The Councilor: A Journal of the Social Studies

October 2020

Preservice Teachers' Perceptions of the "Public Displays of History" Debate

Benjamin R. Wellenreiter
Illinois State University, brwelle@ilstu.edu

Monica Noraian
Illinois State University, mcnora2@ilstu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/the_councilor

Part of the Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons, History Commons, Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons, and the Secondary Education Commons

RUNNING HEAD: PRESERVICE TEACHERS AND PUBLIC DISPLAYS OF HISTORY

Preservice Teachers' Perceptions of the "Public Displays of History" Debate

Benjamin R. Wellenreiter

School of Teaching and Learning

Monica Cousins Noraian

Department of History

Illinois State University

Normal, Illinois

Abstract

We examined how the preservice history and social science teachers (n=84) with whom we worked conceptualized debates regarding Public Displays of History (PDH) such as monuments and building names. Participants described PDH as important venues for learning history but viewed them as incomplete, often biased, sources of information. When determining whether removal or alteration is appropriate, the preservice teachers stressed comparison of the PDH to current societal norms, original overt and tacit intent of the creators of the PDH, the actions or deeds of the subject through a historical accuracy lens, and whether removal changes understanding of the subject of the PDH. Participants described some PDH as ineligible for alteration or removal because of their importance to society. Participants viewed classrooms as appropriate places for students to engage in debate regarding PDH. Discussed are implications for classroom practice and future research.

Keywords; Monuments and memorials, social science teachers, controversial topics

The 2015 church shooting in Charleston, South Carolina and the 2017 Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville, Virginia served as catalysts for impassioned societal debate regarding the role of Confederate statues and memorials in the public sphere. Expanded to include contested narratives within concepts such as colonialism, racial stereotypes, "heroic" but deeply flawed military and political leaders, and dominant war narratives, displays of—and references to—history are receiving unprecedented societal scrutiny. Communities across the United States and across the world continue to examine and evaluate long-standing historical references in their communities. Analyzed, debated, evaluated, and often removed, monuments, public murals, street and building names, mascots, and other "Public Displays of History" are individual and collective case studies for the writing, interpretation, reinterpretation and integration of history into ever-changing societal conceptualizations of what should be remembered and/or celebrated.

Though history and social science teachers may celebrate the passionate societal interest in historiography, their perceptions of these debates remain underexamined. To better understand how the preservice history and social science teachers with whom we worked viewed this debate, we examined their responses to the broad question; "What factors are most salient to you in determining whether a Public Display of History should remain or be removed?" Further, we asked them to describe what role the debate itself might play in their future classrooms. As perceived gatekeepers to society's conceptualization of history, how social science teachers understand and professionally act upon these debates influence how their students will experience it. Their voices are, however, conspicuously absent from a major role in these debates. Needed is deeper understanding of the perceptions of individuals tasked by society with teaching history. Understanding these perceptions sheds light on how future generations may view current debates and ultimately their own identities. Preservice teachers' perceptions of

these debates are important to explore because they will spend future decades influencing

students' understanding of past, present, and future societal dialogue regarding contentious

history and the public displays that represent it. Additionally, preservice teachers, given their

unique positioning as individuals with basic historiographical training but little experience in

teaching in politically nested environments, can provide insights into how perceptions regarding

controversial subjects may change as teaching experience grows. This perspective is of interest

for those engaged in both the content and pedagogy of history and the social sciences.

There is a call to further investigate teachers' understandings of the nature of history

(Fang, 1996; McCrum, 2013; Slekar, 1998; Voet & De Wever, 2016; Yilmaz, 2008). This

exploration responds to this call by investigating how the preservice history and social science

teachers with whom we worked described their views on factors they believe should play a role

in the maintenance, alteration, or removal of public displays of history and in the study of these

displays in K-12 history and social science classrooms. Further, as teaching and learning

standards within the social science place greater emphasis on identification, analysis,

interpretation, and critique of sources of information, (NCSS, 2013), it is imperative to better

understand how teachers new to the profession navigate politically and culturally controversial

reflections of history.

Literature Review

Context and Definition of Public Displays of History

Ongoing societal discourse in many countries focuses on the roles memorialization,

historical monuments, building names, street names, school mascots, holidays, and other public

displays of history play in their histories, cultures, and identities (Alderman & Inwood, 2013; de

Amézola, 2007; Coker, 2017; Dhupelia-Mesthrie, 2000; Gregory, 2000; Napier, Lebeta, &

Zungu, 2000; Osborne, 2017; Pewewardy, 2004). Protests and subsequent removal of Confederate Civil War monuments in the United States, statues and references to Cecil Rhodes in South Africa and the United Kingdom, and debate regarding how Argentina should memorialize victims of the Dirty War disappearances of 1974-1983 exemplify history-long tensions between historical narratives at the time of the creation of public displays of history and subsequent changing political and societal norms. Similar processes have—or are—taking place in countries such as Belgium, Kenya, and India (Goddeeris, 2015; Levey, 2014; McGarr, 2015).

While the topic of public displays of history—and their impacts on our understanding of the past—has recently emerged as a topic of heated societal debate, the role of these displays in the conceptualization of history has itself a long history. Indeed, Thutmose III worked to change the historical narrative and impact the afterlife of Queen Hatshepsut of ancient Egypt by scrubbing clean references to her after her death in 1483 B.C.E. (Brovarski, 1976). As they have changed, societies have continually struggled with the role public displays of history play in their history narratives, and, subsequently, their identities (Azaryahu, 2011; Foxall, 2013; Wertsch, 2008; Woldemaram, 2016).

Laden with meanings and open to multiple interpretations, representations of historic events, groups, individuals, and ideas displayed in public spheres require continued analyses to better understand the teaching and learning of past events and their integration into individual and social identities (Carretero, Asensio, & Rodríguez-Moneo, 2012; Mayo, 1988; Savage, 1997). In the United States, protests, acts of vandalism, and acts of violence reflect passions individuals and groups have regarding the place of US Civil War monuments in public spaces. These activities demonstrate an ongoing debate regarding the role of monuments and other

public displays of history in the interpretation of historic events and, subsequently, individual

and national identities.

The central focus of our exploration is on "Public Display(s) of History" (PDH). Intended

for consumption by the public outside formalized curriculum or pedagogy, PDH are situated

beyond traditional academic settings such as museums or classrooms (Kelley, 1978).

For our purposes, the working definition of PDH includes forms of public display,

whether originally intended or currently interpreted as vehicles for information about past events,

people, or ideas. Examples include; statues, monuments, memorials, pictures on money, street

names, building and organization names, murals, holidays, business logos, school mascots, and

other forms of public display. The original intent or current interpretation of PDH to influence

public memory through their situatedness in public spaces are the foundational characteristics of

PDH (Blair, Dickinson, & Ott, 2010). Focus, whether formal or informal, original or interpreted,

on the conveyance of information or impression from the past distinguishes PDH from public

works of art that emphasize aesthetics or individual introspection. Rather than taking a

dichotomous view, the conceptualization of public works as either PDH or not is context-based

and is itself open to interpretation. Seen as racial stereotyping and as support of specific

historical narratives, corporate logos or sports team mascots, for example, are PDH for some, but

not for others. Thus, the definition of a specific public display as a PDH is itself open to debate.

To ground the current, working definition of PDH, we broaden Savage's (1997)

conceptualization of monuments to include other forms of public displays such as town and

building names and toponyms:

> Public monuments are the most conservative of commemorative forms precisely because
>
> they are meant to last, unchanged, forever. While other things come and go, are lost and

forgotten, the monument is supposed to remain a fixed point, stabilizing both the physical

and the cognitive landscape. Monuments attempt to mold a landscape of collective

memory, to conserve what is worth remembering and discard the rest. (p. 4)

Emphases on original intent to influence collective memory, avoidance of negative

aspects of the history of many PDH, and of an intended, unchanging narrative as central concepts

to both the nature of PDH and current debates surrounding them, frame our exploration (Savage,

1997).

Elements of the Debates Surrounding PDH

Historical commemoration through PDH, their original intent, ongoing and current

contextualizations and interpretations, and what actions to take regarding them has long been

part of societal discourse (Alderman & Inwood, 2013; Coombes, 2003; Dickenson, Blair & Ott,

2010; Mayo, 1988; Osborne, 2017; Savage, 1999; Savage, 2009). Central to these debates are

conflicts between the subject of PDH, overt and tacit original intent of PDH, the reinterpretation

of these intents in ever-changing political and societal contexts, and whether altering or

removing PDH changes history narrative (Osborne, 2017). Changing political winds, the

revelation or rediscovery of flaws of subjects that recontextualize their deeds, and the morphing

of broad societal norms lead to reinterpretation and reconsideration of the role of specific PDH in

the social sphere (Bartetzky, 2006; Baum, 2012; Cloud, 2003). The subject, the original intent,

the modern interpretation, and how the maintenance or removal of the PDH influence

understanding of history are four essential elements considered in PDH controversies.

