to learn the discipline of history. With regard to time, students need to distinguish the difference between time and change, meaning periods or themes in history versus change which focuses on events, continuity, state of affairs, direction, and pace (Lee, 2005). Change occurs when one moment people appear calm, and the next moment chaos erupts. For example, chaos erupted when the bombing of Pearl Harbor took place indicating a major change in American history.

Empathy represents another second order concept. According to Lee (2005), empathy provides students with opportunities to consider the actions of historical agents while taking into account the beliefs, values, and ideas of those agents with regard to historical contextualization. In addition to time, change, and empathy, cause depicts another second order concept. Cause requires students to exercise a linear way of thinking where one event happens due to another event. Students also need to learn that not all events possess intended consequences nor do they achieve their original purposes (Lee, 2005). Students must consider how history and historical arguments comes to exist, and understand that both require evidence, such as primary sources to survive. Yet students must also comprehend why some interpretations assume prominence over others. Therefore, students must question the authority, bias, and reliability of sources. Lee
(2005) presents historical accounts as the final second order concept students need in order to develop an understanding of history. Varying historical accounts serve as different ways of viewing the past or distinct interpretations of the past rather than precise validations of an earlier time period. This remains crucial to students’ understandings of history when they attempt to make sense of the past (Lee, 2005). For the purpose of this literature review, the researcher focuses on one second order concept—empathy, more specifically, historical empathy.

Arguing for Historical Thinking

A portion of this literature review intends to present readers with a rationale for why historical thinking remains vital for students to understand the discipline of social studies. Historical knowledge exists due to its transmission across generations, and one generation’s lived history transforms into another generation’s available history (Wineburg, Mosborg, Porat, & Duncan, 2007). The collective memory that informs our history requires discussion regarding the creation of the past. Educators advance students’ abilities to learn historical thinking when content connects to students’ lives (e.g., Dewey, 1897/2013; Wineburg et al., 2007). Septima Clark, a pioneer of citizenship schools, connected learning to students’ lived experiences as early as 1916, combining their awareness of community history with her teaching (Charron, 2009). Teachers must move away from simply imparting history to students and provide them with opportunities to work collaboratively to learn history (Martin, 2012). Learning requires students to engage in a social process (Bruner, 1986), and when students work in collaborative groups or even pairs they add to their collective knowledge base.

Educators continue to support students’ conceptual understanding rather than procedural and declarative knowledge (Greene, Bolick, & Robertson, 2010; VanSledright, 2002). This effort assumes a great deal of importance when teaching students historical thinking. Historical
thinking mandates higher order thinking skills (Greene et al., 2010; Viator, 2012). When students learn historical thinking, the intent of the process resides less in creating miniature historians and more in the exercise of creating active, thoughtful, and critical citizens who live in a democratic society (VanSledright, 2004). Therefore, by engaging students in the historical thinking process, teachers create opportunities for students to learn more than just content knowledge.

**Historical Empathy**

As mentioned earlier, historical empathy represents a second order concept, fundamental to developing historical thinking; however, according to Endacott (2014) historical empathy allows students to learn about cause and consequence, continuity and change, significance, agency, and judgment from the perspective of historical figures. Endacott believes historical empathy offers a foundation for understanding; when students engage in the process of historical empathy their comprehension of other second order concepts, like change, improves. Naturally, understanding another’s prior lived experiences, principles, positions, attitudes, and beliefs mandates a strong familiarity with history (Endacott, 2014); only then will students have the potential to consider the role of historical agents and the broader historical context (Huijgen et al., 2017). Effectively engaging in historical empathy hinges on whether or not students have opportunities to immerse themselves in the history. Historical empathy can enable learners to make sense of people from the past and result in an increase in self-understanding and self-awareness (Brooks, 2009; VanSledright, 2001). In the following sections, the review of the literature discusses the meaning of historical empathy and its components; the pedagogy of how to help students develop historical empathy; and the possibility of assessing their grasp of historical empathy.
Defining Historical Empathy

Historical empathy appeared in Britain’s national curriculum about twenty years prior to its emergence in the United States curriculum (Portal, 1987). Understandings of historical empathy differ among scholars depending on their epistemological beliefs, theoretical frameworks, and theories of empathy. Scholars in the field tend to identify with one side of the definitional dispute over historical empathy or the other, and for the most part these sides appear primarily dichotomous. On one side, scholars support a definition of historical empathy that focuses on the cognitive components of historical empathy, and distance themselves from ideas of emotion, sympathy, or affective connection. Scholars on the other side of the continuum view the definition more as a dual process embodying both cognitive and affective components (see Figure 2.2). For the purpose of this study, the researcher will operate under a definition of historical empathy proposed by Endacott and Brooks (2013) who operationalize historical empathy as a process involving cognitive and affective connection with historical agents to understand better their lived experiences, decisions, and actions with respect to historical context.

![Emotional Continuum of Historical Empathy](image)

**Figure 2.2. Emotional Continuum of Historical Empathy.** Continuum interpreting educational researchers’ perspectives on the stance of emotion related to understanding historical empathy

**Disputes over historical empathy.** In psychology “empathy refers to the capacity to understand and respond to the unique affective experiences of another person” (Decety &
Jackson, 2006, p. 54), and empathy operates under terms “of accuracy of cognitive social insight or social/affective role taking” (Bryant, 1982, p. 413). A distinction between affective empathy, concerned with the experience of emotions and feelings of others, and cognitive empathy, understanding another’s feelings through association or complex perspective taking, exists in the field of psychology (de Wied et al., 2007). This distinction in the literature, between a pure cognitive approach to historical empathy or one comprised of cognition and an affective component, pervades the theoretical landscape and leaves scholars and educators grappling with various meanings of historical empathy. Whether scholars believe historical empathy results in a pure cognitive approach or a combination of cognition and an affective connection, representing both perspectives remains essential to develop further scholars’, educators’, and students’ understandings of historical empathy.

For those who represent the cognitive stance, historical empathy implies an understanding that people in the past lived different lives, under different circumstances, and interpreted and experienced the world through different belief systems (e.g., Brophy & Alleman, 2006; Bryant & Clark, 2006; Cunningham, 2007; Foster, 1999). Scholars who believe historical empathy involves an affective component view historical empathy as a process to understand how people from the past thought, felt, made decisions, acted, and faced consequences within a specific historical and social context (e.g., Ashby & Lee, 1987; Endacott & Brooks, 2013; Lee, 1978; Seixas, 2006; VanSledright, 2001). Therefore, historical empathy seeks to deepen understanding of how emotions informed the thinking, culture, and deeds of historical actors. It involves contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection. Although disputes persist in the field of social studies over the exactness of the term historical empathy, few argue against its importance in developing historical understanding. For the purpose of this study, the
researcher continues to operate under the definition and model of historical empathy provided by Endacott and Brooks (2013), which includes an affective component of historical empathy.

Endacott and Brooks (2013) propose a theoretical conceptualization of historical empathy that they consider “dual-dimensional” in that the concept includes both a cognitive and affective component. Due to the inclusion of an affective connection in their proposed model, the authors acknowledge that their conceptualization of historical empathy leans more toward a psychological stance on empathy than previous models proposed by other history educators. Nevertheless, they see a clear distinction between empathy in psychology and empathy in history in that historical empathy “involves people from the past who likely utilized different ways of thinking that were dependent upon the political, social, and cultural context of a different time and place” (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 43). Endacott and Brooks (2013) believe historical empathy includes three interworking concepts—historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection (see Figure 2.3). Each concept holds independent benefits when trying to generate historical empathy. The authors argue that when these three concepts combine, students possess the potential to gain a deeper understanding of historical empathy through historical inquiry (Endacott & Brooks, 2013).

**Historical contextualization.** For historical contextualization to occur, students need to understand differences between the past and present. These include the social, political, and culture norms of the time period under investigation. Grasping the full meaning of historical contextualization also necessitates an understanding of what events occurred leading up to the historical situation as well as events that occurred simultaneously (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). As students develop historical empathy, they must apply historical contextualization in order to consider beliefs, values, courses of action, and social practices of people from the past (Lee &
After placing ideas in their proper historical context, students evaluate the rationale of ideas and contemplate how and why historical agents acted in certain ways throughout history (Bryant & Clark, 2006).

Perspective taking. People in the past made sense of the world during their existence. Perspective taking requires students to understand historical agents’ prior lived experiences, positions, attitudes, beliefs, and principles in order for them to make sense of how people in the past thought about the historical issue under consideration (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Perspective taking invites students to understand how people understood past institutions and social practices in order to fully comprehend their actions even if those actions represent something students oppose (Ashby & Lee, 1987; Shemilt, 1984). Providing students with perspectives from individuals or groups of people increases their recognition that the past represents a different time and place from the present (Brophy, 1999; Foster, 2001). To make this distinction between the past and the present, students must engage in the act of perspective
taking (Dulberg, 2002; Lee, 2005). A willingness to take another’s perspective into account and learning to engage in perspective taking deepens students’ awareness of historical thinking and the discipline of history.

Perspective taking involves attempting to understand the past while dwelling in the present. Historical empathy encompasses a fundamental goal of historical thinking and the social studies: education for the common good (Dulberg, 2002). Learning to recognize what appears as strange or different in another person creates a path to understanding varying perspectives in a pluralistic, democratic society. Historical empathy humanizes history and enables students to move beyond connecting to historical figures (Bryant & Clark, 2006) in order to investigate how people from the past made decisions within a specific historical and social context. Some scholars argue historical empathy might cultivate an openness to others’ ideas, beliefs, and practices and this openness holds the potential to prepare students to participate in a pluralistic democracy (Brooks, 2009; Dulberg, 2002). Examining the perspectives of others also prompts students to investigate their own perspectives (Foster, 2001).

**Affective connection and self-understanding.** Endacott and Brooks (2013) define the affective connection component of historical empathy as, “consideration for how historical figures’ lived experiences, situations, or actions may have been influenced by their affective response based on a connection made to one’s own similar yet different life experiences” (p.43). Students need personal points of entry to engage in historical empathy. When educators present students with opportunities to consider their affective connection, they also offer students a chance to explore a personal point of entry. Prior knowledge and prior lived experiences influence students’ connections with history. When students participate in perspective taking they rely on their social, moral, and cognitive functions simultaneously (Dulberg, 2002). Since
children bring different backgrounds and experiences to the classroom, their connections can serve as a channel for teaching. On a larger scale, this may place students in positions to consider historical empathy and to discern the ways their actions affect others (Foster & Yeager, 1998).

Further building off the benefits of providing students with opportunities to make affective connection to historical agents, research suggests content explicitly linked to students’ identities and experiences provides opportunities for democratic peacebuilding, conflict resolution, acceptance and empathy for others’ perspectives, and understanding perspectives of people from the past (Parker, 2016). Inviting students to use historical empathy to ponder their personal attitudes and beliefs requires an emphasis on issues, like prejudice and discrimination that remain relevant to students’ lives (Monroe, 2006). Empirical research suggests that considering students’ prior knowledge, positionalities, and what appears relevant to students’ lives, serves as an effective approach to teaching historical empathy (e.g., Brophy & Alleman, 2006; Monroe, 2006; Parker, 2016).

**Instructional Practices for Teaching Historical Empathy**

In order to develop historical empathy, students must acquire a strong foundational knowledge of historical content (Foster, 1999; VanSledright, 2001). Learning historical empathy requires historical contextualization, which includes understanding social, political, and cultural norms of the time, as well as knowledge of events leading up to the historical situation under consideration and relevant events (Endacott, 2014; Sansom, 1987). Teachers can help students develop this knowledge by placing students in positions to investigate sources resulting in the construction of knowledge (Foster, 1999).

Methods for engaging in historical empathy vary according to the nature of the historical situation (Shemilt, 1984). However, Riley and Totten (2002) identified four key components for
teaching students historical empathy: introduction and analysis of critical events, context and chronology, evidence, and construction of a narrative framework. In the elementary setting, classroom teachers rely on children’s literature, discussion, small groups, and inquiry to develop skills and understandings. Riley (1998), a professor of education who conducts research on historical empathy as it relates to the Holocaust, once declared, “The quest to understand is the single most important endeavor of a student of history” (p. 32). Whether students engage in source analysis, investigations, classroom discussions, or other methods to learn historical empathy, teachers remain vital to students’ understanding of history.

**Considering historical empathy through children’s literature.** Careful selection of literature, including mentor texts, enables teachers to support students’ development in historical empathy. This requires purposeful text selection, consulting a variety of sources, and including both fiction and non-fiction history texts. Supplementing everyday texts to provide students with a variety of sources provides them with multiple perspectives (Berti, Baldin, & Toneatti, 2009; Brophy & Alleman, 2008). Teachers can combine multiple historical texts with source analysis to encourage students to develop discourse strategies that foster empathy, encourage humility, and promote respect toward people of the past by relating historical topics to students’ lives (Cunningham, 2009).

**Writing and historical empathy.** Requiring students to write about their historical perspectives can provide a scaffold for students as they develop historical empathy and serve as a way to assess their understandings of historical empathy. A study by Brooks (2008) investigating the influence of writing assignments on eighth grade students’ historical empathy compared first person writing samples to third person. The study found that third person narratives provided students with more opportunities to avoid personal identification with historical agents, reference
sources more often, and contextualize the past. By contrast, first person writing samples provided students with more opportunities to include inferential thinking, draw conclusions based on inferences, and engage in perspective taking with regard to historical empathy. With purposeful selection of texts and writing assignments, teachers and students in social studies classrooms find a route to engage in historical empathy.

**Considering inquiry and investigations.** Examining problems, through inquiry and investigations, requires interpretations and conclusions that extend beyond locating information in sources, and these skills enable students to learn historical thinking (Wineburg, 2001). Historical inquiries often focus on historical agents and specific time periods. Similarly, selecting a puzzling or paradoxical situation from the historical past serves as an effective method for engaging students in historical empathy (Bryant & Clark, 2006; Foster, 2001). When students participate in the inquiry process they ask questions, discuss interpretations, and share conclusions. To engage in civil public discourse, students need to learn conflict resolution, interpersonal communication skills, tolerance for diverse perspectives, and how to analyze actions and practices of the past (Gehlbach, 2004; McBee, 1996). Students learning the concept of historical empathy through inquiry can develop these same types of skills. For example, according to Jensen (2008), students’ understandings of historical empathy, with a specific focus on historical contextualization and perspective taking, increased when students participated in debates. The process leading up to the debates focused on students answering a central question, source analysis to build their content knowledge, perspective taking exercises, and drawing conclusions to prepare for the debates. In this specific case, students engaged in inquiry style learning to develop their understandings of historical empathy.
At a time when global interdependence continues to rise, the use of inquiry to learn historical empathy remains vital to provide students with more opportunities to learn about diverse perspectives. Grouping inquiry with critical thinking and perspective taking can promote critical self-reflection needed to understand the complexities of global issues (Bohman, 1999; Harshman, 2016). This relates to historical empathy in the sense that pairing perspective taking with affective connection aims to promote empathy in students (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Engaging in inquiry to learn about diverse perspectives from the past, specifically why historical agents made certain decisions, enables students to consider the complexities that go into decision making in both the past and the present. Students need an understanding of how current issues relate to the past, present, and future of their country. When students engage in inquiry, they make connections to problems or issues of concern. Students who research issues through source analysis can identify options for addressing problems, and plan civic action (Croddy & Levine, 2014). Food collection and donation for hungry families represents one example of how elementary aged students engage in civic action.

The introduction of historical empathy typically involves an overarching question or task that presents a historical situation to students. Then students analyze primary and secondary sources to investigate the historical context, perspectives, and affective connection surrounding the historical figure(s) in question (Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; Wright & Endacott, 2016). When teachers foster historical empathy in ways that provide students with opportunities to engage in inquiry, students possess the potential to interpret and think critically about history (Yeager, Foster, Maley, Anderson, & Morris, 1998). Using an inquiry model to teach historical empathy provides students with opportunities to investigate compelling questions, engage in source analysis, and draw conclusions. Bringing historical empathy into the classroom with
inquiry, as a method for instruction, may enhance students’ understandings of how their nation’s history relates to the contemporary issues of today.

Similar to teaching students historical empathy, engaging in inquiry places the teacher in a position that remains imperative to students’ success. John Dewey (1938) proclaimed the teacher must endeavor “to keep alive the sacred spark of wonder and to fan the flame that already glows” (p. 34) when students engage in the process of inquiry, so they will continue to learn throughout their life. Teachers support students throughout the inquiry process by asking complex and thought-provoking questions and encouraging students to examine their own assumptions or bias before and during source analysis. Teachers must probe students’ initial understandings and invite students to share and defend their thoughts (Foster, 2001). Inquiry instruction enables teachers to fine tune their practices and address dilemmas and controversial issues (Saye, Kohlmeier, Brush, Mitchell, & Farmer, 2009). Engaging students in inquiry learning serves as a powerful approach for teachers to use when teaching historical empathy.

**Classroom discussion and historical empathy.** Research focused on historical empathy with students in secondary grades has emphasized the importance and benefits of classroom discussions for students to develop a more holistic understanding of history (e.g., Doppen, 2000; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; Kohlmeier, 2006). According to Kohlmeier (2006), while practicing group discussions in a seminar aided students’ efforts to recognize differences between past and present, defend interpretations with historical evidence, and deepen their understandings of historical documents. In one study, Doppen (2000) investigated how using the historical situation of the atomic bomb as a focus provided students with a richer understanding of the past that fostered historical empathy. This study required the teacher to act as a facilitator in order to guide students to focus on content, consider facts, refer to historical context, look
beyond their own worldviews, and examine multiple sources in order to draw conclusions (Doppen, 2000).

Classroom discussions used to advance students’ understandings require teachers to serve as important facilitators during group discussions and seminars (Doppen, 2000; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015). Modeling discussions through teacher think-alouds, asking questions to probe students to consider alternative perspectives, and learning to read the room for other needs that arise during seminars and discussions remains essential in students’ development of historical empathy. Student discussions also enable teachers to gauge and assess students’ understandings of content (Viator, 2012). Discussions create avenues of opportunity for historical thinking to occur by engaging students in a cognitive process of arguing and reasoning; discussions can serve as a venue for problem solving, collective discourse, and instructional or academic conversations (Pontecorvo & Girardet, 1993). When provided with opportunities for open-ended dialogue on events of the past, the possibility for students to learn historical empathy increases.

**Pitfalls of Teaching Historical Empathy**

Scholars have debated the advantages and pitfalls of teaching empathy as an analytical tool (Schwartz, 2017). Many social educators recognize the value of teaching historical empathy; however, reconciling whether or not to teach historical empathy as a cognitive approach or a combined approach with a cognitive component and affective aspect remains unresolved. This uncertainty is compounded as scholars substitute empathy with perspective taking, perspective recognition, or rational understanding, which indicate more of a cognitive approach to learning historical empathy (Endacott, 2010).

Confusion also exists over the desired outcomes of teaching empathy. For example, scholars debate whether historical empathy assumes a pre-determined end-goal. Bruce
VanSledright (2001) refers to historical empathy as an achievement rather than a process, and he believes students might get close to understanding life in the past, yet one’s positionality places a complex lens on understanding historical empathy. Darren Bryant and Penney Clark (2006) argue that empathy may turn into sympathy, and that students possess limited abilities to understand historical agents, their circumstances, and actions. The lack of consensus over the definition of historical empathy, determining if empathy signifies a process or achievement, and concerns over how students may perceive empathy as sympathy continue to raise apprehensions for scholars.

**Who Should Learn Historical Empathy**

Scholars debate whether or not elementary aged students have the ability to fully engage in historical empathy (e.g., Cunningham, 2009; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; Schwartz, 2017). Some students get drawn into presentism—deeming people in the past as ignorant and life as monotonous (Brophy & Alleman, 2006). One study on students’ understandings of historical empathy raised concern about children’s abilities to develop sensitivities, appreciations, and understandings of the complexities of human actions in historical situations (Endacott, 2010). Many students tend to explain historical actions by providing reasons not supported by primary and secondary sources. Students often account for historical agents’ actions by considering how they would act or respond in the given historical situation. Frequently, the historical world makes little sense to young students, and they tend to view history as foreign and removed (Brooks, 2009). As time passes historical events grow further away from the present day and students’ understandings of life in the past. Therefore, for students in primary grades to learn history, an intentional effort to understand how they conceptualize historical thinking, more specifically historical empathy, must be undertaken. Educators must keep in mind that children’s historical
thinking and understandings do not equate to those of historians and experts in the field (Dulberg, 2002).

Historical empathy requires students to make sense of human behaviors, apply historical contextualization to practices that might appear irrational today, and seek affective connection to understand historical agents’ actions (Lee & Shemilt, 2011). Studying some historical agents, like Adolf Hitler, and historical events, like the Holocaust, generates concern when teaching historical empathy due to the complexities of perspective taking when views of historical agents and events appear immoral. This dilemma provides reasons for why some scholars debate the teachings of historical empathy in classrooms, especially at the elementary level. Manfra (2017) notes that most studies exhibit trepidation with “whether students can move beyond mere perspective taking” (p. 148). This concern invites pause. According to Endacott and Brooks (2013), perspective taking among students represents only one of the three components of historical empathy. Whether or not students can move beyond perspective taking remains unknown since little research exists to uncover if younger students can engage in all three components of historical empathy and then determine whether or not they can grasp the concept of historical empathy. If one aim of historical empathy includes teaching students multiple perspectives on events in history, then providing opportunities for students to engage in source analysis accomplishes part of the goal. However, perspective taking only delineates one part of truly engaging students in historical empathy.

When to Teach Historical Empathy

Teaching historical empathy requires instructional time, support and training for teachers, understanding students of diverse backgrounds, and means of assessment. Teachers serve as facilitators when teaching historical empathy, and many lack preparation for this endeavor.
A specific need also exists for teachers to understand how to develop their own historical empathy before cultivating it in students of diverse backgrounds. Academically and ethnically diverse students enter classrooms on a variety of different empathetic levels; teachers need training opportunities to develop best teaching practices for historical empathy with diverse populations (Akinyele, 2017). If students’ success with historical empathy depends on teachers’ effectiveness as facilitators (Jensen, 2008; McBee, 1996), then teaching historical empathy necessitates professional development for teachers. In elementary education, a lack of empirical research exists on how students learn and how teachers teach historical empathy. This quandary adds to the complexity of how to incorporate historical empathy in classrooms.

The recognition of different levels of empathy might seem appropriate when considering how to teach historical empathy, yet it raises problems for examining and assessing empathy in children (Portal, 1990). Due to the fact that people possess different levels of empathy (Paciello, Fida, Cerniglia, Tramontano, & Cole, 2013), teachers must recognize the depth of students’ perceptions of others vary. VanSledright (2013) reminds teachers that “We cannot see learning or cognition take place in the mind; all we can see at present are their proxies” (p. 336). The abstractness of measuring and assessing historical empathy appears complex, especially when confusion exists over the mere meaning of the term. Yet, some concepts “are so intrinsically meritorious that they are worth the risk of some instructional investment” (Popham, 2013, p. 97). If teaching historical empathy provides students with a richer understanding of the past, even though it offers no absolute truths (Yeager et al., 1998), the pitfalls for society may be greater than neglecting to teach historical empathy at all.
Gaps in Research

Numerous studies regarding children’s understandings of historical empathy in social studies education exist; however, much of the research focuses on students in secondary education. Studies examine whether or not students in secondary education appear capable of engaging in historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection with regard to historical empathy. Results of these studies often address instructional practices for how teachers should teach historical empathy (e.g., Kohlmeier, 2006). By contrast, studies concerning elementary school students’ understandings of historical empathy in the classroom comprise a small body of research. Without understanding the value of teaching historical empathy at a young age in order to develop an understanding of the past and present, scholars have no foundation upon which to collaborate with students and teachers. Similarly, without awareness of the struggles, resistance, and pitfalls with the implementation of teaching historical empathy to young children, scholars cannot serve to improve teacher education programs or professional development that attempt to cultivate liberating educators. The aforementioned gaps in research showcase a limited understanding of how elementary aged students understand historical empathy. Sam Wineburg (2001) believes, “At its heart, historical understanding is an interdisciplinary enterprise, and nothing less than a multidisciplinary approach will approximate its complexity” (p. 52). Thus, using the theoretical conceptualization with a dual-dimensional approach to teaching historical empathy remains necessary if educational researchers aim to provide a holistic picture of how students develop and comprehend historical empathy.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Methodology Overview

The current sociopolitical climate begs the question of whether or not empathy exists in our society and how to cultivate a sense of empathy in the future. Documentation of teaching historical empathy in elementary schools remains sparse; therefore, educators and scholars lack understanding of how students make sense of historical empathy. Current studies suggest that when students engage in the process of historical empathy, they possess an opportunity to consider historical agents’ lived experiences and deepen their comprehension of both self and others (Dulberg, 2002; Endacott, 2009; VanSledright, 2001). In this qualitative research study, the researcher sought to examine how elementary school children express their understandings of historical empathy by conducting semi-structured interviews with focus groups and individual students. Specifically, the researcher was interested in exploring the extent to which their descriptions fit the characteristics of historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection as defined in the literature.

