



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Inquiry learning in history

van Boxtel, C.; Voet, M.; Stoel, G.

DOI

[10.4324/9781315685779-20](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315685779-20)

Publication date

2021

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

International Handbook of Inquiry and Learning

License

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/in-the-netherlands/you-share-we-take-care>)

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van Boxtel, C., Voet, M., & Stoel, G. (2021). Inquiry learning in history. In R. G. Duncan, & C. A. Chinn (Eds.), *International Handbook of Inquiry and Learning* (pp. 296-310). (Educational psychology handbook series). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315685779-20>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

INQUIRY LEARNING IN HISTORY

Carla van Boxtel, Michiel Voet, and Gerhard Stoel

Introduction

Inquiry learning in history education is typically about students developing or evaluating interpretations of the past. Students are expected to do so through inquiry tasks that usually center on investigations of authentic historical questions, and on the reading, analysis, and synthesis of multiple sources, which can include historical documents, artifacts, and accounts created by historians. These inquiry tasks focus on distinct issues in history, such as exploring causes and consequences of the French Revolution, evaluating different interpretations of the collapse of the Soviet Union, or comparing how people in the past and in the present times have dealt, and are dealing, with immigration challenges and issues. In this chapter, we use the term *inquiry learning* but would like to point out that the history education literature, in addition to using “inquiry learning” (e.g., Goldman et al., 2016; Seixas, 1993), also uses other, interchangeable terms like “inquiry-based learning” (e.g., Pellegrino & Kilday, 2013; Voet & De Wever, 2017), “(problem-based) historical inquiry” (Brush & Saye, 2014), “document-based lessons” (e.g., Reisman, 2012), or “doing history” (e.g., Barton & Levstik, 2004; Levstik & Barton, 2015). So far, the main focus of research on this pedagogical approach has been to uncover the disciplinary reasoning and knowledge that underlie successful inquiry learning, students’ ability and difficulties when engaging in such disciplinary reasoning, and ways in which inquiry learning in history can be facilitated.

In this chapter, we first discuss how inquiry learning has been conceptualized by history education researchers and how students engage in historical inquiry. We then examine instructional strategies that are advocated and found to be effective for engaging students in historical inquiry and developing historical inquiry competences. In addition, we address the role of teachers as the orchestrators of inquiry learning in history. Finally, we will formulate challenges for future research and implications for educational practice. We will argue that successful implementation of inquiry learning in the history classroom requires a clear view of the learning goals that are aimed at and the processes that students should engage in.

Conceptualizations of Inquiry Learning in History

In order to understand inquiry learning in history, we first look at the connection with the academic discipline. What is characteristic of historical inquiry practices? Then we look at conceptualizations in which inquiry learning is presented as a learner-centered approach, during which students engage in domain-specific reasoning and construct their own account of the past or evaluate a given account.

Historical Inquiry as a Specific Form of Academic Inquiry

History education researchers refer to historical inquiry as a specific form of academic inquiry and have argued that, if students are to understand historical inquiry and use disciplinary strategies, they should first of all become familiar with the nature and construction of historical knowledge (Maggioni, VanSledright, & Alexander, 2009; Stoel, Logtenberg, Wansink, Huijgen, Van Boxtel, & Van Drie, 2017). This claim is based on observations that, while historical inquiry shares some common attributes of inquiry with other disciplines, there are also important differences (Levy, Thomas, Drago, & Rex, 2013). For instance, historical inquiry resembles research in other disciplines in that it typically starts with a question or a tentative thesis. Unlike researchers in many disciplines, however, historians cannot directly observe or reenact the subject of investigation. As such, their task consists in creating, through inquiry of primary and secondary sources, the subject that they work on (Maza, 2017).

However, the variety in historical inquiry practices that exist within the discipline is often not discussed in history education research. Experts in the philosophy of history, who discuss how historians conduct research and compose historical narratives, point out that historical inquiry is not a singular scientific practice (Paul, 2015; Tosh, 2015). There are many sub-disciplines and methods of historical inquiry. There are, for example, different ideas about how to explain historical events. Retz (2016) argued that the intentionalist philosophy of history has had a profound influence on the work of history education researchers. Influential scholars, such as Wineburg and Seixas, clearly align themselves with this view that reconstructing and contextualizing the intentions of human agents is key to the process of historical inquiry. The focus is on the specific situation and human agency rather than on any overarching universal laws or categories. Chapman (2017), however, mentions not only the intentions of historical actors and the context for their actions as important aspects of causal explanation but also the unintended consequences of intentional action and the impact of factors of change that lack intention and belief, such as states of affairs, nonhuman “agents,” and structures.

Another specific characteristic of historical inquiry is the idea that the narratives by historians do not present the past as it was but, instead, offer representations of what the past can be expected to have been like. This view is rooted in common agreement that historical inquiry centers on a specific form of theory-evidence coordination: Because historical claims cannot be empirically tested, they need to be argued for and supported by evidence from historical sources (Kuhn, Weinstock, & Flaton, 1994). As a consequence, historians may arrive at different accounts of the past as they ask different questions, use different sources, or draw on different interpretative frameworks (e.g., focusing on either the political or the social dimension, or using a different periodization). Recently, this view has become even more prevalent due to increasing attention for research on collective memory and sensitive history. The work in these interdisciplinary fields clearly shows how sociocultural contexts also affect the construction of historical narratives.

Historical Inquiry as a Pedagogic Approach

When we look at historical inquiry as a pedagogic approach, inquiry learning is often regarded as the opposite of more explanatory approaches, during which a readymade historical narrative is presented to students. Inquiry learning does, however, not mean that students need to discover all of history by themselves, but rather that they form their own conclusions about particular historical phenomena, under the expert guidance of the teacher. Most researchers emphasize the application of disciplinary methods of collecting data and drawing conclusions, but others have also emphasized the importance of dialogue in inquiry (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Van Boxtel & Van Drie, 2017; Dobber & Van Oers, 2015). More specifically, Dobber and Van Oers (2015) stated that

inquiry learning implies learning to talk, think, and work as researchers within a community of inquiry and therefore considered interactions within the classroom and with others from outside of the classroom as central aspects of inquiry.

