



What does a history teacher do? Knowing, understanding, and enacting the work of teaching history

Sarah Drake Brown
Lewis University, USA

Richard Hughes
Illinois State University, USA

ABSTRACT

This study considers the questions, “How do teacher candidates conceptualize the relationship among historians, history teachers, and history students?” and “How is this understanding revealed in candidates’ representation of the work they do in classrooms as history teachers?” Using a case study approach, researchers gathered data from fifteen teacher candidates in a teacher preparation program in the Midwestern United States. The data consisted of participants’ responses to three questions (What do historians do? What do history teachers do? What do history students do?) and their selections of and rationale for including artifacts in a portfolio designed to showcase “who they are” as history teachers as represented by their developing pedagogical content knowledge in history. The researchers’ findings reveal a discrepancy exists between teacher candidates’ emerging beliefs about their responsibilities as teachers and the work that they chose to highlight after having completed clinical experiences. Specifically, the findings suggest a critical disconnect exists between what teacher candidates are taught about teaching history, what they believe about teaching history, and the opportunities that they have in clinical experiences to enact these ideas. This research highlights the central yet often unexamined role of emerging teachers’ epistemic understandings in shaping opportunities for pedagogical reform in history.

KEYWORDS

History teaching, History teacher education student beliefs

CITATION

Brown, S. D., & Hughes, R. (2024). What does a history teacher do? Knowing, understanding, and enacting the work of teaching history. *Historical Encounters*, 11(2), 114-132.
<https://doi.org/10.52289/hej11.208>

COPYRIGHT

© Copyright retained by Authors
Published 13 August 2024
Distributed under a [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 License](#)

Introduction

Americans often base their understanding of the practice of teaching on the experiences they encountered as students (Cuban & Tyack, 1995; VanSledright, 2011). Having studied history, to varying extents, in elementary and secondary schools, many Americans believe that they know and understand what history is, and the majority consider it an “assemblage of names, dates, and events” (Burkholder & Schaffer, 2021). Yet, historians and history educators argue vehemently that as a discipline, history represents a way of thinking and a way of knowing (Fischer, 2013; Gagnon, 1989; Wineburg, 2001). As they enter universities, teacher candidates often encounter competing epistemological models as they engage, as historians, in the formal study of the discipline while also preparing for a teaching career in classrooms that rarely reflect the disciplinary approach to studying the past.

History educators often advocate for and implement discipline-based approaches to the teaching of history. But studies frequently report that little has changed in American classrooms when it comes to history teaching and learning. To make significant and lasting changes with respect to history teaching, researchers must pay more attention to the evolving epistemic stances of teacher candidates that frame the possibilities and limits for classroom learning. This study investigates the relationship between teacher candidates’ understanding of history and history teachers (Yilmaz, 2008) and their intended practices pertaining to planning, teaching, and assessment. The research draws from theoretical frameworks pertaining to beliefs about the nature of history as a discipline and about the teaching of history (McCrum, 2013; McDiarmid, 1994), and it is situated in research that studies the relationship between these two types of beliefs and the ways that context influences beginning teachers’ actions (Voet & De Wever, 2016). The two questions guiding this work seek to connect beginning teachers’ epistemological understandings of the practice of doing history and how they represent their understanding of teaching history:

Research Question 1: How do teacher candidates conceptualize the relationship among historians, history teachers, and history students?

Research Question 2: How is this understanding revealed in candidates’ representation of the work they do in classrooms as history teachers?

Previous Research

Student learning and classroom culture are shaped by countless decisions that teachers make before, during, and after direct instruction, and these decisions reflect the important role that teacher beliefs play in pedagogical decision making (Stoel et al., 2022). While research increasingly explores the epistemic stances of students and teachers and places such ideas on a developmental framework (Stoel et al., 2022), the disciplinary understandings of teacher candidates is an under examined fulcrum of history education as such ideas play a role in both “mediating the curriculum” and shaping the professional identity and roles of emerging teachers (McCrum, 2013, p. 79). A key ingredient in reimagining the teaching of history is reforming history teacher education to make these beliefs visible and subject to interventions that ensure that teachers’ decisions reflect a disciplinary approach or what Jay refers to as the “signature intellectual processes” of historians (2022). The most recent research (Wilke et al., 2022) suggests the nuanced roles of educational context and teacher education, a complex set of experiences

where students transition from secondary students to professional teachers, are the most important ingredients in understanding the persistent gap between theory and practice.

The disciplinary approach to history education in the United States struggled to take hold until the cognitive revolution in education led to the Amherst Project in the 1960s and Shulman's articulation of pedagogical content knowledge in the 1980s. (American Historical Association, 1898; Brown, 1996; Bruner, 1961; Hughes & Brown, 2023; Shulman, 1986; VanSledright, 2011; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988; Wineburg, 1998). However, much of the subsequent scholarship perceived the epistemological stances of history teachers as an assumed and relatively stable ingredient in the learning process. Instead, scholars often prioritized the complex role of historical consciousness among students who find their experiences with the past, both individually and collectively, shaped by the historical profession, classroom instruction, and collective memory (Lévesque, 2008; Rusen, 2005; Seixas, 2004; Taylor, 2019). For many such scholars, curriculum reform meant teachers creating meaningful, intentional, and assessed opportunities for students to embrace the disciplinary methods and concepts of historians (Bain, 2000; Chapman, 2017; Lavelle, 2004; Lee, 2004; Lee & Ashby, 2000; Stearns et al., 2000). As Seixas (2004) explained, such efforts meant that historians' practices, rather than the specific scholarship historians produced, became the standard for evaluating history education. This emphasis resulted in a growing number of studies assessing student thinking and often emphasizing the challenges of teaching historical thinking to students (Bain, 2000; Letourneau & Moisan, 2004; Monte-Sano et al., 2014; Reisman, 2012; van Boxtel & van Drie, 2013; Wineburg et al., 2011).