Researcher Perspective and Positionality

When selecting a research design and approach, a researcher must contemplate whether the method chosen aligns with the researcher’s worldview, personality, and skills (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Crotty (2015) encourages researchers developing a research proposal to consider all methods, methodologies, purposes, intended outcomes, and consider appropriate theoretical perspectives, and epistemological beliefs to best fit the researcher’s purpose. In order to inquire into the thinking of elementary children, the researcher used a qualitative approach to her study that allowed for intentional questioning, discourse, and follow-up interviews as themes emerged.
in students’ understandings of historical empathy. Constructionism represented the researcher's theoretical perspective, which according to Michael Crotty (2015), constructionism signifies a “view that all knowledge, and therefore, all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context” (p. 42).

The researcher agrees that meanings are constructed rather than discovered. Applying this same line of reasoning, when students interact with primary and secondary sources, they construct meanings. The meanings, in turn, provide a deeper understanding of how students engage in dialogue (Rock et al., 2006) to learn historical empathy and how they express their understandings of empathy. Constructionism—more specifically social constructionism—indicates that individuals construct meaning from their worlds and these meanings are influenced by many other factors, such as institutions (Crotty, 2015). The researcher believes students construct meanings and each of these meanings bears connections with meanings already present in their worlds, such as the American ideals grounded in a free market economy.

Throughout the research process, social scientists frequently interact with participants. The likelihood that researchers might influence the methodology or findings of a study exist. In qualitative research, the researcher must remain impartial and avoid interfering with data collection. The researcher’s experiences working in public elementary schools, the current sociopolitical climate, and the perceived inability for the public to debate issues of the past and present without conflict encouraged the researcher to consider how elementary students discuss empathy, more specifically—historical empathy. Qualitative research sets researchers up as key instruments in the data collection process (Bourke, 2014). The researcher recognizes her positionality as a white southern female and former elementary educator, and that the setting of
the research study took place in an elementary school. As Brian Bourke (2014) notes, “Identities of both researcher and participants have the potential to impact the research process” (p. 1). The researcher’s prior experience in the field of education possessed the potential to shape the research process; using the researcher’s biases to serve as checkpoints along the way proved beneficial in gaining new insights to research in the field (Bourke, 2014). The researcher recognizes her minimal experience in the work of qualitative inquiry. As a novice, time in the field remains far from an expert level researcher; therefore, following guidelines and protocol procedures developed by adept and experienced colleagues in qualitative research served as a primary scaffold to the investigative process.

**Qualitative Case Study**

This qualitative research study answers the following research question:

How do elementary school children talk about Japanese-American internment and their understandings of historical empathy and its characteristics and components (historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection)?

Qualitative methods represented the most appropriate methodology for this research since the goal lies in discovering how younger students discuss their understandings of historical empathy. A qualitative approach allowed the researcher to probe students’ specific understandings, ask for clarifications when needed, and engage students in the process of historical empathy to comprehend how students made sense of each of the characteristics and components of historical empathy. Through qualitative inquiry, the researcher employed an “interpretative, naturalistic approach” in order to “make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms [of] the meanings people bring to them” (Creswell, 2013, p. 44). More specifically, this study investigated historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection made by elementary aged
students when introduced to a puzzling or paradoxical situation. This case study employed a four-part model for engaging students in a historical investigation while also eliciting student feedback and metacognitive reflections through think-aloud prompts. The aim was to provide a more genuine opportunity for students to engage in historical thinking and, in turn, enable the researcher to interpret their processes, understandings, and development of historical empathy. The researcher specifically planned to answer whether students’ descriptions fit the characteristics of historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection as defined in the literature.

By using qualitative research to investigate how students understand historical thinking and historical empathy in elementary schools (see Figure 3.1), data collected helped provide new perspectives, spark dialogue and debate, and suggest ideas for evidence-based practice that can lead to societal change (Major & Savin-Baden, 2010). This research study followed an instrumental case study design to gather information that describes everyday practices and generates understanding about these new practices (Freebody, 2003; Grandy, 2010). This study primarily relied on data collected through semi-structured focus groups (see Appendix A) and individual semi-structured interviews (see Appendix B). Both protocols included open-ended questions allowing students more freedom in their responses. Using a combination of focus group interviews and individual semi-structured interviews granted an opportunity to hear the voices, experiences, and interpretations of elementary students’ understandings of knowledge construction. These understandings provided insight about how students conceptualize historical empathy in classrooms.
A case study approach allows investigators to provide a holistic perspective of the issue under study (Yin, 2009). This instrumental case study analyzed the experiences of students to better comprehend the issue of their beliefs and expressed understandings of historical empathy. It remained bound by time, in that the researcher planned to spend four weeks collecting data, and by place, in that the participants attended one urban school in the southeastern United States. This method enabled the researcher to understand these cases well. Themes drawn from this data could provide a reference in driving future research to develop scholars’ understandings of how children make sense of historical empathy and could provide a foundation on which to build further research that investigates models for teaching historical empathy to elementary aged children. Therefore, a qualitative instrumental case study best suited this research as it created an opportunity to identify more details and insights into how students talk about their understandings of historical empathy.
Data Collection

Participants and Context

In this research study, the researcher limited the sample size to 16 participants (see Table 3.1) with an intent to “...provide ample opportunity to identify themes of the cases as well as conduct cross-case theme analysis” (Creswell, 2013, p. 157) without diminishing the depth with which the researcher approached each individual (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The researcher employed convenience sampling—selecting participants due to convenience, accessibility, and proximity to the researcher (Creswell, 2008) and attempted to ensure a balance between race, gender, and academic levels. Students in the study included those with special needs in an attempt to understand multiple perspectives of students who learn at different academic levels and access knowledge differently. No exclusion criteria for the participants existed in this study.

All participants engaged in three focus groups, sessions containing five or six participants each. Of the 16 focus group participants, three students also took part in individual semi-structured interviews selected through convenience sampling methods (see Table 3.1). Interview protocols included initial interviews with focus groups and individual participants in order to develop rapport between the researcher and human subjects. Due to the series of interviews, the potential for attrition represented a factor of concern; however, this did not pose an issue for the researcher. Each focus group participated in three rounds of interviews, and three individual participants engaged in one additional round of interviews. The focus groups required three rounds due to the expected length of the task that took place during a round. The researcher transcribed interviews by hand and used a priori and a posteriori codes to categorize data. Throughout the study, the researcher took appropriate steps to secure credibility and trustworthiness and applied them in the final stages.
Table 3.1. Participant Profiles. Description of participant profiles using pseudonyms for confidentiality purposes. Participants with an asterisk indicate participation in focus groups and semi-structured interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group One</td>
<td>Ashton</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elijah*</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Two</td>
<td>Faith*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabby</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huck</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamar</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Three</td>
<td>Kane*</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landyn</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maya</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second and third graders served as the population selected for this study for a couple of reasons. First, the decreased number of standardized assessments conducted on second grade students in the school district lends teachers and students increased flexibility in instructional time dedicated to social studies. Additionally, studying second and third graders’ views on historical empathy addressed an under researched population of students since the majority of studies on historical empathy focus on middle or secondary education.

After gaining IRB approval, the researcher emailed administrators (see Appendix C) at potential research sites who serve as the gatekeepers to their students. The researcher obtained access to email addresses for principals from a public domain. After one principal granted permission for his second and third graders to participate in the research study, the researcher narrowed the focus to one school. Then the researcher drew interest for the study through a flyer
The flyer needed the administrator’s approval before the principal advertised the opportunity to parents via email and hard copies of the flyers. After receiving an email from interested parents, the researcher sent a confirmation email to parents (see Appendix E). The email to parent(s)/guardian(s) included an explanation of the study, confirmed interests, and addressed consent and assent forms.

**Focus Groups**

Focus groups represent an opportunity for dynamic group discussions and serve as a method for data collection (Barbour, 2014; Morgan & Hoffman, 2018). The structure of the focus groups aimed to engage students in the process of historical thinking to understand their experiences when learning about historical empathy. In order to structure the focus group protocols on historical empathy, the researcher developed a four phase approach (see Table 3.2) adapted from Jason Endacott and Christina Pelekanos (2015). The four components used include the introduction phase, investigation phase, display phase, and reflection phase. During the introduction phase, students gained familiarity with the historical period or historical agents under consideration. The investigation phase exposed students to primary and secondary sources to gain historical and social context. The display phase provided students an opportunity to discuss the understandings they developed during the investigation phase, and the reflection phase focused on students making connections between the past and present. Each phase included think-aloud prompts—a process where participants are encouraged to describe their thinking verbally in an attempt to provide evidence supporting the topic under investigation. The researched also encouraged students to record their thinking through written expression.
Table 3.2. Structural Phases for Focus Groups. Flow for focus groups with each phase corresponding to an instructional purpose. Adapted from “Slaves, Women, and War! Engaging Middle School Students in Historical Empathy for Enduring Understanding” by J. L. Endacott and C. Pelekanos, 2015, The Social Studies, 106, p. 2. Copyright 2015 by Taylor & Francis Ltd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Instructional purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Introduce students to a historical situation and the historical figures under examination (United States after Pearl Harbor; Japanese-Americans affected by Executive Order 9066).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Examine primary and secondary source material to develop a deeper understanding of the historical and social context of the United States, the historical perspectives of Japanese-Americans, and relevant affective considerations that may influence their thoughts and actions. This phase works in conjunction with the display phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Provide an opportunity for students to demonstrate their historical understandings of the puzzling and/or paradoxical situation through think-alouds, which work in conjunction with the investigation phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Help students make connections between the past and the present while considering how their personal views may change as a result of engaging in historical empathy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas Endacott and Pelekanos conducted a whole class investigative approach, with seventh graders, to teaching historical empathy, the researcher chose to make small groups of second and third grade participants and add additional scaffolds, such as guiding questions and opportunities to take notes as other participants share their thoughts. In the adapted protocol, the investigation phase and display phase work in conjunction with one another rather than as separate stages of the process. By allowing students to participate in both the investigation and display phases during a single meeting, less time lapsed between the two phases, thus aiding the researcher in collecting data that demonstrated understanding of historical empathy related to a single source when working with younger children.
**Content selection.** Careful consideration of content remained necessary for the design of this study. In order to select appropriate content, the researcher relied heavily on state social studies curriculum standards for second and third grade, the grade levels under study. Within the domain of history, these standards assert that students must understand how various sources provide information about the past. Furthermore, they require students to compare multiple interpretations and perspectives of the same era through the use of primary and secondary source materials. The researcher selected the time period 1942 to 1945, after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 authorizing evacuation procedures of persons posing a threat to national security from the West Coast military areas to relocation centers further inland. As a result of this order, military personnel relocated thousands of Japanese-Americans to internment camps built by the United States military. Living conditions endured by Japanese-Americans during this episode represent a puzzling and/or paradoxical situation, which served as an effective method for engaging students in historical empathy (Bryant & Clark, 2006; Foster, 2001).

The selected sources for the focus group included seven photographs (see Appendices F, G, H, and I), two letters (see Appendices J and K), two oral histories (see Appendices L and M), and a children’s book, *The Bracelet* by Yoshiko Uchida. Using children’s literature, which includes picture books, to teach social studies, can offer students a variety of perspectives that might prove difficult to grasp when young students engage with primary source texts. Picture books can thus add depth to social studies topics, present complex or sensitive topics in developmentally appropriate ways, and pique the curiosity of students (Farris & Fuhler, 1994); hence the selection of *The Bracelet* to introduce students to the historical situation. The order of sources remains significant when introducing students to historical situations. Using *The
Bracelet, narrated from the perspective of a child, enabled students to connect immediately with the character based on age, and to consider the historical situation from a unique point of entry. Selecting this period of American history and providing primary and secondary sources aimed at capturing the attention of elementary students, who may not initially seek to understand the multiple perspectives represented, affords opportunities for students to enter the process of historical empathy and the researcher to study those processes.

**Think-alouds.** During the introduction, investigation, display, and reflection phases of focus group interviews (see Appendix A) and individual semi-structured interviews (see Appendix B), the researcher prompted participants to share their understandings and learning processes through think-aloud prompts. “Think-alouds” make-up one tool researchers can use to make more visible or explicit different levels or layers of student thinking (Davey, 1983). The researcher strategically planned for opportunities to model and encourage think-alouds to build group understanding through the discourse of group deliberations (Davey, 1983; VanSledright & Kelly, 1996). After the researcher modeled the think-aloud strategy, students applied it to describe visualizations, share prior knowledge, or question information for clarification (Davey, 1983). The process of a concurrent think-aloud protocol often leads participants to more questions, develop inferences, and discuss points of confusion (Harvey & Goudvis, 2017), which the researcher then used to further probe during the think-aloud process.

**Procedures.** The researcher worked with one administrator to identify participants for the study. Data collection procedures for this study involved facilitating three focus groups consecutively, transcribing focus group data, and conducting three one-on-one semi-structured interviews. Each focus group met three times, whereas individuals participated in a single interview (see Table 3.3). The initial focus group meeting with participants enabled the
researcher to learn more about the students as well as establish rapport. The focus groups took place in the elementary school environment as it served as a naturalistic setting for the participants. The researcher used an audio recording device for each meeting for the purpose of transcription and coding. The planned meeting time for each group occurred after the school day. Each meeting lasted approximately 30 minutes, and the researcher completed one round of focus group meetings within one week.

For this study, two focus groups consisted of five participants and one focus group consisted of six participants. Each focus group met on three separate occasions over the course of three weeks. Focus group one completed three meetings with the researcher in order to complete the four structural phases for focus groups (see Table 3.3). The researcher served as a facilitator and data collection instrument throughout the process. The first five minutes of every meeting remained dedicated to building rapport with students, acquiring permission to audio record the discussion, and allowing students to ask any questions related to their participation. The second and third meetings included time for students to revisit the content from previous meetings.

In the initial meeting, the researcher implemented the focus group protocol (see Appendix A). Meeting one involved getting acquainted with the participants and an introductory phase where participants listened to *The Bracelet*, a children’s book by Yoshiko Uchida. The book launched background information and began to familiarize students with the historical time and events referenced in the study. *The Bracelet* served as a secondary source to give a child’s perspective to Japanese-American internment camps. The researcher read the book aloud to students and then returned to the book to read the story and model the think-aloud approach. The researcher stopped and called students’ attention to specific illustrations and texts most pertinent in developing contextual understanding. To conclude the first meeting, students engaged in a
think-aloud to share their own wonderings, observations, and questions about the text, historical figures, and historical era introduced.

**Table 3.3. Timeline for Data Collection Procedures.** Timeline for the data collection process and procedures for focus groups and semi-structured interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of procedures</th>
<th>Type of procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Week 1, Meeting 1: Getting Acquainted and Introduction Phase (approximately 30 minutes)</td>
<td>● Focus Group 1 (Day 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Focus Group 2 (Day 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Focus Group 3 (Day 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Appendix A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Week 2, Meeting 2: Investigation and Display Phase Part I (approximately 30 minutes)</td>
<td>● Focus Group 1 (Day 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Focus Group 2 (Day 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Focus Group 3 (Day 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Appendix A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Week 3, Meeting 3: Investigation and Display Phase Part II and Reflection Phase (approximately 30 minutes)</td>
<td>● Focus Group 1 (Day 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Focus Group 2 (Day 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Focus Group 3 (Day 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Appendix A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Week 4, Semi-Structured Interviews: Getting Reacquainted and Think-Aloud (approximately 30 minutes)</td>
<td>● Student from Focus Group 1 (Day 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Student from Focus Group 2 (Day 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Student from Focus Group 3 (Day 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Appendix B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting two followed the focus group protocol (see Appendix A) and students engaged in the investigation and display phases. During the interview, students examined four images (see Appendices F, G, H, and I) taken from Japanese-American internment camps to develop historical contextualization. As the small group of students took time to examine one image at a time, the facilitator again modeled think-aloud and wonderings about the images. The protocol embedded an outline of specific items to direct students’ attention to historical contextualization in each image. The researcher afforded each student the opportunity to write notes while other
students shared thoughts and wonderings and responded to the researcher’s specific questions that direct students’ thinking toward historical contextualization (see Appendix A). The researcher continued to model the think-aloud process after an initial read aloud of one letter written by a Japanese-American (see Appendix J) for the purpose of encouraging students’ processes in perspective taking. After modeling the think-aloud, the group participated in another opportunity to share observations and responses to targeted questions aimed to gather additional data aligned with the purpose of the study. The researcher replicated the process with two oral histories (see Appendices K and L). The researcher played each sound clip aloud for the group. The facilitator and students alike participated in think-aloud strategies that demonstrated student understanding of historical contextualization. The oral history think-alouds served as the conclusion for meeting two. Data collection for both the investigate and display phases for the group continued into meeting three when affective connection and the final reflection phase took place.

The final meeting followed focus group protocol for round three (see Appendix A). Students participated in the final investigation and display phase by analyzing an apology letter from former President George H. W. Bush (see Appendix K) regarding the effects of Executive Order 9066 on Japanese-Americans. The researcher presented a copy of the text to students to follow along while reading the letter aloud. The researcher provided highlighters to students. As participants listened and read, the researcher encouraged students to highlight clues that tell them why former President George H. W. Bush made the decision to write the letter on behalf of the nation. After modeling the think-aloud process during the read aloud, students shared the clues they found in the text, why they believed the president made the decision, and made connections to explain if they believe others would make the same decision. To conclude focus group
meeting three, the facilitator led students in a structured reflection using two questions. Students shared how their thinking evolved over the course of the three meetings with the focus group and how the participation process may affect each student moving forward. The researcher repeated the same process for focus groups two and three. After data collection, the researcher transcribed focus group interviews. The data collected from focus groups informed follow-up questions and activities in the following focus groups and semi-structured interviews with individual students.

**Individual Interviews**

In addition to focus groups, the researcher selected three participants from the focus groups, one from each, to participate in one-on-one semi-structured interviews. Individual interviews allowed the researcher to go into more depth and gather more details on topics that emerged in the group interviews. The researcher used purposeful sampling based on three participants from the focus group meetings. The researcher considered who might advance the topic under study. Combining focus groups with interviews served to strengthen the study since interviews allow for individual perspectives (Morgan, 1997). In semi-structured interviewing, researchers use guides and/or probes for questions and topics. The style of these interviews relied on a conversational structure, which enabled the researcher to delve deeply into topics and focus more thoroughly on participants’ responses (Harrell & Bradley, 2009). In order to craft the interview protocols, the researcher drew on previous studies regarding historical empathy in classrooms (e.g., Brooks, 2011; Bryant & Clark, 2006; Doppen, 2000; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; VanSledright & Kelly, 1996). Michael Patton (2015) specifically details qualitative interviewing as a method of data collection. He asserts qualitative interviewing, on the part of the researcher, involves study and practice, and addresses the critical need for rapport, neutrality, and cultivating a level of trust during the interview process. Martin Forsey (2012) argues for the
importance of interviews in qualitative research and points out his belief that “interviews are arguably the most used instrument in qualitative research” (p. 364).

In order to develop questions for the individual interviews the researcher combed through studies on historical empathy to find specific inquiries related to historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection. Furthermore, the researcher used the content of the questions to develop her own protocol questions. During the interview, students examined primary source material, on the same topic investigated in the focus groups, to develop a deeper understanding of the historical and social context of the United States, the historical perspectives of Japanese-Americans, and relevant affective considerations that potentially influence their thoughts and actions. These interviews also utilized think-alouds to serve as an opportunity for the student to demonstrate his or her historical understandings of the puzzling and/or paradoxical situation. During individual interviews, the researcher continued to implement the four phase approach used to outline focus group discussions (Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015). The interviewer briefly guided the student through the introductory phase by revisiting previous knowledge and experiences from the focus group activities before facilitating conversation through modeled think-aloud in the investigation and display phases. Every interview concluded in the reflective phase to draw the participant back to the process of developing historical empathy.

The opportunity to create relationships and rapport with participants remained exclusive to qualitative research. Jane Elliott (2012) describes rapport with interviewees as an opportunity to show interest in people’s experiences, a desire to empower participants, and a means to develop an awareness of the researcher as a narrator. Through the holistic approach of qualitative inquiry, researchers study and make sense of phenomena, gain insight, answer questions, and focus on cultural and contextual factors (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007). The researcher asked
participants questions that probed for metacognition. By hearing participants’ stories, the researcher possessed the rare opportunity to enter the participant’s world, discover how participants construct meaning, and discover what they deem significant (Mears, 2009). Building relationships with people different from themselves enables others to engage in open dialogue and seek to understand how people make sense of the world (Maxwell, 2004).

**Content selection.** Like the focus group meetings, the one-on-one semi-structured interviews required careful consideration of content selection. The same second and third grade social studies standards remained in use for the individual interviews. In order to understand how students made sense of historical empathy on a deeper level, the researcher chose to use the same time period 1942 to 1945, after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. From prior participation in the focus group rounds, participants possessed some understanding of the historical situation under investigation. With this in mind, the researcher spent less time building content knowledge and more time focusing on how individuals expressed their understandings of historical empathy.

The selected sources for the individual interviews included three images (see Appendices O, P, and Q) and one letter (see Appendices N). The three images displayed various aspects of life in the Japanese-American internment camps. For example, one image depicted an evacuee resting in his barracks room (see Appendix P). The letter used in the individual interviews provided students with a perspective written by the Assistant to the Attorney General, James H. Rowe, Jr. written on February 2, 1943 to the President’s private secretary, Grace Tully. Rowe expressed his sentiment toward Executive Order 9066 (see Appendix N).

**Procedures.** After focus groups concluded, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with three of the sixteen students. The researcher completed all three semi-structured interviews in one week (see Table 3.4). She served as a facilitator and data collection instrument
throughout the process and during meetings with each participant. The researcher implemented the semi-structured interview protocol (see Appendix B). The themes and questions that arose during data analysis of focus group discourse influenced the content of individualized interviews and the researcher adjusted the protocol as necessary. Each student interview involved getting reacquainted with the participant and the think-aloud phases when participants listened to Yoshiko Uchida’s children’s book, *The Bracelet*, and participated in affective connection by interacting with a letter of apology from former President George H. W. Bush. The reflection on the two activities served as the interviewer and interviewee participating in the introduction phase of the interview protocol (see Appendix B).

During the same meeting, the interviewer facilitated conversation to guide the student through the investigative and display phases, where the participant once again engaged in think-aloud processes. The content selected for the interview included four primary sources: one letter written by a Caucasian-American man expressing opposition to internment camps (Appendix N) and three images (Appendices O, P, and Q). The interviewer modeled the think-aloud process for each source, pointing out predetermined characteristics, and encouraged the student’s engagement in think-aloud to collect additional data as the student thought and talked about the characteristics of developing historical empathy. The reflection phase concluded each individual interview by revisiting the reflection questions posed at the end of each focus group: did your thinking change on how you treat people different from you? How did your thinking change? And, how does this affect what you think about the decisions people make today? The researcher repeated the same process for interviews two and three. After data collection, the researcher transcribed all interviews.
Data Analysis

Just as the researcher served as a key figure in data collection, the same applied to data analysis. Qualitative researchers widely recognize data analysis as customized for the particular interests of a study and based on intuitions, perceptions, and impressions (Dey, 1995). Therefore, the researcher approached the data through the use of cross case analysis, which best fit the goal of the research. Cross case analysis allows researchers to analyze data across cases and identify similarities and differences providing a better understanding of the issue and an awareness of the relationships within the data (Yin, 1984). Matthew Miles and Michael Huberman (1994) draw researchers’ attention to the importance of qualitative data analysis in the early stages of a study. One argument for this approach relies on the value of bringing the researcher back and forth between the incoming or current data and previously extant data. Miles and Huberman (1994) theorize that weaving oneself in and out of data during the collection period represents an ongoing attempt to improve the process. Multiple methods exist to aid researchers in early data analysis. In this study, the research intended to name methods, analyze problems, write brief descriptions, consider variations, solicit advice, allot chunks of time, and supplement analysis methods (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Procedures

First, the researcher transcribed each interview by hand in order to engage deeply and repeatedly with the information allowing the researcher to absorb all the details and understand the narrative as a whole (Agar, 1980). Following each focus group meeting and individual interview, the researcher transcribed and analyzed the data; this allowed the researcher to adjust the protocols as needed. The researcher determined whether or not to provide additional scaffolding, alter think-alouds, adjust questions, and modify time allotted for interviews. Next,
the researcher developed a priori codes from theory and literature and broke them into three main categories established by the research question—historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection. As the researcher worked through the data to categorize participants quotes with relevant codes, she also allowed for “emergent” categories when a reason or problem did not fit a preexisting code in order to avoid limiting the findings and to support the participants’ voices (Crabtree & Miller, 1992, p. 151). After labeling all the data with the appropriate codes, the researcher established themes to classify data into categories or “...broad units of information that consist of several codes aggregated to form a common idea” (Creswell, 2013, p. 186). These themes allowed the researcher to organize the data by combining similar codes and identifying patterns that existed across the participants’ stories (see Figure 3.2).