Historical Inquiry Processes

Several researchers have tried to unravel historical inquiry in terms of its components and underlying knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Perhaps the most influential definition of historical inquiry processes has been provided by Wineburg (1991). Wineburg and history education researchers who have built upon his work focus on the strategies that are characteristic of the analysis of historical information sources, such as contextualization, sourcing, evaluating reliability, corroboration, and close reading (Breakstone, Smith, & Wineburg, 2013; Nokes, 2017; Nokes, Dole, & Hacker, 2007; Reisman, 2012; Wineburg, 1991). The act of contextualizing (i.e., considering how a historical context may have shaped actions or interpretations) in particular has been considered as a strategy that sets historical inquiry apart from that in other disciplines. Historians aim to reconstruct the larger processes, atmosphere, and mentality of the context and try “to understand each age in its own terms, to take on its own values and priorities, instead of imposing ours” (Tosh, 2015, p. 6).

Other scholars have pointed out that an analysis of historical sources is only a part of historical inquiry and that historical inquiry neither starts nor ends with it (Nokes, 2017; Van Boxtel & Van Drie, 2018; Voet & De Wever, 2016). These scholars emphasize that other processes also play a key role in historical inquiry. For example, historical inquiry typically starts with a historical question or problem (Logtenberg, Van Boxtel, & Van Hout-Wolters, 2011), focusing on themes such as change and continuity, causes and consequences, ways in which the past has been or is represented, or ethical judgment. Given the centrality of these questions to historical inquiry, the act of problem-finding, forming historical questions, and formulating hypotheses can be regarded as another key activity of historical inquiry (e.g., Van Drie & Van Boxtel, 2008; Logtenberg et al., 2011; Schreiber et al., 2006; Voet, 2017).

Another contribution to the identification of reasoning processes involved in historical inquiry comes from scholars who focus more on the synthesis of information from multiple sources and the construction of evidence-based written arguments (e.g., Monte-Sano, De La Paz, & Felton, 2014; Nokes, 2017). After all information has been analyzed, one needs to weigh different interpretations to formulate a claim about the past. This claim then needs to be substantiated with arguments based on relevant evidence, examples, details, footnotes, and quotations. In addition, the argumentation must address historical evidence that goes against the claim (Chapman, 2017). Research on the written and oral language forms that are used to construct historical arguments further points out that historical arguments may take on different structures. To be more specific, Goldman et al. (2016) made a distinction between descriptive, explanatory, and narrative structures. Later, Chapman (2017) added an evaluative structure as another form of historical writing.

Several scholars brought several inquiry activities together in a definition or integrative framework. Levstik and Barton (2015), for example, conceptualized “doing history” as the asking of questions, gathering data from primary and secondary sources, organizing and interpreting data, and sharing the results with particular audiences. Recently, Voet (2017) discussed different conceptualizations of inquiry learning in history education and stated that these conceptualizations revolve around working with an open-ended historical question, which drives the investigation, using multiple information sources representing different perspectives on a topic in order to construct an argumentative account. Van Boxtel and Van Drie (2018), and Van Drie and Van Boxtel (2008) developed a framework of historical reasoning, including inquiry activities. They defined historical reasoning as an activity in which a student attempts to reach justifiable conclusions about processes of continuity and change, causes and consequences, and/or differences and similarities

between historical phenomena or periods. Historical reasoning is constructed through asking historical questions, constructing temporal and causal relationships and historical contextualization, and supporting assertions with arguments based on critical analysis and evaluation of available historical interpretations and primary sources. Based on the model of expertise development of Alexander (2003), Van Boxtel and Van Drie (2018) pointed out that students' historical reasoning in the context of historical inquiry is dependent on historical interest, substantive historical knowledge (historical facts, concepts, and chronology), understanding of metahistorical concepts (e.g., causation in history, change, historical significance), and epistemological beliefs. When a student does not consider a historical question or topic relevant, it is not likely that he or she will make much effort to critically examine historical sources and come to an elaborate historical argument. In addition, students need knowledge of historical events, developments, and chronology to contextualize, explain, or compare historical phenomena. Furthermore, students' questions and argumentation are shaped by their understanding of what historical change or causation can entail and their understanding of the nature of historical knowledge. Maggioni et al. (2009) showed that students often consider historical claims as either correct or wrong or as a matter of opinion, whereas historians understand the constructed nature of history and use scientific criteria for evaluating the quality of interpretations.

Potential Benefits of Inquiry Learning in History

Above we discussed the processes involved in historical inquiry and the role of available mental resources. But what do scholars consider potential benefits of inquiry learning in history? Why do history education researchers emphasize engagement in historical inquiry, rather than having students learn about the outcomes of historical inquiries by reading a textbook or listening to their teachers? Over the years, researchers have mentioned different reasons for doing so.

First, they emphasized that historical inquiry allows students to develop a deeper understanding of how historical accounts are created and historical thinking and reasoning skills (e.g., Levstik & Barton, 2015; Stoel, Van Drie, & Van Boxtel, 2017). Nuanced beliefs about the nature and construction of historical knowledge and historical reasoning skills are important for the critical examination of historical representations in the media, films, museums, and other settings (Trautwein et al., 2017; Van Boxtel & Van Drie, 2018). When students engage in the analysis of multiple sources and historical argumentation, they are likely to discover that there is typically more than one plausible answer and that the validity of their claims therefore rests on their arguments and use of evidence. Some researchers have found positive effects of inquiry learning on historical thinking and reasoning skills, for example, sourcing and close reading skills (Britt & Aglinskas, 2002; Nokes, Dole, & Hacker, 2007; Paxton, 2002; Reisman, 2012; Rouet, Britt, Mason, & Perfetti, 1996; Wiley & Voss, 1999).