The subject.

To remember or honor deeds or honorable individuals, groups or individuals often

establish PDH (Brown, 2017; Daise, 2017; Mills, 2012). Invariably linked to the perceptions of

PDH are additional facts or perspectives not reflected in their presentation (Savage, 1997). It may have been the intent to honor Woodrow Wilson for his advocacy for the League of Nations and other peace-seeking pursuits through the naming of schools, place names, and US Currency, ($100,000 bill), but these overlook his racist statements and ties to the Ku Klux Klan (Rose, 2016). Likewise, PDH focused on George Washington and Thomas Jefferson emphasize their roles in the founding of the United States but make little or no mention of their slave ownership status' (Beetham & Clinton, 2016; Siegel, 2017).

PDH created to honor or remember groups or ideas such as the "average" Confederate soldier may carry the concepts of sacrifice and honor without the weight of individual misdeeds or character flaws that burden PDH to individuals. Debate regarding these corporate PDH, despite representing general concepts of honor and sacrifice and lack of focus on individual flaws, is taking place (Daise, 2017).

Original intent.

Decisions to craft monuments, name schools and streets, place pictures on money, and declare official holidays occur in specific and broad political and social contexts (Hitchmough, 2013; Marschall, 2010; Vanderford, 1996). The decision to fill a public space with a work that recognizes an individual or event requires exclusion of others. Light and Young (2015) framed this decision as reflecting the desires of an economic, political, or social majority; "The names attributed to places (settlements, urban streets and landmarks) are not accidental or politically neutral but are chosen and foregrounded as being somehow 'appropriate', while other, less acceptable, names are overlooked or marginalized" (p. 436). Through this process, the PDH is by its nature a combination of the subject and of motives for its creation that transcend the subject

(Frei, 2017; Mills, 2012). The creator of a PDH selects, filters, and eliminates aspects of the subject of PDH. Crankshaw, Brent, and Brent (2016) stated:

> Memorials represent their producers, not the events they commemorate. They remark on the past to make intentional claims on history and to mold the ideological future. Memorials are given birth by campaigns that also conceive political positions, educational efforts, and organized rituals (p. 1).

Complicating challenges to the original intent of a PDH is that it may include more than one, and the intents may be both overt and tacit (Crow, 2006; Ernsberger Jr., 2018). As with current interpretations of intent and meaning of PDH, original intent and meaning is varied and open to individual perspectives. For example, the creation of many Confederate monuments both mourned the loss of young men and promoted the Lost Cause narrative of the Civil War (Beetham, 2016; Brown, 2017; Daise, 2017; Goodman, 2017). To state any given PDH has a single, original meaning denies the multiple perspectives of those responsible for their creations and does not acknowledge the time, place, and cultural context of the conception and erection of a PDH.

Modern interpretation.

Just as with the creators and their original intents and interpretations of PDH, current interpretations of these works vary, depending on the positioning of the individual (Beetham, 2016). Viewed through lenses influenced by events such as recent protests and violence in Charlottesville, Virginia and the Black Lives Matter Movement, PDH take on new meanings, revisit old implications, and are subject to continued critique (Beetham, 2016). In explaining the rationale for covering murals depicting Christopher Columbus, University of Notre Dame's

President John Jenkins (2019) worked to balance the original intent of the work with the modern

interpretation that takes a wider variety of voices into account:

> At the time they were painted, the murals were not intended to slight indigenous peoples,
>
> but to encourage another marginalized group. In the second half of the 19th century,
>
> Notre Dame's Catholic population, largely immigrants or from families of recent
>
> immigrants, encountered significant anti-Catholic, anti-immigrant attitudes in American
>
> public life....Our goal in making this change is to respect both Gregori's murals,
>
> understood in their historical context, and the reality and experience of Native Americans
>
> in the aftermath of Columbus's arrival (Jenkins, 2019).

Rather than remaining static in their meanings and implications, continual revisiting and

reinterpretation of purpose and meaning of PDH takes place (Glazer, 1996; Kattago, 2009). The

significance and importance of the PDH changes over time as the past is continually

recontextualized in the present. This is both a national and international phenomenon (Larsen,

2012; McGarr, 2015; Stańczyk, 2013).

The impact on history of changing a PDH.

The alteration or removal of a PDH does not change the history surrounding the subject

or the erection of the PDH (American Historical Association, 2017; Grossman, 2016). In its

statement regarding Confederate monuments, the American Historical Association stated; "To

remove such monuments is neither to "change" history nor "erase" it. What changes with such

removals is what American communities decide is worthy of civic honor." Indeed, erasing the

bas-relief Confederate memorial on Stone Mountain in Georgia or covering the Christopher

Columbus murals at the University of Notre Dame, as examples, would not alter the history of

the individuals represented or the histories of the establishment of the PDH. Alteration or

covering of these works would change messages sent to current and future societies about the worthiness of the individuals depicted.

The complete removal of monuments and other PDH from public spaces changes perceptions of the subject and influences broader societal identity (Larsen, 2012; McGarr, 2015; Stańczyk, 2013). In response to the August 20, 2018 toppling of the Confederate monument, commonly known as "Silent Sam" on the campus of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the university's Board of Trustees recommended keeping the statue while creating a new education center that would; "…[allow] us to contextualize the artifacts" (The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Board of Trustees, 2018, p. 5). Through this recommendation, the report acknowledged that alteration of the statue's location and the addition of narratives more deeply informs the public of the university's history (The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Board of Trustees, 2018). Rejecting the recommendation to maintain the PDH in a revised location were protesters who stated that the university was on the wrong side of history ('Silent Sam' Tensions Erupt Again on UNC Campus After Latest Decision by University, 2018).

If memory and perceptions of PDH change over time, their removal, repositioning, or continued positioning impact how we understand history (Glazer, 2006; Osborne, 2017). A major argument of those wishing to maintain PDH in their spaces, even with the addition of countermonuments or PDH, is that any change to the PDH alters views of history (Osborne, 2017). To work to slow down—or perhaps prevent—changes in the understanding and perceptions of historic events and individuals, legislation such as The Alabama Memorial Preservation Act of 2017 (AL Act 2017-354, Senate Bill 60) imposes fines upon municipalities that alter or remove PDH that are more than 40 years old without permission from a state appointed board. Similarly, in response to criticism of the Confederate Memorial at Stone

Mountain, Georgia, the legislature forbade the alteration of the bas-relief except with its approval (Georgia Code, O.C.G.A. § 50-3-1 (c)). Legal responses such as these reflect thought that any change to a PDH may negatively impact the conceptualization of perceived honorable deeds promoted by the individuals or groups who created the PDH.

Preservice Teacher Interpretation of Texts and PDH

How teachers view the nature of history, particularly regarding the openness to interpretation because of changing societal norms and contextual considerations, influence how they approach the subject with their students (James, 2008; Slekar, 1998; Slekar, 2006; van Hover & Yeager, 2003). Preservice social science teachers, for example, feel that though they are capable of critiquing and interpreting history in various ways, their elementary students are not yet capable of such work, leading preservice teachers to believe their students are only ready for a single historical narrative (James, 2008). Preservice teachers do describe historical interpretation as being an important skill for students to experience at the secondary level (Ozmen, 2015). Engaging preservice teachers through exposure to various texts and narratives can deepen their understanding of history as multidimensional (Vansledright & Afflerbach, 2000) Texts, broadly defined, certainly include various PDH. In addition to exploring the preservice teachers' perceptions of the PDH debate, we hoped the process of inquiry would stimulate their consideration of the interpretation and re-interpretation of PDH as historical texts.

Method

Context and Design

We explored perceptions of preservice teachers working toward licensure in social science at a medium-sized, Midwestern university with a deep history of teacher education. Located in a small-city setting, the university is approximately 120 miles from the major urban

center of the state. Though situated in an ideologically conservative area, 62% of the university's students come from the more liberal suburban and urban areas of the state. The undergraduate population of over 16,000 consisted of 73% white, 11% Latinx, and 9% Black students. Reflecting the larger student population, a majority of participants were white, middle class students while a minority of participants were Latinx or Black.

Students in three sections of a middle level history-social science methods course and two sections of a secondary history-social science methods course participated during the Fall 2017 and Fall 2018 semesters. We taught two middle level courses and both secondary level courses. An adjunct faculty member taught the third middle level course. All three instructors are former history and social science public school teachers.