[Diagram: Process for Data Analysis]

**Figure 3.2. Process for Data Analysis.** This figure outlines the process used by the researcher for data analysis.

For the purpose of analyzing focus group data, the researcher looked beneath the surface of conversations to search for troublesome or rich exchanges. When analyzing focus group meetings, the researcher highlighted themes and big pictures that emerged from small details and pieces of data (Barbour, 2014). This step resulted in four primary level codes: historical contextualization, perspective taking, affective connection, and metacognitive strategies. Metacognitive strategies served as the only emergent code in the first round of coding. Miles and Huberman (1994) draw attention to making sense of data through a meaning making process.
Specifically, the authors recommend noting patterns or themes, seeing plausibility, clustering, making metaphors, counting, and making comparisons and contrasts within data. After sifting through the primary codes, the researcher organized the data into 12 additional categories within the four primary codes (see Figure 3.3).

![Figure 3.3. Descriptive Coding Process.](image)

As the researcher worked through the data and attempted to make meaning, she adhered to the argument, made by Miles and Huberman (1994), to see data with an abstract lens and note relationships between variables and find intervening variables. This step led the researcher to develop a third level of coding to establish the relationships between codes. Seven additional codes emerged from the data. One final round of coding took place when three codes emerged...
from students’ discussions of perspective taking that included attitudes related to fear, reflection, and sadness. The researcher will further define, explain, and provide examples of each code in the following chapter. Once these steps took place, the researcher built a logical chain of evidence to make conceptual and theoretical coherence of the coded data. At that time, drawing and verifying conclusions represented a gradual process (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

**Verification**

Researchers must consider measures to ensure trustworthiness and credibility in any study. The researcher established trustworthiness during each phase of thematic analysis (see Table 3.4). To address these concepts, the researcher utilized descriptive validity, interpretive validity, and theoretical validity since they serve as necessary components in establishing credibility in qualitative research (Johnson, 1997). To establish descriptive validity, the researcher transcribed each interview, then listened to the interview to check for accuracy in each transcription, and adjusted the transcriptions as needed. Memoing as well as writing thick and rich descriptions to describe the field setting and participants represent another measure taken to prompt descriptive validity; this allows researchers to convey patterns of human behavior (Erlandson et al., 1993; Stake, 2010). Interpretive validity aims to hold the researcher accountable when deriving meaning from participants (Johnson, 1997); therefore, the researcher used a group of inservice educators as a validation group since the age of the participants may not allow for the maximal potential found in member checking. The validation group read the transcripts and questioned any concerns. For example, the group had the opportunity to determine whether or not the researcher lacked enough evidence to make an interpretation based off the given transcripts.
Experts agree that collecting data in a natural setting, familiar to the research participants, remains critical to the validity of any qualitative research (Anderson & Shattuck, 2012; Creswell, 2013). Thus, the setting for focus groups and individual interviews took place in a familiar classroom. To increase the reliability of the case study research and guide the researcher in carrying out data collection, the researcher implemented protocols (Yin, 2009). Each time the researcher met with focus groups or interviewees, she followed proper protocol procedures. Finally, the researcher prepared a subjectivity/positionality statement to interrogate her biases with relation to the research topic (Merriam, 1988).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases of Thematic Analysis</th>
<th>Means of Establishing Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phase 1: Familiarizing yourself with your data | Prolong engagement with data  
Document theoretical and reflective thoughts  
Document thoughts about potential codes/themes  
Store raw data in well-organized archives  
Keep records of all data field notes, transcripts, and reflexive journals |
| Phase 2: Generating initial codes | Inservice teacher debriefings  
Reflexive journaling  
Use of a coding framework  
Audit trail of code generation  
Documentation of all inservice teacher debriefings |
| Phase 3: Searching for themes | Diagramming to make sense of theme connections  
Keep detailed notes about development and hierarchies of concepts and themes |
| Phase 4: Reviewing themes | Themes and subthemes vetted by inservice teachers  
Test for referential adequacy by returning to raw data |
**Table 3.4 (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases of Thematic Analysis</th>
<th>Means of Establishing Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phase 5: Defining and naming themes | Inservice teacher debriefings  
Consensus on themes  
Documentation of inservice teacher meetings regarding themes  
Documentation of theme naming |
| Phase 6: Producing the report | Inservice teacher debriefing  
Describing process of coding and analysis in sufficient details  
Thick descriptions of context  
Description of the audit trail  
Report on reasons for theoretical, methodological, and analytical choices throughout the entire study |

**Ethical Considerations**

As researchers in education examine social studies in classrooms, they must realize that children exist as social individuals and the socializations of children create learning opportunities for researchers. Educational researchers must explore children’s abilities, interests, and habits; researchers must interpret data in order to understand how children make meaning of their world (Dewey, 1897/2013). The use of qualitative research with children presents researchers with both opportunities and dilemmas. As with any research participant, some children experience discomfort when interviewed by adults. Therefore, the balance or imbalance of power needs careful consideration. Methods, methodology, and data collection enable researchers to create ways for children’s voices to provide insight into their experiences and better understand children's learning environments (Eder & Fingerson, 2003). Researchers need knowledge of memory-work and an awareness of participants’ abilities to distinguish between the past, present, and future in order to explore relationships in social sciences (McLeod & Thomson, 2009).
All participants of focus groups and interviews maintain strict confidentiality by having both names and identifying characteristics eliminated from reported data during and after the study. All data collected included pseudonyms with ascending code numbers in the order of initial interviews and/or focus groups. In the circumstance of working with elementary aged students, consent from parents/guardians (see Appendix R) and assent from students (see Appendix S) remained necessary to inform adults and minors about the study. In consenting to participate in the study, all students and adults understood that the design of the study acknowledged minimal risk to participants, and that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated during research represented one no greater than any encountered during the performance of routine tests or daily life. The research stayed in compliance with the protection of human subjects as described by the IRB (APA, 2016). Consent forms required participants to acknowledge the nature of the study and that participation remained voluntarily and could end at any time without questions from the researcher.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

Findings from this qualitative research case study describe how elementary students conceptualized the components of historical empathy—historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection to make meaning of the selected content material. Themes that emerged from the categories answer the following research questions for this study:

1.) How do elementary school children talk about and discuss their understandings of Japanese-American internment and historical empathy as a concept?
   a.) How do elementary school students apply historical contextualization to the content?
   b.) How do elementary school students engage in perspective taking with regard to the content?
   c.) What discussions, if any, reflect students’ ideas about affective connection to the selected content material?

The first three themes—the role of historical contextualization, the role of perspective taking, and the role of affective connection—describe students’ understandings of Japanese-American internment and the components of historical empathy. The fourth and final theme, the role of metacognitive strategies, showcases metacognitive strategies utilized by students to discuss their comprehension of the content, Japanese-American internment, and components that comprise historical empathy (see Figure 4.1).
Figure 4.1. Themes Utilized to Understand Historical Empathy. This figure represents the four themes present in this study of historical empathy.

**Theme One: The Role of Historical Contextualization**

The role of historical contextualization represents one theme present in the findings of this study. All participants applied historical contextualization to their understandings of Japanese-American internment. To commence the initial round of focus groups, the researcher asked students questions about their familiarity with World War II, the bombing of Pearl Harbor, and Japanese-American internment. The elementary student participants in this study exhibited varying levels of prior knowledge about events related to World War II and the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Of the 16 participants, all exhibited some knowledge of World War II and 10 of the 16 shared some prior exposure to the bombing of Pearl Harbor event. Among the participants, not a single student reported prior knowledge about Japanese-American internment. Throughout the study, there was evidence to suggest that participants applied historical contextualization to their understandings of the selected content. The next section defines, describes, and provides examples of each category related to the role of historical contextualization in historical empathy.
Defining Historical Contextualization

Evidence of students engaging in historical contextualization included times when participants provided comments or thoughts about the time period under investigation as well as knowledge of events leading up to the historical situation and other relevant events happening concurrently (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Four categories, two a priori and two emergent, comprise this theme (see Figure 4.2). The Japanese bombing of “Pearl Harbor” was identified as a sub-theme defined as participants’ reference to Pearl Harbor as a prerequisite event to Japanese-American internment. For example, Brandon commented, “America, at first, they didn’t want to join the World War, but then it was forced to after the Japanese did an attack on Pearl Harbor. They wanted to get revenge and so they joined the war” (interview, February 25, 2019). Here he indicated his understanding of the cause and effect relationship between the bombing of Pearl Harbor and Japanese-American internment. “Geography”, another sub-theme for historical contextualization, designated participants’ sense of place with regard to location, the West Coast, and Hawaii. Elijah provided an example when he claimed, “Hawaii is in the ocean and off the West Coast. Japanese-Americans were living in California when the bombing happened. That’s not the same place” (interview, March 4, 2019). This demonstrates an example of using geography to understand the time period under investigation.

Two sub-themes, “camps” and “apology letter,” served as categories for participants to exemplify further their understandings of Japanese-American internment related to historical contextualization. Camps refers to participants’ descriptions or thoughts about the physical state of the internment camps and the camps as a connection to the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Kane provided a brief example of camps when he stated, “President FDR sent them [Japanese-Americans] to the camps” (interview, March 14, 2019). The second emergent category, apology
letter, only shows up in the semi-structured interviews. The apology letter describes participants' references and thinking about a formal apology letter written to Japanese-American internees by George H. W. Bush in 1991. Faith’s inquiry, “They’re apologizing for taking the Japanese-Americans and moving them, right?” (interview, March 19, 2019) emphasizes the knowledge of other relevant events, such as the apology letter, to conceptualize the role of historical contextualization as it relates to the concept of historical empathy. In the following sections, the researcher will discuss the role of historical contextualization in focus groups and semi-structured interview settings to uncover how participants made sense of this component of historical empathy.

**Figure 4.2. Categories Representing Historical Contextualization.** This figure represents the four categories that derived from participants’ application of historical contextualization to Japanese-American internment.

**Historical Contextualization Sub-Themes**

When participants applied the knowledge they gained, through the lens of historical contextualization to understand the selected content, all three focus groups utilized three of the four categories: the bombing of Pearl Harbor, geography, and camps (see Table 4.1). Participants in the semi-structured interviews did not reference geography as a category when making sense of the event under study. These categories served as a foundation for students building their content knowledge of Japanese-American internment. Participants in the semi-structured interviews referenced the apology letter written by George H. W. Bush as an avenue when
applying historical contextualization to their understandings of Japanese-American internment, whereas students in focus groups referenced the apology letter when applying their knowledge to other components of historical empathy. Students in the focus groups relied heavily on content knowledge gained from The Bracelet, primary source images, and oral histories. Participants in the semi-structured interviews applied content knowledge gained from The Bracelet, primary source images, and oral histories to deepen their understanding of Japanese-American internment.

**Table 4.1. Codes Within Historical Contextualization.** PH=Pearl Harbor; G=Geography; C=Camps; AL=Apology Letter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>Pearl Harbor: referring to the bombing of Pearl Harbor as a prerequisite event to Japanese-American internment</td>
<td>America, at first, they didn’t want to join the World War, but then it was forced to after the Japanese did an attack on Pearl Harbor. They wanted to get revenge and so they joined the war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Geography: describing a physical location or making sense of a physical location</td>
<td>Hawaii is in the ocean and off the West Coast. Japanese-Americans were living in California when the bombing happened. That’s not the same place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Camps: discussing the physical state of Japanese-American internment camps and the camps as a result of the bombing of Pearl Harbor</td>
<td>President FDR sent them [Japanese-Americans] to the camps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Apology Letter: referencing the formal letter of apology written by former President George H. W. Bush to Japanese-American internees</td>
<td>They’re apologizing for taking the Japanese-Americans and moving them, right?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pearl Harbor.** When referencing the Japanese bombing of the American naval base at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii (referred to as Pearl Harbor), students contextualized Japanese-American internment as the application of prior knowledge and new knowledge. During the first meeting of
one focus group discussion, Jamar shared his prior knowledge of World War II and the bombing of Pearl Harbor by stating:

World War II started after Japan blew up Pearl Harbor. Pearl Harbor was a place with a lot of ships and then Japan came because their leader started bombing everything. The Japanese on the side of their jets had Japan signals. They destroyed attacking planes before they got to them. (interview, February 26, 2019)

Similarly, Brandon called on prior knowledge and made connections from previous learning to conclude:

I do know the Japanese were silent and sneaky and even though America wasn’t in the war, they wanted them in the war so they bombed them. In World War like Pearl Harbor, I do know a true story about a boy, I forget his name, but it’s part of the *I Survived* books where things happened to real characters. I forgot the name of the book, but he survived the attack because he knew how to drive a car and he escaped. (interview, February 25, 2019)

The majority of students relied on information learned from *The Bracelet* and primary sources to develop knowledge of the events at Pearl Harbor. At the start of each of the three focus group meetings, the researcher prompted students to share information they knew or learned from the previous week about World War II, Pearl Harbor, and Japanese-American internment. During the second round of focus groups, the researcher asked students to recall and reflect on the discussion from the previous week. Ashton recalled:

Japan attacked the United States at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, Military Base. The United States thought that Japan may be hiding spies in the United States so they sent all the
Japanese on the West Coast to these camps because they saw them as a threat. She’s [the main character of *The Bracelet*] Japanese-American. (interview, March 4, 2019)

Another example of a student using information from the prior week emerged when Kane concluded:

The bombing of Pearl Harbor is when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor and the U.S. was defeated so the President of that time had to declare war on Japan. He told everyone that was living at the West Coast to leave their homes because they were Japanese-Americans. (interview, March 7, 2019)

Several students participating in focus groups cited Pearl Harbor as the reason for Japanese-American internment. Throughout the three weeks of focus group meetings, students continued to recall factual information about Pearl Harbor and Japanese-American internment. Other participants used both prior and new knowledge about the time period to make connections, draw conclusions, and make sense of new information. At the launch of one of the focus group’s second meetings, Gabby applied both synthesis and analysis to her understanding of Japanese-American internment while using historical contextualization to conclude:

The Japanese were the people who bombed Pearl Harbor. Japanese-Americans are part Japanese, so they had to go to the camp because even though they’re loyal to America, they [Americans] thought that because people are Japanese, they’re part of what happened. We learned that Japanese-Americans weren’t treated fairly just because people who were living in Japan came over and attacked Pearl Harbor, so they [the government] took all the Japanese-Americans even though they are loyal to America. (interview, March 12, 2019)

At the commencement of the same focus group meeting Jamar recounted what he learned from
the previous week by voicing, “That they [Japanese-Americans] had to be sent to a camp, which they were prisoned there for six years because of Japan exploding Pearl Harbor in some jet” (interview, March 12, 2019).

In a separate focus group, Elijah declared that the United States imprisoned Japanese-American “because after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the Americans weren’t sure if they [Japanese-Americans] were spies or not so they decided to put them in the internment camps” (interview, March 11, 2019). Every student participating in the focus group discussions recalled and applied factual knowledge about Pearl Harbor and subsequent consequences for Japanese-Americans. Students, via prior knowledge and making sense of new knowledge, demonstrated comprehension of Pearl Harbor as a prerequisite event to the internment of Japanese-Americans.

Three participants, one student from each focus group, Kane, Faith and Elijah, participated in individual semi-structured interviews to examine and respond to four additional primary sources: three images (see Appendices O, P, and Q) and a letter of apology from President George H. W. Bush sent to Japanese-American internees (see Appendix M). As Kane processed the timeline of events beginning with the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, he referenced that day to contextualize the letter of apology from former President George H. W. Bush by saying:

What he was saying is he made the wrong choice in sending those Japanese-Americans to internment camps because they weren’t the ones who attacked Pearl Harbor. It was the Japanese Navy, so he realized that the government did something wrong. He wanted to apologize to the Japanese-Americans and free them. Of course, the government did something wrong. They just imprisoned innocent Japanese-Americans. Of course, they [Japanese-Americans] didn’t start the war. (interview, March 21, 2019)
**Geography.** Geography represents the second sub-theme of historical contextualization identified in the first theme—the role of historical contextualization. Participants only used references to this particular sub-theme during the first meeting of each focus group discussion. No references to the physical location of Pearl Harbor, California, the West Coast, and Allied or Axis countries participating in World War II exist during focus group meetings two and three. Students did not refer to geography during semi-structured interviews. In the initial focus group meeting only one student referenced geography when sharing his prior knowledge of the content. Ashton knew “it was the allied powers which include America, France, Canada I think and Great Britain against the axis power which the most known axis powers are Italy, Japan, and Germany” (interview, February 25, 2019). Both Elijah and Brandon mentioned geography as they reflected on what they learned from *The Bracelet* and applied it to the discussion of Japanese-Americans. When the researcher asked for thoughts on why America sent Japanese-Americans to internment camps, Elijah relied on his knowledge of geography and declared, “They [Japanese-American] were Americans and they probably weren’t even at the Harbor” (interview, March 4, 2019). Suddenly Brandon interjected, “They weren’t even in Hawaii” (interview, March 4, 2019). These three students used their understanding of location to develop make sense of the content and apply their thinking about historical contextualization as a component of historical empathy.

**Camps.** The sub-theme camps signified participants’ discussions about the physical state of the internment camps or camps as a connection to the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Students applied historical contextualization to the content in order to make sense of the historical situation. In response to the mentor text, *The Bracelet*, and primary sources—*Supper Time!* (see Appendix I) and *Life in Camp* (see Appendix L), students gained an understanding of conditions that Japanese-Americans experienced in the internment camps. During focus group discussions,
students processed the conditions of the camps by starting with concrete details and then producing more complex observations and analysis. During the initial questioning on what participants learned about internment camps, Elijah stated, “they [Japanese-Americans] are staying in a horse stable” (interview, February 25, 2019), and Dakota elaborated, “Japanese-Americans were put into internment camps...it’s [internment camp] dirty with bugs” (interview, February 25, 2019). In a separate focus group meeting, Philip recalled, “because they were Japanese-Americans. They all had to go to a camp” (interview, March 7, 2019). When the researcher asked participants to share what they had learned the previous week, Ashton noted, “we’ve been talking about the Japanese internment and last time, we saw notes and pictures of letters of people doing stuff in internment camps and what they wrote to each other” (interview, March 11, 2019). These examples contextualize students’ comprehension of camp life at a concrete level.

As each focus group progressed and students expounded upon their peers’ recollections of content, their references to internment camps demonstrated higher levels of thinking. Participants thinking continued to progress in complexity as they analyzed and synthesized the content. Isabella recounted “a family that didn’t do anything had to be sent to a prison camp because they are Japanese-Americans” (interview, March 5, 2019), and Huck remembered a “dad went to a Japanese prison camp because he worked for a Japanese-owned company” (interview, March 5, 2019). When thinking aloud about Life in Camp (see Appendix L), Huck also understood that “they [Japanese-Americans] were there for six years, I think. They were there from 1941-1947, so six years” (interview, March 5, 2019). In summarizing his learning from the image Supper Time! (see Appendix I) as well as a book he brought from home about the bombing of Pearl Harbor and Japanese-American internment, Kane explained to the group,
“there were ten different internment camps scattered in isolated areas of the West, each housed about ten thousand people,” (interview, March 7, 2019) which created an opportunity for focus group participants to contextualize the historical situation.

Participants referenced different source materials when making sense of the historical situation. In focus group meeting two, Omar expounded on the main character of *The Bracelet* and her experiences in the story when he recalled:

They were Japanese, Japanese-American. There was this girl and her sister and they had to go [to the camps] and they had done nothing. Her best friend gave her a bracelet and they went to the waiting section [for camp]. They saw the soldiers with guns and said, “Are they going to shoot us?” I don’t know. They went to the truck and they said ‘stupid soldiers.’ When they arrived, there were bugs in their cabin. Her friend helped them go in there and there were bugs. (interview, March 7, 2019)

Students gathered information from the mentor text, secondary source, to build their understanding of the historical situation specifically regarding what Japanese-Americans experienced in the internment camps. Participants also relied on information they gleaned from oral histories to build their understanding of the internment camps. Gabby reflected on Life in Camp (see Appendix L) when she explained:

That reminds me of my earlier thoughts when we were talking about this, I said they’re probably there [at the internment camp] for three months. Now, we know that they’re probably there for over two years, at least. (interview, March 5, 2019)

The sixteen participants developed both a concrete and conceptual understanding of the physical state of Japanese-American internment camps and the camps as a connection to the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Kane referenced the internment camps as he processed a letter written by Assistant
to the Attorney General (see Appendix N). Specifically, Kane made a connection to the internment camps when he announced “1942, that was the exact same date when they [Japanese-Americans] were captured and sent to the internment camps” (interview, March 21, 2019). Similarly, Faith also noted the date on the letter as the time period when Japanese-Americans experienced internment camps (interview, March 19, 2019). These two examples further exemplify participants’ connections to internment camps as a result of Pearl Harbor and contribute to the depth of applying historical contextualization to make sense of the historical situation.

**Apology letter.** The final sub-theme of historical contextualization of the historical situation emerged from the apology letter to Japanese-American internees, an artifact only shared during semi-structured interviews. All three students believed former President George H. W. Bush rightly sent a letter of apology to Japanese-American internees. Faith felt:

> I think they’re trying to admit what they did was wrong because that’s really the best way to say sorry by admitting your wrongs to do the right. It’s [the letter] very sincere, I can tell. It’s an apology from the country, so it means this was a big mistake that they made. They’re trying to fix it as much as they can. (interview, March 19, 2019)

Similarly, Kane stated that he felt the former President “meant it, but it was a late apology” (interview, March 18, 2019), and Elijah stated that the former President did the “right thing” by sending a letter to the victims (interview, March 21, 2019).

**Theme Two: The Role of Perspective Taking**

Student participants in this study seemed to engage in perspective taking to make sense of the selected content materials and the historical situation of Japanese-American internment. Students participated in perspective taking when they interacted with mentor text, *The Bracelet,*
primary source images, oral histories, a letter from a Japanese-American internee, a letter of apology from George H. W. Bush, and a letter written by the Assistant to the Attorney General, James H. Rowe, Jr. When partaking in perspective taking, all 16 participants discussed responses to the mentor text, 15 of the 16 participants referred to primary source images, nine of the 16 cited the oral histories, and 12 of the 16 noted one of the three letters. Throughout the focus group meetings and semi-structured interviews, students joined in perspective taking to conceptualize their understandings of Japanese-American internment. The following section defines, describes, and provides examples of each category related to theme two—the role of perspective taking in historical empathy.

**Defining Perspective Taking**

Perspective taking signified times when participants provided responses that demonstrated an understanding of another’s prior lived experiences, attitudes, and positions in order to understand how a person might think about the historical situation in question (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Here students demonstrated perspective taking when they discussed living experiences, such as gratitude, and when students took positions - judging something to be unjust, reflecting, identifying feelings of fear or sadness, or expressing concern over the treatment of people. This particular theme necessitated a multiple sub-themes: fear, sadness, and treatment which emerged from within lived experiences and attitudes (see Figure 4.3). These results comprise theme two—the role of perspective taking in historical empathy.