Second, it has been argued that inquiry learning helps students to reach a deeper historical understanding of how people lived in the past. The investigation of primary sources, such as historical images or diaries that provide concrete details, can help students imagine how life in the past was different (Lévesque, 2008). Through historical investigation, students can construct a vivid image of how things looked like, how people lived, and the ideas and emotions they had (De Leur, Van Boxtel, & Wilschut, 2017). Inquiry learning enhances deep elaboration of the learning content.

A third expected benefit of inquiry learning in history is the assumed contribution to *generic* literacy skills, which includes reading comprehension, critical analysis of sources, and construction of arguments (e.g., Reisman, 2012; De La Paz & Felton, 2010; Wineburg & McGrew, 2018). Skills related to the evaluation of historical sources, for example, partly overlap with media literacy skills. To illustrate this, the educational materials that have been developed for the critical analysis

of primary historical sources are currently expanded to help students to spot fake information online (the project MediaWise, co-developed with the Stanford History Education Group of Sam Wineburg).

Finally, some scholars state that inquiry learning can increase motivation and student engagement. Working with historical sources, such as objects or a photograph, can stimulate curiosity, particularly when they puzzle students (Barton, 2005). As such, Stoel, Van Drie, & Van Boxtel (2017) found a significant increase in students' interest when strategy instruction was embedded in a historical inquiry task. It has, however, also been argued that large amounts of source work can be quite boring for students. Counsell (1998) even used the phrase "death by sources." Several researchers have therefore emphasized the importance of inquiry questions that students consider meaningful or that originate in students' own curiosity and interest (Logtenberg, 2012; Saye & Brush, 2002).

Instructional Strategies and Approaches

History educators usually conceptualize inquiry learning as guided or scaffolded discovery learning. This approach is in line with more general research showing that inquiry is most effective when students are guided by an expert (Hmelo-Silver, Duncan, & Chinn, 2007). This guidance is provided by designing instruction, activities, materials, and feedback in such a way that they foster concrete aspects of historical thinking and reasoning. In this paragraph, we discuss several approaches that research on history education has shown to be effective.

Historical questions are important starting points for historical inquiry. Historical questions can be taken from the discipline of history, or from the daily life, or interests of students. Van Drie, Van Boxtel, and Van der Linden (2006) showed that an evaluative historical question ("to what extent were changes in the 1960s revolutionary or not?") was more effective in stimulating historical reasoning than a descriptive historical question ("what has changed in the 1960s?"). Similarly, Monte-Sano and De La Paz (2012) found that analytical questions (i.e., asking to consider various causes, compare multiple sources, or explore bias in sources) elicited more awareness of differing perspectives in historical sources than a question in which students had to imagine themselves as an historical agent.

Considering the effects of historical questions from a more affective point of view, Barton and Levstik (2004) argued that questions from academic history are not necessarily meaningful for students. Instead, questions related to students' own reality or interests may be more able to generate an interest in historical inquiry. Along these lines, Brush and Saye (2008) focused on persistent societal problems in a historical context to promote student engagement. In their study, students took the roles of consultants to Civil Rights leaders in 1968 to discuss the strategies that should be pursued in the struggle for a more equal society. Interview and classroom observation data showed that students were highly engaged. Likewise, Van Straaten, Wilschut, and Oostdam (2018) suggested that inquiries into enduring human issues and historical analogies can stimulate interest in history, due to the connections among past, present, and future. Finally, Logtenberg (2012) went a step further by suggesting that students should be given the opportunity to formulate their own questions. From his point of view, the process of formulating personal historical questions does not only make the inquiry more relevant but may also serve as an engine that triggers other historical reasoning processes.

In addition to working with authentic and meaningful questions, researchers have also reported that explicit attention to reasoning strategies can be effective (Stoel, Van Drie, & Van Boxtel, 2015). Most empirical studies to date have focused on the strategies related to the analysis of multiple sources (Nokes et al., 2007; Reisman, 2012; Rouet et al., 1996; Wiley & Voss, 1999). For instance, Nokes et al. (2007) showed how explicit strategy instruction on sourcing, contextualizing, and

corroborating embedded in inquiry tasks effectively fostered students' ability to reason with multiple historical sources. In recent years, the focus of researchers has broadened from strategies used to critically analyze and compare historical sources to include the additional strategies and concepts needed to synthesize historical information and construct an historical account. This holds especially true for the construction of causal explanations. For instance, a study by Stoel, Van Drie, & Van Boxtel (2017) showed that students' ability to use causal reasoning strategies and the language needed to express causation in a nuanced manner increased after a lesson unit that combined historical inquiry with explicit instruction about how to categorize causes and practice in using the vocabulary related to causal relationships.

An important characteristic of explicit strategy instruction is that not only the thinking of the teacher becomes explicit through instruction and modeling but also that the reasoning of the students becomes explicated and visualized through scaffolded inquiry activities. This can be achieved by using graphical organizers, e.g., card sorting, matrices, and (causal) concept maps (Chapman, 2003; Stoel et al., 2015; Van Drie, Van Boxtel, Jaspers, & Kanselaar, 2005). During group work these graphical representations function as concrete "objects" that structure the discussion and elicit historical reasoning. Teachers can see what students are thinking, ask questions, and provide feedback. This "just-in-time" teacher feedback is an important aspect of a learning environment that fosters historical reasoning. For instance, Saye and Brush (2002) investigated the extent to which expert guidance embedded in a multimedia learning environment (i.e., a storyboard that guided students through the process of constructing an historical argument) supported students' critical reasoning about ill-structured problems. They found that this scaffolding provided limited support in the process of historical inquiry and suggested that complex inquiry tasks also require spontaneous support that can only be provided by a teacher.