In contrast, this research on teacher candidates, a unique type of student of history, intersects with studies that emphasize the historical thinking of teachers and how their perceptions of history as a discipline inform their emerging practices and, in turn, classroom learning (Fehn & Koeppen, 1998; Bohan & Davis, 1998; Hartzler-Miller, 2001; Maggioni et al., 2009; Monte-Sano & Cochran, 2009; Seixas, 1998; VanSledright & Maggioni, 2016; Yeager & Wilson, 1997). Often this line of inquiry has sought to better understand the limits of educational reform as scholars such as Barton and Levstik (2004) have explored the intractable "gap between promise and practice." Many history teachers, even those who have demonstrated excellent disciplinary knowledge, deliver classroom instruction shaped far more by issues such as classroom management, real or perceived curriculum mandates, and their specific educational context than the provocative research on historical inquiry (Chapman et al., 2018; Cuban, 2016; Van Hover & Yeager, 2007; Watras, 2004).

This study falls squarely into what McDiarmid and Vinten-Johanson (2000) referred to as the "perennial puzzle" of history teacher education. In this vein, researchers have emphasized the need to better understand the varied cognitive frameworks of teacher candidates (Chapman, 2017; Chapman et al., 2018; Lévesque, 2014; Pollock, 2014; Sears, 2014; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988; Yeager & Davis, 1995). For Fragnoli (2005), individual reflection is a key part of this process as teacher candidates must identify the contradictions between "their theories and practice" as they "negotiate their preexisting conceptions" with the evolution of history education. However, others such as Barton and Levstik (2004), who stress the sociocultural context of teaching, encourage scholarly research centered on the actual classroom behavior rather than the thinking of teacher candidates. From this perspective, the evidence suggests that teacher candidates struggle to embrace historical inquiry as their "internal discourse," especially when it conflicts with their preconceptions about teaching and learning or their specific classroom goals formulated well before higher education (James, 2008; Van Hover & Yeager, 2007; Virta, 2002).

Not surprisingly, such conclusions have fueled increased commentary about the need to reimagine history teacher education. VanSledright (2011) argued that 95% of teacher candidates' learning as apprentices stems from problematic observations of practicing teachers, as opposed to teacher education faculty, and VanSledright (2011), McDiarmid and Vinten-Johansen (2000), and Von Heyking (2014) call for increased collaboration between historians and history teacher educators. Moreover, the implication of this research and the arguments of others is the need for a different kind of teacher education, what Sears (2014) contends includes "boundary practices" that involve specific kinds of transformative, longitudinal, and collective professional

development where emerging teachers confront, revise, and develop their cognitive frames for teaching history. The purpose of this study is to contribute to research in the realm of boundary practices.

Research Design and Methodology

This research used a case study design bound by definition and context (Yinn, 2003; Miles & Huberman, 1994). It centered on two questions:

RQ1: How do teacher candidates conceptualize the relationship among historians, history teachers, and history students?

RQ2: How is this understanding revealed in candidates' representation of the work they do in classrooms as history teachers?

Participants and Context

Participants included fifteen undergraduate social studies teaching majors at a large public university in the Midwestern United States. The eleven male and four female participants took part in the study during two consecutive semesters of their undergraduate teacher preparation program. During each of these two semesters, participants enrolled in a class that focused specifically on methods of teaching history/social studies. The first class emphasized teaching at the middle school level (Content Methods I), and the second class focused on teaching at the high school level (Content Methods II). One of the authors of this chapter was the instructor of both courses. While enrolled in Content Methods II, candidates also took two courses designed to provide them with extensive field experiences in middle schools and high schools. These two courses were taught by faculty other than the researchers.

Data Collection

The researchers collected data in two sets (see Table 1). Data Set 1 corresponded to RQ1 and consisted of participants' written responses to three questions: 1) What do historians do? 2) What do history teachers do? 3) What do history students do? During the first week of the Content Methods I course, participants were given 10-15 minutes to respond, in writing, to these three questions. The researchers limited participants' response time in order to capture participants' frames of reference, rather than gathering responses they might have composed if engaged in significant reading and conversations with peers.

At the onset of the study, the researchers assigned participants random numbers. For Data Set 1, researchers first organized participants' responses to the three questions by question (listing the responses of all 15 participants to question 1, then to question 2, then to question 3) and then by individual (listing the responses of each individual to all three questions to check for a relationship among responses by individual). For question 1, "What do historians do?" researchers engaged in descriptive and pattern coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994). They read the participants' responses closely and highlighted common words and/or themes that emerged. Through discussion, they achieved consensus and determined that use of a word or expression of an idea by two or more candidates would be noted. They recorded these responses in Table 2.

The researchers initially followed a similar approach when analyzing candidates' responses to question 2. However, identifying clear patterns (beyond a general emphasis on "teaching" and "history") that could be categorized by close reading and pattern coding alone proved challenging. Therefore, researchers decided to utilize an existing framework to help them code candidates' responses. Because the emphasis in question 2 was on the work of teachers ("What do history teachers do?") and a purpose of this research was to determine the extent to which there is a relationship between candidates' understanding of disciplinary practices and the work of teachers, the researchers decided to draw upon "Teaching Practices for Historical Inquiry" as

articulated in a Delphi survey led by Fogo (2014). Using the nine practices identified by the Delphi survey experts, the researchers coded participants’ responses based on the extent to which they aligned with descriptions of the practice. Again, consensus was achieved through discussion. These outcomes appear in Table 3.

For question 3 (“What do history students do?”), researchers utilized methods similar to those incorporated when analyzing participants’ response to question 1. While a clear response to the question was simply that students “learn,” close reading and pattern coding prevailed without the need of an additional framework. After discussion and consensus, four categories emerged as depicted in Table 4. Three of the categories also aligned with “Teaching Practices for Historical Inquiry” in the Delphi survey. Therefore, for both question 2 and question 3, the Teaching Practices in the Delphi survey played a role in the data displays that emerged.