“Gratitude” represents the first sub-theme in perspective taking and refers to the students’ noting instances when the historical subjects potentially felt gratitude and/or they might have felt that emotion in the same situation. When thinking aloud about an image, *Pickle Barrel* (see Appendix F), Elijah’s comment, “He looks so happy. Maybe if the water’s hot, he might be
grateful for that, that they gave him water,” (interview, March 4, 2019) illustrates gratitude as part of a lived experience for Japanese-American internees. The category of fear emerged as a part of lived experiences and attitudes. “Fear” denotes participants’ remarks when assessing the perspectives of Japanese-American internees with regard to worry, anxiety, and stress. When questioned how Japanese-Americans might feel about internment camps, Landyn responded, “Scared, because they’re going to go to prison because they were Japanese-American” (interview, February 28, 2019). This demonstrates an example of identifying fear as a perspective experienced by Japanese-Americans during internment. The emergent sub-theme “sadness,” signifies participants’ discussions when evaluating the perspectives of Japanese-American internees specifically with references to feeling sad, lonely, or depressed. Chloe interpreted the perspective of Emi, the main character of the mentor text, *The Bracelet*, when she claimed that Emi felt “sad, because she is having to leave her home and she might not want to and sad for her family” (interview, February 25, 2019) exemplifying sadness as a perspective experienced by Japanese-Americans during internment.

![Figure 4.3. Categories Representing Perspective Taking](image)

**Figure 4.3. Categories Representing Perspective Taking.** This figure represents the two first level codes: lived experience and position, four second level codes: gratitude, attitude, unjust, and reflecting, and three third level codes: fear, sadness, and treatment that derived from participants participation in perspective taking with regard to Japanese-American internment.
Furthermore, treatment, unjust, and reflecting represent three more sub-themes in the role of perspective taking. “Treatment” indicates students’ dialogue when considering the perspectives of Japanese-Americans on the treatment and conditions inside internment camps. Jamar analyzed an image, *Pickle Barrel* (see Appendix F), and pondered aloud, “He may be in some place where only one person can take a bath at a time and they have to use the same water” (interview, March 5, 2019), which serves an example of perspective taking on the treatment and conditions of Japanese-Americans inside the internment camps. Another sub-theme, “unjust,” defines participants’ commentary as times when Japanese-Americans felt they experienced wrongdoings and other historical figures expressed regret. Huck provides an example of this category when he announced, “I think he [George H. W. Bush] wrote this [letter of apology] because it might be a sorry letter. The innocent Japanese-Americans didn’t have anything to do with the bombing, but they got sent to the camp” (interview, March 12, 2019), which takes on the perspective of a former president who expresses regret for the actions taken against the Japanese-Americans during World War II. The sixth and final sub-theme, “reflecting,” symbolizes moments when participants considered the perspectives of Japanese-Americans’ lives before the internment camps and during or after the internment camps. To capture an example of reflecting on the perspectives of Japanese-Americans’ lives before the internment camps, Faith explained, “I know I mentioned anxiety before, but the further I read into the book, I realized more confidence and the more they [the family in the book] believed in their hearts and in their family and friendship and the things they left behind” (interview, February 26, 2019). In the following sections, the researcher will discuss the role of perspective taking in focus groups and semi-structured interviews to unveil how participants conceptualized this component of historical empathy.
Perspective Taking Sub-Themes

All students engaged in perspective taking to understand the selected content. The focus group participants contributed to each of the six categories: gratitude, fear, sadness, treatment, unjust, and reflection (see Table 4.2). When participants engaged in perspective taking during focus groups, they typically used sources that enabled them to identify with a character, Emi in *The Bracelet*, or a historical agent like someone writing one of the three letters. Oral histories and primary source images also served as avenues for students to engage in perspective taking as a component of historical empathy. Gratitude only emerged as a category in the focus group data. When interview participants engaged in perspective taking, they relied on all four additional sources: a letter written by the Assistant to the Attorney General (see Appendix N), *Camp Sign* (see Appendix O), *Evacuee Resting* (see Appendix P), and *Dinner is Served* (see Appendix Q) to conceptualize their understandings of Japanese-American internment.

Table 4.2. Codes Within Perspective Taking. LE=Lived Experience; G=Gratitude; A=Attitude; F=Fear; S=Sadness; T=Treatment; P=Position; U=Unjust; R=Reflecting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LE: G</td>
<td>Lived Experiences: Gratitude: describing a sense of thankfulness in light of the historical situation</td>
<td><em>He looks so happy. Maybe if the water’s hot, he might be grateful for that, that they gave him water.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE: A: F</td>
<td>Lived Experiences: Attitude: Fear: discussing perspectives related to worry, anxiety, and stress</td>
<td><em>Scared, because they’re going to go to prison because they were Japanese-American.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE: A: S</td>
<td>Lived Experiences: Attitude: Sadness: discussing perspectives related feeling sad, lonely, or depressed</td>
<td><em>Sad, because she is having to leave her home and she might not want to and sad for her family.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE: A: T</td>
<td>Lived Experiences: Attitude: Treatment: describing the treatment and conditions Japanese-Americans experienced inside internment camps</td>
<td><em>He may be in some place where only one person can take a bath at a time and they have to use the same water.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 4.2 (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P: U</strong></td>
<td>Position: Unjust: defining the historical situation as unjust or wrong and identifying points where historical figures expressed regret</td>
<td><em>I think he [George H. W. Bush] wrote this [letter of apology] because it might be a sorry letter. The innocent Japanese-Americans didn’t have anything to do with the bombing, but they got sent to the camp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P: R</strong></td>
<td>Position: Reflecting: discussing perspectives of Japanese-Americans’ lives before the internment camps and during or after the internment camps</td>
<td><em>I know I mentioned anxiety before, but the further I read into the book, I realized more confidence and the more they [the family in the book] believed in their hearts and in their family and friendship and the things they left behind.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gratitude.** As students in focus groups learned from the mentor text, *The Bracelet*, images, oral histories, and letters, all participants engaged in perspective taking with regard to the content. Unexpectedly, the sub-theme of gratitude surfaced as three students identified with the image *Pickle Barrel* (see Appendix F). Omar’s illustrated gratitude when he expressed:

> He is in a barrel and there’s water. It’s a pickle barrel but he doesn’t care because there’s water in there and the pickles have been dumped out. He’s glad that he can take a bath in something because they don’t have any bath tubs in this camp. In some jails and prisons, a bathroom where you take a shower is even worse, like in public... (interview, March, 7, 2019)

Despite the conditions of the internment camp, Omar identified the man’s gratitude for the opportunity to bathe. Gabby noted that “people took baths different and got clean differently. I think that he’s smiling because it feels good to just get in warm water” (interview, March 5, 2019). Similarly, Isabella inferred that the man in the image appears “smiling because he’s
thankful because he knows it could have been worse. So, he’s thankful that it’s not worse” (interview, March 5, 2019). The sub-theme gratitude did not emerge again during the semi-structured interviews.

Fear. When students engaged in perspective taking to understand the characters in the mentor text, *The Bracelet*, fear emerged as a sub-theme. Students identified fear as an underlying emotion when Japanese-Americans in *The Bracelet* left their homes and experienced life in internment camps. Faith imagined characters “feeling a lot of anxiety from not knowing what’s going to happen next” (interview, February 25, 2019). Both Chloe and Ashton focused on families’ arrival at the camp and daily life at the camp. They expressed thoughts about Japanese-Americans’ feelings of fear toward the armed guards. Ashton practiced perspective taking when he noted, “when they [Emi’s family] arrived they’re gonna be scared because they will see the tall guard towers and barbed wire. I can tell they’re [the family] mad because what her [Emi’s] sister said” (interview, February 25, 2019). Chloe asserted that Japanese-Americans “may be experiencing bad things like depression. They might be scared because if they do something bad they might get shot” (interview, February 25, 2019). Elijah identified a sense of fear on the part of Japanese-Americans when he referenced an oral history, *Life in Camp* (see Appendix L). He claimed, “maybe he [the Japanese-American] was feeling nervous. He wasn’t sure what was going to happen” (interview, March 4, 2019).

In semi-structured interviews Elijah, Faith, and Kane continued to identify the emotion of fear while processing and reacting to primary sources including a letter written by the Assistant to the Attorney General, James H. Rowe, Jr. (see Appendix N) and *Dinner is Served* (see Appendix Q). In analyzing the letter, the participants noted the fear from the author, the public, and the Japanese-Americans. Participants identified these lived experiences as warranting
anxiety pertaining to government officials and worry regarding how the American public perceived internment camps. Elijah commented, “I think the guy who is writing the letter is a little bit worried. But, he’s kind of pressured… He's probably worried, but not for the Japanese-Americans, just worried that the situation is going to explode” (interview, March 18, 2019).

Throughout the reading of the letter, the researcher prompted (see Appendix B) students to explore and contemplate the meaning of the text. Faith deconstructed the meaning the author’s words, specifically when she stated:

It [the word explode] could mean building up because when something explodes it gets bigger and bigger and bigger. That probably means that it’s [the situation with the Japanese-Americans] getting bigger and bigger and bigger until it becomes a big mess.

The problem with the Japanese-Americans is getting bigger. (interview, March 19, 2019)

Indirectly, Faith identified the Assistant to the Attorney General’s anxiety concerning potential repercussions faced by former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. She continued to explore the problem penned in the letter and possible solutions offered as the writer’s fear of public pressure mounted. She shared:

I think he’s [the writer] meaning that the citizens that live there [the United States] are going to be in great shock and that it will cause a panic. I think they’re [the government] too focused on the problem and they just want to get them [the Japanese-Americans] out quickly. They [the government] don’t really care about anything else at that moment. They [the government] want to figure out how to get them [Japanese-Americans] out as soon as possible. (interview, March 19, 2019)

Kane analyzed the text from the letter when he shared that “no one seems to worry about how or where” the Japanese-Americans live in internment camps. As he shared his thoughts aloud, Kane
recognized anxiety and fear in the author’s tone and perceived fear in the Japanese-Americans when he identified key phrases and inferred their meaning saying:

The Japanese-Americans don’t know [the government’s plan] so they’re probably relaxing until they have to move. They’re [Japanese-Americans] starting to get more pressure on them and starting to worry that they’ll be sent out of here [the United States] or saying, “Are we going to go back to Japan?” Plus, the feelings that we would have another Supreme Court fight on our hands. The Supreme Court will now tell the President that maybe there’s going to be a fight with the Japanese-Americans. They will try to attack the President, knock out the men, get their weapons, and head for D.C. So, the Supreme Court is doing something to keep the Japanese-Americans from doing that.

(interview, March 21, 2019)

To conclude the semi-structured interview protocol (see Appendix B) the researcher introduced Dinner is Served (see Appendix Q) to all participants. Fear, as a sub-theme, emerged as Faith and Elijah took the perspective of the child in the image. Faith focused on one of the rules she observed in Camp Sign (see Appendix O):

He’s [the child] probably following the rule, “Children under 8 years old must be escorted by a parent or responsible adult.” He must know that his mother has told him to stay with her, and follow her around so he wouldn’t get lost because it says that there is 125,000 of them [Japanese-Americans]. That mother probably wouldn’t want her child getting lost. (interview, March 19, 2019)

Elijah took a few moments to evaluate Dinner is Served (see Appendix Q) and make observations before sharing his thoughts. Eventually, Elijah concluded, “maybe he [the child] is scared because maybe you can’t see it or something. Maybe there’s a military police person or
someone is getting in trouble because they broke a rule on accident” (interview, March 18, 2019). The interviewed participants continually identified the underlying anxiety felt by both Japanese-American internees and government officials.

**Sadness.** Ten of the 16 participants identified sadness as they engaged in perspective taking to understand the content portrayed in *The Bracelet, Bidding Goodbye* (see Appendix H), *Supper Time!* (see Appendix I), and *Life in Camp* (see Appendix L). After hearing the story of Emi’s family in *The Bracelet* and seeing the image *Bidding Goodbye* (see Appendix H), the majority of students focused on the feelings surrounding people leaving their homes, possessions, and friends behind. Nora stated that the main character in the book felt “sad and lonely because she liked her house and she probably is going to miss it” (interview, February 28, 2019). Isabella concurred saying the character, Emi, felt “sadness because she didn’t want to leave her old home” (interview, February 26, 2019). Elijah reflected on the book sharing, “most of the parts were sad. Since they were getting sent to the camps, it wasn’t really what they wanted so it was sad for them to experience it” (interview, March 4, 2019). Philip stated, “they’re sad that they’re going on a bus to a camp jail and she [Emi] looked at her sister and her sister tried not to cry” (interview, February 28, 2019). Omar engaged in perspective taking when he stated his understanding of how Emi felt:

Sad and unfair because they’re at war and because Japan did something the President didn’t like. He thinks all Japanese-Americans need to go to prison camps and he sent her [Emi’s] dad away. She is so sad that he [her dad] left and it wasn't fair. They did nothing wrong, but they [the government] think they’re a threat. (interview, February 28, 2019)

The focus group participants agreed that Japanese-Americans felt sadness when considering the image *Bidding Goodbye* (see Appendix H). Dakota observed that the people in the image “are
sad going on there [the train] to go to the internment camps. They’re saying goodbye to friends and family” (interview, March 4, 2019). Brandon agreed and stated, “I think they are saying goodbye. They are not happy that they have to go to internment camps. So, they are unhappy when they are saying goodbye” (interview, March 4, 2019). When Landyn analyzed the perspectives of the Japanese-Americans in the image he declared, “they’re probably so many people [Japanese-Americans] and they’re probably so sad. They’re trying to get to their families” (interview, March 7, 2019). Ashton remained the sole participant who focused on Japanese-Americans expressing sadness after arriving at camp and he took that perspective when analyzing the image *Supper Time!* (see Appendix I). He said the people at the camp “may get sad again because they’re in internment camps so they probably won’t be fed very good” (interview, March 4, 2019). Regardless of the source, all participants agreed that the Japanese-Americans felt sad, among other emotions, at being forced to leave their homes and families and move into the internment camps.

The researcher presented interviewees with *Camp Sign* (see Appendix O) which details the expected rules Japanese-Americans needed to follow while in internment camps and the consequences for non-observance. Elijah and Kane responded to the image by expressing that the Japanese-Americans internees might feel sadness when reading the posted expectations. Elijah worried Japanese-Americans felt “... unwanted. They weren’t wanted because the military police may be being a little controlled because they were frustrated. They felt controlled” (interview, March 18, 2019). In a separate interview, Kane expressed concern over how the Japanese-Americans felt after seeing the sign. When asked what the Japanese-Americans might think or feel he said:
“Woah! We can’t do all those [rules]! The restrictions, we can’t do all those! These guys are strict! We have to help prevent fire hazards. Why don’t the Americans do that? Huh?” They are furious about these rules and probably sad that they can’t go see birds and animals, no swimming! (interview, March 21, 2019)

**Treatment.** The sub-theme identified as treatment describes the treatment and conditions Japanese-Americans experienced inside the internment camps. Students perceptions of the conditions experienced varied from disbelief and sadness concerning the treatment of Japanese-Americans to some more optimistic interpretations. The sub-theme treatment emerged during focus group discussions surrounding almost every source presented to the groups including the images *Pickle Barrel* (see Appendix F) and *Supper Time!* (see Appendix I), the primary source letter *Louise Ogawa to Miss Breed* (see Appendix J), the mentor text *The Bracelet*, and the oral history *Departure for Camp* (see Appendix K). During the second meeting of the focus group, the researcher introduced students to the image *Pickle Barrel* (see Appendix F) and when she asked for participants’ thoughts, Ashton, in disbelief, shared:

> I think maybe when they first saw it, they were disgusted and were like, “What are we supposed to do with this? It’s a pickle barrel, an empty pickle barrel, what do you want us to do with it? Stand in it?” They probably found out that they had to take a bath in it, they were like, “Really? You’re going to make us take a bath in a pickle barrel?” Not to mention it’s wood, so children if they splash around in it, they could rub up against the sides and get splinters which would really hurt. They were like, “Come on, a pickle barrel!” (interview, March 4, 2019)

The same student expressed concern of the treatment of people at the camp when introduced to the image *Supper Time!* (see Appendix I). Ashton mused, “I think that’s the line for dinner. If
they have to wait, this line is long, so if they have to wait that long for food, they’d be starving!” (interview, March 4, 2019). During a subsequent focus group, two participants echoed similar interpretations when Philip remarked, “Maybe they’re all lining up because they all want to eat because they’re probably very hungry,” and Maya replied “They must be really starving” (interview March 7, 2019).

Students continued to express concern about the treatment of Japanese-Americans based on details included in The Bracelet related to the conditions that Emi’s family endured. Ashton reflected on the treatment of Emi’s family by sharing:

I think she’s mad at the U.S. government for making her move out of her home and into this camp, internment camp, where they weren’t treated fairly and nicely and they probably slept on either cots or on the ground. As I said earlier, they are probably mad at the government for forcing them to leave their home and go into this camp that they didn’t know. (interview, February 25, 2019)

Students took time to process their thoughts and continued to engage in perspective taking to understand what Emi’s family experienced in The Bracelet. Jamar listened to his peers and when asked for his thoughts about the text he simply stated, “that’s just mean” (interview, February 26, 2019). Gabby provided a different response as she explained, “they’re [the Japanese-Americans] experiencing hard times and stress. They’re getting blamed for something they didn’t do. Just because they were the same kind of race as them [the Japanese], doesn’t mean they’re not loyal to the country they’re in [the United States]” (interview, February 26, 2019). Regardless of the words or emotions participants used to identify the treatment and conditions of internment camps, the researcher observed non-verbal communication of students nodding their heads and expressing agreement with their peers when Omar summarized that “Emi’s family was
practically in jail and behind bars when they did nothing wrong and they’re innocent. They didn’t do anything wrong” (interview, February 28, 2019).

Focus group discussions continued to evolve around the treatment of Japanese-Americans as students examined the primary sources *Louise Ogawa to Miss Breed* (see Appendix J) and *Departure for Camp* (see Appendix K). The researcher read aloud the letter while encouraging students to consider the emotions and feelings of the author. After considering and recording her thoughts, Faith noticed, “It [the camp] doesn’t seem as bad at some of the camps. She [Louise Ogawa] describes differences and I think one camp was better than the other because they get cots and then they get mattresses. I feel that I would be much more comfy on the mattress” (interview, March 5, 2019). Faith continued, “I think she [Louise Ogawa] was reassuring the reader that their camp there wasn’t so bad, but it did have its…,” “ups and downs,” Jamar finished Faith’s thought (interview, March 5, 2019). Faith concluded that the author of the letter said, “even though her food at the camp sounds good, she still wishes she could eat certain things that were outside the camp” (interview, March 5, 2019). In a later focus group meeting Omar made a similar point saying, “like if they’re [the Japanese-Americans] lucky, every year, every month they stay there, they might get a special meal that is really yummy” (interview, March 7, 2019). Philip participated in perspective taking on the same letter when he considered the conditions of the camps by stating, “I think they’re imagining, like in Heaven, having all that good food” (interview, March 7, 2019). In response to the letter, Gabby shared:

I noticed that she was comparing and contrasting all the camps she went to. Can you think of moving to camp to camp to camp, probably every few months or so? She’s saying that overall, it’s not too bad, it’s okay, she’s going to be okay. She likes it better here than the other camp. (interview, March 5, 2019).
During the second focus group meeting, participants listened to the researcher read an oral history and noted their thoughts about the Japanese-American’s perspective. After hearing the internee’s account of life in the internment camp, Dakota noted the connections by proclaiming, “I would never go to sleep with that [straw mattress] because it would poke you because the ends of the straw. It’s also kind of hard, I think” (interview, March 4, 2019). Gabby shared that the Japanese-Americans probably thought, “what are we going to do with this? They’re probably thinking how are we going to sleep on this thing? But, at least it was a bed, I guess” (interview, March 5, 2019). Ashton indicated that he struggled with the treatment of the Japanese-Americans. He asserted:

I think that that’s just crazy. They had that bad of living conditions. So, they were handed this canvas bag and people told them, “Go find a pile of hay and fill it up and that’s your mattress.” So, they did that and they probably couldn’t go to sleep the first few days because the straw would be poking at their heads, poking at their backs, poking them. It would probably be really itchy. They may be bugs or fleas in there that could get on them and then that would make them even more itchy or maybe a tick. (interview, March 4, 2019)

Maya worried that “it [the canvas bag] must have felt really uncomfortable because they wouldn’t be used to them from home so they had to get these [straw mattresses] full” (interview, March 7, 2019). Students across all focus groups engaged in perspective taking when considering the treatment and conditions of Japanese-Americans inside the internment camps.

As the researcher introduced individual interviewees to Dinner is Served (see Appendix Q), Kane and Elijah focused on the details of the image to infer the perspectives of the people in the images. Kane examined the image and observed:
That’s a long line and there’s three servers there. Everyone is begging for food because they’re so hungry. What are they serving anyway? Right here it looks like rice. There’s this baby right here tugging saying, “I’m hungry! I need food!” “He’s staring at us!” [referring to a guard] (interview, March 21, 2019)

In his interview, Elijah analyzed the same image and expressed worry about the treatment of the Japanese-Americans based on what he observed. He noted:

- It doesn’t look like they’re serving much food and they’re serving it to a lot of people.
- You can only see a few pots and pans. They might be dirty, I’m not really sure. Because of the conditions, it might be dirty. (interview, March 18, 2019)

The three students participating in the semi-structured interviews continued to engage in perspective taking when analyzing *Evacuee Resting* (see Appendix P). Interviewees recognized that “it’s [horse stall] very small. If there’s a family of six, they wouldn’t even be able to fit” (Kane, interview, March 21, 2019). In a separate interview, Faith elaborated and shared her personal experience of sleeping on a cot. She commented:

- I’ve slept in a cot before. It looks like this [horse stall] is where they’d [Japanese-Americans] be sleeping. It looks like they have a little bit more of a covered area than we thought before because it [*The Bracelet*] mentioned sleeping in horse stables. It looks like some of them [Japanese-Americans] were a little bit more fortunate and got little cabins. (interview, March 19, 2019)

As Kane focused on the size of the space and Faith on the physical structure, Elijah drew on prior knowledge from a previous source and worried “he doesn’t have a good mattress. He really doesn’t have a mattress at all. I think there are bugs in there” (interview, March 18, 2019). The
thoughts and feelings of the interviewees continued to express concern for the treatment of the Japanese-Americans as the researcher presented subsequent artifacts.