A growing body of work emphasizes the need also to pay explicit attention to the demands of historical literacy and the role of language. Historians use everyday language, but often do so in domain-specific and nuanced ways (e.g., they use concepts like *reliable*, *representative*, *short-term*, *process*, and *precondition*). Furthermore, they use specific genres or text structures that allow them to express their analysis (Coffin, 2006; Goldman et al., 2016; Monte-Sano, 2010; Schleppegrell, Greer, & Taylor, 2008). Finally, historians write accounts in which the author is clearly present; they argue for a certain perspective, discuss the evidence for their claim, and reference the sources they use. In contrast, students often write rather linear and factual recounts and tend to use sources only as carriers of information (McCarthy Young & Leinhardt, 1998; Stoel, 2017; Wineburg, 1991). Several recent studies have shown that an explicit (discipline-based) writing instruction positively affects the ability of students to articulate historical reasoning in their writing (De La Paz & Felton, 2010; De La Paz & Wissinger, 2015; Van Drie, Braaksma, & Van Boxtel, 2015). Other research showed positive effects of instruction on referencing sources and integrating source information in a written essay (Britt & Aglinskias, 2002; De La Paz, 2005). It is important to acknowledge and carefully scaffold the linguistic demands that historical inquiry tasks place on students—especially if students have to generate a written answer. Otherwise, the result might not represent a student's actual ability to reason historically (Reisman, 2012).

In the finishing phases of historical inquiry, whole-class discussion is advocated as an effective way to foster historical thinking and literacy (Reisman et al., 2018; Van Boxtel & Van Drie, 2017; Dobber & Van Oers, 2015). Through whole-class discussion students can compare findings, while teachers can provide feedback, ask (epistemological) questions, and reflect with the students on learning outcomes (Stoel et al., 2015; Van Drie & Van Boxtel, 2011). In a recent study, Van Drie and Van de Ven (2018) found that students who participated in whole-class discussion included and transformed ideas from this discussion in subsequent writing. Furthermore, they found that discussion contributed to students' ability to use abstract historical concepts in their writing.

The Implementation of Inquiry Learning by Teachers

Despite the potential of inquiry learning to support history learning, and despite examples of effective instructional approaches, studies have shown that it is still far from common practice in most history classrooms (see e.g. Cuban, 2016; VanSledright, 2011). A relatively large body of research on history education has therefore focused on the question as to why teachers' adoption of inquiry learning remains rather low and how the implementation of inquiry learning can be enhanced and supported.

Why Are Many History Teachers Reluctant to Use Inquiry Learning?

Studies on the adoption of inquiry learning reveal the existence of several barriers to inquiry learning, spread out across the macro-, meso-, and micro-level of history teachers' working context. One of the main problems at macro-level is that current history textbooks and teaching materials typically offer little support for the organization of inquiry learning. Instead, their contents are often dominated by a desire to provide students with an outline of national or world history (Loewen, 2018). Most history textbooks also tend to reduce history to a fixed narrative, rather than presenting it as the result of disciplinary inquiry (Paxton, 1999). This suggests to teachers that history teaching mainly revolves around covering a vast narrative and that stories and lectures are effective ways to teach history (VanSledright & Limón, 2006). Although some scholars have taken it upon themselves to create more inquiry-oriented curriculum materials (e.g., Reisman, 2012), educational publishers have yet to follow suit. Another macro-level barrier consists of restrictions imposed on teachers by limited time and demands related to high-stakes testing (Haydn, 2011). Such restrictions force teachers to make choices about what to teach, and when they do so, they tend to drop the most time-consuming activities, such as inquiry learning (Van Hover & Yeager, 2003). Moving on to the meso-level, teachers also have to take into account the views of their colleagues. In some cases, these colleagues may act as mentors that support inquiry learning (Achinstein & Fogo, 2015). More often than not, however, it appears that teachers' options to organize inquiries are instead constrained by their colleagues' expectations to cover particular content (Fehn & Koeppen, 1998). At the micro-level, the presence of low-ability students, who sometimes lack even basic reading skills, may further dissuade teachers from organizing classroom inquiries (Van Hover & Yeager, 2003), despite research suggesting that such students may also benefit from historical inquiry activities (e.g., De La Paz & Wissinger, 2017).

The barriers associated with history teachers' working context make it clear that implementing inquiry learning in history classrooms is no simple matter. Even so, it also appears that teachers cope differently with these constraints (Voet & De Wever, 2017). Some studies suggest that this is largely due to differences in teachers' subject matter knowledge and, in particular, their understanding of the nature of history (Bouhon, 2009; McCrum, 2013). According to these studies, teachers with a sound understanding of history's interpretative nature are more inclined to organize historical inquiries, in order to convey this understanding to their students. Other studies have cast doubt on this proposition, however, by demonstrating that even teachers with a very nuanced understanding of history may still choose to teach through traditional, expository approaches (Hartzler-Miller, 2001; VanSledright, 1996). A study by McDiarmid (1994) even showed that, after student teachers had been taught through an inquiry-based curriculum, lectures and stories kept on dominating their thinking about instruction. In summary, it is clear that history teachers' classroom instruction does not necessarily reflect their own subject matter knowledge (Williamson McDiarmid, 1994). That teachers' subject matter knowledge appears to have little effect on the decision to implement historical inquiry does not mean that this kind of knowledge is irrelevant, however. After all, teachers cannot properly introduce students to historical inquiry

if they are not familiar with it themselves (Martin & Monte-Sano, 2008; Fehn & Koeppen, 1998) or if they are unable to transform content into inquiry activities that allow students to further develop their understanding of history (Monte-Sano & Budano, 2013).

As researchers failed to find strong influences of subject matter knowledge on history teachers' adoption of inquiry learning, they turned instead to teachers' beliefs about education. These beliefs are a set of ideas that teachers hold about different aspects of their work, such as the purpose of education, their own teaching abilities, and the school environment (Pajares, 1992). They differ from knowledge in that they are not so much a consensus about reality but rather a personal view that others do not necessarily have to agree with (Rokeach, 1968). Another important aspect of beliefs is that they generally carry a strong affective and evaluative component (Nespor, 1987). What this means, in essence, is that teachers can be expected to attach different values to various aspects of their work and to judge instructional situations differently. Beliefs thus function as a kind of lens through which teachers interpret and organize their work.