Data Set 2 consisted of a portion of a portfolio that participants submitted in the final weeks of enrollment in Content Methods II and the two field experience courses. The teacher candidates were instructed to organize their portfolio around four areas pertaining to pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) in history as articulated in Monte-Sano and Budano’s (2013) synthesis of history education literature: 1) representing disciplinary practices; 2) transforming sources for student use; 3) considering and responding to student thinking; and 4) framing the past for understanding. Candidates were to include seven artifacts in the portfolio, and they were required to include at least one artifact in each of the four categories. In addition to including artifacts, teacher candidates were required to write a paragraph for each artifact, explaining why they believed the artifact met the criteria for the portfolio and describing how it represented “who they are as teachers,” and how it related to their developing PCK in history. An artifact was defined as any assignment or materials created in upper-level coursework or field experiences in the teacher preparation program. This structured flexibility compelled teacher candidates to address each area of PCK in history while providing them with the opportunity to highlight artifacts that most interested them or that they felt best represented their development as history teachers. In this study, the researchers focused on artifacts candidates submitted in two specific areas: considering and responding to student thinking and framing the past for understanding.

Table 1

Summary – Research Questions and Data Set Descriptions

<p>Research Question: How do teacher candidates conceptualize the relationship among historians, history teachers, and history students?</p> <p>Data Set 1 (3 Questions) Question 1: What do historians do? Question 2: What do history teachers do? Question 3: What do history students do?</p>	<p>Research Question: How is this understanding revealed in candidates’ representation of the work they do in classrooms as history teachers?</p> <p>Data Set 2 (Portfolio with Four Categories) Emphasis: Considering and responding to student thinking Emphasis: Framing the past for understanding</p>
--	--

Data Analysis

The researchers analyzed participants’ responses for the purposes of this study only after the candidates had completed their coursework in its entirety. In Data Set 1, question 1 elicited the most detailed and descriptive responses from participants. Table 2 depicts participants’ responses, by candidate, to the question, “What do historians do?” To demonstrate the coding, an example response from Candidate 10 follows Table 2.

Table 2

(Question 1) What do historians do?

Coding for Question 1	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	C14	C15	Total Number of References Across Candidates
Primary sources	x			x	x			x	x	x			x	x		8
Understand		x		x			x		x			x	x		x	7
Present		x			x	x			x		x	x			x	7
Analysis	x		x	x	x				x							5
Narrative				x		x	x			x			x			5
Secondary Sources					x			x		x			x			4
Question			x		x		x						x			4
Communicate to the public			x	x		x			x							4
Evidence	x													x		2
Gather information						x		x								2
Explain									x	x						2

Notes. C=Candidate, followed by their assigned number

C10: Historians use **primary** and **secondary sources** in order to create a **narrative** about the past. They can use these **narratives** to further **explains** [sic] other events, artifacts or anything else from the past.

Based on the information in Table 2, candidates believe historians’ work focuses on providing the public with an understanding of the past. Historians engage in this process by analyzing primary and secondary sources, creating narratives, and asking questions to help the public link the past to the present. Candidates did not emphasize particular disciplinary concepts or provide specific information about historical narratives. Perhaps, given the broad nature of the question, teacher candidates answered the question with a response that was equally broad in nature.

When responding to question 2 in Data Set 1, participants used words abundantly, but deriving meaning from their words alone or seeing patterns proved challenging. “History,” “historians,” or “historical” appeared frequently (77 times) in their collective responses, and five of the fifteen participants referenced preparing students for “citizenship” as the role of the history teacher (none of the participants who referenced citizens or citizenship explained their understanding of this concept). The researchers therefore turned to the aforementioned Delphi survey to be used as a lens through which to read the responses to question 2. Within the context of this framework, the researchers were able to derive meaning from the participants’ statements, and patterns emerged. Because the researchers were drawing from a specific framework in their analysis of responses to question 2, they agreed to record even one reference of a teaching practice by participants. The responses are recorded in Table 3, with Candidate 10 highlighted as an example.

Table 3

(Question 2) What do history teachers do?

Coding for Question 2	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	C14	C15	Total Number of References Across Candidates
Use historical questions					x		x				x		x			4
Select & adapt historical sources	x						x	x	x	x	x	x		x		8*
Explain & connect historical content		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	12**
Model & support historical reading skills																0
Employ historical evidence											x					1
Use historical concepts																0
Facilitate discussion on historical topics					x											1
Model & support historical writing																0
Assess student thinking about history																0

Notes. C=Candidate, followed by their assigned number

* Participants only referenced selecting sources, not adapting sources.

** Participants often focused on describing, understanding, relating, or giving content.

C10: History teachers **use sources** and narratives to **explain to students past events** and **create understanding** with these. They should also teach the students how past events can be applied to current and future events.

Table 4

(Question 3) What do history students do?

Coding for Question 3	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	C14	C15*	Total Number of References Across Candidates
Learn/connect / absorb content	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x			11
Question					x		x				x		x	x		5
Use documents/ sources	x	x														2
Engage in citizenship				x										x		2

Notes. C=Candidate, followed by their assigned number

*C15 emphasized paying attention and being respectful of others.

C10: History students learn from teachers in order to form their own opinions on current and past events.