Each child seemed drawn to the image *Camp Sign* (see Appendix O), which outlined the rules of the internment camps that Japanese-Americans must follow. Reactions ranged from skepticism to disbelief and outrage on behalf of the Japanese-American internees. During individual interviews, the researcher called attention to the rule, “Do not pick fruit.” Elijah interpreted the rule to mean: “I bet it’s because they couldn’t eat when they weren’t supposed to” (interview, March 18, 2019). Faith expressed surprise saying, “It does seem that it’s really restricted. They have high expectations, such as, do not pick fruit. It seems kind of out of the ordinary to have it be a rule, but I bet they had their reasons” (interview, March 19, 2019). Kane expressed outrage when he exclaimed, “That would be starvation! Because fruits may be out of the limited areas so the Japanese-Americans won’t get out” (interview, March 21, 2019). He continued his concern over treatment when he pointed out additional objections to the posted rules when he said:

No trespassing on the farm area? It’s just land! Do not dig or damage trees. Stay within signs of limited area. If there’s a small space, then Japanese-Americans would be smooshed together and there would be no room, so most Japanese-Americans would have to get out and the rest would stay there. But, children under 8 years old must be escorted by a parent or responsible adult? If you’re under 8 years old, then you’re not very responsible for your stuff, so you may go out of the area. You need an adult, so you stay within the limited area. If you don’t, then the adult can grab the child and then go back. No wading or otherwise polluting creek water. Because the Japanese-Americans at least need something to drink, but if the water is polluted then there’s nothing they can drink.
All they can do is eat the food. Time: Gates open between 8am and 6pm. Warning: 7pm to 7am (night) closed by Military Police. Well at least Japanese-Americans don’t get hurt at night. (interview, March 21, 2019)

When the researcher asked Elijah to assess the strictness and reasonableness of the posted rules, he took time to read the rules again and reflect before answering:

When they [the rules] say, “Gates open between 8am and 6pm” and 7pm-7am at night and then it’s closed by the military police is kind of threatening because the military could hurt them. Children under 8 years old must be escorted by a parent or responsible adult because if you were under 8 years old, you might get lost or someone might capture you or something. The sanitation rule with all rubbish, papers, fruit skins, etc. must be in rubbish cans. You might get sick because it’s already so dirty that you might get sick. (interview, March 18, 2019)

Both boys agreed that the rule regarding children being escorted by parents a reasonable request to ensure safety since it serves as a rule they also follow when visiting unfamiliar places. Faith also agreed that, to maintain the sanitation of the camp, an appropriate rule requires rubbish placed in bins; however, she questioned the rule she deemed most strict. She expressed her thoughts by explaining:

I would say “do not dig or damage trees” because I wouldn't expect somebody to dig up a tree. I don’t think they [Japanese-Americans] were given enough tools either, to do anything like that. I think they’re [the government] just trying to have as much power as possible, and trying to keep them within the walls, within this area, within these boundaries. (interview, March 19, 2019)
The sub-theme treatment continued to pervade the interviews as participants shifted to discussing a letter written by the Assistant to the Attorney General. Elijah focused on the writer’s description of the current hostility in California. He interpreted the letter:

The population of all the people in the camps is too much. All the people leaving to go to the internment camps is too much. They can’t hold all the people in the trains. I can remember in the book *The Bracelet* they had to go to the station. It was really crowded and there were so many people and security guards. They had all the security and that only made it more crowded. No one seems to worry about where to put them [Japanese-Americans] or how to put them there because they don’t really care about them. They [the government] think they’re spies from the country [Japan] so they’re feeding information to their side… It’s kind of threatening, like in *The Bracelet*, they had a racetrack and the tall towers and the armed guards, so they [the government] should think about the conditions. (interview, March 18, 2019)

In Elijah’s interpretation, the Assistant to the Attorney General used the word “explode” to describe the number of people in the camps and the assumption that the camps may not hold that many people. Kane listened to the text of the same letter, but interpreted “explode” as referencing the emotions of President Roosevelt. As Kane thought about the wording of the letter he explained:

When it says, “explode any day now” it’s probably about the President because he’s going to get furious about what happened with what Japan did about Pearl Harbor. He’s [FDR] starting to get more furious by the moment so he ordered all Japanese-Americans out of California. Japan attacked Pearl Harbor so there’s no reason for the government to
care about Japanese-Americans being innocent. Innocent because they never did anything wrong, they were just relaxing. (interview, March 21, 2019)

Despite different connotations when explaining the wording in the Assistant to the Attorney General’s letter, both Elijah and Kane took the perspectives, experiences, and attitudes of the writer, the President, and the Japanese-Americans and considered how those perspectives effected the country during the historical situation.

**Unjust.** From the first exposure to internment camp content to the final focus group meeting that analyzed the apology letter written by President George H. W. Bush (see Appendix M), the sub-theme of injustice emerged. Students continued to engage in perspective taking in order to conceptualize Japanese-American internment. In reference to *The Bracelet*, Faith proclaimed, “She [Emi] probably feels like she is being treated harshly and unfairly because she's getting framed for something she didn't do or at least for what she knows. She knows that her family wasn't responsible for it [Pearl Harbor]” (interview, February 26, 2019). The sub-theme unjust continues to emerge when participants engage in perspective taking with other sources. After listening to the apology letter from former President George H. W. Bush’s to Japanese-American families (see Appendix M), Chloe opened the discussion with “I think he [former President George H. W. Bush] felt bad for what was done to the people and he might have thought, ‘What if I was those people? What would I be thinking?’” (interview, March 11, 2019). Brandon also considered the implications of the letter by sharing:

> My thoughts are about the letter. I think why the President did this 45 years after Japanese-Americans were put into internment camps was because he realized that they [the government] were doing injustice instead of justice and they [Japanese-Americans] weren’t spies. How I found this was because right here says, “monetary sum and words
alone cannot restore lost years or erase painful memories; neither can they fully convey our Nation’s resolve to rectify injustice and to uphold the rights of individuals. We can never fully right the wrongs of the past. But we can take a clear stand for justice and recognize that serious injustices were done to Japanese-Americans during World War II.” Justice means you’re doing a good thing and suing the bad people, and injustice means you’re doing a bad thing and suing the wrong people. You are hunting down the wrong people or being rude. (interview, March 11, 2019)

Brandon specifically identified injustice as not only the treatment of the Japanese-Americans, but also pointed to a social injustice against a race of people. Brandon claimed that regardless of the treatment of people in the camps, forcibly moving them based on the assumption of potential wrongdoing constituted an unethical act.

Digging even deeper into the context of the former President George H. W. Bush’s letter, Ashton interpreted:

Because he [the former President] realized what the country did to all those people [Japanese-Americans] and probably was like, “What if someone did that to us and we had to go live in a different place that we didn’t know?” So, he [the former President] found out a way to right what the country has done wrong and he did that. It [the letter] didn’t say that one President helped with the situation because in the context it says on “August 10, 1988, President Ronald Reagan signed HR442 into law. Three years later on October 9, 1991, letters of formal apology and checks from the United States government were issued to each of the living survivors of internment.” So, it took not only one President, but maybe two or more. (interview, March 11, 2019)
Ashton believed that the former President George H. W. Bush considered the perspectives of the Japanese-Americans when he wrote his letter of apology. Ashton then thought aloud and shared his curiosity about what would happen if these same actions occurred against people today, including his own family. As the participants engaged in discourse about the injustices of Japanese-American internment camps and the role of the United States government in apologizing to internees, Gabby applied her learning by sharing:

It [former President George H. W. Bush’s letter] says, “We can never right the wrongs of the past” so he’s saying that no one can change the past and what we did was wrong, but we can change the future and we can change your opinion of what you think of us. We can’t change the past, but we can do it in the future. I would have written a letter because some people don’t think of what it’s like in their footsteps. If you were in their footsteps, you would realize that we should give them an apology because it’s not right. So, I would have written it [the letter] because if I thought of what it would feel like in their footsteps, I think that that’s wrong. It shouldn’t be like this. (interview, March 12, 2019)

Gabby engaged in perspective taking illustrating an example of unjust when she examined the apology letter from former President George H. W. Bush. She pointed out the necessity of an apology to begin rebuilding trust between Japanese-Americans and the United States government. When asked to evaluate the former President’s decision on whether or not the actions taken against Japanese-Americans warranted a letter of apology, Elijah engaged in perspective taking when he responded, “I would have [sent a letter] because they [Japanese-Americans] haven't done anything wrong” (interview, March 11, 2019).
Jamar evaluated the perspectives of multiple stakeholders affected by internment camps. As he processed the question of whether or not the President should write a letter of apology he explained:

I think I would write an apology because if I was born during that War, if I was an adult during that War, if I was Japanese, it would make me feel so scared and sorry if my dad was Japanese and my mom was American. I would feel so bad. I feel so scared if I was all American and my wife and children were Japanese, I would feel so sorry because he [the former President] didn’t know. I think George H. W. Bush was born during World War II. I think a while back when he was a kid, like our age, he’s been thinking, “Wow, that’s so unfair.” And when he grew up and he became President, he just wanted to write that apology for what happened when he was a kid. (interview, March 12, 2019)

Jamar pondered the perspectives and lived experiences of children, adults, parents, and the former President George H. W. Bush. Nora processed the aforementioned question and assessed the perspectives of the former President and Japanese-Americans internees. She shared her thoughts by saying, “I would [send a letter] because it was wrong. It wasn’t their [Japanese-Americans] fault. If it wasn’t their fault, then it’s not nice to put them in jail. It wasn’t their fault. They [Japanese-Americans] never started it” (interview, March 14, 2019). While thinking and processing aloud with the group, Nora concluded that injustice had taken place. Omar nodded while listening to Nora’s thoughts with a confused look before commenting, “They [the government] realized that it [Japanese-American internment] was wrong and that if one Japanese does it [the bombing of Pearl Harbor], it doesn't mean all innocent ones have to do it [go to internment camps] because they weren’t included. They’re just sitting at their homes doing nothing” (interview, March 14, 2019).
After hearing the letter written by the Assistant to the Attorney General, Faith focused on injustice. She reflected on the letter by sharing:

I think the writer is trying to warn the President about the situation and I believe that James [the writer] probably had a good thought on the situation. He’s right that it [internment of Japanese-Americans] was wrong and they [the government] knew that they made a mistake, but I think he [the writer] knew it was going to be a big mistake way before it happened. So, he’s trying to give them a little heads up. This is going to become a problem. We better take care of it. (interview, March 19, 2019)

Faith identified the government’s recognition of the injustice against the Japanese-Americans and inferred the Assistant to the Attorney General’s written letter as an attempt to explore potential solutions to internment camps before the situation “explodes.”

Reflecting. As students responded to new content and continued to engage in perspective taking, another sub-theme, reflecting, emerged. Participants contemplated the lives of Japanese-Americans before they arrived at the internment camps. During the second and third meetings of focus groups, students not only considered the perspectives of the internees while in the camp, but inferred the thoughts of the internees as they experienced day to day life and longed for their former lives. When analyzing Playing Marbles (see Appendix G), participants shared their reflections on the perspectives of the children in the camps, especially considering the games children played and the potential boredom they experienced. Dakota wondered if the children in the image previously played marbles. She stated, “I think it’s kind of hard to play marbles on soil because it’s not smooth,” (interview, March 4, 2019) as if children played on a smooth floor in their homes. In a different focus group Nora and Omar also reflected on ways to pass the time in the internment camp and how children longed for their previous lives. Nora felt:
I think that they’re [the children] bored and they’re trying to find something fun to do because maybe they’re sad and don’t want to be in the camp. So, they [the children] found some different people to make friends with and that’s why they play marbles. (interview, March 7, 2019)

While listening to Nora’s comments, Omar looked thoughtful and processed the perspectives of the children missing their homes, toys, and games. As he took a moment to consider that lens, Omar articulated:

So, they’re [the children] at a prison camp and they don’t want to sit inside. They want to explore and play games. They went outside and they found, because I don’t think they have any marbles, I think they just have rocks. Then they [the children] came to their friends and they suggested to play marbles with rocks. (interview, March 7, 2019)

Omar noted the children at the internment camps remembered playing marbles back home, yet they used rocks at the internment camps to create a similar game and escape the boredom of life without toys.

When responding to Life in Camp (see Appendix L), reflection continued to emerge as a sub-theme throughout the focus group meetings. After listening to an oral history clip describing life in an internment camp, the researcher asked participants to their thoughts on the sound bite. Ashton engaged in perspective taking and disclosed his thoughts on the Japanese-American’s desire to leave the camp when he said:

You would probably get tired of looking at it [the road outside the camp] and then get really mad because you’re like, “I’ve been in here [the internment camp] a long time, just let me out. I am not a bad person. I will not bomb the U.S. I am not a terrorist. Just let me go.” If they [the internees] did say that, they would probably have to go back to what they
were doing, staring out at the highway. You’d wake up and look out and you’d see the same highway with a bunch of buses and cars and you’re like, “I want to go on that [the highway]. One day I’m going to get out of here [the internment camp] and go back on that highway.” (interview, March 4, 2019)

Elaborating on Ashton’s comment about seeing the highway from the camp, Dakota added, “I would go mad because I haven’t been on the highway and I like the breeze when I come out of the car” (interview, March 4, 2019). Similarly, in a different focus group Maya and Landyn reflected on the desire of the internee to leave the camp and return to a previous life. Maya personified the author’s thoughts saying, “They [internees] must have been like ‘man, I wish I could go on that highway, so I wouldn’t have to be at this camp’” (interview, March 7, 2019). Landyn focused on the desire of freedom from the camp when he shared, “...to feel the wind blowing on my face and not just standing here for a very long time. It would be nice to actually be able to sit down” (interview, March 7, 2019).

In response to *Dinner is Served*, Elijah returned to taking the perspective of the Japanese-Americans by reflecting on their former lives prior to the internment camps. He analyzed the image and pondered aloud, “maybe they’re thinking about if they were back home what they would do and thinking about ways they can improve the conditions” (interview, March 18, 2019). By reflecting on the concrete examples presented to the group, second and third grade students demonstrated perspective taking when interacting with the subjects in the mentor text, images, and oral histories to construct their understanding of the historical situation.

**Theme Three: The Role of Affective Connection**

Across the study, students conveyed their thoughts about affective connection when they responded to direct prompts. These prompts focused on how participants’ thinking changed after
studying this historical situation, consideration of the treatment of people who identify as different from the majority, examining how historical agents made decisions, and connecting to the process of decision-making in participants’ daily lives. At some point during the reflection phase of the study, all 16 participants referred back to the historical situation when responding to the researcher’s prompts (see Appendices A and B). Throughout the focus group meetings and semi-structured interviews, students communicated ideas about affective connection to conceptualize their understandings of Japanese-American internment. The subsequent section defines, describes, and provides examples of each category related to theme three—the role of affective connection in historical empathy.

**Defining Affective Connection**

Affective connection indicated times when participants provided comments or thoughts regarding the consideration for how historical figures’ lived experiences, situations, or actions may be influenced by their affective response to a situation based on a connection made to one’s own similar yet different life experiences (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). This theme primarily appears during the reflection phase of the meetings. Two categories, one a priori and one emergent, comprise this theme (see Figure 4.4). “Personal connections” as a sub-theme refers to participants’ responses explaining a connection from their personal lives to the historical situation. When considering the treatment of people who identify as different from the majority, Isabella commented, “You treat people who are different than you with respect and that’s how you treat other people. You treat people how you want to be treated” (interview, March 12, 2019). This serves as an example of a personal connection and belief she holds from her lived experiences. “Expectations” designated students’ thoughts regarding expectations, reactions, or
reflections with respect to the historical situation. Elijah provided an example of expectations when he declared:

If someone acts different than me, if they’re acting bad, I will tell them to stop if it’s something they shouldn’t be doing. If it’s something like this [Japanese-American internment] and they are just doing their regular lives, doing what they’re supposed to do, then I wouldn’t treat them badly unless I didn’t see what they did. I guess, maybe, the government got confused and they weren’t really sure because they hadn’t witnessed it [the bombing of Pearl Harbor]. (interview, March 18, 2019)

In the following sections, the researcher will discuss the role of affective connection in focus groups and semi-structured interviews to construct how participants conceptualized this component of historical empathy.

Figure 4.4. Categories Representing Affective Connection. This figure represents the two categories that evolved from participants’ application of affective connection to Japanese-American internment.

Affective Connection Sub-Topics

When participants constructed ideas about affective connection related to selected content material, all three focus groups contributed responses indicative of personal connections and expectations (see Table 4.3). These sub-themes display instances where students made connections to their personal lives in conjunction with what they learned about the historical situation. Students’ responses signify specific ideas about their expectations, reactions, and reflections related to their beliefs and knowledge about Japanese-American internment. Students
in the focus groups relied heavily on content knowledge gained from the mentor text, *The Bracelet*, and primary sources in order to transfer their learning throughout the reflection phase of this study. All three interview participants referenced personal connections and expectations as a means to understanding Japanese-American internment in response to four additional primary sources (see Table 4.3).

**Table 4.3. Codes Within Affective Connection.** PC=Personal Connections; E=Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Personal Connections: connecting to the historical situation and explaining a connection from their personal lives</td>
<td>You treat people who are different than you with respect and that’s how you treat other people. You treat people how you want to be treated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Expectations: defining expectations, reactions, or reflections with respect to the historical situation</td>
<td>If someone acts different than me, if they’re acting bad, I will tell them to stop if it’s something they shouldn’t be doing. If it’s something like this [Japanese-American internment] and they are just doing their regular lives, doing what they’re supposed to do, then I wouldn’t treat them badly unless I didn’t see what they did. I guess, maybe, the government got confused and they weren’t really sure because they hadn’t witnessed it [the bombing of Pearl Harbor].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal connections.** Throughout focus group interviews students identified connections to historical figures and the historical situation by making a connection to their own similar, yet different, life experiences. After analyzing *Playing Marbles* (see Appendix G), participants thought about what items they would take with them in one suitcase—a connection to text in *The Bracelet*. Responses varied, but followed the underlying theme of meaningful items. Jamar shared that he would take his jerseys and Legos, while Huck chose stuffed animals
Participants readily made personal connections when asked to share a time they apologized to someone. Ashton reflected and shared:

I apologize a lot because sometimes I interrupt people and adults when they’re talking, so I apologize. Or, if I hurt someone, I apologize and make sure they’re okay even if I don’t agree, even if you’re playing a sport and on different sides. Even if I didn’t do it, I say “I’m sorry, are you okay?” or “Can I help you?” (interview, March 11, 2019)

Other participants chimed in to share their own experiences of recognizing their own mistakes and apologizing to others. Nora made a personal connection to a recent incident that happened in her classroom:

I apologized to my friend because she had the same bracelet as me. On the last day of school, she brought her bracelet and I had mine in my desk. Then, I saw it and I said, “That’s my bracelet, can I have it back?” She said, “no.” So, I told the teacher and she had to give it back. Then, she got mine out of my desk and I had to say sorry because I stole her bracelet, but then I gave it back. I thought she did something wrong, but I was wrong. (interview, March 14, 2019)

Omar listened to the experience that Nora shared and connected his own experience to the situation mentioned. He connected his memory to Nora’s and applied its relevance to the apology letter sent to Japanese-Americans when he shared:

One time I did something wrong like Nora. I lost something of mine and I saw someone who had the same exact thing. I said, “That’s mine.” They said, “no, it’s not. I bought it at the same place.” Then, I still had the tag on mine. (interview, March 14, 2019)

The opportunity to create connections started with asking questions (see Appendix A) related to students’ personal experiences. Then the researcher scaffolded students’ understandings of their
own experiences in order to connect to the historical situation. Students drew on past experiences and contemplated how learning about the content might influence their judgement in the future. Responses from the participants varied on whether their thinking and judgement changed over the course of the study and multiple students referred to drawing connections between Japanese-American internment and African-Americans’ fight for civil rights. Isabella referenced unfair treatment of African-Americans as slaves:

Harriet Tubman was treated differently because of her skin color. The white people were disrespectful to people with darker color skin. They made them slaves, which I really hate. Just because they look different. (interview, March 12, 2019)

Huck made the point that Harriet Tubman lived long before Martin Luther King, Jr. but some of the issues remained the same. Huck remembered:

Martin Luther King, Jr. talked about how whites were treated more fairly and brown people had to go to different schools and drink out of certain water fountains and all that. They had to go to different stores than whites. (interview, March 12, 2019)

Isabella also remembered what she learned in her class during Black History month and drew a connection between Japanese-American internment and what she learned about Rosa Parks and resistance to discrimination. Isabella remembered:

Her [Rosa Parks] skin tone was a darker skin tone, so they had to be treated differently just because of that. When she was at the bus, they told her to sit in the back and she didn’t do it. For that, she went to jail. (interview, March 12, 2019)

The researcher followed the focus group protocol (see Appendix A) and asked whether the students’ thinking and judgement changed about how to treat people throughout the study of the historical situation. Nora answered that her thinking did not change. She shared, “I think it did
not change because I knew that it doesn’t matter what skin you are because I have a best friend that speaks Spanish and I still play with her on the playground” (interview, March 14, 2019).

The researcher continued to probe students’ thinking by phrasing questions to allow students the potential to apply their knowledge to current events—whether Americans as individuals or as a whole learned from the mistake of Japanese-American internment. Students’ personal connections ranged from a focus on school experiences with their peers to general ethical decisions. In Omar’s experience he shared, “Sometimes I get treated differently because my hair looks different. People say I have crazy hair and they say, ‘Get that hair away from me.’ It makes me feel sad” (interview, March 14, 2019). Another student, Brandon, pointed to his cochlear implants and remarked:

Do you know these [pointing to his cochlear implants]? A lot of people don’t have them and some people are born deaf, and some are born without arms, or no legs, or one arm, or one leg. I’m treated differently sometimes because people say I can’t even hear anything in the next room, but I can hear about a mile away. (interview, March 11, 2019)

Directly following Brandon’s comments, Ashton shared:

Some people, sometimes even me, misjudge people that may be different… I think just because people do some stuff that I don’t like, I won’t judge them by it or I think someone has done something, I won’t misjudge them and say, “I’m not going to hang around with you anymore because you did something.” (interview, March 11, 2019)

After Ashton shared his own learning, Chloe agreed and applied the same learning to a connection from her teacher. Chloe said, “You should always remember and you should think before you do stuff. ‘Before you speak, think and be smart. It’s hard to fix a wrinkled heart’” (interview, March 11, 2019).
The general theme students expressed through their personal connections remains to treat all people “how you want to be treated” (Isabella, interview, March 12, 2019). Isabella believes “people have learned a lesson from what happened in Pearl Harbor and now treat people with respect” (interview, March 12, 2019). Landyn and Nora agreed that they learned to consider other people when making decisions. Nora shared:

Now that I think of it, I think some people make good decisions and some people make bad decisions. It depends on what they say and do. For example, say this random guy came up and gave you candy and said, “hey, you want some candy?” and you really want candy. You think about it for a minute and that would be a bad decision because you don’t know if they might have poisoned it. (interview, March 14, 2019)

In response to Nora’s thoughts, Landyn agreed. He reflected, “If other people make a decision, a bad decision, I will try to ignore it and not tell other people about it. If I make a bad decision, I will just try to say, ‘sorry’” (interview, March 14, 2019). Students’ personal connections included apologies, the acknowledgment of wronging another person, and the expectation of treating everyone the same regardless of race or ethnicity. As the researcher pushed students to think critically, a new sub-theme of expectations for others’ behavior emerged in participants’ answers.

As the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews, the participants applied prior knowledge and drew upon their personal connections and experiences to make sense of the historical situation in four additional sources presented to them. Elijah summarized his learning by saying:

If someone is different from you, for example, if it’s the first day of school and a new student came into our class… It doesn’t make you treat them differently, but you don’t
talk to them as much as other people you’re used to and like to hang out around… So, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt decided to imprison them [Japanese-Americans], I feel like he was not very thoughtful because he did not think it through and he just decided to imprison them almost right away because they were part Japanese, but he didn’t know them. They probably didn’t even know what the Japanese were planning to do it because it was kept secret from them. So, when it happened, it was a shock to them, too, because they were also American citizens. (interview, March 18, 2019)

Elijah applied his knowledge of the concepts, historical contextualization and perspective taking, when he expressed comments related to affective connection about the historical situation. Faith reflected on her learning including the timeline of events and ethical behavior of the historical figures involved. When asked to analyze the letter written by the Assistant to the Attorney General, Faith responded:

I think I did know that something like this [Japanese-American internment] would be wrong. The farther I saw into it, I saw how much more of a bigger deal it is. I feel like James [Assistant to the Attorney General] was right, and that this did turn into a big mess, but they [Japanese-American] got their apology. Everything was fixed. I think minds might have changed on how to treat Japanese-Americans. (interview, March 19, 2019)

Faith’s reflection bared similarities to Kane’s thoughts as he considered the historical significance of the internment camps and the letter of apology written by former President George H. W. Bush. He made a personal connection on how to approach future situations in his own life. After considering what he had learned, Kane explained:

If they [people] look differently, it doesn’t mean that you treat them another way. I have a friend that’s annoying to me and he’s Spanish, but I still treat him how I want to be
treated because if he treated me badly then I would feel the exact same way. So, treat others how you want to be treated. There’s some things that are important to remember like don’t punish people that didn’t do anything, like Japanese bombing Pearl Harbor. Don’t do anything bad to them because they really didn’t do anything. When George H. W. Bush signed the apology, he changed FDR’s decision on placing the Japanese-Americans in internment camps because that’s what was right. (interview, March 21, 2019)

**Expectations.** After participating in the introduction, investigation, and display phases of the study, focus groups engaged in the reflection phase. During this phase, expectations emerged as a sub-theme related to affective connection. On two different occasions, Ashton reflected on historical figures recognizing a wrong and attempting to change. As Ashton processed his thoughts, he shared:

> They [the government] realized what they did [Japanese-American internment] was wrong. Earlier we read that the people that were put in internment camps, those families were given a lot of money. President Carter came out and said, “Hey guys, this was wrong. I think we should do something to make it up to them because they had something really bad done to them.” They [Japanese-Americans] were taken from their homes into these camps where they lived in horse stables or fairgrounds. Then they went to an even worse place in remote areas. (interview, March 4, 2019)

Brandon agreed, “They realized they [the government] were doing something wrong, treating the Japanese-Americans wrong. They also realized the Japanese-Americans were loyal, not trying to betray them. It wasn’t fair when they got them in camps because they didn’t even give them trials” (interview, March 4, 2019). Brandon and Ashton expressed their expectation of those who
committed wrong acts against the Japanese-Americans needing to recognize their errors and make amends.