Teachers' beliefs are largely developed through experience, which includes a large number of observations during teachers' own careers as students (Lortie, 1975). As a consequence, studies have found history teachers are generally inclined to recreate for others the kind of instruction that worked well for them (Hicks, 2005). In particular, Virta (2002) discovered that novice history teachers generally accepted, or even praised, the lecture-based approaches through which charismatic teachers had been able to capture their interest. Similarly, McDiarmid (1994) noted how she was struck by the extent to which novice history teachers were prisoners of their own experiences as students, when she found that they generally equated history teaching with telling about events in the past and explaining why these had happened.

This led Barton and Levstik (2003) to conclude that the main reason history teachers are reluctant to adopt inquiry learning is that doing so conflicts with what they believe to be two of their primary tasks: controlling students' behavior and covering content. This claim is supported by several studies, such as by Hicks (2005) and Van Hover and Yeager (2003), who found that novice history teachers' work is often driven by concerns about behavior management and a desire to pass down historical narratives. More recent work by Voet and De Wever (2019) starts from a different, but complimentary, point of view and argues that adoption of inquiry learning remains limited due to negative perceptions of its expected value. This expected value is the function of the extent to which history teachers value the outcomes of inquiry learning and the extent to which they then feel capable to realize these outcomes (Pollock, 2006). Empirical data show that this framework is able to explain about 38% of the variance in history teachers' adoption of inquiry learning (Voet & De Wever, 2019). To sum up, there is thus ample evidence that teachers' adoption of inquiry learning depends in significant part on their beliefs.

How Can History Teachers Be Stimulated to Adopt Inquiry Learning?

Initiatives to facilitate history teachers' adoption of inquiry learning generally take the form of teacher training (e.g., Levy et al., 2013; Martin & Monte-Sano, 2008; Voet & De Wever, 2017), as it has been firmly established that this approach is effective in altering teachers' practice (Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005). Some have proposed other approaches, such as the use of educative curriculum materials, which not only provide an outline of instructional activities but also try to address teachers' subject matter and pedagogical knowledge (Davis & Krajcik, 2005). Even so, others have noted that differences in the impact of such materials can often be traced back to teachers' training (Reisman & Fogo, 2016).

There exists quite a large body of research on what makes teacher training effective, with some studies providing a number of criteria for the design of training programs (e.g., Desimone, 2009). Recent work, however, has rightly argued that the design of effective training programs starts

with being familiar with teachers' decision-making and the particular problems that they face (Kennedy, 2016). Bearing in mind the research on history teachers' adoption of inquiry learning, this means that initiatives to facilitate high-quality inquiry learning in history classrooms should primarily address teachers' history subject matter and pedagogical knowledge and their beliefs.

Although there are only a few studies that have looked into the matter of preparing history teachers for inquiry learning, their findings are fairly consistent. These studies first of all point toward the benefits of an inquiry-based teacher training curriculum, which engages trainees in inquiries and provides models of inquiry lessons. More specifically, engagement in historical inquiry has been found to improve teachers' understanding of history (Williamson McDiarmid, 1994) and positively affect their beliefs regarding inquiry learning's expected value (Voet & De Wever, 2018). Furthermore, teachers' observations of inquiry learning show them how they can structure similar activities in their own classroom (Levy et al., 2013). Second, the available research stresses the importance of providing teachers with concrete information about how inquiry learning can benefit history learning and how it can then be organized in classrooms. In a recent study, Voet and De Wever (2017) were able to positively affect teachers' attitudes toward inquiry learning, by discussing its relative benefits, compared to more expository teaching approaches, and by addressing various popular misconceptions about historical inquiry. Examples of such misconceptions include beliefs that secondary-school students lack the intellectual maturity to carry out historical inquiries (Booth, 1994) or that inquiry learning tends to focus on skills while neglecting content (Martin & Monte-Sano, 2008). When it comes to giving practical information on how to organize inquiry learning, Levy et al. (2013) noted that it is important to ensure that teachers are able to locate resources that can assist them in preparing inquiry activities, such as online repositories for source materials or lesson plans. In addition, teacher trainers should also make sure that their trainees are able to develop appropriate scaffolds for inquiry activities. Such scaffolds may vary from simple adjustments that make source materials more accessible, to more elaborate support for students' reasoning during the inquiry (see e.g. De La Paz & Felton, 2010).

Although research has shown that training that follows these directions may have a positive effect on teachers' knowledge and beliefs in general, it appears that such training also has its limitations. In particular, it has been found that the impact of training on teachers' beliefs tends to die out as they reenter the classroom (Fehn & Koeppen, 1998; Voet & De Wever, 2017). It thus seems that when history teachers are confronted with the various barriers to inquiry learning that exist within their work environment, they tend to fall back on their old beliefs (Kagan, 1992). It is therefore particularly important for training to provide teachers with extended support after the training has ended. One of the most common approaches is to give teachers the opportunity to continue exchanging ideas with teacher trainers and their colleagues after training has ended (Levy et al., 2013). Other promising approaches include the use of professional learning communities and lesson study protocols (e.g., Callahan, 2018; Saye, Kohlmeier, Brush, Mitchell, & Farmer, 2009), where teachers work together to design, implement, evaluate, and revise lessons. So far, however, research has not investigated how such extended support after training might affect history teachers' use of inquiry learning in the long term.

Conclusions

This chapter has focused on specifics of inquiry learning in history education. Our discussion started with conceptualizations of this approach in history education research. These conceptualizations range from a focus on the analysis of historical sources or historical argumentation to more integrative approaches that allow us to gain deeper understanding of the interrelatedness of the processes and resources that are central to inquiry learning and might contribute to a more common language to talk about historical inquiry processes. In recent decades, more researchers

have emphasized the social nature of historical inquiry practices. This approach raises new questions for the design and implementation of inquiry learning in history, for example, about the potential of dialogic teaching approaches, collaborative learning, and professional learning communities. More research is needed to investigate the potential of such approaches.