Each course placed emphasis on history and social science teachers as critical examiners of historical narratives. Encouraging preservice teachers to view their role as politically, socially, and culturally nested within their own experiences and perspectives, the courses challenged preservice teachers to see their pedagogic choices as inherently politically positioned. Employing the College, Career, & Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies as a fundamental framework for classroom work in history and social science, we encouraged the preservice teachers to view their craft as systematic interpretation of texts, narratives, and sub-narratives (NCSS, 2013). Exemplifying this approach, one of the middle-level sections explored the multiple narratives used to teach Christopher Columbus' landing in the Western Hemisphere and how a teacher's selection of sources and philosophical positioning impacted students' views on the subject. Though perhaps influencing the results of our survey regarding PDH, the intent of this approach was to encourage the preservice teachers with whom we worked to view the concept of texts broadly. Emphasized was the concept that crafting of texts such as PDH require

exclusion of narratives. It is thus the teacher's responsibility to assist students in exploring

multiple texts from various perspectives to gain fuller understanding of history and its people.

Not specifically discussed in whole-group settings until after the completion of the surveys were

PDH and current PDH controversies.

Watching news reports of protests, violence, and action against PDH across the country,

we became interested in what the preservice teachers thought about the "take it down, leave it

up" dichotomy often presented in the PDH debate. During the fall 2017 and fall 2018 semesters,

participants completed an online survey near the end of their middle- and secondary- history-

social science methods courses (see Appendix A). The survey consisted of two parts: a)

questions that asked participants to rank order the relative importance to learning history of

various forms of Public Displays of History and rank the relative importance of various factors

that they believe should be taken into consideration when deciding whether to remove a Public

Display of History from the public sphere; and b) 8 open-ended questions that asked participants

to discuss; the role PDH should play in learning about history, what considerations should be

taken into account when determining whether a PDH should be removed or altered, the process

by which society should decide whether a PDH should be altered or removed, the circumstances

under which a PDH should not be changed, and questions regarding the role PDH and the PDH

controversy should play in K-12 history-social science courses.

We created a semi-structured interview based on the themes we identified from the

survey data. We extended an invitation to the survey participants to engage in this follow-up

group interview. Our intent was to include additional voices in the conceptualization of the

results.

Participants

Participants (n=84) in the survey portion of the study were junior and senior level teacher education majors. 46 participants were middle-level education majors seeking endorsement in social sciences and 38 participants were secondary history-social science education majors. Participants in the semi-structured interview were two secondary-level history-social science education majors and a middle-level education major seeking a social science endorsement. Though only 3 participants engaged in the follow up interview, their insights assisted in reaffirming the themes we identified in the survey data.

Data Analysis

We coded participants' open-ended survey responses into *central categories* after open coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2014; Moghaddam, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1988). Through keywords and phrases used by participants, we observed themes related to the role of PDH in learning history, what considerations to emphasize in determining whether to remove, alter, or maintain PDH, and the role of PDH in teaching history. For example, we categorized words and phrases such as "most if not all should stay" with "…a lot of [PDH] should not be removed". Similarly, we categorized statements such as "current understanding should be taken into consideration" and "looked at through a modern eye" together.

<div align="center">

Results

</div>

Role of PDH in Learning History

Preservice teachers rank ordered the relative importance of various forms of PDH and other sources of information in understanding history. Table 1 provides participant responses to this question. Participants ranked monuments (58.34%), textbooks (48.81%), holidays (50.01%), movies and documentaries (40.47%), pictures on money (21.42%), and the names of individuals

on public buildings (17.85%) as the most important sources of historical information. Though not within the working definition of PDH for the current exploration, included were textbooks and movies/documentaries to serve as reference points familiar to the participants and because of their predicted, perceived primary role in the learning of history.

Regarding the role they play in the learning about people or events, 65 participants (77%) described PDH as important or useful sources of historical information, though 12 (14%) specifically described this information as being potentially or historically flawed or biased. 8 participants (9.5%) described PDH as having little educational value.

11 participants (13%) specifically described PDH as reflective of societal or local values. Participant 25 stated; "The role of public displays of history is to show people what their community/town/nation values. That may be a person, a moment in history, but more importantly an ideal". Similarly, in describing the naming of schools after previous superintendents, Participant 21 stated: "These don't necessarily teach much about the past but rather reveal what parts of history are important to the school districts." The function of a PDH to remember, glorify, honor, or value may appear at first to be obvious, but participant statements regarding this function often focus on the creators and maintainers of the PDH, rather than the PDH itself. This is reflective of the view that PDH represent their creators more so, perhaps, than the subjects themselves (Crankshaw, Brent, and Brent, 2016).

Those who described PDH as being important sources of information often framed them as starting points rather than as end points for learning about a subject. 19 participants (23%) described PDH as catalysts for the desire to learn more. Participant 48's comments exemplify these sentiments:

Public displays of history help people learn about people or events from the past because they are out in the open and people want to know what those displays are. When people see displays they don't know they want to know more about it and will do what they can to learn more so that helps them learn about our history.

Though described as important sources of information, 12 participants (14%) stated that PDH are often misleading or ignore important aspects of the subject. Exemplifying this view, Participant 63 stated:

Often there are public displays of good parts of history and people will try to gloss over anything thing bad that has happened in their history. It can be very one sided so that can teach the public that it is okay to be one sided and not critically think about the past.

Likewise, Participant 22 stated: "Putting a person or event on a pedestal will create a positive view of the event. Without any 'negative' it can easily lead to a bias in the public who only know one side of the display's story."

Considerations for Alteration or Removal of a PDH

Table 2 displays participant responses to the question; "W*hich considerations are most important when a society decides whether or not to alter or remove a "public display of history" such as a statue, street name, or portrait on money?*". The themes we observed reflect major positions taken in broad societal dialogue regarding PDH: That the original intent, current interpretation, and the impact of removal on the understanding of history are salient factors when determining the fate of PDH. Participants placed highest priority on the current interpretation of the person or event in question (30 participants/36%), the intent of the original people who created the PDH (19 participants/23%), and the importance to society of the individual or event

(10 participants/12%). 62 participants (74%) placed current interpretation in the top 3

considerations while 55 (65%) placed original intent in the top 3. Broadly, the two top

considerations listed as highest priority were the current interpretation and the original

interpretation of the PDH, with the importance of the individual, the type of display, and whether

change to the PDH would change understanding of history taking secondary roles. Not listed as

high priorities by participants were the cost of alteration or removal and whether alteration or

removal would cause additional controversy.

In the open-ended response portion of the survey, participant responses fell into one of

five categories of emphasis when describing the considerations important for determining the

status of a PDH. Though the considerations were not necessarily exclusive, categories are:

Refusers, Original Intentors, Current Interpreters and *Historical Absolutists.* The Current

Interpreter's category divides into those participants focused on *Societal Norms* and those

focused on deciding through *Democratic Processes*. One participant (Participant 76) specifically

described working to avoid additional controversy as the main factor in determining whether a

PDH should remain in its current location.

Refusers.

Though asked to rank considerations for alteration or removal, nine participants (11%)

explicitly stated unqualified objection to the removal of PDH. Reasoning given for this stance

focused on the need to maintain PDH as a source of history and that their removal threatens

understanding of history. Participant 6 statements exemplify this view: "I believe most if not all

public displays of history should remain the same. They are learning tools, that is all they are."

Participant 11 argued that maintaining a PDH that is disagreeable does not necessarily reflect

current societal standards but that removing a PDH changes history: "I believe that it does take

away a part of history because keeping it does not say that we believe in that person or things

beliefs but that we accept that it happened." Likewise, participant 10 placed emphasis on

ongoing conversation through maintenance of a PDH:

> I think a lot of public displays of history should not be removed. Even if our
>
> interpretation of history or that person has changed they are still a part of our history and
>
> just because we removed them does not mean we have removed them from our past. We
>
> need to understand our history through these public displays, good and bad.

Original intentors.

In describing the most salient consideration for potential alteration or removal of PDH,

13 participants (15%) placed greatest emphasis on the intent of the original creators or those

responsible for the PDH in question. It is interesting to note that participants who described the

intentions of those responsible for the creation of the PDH were not necessarily in favor of

maintaining the PDH in its current location or form. Rather, both official, documented reasons

and subtexts of those initially responsible for a PDH should be the primary consideration used to

determine its fate. Participant 4 placed emphasis on original intent but evaluates it through a

contemporary lens: "What was the intent of its construction, what is the displays significance in

history, and what are the issues that bring it in to question. Depending on how these questions

are answered should determine the condition of the display."

Participant 2 was more direct in the employment of original intent in determining

whether to remove a PDH:

> I believe that original intent and the target of the monument is key. For example, for the
>
> recent Confederate statue controversy, many of the statues in question were not erected to
>
> memorialize (treacherous) war dead. Rather, they were erected as responses to the

questioning of white supremacy in the south. The target is the other aspect, and to use the Confederate example again, I do not believe it is appropriate to honor traitors to the nation in such a way.