Ashton continued during the following focus group meeting by reflecting, “I changed a little because I usually encourage people to be different, but I have gotten even more compassionate reading about this because many people were taken from their homes and put in these places out in deserts” (interview, March 11, 2019). Whereas Ashton commented that he had become increasingly compassionate, Elijah did not think much changed after studying Japanese-American internment. Elijah claimed, “I don’t feel like it [his thinking] changed that much because you know you should do the right thing, but sometimes when you’re angry, you’re just not thinking clearly so that’s why you do it” (interview, March 11, 2019). As the focus groups reflected on the learning over three meetings, Isabella concluded, “I think everyone should be treated with respect as if you’re going to treat your best friend” (interview, March 12, 2019) and Omar closed by sharing:

We learned that if somebody sees something and they stop to think they may realize something is wrong. People first thought it [Japanese-American internment] was okay because they weren’t thinking hard enough. So, they all did it. So, they put them in jail and later on they thought harder and harder and they finally knew just if somebody does something wrong, it doesn’t mean every single person. (interview, March 14, 2019)

Elijah, Faith, and Kane concluded semi-structured interviews by considering the question, “When you hear about decisions that people make today what are some important things to remember?” Faith answered with her thoughts:

Well, we are all taught to treat all people with equality. That’s something that a lot of people are taught in school and at home. It’s like the golden rule, treat people as you
would have them treat you. No, we don’t all do that. It’s impossible for everybody to do that because there’s no way for everything to be fixed. I know they [Japanese-Americans] got their apology, but still something was done wrong and it is wrong and people still do wrong. Some things that are important to remember are things can turn into a mess. They can explode any day. To take note that it did become a mess, and it’s kind of like a lesson that we all need to watch our decisions more carefully. We also need to think about the bigger picture. We don’t need to rush into it. We need to figure out what our decisions are going to cause. How big of a problem is it going to be? And is it really worth it to put that much effort into doing something that might become a mess? (interview, March 19, 2019)

Faith’s reflection encourages individuals to pause and consider all perspectives before acting while also weighing the positive and negative consequences of actions. Finally, Elijah expressed his expectations on the decisions and behaviors of leaders making decisions. He reflected:

Some decisions are good and some are bad. Some things that are important to remember about this, it’s not the same but it always teaches you that you can apologize to someone and you shouldn’t do it late because then maybe if you do it late, they won’t be able to forgive you. It will be important to remember if it’s a good decision or bad decision. It’s important to think how you can change it to make it more positive, how can you change it to make it more fair, how can you change it to make it treat everyone equally. (interview, March 18, 2019)

Kane summarized his learning by explaining:
When you’ve made a wrong choice, you have to try to fix it so you can gain trust back on them. Don’t do anything badly to them. Think before you speak to them so you can make the right choice. (interview, March 21, 2019)

**Theme Four: The Role of Metacognitive Strategies**

The role of metacognitive strategies denotes the third theme exhibited in the findings of this study. All three focus groups and all three participants in the semi-structured interviews exercised the use of metacognitive strategies in understanding the selected content and the three components of historical empathy—historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection, as a concept. Students engaged in metacognitive strategies to understand the content in all three focus group meetings, all phases of the study, and each semi-structured interview. Of the 16 participants, 15 applied metacognitive strategies to understand the selected sources. Out of the 15 participants who used metacognitive strategies to understand the content materials, 11 applied the use of these strategies on more than one occasion and in more than focus group one meeting. The subsequent section defines, describes, and provides examples of each category related to theme four—the role of metacognitive strategies in historical empathy.

**Defining Metacognitive Strategies**

Metacognitive strategies indicated instances when participants discussed content within the discipline, communicated their understandings, and aimed to grasp the vocabulary of the discipline specific content (Edwards, 1978; Levisohn, 2017). Students constantly took time to pause and consider the meaning of words, draw conclusions, and question the historical situation. Six categories constitute this theme (see Figure 4.5). “Vocabulary” signifies cases where students took a pause to think aloud and define or ask questions about unknown or unfamiliar words. Elijah’s paused to clarify the meaning of Pearl Harbor when he stated, “It’s a harbor in
Hawaii and the Japanese bombed it using planes” (interview, February 25, 2019), which illustrates an instance where he discussed the vocabulary within the content. “Context clues,” refers to participants remarks when they notice details or clues related to a specific source. In the image *Supper Time!* (see Appendix I), Huck commented, “I noticed that there’s a little kid out of the line for some reason” (interview, March 5, 2019), which demonstrates an example of utilizing context clues.

![Figure 4.5. Categories Representing Metacognitive Strategies](image)

**Figure 4.5. Categories Representing Metacognitive Strategies.** This figure represents the four categories: vocabulary, context clues, inference, and questioning, as well as three subcategories: situation, understanding, and concern that derived from participants’ use of metacognitive strategies to understand the historical content.

The use of “inference” symbolizes participants’ use of personal experiences or prior knowledge to hypothesize unknown details of the selected content. When analyzing an image, *Bidding Goodbye* (See Appendix H), Philip relied on his prior knowledge from the previous week to make an inference and conclude, “All the windows are open. Some of their best friends are on the train. They’re [Japanese-Americans] putting their hands up to say farewell in the camps and then they’re saying goodbye” (interview, March 7, 2019). Questioning served as a sub-theme and contributed to the role of metacognitive strategies in understanding historical empathy as a concept. Students developed three types of questions: questioning the situation, questioning for understanding, and questioning for concern. “Questioning the situation” refers to asking questions about the actions of others—historical figures, characters in a book, and the
United States government. Maya analyzed an image, *Bidding Goodbye* (See Appendix H), and questioned the situation when she asked, “Why do the people [on the ground] hold up their hands to the train?” (interview, March 7, 2019). The sub-theme, “questioning for understanding,” denotes times when participants asked questions about unknown or unfamiliar words, concepts, or ideas. Simply put, Isabella illustrated questioning for understanding when she stated, “What is a cot?” (interview, February 26, 2019). “Questioning for concern” represents the sixth and final emergent category used in this theme. Questioning for concern recognizes when students posed questions related to the well-being of others. After analyzing an image, *Marbles* (see Appendix G), Faith expressed a question of concern by noting, “Because they’re [Japanese-Americans] so far away from home, do you think they would have had them [marbles] mailed or they would have brought them?” (interview, March 5, 2019). In the following sections, the researcher will discuss the role of metacognitive strategies in focus groups and semi-structured interviews to demonstrate how participants made sense of content material and the historical situation.

**Metacognitive Strategies Sub-Themes**

In each of the three meetings, all three focus groups implemented metacognitive strategies to make sense of the selected content and sources. Each of the three focus groups utilized all six emergent categories: vocabulary, context clues, inference, questioning the situation, questioning for understanding, and questioning for concern (see Table 4.4). Throughout the focus group meetings, participants continued to use various metacognitive strategies to make sense of Japanese-American internment, the mentor text *The Bracelet*, and primary sources. Only one focus group used metacognitive strategies when responding to *Departure for Camp* (see Appendix K), and none of the three focus groups exercised metacognitive strategies when referencing *Life in Camp* (see Appendix L). Throughout the focus
group interviews students’ use of metacognitive strategies resulted in a deeper understanding of the historical situation and the selected sources. Students in the semi-structured interviews applied metacognitive strategies to all four primary sources.

**Vocabulary.** During focus group discussions, students identified unfamiliar vocabulary words essential to their understanding of the text or title of a source. This metacognitive strategy allowed students to access the content and make meaning. During the first focus group meeting, the mentor text, *The Bracelet*, described the internment camp as surrounded by barbed wire. A student asked about the meaning of barbed wire. To the group Ashton explained, “It is a fence with sharp barbs on it that are very dangerous. They [the government] use that to scare them [Japanese-American internees] so they don't get out. If you touch one it will give you a really bad scratch” (interview, February 25, 2019). During the second focus group meeting, the researcher presented students with *Supper Time!* (see Appendix I). Jamar commented, “Supper means dinner. My grandpa says that all the time. They’re [Japanese-American internees] standing in one big line because where they eat, like their cafeteria, may not be as big as ours” (interview, March 5, 2019). Jamar used metacognition to understand the image. Finally, Chloe used questioning about unfamiliar vocabulary to gain access to the content of the letter *Louise Ogawa to Miss Breed* (see Appendix J). When given the opportunity, Chloe asked the researcher to define the words “linoleum” and “envied” (interview, March 4, 2019). Student reliance on key vocabulary terms and context clues continued during semi-structured interviews as participants used metacognitive strategies to build understanding. Elijah reflected on the title “Attorney General.” He knew the title described a person working for the government, and therefore, potentially advised the president (interview, March 18, 2019).
### Table 4.4. Codes Within Metacognitive Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vocabulary: defining unknown or unfamiliar words</td>
<td><em>It’s a harbor in Hawaii and the Japanese bombed it using planes.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Context Clues: noticing details or clues in a specific source</td>
<td><em>I noticed that there’s a little kid out of the line for some reason.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Inferences: using personal experiences or prior knowledge to hypothesize unknown details in order to make sense of the content</td>
<td><em>All the windows are open. Some of their best friends are on the train. They’re [Japanese-Americans] putting their hands up to say farewell in the camps and then they’re saying goodbye.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: S</td>
<td>Questioning the Situation: asking questions about the actions of others</td>
<td><em>Why do the people [on the ground] hold up their hands to the train?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: U</td>
<td>Questioning for Understanding: asking questions about unknown or unfamiliar words, concepts, or ideas</td>
<td><em>What is a cot?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: C</td>
<td>Questioning for Concern: asking questions related to the well-being of others</td>
<td><em>Because they’re [Japanese-Americans] so far away from home, do you think they would have had them [marbles] mailed or they would have brought them?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context clues.** Students continued to build understanding through historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection by using the metacognitive strategy context clues. While listening to texts, reading texts, and examining images, the participants gathered hints to tell more about the thoughts, feelings, and situations of the historical figures represented. In focus group meetings, students specifically used context clues to make meaning of two images, *Pickle Barrel* and *Supper Time!* (see Appendices F and I).

Dakota and Faith made note of a faucet in the corner of the image *Pickle Barrel* (see Appendix F) that led them to believe the man bathed in the barrel as a bathtub (interview, March 4, 2019; interview, March 5, 2019). Maya also noticed lather resembling soap on the hands of the man in
the pickle barrel, leading her to believe camp internees bathed in the pickle barrel (interview, March 7, 2019). Chloe observed Japanese-Americans standing in line waiting to get their supper and hypothesized that the people in the image ate in a setting similar to a cafeteria (interview, March 4, 2019). In one focus group meeting Omar analyzed *Supper Time!* (see Appendix I) and reflected:

First, I thought that it was the line to leave because it was showing a place and building and some fences and they’re [Japanese-American internees] going inside. So, I think that’s when they walk inside the prison camp, the barracks, to get their food. (interview, March 7, 2019)

By employing the metacognitive strategy, context clues, to gain understanding, students interpreted the historical situation and conditions affecting the Japanese-Americans they studied.

Faith and Kane relied on context clues during their semi-structured interviews. While analyzing *Evacuee Resting* (see Appendix P), Faith mentioned, “I think there’s two cots in there. I see a window though, so it makes me think…” (interview, March 19, 2019). After commenting on her observation, Faith continued to wonder about the size of the barracks and figured that multiple people shared the small space, unlike if they lived in their own houses with individual bedrooms. Kane also pondered *Evacuee Resting* (see Appendix P) by noticing “the beds, well, they look normal to me. He’s on a mattress, but there’s only one window” (interview, March 21, 2019). He concluded that the sleeping conditions in the image remained better than the camp where internees used straw mattresses.

**Inferences.** Throughout the focus group process, the researcher intentionally asked participants questions to challenge critical thinking skills and push students to draw conclusions about the content. Multiple examples showed students drawing inferences to answer the
question. Data shows students utilizing inferences to analyze the images *Pickle Barrel, Playing Marbles, Bidding Goodbye,* and *Supper Time!* (see Appendices F, G, H, and I). While analyzing an image of boys playing marbles in the internment camp, Elijah reasoned, “They’re trying to make it remind them of home” (interview, March 4, 2019). Chloe hypothesized that the image *Pickle Barrel* implied “the person’s taking a shower or something and it’s a pickle barrel. It sounds like when you take a bath or something in it, it makes you smell like pickles” (interview, March 4, 2019). The students in focus group two made multiple inferences during their meeting. Huck, Isabella, and Faith used metacognitive strategies to make meaning of *Bidding Goodbye* (see Appendix H). Huck concluded that the men in the image “are waving goodbye to their children and wives,” while Isabella wondered if the image captured people arriving or leaving the camp by train (interview, March 5, 2019). Faith deduced:

I think they’re [Japanese-Americans] saying goodbye to their loved ones, just like Huck said, who are going off to the camp and I bet they’re heading off to a prison camp because they weren’t always put together in the same families. It’s put together by number. (interview, March 5, 2019)

Faith continued drawing inferences as she examined *Supper Time!* (see Appendix I). She noted:

I believe they’re [Japanese-Americans] waiting. From the book *[The Bracelet]*, they were talking about how everybody would line up and wait for their hot dinner to be passed to them. That looks like them lining up because you can see multiple people lining up. In the book it talks about such the crowd that there was. (interview, March 5, 2019)

Gabby followed Faith’s comment by theorizing what the line of Japanese-Americans waiting for food told her about the quantity of people living within the camp. She surmised:

It shows how many Japanese-Americans there were and how many were sent away
because this is a lot of people. There’s probably five times that much that went to the camp and so now you can see how many people there really was, so how many camps there would have been. (interview, March 5, 2019)

The inferences these students made aided their comprehension of the context and factors influencing the subjects of the images. This metacognitive strategy assisted the participants in drawing conclusions and making meaning of the historical content.

In addition to vocabulary and context clues, students interviewed relied heavily on inferences to make sense of images. Both Kane and Faith referenced the clothes air drying in *Evacuee Resting* (see Appendix P). Faith commented, “I see that they’re drying their clothes on the clothing line, which probably means they didn’t have dryers” (interview, March 19, 2019). Similarly, Kane noticed, “There’s some clothes there. Maybe they had to hang their clothes by wire. They didn’t have any hangers. They had to do it by wire” (interview, March 21, 2019).

From these inferences, Faith concluded that potentially dryers did not exist in this time period, while Kane felt confident that the Japanese-Americans learned how to adapt to the conditions in the internment camps. During semi-structured interviews, the researcher introduced students to *Dinner is Served* (see Appendix Q). Faith made a connection to an image shown to the focus groups two weeks before. She said:

I bet they’re [Japanese-Americans] lining up to receive dinner. Last week, or two weeks ago, we saw the line for food. This is probably where they would receive it. I see the plate that the child is holding. That’s probably how they would receive their food. I can see the clothing that they’re wearing. I wonder if that’s what’s given to them to wear, or if that’s what they packed because a lot of it looks similar. (interview, March 19, 2019)
Elijah made a different inference when examining the same image. He thought aloud, “I look at the picture and it feels like a restaurant. There are people cooking and they have traditional meals like they have at home. The people who are cooking are Japanese-American” (interview, March 18, 2019). These conclusions led Kane, Faith, and Elijah to push beyond what they saw in the images to consider the lives, conditions, thoughts, and feelings of the historical figures.

**Questioning the situation.** The researcher identified a sub-theme during data analysis that embodied students questioning the situation experienced by Japanese-Americans. As students analyzed historical content, many used questioning to gain a better understanding of the historical situation. In the initial focus group meeting, Brandon utilized questioning the situation to make meaning of the content. He stopped the group to think aloud:

> Hold on, I want to say something. Couldn’t they at least make it [horse stall] like their home? Like Emi’s family had a nice house and they will make it like their nice home. Why did they [the government] want them [Japanese-Americans] to suffer? Why couldn't they just listen to their words instead of forcing them? They could just say, “Excuse me,” with their words. Couldn’t they? (interview, February 25, 2019)

In a later meeting, while analyzing *Supper Time!* (see Appendix I) Chloe wondered aloud:

> Why is the line so big? Why do they [Japanese-Americans] have to go in a line? Why can’t they go whenever they want to? If they want to have it [food] late, a late dinner they could and it won’t be so crowded. If they want to have an early one, they could.

(interview, March 4, 2019)

A question from Landyn sparked a conversation with Kane. Landyn asked, “How are you supposed to get out of the camp?” and Kane replied, “You can’t unless soldiers try to attack you. The guards are surrounding the entire place” (interview, March 7, 2019). The researcher
observed that in most instances the use of questioning led to thick, powerful dialogue among the members of the group. One particular dialogue emerged with Kane’s question and led to deeper understanding by many group members.

Kane: Japanese-Americans were not involved! It was just the Japanese Navy that was involved. What’s the point in sending the Japanese-Americans to camp when they were not even involved in the attack?

Landyn: They got put in the camp because they [the government] didn’t really think about it. They just thought all people related to Japan and sent them to camp.

Philip: Because they [the government] thought they [Japanese-Americans] were associated with Japan and Pearl Harbor.

Nora: Because they [Japanese-Americans] might have had a different skin tone. That’s why they thought it [the bombing of Pearl Harbor] was them because they were a different color.

Landyn: Did all Japanese go to the camps or just Japanese-Americans?

Kane: They would never go for anyone who is European-American because the U.S. already aligns with Great Britain, the UK. They wouldn't dare to arrest the European-Americans because they already align, but if they did, they could actually be broken off and the U.S. and the USSR would be left alone.

Nora: I have a question: Were the Japanese-Americans then released from the camps?

Did they keep the Japanese-Americans during the World War so they wouldn’t do anything wrong?

Kane: They were arrested in 1942. So, basically that is during World War II. (interview, March 14, 2019)
Elijah relied on questioning a situation and questioning for understanding as he considered a letter written by the Assistant to the Attorney General. After listening to the researcher read the text of the letter, Elijah inquired:

   Wait, remember when it said habeas corpus? What’s that mean? So they [the government] need to think about what makes them [Japanese-Americans] a citizen or what makes someone who lives in the United States a threat? So they need to consider if it’s good to send them to the camps based on who they are or if they’ve actually done something wrong? (interview, March 18, 2019)

Elijah questioned the meaning of habeas corpus and the situation to try to make sense of the letter. He continued by asking, “I wonder who he is? Maybe it’s the President of the United States or something” (interview, March 18, 2019). Finally, Elijah considered Camp Sign and the rules posted for Japanese-Americans to follow. He wondered, “Where’s the location because it says no trespassing on farming lands?” (interview, March 18, 2019). Elijah asked questions, reflected on the question, and potential answers, and drew inferences as metacognitive strategies to process new information. Through the strategy of questioning the situation, students applied prior knowledge, learning from each other, and uncovered new knowledge through metacognitive processes.

**Questioning for understanding.** Another second level sub-theme of metacognitive strategies, questioning for understanding, emerged as students grappled with new content and sought to make sense of the historical situation. In three of six questions for understanding during focus group meetings, students used questioning to better comprehend unfamiliar vocabulary in the text. Chloe asked, “What’s linoleum?” (interview, February 25, 2019). Jamar asked, “What are typhoid shots?” (interview, March 5, 2019). Brandon questioned, “What is
typhoid?” (interview, March 4, 2019). Isabella questioned, “What is a barrack?” (interview, March 5, 2019). Philip wondered, “What is marbles? Like pool? Like golf?” (interview, March 7, 2019). As students struggled to understand the content and details of the text they used questioning as a strategy. Aside from unfamiliar vocabulary, group members also used questioning for understanding to process the primary sources presented to them. In referencing the letter written by Louise Ogawa (see Appendix J), Nora asked, “Did this girl actually write this?” as she struggled to understand the author of the primary source she studied (interview, March 7, 2019). Similarly, Jamar asked, “So was that audio like what really someone said? I wonder how they kept it for that many years” (interview, March 5, 2019). The questioning for understanding sub-theme emerged as an opportunity for productive struggle as students grappled with developmentally appropriate appreciation for primary sources.

**Questioning for concern.** The emergent sub-theme, questioning for concern, emerged from the data as a final metacognitive strategy used by participants throughout the focus group meetings. Four of the six students who utilized questioning for concern focused on *Playing Marbles* (see Appendix G). Maya initially questioned, “How did they bring the marbles? Did they bring them in their suitcase or just find them?” (interview, March 7, 2019). During meeting two of one of the three focus groups, an exchange occurred between Faith and Gabby about the possession of the marbles at the internment camp:

Faith: Because they’re so far away when they got moved, do you think that they would have had it mailed or they would have brought it?

Gabby: I think they would have brought it or they might have just used the smoothest rocks they could find.

Faith: But also, they have to pack as much as they can because they’re going to be living
at this camp for a good bit of time. They don’t always have time to pack such things. (interview, March 5, 2019)

Philip also expressed concern, “They [Japanese-Americans] knew it would be boring in the house. I don’t really think they want to be there” (interview, March 7, 2019) as he examined the children playing marbles at the internment camp.

Students expressed surprise in early meetings to learn that the United States government forced Japanese-Americans to move into internment camps; however, participants’ learning evolved over three weeks. Some participants considered the long-term implications for these families. One student specifically wanted to know what happened to the individuals and families in the images. When referencing the mentor text, *The Bracelet*, Ashton commented:

I think it’s actually kind of an incomplete story since it doesn’t really tell when are they going to go to the Utah desert. What happens after this? It just says they had to move into this camp and that Emi was sad and her sister was also sad and mad and her mom was trying to make it more like home. (interview, March 4, 2019)

Another participant also expressed concern for the Japanese-Americans when she remarked, “Where are the people that were in the story? Did they go back to their houses? Are they still alive?” (interview, March 7, 2019). The sub-theme questioning for concern, on behalf of the Japanese-Americans that suffered in internment camps, developed throughout the study.

**Chapter Summary**

In this chapter, the researcher discussed the findings from this study. In this qualitative case elementary school children discussed their understandings of Japanese-American internment and historical empathy as a concept as well as applied its components—historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection—to the selected content.
Throughout focus group and semi-structured interviews, participants integrated the components of historical empathy and metacognitive strategies to make sense of the historical situation (see Figure 4.6). In chapter five, the researcher situates these findings within the existing literature and presents implications for future policy, practice, and research.

**Figure 4.6. Integration of Historical Empathy and Japanese-American Internment.** This figure maps out the categories that comprise each of the aforementioned themes in this study. PH=Pearl Harbor; HC: G=Geography; C=Camps; AL=Apology Letter; PT: G=Gratitude; F=Fear; R=Reflecting; S=Sadness; U=Unjust; T=Treatment; PC=Personal Connections; E=Expectations; V=Vocabulary; CC=Context Clues; I=Inference; Q: S=Questioning: Situation; Q: U=Questioning: Understanding; Q: C=Questioning: Concern
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

This qualitative case-study examined how students think about and discuss Japanese-American internment and historical empathy as a concept. The study focused on elementary aged students, specifically second and third grade students, due to minimal previous research on historical empathy as a concept with this population of participants. Former studies related to historical empathy, with elementary aged students, focus on one component of the concept, such as historical time (e.g., Barton & Levstik, 1996) or perspective taking (e.g., VanSledright, 2002) while this study analyzed students’ understanding of all three components of historical empathy. At the inception of this study, students’ prior knowledge represented varying levels of understanding surrounding the events leading up to Japanese-American internment, such as World War II and the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Throughout the study, participants’ comprehension of Japanese-American internment and historical empathy as a concept continuously evolved.

Major Findings

In this study, the researcher further explored how participants applied historical contextualization, engaged in perspective taking, and discussed affective connection when interacting with primary and secondary sources related to Japanese-American internment. The researcher used the findings of the study to develop four assertions related to how students comprehend Japanese-American internment and historical empathy as a concept.

1. Students applied historical contextualization in order to build a foundational understanding of the time period under investigation.
2. When engaging in perspective taking, students relied on historical contextualization to analyze the lived experiences of historical figures with regard to the content.

3. Through discussion of affective connection, students synthesized historical contextualization and perspective taking to make connections to one’s own similar yet different life experiences.

4. Students applied metacognitive strategies to gain access in comprehending primary and secondary sources related to Japanese-American internment.