We showed that the literature mentions a variety of reasons to implement inquiry learning in history education. These entail that inquiry learning contributes to more nuanced epistemological ideas, historical and more generic thinking and reasoning skills, historical understanding, historical interest and motivation. To substantiate these claims, more research is needed. Given the limited availability of valid and reliable instruments to measure learning outcomes in history, this is a challenge.

In the available studies, students are supported in a variety of ways, for example, by explicit instruction about how to corroborate between sources or to construct a historical explanation or by scaffolds that support the writing of a historical argument. We know little about how students' proficiency in historical inquiry develops in primary and secondary education with effective support. At present, there is also little research on how to adjust inquiry learning to the needs of students, for example, high-ability students or students with low language proficiency. In addition, more research is needed on the potential of inquiry tasks that more explicitly connect past, present, and future. The historical questions that students investigate do not always seem meaningful from a student perspective.

It is widely acknowledged that the adoption of inquiry learning is still limited. Researchers have emphasized the importance of information about how inquiry learning can benefit history learning, because teachers often have negative perceptions of its expected outcomes. Furthermore, teachers can be supported by practical information on how to organize inquiry lessons and collaboration in professional learning communities. There is a need for more longitudinal designs that allow to map the effect of extended support on history teachers' work after training has ended.

The research that we discussed in this chapter can inform teachers who want to implement inquiry learning in the classroom about the processes that students need to engage in and about effective instructional strategies. Precisely because teachers may not have a clear view of potential benefits of inquiry learning, and because different goals are possible and inquiry learning can be filled in different ways, it seems important that teachers implement inquiry learning with a clear view on what their goals exactly are. Goals give direction to the reading, thinking, reasoning, argumentation, and writing processes that students should engage in during an inquiry task and, subsequently, to the kind of tasks, instruction, and scaffolds that can provoke and support these processes. For example, when teachers aim at the development of nuanced views on the interpretative nature of history, they should engage students in the critical examination of multiple (partly conflicting) sources, the development of claims and arguments, and enhance dialogue in which different answers are compared and students reflect on epistemic questions. When development of historical thinking and reasoning skills is aimed at enhancing students' understanding of present issues and reflection on future possibilities, teachers need to engage students in authentic inquiry questions, such as questions asked by the students themselves or enduring issues in society, and support particular thinking and reasoning processes (e.g., evaluating reliability of sources or causal reasoning) by providing explicit instruction or scaffolds. If teachers want to adopt inquiry learning to help students form a concrete picture of a complex historical development or phenomenon, they can select sources that shed light on concrete aspects of daily life and ideas of people in the past and support students in processes of identifying aspects of change and continuity and historical contextualization. We propose that researchers should also be clear about the learning processes and outcomes that are central to their studies. Just as historical inquiry is not a single academic practice, inquiry learning in the classroom is not one single practice but needs to take different forms according to the goals that are central and the level and experience of the students.

References

- Achinstein, B., & Fogo, B. (2015). Mentoring novices' teaching of historical reasoning: Opportunities for pedagogical content knowledge development through mentor-facilitated practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 45(1), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.09.002>
- Alexander, P. A. (2003). The development of expertise: The journey from acclimation to proficiency. *Educational Researcher*, 32(8), 10–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X032008010>
- Barton, K. C. (2005). Primary sources in history: Breaking through the myths. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(10), 745–753. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170508601006>
- Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (2003). Why don't more history teachers engage students in interpretation? *Social Education*, 67(6), 358–361.
- Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Booth, M. (1994). Cognition in history: A British perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 29(2), 61–69. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2902_1
- Bouhon, M. (2009). *Les représentations sociales des enseignants d'histoire relatives à leur discipline et à son enseignement*. Université Catholique de Louvain. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2078.1/30401>
- Breakstone, J., Smith, M., & Wineburg, S. (2013). Beyond the bubble in history/social studies assessments. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 94(5), 53–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171309400512>
- Britt, M. A., & Aglinskias, C. (2002). Improving students' ability to identify and use source information. *Cognition and Instruction*, 20(4), 485–522. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532690XCI2004_2
- Brouwer, N., & Korthagen, F. (2005). Can teacher education make a difference? *American Educational Research Journal*, 42(1), 153–224. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312042001153>
- Brush, T., & Saye, J. (2008). The effects of multimedia-supported problem-based inquiry on student engagement, empathy, and assumptions about History. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 2(1), 21–56. <https://doi.org/10.7771/1541-5015.1052>
- Brush, T., & Saye, J. (2014). An instructional model to support problem-based historical inquiry: The persistent issues in history network. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 8(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.7771/1541-5015.1409>
- Callahan, C. (2018). Promoting second-order historical domain knowledge through recursive and collaborative professional development. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 42(3), 287–297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2017.06.001>
- Chapman, A. (2003). Camels, diamonds and counterfactuals: A model for teaching causal reasoning. *Teaching History*, 112, 46–53.
- Chapman, A. (2017). Causal explanation. In I. Davis (Ed.), *Debates in history teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 1–22). London: Routledge.
- Coffin, C. (2006). Learning the language of school history: The role of linguistics in mapping the writing demands of the secondary school curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38(4), 413–429. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270500508810>
- Counsell, C. (1998). Editorial. *Teaching History*, 91, 2–3.
- Cuban, L. (2016). *Teaching history then and now: A story of stability and change in schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Davis, E. A., & Krajcik, J. S. (2005). Designing educative curriculum materials to promote teacher learning. *Educational Researcher*, 34(3), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X034003003>
- De La Paz, S. (2005). Effects of historical reasoning instruction and writing strategy mastery in culturally and academically diverse middle school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 139–156. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.139>
- De La Paz, S., & Felton, M. K. (2010). Reading and writing from multiple source documents in history: Effects of strategy instruction with low to average high school writers. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 35(3), 174–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.03.001>
- De La Paz, S., & Wissinger, D. R. (2015). Effects of genre and content knowledge on historical thinking with academically diverse high school students. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 83(1), 110–129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2013.876228>
- De Leur, T., Van Boxtel, C., & Wilschut, A. (2017). 'I saw angry people and broken statue': historical empathy in secondary history education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 65(3), 331–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2017.1291902>
- Desimone, M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181–199. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626800>