Table 5

Coded responses to Questions 1, 2, and 3, by candidate

Candidate (C)	Coding Question 1	Coding Question 2	Coding Question 3	Connected Understanding
C1	Primary source; analysis; evidence	Select and adapt historical sources; explain and connect historical content	Understand/connect/absorb content; use documents/sources	All three actors use primary sources to understand the past.
C2	Understand; present	Explain and connect historical content	Understand/connect/absorb content; use documents/sources	We study the past to explain the present and learn from mistakes.
C3	Analysis; questions public	Explain and connect historical content	Understand/connect/absorb content	Historians know a lot and teachers select what to show students from this knowledge; students write about how the present comes from the past.
C4	Primary source; understand; analysis; narrative; public	Explain and connect historical content	Understand/connect/absorb content; engage in citizenship	Historians make sense of the past; teachers connect students to historians; students learn and apply it.
C5	Primary source; present; analysis; secondary source; questions	Use historical questions; facilitate discussion on historical topics	Question	Questions are important and so is using sources.
C6	Present; narrative; public; gather information	Explain and connect historical content	Understand/connect/absorb content	Historians determine the value of the past, teachers present it, and students draw conclusions.
C7	Understand; narrative; questions	Use historical questions; select and adapt historical sources	Understand/connect/absorb content; question	Historians ask and answer questions, teachers filter and teach, students ask and answer questions.
C8	Primary source; secondary source; gather information	Select and adapt historical sources; explain and connect historical content	Understand/connect/absorb content	Historians compile information, teachers teach it, students consume it.
C9	Primary source; understand; present; analysis; public; explain	Select and adapt historical sources; explain and connect historical content	Understand/connect/absorb content	All understand the content so we can take the information and use it in the present.
C10	Primary source; narrative; secondary source; explain	Select and adapt historical sources	Understand/connect/absorb content	Narratives are developed from sources, teachers explain them, and students learn them.
C11	Present	Use historical questions; employ historical evidence; select and adapt historical sources	Question	Historians pay attention to context, teachers bring sources to students, students ask questions.
C12	Understand; present	Select and adapt historical sources; explain and connect historical content	Understand/connect/absorb content	Historians investigate the past so we can understand the present, teachers make it consumable for students, and students understand.
C13	Primary source; understand; narrative; secondary source; questions	Use historical questions; explain and connect historical content	Understand/connect/absorb content; question	Historians understand the past through sources, teachers present it and encourage questions, students absorb information and ask questions.
C14	Primary source; evidence	Select and adapt historical sources; explain and connect historical content	Question; engage in citizenship	Historians create accounts, teachers use sources to build citizens, students take the skills and use sources to become citizens.
C15	Understand; present	Explain and connect historical content	n/a [response addressed being respectful]	All actors understand others through diverse perspectives and respect.

Notes. C=Candidate, followed by their assigned number

While a clear common theme for Question 3 was that history students “learn,” close reading and pattern coding revealed four areas that served as participants’ points of focus (as with question 1, two or more explicit references to a concept by participants overall deemed the concept significant enough to appear on Table 4). Candidate 10’s responses once again provide an example.

While it is tempting and potentially illustrative to draw conclusions based on the number of references candidates made to concepts/ideas, given the small data set, a frequency study can be misleading. Therefore, Table 5 illustrates the coded responses of each teacher candidate individually, across the three questions.

Potential connections among participants’ responses to the three questions make sense given that the teacher candidates were asked to respond to all three questions in the same sitting, and examining candidates’ responses to determine if a relationship exists aligns with the first question that drove the purpose of this study (“How do teacher candidates conceptualize the relationship among historians, history teachers, and history students?”). For example, Candidate 10 emphasized historians’ use of sources when constructing explanatory narratives, and this individual connected sources and narratives to teachers’ explanations for students as well. For Candidate 10, the task of students was to learn from their teachers in order to form their own opinions about both the past and the present. This individual connected the three “actors” - historians, teachers, and students - in the history classroom. Other candidates’ understanding of the relationship among the three “actors” is documented in Table 5 as well, with the researchers’ summaries included in the column on the far right side. Making sense of and/or explaining content was a clear point of focus of most of the teacher candidates.

Next, the researchers wanted to investigate if there would be a connection between candidates’ understanding of the relationship among the “actors” in the history classroom and how these candidates would represent their work as teachers (RQ2: How is this understanding revealed in candidates’ representation of the work they do in classrooms as history teachers?). To that end, researchers analyzed a portfolio that candidates created after extensive field experiences. Their selections constitute the body of evidence in Data Set 2.

It is important to note that the researchers did not assess the quality of the artifacts included in the portfolio, nor did they observe the candidates’ teaching practices; rather, they focused only on the description of the artifacts and the rationale candidates provided for including the artifacts. Drawing from Fragnoli’s (2005) emphasis on reflection, the researchers’ focus remained on what the candidates *thought* they were conveying about their own beliefs as history teachers. The researchers did note if the artifact failed to meet the criteria of the portfolio category.

Because of teacher candidates’ emphasis on “understanding content” as a primary contribution made by historians and history teachers and as an action taken by history students (Data Set 1), researchers decided to focus on artifacts submitted in categories 3 and 4 of the portfolio. The researchers selected category 3 (considering and responding to student thinking) because participants identified understanding content as a key responsibility of history students. The researchers wondered how the teacher candidates would select and explain artifacts in which they were assessing their students’ historical understandings. The researchers selected category 4 in the portfolio (framing the past for understanding) because it aligned most closely with the candidates’ emphasis on content understanding as represented in responses to questions 1, 2, and 3 in Data Set 1.

Table 6 summarizes the artifacts participants selected for category 3 (addressing student thinking) in the portfolio. Ten of the fifteen participants selected the same artifact—an assignment from the Content Methods I class. In this task, candidates traveled to a local middle school and engaged an assigned student in a “think aloud” activity with primary sources (Wineburg, 2001). The candidates were asked to instruct their student to read a primary source out loud and to stop and explain their thinking. Candidates took detailed notes and then wrote an essay in which they analyzed the thinking of the student. This assessment took place in the first four weeks of Content Methods I. Although the original assignment called for candidates to provide an analysis of student

thinking, only six of the ten candidates called attention to their original analysis of student thinking when writing the rationale for including the artifact in the portfolio. For an example of a candidate calling attention to a student’s thinking, see Table 6.

Of the other five participants, two selected artifacts that were assessments they designed. While these assessments provided purposeful opportunities for students to engage in disciplinary thinking, the assignments had never been administered to students; they were part of lesson plans that were never taught. Therefore, the candidates were unable to write reflections that included what they learned about their students’ learning. The artifacts selected by the other three participants focused on note-taking, a discredited “learning style” self-assessment, and an assessment that focused on general literacy categories. Based on the participants’ descriptions, it was not clear if these assessments had been used with students; no analysis of student thinking accompanied these artifacts in the portfolio.