In the follow-up interview, Interviewee 1 stated: "I think the most important part [with] the original intentors--…they focus on the history of the time period, when it was put up". Providing an example of this concept, Interviewee 2 stated:

> …Stonewall Jackson, Robert E. Lee were rallying points for the ideals of white supremacy, especially in the south of the nation. That is something to consider. And obviously a statue with that intent to put up, even if it's the intent may have originally been to honor veterans of "X" war, whatever um, you look at the subtext—obviously the subtext of it."

Original Intentors placed greatest focus on the original intentions and broader historical context at the time of the creation of the PDH. More salient than modern interpretation is the intent of those who established a PDH. For example, in 1861 Georgia renamed Cass County to Bartow County in honor of a Confederate Colonel Francis S. Bartow. An individual with the Original Intentors perspective considers the reasoning behind the decision to rename the county, rather than the current interpretation of Bartow's legacy, as the most important consideration in a debate to change the name.

Current interpreters.

The largest category, *Current Interpreters*, contains 53 participants (63%), with two distinct subcategories *Current Interpreters—Societal Norms* (36 participants/ 43%) and *Current Interpreters—Democratic Processes* (17 participants/20%). Participants in this category placed emphasis on current societal norms, dialogue, and the perspectives of traditionally and currently

marginalized groups directly impacted by the PDH in question. Participant 47, reflecting the views of many in this group, placed emphasis on current values and whether PDH were representative of those values:

> I think that if a "public display of history" involves something that doesn't match the ethics associated with current societies standards then it should be altered, removed, etc. It is important to still learn about the people or event, but not to put it on a pedestal if it is unjust or negatively represents a group of people.

> Similarly, Participant 1 stated:

> I think debating the alteration, removal, or to keep the "public display of history" does need to include several conversations and perspectives. Who is it affecting and how? Is it completely altering history in a miseducated way or enacting racism/sexism/homophobia and any other institutions that perpetuate systems of oppression.

> Rather than advocating for the destruction of a PDH, however, participants in this category encouraged examination of a PDH, often with the intent of removal from their original locations to spaces that more deeply encouraged critique and evaluation, such as museums. Participant 16 stated:

> A society should also consider how it portrays what this society values. While specific public displays of history may represent a specific part of history, it may have a place where it can serve its educational purpose, for example in a museum, as opposed to being in public portraying an offensive ideal.

> Participant 30 summed up this perspective:

I think that they could be moved to a museum and have the same effect on telling history.

I don't think they should be destroyed but I don't think anything that is offensive to any

group should be front and center.

Indeed, destruction of a PDH, according to Interviewee 2, denies future generations the

opportunity to further interpret its meaning:

You could put it in a museum and say it used to be here but then it was removed because

of this reason. Rather than completely eliminating it from our—from completely

eliminating it from the world or completely destroying it. I think is really harsh,

especially if you want to study history. 'Cause taking monuments away that's a reflection

of like our current views too. And if you destroy it, it is kinda like a lot harder to

understand why we took it away.

Current interpreters—Societal norms.

The distinction between the Societal Norms subcategory and the Democratic Processes

subcategory reflects differences in the process of removal of a PDH if it is determined that it is

not suitable for its current location. When discussing how the process of determining the fate of a

PDH when placed next to current societal standards, participants in this subcategory either did

not describe the specific process of determination or advocated for a process that did not directly

involve voting or referenda. Indeed, arguing against direct voting or referenda, Participant 39

stated: "Despite living in a democracy, I think it would be unfair to leave it to "the people" to

decide, since white power is still overwhelmingly dominant in politics." Participants in this

category believe it is inappropriate to rely on a direct vote because the cultural, political, or

economic majority responsible for the PDH may still exist. Participant 29 took this concept one

step further, working to minimize the voice of the historical majority:

For me, it is not my right as a white, middle class woman to stand there and say that the Cleveland Indians' mascot is not offensive. I am not Native American, and I really gain nothing from keeping the mascot except a sense of control/ownership over another population…. Despite living in a democracy, I think it would be unfair to leave it to "the people" to decide, since white power is still overwhelmingly dominant in politics.

Current interpreters—Democratic processes.

Though similar in the consideration of multiple, contemporary voices, participants in the Current Interpreters—Democratic Processes subcategory encourage the final action to be determined by direct vote or referenda. Different from those in the Current Interpreters-Societal Norms, participants in this category explicitly described debate followed by direct democracy. Participant 77 described this debate-referendum process that takes multiple perspectives into account, but leaves the final verdict up to the population at large:

> I believe that society should decide to remove or alter a public display of history through a referendum added to the local elections, a town hall meeting where people can choose to defend their side of the argument, and a thorough investigation into why they would want to remove this display, and who they would replace it with.

Participant 45 also considered debate in this voting process:

The majority of the time, public displays of history are publicly funded, which in that case, would have to have a vote or public forum. In the event of people finding a public display as offensive, it would stem from a current event gone wrong…. If it was publicly funded, I believe that if a majority says take it down, it must be taken down.

Historical absolutists.

Six participants, (7%) placed focus on the maintenance, removal, or elimination of a PDH on the acts of the figure or event of the PDH represented. Distinct from Original Intentors, who focused on the individuals responsible for the creation of the PDH, Historical Absolutists placed greater focus on facts surrounding the subject. Distinct from Current Interpreters, Historical Absolutists placed little emphasis on debate, perspective and interpretation and instead focused on seemingly inarguable facts. Indeed, every individual in this category described either "facts", "evidence" or "false narratives" as major considerations, exemplified by Participant 33's statements:

> I think that it should be decided based on actual evidence for the monument or name to be taken down or removed. I think that it is a major decision that needs to be made sometimes, but history is history and one way or another, in some sense it needs to be represented in our society.

Historical Absolutists were direct in their emphases on facts but did not articulate the processes by which they give weight to facts when determining the fate of any given PDH. Historical Absolutists placed emphasis on the idea that PDH are strong vehicles for learning about history and that their accuracy is primary, with interpretation, both original and current, taking a secondary role. Participant 13 summarized this view, which places nuanced focus on factual information more so than current interpretation:

> I think that it does take away parts of history, but they need to be removed. If the public display of history is creating misconceptions for the public, they should be removed. It's the only way people will get a complete and accurate view of history.

Sacrosanct PDH

Transcending categories, we observed a theme describing certain PDH as being exempt from removal or alteration. Though they may be up for academic debate, the actual alteration or removal of PDH dedicated to specific individuals or events is out of the question. 12 participants (14%) carved out PDH recognizing "Founding Fathers" such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, other leaders such as Abraham Lincoln and Martin Luther King Jr., and PDH commemorating events such as the 9/11 attacks or Pearl Harbor as off limits for alteration or removal. Participants viewed these PDH as foundational to societal and individual identity, the removal of which would adversely affect understanding of history. The conflicting comments of Participant 8, reflect those who carved out exceptions for a select few:

> Public displays of history act as ways of making everyday people into heroes. These can be dangerous because they get rid of all of the negative parts of the person and glorify their achievements.
>
> …
>
> Founding fathers should not be removed because they were fundamental to the foundation of the country. Any time the thought of taking away public displays of history comes to fruition, contextuality of the acts should be taken into account. Yes, the founding fathers owned slaves, but at the time that was the norm.

Sharing the view that certain subjects of PDH are exempt from the alteration or removal debate and applying a different standard of behavior, Interviewee 1 exempted George Washington in ways not applied to Confederate leaders:

> Yeah, I think that it is a little ridiculous to think that anyone in history was perfect. And that to think that they never did anything wrong, um, but I think the most important thing is that when you are examining Washington in the time period, people own slaves. That

was the culture like that, so if you want to attack him for owning slaves, you also have to

realize that that's what was happening at the time. You have to examine, you know, what

else was going on. He wasn't the only person owning slaves in America. I mean—

…

I think that can get tricky when you start looking at the Civil War. Um, because people

are like "oh, well it was the time period to own slaves." I was like, yeah, but those people

also committed treason. I mean, uh, you know, they seceded from the United States,

which is a lot different than just, you know, owning slaves.

The Role of the PDH Debate in K-12 Classrooms

Three themes were observed from participant responses to the question; "*What role does

the 'public display of history' debate play in K-12 social science classrooms and what are the

implications for teachers?"* Participants described the PDH debate as: being an important venue

for students to express their opinions on the interpretation of historical events, as an opportunity

to bridge concepts studied in the history classroom to life outside of school, and as a way of

correcting factual inaccuracies regarding the subjects of the PDH. Eight participants (10%)

specifically stated PDH has little or no importance to K-12 history or social science classrooms

or is inappropriate as a discussion topic.

Reflecting the widespread emphasis on the perspectives and opinions of a diversity of

individuals regarding the PDH debate generally, many participants described the importance of

using their classrooms as venues for students to explore and debate varying points of view

regarding PDH and their subjects. The statement of Participant 38 summed up the perspectives

of many:

This can and should be talked about if it is something that the student brings to attention.