These assertions outline how participants thought about and discussed Japanese-American internment and historical empathy as a concept. The results of this study demonstrate a linear but interdependent relationship of the components of historical empathy while students simultaneously utilized metacognitive strategies to make sense of the content. The findings align with current research which suggests the three components of historical empathy—historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection—exist as interrelated and independent elements (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). At the same time, this present study suggests that the students who participated relied on a linear understanding of the three components as well as metacognitive strategies prior to understanding the components of historical empathy as interrelated and independent (see Figure 5.1).

This idea of a linear model emerged when students discussed their understandings of the mentor text, *The Bracelet*, and primary sources, including images, letters, and oral histories. In order to grasp an understanding of the content and historical empathy as a concept, students relied on prior knowledge, background knowledge, and content knowledge to make meaning of the historical context. According to Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy (Anderson, Krathwohl, & Bloom, 2001) remembering and understanding, skills used when applying historical
contextualization, require lower order thinking skills. After grasping the historical contextualization, students moved into the idea of perspective taking, which requires higher order thinking skills, with regard to the content before moving into affective connection, the final component of historical empathy. When engaging in tasks linked to the components of historical empathy, students’ discussions evolved to reflect the use of higher order thinking skills (see Figure 5.2). As students continued to interact with the content, the linear understanding of historical empathy dissolved and the interrelated elements of the components emerged.

**Figure 5.1. Model for Historical Empathy.** This figure illustrates a model for understanding historical empathy exhibited by the participants in this study.

**The Role of Historical Contextualization**

Based on the findings from focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews, the first assertion indicates that students applied historical contextualization in order to build a foundational understanding of the time period under investigation. As defined by Endacott and Brooks (2013), historical contextualization denotes a temporal awareness of differences, which includes a deep understanding of political, social, and cultural norms of the time period under examination as well as knowledge of events happening concurrently. The role of historical
contextualization represented an initial foundation for students to build their content knowledge of Japanese-American internment. Historical contextualization served as a reference point for students when sequencing events, making sense of the historical period, and considering how its norms might influence historical agents.

Results from this study indicate that participants rooted their understanding of Japanese-American internment in the time period in which case they relied on their comprehension of the bombing of Pearl Harbor, geography, life in internment camps, and an apology letter written to Japanese-American internees by former President George H. W. Bush. The extent to which students applied historical contextualization to make sense of the content evolved throughout the focus group sessions and continued into the semi-structured interviews (see Figure 5.3). Prior to discussions involving perspective taking and affective connection, students relied on their understanding of the historical context regarding Japanese-American internment. Students often referenced their knowledge of the time period and events when engaging in perspective taking.

Figure 5.2. Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy and Historical Empathy. The first triangle represents Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy (Anderson, Krathwohl, & Bloom, 2001). The second triangle represents participants’ use of higher order thinking skills, according to Bloom’s Taxonomy, to understand Japanese-American internment and the components of historical empathy.
and discussing affective connection. These results indicate that participants needed a strong grasp of the content in order to apply historical empathy to the selected content.

![Figure 5.3. Understanding Historical Contextualization](image)

**Figure 5.3. Understanding Historical Contextualization.** This figure illustrates how participants’ application of historical contextualization to Japanese-American internment evolved throughout the study.

Participants used their knowledge of the bombing of Pearl Harbor and geography to further their comprehension of Japanese-American internment camps. Furthermore, the three students who participated in semi-structured interviews, after participating in three focus group meetings, added an additional level of understanding to the content when they situated the apology letter to Japanese-American internees from former President George H. W. Bush within the historical context (see Figure 5.3). Before applying critical thinking skills, such as reflecting and making inferences, students sequenced events in order to make sense of the content. This served as a prerequisite concept for students to engage in perspective taking and discussion of affective connection. The findings in this study suggest a solid foundation of knowledge remains necessary for students to apply their understanding of historical contextualization to Japanese-American internment.
The Role of Perspective Taking

The second assertion made by the researcher stipulates, when engaging in perspective taking, students relied on historical contextualization to analyze the lived experiences of historical figures with regard to the content. Perspective taking signifies an understanding of one’s prior lived experiences, values, attitudes, positions, and beliefs in order to understand how a person might perceive or think about the situation in question (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Findings from the role of perspective taking indicated students’ ability to engage in perspective taking from a variety of historical figures including: Japanese-American internees, former Presidents, the general public, and an Assistant to the Attorney General. In order to engage in varying perspectives, students referred back to the time period under investigation and often cited sources (e.g., *The Bracelet*) when considering the perspectives of historical figures. As a result of engaging in perspective taking, participants demonstrated an understanding of Japanese-American internment from different vantage points.

Participants relied on their comprehension of historical contextualization to build on their conceptualization of varying perspectives. For example, one student cited the living conditions of Japanese-Americans in internment camps as being thankful “he can take a bath” (interview, March 7, 2019) in spite of being imprisoned. The participant demonstrated an understanding of the historical contextualization in order to engage in perspective taking on behalf of a Japanese-American internee. When engaging in perspective taking, students identified perspectives related to gratitude, fear, sadness, treatment, unjust, and reflecting. Throughout this component of historical empathy, participants thinking continued to evolve (see Figure 5.4). In this study, while participants engaged in perspective taking, they consistently analyzed the lived experiences of historical figures through historical contextualization. Historical contextualization
worked as a lens for students to engage in perspective taking before they discussed any ideas related to affective connection. These results reiterate the linear process used by students to understand the concept of historical empathy and further support the assertion that perspective taking necessitated comprehension of historical contextualization of the time period under investigation.

**Figure 5.4. Understanding Perspective Taking.** This figure illustrates how participants’ engagement in perspective taking with regard to Japanese-American internment evolved throughout the study.

Students relied on their understanding of the historical contextualization to formulate differing perspectives of gratitude and fear before advancing to perspectives of sadness and treatment of Japanese-American internees. Eventually, students developed perspectives of unjust treatment on behalf of Japanese-Americans and used their understanding of the historical situation to engage in perspective taking that incorporated reflection on how Japanese-Americans’ lives differed after the bombing of Pearl Harbor (see Figure 5.4). When students engaged in perspective taking in focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews, this progression of thinking—where students used their understanding of historical contextualization to develop more complex perspectives—continued. Findings in this study suggest an
understanding of historical contextualization serves as a precursor to perspective taking when students engage in content related to Japanese-American internment.

**The Role of Affective Connection**

The third assertion devised by the researcher specifies that through discussion of affective connection students synthesized historical contextualization and perspective taking to make connections to one’s own similar yet different life experiences. Affective connection considers the way in which historical figures’ lived experiences, circumstances, or actions possess the potential to elicit an affective response from learners by connecting historical information to their personal lived experiences. When learners lack the ability to understand historical agents fully, experiencing affective responses enables them to draw on similar yet different lived experiences (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). When discussing affective connection students’ discussions focused on personal connections to the content and personal expectations related to Japanese-American internment as well as expectations for future treatment of all people. Discussion of affective connection demonstrated how students’ applied historical contextualization and engaged in perspective taking to express their understanding of Japanese-American internment (see Figure 5.1).

Findings from this study indicate that participants incorporated their comprehension of historical contextualization and perspective taking in order to discuss affective connection to Japanese-American internment. For example, one student classified what happened to the Japanese-Americans after the bombing of Pearl Harbor as “a mess” (interview, March 19, 2019). This required the student to consider both historical contextualization and perspective taking before discussing her affective response to the historical situation. Participants’ discussion of affective connection continued to advance as they made sense of their personal connections
before they drew on their similar yet different lived experiences to conclude with expectations for the treatment of all people (see Figure 5.5). This remained true for the focus group meetings and semi-structured interviews. These results suggest that when students discussed ideas about affective connection to Japanese-American internment, they relied on an understanding of historical contextualization and perspective taking.

**Figure 5.5. Understanding Affective Connection.** This figure illustrates how participants’ discussion of affective connection to Japanese-American internment advanced throughout the study.

Participants discussed personal connections and expectations related to Japanese-American internment to further their comprehension of the time period under study. Students used their personal connections, such as mistreatment by peers for their appearance, to relate to the similar yet different lived experiences of Japanese-Americans. Students acknowledged the treatment they faced as an affective connection to the historical situation while indicating that the treatment of Japanese-Americans differed in intensity of discrimination. When discussing the mistreatment of an individual versus an entire group, one student explained, “I am one person and was treated bad. This was a group of people [Japanese-Americans]. It would be like if people have a special need, you treat all of them bad because they are different” (interview, March 12, 2019). Students continued to apply historical contextualization and perspective taking to their affective responses about Japanese-American internment. These findings intimate that discussion
of affective connection to Japanese-American internment involves a linear and interrelated understanding of historical empathy.

**The Role of Metacognitive Strategies**

The final assertion made by the researcher indicates that students apply metacognitive strategies to gain access in comprehending primary and secondary sources related to Japanese-American internment. In this instance, metacognitive strategies denoted participants’ discussion of content within the discipline, communication of their understandings, and an aim to grasp the vocabulary of discipline specific content (Edwards, 1978; Levisohn, 2017). Throughout the study, participants applied metacognitive strategies to their understanding of Japanese-American internment which demonstrated students’ critical thinking skills pertaining to historical empathy. In order to make sense of the components of historical empathy and Japanese-American internment, students demonstrated the use of metacognitive strategies when they engaged in primary and secondary source analysis.

Findings from this study indicate that participants used metacognition to make sense of the content and historical empathy as a concept. Initially, students focused on unfamiliar words, context clues, and inferences to make sense of sources. When analyzing *Evacuee Resting* (see Appendix P), one student asked a question while making an inference when he announced, “Is that a cot? It’s like a bed but not as nice” (interview, March 18, 2019). As the progression of focus groups and semi-structured interviews continued, students applied questioning, a more advanced metacognitive strategy, to the content (see Figure 5.6). Students exercised the idea of questioning when considering historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection. These results demonstrate that students needed to apply metacognitive strategies in order to make sense of Japanese-American internment and historical empathy as a concept.
### Figure 5.6. Understanding Metacognitive Strategies.

This figure illustrates how participants’ application of metacognitive strategies, to make sense of the content and historical empathy as a concept, evolved throughout the study.

Throughout the study, participants applied a variety of metacognitive strategies to further their understanding of Japanese-American internment and historical empathy as a concept. In focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews, students constantly stopped to think about the meaning of words, images, and dates. They stopped to question misconceptions, ask for clarity, and share aloud questions related to their thought processes on the treatment of Japanese-American internees. The findings of this study suggest that metacognitive strategies remain necessary for students to understand Japanese-American internment and the components of historical empathy. Furthermore, the findings in this study indicate that students engaged in a linear progression of understanding historical empathy before participating in the interrelated process described by Endacott and Brooks (2013).

### Implications

#### Students

The amount of time given to social studies instruction at the elementary level continues to generate debate (e.g., Fitchett, Heafner, & Lambert, 2014). If we seek to develop historical empathy in students, then the fact that social studies educators and researchers must consider the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metacognitive Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>historical contextualization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questioning: understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>perspective taking</strong> + affective connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questioning: situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affective connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questioning: concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| historical contextualization |
| vocabulary |
| historical contextualization + perspective taking |
| context clues |
| perspective taking |
| inference |
amount of time necessary for students to engage in primary and secondary source analysis adds to the concern. Prior to discussing their understandings of Japanese-American internment and historical empathy, students engaged in a lengthy process of source analysis. This provided students with opportunities to think critically, pose questions, and build content knowledge. Thus, students need continued opportunities to analyze sources in order to deepen their understanding of content and historical empathy as a concept.

Students need a firm foundation of knowledge ordered around key concepts, and educators need to understand the importance of metacognitive strategies (Lee, 2005). Throughout the study, participants demonstrated the necessity of a solid foundation of content knowledge, historical contextualization, in order to understand Japanese-American internment and historical empathy as a concept. Furthermore, participants applied metacognitive strategies to make sense of the sources. When implementing metacognitive strategies to make sense of the content and concepts, students discussed content within the discipline, communicated their understandings, and grasped the technical vocabulary (Edwards, 1978; Levisohn, 2017). This demonstrates the need for teachers to work with students to develop a solid foundation of content knowledge and understanding of metacognitive strategies to make sense of the discipline and engage in the process of historical empathy.

Students also need opportunities to engage in source analysis in order to build content knowledge of the discipline, an increased understanding of metacognitive strategies, and practice using the components of historical empathy as independent and interrelated entities. When students engage in the process of historical empathy, they experience opportunities to investigate historical events, their antecedents, and the words and actions of historical agents. Collectively, these influence the teaching of history, how students perceive it, and how history shapes the
future (Brooks, 2009). Findings from this study demonstrate students’ understanding of
Japanese-American internment and the concept of historical empathy as a linear process that
builds on higher order thinking skills. Participants’ discussion of historical empathy involved
analysis of critical events, context and chronology, evidence, and construction of a narrative
framework (Riley & Totten, 2002). Consequently, students need an understanding of second
order concepts: time, change, empathy, cause, evidence, and historical accounts (Lee, 2005), to
understand the discipline.

Teachers

For students to understand the content and historical empathy as a concept, teachers must
serve as facilitators. The researcher acted as a facilitator throughout this study in order to guide
students to focus on content, consider facts, refer to historical context, look beyond their own
worldviews, and examine multiple sources in order to draw conclusions (Doppen, 2000). The
role of teachers as facilitators extends beyond that of a guide. As teachers encourage students to
make sense of content material and historical empathy as a concept, it remains critical for the
teacher to take on the role of a facilitator who uses discussions in order to advance students’
understandings (Doppen, 2000; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015). Two key practices, scaffolding
and modeling, are essential in teachers’ roles as facilitators when supporting students’
comprehension of historical empathy. The researcher modeled think-alouds, asked questions to
prompt students to consider alternative perspectives, and read the room for needs that arose
during focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews (Viator, 2012). Teachers should
scaffold students’ understandings and encourage the use of metacognitive strategies when
interacting with primary and secondary sources. For students to understand the content and
concepts of the discipline, teachers must serve as facilitators, model think-aloud and
metacognitive strategies, and scaffold students’ comprehension of primary and secondary sources.

The consideration of sources and the process of source selection represent additional implications for teachers. Using *The Bracelet* as a mentor text for this study demonstrated the power of using children’s literature to teach social studies content to elementary students. In addition to using mentor texts, teachers must select primary and secondary sources that provide students with multiple perspectives (Berti, Baldin, & Toneatti, 2009; Brophy & Alleman, 2008). During source selection, teachers must acknowledge their personal bias in order to provide students with opportunities to understand the content and make sense of historical empathy as a concept. Through the use of texts that provide multiple perspectives and opportunities for students to use historical empathy as a concept, teachers can facilitate students’ development of discourse strategies that foster empathy, encourage humility, and promote respect toward people by relating historical topics to students’ lives (Cunningham, 2009). For students to comprehend content and historical empathy as a concept, teachers must develop awareness of bias toward source selection and continue to provide students with a variety of texts that represent multiple perspectives.

**Teacher Educators**

For students to understand the concept of historical empathy and teachers to serve as facilitators throughout the process, teacher educators must provide training for preservice and inservice teachers regarding the components of historical empathy as linear and interrelated. Whether students engage in source analysis, investigations, inquiry, classroom discussions, or other methods to learn historical empathy, teachers remain vital to students’ understanding of history. Thus, teachers must receive training to recognize their own biases and select sources that
allow students to engage in a wide variety perspective taking. Empirical research suggests that considering students’ prior knowledge, positionalities, and what appears relevant to students’ lives, serves as an effective approach to teaching historical empathy (e.g., Brophy & Alleman, 2006; Monroe, 2006; Parker, 2016). Teacher preparation programs serve an important role by training teachers to educate students despite differences of opinions, values, and beliefs. Teacher educators must teach historical empathy as a concept for understanding social studies just as they teach the importance of any other second order concept, such as time or change. Furthermore, teacher educators must convey the importance of historical empathy as an avenue to work toward the goals of elementary social studies, which consists of social understanding and civic competency. Historical empathy encompasses a fundamental goal of historical thinking and the social studies—education for the common good (Dulberg, 2002). Therefore, teacher educators must go a step farther than teaching diversity and multiculturalism to a learning environment that encourages future teachers to recognize and challenge their own bias and seek opportunities for discussing stark social realities with elementary students.

Field of Social Studies

Experts in the field of social studies remain well versed on the importance of teaching historical empathy to students. However, the best ways to teach historical empathy remains highly contested. In this study, students benefited from a variety of models on teaching historical empathy (e.g., Endacott & Brooks, 2013; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; Wright & Endacott, 2016) and general best practices for teaching, such as modeling and scaffolding (Bryant & Clark, 2006; Yilmaz, 2007). Since student success of understanding historical empathy depends on teachers’ effectiveness as facilitators (Jensen, 2008; McBee, 1996), then teaching historical empathy necessitates training for preservice teachers. The field must continue to integrate
general best practices, such as higher order thinking skills and metacognitive strategies, into models that describe the process of how students engage in historical empathy (see Figure 5.2).

**Future Research**

Although this study provides a proposed revised framework to the development of historical empathy for this group of participants, experts in the field need to conduct further research on how elementary aged students understand historical content and historical empathy as a concept. The sample size in this study remained limited to 16 elementary students who participated in focus groups and semi-structured interviews. A direct extension of this study might include a larger sample size, such as one classroom or grade level. The time period under investigation, Japanese-American internment, served as another limiting factor to consider in future research. Increasing the sample size of participants, investigating a different time period, and selecting participants from grades other than second and third might serve as ways to directly extend the research in this study.

When contemplating how to extend this study on a broader scale, one might focus on the cognitive and affective dimensions of historical empathy as opposed to the individual components. Another option for extension might include research on the training, if any, teachers receive on best practices for teaching historical empathy to elementary students. Furthermore, future research might focus on how teachers who incorporate historical empathy into their classrooms select primary and secondary sources. Finally, an extension of this study might develop an index to measure the development of historical empathy in students.
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Appendix A

Focus Group Protocol

Meeting One: Getting Acquainted and Introduction Phase

1. Getting Acquainted: Introduce yourself and explain the purpose of the focus group. The researcher will conduct an icebreaker with the group.
   a. Script:
      i. My name is Charlotte Roberts. I am a researcher and former teacher. I taught elementary school, and now I am a student at NC State University. I am trying to learn how students think about history. I am really interested in how students think about people and events in history. We will meet together three different times to talk about history. For the purpose of our group meetings I am going to record our conversations so that I can remember them later. Is that ok with everyone? Researcher will begin audio recording.
      ii. All of the thoughts and information you share with me will be kept confidential, which means not shared with others, and your name will not be included in any reports I write. Do you have any questions for me?
      iii. We are going to go around the group so that each of you can share your name and one thing you have learned or know about social studies or history.
      iv. Thank you for sharing. For the purpose of our meetings it will help me if you can raise your hand before you speak so that I can call your name. That way I will remember who said what when I listen to our conversation later.

2. Introduction Phase
   a. The researcher will introduce the topic to the students, present some essential questions, and read aloud the book “The Bracelet” by Yoshiko Uchida (1993)
   b. Script:
      i. The time period we are investigating is during an event called World War II. Does anyone know anything about World War II? This event happened over 70 years ago and the United States entered this war after a bombing in Hawaii at Pearl Harbor. The country Japan dropped bombs on the United States navy base which hurt lots of people and sunk a lot of ships. After the bombing the president of the United States signed something called an executive order. That order made it ok to move people and families who posed a threat to national security to new relocation camps. What do you think it means to pose a threat to national security? Why do you think the president decided to do that? How do you think people felt after Japan dropped bombs on Hawaii?
      ii. There were many Japanese-American families living on the West Coast of the United States. When the order was given by the president, many of these families were relocated to internment camps. The families did not get to choose to stay in their homes. The military forced them to move to one of the camps. How would you feel if someone made your family move
out of your house if you did not want to move? Do you think Japanese Americans would have felt that way, too?

iii. Now we will read a book together. This book is fiction and it is told from the point of view of a young Japanese American girl who moved into an internment camp. Researcher reads the book aloud.

1. At the bottom of the first page: “The little girl is trying not to cry and shared that her family isn’t moving because they want to. She also shared that her dad was taken away. Early in the book it seems that Emi is really sad and not excited that her family is leaving her home. What are some other feelings Emi may have?”

2. After reading page 15: “When Emi’s family arrived at the racetrack the text says there was ‘barbed wire all around it and guard towers at each corner.’ That would make me nervous and remind me that Emi and her family aren’t allowed to leave even if they want to. What are your thoughts about what Emi’s family is experiencing?”

3. What are your thoughts on this story?

Meeting Two: Investigation and Display Phase Part One

1. Investigation and Display Phase Part One
   a. The focus group will examine primary source material to develop a deeper understanding of the historical and social context of the United States, the historical perspectives of Japanese-Americans, and relevant affective considerations that may have influenced their thoughts and actions. This phase will focus on investigations, findings, inferences, and conclusions and will serve as an opportunity for students to demonstrate their historical understandings of the puzzling and/or paradoxical situation through think-alouds.
   b. Script:
      i. I am excited to meet with you all again today. Just as a reminder, my name is Charlotte. I am a student at NC State University and I am trying to learn how students think about people and events in history. For the purpose of our group meetings I am going to record our conversations so that I can remember them later. Is that ok with everyone? Researcher will begin audio recording.
      ii. All of the thoughts and information you share with me will be kept confidential and your name will not be included in any reports I write. Just as a reminder, for the purpose of our meetings it will help me if you can raise your hand before you speak so that I can call your name. That way I will remember who said what when I listen to our conversation later. Do you have any questions for me?
      iii. Today we are focusing on investigating what occurred after the bombing on Pearl Harbor. What do you remember about this topic? Today we will look at several sources to find out more about this event. We will analyze four photographs, read a letter written by a Japanese-American, listen to two oral histories, and an executive order from the President of the United States.
c. Historical Contextualization: The researcher will use four photographs as primary sources to unpack the historical context surrounding the event.
   i. Script: I have four photographs that I will share with the group. I want you to consider what is going on at the time of the photos and share which clues you used to draw your conclusions. I will share some questions and thoughts that I have for the image and then you will have the opportunity to share your thoughts on what you notice or questions that you wonder about the people or situation in the photo. I want you to consider what is going on at the time of the photos and share which clues you used to draw your conclusions.
   
   1. Photograph One: Researcher will display photograph one (Pickle Barrel) and read the description to the student.
      a. That does not look like a typical bathtub! But, I do see a smile on the man’s face that makes me think he is happy to be getting clean. What are your thoughts of questions about the way the Japanese-Americans lived in the internment camp based on this photo?
   
   2. Photograph Two: Researcher will display photograph two (Playing Marbles) and read the description to the student.
      a. I see the three boys playing outside with their marbles. I played marbles when I was little, too so maybe the kids in the camp are still able to do some normal things that they did before the camp. What are thoughts or questions that come to mind when you study this picture?
   
   3. Photograph Three: Researcher will display photograph three (Bidding Goodbye) and read the description to the student.
      a. This time I would like for you to share your thoughts on the photo and explain your thinking.
   
   4. Photograph Four: Researcher will display photograph four (Supper time!) and read the description to the student.
      a. This time I would like for you to share your thoughts on the photo and explain your thinking.

d. Perspective Taking: The researcher will use primary sources, one letter written by a Japanese-American and two oral histories, to unpack multiple perspectives surrounding the event.
   i. Script: The next activity will include reading and thinking about a letter written by a Japanese-American during this time. As I read the letter aloud to you, I want you to record your thoughts and I will share some of my thoughts or questions. The author of this letter wrote that the people in the camp do not have mattresses to sleep on and that makes me think that their new homes in this camp may not be very comfortable. By the end of the letter the author had written some aspects of the camp that maybe did not seem so bad. What were some of the things the author mentioned? Did she seem to think those things were good or bad? How do you know?
   
   ii. What do you think the writer is thinking? How do you think the writer is feeling? How do you know what the writer is thinking and feeling? What
are any questions you have about the letter? After you have time to record your thoughts, we will share with the group. Researcher will read aloud letter to students.

iii. Now we are going to listen to two oral histories. These sound clips are from Japanese-Americans who spent time in the internment camps. These clips are short so listen carefully to both clips and record your thoughts. After we listen I will share some of my thoughts.

1. Departure for Camp: Researcher will play oral recording for students. The Japanese-Americans had a bag and were told to fill it with hay to make a mattress. That makes me think that their beds in camp were probably not as nice or comfortable as their bed at their old houses. And they had to make the mattresses themselves. How do you think they felt when they were told to go do this? What questions do you wonder after hearing that clip?