Table 6

Considering and Responding to Student Thinking

Artifact	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	C14	C15
Think-Aloud from Content Methods I	Y				Y	N		Y	N	N		N	Y	Y	Y
Reading Sources to Promote Disciplinary Thinking			N				N								
General Instructional Strategies		N		N							N				

Notes. C=Candidate, followed by their assigned number

Y=Candidate offered an analysis of student thinking; N=no analysis of student thinking included in portfolio

C8: I chose to include this artifact because as he was struggling to make sense of the significance of those differences, I was able to use his ideas to point him in a direction where he was able to gain the information he needed to make a full interpretation of the story being told by the two sources. I was able to assess his knowledge and ideas about the historical circumstances displayed within the documents, and help to eventually direct his thinking toward the conclusions that I was looking for in the activity. This type of exercise in close reading displays something that is commonly done in history classes, and is a crucial skill required to practice historical inquiry.

When addressing framing the past for understanding (portfolio category 4), twelve of the fifteen participants included artifacts that related to this category. Artifacts submitted by the other three participants were not considered in this analysis because they did not meet criteria in the category. The artifacts that met the criteria consisted of unit plans or series of linked lesson plans, and in the rationales that participants wrote to explain why they selected these artifacts for this category, all twelve focused on specific concepts that relate to the discipline of history. Table 7 depicts the ideas expressed by the participants in portfolio category 4 and draws attention to Candidate 1’s response as an example.

Table 7

Framing the Past for Understanding

Disciplinary Concept/ Practice	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	C14	C15	Total Number of References Across Candidates*
Cause	X						X				X	X		X		5
Building Narratives		X		X				X					X		X	5
Historical Significance				X	X									X		3
Chronology			X													1
Not Applicable						X			X	X						

Notes. C=Candidate, followed by their assigned number

*Total number of concepts referenced = 14 because 2 candidates identified 2 concepts each.

C1: [F]raming history in this manner, help[s] to build the understanding of history as a cause and effect story, where a wide variety of coexisting movements and contexts have influence upon one another in a variety of ways.

Results

The researchers’ findings reveal a discrepancy exists between teacher candidates’ emerging beliefs about their responsibilities as teachers and the work that they selected to highlight their professional identity after having completed clinical experiences. When asked what history teachers do, no candidate identified assessing students’ thinking about history as a task of a history teacher (Table 3). Their apparent disconnection from this aspect of pedagogical content knowledge in history, as documented in the selections they made for their portfolio (Table 6) changed very little from the time when they responded to the questions that constitute Data Set 1 and when they submitted artifacts for Data Set 2. They emphasized multiple times that history teachers should explain content to students (Table 5), but their portfolios suggest they either did not consider or did not have examples of how they would evaluate the success of this endeavor. Specifically, the findings suggest that beginning teachers’ epistemic understandings of teaching history might not include thinking about their students in substantive ways. As importantly, the findings demonstrate that these candidates’ had likely not integrated disciplinary thinking into their classroom teaching. Their portfolio examples, which did focus on disciplinary thinking, came from assignments they created specifically for a university-based class, not materials they prepared for use with their own students in field experiences.

When demonstrating their ability to consider and respond to student thinking specifically (Data Set 2, portfolio category 3), twelve of the teacher candidates selected artifacts that accurately reflected the requirements of the portfolio. The artifact selected by ten of these candidates was highly directed by the course instructor and was designed as an introduction to learning about and from student learning; but only six of these ten candidates wrote rationales that demonstrated that they understood how to consider and respond to student thinking. In a portfolio designed to allow candidates to showcase their best work as history teachers, candidates selected an example from the first weeks in their teaching methods course sequence, and the example they selected was an assignment the instructor intended to be a starting point for their learning—not an assignment that represented their best work as teachers. In addition, the candidates had all completed the assignment satisfactorily, but when asked to reflect on why their previous work demonstrated their ability to respond to student thinking, four of the candidates merely described the assignment; they did not link their work to learning about how students think—even though the original assignment had set that goal as the purpose. Furthermore, this

example represented a single interaction with students, and it broke away from what many of the candidates themselves had identified as the role of teachers and the role of students in the history classroom (Data Set 1, questions 2 and 3): understanding content.

It is significant that the teacher candidates in this program experienced 16 weeks of clinical experiences and daily interactions with students, but when asked to identify artifacts that represent how they consider and respond to student thinking, twelve of the fifteen candidates did not pull examples from their work with students in extended clinical experiences. Furthermore, the examples of three candidates in no way reflected assessments designed to engage students in disciplinary thinking in history or to promote students' understanding of content in a clear way. Candidates' beliefs about their students and other contextual factors potentially played a role in their decisions (Van Hover & Yeager, 2003), but we can tentatively conclude that there is missing piece in clinical experiences that did not provide space for candidates to believe that they were engaged, in significant and notable ways, in considering their students' thinking, especially as it relates to the discipline of history.

Based on findings in Data Set 1, the researchers also focused on teacher candidates' depiction of how they frame the past for understanding (Data Set 2). Analysis of artifacts from Data Set 2 indicates that teacher candidates can articulate their own disciplinary understandings and can design lesson plans that incorporate disciplinary concepts into their framing of history. They incorporated such concepts as cause, historical significance, and chronology, and they emphasized the role that narrative construction plays in history as a discipline. Importantly, for all fifteen candidates the lesson plans included in their portfolios in this category were never used with students. Even though candidates worked in classrooms and taught multiple lessons over the course of their field experience, the artifacts represented candidates' ideas about framing history, but they did not demonstrate how candidates incorporated these ideas in practice.