I think the history behind these monuments and the stories that follow it are what should

be focused most on and we should allow students to have their own opinions.

Similarly, Participant 5 placed the final evaluation firmly in the hands of students when it

comes to the fate of PDH and their subjects:

It is important for teachers to let students decide for themselves what they believe, there

is obviously no right answer to these debates. However, fostering an environment of

individual thinking is paramount for students to articulate matters in these issues.

Bridging the classroom and the broader world, Participant 32 described using the

classroom as a place of practice for dialogue in which they may engage outside the classroom:

"It is an opportunity for students to debate. Students should simulate within the safety of a

classroom the debate society is having outside the classroom. It's a learning opportunity, nothing

more."

Likewise, Participant 30 described students bringing the controversy to the classroom,

then employing school resources to further inform the discussion while acknowledging the

influential role of the teacher:

They are in the media and could be discussed at home so that discussion could make its

way into the classroom. It could also be looked at in a history book and then brought up

on its controversy. The implications for teachers are that they need to be mindful of what

underlying bias they may be instilling in their students.

Engaging students in debate while emphasizing their various perspectives provides

practice for future discussions they may have in the social sphere. Participants also describe the

PDH debate as an opportunity to fill in missing information, to correct, or to more deeply

contextualize the subjects of the PDH. Participant 22 offered a variety of questions to more

deeply understand various aspects of the PDH, its subject, its creators' intents, modern

interpretations, and even considerations for compromise:

> What is the monument of? Who thinks it should be taken down? Who thinks it should
>
> stay up? Have those who believe it should be taken down learned the side of history that
>
> those who think it should stay up have? Have those who believe it should stay up learned
>
> the side of history that those who think it should be taken down have? What did that
>
> person do to make them worthy of being honored? How would those that want it taken
>
> down address those worthy? How does the statue being up make those who want it taken
>
> down feel? How would you address the people who feel that way? Is there anything that
>
> could be honored for those same values without causing distress in others?

In addressing the role of the PDH debate in classrooms, Participant 34 summed up both

the nature of history and the role of the teacher in its exposure to students:

> I think it brings up the question of what aspects or views of history are important. This
>
> challenges SS teachers to show multiple sides to different events in history. It also
>
> requires us to challenge our students to view things from other perspectives and consider
>
> events in different contexts.

Participants placed more emphasis on the PDH debate as having historiographical value

than as a venue to learn about the specific subject of the PDH. Describing questions they might

ask their future students, participants focused on the process of studying history and the impact

of historical interpretation. Participants described their future classrooms as venues for debate

regarding original intent of the creators of the PDH, the current interpretation, and the overall

"value" of the subject of the PDH. Integrating questions regarding original intent, current

interpretation and historical accuracy, Participant 23 placed focus on interpretation, with historical accuracy as a last thought:

> What ideas does this monument represent? What positive qualities did people originally see in this person or event? What negative qualities does it represent? How might monuments like these affect society on a broad scale if not questioned with critical thought? Is this historically accurate?

Discussion

The preservice teachers with whom we worked described PDH as important venues for the discussion of how past and current societies interpret historic people, deeds, and ideas. While PDH serve as catalysts for learning more about their subjects, participants placed greater focus on the original and current interpretations of their subjects. Broadly, participants stated that the subject of the PDH is a less important factor in its public positioning than how the subject is— and was—interpreted. This focus is reflective of Crankshaw, Brent, and Brent (2016) who assert that monuments say more about their creators and interpreters than the subjects themselves.

Rather than destroy or entirely remove PDH from display, participant consensus was that they serve as important venues for learning more about subjects' places in history and the complexity of history and historical interpretation. Reflective of the complex nature of PDH and their subjects, participants described multiple, often intermingled considerations that they use to inform their perspectives on the maintenance, removal, or destruction of any given PDH.

Current interpretations of PDH, followed by original intent of the establishment of the PDH—more so than their actual subjects— play the most important roles in determining the fate of specific PDH. *Refusers*, who stress the importance of maintenance in original spaces, acknowledge the influence of interpretation of the subject, but defend maintaining PDH in their

locations to encourage continued dialogue. *Historical Absolutists,* who focus on using irrefutable facts to determine the fate of a PDH face the interpretive tasks of selecting and weighing those facts in the decision-making process. Though they place the focus on irrefutable facts, value and interpretation of these facts ultimately play key roles. In this way, even *Historical Absolutists* must rely on an interpretative process.

Widespread emphases on the current interpretations and original intent, with relatively less emphasis on the specific subject, works to apply Savage's (1997) focus on our understanding of the broader contexts in which PDH were created, in addition to understanding the subject of the PDH: "We must investigate who were the people represented in and by monumental space, and how they competed to construct a history in the language of sculpture and in the spotlight of the public sphere." (p. 8)

Refusers who stress the maintenance of PDH in their original positioning and *Current Interpreters* who stress modern perspectives may find philosophical consensus in their views of these objects as venues for ongoing discussion. These perspectives may find compromise in the growing countermonument movement (Niven, 2013) that seeks to provide balance to narratives that obfuscate the deeds of the subject or the original intent of the PDH. Rather than destroy or remove offending PDH, which would—ironically— offend, and thus violate a central tenet of *Current Interpreters* approach that emphasizes multiple perspectives, providing venues for countermonuments in forms and spaces of equal impact, may work to advance the goals of groups who wish to maintain specific PDH with those who wish to remove them.

Participants viewed debates regarding PDH as applications of many concepts they saw as important for their future classroom practices. Participants described the PDH debate as a relevant and useful venue for learning more about the subject and, more importantly, as an

opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of how history itself is conceptualized and interpreted.

Acknowledging the role of teacher as facilitator, and sometimes as political agent, participants placed emphasis on the final interpretation and decision-making in the hands of students. The classroom emphasis on student interpretation is congruent with the participants' emphasis on interpretation in the public sphere. That participants viewed original and current interpretation as vital elements to the discussion of the classroom and societal role of PDH supports the view that interpretation—more so than the subject—is key to understanding the PDH debate.

Preservice social science teachers' emphasis on current and original interpretation is important to note because of implications for their future classroom practices. Rather than a focus on isolated historic facts regarding the subject of the PDH, participants described a focus on the interpretation and subsequent contextualization of those facts. This slight but important distinction provides evidence of preservice teachers' recognition of the interpretive nature of history and perhaps the interpretive role of the social science teacher in the classroom. Applied in a classroom setting, a teacher may spend time encouraging students to investigate the overt and tacit subtexts surrounding the creation of a statue to Robert E. Lee. Through this process, students learn about the subject, but spend more focus on how the subject was—and is—contextualized.

Limitations

The historic, geographic, cultural, and economic positioning of the participants undoubtedly influenced their perspectives regarding the PDH debate. The conceptual framework of the categories and the described roles of the PDH debate in classrooms may not be

generalizable in different cultural or geographical contexts, especially those who have experienced recent, intense debate—and even violence—regarding local PDH. Indeed, a teacher in a community where violence or protests related to this topic have recently occurred, may perceive the PDH debate and its role in the classroom in fundamentally different ways. Exploration in these geographic and cultural settings is imperative to further inform the conceptual framework and to serve as additional evidence that may contradict the perspectives of the participants in this study. Indeed, we suggest history and social science education programs address the PDH debate question within their contexts to further dialogue regarding this complex and context-specific debate.

Preservice teachers have little experience facilitating learning experiences with K-12 students. Without cultural contexts to inform their views, the perceptions of the role of the PDH debate may not reflect widespread approaches in the field. While a limitation, future investigations may seek to compare this positioning of preservice teachers to practicing teachers to better understand professional developmental trajectories regarding historical thinking skills and application.

Beyond the scope of the questions was the concept of public art not intended to place emphasis on specific historical events or people or not specifically intended to stir controversy. Examples of these types of work are *Bacchante and Infant Faun* by Frederick William MacMonnies which resides in Paris and *Tilted Arc* by Richard Serra (Horowitz, 1996; Rosenbaum, 2000). Likewise, consideration of other platforms of historical information, such as museums, lectures, and various primary and secondary sources, may have had influence on participants' perspectives.

Areas for Further Study

Though the historic and social contexts influencing the study of the US Civil War are unique to the United States, the challenge of understanding how contentious events inform identities is not. People in various regions and countries employ context specific factors to inform their conceptualization and integration of contentious histories into their identities. Uncovering how social science teachers in various regions and countries describe the role of contentious PDH and histories in their classrooms grows understanding of the landscape of history-social sciences education. Future research should focus on geographic comparisons in how social science teachers conceptualize contentious events and the role of PDH in societal discourse.

The mode of the PDH may have an impact on its interpretation and framing within societal discourse. A statue, for example may be very large but experienced only occasionally by citizens whereas experiencing the picture on currency may happen daily but be considered less— or more—salient because of its ubiquity. Likewise, a historically-oriented mascot selected by a school may receive frequent "surface level" attention at sporting events whereas a yearly interaction with a national holiday has deep—if not temporary—impact on individuals who have their daily schedules altered as a result. The relationship between the mode of PDH and factors taken into consideration for their removal or maintenance needs further exploration.