- Dobber, M., & Van Oers, B. (2015). The role of the teacher in promoting dialogue and polylogue during inquiry activities in primary education. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 22(4), 326–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10749039.2014.992545>
- 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 and Research in Social Education*, 26(4), 461–484. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.1998.10505861>
- Goldman, S. R., Britt, M. A., Brown, W., Cribb, G., George, M., Greenleaf, C., ... Project READI. (2016). Disciplinary literacies and learning to read for understanding: A conceptual framework for disciplinary literacy. *Educational Psychologist*, 51(2), 219–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1168741>
- 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>
- Haydn, T. (2011). Secondary history: Current themes. In I. Davies (Ed.), *Debates in history teaching* (pp. 30–45). Oxon: Routledge.
- Hicks, D. (2005). Continuity and constraint: Case studies of becoming a teacher of history in England and the United States. *International Journal of Social Education*, 20(1), 18–40.
- Hmelo-Silver, C., Duncan, R., & Chinn, C. (2007). Scaffolding and achievement in problem-based and inquiry learning: A Response to Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark. *Educational Psychologist*, 42(2), 99–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520701263368>
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 65–90. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2701_6
- Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 945–980. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626800>
- Kuhn, D., Weinstock, M., & Flaton, R. (1994). Historical reasoning as theory-evidence coordination. In M. Carretero & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Cognitive and instructional processes in history and the social sciences* (pp. 377–401). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lévesque, S. (2008). *Thinking historically: Educating students for the twenty-first century*. Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Levstik, L., & Barton, K. C. (2015). *Doing history. Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Levy, B. L. M., Thomas, E. E., Drago, K., & Rex, L. A. (2013). Examining studies of inquiry-based learning in three fields of education: Sparking generative conversation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(5), 387–408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487113496430>
- Loewen, J.W. (2018). *Lies my teacher told me: everything your American history textbooks got wrong*. New York, London: The New Press.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological Study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Logtenberg, A. (2012). *Questioning the past. Student questioning and historical reasoning*. University of Amsterdam: Dissertation. <https://doi.org/11245/1.374232>
- Logtenberg, A., van Boxtel, C., & van Hout-Wolters, B. (2011). Stimulating situational interest and student questioning through three types of historical introductory texts. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 26(2), 179–198. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-010-0041-6>
- Maggioni, L., VanSledright, B., & Alexander, P. A. (2009). Walking on the borders: A measure of epistemic cognition in history. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 77(3), 187–214. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JEXE.77.3.187-214>
- Martin, D., & Monte-Sano, C. (2008). Inquiry, controversy, and ambiguous texts: Learning to teach for historical thinking. In W. J. Warren & A. D. Cantu (Eds.), *History education 101: The past, present, and future of teacher preparation* (pp. 167–186). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Maza, S. (2017). *Thinking about history*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- McCarthy Young, K. M., & Leinhardt, G. (1998). Writing from primary documents. A way of knowing in History. *Written Communication*, 15(1), 25–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088398015001002>
- McCrum, E. (2013). History teachers' thinking about the nature of their subject. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 35(1), 73–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.05.004>
- 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). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Monte-Sano, C. (2010). Disciplinary literacy in history: An exploration of the historical nature of adolescents' writing. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19(4), 539–568. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2010.481014>
- 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. (2012). Using writing tasks to elicit adolescents' historical reasoning. *Journal of Literacy Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X12450445>
- Monte-Sano, C., De La Paz, S., & Felton, M. (2014). Implementing a disciplinary-literacy curriculum for US history: learning from expert middle school teachers in diverse classrooms. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 46(4), 540–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2014.904444>
- Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(4), 317–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027870190403>
- Nokes, J. D. (2017). Exploring patterns of historical thinking through eighth-grade students' argumentative writing. *Journal of Writing Research*, 8(3), 437–467. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2017.08.03.02>
- Nokes, J. D., Dole, J. A., & Hacker, D. J. (2007). Teaching high school students to use heuristics while reading historical texts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99, 492–504. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.492>
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307>
- Paul, H. (2015). *Key issues in historical theory*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Paxton, R. J. (2002). The influence of author visibility on high school students solving a historical problem. *Cognition and Instruction*, 20(2), 197–248. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532690XC12002_3
- Paxton, R. J. (1999). A deafening silence: History textbooks and the students who read them. *Review of Educational Research*, 69(3), 315–339. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543069003315>
- Pellegrino, A. M., & Kilday, J. (2013). Hidden in plain sight: Preservice teachers' orientations toward inquiry-based learning in history. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 4(2), 1–26.
- Pollock, J. L. (2006). *Thinking about acting. Logical foundations for rational decision making*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reisman, A. (2012). Reading like a historian: A document-based history curriculum intervention in urban high schools. *Cognition and Instruction*, 30(1), 86–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2011.634081>
- Reisman, A., & Fogo, B. (2016). Contributions of educative document-based curricular materials to quality of historical instruction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, 191–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.05.018>
- Reisman, A., Kavanagh, S. S., Monte-Sano, C., Fogo, B., McGrew, S. C., Cipparone, P., & Simmons, E. (2018). Facilitating whole-class discussions in history: A framework for preparing teacher candidates. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 69(3), 278–293. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117707463>
- Retz, T. (2016). At the interface: Academic history, school history and the philosophy of history. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 48(4), 503–517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2015.1114151>
- Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes and values: A theory of organization and change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rouet, J.-F., Britt, M. A., Mason, R. A., & Perfetti, C. A. (1996). Using multiple sources of evidence to reason about history. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88, 478–493. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.88.3.478>
- Saye, J. W., & Brush, T. (2002). Scaffolding critical reasoning about history and social issues in multimedia-supported learning environments. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 50(3), 77–96. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02505026>
- Saye, J. W., Kohlmeier, J., Brush, T., Mitchell, L., & Farmer, C. (2009) Using mentoring to develop professional teaching knowledge for problem-based historical inquiry. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 37(1), 6–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2009.10473386>
- Schleppegrell, M. J., Greer, S., & Taylor, S. (2008). Literacy in history: Language and meaning. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 31(2), 174–188.
- Schreiber, W., Körber, A., von Borries, B., Krammer, R., Leutner-Ramme, S., Mebus, S., ... Ziegler, B. (2006). *Historisches Denken. Ein Kompetenz-Strukturmodell* [Historical thinking. A competence structure model], 2. Auflage, Neuried, Germany: Ars Una.
- Seixas, P. (1993). Historical understanding among adolescents in a multicultural setting. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 23(3), 301–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1993.11076127>
- Stoel, G., Logtenberg, A., Wansink, B., Huijgen, T., van Boxtel, C., & van Drie, J. (2017). Measuring epistemological beliefs in history education: An exploration of naïve and nuanced beliefs. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 83, 120–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.03.003>
- Stoel, G. L. (2017). *Teaching towards historical expertise: Developing students' ability to reason causally in history*. University of Amsterdam: Dissertation. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/11245.1/1cfaaed8-9929-462e-b2e0-ad1945f1f034>
- Stoel, G. L., van Drie, J. P., & van Boxtel, C. A. M. (2015). Teaching towards historical expertise. Developing a pedagogy for fostering causal reasoning in history. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 47(1), 49–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2014.968212>