These findings relate to research that addresses the importance of context with respect to teachers' beliefs about the teaching of history (McCrum, 2013; Voet & De Wever, 2016). The participants believed that building their students' content understanding was important, and they demonstrated that they were capable of drawing from discipline-specific ideas when planning lessons for students. But they chose not to demonstrate how they enacted these beliefs in the context of working with students. This begs the question: Did they? When examining the artifacts participants included in their portfolio, researchers noted that of the total artifacts submitted by all fifteen teacher candidates, 49.5% of the artifacts came from candidates' clinical experiences. Even though the portfolio was presented to teacher candidates as their opportunity to demonstrate "who they are" as teachers, only half of the items they collected as a whole came from potential interactions with students. When researchers considered portfolio artifact selection by individual, no one candidate selected more than four artifacts from their field experiences, and four candidates included only one or zero artifacts that demonstrated their work in classrooms. Candidates understood that their portfolios were meant to highlight their developing expertise as history teachers, but a significant number of candidates selected artifacts that reflected only their planning and their thinking while in a university classroom; the artifacts did not demonstrate a key aspect of teaching—interactions with actual students. It is possible that candidates were observing and working with mentor teachers whose practices did not frontload student learning (VanSledright, 2011) and that other contextual factors (McCrum, 2013; Voet & De Wever, 2016) restricted their ability to emphasize student learning.

Discussion and Conclusions

The findings suggest a critical disconnect exists between what teacher candidates are taught about teaching history, what they believe about teaching history, and the opportunities that they have in clinical experiences to enact these beliefs. This research highlights the central yet often unexamined role of emerging teachers' epistemic understandings in shaping opportunities for significant pedagogical reform in history.

Based on their responses to RQ1, participants believe that knowing content is most important in “doing” history and that content knowledge develops through the study of primary sources. Their responses also indicate that the candidates did not think about paying attention to student learning as an obligation of history teachers. In their responses to the three questions asked initially, candidates made it clear that history teachers were supposed to use primary sources to assist them in conveying content to students, but then it was unclear what students were supposed to do with this knowledge other than “understand” it.

Participants in this study mainly identified understanding and/or explaining historical content as a key task of historians, history teachers, and history students. But when asked to select artifacts that best represented “who they are” as history teachers, they did not include materials that related to a focus on content knowledge. And, importantly, they did not include materials that demonstrated their interaction with students in any way. Instead, they focused on disciplinary understandings. Perhaps candidates’ beliefs had shifted, after having taken two teaching methods courses that emphasized discipline-based teaching. Or, perhaps simply the requirements of their portfolio led students toward this focus on disciplinary understandings. But, when they spent 16 weeks in clinical experiences working daily with students, they apparently could neither provide evidence of working with students to build their disciplinary understandings nor provide evidence of having emphasized building students’ understanding of content. Their artifacts that focused on attending to students’ ideas about history (Data Set 2, Category 3) and framing students’ historical understandings (Data Set 2, Category 4) came mainly from assignments they completed in a university classroom. There did not seem to be a space in their clinical experiences to demonstrate any part of their beliefs as history teachers with respect to these two aspects of pedagogical content knowledge. Or, perhaps they did not receive explicit support for engaging in these practices and therefore, they simply did not do so. Regardless, while the candidates might have intended to teach in a disciplinary fashion or to teach by emphasizing content acquisition through the use of primary sources, they did not provide evidence of having enacted their own beliefs.

This study, of course, has limitations. First, while the task of answering three key questions about the roles of historians, history teachers, and history students provided a potentially honest response from candidates, the methodology (requiring candidates to respond without preparation and in a specific amount of time) precluded opportunities for clarification, probing, and follow-up evidence. Second, the use of a portfolio that was created as a class assignment is a limiting factor because of the possibility that candidates selected artifacts they thought would please the instructor, that they had discussed and confirmed with peers, or that were simply readily available. And, while engaging teacher candidates in purposeful reflection (Fragnoli, 2005) was a key purpose of this study, the use of evidence from a portfolio meant to represent the thinking of teacher candidates did not enable the researchers to ask candidates questions about why they did not provide artifacts that linked clearly to their classroom behavior (Barton and Levstik, 2004) in clinical experiences. Finally, focusing on a small amount of evidence from fifteen candidates in a case study limits the generalizability of the outcomes, and achieving interrater reliability through discussion also limits reproducibility. Nevertheless, our findings contribute to research pertaining to the epistemic stances of teacher candidates because this work has highlighted the need to investigate thoroughly the opportunities that do or do not exist for candidates to learn to enact their beliefs during clinical experiences. These outcomes align with previous findings relating to the important role that context plays (Voet & De Wever, 2016) with respect to teachers’ beliefs.

Our emphasis on considering opportunities for candidates to interact purposefully with students, in the context of clinical experiences, is significant and calls attention to the need for further examination of the epistemic stances of teacher candidates in order to enact meaningful pedagogical reform in history teacher education. The researchers operated under the assumption that teacher candidates would think about their students’ thinking, especially when explicitly tasked with doing so in order to meet the requirements of a portfolio. This study indicates that this clearly was not the case and that candidates needed explicit support and guidance. Twenty

years ago, Van Hover and Yeager (2003) called for extended mentoring for beginning history teachers. This research confirms that extended mentoring, beginning in clinical experiences, would indeed be beneficial. In addition, further study of the evolving epistemic stances of emerging teachers, in the context of clinical experiences, is central to creating and sustaining meaningful pedagogical reform in history education.