Though the survey questions defined PDH as containing many different modes of historical communication, participant focus on monuments—and limited discussion regarding other PDH modes—is important to note. Needed is future research on other, specific PDH modes to further understand perspectives on this wide landscape of historical communication. How history and social science teachers employ PDH and the PDH debate in their classrooms requires additional study, especially given recent, intense public debate. As stewards of public historical

knowledge and its interpretation, history and social science teachers play an integral role in the continued debate of PDH and of the broader understanding of history. Uncovering how they describe the employment of PDH—and the debates regarding PDH—in their classrooms is essential as societal discourse continues. Of interest is the role of context-specific considerations inservice teachers must employ in determining the role of PDH in their classrooms.

Implications

Current debates regarding specific Public Displays of History are reflective of deeper and longer-term conceptualizations of history and how they work into societal norms and identities. Across historic, cultural, and political contexts, the process of deciding to create, subsequently interpret, and perhaps subsequently remove or destroy PDH reflects how societies understand their pasts, their presents, and their futures. Though nested in a climate of current socially and politically charged debate, the perceptions of the participants reflect broader themes that may apply in different contexts. Societal dialogue regarding these demonstrations of history promotes a false dichotomy that oversimplifies both the nature of the controversy and the impact changing the PDH would have on broad understanding of historical events and people. Focus on the "take it down" or "leave it up" positionings, rather than working to understand perspectives that articulate reasoning behind the decision-making logic discourages dialogue needed to promote deeper understanding and, perhaps, compromise. Rather than focus on the end fate of specific PDH, we observed categories from participant responses that articulated a variety of perspectives on determining whether to maintain, alter, or remove any given public display of history.

Participant descriptions of the role of PDH and debates surrounding them in their future classrooms informs policy makers, administrators, teacher educators, and society at large. Participants anticipate engaging with their students in dialogues regarding historical and

contemporary interpretation of past figures and events. Going beyond isolated memorization and shallow coverage of history, participants described desire to engage in critical analysis of historical narratives and how modern society interprets and reinterprets them. While new to the profession, the perspectives of the preservice teacher participants provided meaningful insights into what may lie ahead for future generations of K-12 social science students.

In both teacher education and K-12 classrooms, the results of this investigation may be used as illustrations of major arguments of the PDH debate. Though they may not be generalizable to other settings, the themes we observed may serve as discussion starting points in other contexts. Proposing the results of our investigation to preservice history and social science teachers and K-12 students in various locations throughout the United States, for example, may lead to insights unobtainable in the current socio-political context.

Conclusion

We explored the perspectives of preservice history and social science teachers on debates surrounding Public Displays of History. We found that preservice teachers value PDH as venues for dialogue regarding the understanding of history. Participants described original and current interpretations of the subjects of PDH as vital considerations when determining their role in public spaces. Participants were hesitant to advocate for the complete destruction of PDH, instead advocating for; maintaining PDH in their locations to provide opportunity to debate their subjects, moving them to spaces more conducive to deep experience with counternarratives, and using them as opportunities to further explore the subjects themselves. The participants described PDH and the debates surrounding them as important classroom opportunities for students to practice debate, to see the application of concepts studied in classrooms in the public sphere, and as sources of historical information. Needed are further studies, especially in different

geographic and cultural contexts, to advance understanding of the PDH debate and how history

and social science teachers perceive and employ it in their classrooms.

References

The Alabama Memorial Preservation Act of 2017. AL Act 2017-354, Senate Bill 60.

Alderman, D. H. & Inwood, J. (2013). Street naming and the politics of belonging: Spatial
injustices in the toponymic commemoration of Martin Luther King Jr. *Social & Cultural
Geography, 14*(2), 211-233. doi:10.1111/1475-4762.00250

American Historical Association. (2017). Statement on confederate monuments. Washington
D.C. Author.

Azaryahu, M. (2011). Public controversy and commemorative failure: Tel Aviv's monument to
the Holocaust and national revival. *Israel Studies, 16*(1), 129-148.
doi:10.2979/ISR.2011.16.1.129

Bartetzky, A. (2006). Changes in the political iconography of east central European capitals after
1989 (Berlin, Warsaw, Prague, Bratislava). *International Review of Sociology—Revue
Internationale de Sociologie, 16*(2), 451-469. doi:10.1080/03906700600709434

Baum, J. (2012). Joe Paterno's statue fuels debate on Penn State campus. *Newsday, (Melville,
NY)*, July 20, 2012.

Beetham, S. (2016). From spray cans to minivans: Contesting the legacy of confederate soldier
monuments in the era of "Black Lives Matter". *Public Art Dialogue, 6*(1), 9-33.
doi:10.1080/21502552.2016.1149386

Beetham, S. & Clinton, C. (2016). Town square soldiers. *Civil War Times, 55*(1).

Blair, C., Dickinson, G., & Ott, B. L. (2010). Rhetoric/memory/place. In G. Dickinson, C. Blair,
and B. L. Ott, (Eds.), *Places of public memory: The rhetoric of museums and memorials,*
(p 1-54). Tuscaloosa, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.

Brovarski, E. (1976). High priest of Amūn at Deir El-Bahri. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 62*, 57-73. doi:10.2307/3856345

Brown, J. S. (2017). Breaking down confederate monuments. *Army Magazine, 67*(12), 34-66.

Carretero, M., Asensio., M., & Rodríguez-Moneo, M. (Eds.) (2012). *History education and the construction of national identities.* Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Cloud, D. L. (2003). *Conference Proceedings—National Communication Association/American Forensic Association, (Alta Conference on Argumentation).* 2, 622-631.

Coker, C. R. (2017). Harriet Tubman, women on 20s, and intersectionality: Public memory and the redesign of U.S. currency. *Southern Communication Journal, 82*(4), 239-249. doi:10.1080/1041794X.2017.1332091

Coombes, A. E. (2003). *Visual culture and public memory in a democratic South Africa.* London: Duke University Press.

Crankshaw, N., Brent, J. E., & Brent, M. C. (2016). The lost cause and reunion in the confederate cemeteries of the North. *Landscape Journal, 35*(1), 1-21. doi:10.3368/lj.35.1.1

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2014). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory, Fourth Edition.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Crow, A. (2006). "In memory of the Confederate dead": Masculinity and the politics of memorial work in Goldsboro, North Carolina 1894-1895. *North Carolina Historical Review, 83*(1), 31-60.

Daise, R. (2017). A pedestal for perception: Confederate monuments from an African-American perspective. *Sculpture Review, 66*4), 26-31.

de Amézola, G. (2007). A 'necessary' dictatorship: The 'age of Rosas' in Argentine history textbooks published between 1956 and 1983 and the defence of authoritarianism. *Paedagogica Historia, 43*(5), 669-684. doi:10.1080/00309230701587157

Description of state flag; militia to cary flag; defacing public monuments; obstruction of Stone Mountain. Georgia State Code. § 50-3-1.

Dickinson, G., Blair,C., & Ott, B. L. (Eds.), (2010). *Places of public memory: The rhetoric of museums and memorials,* Tuscaloosa, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.

Dhupelia-Meshrie, U. (2000). 'A blast from the past': The teaching of South African history at an apartheid university, 1960s-1980s. *South African Historical Journal, 42*(1), 49-68. doi:10.1080/02582470008671367

Ernsberger, Jr., R. (2018). 'Cause they lost. *American History, 53*(2), 14-15.

Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research, 38*(1), 47-65.

Foxall, A. (2013). A contested landscape: Monuments, public memory, and post-Soviet identity in Stavropol', Russia. *Communist & Post-Communist Studies, 46*(1), 167-178. doi:10.1016/j.postcomstud.2012.12.012

Frei, C. J. (2017). Toward memory, against oblivion: A comparative perspective on public memory, monuments, and confronting a painful past in the United States and Argentina. *The Public Historian, Special digital issue: Monuments, Memory, Politics, and our Publics.* Retrieved from http://tph.ucpress.edu/content/special-virtual-issue-monuments-memory-politics-and-our-publics#Essay.

Glazer, N. (1996). Monuments in an age without heroes. *Public Interest, 123,* 22-39.

Goddeeris, I. (2015). Colonial streets and statues: Postcolonial Belgium in the public space. *Postcolonial Studies, 18*(4), 397-409. doi:10.1080/13688790.2015.1191986

Goodman, J. (2017). Monumental concerns: Cities grapple with what to do about confederate statues. *Planning, 83*(11), 18-23.

Gregory, I. (2000). Teaching about the holocaust: Perplexities, issues and suggestion. In I. Davies (Ed.), *Teaching the holocaust: Educational dimensions, principles and practice,* (p37-47). New York: Continuum.