- Stoel, G. L., van Drie, J. P., & van Boxtel, C. A. M. (2017). The effects of explicit teaching of strategies, second-order concepts, and epistemological underpinnings on students' ability to reason causally in history. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 109*(3), 321–337. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000143>
- Tosh, J. (2015). *The pursuit of history. Aims, methods and new directions in the study of history*. London: Routledge.
- Trautwein, U., Bertram, C., von Borries, B., Brauch, N., Hirsch, M., Klausmeier, K., ... & Neureiter, H. (2017). *Kompetenzen historischen Denkens erfassen. Konzeption, Operationalisierung und Befunde des Projekts «Historical Thinking-Competencies in History» (HiTCH)*. Münster, New York: Waxmann.
- Van Boxtel, C., & Van Drie, J. (2017). Engaging students in historical reasoning: The need for dialogic history education. In M. Carretero, S. Berger, & M. Grever (Eds.), *Palgrave handbook of research in historical culture and education. Hybrid ways of learning history* (pp. 573–589). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- van Boxtel, C. A. M., & Van Drie, J. P. (2018). Historical reasoning: conceptualizations and educational applications. In S. A. Metzger & L. McArthur Harris (Eds.), *The Wiley international handbook of history teaching and learning* (pp. 149–176). Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Van Drie, J., Braaksma, M., & van Boxtel, C. (2015). Writing in history: Effects of writing instruction on historical reasoning and text quality. *Journal of Writing Research, 7*(1), 123–156. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2015.07.01.06>
- Van Drie, J., & van Boxtel, C. (2011). In essence I'm only reflecting: teaching strategies for fostering historical reasoning through whole-class discussion. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research, 10*(1), 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.18546/HERJ.10.1.05>
- 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>
- Van Drie, J., van Boxtel, C., Jaspers, J., & Kanselaar, G. (2005). Effects of representational guidance on domain specific reasoning in CSCL. *Computers in Human Behavior, 21*(4), 575–602. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2004.10.024>
- Van Drie, J., van Boxtel, C., & van der Linden, J. L. (2006). Historical reasoning in a computer-supported collaborative learning environment. In A. M. O'Donnell, C. E. Hmelo, & G. Erkens (Eds.), *Collaborative learning, reasoning, and technology* (pp. 265–296). Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Van Drie, J., & van de Ven, P-H. (2017). Moving ideas: An exploration of students' use of dialogue for writing in history. *Language and Education, 31*(6), 526–542. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2017.1326504>
- Van Hover, S. D., & Yeager, E. A. (2003). Challenges facing beginning history teachers: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Social Education, 19*(1), 8–21.
- VanSledright, B. (1996). Closing the gap between school and disciplinary history? Historian as high school teacher. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research in teaching, 6, Teaching and learning history* (pp. 257–289). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- VanSledright, B., & Limón, M. (2006). Learning and teaching social studies: a review of cognitive research in history and geography. In P. A. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), *The handbook of educational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 545–570). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- VanSledright, B. A. (2011). *The challenge of rethinking history education*. New York: Routledge.
- Van Straaten, D., Wilschut, A., & Oostdam, R. (2018). Exploring pedagogical approaches for connecting the past, the present and the future in history teaching. *Historical Encounters, 5*(1), 46–67.
- 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)
- Voet, M. (2017). *Inquiry-based learning in history education: Exploring teachers' beliefs, knowledge and use of technology, and preparing future teachers for implementation in class*. Ghent University: dissertation. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1854/LU-8521306>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.12.008>
- Voet, M., & De Wever, B. (2017). Preparing pre-service history teachers for organizing inquiry-based learning: The effects of an introductory training program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 63*, 206–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.12.019>
- Voet, M., & De Wever, B. (2018). Effects of immersion in inquiry-based learning on student teachers' educational beliefs. *Instructional Science, 46*(3), 383–403. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-017-9439-8>
- Voet, M., & De Wever, B. (2019). Teachers' adoption of inquiry-based learning activities: The importance of beliefs about education, the self, and the context. *Journal of Teacher Education, 70*(5), 423–440. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117751399>

- Wiley, J., & Voss, J. F. (1999). Constructing arguments from multiple sources: Tasks that promote understanding and not just memory for text. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(2), 301–311. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.91.2.301>
- Wineburg, S. (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*(1), 73–87. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.83.1.73>
- Wineburg, S., & McGrew, S. (2018). Lateral reading and the nature of expertise: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information. *Teachers College Record, 121*(11), 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.3048994>