References

- American Historical Association. (1898). *The study of history in schools: Report to the American Historical Association by the Committee of Seven*. Macmillan.
- Bain, B. (2000). Into the breach: Using research and theory to shape history education. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 331-352). New York University Press.
- Barton, K. C. (2001). A sociocultural perspective on children's understanding of historical change: Comparative findings from Northern Ireland and the United States. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 881-913.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.3102/00028312038004881>
- Barton, K. C., & McCully, A. W. (2012). Trying to 'see things differently': Northern Ireland students' struggle to understand alternative historical perspectives. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 40(4), 371-408.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2012.710928>
- Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bohan, C. H., & Davis Jr., O. L. (1998). Historical constructions: How social studies student teachers' historical thinking is reflected in their writing of history. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 26(2), 173-197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.1998.10505843>
- Brown, R. (1996). Learning how to learn: The Amherst Project and history education in the schools. *Social Studies*, 87(6), 267-274.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00377996.1996.10114499>
- Burkholder, P., & Schaffer, D. (2021). A snapshot of the public's views on history. *Perspectives on History*, 59(6), 28-31. https://www.historians.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/Perspectives_59N6.pdf
- Bruner, J. S. (1961). *The process of education*. Harvard University Press.
- Chapman, A. (2017). Research and practice in history education in England: A perspective from London. *Journal of Social Studies Education*, 6, 13-41. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10059273/3/Chapman_1236-2827-1-SM.pdf
- Chapman, A., Burn, K., & Kitson, A. (2018). What is school history for? British student-teachers' perspectives. *Arbor*, 194, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.3989/arbor.2018.788n2003>
- Counsel, C. (2018). *Taking Curriculum Seriously*. Retrieved from https://my.chartered.college/impact_article/taking-curriculum-seriously/
- Cuban, L. (2016). *Teaching history then and now: A story of stability and change in schools*. Harvard Education Press.

- Cuban, L., & Tyack, D. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Harvard University Press.
- Fallace, T. (2017). The intellectual history of the social studies. In M. Manfra & C.M. Bolick (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of social studies research* (pp. 42-67). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fehn, B., & Koeppen, K.E. (1998). Intensive document-based instruction in a social studies methods course and student teachers' attitudes and practice in subsequent field experiences. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 26(4), 461-484.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.1998.10505861>
- Fogo, B. (2014). Core practices for teaching history: The results of a Delphi panel survey. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 42(2), 151-196.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2014.902781>
- Fragnoli, K. (2005). Historical inquiry in a methods classroom: Examining our beliefs and shedding our old ways. *Social Studies*, 96(6), 247-251.
<https://doi.org/10.3200/TSSS.96.6.24-252>
- Grant, S.G., & VanSledright, B.A. (1996). The dubious connection: Citizenship and the social studies. *Social Studies*, 87(2), 56-60.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00377996.1996.9958413>
- Grever, M., & van der Vlies, T. (2017). Why national narratives are perpetuated: Promising reorientations in history textbook research. *London Review of Education*, 15(2), 205-301.
<https://doi.org/10.18546/LRE.15.2.11>
- Hartzler-Miller, C. (2001). Making sense of "best practice" in teaching history. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 29(4), 672-695. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2001.10505961>
- Hughes, R., & Brown, S.D. (2021). Collective memory and historical narratives: The African American civil rights movement. *History Education Research Journal*, 18(2), 166-182.
<https://doi.org/10.14324/HERJ.18.2.03>
- Hughes, R., & Brown S.D. (2023). Teaching history in a place with a different history: Theory, policy, and practice in the United States and England. In B. Bain, A. Chapman, & A. Kitson (Eds.), *History education and historical enquiry*. Information Age Publishing.
- Husbands, C. (2011). What do history teachers (need to) know: A framework for understanding and developing practice. In I. Davies (Ed.), *Debates in history teaching* (pp. 84-95). Routledge.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2008.10473372>
- Jay, L. (2022). The disciplinary and critical divide in social studies teacher education research: A review of the literature from 2009-2019. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 50(3), 339-374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2022.2077156>
- Lavelle, C. (2004). Historical consciousness and historical education: What to expect from the first for the second. In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing historical consciousness* (pp. 165-182). University of Toronto Press.
- Lee, P. (2004). Walking backwards into tomorrow: Historical consciousness and understanding history. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching, and Research*, 4(1), 1-46. <https://doi.org/10.18546/HERJ.10.2.07>

- Lee, P., & Ashby, R. (2000). Progression in historical understanding among students ages 7-14. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 199-222). New York University Press.
- Létourneau, J., & Moisan, S. (2004). Young people's assimilation of a collective historical memory: A case study of Quebeckers of French-Canadian heritage. In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing historical consciousness* (pp. 109-128). University of Toronto Press.
- Lévesque, S. (2014). What is the use of the past for future teachers? A snapshot of Francophone student teachers in Ontario and Quebec universities. In R. Sandwell & A. Von Heyking (Eds.), *Becoming a history teacher: Sustaining practices in historical thinking and knowing* (pp. 115-138). University of Toronto Press.
- Lévesque, S. (2008). *Thinking historically: Educating students for the twenty-first century*. University of Toronto Press.
- Levstik, L. (2000). Articulating the silences: Teachers' and adolescents' conceptions of historical significance. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 284-305). New York University Press.
- Maggioni, L., VanSledright, B., Alexander, A. (2009). Walking on the borders: A measure of Epistemic cognition in history. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 77(3), 187-213. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JEXE.77.3.187-214>
- McCrum, E. (2013). History teachers' thinking about the nature of their subject. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 35(1), 73-80.
- McDiarmid, G. W. (1994). Understanding history for teaching: A study of the historical understanding of prospective teachers. In M. Carretero, & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Cognitive and instructional processes in history and the social sciences* (pp. 159-185). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McDiarmid, G. W., & Vinten-Johanson, P. (2000). A catwalk across the great divide: Redesigning the history teaching methods course. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 156-177). New York University Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. SAGE Publications.
- Monte-Sano, C., & Budano, C. (2013). Developing and enacting pedagogical content knowledge for teaching history: An exploration of two novice teachers' growth over three years. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 22(2), 171-211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2012.742016>
- Monte-Sano, C., De La Paz, S., & Felton, M. (2014). *Reading, thinking, and writing about history: Teaching argument writing to diverse learners in the Common Core classroom, grades 6-12*. Teachers College Press.
- Monte-Sano, C., & Cochran, M. (2009). Attention to learners, subject, or teaching: What takes precedence as preservice teachers learn to teach historical thinking and reading?" *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 37(1), 101-135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2009.10473389>
- Pollock, S. A. (2014). The poverty and possibility of historical thinking: An overview of recent research into history teacher education. In R. Sandwell & A. Von Heyking (Eds.), *Becoming a history teacher: Sustaining practices in historical thinking and knowing* (pp. 60-74). University of Toronto Press.