Grossman, J. (2016). Whose memory? Whose monuments? History, commemoration, and the struggle for an ethical past, *Perspectives on History.*

Habachi, L. (1957). Two graffiti at Sehēl from the reign of Queen Hatshepsut. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 16*(2), 88-104. doi:10.1086/371378

Hitchmough, S. (2013). "It's not your country any more". Contested national narratives and the Columbus Day parade protests in Denver. *European Journal of American Culture, 32*(3), 263-283. doi:10.1386/ejac.32.3.263_1

Horowitz, G. M. (1996). Public art/public space: The spectacle of the Tilted Arc controversy. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 54*(1), 8-14. doi:10.2307/431676

Jenkins, J. I. (January 20, 2019). Letter to campus regarding Columbus murals. Retrieved on January 31, 2019 from: https://president.nd.edu/writings-addresses/2019-writings/letter-to-campus-regarding-columbus-murals/

James, J. H. (2008). Teachers as protectors: Making sense of preservice teachers' resistance to interpretation in elementary history teaching. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 36*(3), 172-205. doi:10.1080/00933104.2008.10473372

Kattago, S. (2009). War memorials and the politics of memory: The Soviet war memorial in Tallinn, *Constellations, 16*(1), 150-166. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8675.2009.00525.x.

Kelley, R. (1978). Public history: Its origins, nature, and prospects. *The Public Historian, 1*(1), 16-28. doi:10.2307/3377666

Larsen, L. (2012). Re-placing imperial landscapes: Colonial monuments and the transition to independence in Kenya. *Journal of Historical Geography, 38*(1), 45-56. doi:10.1016/j.jhg.2011.07.004

Levey, C. (2014). Between marginalization and decentralization of memory: Peripheral palimpsests in post-dictatorship Buenos Aires and Montevideo. *Journal of Romance Studies, 14*(3), 67-85. doi:10.3828/jrs.14.3.67

Light, D., & Young, C. (2015). Toponymy as commodity: Exploring the economic dimensions of urban place names. *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research, 39*(3), 435-450. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12153

Marschall, S. (2010). How to honor a woman: Gendered memorialisation in post-apartheid South Africa, *Critical Arts: A South-North Journal of Cultural & Media Studies, 24*(2), 260-283. doi:10.1080/02560041003786524

Mayo, J.M. (1988). *War memorials as political landscape: The American experience and beyond.* New York, New York: Praeger.

McCrum, E. (2013). History teachers' thinking about the nature of their subject. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 35, 73-80. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2013.05.004

McGarr, P. M. (2015). 'The viceroys are disappearing from the roundabouts in Delhi': British symbols of power in post-colonial India. *Modern Asian Studies, 49*(3), 787-831. doi:10.1017/S0026749X14000080

Mills, R. (2012). Commemorating a disputed past: Football club and supporters' group war memorials in the former Yugoslavia. *History, 97*(328), 540-577. doi:10.1111/j.1468-229X.2012.00564.x

Moghaddam, A. (2006). Coding issues in grounded theory. *Issues in Educational Research, 16*(1), 52-66.

Napier, D. B., Lebeta, V.T., & Zungu, B. P. (2000). Race, history, and education: South African perspectives on the struggle for democracy. *Theory and Research in Social Education,* 28 (3), 445-450. doi:10.1080/00933104.2000.10505916

National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). (2013). *The college, career, and civic life (C3) framework for social studies state standards: Guidance for enhancing the rigor of K-12 civics, economics, geography, and history.* Silver Spring, MD.: Author.

Niven, B. (2013). From countermonument to combimemorial "Developments in German memorialization. *Journal of War & Culture Studies, 6*(1), 75-91. doi:10.1179/1752627212Z.0000000006

Osborne, J. F. (2017). Counter-monumentality and the vulnerability of memory. *Journal of Social Archaeology, 17*(2), 163-187. doi:10.1177/1469605317705445

Ozmen, C. (2015). Social studies teacher candidates' views on historical thinking. *Educational Research and Reviews, 10*(14), 2031-2042. doi:10.5897/ERR2015.2294

Pewewardy, C. D. (2004). Playing Indian at halftime the controversy over American Indian mascots, logos, and nicknames in school-related events. *Clearing House, 77*(5), 180-185. doi:10.3200/TCHS.77.5.180-185.

Rose, J. (2016). Despite protests, Princeton to keep Wilson's name on school buildings. *Morning Edition,* March 5.

Rosenbaum, J. (2000). Displaying civic culture—the controversy over Frederik MacMonnies'

Bacchante. *American Art, 14*(3).

Savage, K. (1997). St*anding soldiers, kneeling slaves: Race, war, and monument in nineteenth-

century America.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Savage, K. (2009). *Monument wars.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of

California Press.

Siegel, R. (20017). Does Trump's slippery slope argument about Confederate statues have merit?

All Things Considered, August 16.

Slekar, T. D. (1998). Epistemological entanglements: Preservice elementary school teachers

"apprenticeship of observation" and the teaching of history. *Theory & Research in Social

Education, 26*(4), 485-507. doi:10.1080/00933104.1998.10505862

Slekar, T. D. (2006). Preaching history in a social studies methods course: A portrait of practice,

theory & research in social education. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 34*(2),

241-258. doi:10.1080/00933104.2006.10473306

'Silent Sam' Tensions Erupt Again on UNC Campus After Latest Decision by University [Video

file]. (2018, December 4). Retrieved from

https://www.wfmynews2.com/article/news/local/silent-sam-tensions-erupt-again-on-unc-

campus-after-latest-decision-by-university/83-620506739.

Stańczyk, E. (2013). Remaking national identity: Two contested monuments in post-communist

Poland. *Central Europe, 11*(2), 127-142. doi:10.1179/1479096313Z.00000000015

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for

developing grounded theory (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Board of Trustees. (2018). *Recommendation for the Disposition and Preservation of the Confederate Monument: A Four-Part Plan presented by UNC-Chapel Hill to the UNC Board of Governors.* Retrieved from https://bot.unc.edu/files/2018/12/Final-Report.pdf.

van Hover, S. D., & Yeager, E. A. (2003). "Making students better people?" A case study of a beginning history teacher. *International Social Studies Forum, 3*(1), 219-232.

Vanderford, H. A. (1996). What's in a name? Heritage or hatred: The school mascot controversy. *Journal of Law & Education, 25,* 381-388.

Vansledright, B. & Afflerbach, P. (2000). Reconstructing Andrew Jackson: Prospective elementary teachers' readings of revisionist history texts. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 28*(3), 411-444. doi:10.1080/00933104.2000.10505915

Voet, M., & De Wever, B. (2016). History teachers' conceptions of inquiry-based learning, beliefs about the nature of history, and their relation to the classroom context. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 55*, 57-67. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2015.12.008

Wertsch, J. V. (2008). Collective memory and narrative templates. *Social Research, 75*(1), 133-156.

Woldemaram, H. (2016). Linguistic landscape as standing historical testimony of the struggle against colonization in Ethiopia. *Linguistic Landscape: An International Journal (LL), 2*(3), 275-290. doi:10.1075/ll.2.3.04wol

Yilmaz, K. (2008). Social studies teachers' conceptions of history: Calling on historiography. *Journal of Educational Research, 101*(3), 158-176. doi:10.3200/JOER.101.3.158-176

Appendix A

Survey instrument

    1) Society learns about history from many different sources. "Drag and drop" the following "public displays of history" in order of importance to society for learning history, with 1 being the most important, 2 being next important, etc. You may include your own examples if you wish.

        Monuments in public spaces

        Names of individuals on public buildings

        Streets named after people or events

        Pictures on money

        Holidays in honor of events or people

        Textbook descriptions of events or people

        Public displays of murals or paintings of people or events

        Names of locations (ex. Town, city, or county names)

        School or organization mascots

        Movies or documentaries

        Other

    2) Discuss the role of "public displays of history" in how people learn about people or events of the past.

    3) Which considerations are most important when a society decides whether to alter or remove a "public display of history" such as a statue, street name, or portrait on money? Please "drag and drop" these concepts regarding the decision of whether to alter or remove a

"public display of history", with 1 being the most important, 2 the second most important, etc.
You may add your own concepts if you wish.

The intent of the original people who decided to create a public display of history for the person or event

The current interpretation of the person or event in question

The type of display being debated, (monument, picture on money, name on building)

The cost of removal or replacement of the public display of history

The importance to society of the individual or event being discussed

Whether current understanding of the person or event would be changed if the display is altered or removed

Whether the removal or replacement would cause additional controversy

Other

4) Describe how society should decide whether a "public display of history" such as a monument or picture on money should be altered, removed, or stay the same.

5) Describe circumstances under which a "public display of history" should NOT be removed or altered.