2. Life in Camp: Researcher will play oral recordings for students. What do you think the people are thinking? How do you think the people are feeling? How do you know what they are thinking and feeling? What are any questions you have about the sound clip?

Meeting Three: Investigation and Display Phase Part Two; Reflection Phase

1. Investigation and Display Phase Two
   a. The focus group will examine primary and secondary source material to develop a deeper understanding of the historical and social context of the United States, the historical perspectives of Japanese-Americans, and relevant affective considerations that may have influenced their thoughts and actions. This phase will focus on investigation; findings, inferences, and conclusions and will serve as an opportunity for students to demonstrate their historical understandings of the puzzling and/or paradoxical situation through think-alouds. Due to the complexity of the selected primary source, the researcher will use the following think-aloud prompts to monitor students’ comprehension of the text.
   b. Script:
      i. I am excited to meet with you all again today and this will be our last meeting together. Just as a reminder, my name is Charlotte. I am a student at NC State University and I am trying to learn how students think about people and events in history. For the purpose of our group meetings I am going to record our conversations so that I can remember them later. Is that ok with everyone? Researcher will begin audio recording.
      ii. All of the thoughts and information you share with me will be kept confidential and your name will not be included in any reports I write. Do you have any questions for me?
   c. Affective Connection: The researcher will use a primary source, letter of apology from President George H.W. Bush to Japanese-American Internees, in order to understand affective responses from students and historical figures alike.
      i. Script: Our last source is a letter of apology written by former President George H.W. Bush to the Japanese-American internees. The letter uses some vocabulary that might be unfamiliar so I will read it to you. As you
are listening and reading, highlight clues that might tell us why the president made this decision. You will have an opportunity to share which clues you chose. *The researcher will read the letter to students.* I notice the former President refers to “lost years” and “WWII”. Hearing that makes me think a lot of time has passed since this letter was written. In fact, over 45 years passed before an apology was issued to Japanese-Americans. What do you think of the former President’s letter?

ii. Why do you think the president wrote the letter? Would you have written a letter of apology? Why or why not? Can you explain a time in your life when you apologized for your actions, and explain why you apologized?

2. Reflection Phase - Help students make connections between the past and the present while considering how their personal views may have changed as a result of engaging in historical empathy.
   a. **Script:**
      i. For our final activity we will take time to reflect on all that we have learned and discussed during our time together. I have two questions for you to think about and answer with the group.
      ii. Think about how you treat people who think, act, or look differently than you. Throughout our time together we can see that the Japanese-Americans faced discrimination because of their identity.
         1. When you think about the experiences of the Japanese-Americans, did your thinking change on how you will treat people who are different from you? In what way did it change?
      iii. Think about the decision made by former President George H.W. Bush to issue an apology on behalf of the United States government. We figured out that lots of things affect the decisions we make.
         1. In the future, how will you think about the decisions people make?
      iv. Thank you for attending our group, sharing your thoughts, and helping me better understand how students think about people and events from history. All of the thoughts and information you shared with me will be kept confidential and your name will not be included in any reports I write. This concludes our focus group.
   
   i.
Appendix B

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

Getting Reacquainted and Think-Aloud

1. Getting Reacquainted: Introduce yourself and explain the purpose of the interview. Make a personal connection from the focus group meetings with the student.
   a. Script:
      i. I wanted to take a moment to remind you who I am and why we are meeting again. My name is Charlotte Roberts. I am a researcher and former teacher. I taught elementary school, and now I am a student at NC State University. I am trying to learn how students think about history. I am really interested in how students think about people and events in history. After meeting with you in the focus group, I would like to learn more about how you think about history. For the purpose of our meeting I am going to record our conversation so that I can remember it later. Is that ok with you? Researcher will begin audio recording.
      ii. All of the thoughts and information you share with me will be kept confidential, which means not shared with others, and your name will not be included in any reports I write. Do you have any questions for me?
      iii. Can you tell me something you remember from our focus group meetings? Which was your favorite source we looked at and why did you like that one?

2. Reintroduce the Topic/Introduction Phase
   a. Script: We discussed the time period in the 1940s when Japan dropped a bomb on Pearl Harbor. This prompted President Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) to send out Executive Order 9066 that forced Japanese-Americans to relocate to internment camps. What do you remember about the Japanese-Americans’ experiences? Over 45 years later, former President George H.W. Bush issued a letter of apology on behalf of the United States government to apologize to Japanese-Americans for this decision. Why did the former president release the letter of apology? What are your thoughts about the apology letter?

3. Investigation and Display Phases:
   i. Script: Today we will look at one letter and three images. I will share my thoughts with you on each of the sources, and then ask for your thoughts.
   b. Letter Analysis
      i. Opening Script: The next activity will include reading and thinking about a letter written by a Caucasian-American during this time. The letter is written to the President’s private secretary by an assistant to the Attorney General. What is an Attorney General?
Think-aloud Script: I will read the letter to you, and as I read the letter I will point out places in the text that make me wonder questions or that stand out to me. I will also ask you questions about your thinking. Specifically, I want us to think about how the writer is feeling, and what the writer is thinking.

Stopping Point One: *Stop at “explode any day now.”* Explode makes me think about a bomb. If a situation is about to explode, that makes me think something is wrong. What are your thoughts? Why would something be wrong?

Stopping Point Two: *Stop at “tremendous public pressure.”* Tremendous public pressure makes me think about pushing and a lot of pressure or pushing from people in the United States. I wonder why people are putting pressure and who they are putting pressure on. What are your thoughts? What does it seem that the American public wants to happen? Why do they want that?

Stopping Point Three: *Stop at “no one seems to worry about why or to where.”* I wonder why the writer of the letter mentioned that no one seems concerned about people being relocated. This makes me think the writer is concerned. What are your thoughts? Why would the writer be concerned for those who are relocated? Should everyone care where these people or going and why they are being moved? Why?

Now I would like to keep reading to you, and I would like for you to tell me to stop when you have a question or want to share your thoughts with me about what you are thinking and why.

What do you think the writer is thinking? How do you think the writer is feeling? How do you know what the writer is thinking and feeling? What are any questions or other thoughts you have about the letter?

c. Image Analysis: The researcher will use three images as primary sources to unpack the historical context surrounding the event

i. Script: I have three photographs to share with you. Each one displays life or something about life at the internment camps. We will look carefully at each photograph. I will share some questions and thoughts that I have for the image and then you will have the opportunity to share your thoughts on what you notice or questions that you wonder about the people or situation in the photograph. I want you to consider what is going on at the time of the photographs and share which clues you used to draw your conclusions. *Researcher will share photographs with student.*

ii. Photograph One: *Researcher will display photograph one (Camp Sign).* As I look at this photograph and read the rules some of them surprise me. For example, “Do not pick fruit.” I wonder why the Japanese-Americans
were not allowed to pick fruit. I think the Americans created very strict rules at the internment camps. What are your thoughts? Which rule do you think is the strictest? Why? Which rules do you think are reasonable? Why? How do you think these rules made the Japanese-Americans feel?

iii. Photograph Two: Researcher will display the photograph two (Evacuee Resting) and read the description to the student. This time I would like for you to share your thoughts on the photograph and explain your thinking.

iv. Photograph Three: Researcher will display the photograph three (Dinner is Served) and read the description to the student. This time I would like for you to share your thoughts on the photograph and explain your thinking.

4. Reflection Phase: Help the student make connections between the past and the present while considering how his or her personal views may have changed as a result of engaging in historical empathy.

a. Script: For our final activity we will take time to reflect on all that we have learned and discussed during our time together. I have two questions for you to think about and answer. These questions may sound familiar because they are the same questions I asked you at the end of our focus group meetings.

b. Think again about how you treat people who think, act, or look differently than you. Throughout our time together we can see that the Japanese-Americans were treated badly because of their identity.

i. When you think about the experiences of the Japanese-Americans and what we discussed today, did your thinking change on how you will treat people who are different from you? In what way did it change?

c. Think about the decision made by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. We figured out that lots of things affect the decisions we make.

i. When you hear about decisions that people make today what are some important things to remember?

d. Thank you for working with me, sharing your thoughts, and helping me better understand how students think about people and events from history. All of the thoughts and information you shared with me will be kept confidential and your name will not be included in any reports I write. This concludes our time together!
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Administrator Email Communications

Principal Email #1

Good afternoon!

My name is Charlotte Roberts and I am a fourth-year doctoral student at N.C. State University.

I am writing having already received clearance and approval from central office to conduct research with elementary school students in the district.

I am interested in learning more about how second and third grade students talk about their understandings of historical empathy; historical empathy involves how learners make sense of past events and people. To get a better understanding of student development, I am hoping to conduct brief interviews, three to four per child, with second and third grade students during before or after school. Each interview would last approximately 20-30 minutes.

If you are willing to allow your parents/students to consider participation in this study, I will provide you with a flyer to advertise this opportunity before and after school hours. With your permission, I would like to conduct the meetings in the media center at your school. I am happy to answer any questions.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration!

Charlotte Roberts

Principal Follow-up Email #1 (one week after first email)

Dear principal,

About a week ago I sent an email about conducting a study with second and third grade teachers and students in your school. I have already received clearance and approval from central office to conduct research with elementary school students in the district.

I wanted to follow-up to verify that you received my request on Month/Date/Year and inquire whether you are willing to allow me to work with second grade students at your school.

Thank you and take care!

Charlotte Roberts
Appendix D

Student Participation Flyer

A STUDY OF HISTORICAL EMPATHY

DO YOU ENJOY LEARNING HISTORY?

We will focus on making sense of past events and people.

WHO: 2ND AND 3RD GRADE STUDENTS
WHEN: 20-30 MINUTES BEFORE OR AFTER SCHOOL, 3-4 MEETINGS
WHERE: ON SITE

Snacks will be provided at each gathering. If you are interested or have additional questions, email Charlotte Roberts at cerober6@ncsu.edu.

NC STATE UNIVERSITY
Dear Parent(s)/Guardian(s),

My name is Charlotte Roberts and I am a fourth-year doctoral student at N.C. State University.

I am interested in learning more about how students talk about their understandings of historical empathy with regard to Japanese-American Internment. Historical empathy involves how learners make sense of past events and people. To get a better understanding of student development, we will read age/grade-level appropriate texts, listen to stories, and analyze pictures. I am hoping to conduct brief interviews with second grade students before or after school. Students will participate in a series of three to four interviews. Each interview will last approximately 20-30 minutes.

If you are willing to allow your child to participate in this study, I would love to work with you on scheduling dates and times for these meetings to take place. I will provide consent forms and I am happy to answer any questions.

Thank you so much for your time!
Charlotte Roberts

NC State University
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Parent/Guardian Email Communications

Parent/Guardian Email #1

Dear Parent(s)/Guardian(s),

Hello!

My name is Charlotte Roberts and I am a fourth-year doctoral student at N.C. State University. I am writing to confirm your interest in your child’s participation in a study before or after school.

I am interested in learning more about how students talk about their understandings of historical empathy. Historical empathy involves how learners make sense of past events and people. To get a better understanding of student development, I am hoping to conduct brief interviews with second and third grade students before or after school. Students will participate in a series of three to four interviews. Each interview will last approximately 20 to 30 minutes.

If you are willing to allow your child to participate in this study, I would love to work with you on scheduling dates and times for these meetings to take place. I will provide consent forms and I am happy to answer any questions.

Please rank the dates and times that work best for you with number one indicating your first choice, two as your second choice, and three as your third choice.

(Insert month/day/time).

Thank you so much for your time!
Charlotte Roberts

Parent/Guardian Follow-up Email #1 (one week after first email)

Dear Parent(s)/Guardian(s),

About a week ago I sent an email about conducting a study with your child. I received clearance and approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to conduct research with elementary school students.

I wanted to follow-up to verify that you received my initial email on Month/Date/Year and inquire whether you are willing to allow me to work with your child.

Thank you and take care!
Charlotte Roberts
Priorities need be no bar to personal cleanliness. Tak Sugiyama, Heart Mountain resident, is here shown scrubbing up in one of the improvised bath tubs made of sawed off pickle barrels.

If he's a boy in America he plays marbles, as these lads of Japanese parentage are doing at the Rohwer Relocation Center.

Appendix H

Focus Groups: Photograph Three

Reversing the scenes of nearly three years ago when train after train brought more than 11,000 evacuees from the West coast, Heart Mountain residents now are bidding goodbye to friends and neighbors as they return to their homes or depart for new homes and work throughout the nation. This scene taken at a recent departure shows the largest group to date to be taken away from their wartime home. Four to six coaches have been leaving the Heart Mountain Center weekly for Billings, Montana, where they will connect with the mainliners both East and west.

Appendix I

Focus Groups: Photograph Four

Supper time! Meal times are the big events of the day within an assembly center. This is a line-up of evacuees waiting for the B shift at 5:45 P.M. They carry with them their own dishes and cutlery in bags to protect them from the dust. They, themselves, individually wash their own dishes after each meal, since dish washing facilities in the mess halls prove inadequate. Most of the residents prefer this second shift because they sometimes get second helpings, but the groups are rotated each week. There are eighteen mess halls in camp which, together, accommodate 8,000 persons three times each day. All food is prepared and served by evacuees.

Appendix J

Letter from Louise Ogawa

Sept. 27, 1942

Thank you Miss Breed, for asking questions because it has helped me a lot — for then I know this letter has something of interest to you. Now to answer them — yes, we do have chairs and tables. Father made them out of scraps of wood which we found here and there. They may not be the best but they are substantial. We also have pillows which we brought from San Diego. But we do not have mattresses. We use some of our blankets as mattresses. In Santa Anita we were issued a spring bed and mattress, but here we were just issued a cot. Many people who are skilled are making beds. They say a wooden bed is much better for your posture. The cot sinks down in the middle while the wooden bed stays straight.

The movies are just grand. We see one every Saturday evening. It is shown outdoors. The screen is placed right in front of the oil tank and we sit (bring our own chairs) or stand and enjoy the movie.

The police and the post office and fire dept. is run by Japanese Americans. As yet I have not seen any persons connected with the army. There are no fence around this camp as there was in Santa Anita

School has not begun yet and I do not know who the teachers are. But I shall write more fully about it after school begins. Yesterday we saw how a teacher's room is going to be furnished. There was a nice bed with a spring and mattress, nice Spanish style bedroom set, a soft chairs, lamps and linoleum on the floor. I was almost tempted to sit on the soft chair, sit before the large dresser and lay on the bed.

I received a letter from a friend who is now in Lamas, Colorado. During the days they were on the train, they had — fried eggs for breakfast — fried chicken, fried turkey, cookies, cakes, and canned fruits. When I read about this, my mouth watered and I certainly envied them. If I can only eat fried eggs and fried chicken just once more — maybe, as the saying goes, if I am a nice girl my wish will soon be granted.

The food here is grand. Every Sunday morning we have 2 pancakes, 1 boiled egg, cocoa. I think that's a grand breakfast. This evening meal was the best we ever had here 1 piece of steak, 1/2 sweet potato, lettuce, rice, veg. salad and catup. If you are interested I shall keep the menu for one week and inform you of it.

Most sincerely,

Louise Ogawa

Appendix K

Oral History: Departure for Camp

Karen Ishizuka:
Can you describe how you went to Manzanar?

Archie Miyatake:
It was early in the morning--about eight o'clock. I can't remember exactly, but we were all told to
go to the old Santa Fe Station which is right under the 1st Street bridge...We gathered there and
were told to wait there and get on the train... As soon as it started moving everyone was told to
pull the blinds down so we couldn't see the outside...We got off the train and were hurried to the
bus. We got on the bus. From there you look around--it was the first time we got to see outside.
Nothing but desert all around. I thought, "My gosh, I wonder where else we're going to go? What
kind of place is it going to be?"

We finally arrived at a place where we saw some black barracks built. We could see some dust
blowing and I said, "Oh my gosh." We got off the bus and sure enough, the wind was blowing
like anything. We had to line up at the table to register ourselves. There was another line where
people lined up to get typhoid shots...We were assigned to different barracks.

At this time, play the audio from the link below to hear the bold words.

We were given a canvas bag and were wondering what we were going to do with it. They
told us to go to a pile of hay. We had to fill the canvas bag with the straw that was out
there. That was our mattress.

We went inside [the barrack] and we could just smell the dust in there. Every time there's a
strong wind you could see the dust coming through the cracks on the floor. Well, we set up our
bed, went to sleep, and got up the next morning. We looked, and there was a clear outline of our
head on the mattress (chuckle). Where our head was, was white but the rest of it was all gray
with sand. My mouth was full of sand and our hair was just all sticky with sand in it!

from http://www.janm.org/exhibits/breed/depar_au.htm
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Oral History: Life in Camp

Karen Ishizuka:
Did you guys realize what was happening to you? Were there discussions about what was going to happen to you?

Archie Miyatake:
One of the things that we tried to do as much as we could, was to try to make the best of the situation. It seemed like that was our most important thing to do. Since you're in there already, there's no use in crying about it. The only thing to do is try to make the best of the situation.

Karen Ishizuka:
Looking back on this, what do you think your worst memory was?

Archie Miyatake:
When you're in that kind of a situation, you wonder how long you're gonna have to stand for all this. We just got in--the second day only--and you're thinking, "When are we going to be able to get out of here and go back to normal life." After that I use to stand by the barbed wire fence. There's a highway 395 which a lot of people used to go to Bishop and the High Sierras to go fishing.

At this time, play the audio from the link below to hear the bold words.

You could see that highway almost within your reach, and yet you couldn't go on there. You just watch the buses and people driving by. And after you stand there for three and a half years, you begin to wonder, "Gee I wonder what it feels to ride on that highway."

A monetary sum and words alone cannot restore lost years or erase painful memories; neither can they fully convey our Nation's resolve to rectify injustice and to uphold the rights of individuals. We can never fully right the wrongs of the past. But we can take a clear stand for justice and recognize that serious injustices were done to Japanese Americans during World War II.

In enacting a law calling for restitution and offering a sincere apology, your fellow Americans have, in a very real sense, renewed their traditional commitment to the ideals of freedom, equality, and justice. You and your family have our best wishes for the future.

Sincerely,

George H. W. Bush

Appendix N

Letter from James H. Rowe, Jr. to Grace Tully

Appendix O

Semi-Structured Interviews: Photograph One

Camp sign

Appendix P

Semi-Structured Interviews: Photograph Two

An evacuee resting on his cot after moving his belongings into this bare barracks room. Army cot and mattress are the only things furnished by the government. All personal belongings were brought by the evacuees.

Appendix Q

Semi-Structured Interviews: Photograph Three

Dinner is served cafeteria style to young and old in the mess halls at the Heart Mountain Relocation Center.

Parker, T. (1942, September 23). Dinner is served. [Photograph]. Retrieved from https://oac.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/ft2489n744/?brand=oac4
Appendix R

Parent/Guardian Consent Form

North Carolina State University
PARENT/GUARDIAN INFORMED CONSENT FORM for RESEARCH

Understanding Historical Empathy Through the Stories of Elementary Students

Charlotte Roberts

What are some general things you should know about research studies?
Your child is being asked to take part in a research study. Your child’s participation in this study is voluntary. You have the right to allow your child to be a part of this study, to choose for him/her not to participate, or to stop his/her participation at any time without penalty. The purpose of research studies is to gain a better understanding of a certain topic or issue. You are not guaranteed any personal benefits from being in a study. Research studies also may pose risks to those that participate. In this consent form, you will find specific details about the research in which your child is being asked to participate. If you do not understand something in this form, it is your right to email the researcher for clarification or more information. If at any time you have questions about your participation, do not hesitate to contact Charlotte Roberts at cerober6@ncsu.edu.

What is the purpose of this study?
The purpose of this study is to learn more about how students talk about their understandings of historical empathy; historical empathy involves how learners make sense of past events and people.

What will happen if your child takes part in the study?
If you decide to allow your child to participate, he/she will engage in three to four interviews. Each interview will take approximately thirty minutes, which will require your child to miss that many minutes of social studies instruction. Your child has the right to skip any questions or stop the interview at any time. The researcher intends to audio record each interview; these audio recordings will be destroyed after the completion of the study.

What will the parent do in the study?
The parent/guardian is giving consent for the child’s participation in the study and removal from social studies instruction.

Risks
There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts.

Benefits
There is no direct benefit to your child; however, this study may help researchers better understand how students process historical empathy. Additional attention to this area could lead
to improved instruction on how elementary school teachers facilitate historical empathy in classrooms.

Confidentiality
The information in the study records will be kept confidential to the full extent allowed by law. The audio-recording data will be kept on a secure server; audio recordings will be destroyed after the completion of the study. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link your child to the study.

Compensation
There is no compensation offered.

What if you have questions about this study?
If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Charlotte Roberts, at 602Poe Hall 2310 Stinson Dr, Raleigh, NC 27695, cerober6@ncsu.edu, or (336) 202-6596.

What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?
If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Deb Paxton, Regulatory Compliance Administrator at dapaxon@ncsu.edu or by phone at 1-919-515-4514.

Consent To Participate
“I have read and understand the above information. I agree to allow my child to participate in this study with the understanding that I may choose to withdraw my child or to stop his/her participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.”

Agree ___ Disagree ___

Signature of Parent/Guardian: ___________________________ Date: ________________

You will receive a copy of this form for your own records.
Appendix S

Minor Assent Scripts

North Carolina State University
MINOR ASSENT SCRIPT for FOCUS GROUP

Title of Study/Repository: Understanding Historical Empathy Through the Dialogue of Elementary School Students: A Qualitative Research Study (14322)
Principal Investigator: Dr. Meghan Manfra, meghan_manfra@ncsu.edu, (919) 513-2590
Faculty Point of Contact: Charlotte Roberts, cerober6@ncsu.edu, (336) 202-6596

Minor Assent Script

“Hello! My name is Charlotte Roberts. If you have any questions about what I am telling you, you can ask me at any time. I am a researcher which means I am trying to find out new information. I am studying how students understand the past, more specifically Japanese-American Internment. Internment is when a group of people are forced into a small area for specific reasons. There are minimal risks involved in this study since we are talking about a serious topic that may make you feel uncomfortable or ask questions. You are being asked to be a part of my study because you are in [second or third] grade. If it is okay with you I am going to ask you to listen to a story, letters, and look at pictures and then discuss them with me and a small group of students. We will meet three times for 20-30 minutes before or after school. If you need to stop at any time you can tell me and we will stop. You do not have to be a part of this study. This is your decision. You can say yes now and still change your mind later. No one will be upset with you if you decide to not be in the study or stop being a part of the study. Your parent(s)/guardian(s) say it is okay for you to be in this study. If you have any questions for me or your parent(s)/guardian(s) you can ask them at any time. Do you understand what I am saying? Do you have any questions? Are you willing to participate in this study?”

Minor’s Name: __________________________________________ Verbal Response: Yes or No

Investigator’s signature ______________________________________ Date ____________

North Carolina State University
MINOR ASSENT SCRIPT for INTERVIEW

Title of Study/Repository: Understanding Historical Empathy Through the Dialogue of Elementary School Students: A Qualitative Research Study (14322)
Principal Investigator: Dr. Meghan Manfra, meghan_manfra@ncsu.edu, (919) 513-2590
Faculty Point of Contact: Charlotte Roberts, cerober6@ncsu.edu, (336) 202-6596

Minor Assent Script

“Hello! My name is Charlotte Roberts. If you have any questions about what I am telling you, you can ask me at any time. I am a researcher which means I am trying to find out new information. I am studying how students understand the past, more specifically Japanese-American Internment. Internment is when a group of people are forced into a small area for specific reasons. There are minimal risks involved in this study since we are talking about a serious topic that may make you feel uncomfortable or ask questions. You are being asked to be a part of my study because you are in [second or third] grade and were a participant in our group discussions. If it is okay with you I am going to ask you to listen to a story, letters, and look at pictures and then discuss them with me. We will meet one time for 20-30 minutes before or
after school. If you need to stop at any time you can tell me and we will stop. You do not have to be a part
of this study. This is your decision. You can say yes now and still change your mind later. No one will be
upset with you if you decide to not be in the study or stop being a part of the study. Your
parent(s)/guardian(s) say it is okay for you to be in this study. If you have any questions for me or your
parent(s)/guardian(s) you can ask them at any time. Do you understand what I am saying? Do you have
any questions? Are you willing to participate in this study?”

Minor’s Name: ___________________________________________ Verbal Response: Yes or No
Investigator’s signature ___________________________________ Date ________________