- Reisman, A. (2012). Reading like a historian: A document-based history curriculum intervention in urban high schools. *Cognition and Instruction*, 22(3), 82-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2011.634081>
- Rusen, J. (2005). *History: Narration, interpretation, orientation*. Berghahn Books.
- Salinas, C., & Blevins, B. (2013). Examining the intellectual biography of pre-service teachers: Elements of 'critical' teacher knowledge. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 40(1), 7-24.
- Sears, A. (2014). Moving from the periphery to the core: The possibilities for professional learning communities in history teacher education. In R. Sandwell & A. Von Heyking (Eds.), *Becoming a history teacher: Sustaining practices in historical thinking and Knowing* (pp. 11-29). University of Toronto Press.
- Seixas, P. (1998). Student teachers thinking historically. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 310-341. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/00933104.1998.10505854>
- Seixas, P. (2004). *Theorizing historical consciousness*. University of Toronto Press.
- Shemilt, D. (2000). The caliph's coin: The currency of narrative frameworks in history teaching. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 83-101). New York University Press.
- Shulman, L.S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004>
- Stoel, G., Logtenberg, A. & Nitsche, M. (2022). Researching epistemic beliefs in history education: A review. *Historical Encounters*, 9(1), 11-34. <https://doi.org/10.52289/hej9.102>
- Taylor, T. (2019). Historical consciousness and the Australian curriculum. In T. Allendar, A. Clark, & R. Parkes (Eds.), *Historical thinking for history teachers: A new approach to engaging students and developing historical consciousness* (pp. 3-17). Allen and Unwin.
- VanSledright, B. (2008). Narratives of nation-state, historical knowledge, and school history education. *Review of Research in Education*, 32(1), 109-146. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X07311065>
- VanSledright, B. (2011). *The challenge of rethinking history education: On practices, theory, and policy*. Routledge.
- VanSledright, B., & Maggioni, L. (2016). Preparing teachers to teach historical thinking?: An interplay between professional development programs and school-systems' cultures. In T. Petty, A. Good, & S. M. Putman (Eds.), *Handbook of research on professional Development for quality teaching and learning* (pp. 252-280). IGI Global.
- Van Hover, S., & Yeager, E. (2003). Challenges facing beginning history teachers: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Social Education*, 19(1), 8-21.
- Van Hover, S., & Yeager, E. (2007). "I want to use My subject matter to...": The role of purpose in one U.S. secondary history teacher's instructional decision making. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 30(3), 670-690. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20466658>
- Virta, A. (2002). Becoming a history teacher: Observations on the beliefs and growth of student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(6), 687-698. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(02\)00028-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(02)00028-8)

- Van Drie, J., & Van Boxtel, C. (2008). Historical reasoning: Towards a framework for analyzing students' reasoning about the past. *Educational Psychology Review*, 20(2), 87-110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-007-9056-1>
- 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 & Teacher Education*, 55, 57-67
- Von Heyking, A. (2014). Canadian history for teachers: Integrating content and pedagogy in teacher education. In R. Sandwell & A. Von Heyking (Eds.), *Becoming a history teacher: Sustaining practices in historical thinking and knowing* (pp. 91-111). University of Toronto Press.
- Watras, J. (2004). Historians and social studies educators, 1893-1998. In C. Woyshner, J. Watras, & M.S. Crocco (Eds.), *Social education in the twentieth century: Curriculum and context for citizenship* (pp. 192-209). Rowman and Littlefield.
- Wiley, J., Griffin, T. D., Steffens, B. & Britt, M. A. (2019). Epistemic beliefs about the value of Integrating information across multiple documents in history. *Learning and Instruction*, 65, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.101266>
- Wilke, M., Depaepe, F., & Van Nieuwenhuysse, D. (2022). The interplay between historical thinking and epistemological beliefs: A case study with history teachers in Flanders. *Historical Encounters*, 9(1), 196-219. <https://doi.org/10.52289/hej9.111>
- Wilson, S.M., & Wineburg, S. (1988). Peering at history through different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in teaching history. *Teachers College Record*, 89(4), 525-539. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146818808900403>
- Wineburg, S. (1998). Reading Abraham Lincoln: An expert/expert study in the interpretation of historical texts. *Cognitive Science*, 22(3), 319-346. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0364-0213\(99\)80043-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0364-0213(99)80043-3)
- Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past*. Temple University Press.
- Wineburg, S., Martin, D., & Monte-Sano, C. (2011). *Reading like a historian: Teaching literacy in middle and high school history classrooms*. Teachers College Press.
- Yeager, E. A., & Davis Jr., O.L. (1995). Between campus and classroom: Secondary student-teachers' thinking about historical texts. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29(1), 1-8.
- Yeager, E. A., & Wilson, E. K. (1997). Teaching historical thinking in the social studies methods course: A case study. *The Social Studies*, 88(3), 121-126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00377999709603758>
- Yilmaz, K. (2008). Social studies teachers' conceptions of history: Calling on historiography. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 101(3), 158-175.
- Yinn, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. SAGE Publications.

About the Authors

Sarah Drake Brown is associate professor of secondary education and director of secondary, middle grades, and foreign language education at Lewis University, United States. She has served in various leadership roles at the National Council for History Education (USA) and as editor of *Teaching History: A Journal of Methods*. Her research interests emphasize the scholarship of teaching and learning and history teachers' understanding of student thinking.

Email: sbrown29@lewisu.edu

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6636-1907>

Richard Hughes is professor of History at Illinois State University, United States where he teaches courses in U.S. history and history education as part of the secondary teacher education program. He has served as Assistant Editor for *Teaching History: A Journal of Methods* and is an officer in The International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in History. His research interests range from race in modern U.S. history to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and the evolving disciplinary understandings of history teachers and teacher candidates.

Email: rhughes@ilstu.edu

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3254-1982>