6) A criticism of efforts to remove certain "public displays of history", such as monuments states that removal takes away vital parts of history. Describe your response to this criticism.

7) What role does the "public display of history" debate play in K-12 social science classrooms and what are the implications for teachers?

8) Let's say you were teaching a history class and there was a monument that was being considered for removal within walking distance of your school. Describe the types of questions you would ask your students when helping them form opinions on the issue.

9) Describe whether or not K-12 students should spend class time discussing the removal, replacement, or maintenance of "public displays of history" such as monuments or portraits on money.

10) Describe any additional insights or comments you have regarding the decision to alter, remove, or maintain public displays of history such as monuments, names of locations, or portraits on money.

Semi-structured interview questions

1) The results of your surveys indicate you believe we learn the most of our history through textbooks, then holidays, then monuments, then other Public Displays of History such as money, street/city/school names, museums, and movies. Describe your thoughts on this.

2) What are your thoughts on the four categories?

a. Describe overall impressions of the categories.

b. is there anything you would change, add, or take away?

3) There was a fairly-even split in the survey responses about whether removal of Public Displays of History changes how we view history. Talk about the concept of "if we remove the Public Display of History, we change how history is viewed".

a. Are Public Displays of History history themselves, or just representations?

4) Many respondents indicated that the "importance of the individual" or event being debated is important in determining whether the PDH should remain or be removed. Talk about

the criteria you use to determine whether a person or event is "important enough" to be part of this debate.

5) A number of responses indicated that the removal of Public Displays of History should be up for debate, but specifically excluded "founding fathers" or other vital individuals or events from this debate. Talk about your thoughts on this concept.

6) Should all PDH be up for debate and potential removal or change, including individuals like Washington, Jefferson, Columbus, and Lincoln, even if it means changes to monuments, city names, or changes in money?

7) Many individuals who say the monuments should remain, (Original Intentors) stated that the PDH are important as a point of the "removal debate" in classrooms. Discuss your thoughts on this observation.

8) Discuss how you might, or why you would not, use Public Displays of History in your history or social science classroom.

9) Discuss how you might, or why you would not, discuss the controversy of changing PDH in your history or social science classroom.

10) There was a lot of media coverage on this topic last summer, but not much recently. Discuss whether this topic has long-term importance or is just a passing discussion point.

11) Do you have anything to add for us to consider regarding Public Displays of History?

Table 1: Relative Importance of Sources of History (n=84)

Sources of history	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Total
Monuments in public spaces	20 (23.81%)	18 (21.43%)	11 (13.10%)	14 (16.67%)	8 (9.52%)	7 (8.33%)	4 (4.76%)	1 (1.20%)	1 (1.20%)	--	--	--	--	84 (100%)
Names of individuals on public buildings	3 (3.57%)	7 (8.33%)	7 (8.33%)	12 (14.29%)	17 (20.24%)	11 (13.10%)	8 (9.52%)	11 (13.10%)	4 (4.76%)	3 (3.57%)	1 (1.20%)	--	--	84 (100%)
Streets named after people or events	1 (1.20%)	1 (1.20%)	4 (4.76%)	7 (8.33%)	12 (14.29%)	14 (16.67%)	11 (13.10%)	14 (16.67%)	12 (14.29%)	6 (7.14%)	2 (2.38%)	--	--	84 (100%)
Pictures on money	3 (3.57%)	10 (11.90%)	5 (5.95%)	7 (8.33%)	8 (9.52%)	11 (13.10%)	10 (11.90%)	8 (9.52%)	10 (11.90%)	10 (11.90%)	1 (1.20%)	1 (1.20%)	--	84 (100%)
Holidays in honor of events or people	16 (19.05%)	11 (13.10%)	15 (17.86%)	8 (9.52%)	8 (9.52%)	8 (9.52%)	5 (5.95%)	8 (9.52%)	4 (4.76%)	1 (1.20%)	--	--	--	84 (100%)
Textbook descriptions of events or people	17 (20.24%)	9 (10.71%)	15 (17.86%)	4 (4.76%)	4 (4.76%)	7 (8.33%)	8 (9.52%)	5 (5.95%)	7 (8.33%)	8 (9.52%)	--	--	--	84 (100%)
Public displays of murals or paintings of people or events	4 (4.76%)	5 (5.95%)	11 (13.10%)	12 (14.29%)	11 (13.10%)	7 (8.33%)	8 (9.52%)	14 (16.67%)	10 (11.90%)	2 (2.38%)	--	--	--	84 (100%)
Names of locations (ex. Town, city, or county names)	6 (7.14%)	5 (5.95%)	4 (4.76%)	7 (8.33%)	8 (9.52%)	8 (9.52%)	15 (17.86%)	9 (10.71%)	14 (16.67%)	7 (8.33%)	1 (1.20%)	--	--	84 (100%)
School or organization mascots	1 (1.20%)	1 (1.20%)	1 (1.20%)	9 (10.71%)	5 (5.95%)	5 (5.95%)	5 (5.95%)	11 (13.10%)	14 (16.67%)	31 (35.71%)	--	--	1 (1.20%)	84 (100%)
Movies or documentaries	9 (10.71%)	16 (19.05%)	9 (10.71%)	4 (4.76%)	3 (3.57%)	6 (7.14%)	10 (11.90%)	3 (3.57%)	8 (9.52%)	16 (19.05%)	--	--	--	84 (100%)
Other_____	4[1,2,3,4] (4.76%)	--	1[5] (1.19%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	79 (94.05%)	--	--	84 (100%)
Other_____	--	1[6] (1.20%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	83 (98.80%)	--	84 (100%)
Other_____	--	--	--	--	1[7] (1.20%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	83 (98.80%)	84 (100%)

Notes:

1. Media

2. Memes/Internet Jokes
3. Museums
4. Various media sources
5. Museums
6. Books based on facts
7. Left Blank

Table 2: Considerations in Deciding to Alter or Remove a PDH (n=84)

Consideration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
The intent of the original people who decided to create a public display of history for the person or event	19 (22.62%)	16 (19.05%)	20 (23.81%)	5 (5.95%)	15 (17.86%)	3 (3.57%)	5 (5.95%)	--	1 (1.20%)	--	84 (100%)
The current interpretation of the person or event in question	30 (35.71%)	22 (26.19%)	10 (11.90%)	8 (9.52%)	8 (9.52%)	3 (3.57%)	2 (2.38%)	--	--	1 (1.20%)	84 (100%)
The type of display being debated, (monument, picture on money, name on building)	8 (9.52%)	5 (5.95%)	14 (16.67%)	16 (19.05%)	12 (14.29%)	21 (25.00%)	7 (8.33%)	1 (1.20%)	--	--	84 (100%)
The cost of removal or replacement of the public display of history	--	5 (5.95%)	1 (1.20%)	5 (5.95%)	9 (10.71%)	16 (19.05%)	46 (54.76%)	2 (2.38%)	--	--	84 (100%)
The importance to society of the individual or event being discussed	10 (11.90%)	22 (26.19%)	11 (13.10%)	19 (22.62%)	12 (14.29%)	7 (8.33%)	2 (2.38%)	1 (1.20%)	--	--	84 (100%)
Whether current understanding of the person or event would be changed if the display is altered or removed	7 (8.33%)	5 (5.95%)	21 (25.00%)	18 (21.43%)	18 (21.43%)	8 (9.52%)	6 (7.14%)	--	1 (1.20%)	--	84 (100%)
Whether the removal or replacement would cause additional controversy	5 (5.95%)	8 (9.52%)	7 (8.33%)	12 (14.29%)	8 (9.52%)	25 (29.76%)	16 (19.05%)	2 (2.38%)	--	1 (1.20%)	84 (100%)
Other_____	3 [1, 2, 3] (3.57%)	--	--	--	2 [4, 5] (2.38%)	1 [6] (1.20%)	--	78 [7] (92.86%)	--	--	84 (100%)

Other_____	1 [8] (1.20%)	--	--	1 [9] (1.20%)	--	--	--	--	82 (97.61%)	--	84 (100%)
Other_____	1 [10] (1.20%)	1 [11] (1.20%)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	82 (97.61%)	84 (100%)

Notes:

1. Whether the person literally owned slaves and was an outright racist
2. The negative actions of the person in the context of their time in history.
3. Whether or not the display is representing a culture or time period that perpetuates, in the past and present, fear, racism, offense, and/or misrepresentation of truth, especially to a "minority" community/population.
4. The 'power' of the group that find the monument or event questionable.
5. Does someone deserve it more (a la Harriet Tubman taking over the $20)
6. Considerations as to what might replace the public display
7. The families that the display is related to (1 participant)
8. What will happen to the public display of history once it is removed
9. Whether or not removal of the display would simply be fuel for misinformation or hysteria
10. Whether or not removal of a public display has wide approval by the local public
11. Is the pdh (public display of history) valid/truthful?