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5 Teacher professional growth on teaching historical thinking and reasoning. Two case studies on the use of an observation instrument

1. Introduction

The training of history teachers is a multifaceted process and is, in fact, a life-long enterprise. As teachers develop professionally, they build up their pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), i.e., their knowledge of how to teach their subject (Shulman, 1986). In regard to the PCK of history teachers, an understanding of historical thinking and reasoning and how to teach it is of importance. Despite historical thinking and reasoning (HTR) having received growing attention in the literature on history teaching during the past two decades, less is known about how teachers can learn to teach it. In this study, we investigated the role of an observation instrument on teaching HTR in fostering teachers’ capability to teach historical reasoning in the classroom. Earlier, we developed and tested an observation instrument, i.e., Teach-HTR, which recognizes the teacher behavior that promotes historical thinking and reasoning (Gestsdóttir et al., 2018). To avoid discouraging possible users of Teach-HTR by only presenting conceptual information, examples of teacher behavior are provided for each of the 33 items of the instrument to explicitly show what teaching HTR may include. A possible way of using this instrument may be in the initial training of history teachers/newly qualified teachers and in the continuous professional development of teachers who wish to become more competent in teaching historical thinking and reasoning.

Regarding professional development, observing teaching behavior and discussing observations are examples of active learning, which is needed for professional development (Imants & Van Veen, 2010). Observation instruments are meant to support both student teachers and experienced teachers. This is particularly appropriate when they aim at teaching higher order skills such as HTR, since the research has shown that teaching HTR is a challenge, even for experienced teachers (e.g., Barak et al., 2007). Observations can result in concrete examples of effective teaching strategies, which contribute to teachers' pedagogical content knowledge and challenge teachers to develop their own teaching methods. The aim of this study was to investigate how Teach-HTR can be used to enhance the professional growth
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of history student teachers and history teachers in the teaching of HTR. For this purpose, we conducted two case studies, i.e., one focusing on professional development and the other on teacher training. There are several ways of investigating the growth of teachers or student teachers. We use the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002) to examine the changes in their beliefs, knowledge and practices.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1 Teaching historical thinking and reasoning

Moving away from what may be labeled as “traditional” history teaching, which focuses on students being able to recall historical facts, is a challenging task for many teachers. Even those who see the value of investigating how historical knowledge is built and how different perspectives in time and space add to it find it difficult to enact it in their classrooms (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Grant, 2018; Reisman, 2012). Teaching HTR is a complex task, as our analysis of history lessons on whether and how historical thinking and reasoning is being taught confirms (Gestsdóttir et al., 2019; Gestsdóttir et al., in press). The interpretative nature of history calls upon higher order thinking skills. Students need to be able to take multiple historical perspectives into account, make use of primary sources, establish historical significance, discern continuity and change and other factors that regard history as a man-made product rather than a fixed historical truth (cf. Chapman, 2011; Lee & Shemilt, 2004; Seixas & Morton, 2013; Stradling, 2003; Van Boxtel & Van Drie, 2018; Van Drie & Van Boxtel, 2008). In addition to being quite demanding for the students, fostering these ambitious goals by active teaching methods is not in line with the emphasis on teacher centered teaching and lecturing, which seems to be the preferred approach of many history teachers, according to various evidence (Bouhon, 2009; Reisman & Enumah, 2020; Sigurgeirsson et al., 2018; Wansink et al., 2016; Wiggins, 2015). More knowledge is needed on how teachers can be supported in teaching HTR during their initial training and their continuous development. The international information on both fields is sparse and leaves room for conjecture (Van Hover & Hicks, 2018).
2.2 The Interconnected Model of Professional Growth

Changing teaching practices towards more of an emphasis on teaching HTR requires professional growth. In their Interconnected Model of Professional Growth, Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002) describe professional growth as changes to any of the following four domains: “the personal domain (teacher knowledge, beliefs and attitudes), the domain of practice (professional experimentation), the domain of consequences (salient outcomes), and the external domain (sources of information, stimulus or support).” (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002, p. 950). As all the domains are interconnected, changes that occur in any of them may influence the others, through reflection and enactment. Hence, the model can not only facilitate the investigation of change in (student) teacher knowledge, beliefs and attitudes towards teaching historical thinking and reasoning but also address potential sources for this change (from information sources, enactment/trying out new methods in the classroom or reflection). In this study, we are mainly concerned with the personal domain but related to the domain of practice and the external domain.

The elements ascribed to the personal domain are often collectively known as pedagogical content knowledge (PCK). A widely used definition of PCK, adding to Shulman’s conceptualization of pedagogical content knowledge, discerns five components (Magnusson et al., 1999). They are as follows: a) orientation towards teaching, b) knowledge and beliefs about the curriculum, c) knowledge and beliefs about students’ understanding, d) knowledge and beliefs about assessment and e) knowledge and beliefs about instructional strategies (Magnusson et al., 1999). A number of studies have taken a closer look at the PCK of history teachers, notably, Tuithof et al. (2019), whose literature review revealed that most studies focus on instructional strategies, followed by teaching orientation. Instructional strategies were also the focus in Monte-Sano’s (2011b) case study, where the aim was to teach novice teachers how to teach interpretative and evidence-based thinking. She concludes that a strong disciplinary understanding of history speeds up the development of a teacher’s PCK. Teachers who approached history as an interpretative and evidentiary discipline were more likely to attend to those attributes of student learning. The PCK element regarding student understanding is particularly challenging for less experienced teachers; Waldis, Nitsche and Wyss (2019) discovered a lack of PCK for more than 200 preservice history teachers who “commented largely on generic teaching strategies while hardly noticing student learning.” (p. 112). A study of Reisman and Fogo (2016) showed that even if the history curriculum
contains educative features, the quality of the instruction is constrained by the teacher’s limited subject matter knowledge and PCK. It seems fair to conclude that to be able to teach HTR, teachers need assistance to develop their PCK. An observation instrument can be of assistance in this respect. Contrary to most observation instruments, Teach-HTR is domain specific. It can, therefore, contribute to professional growth as a source of information on what the teaching of HTR looks like. Using it to analyze lessons provides information on what teachers already do in that respect and where there is space for improvement, as well as suggesting instructional behavior in line with the teaching of HTR. By applying the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth, which has been used in several studies of professional development (Bijsterbosch et al., 2019; Schipper et al., 2017), we wanted to explore how the observation instrument can contribute to the pedagogical content knowledge and instructional behavior of history teachers.

2.3 The use of observation in teacher education and professionalization

The long-standing tradition of classroom observation in teacher training has usually been aimed at evaluating the performance of teacher candidates, however a complicated task that may be (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Darling-Hammond et al., 2012; Gestsdóttir et al., 2018). Gosling (2002) described the following three models of peer observation of teaching: evaluation model, development model, and finally, a peer review model whose purpose is “engagement in discussion about teaching; self and mutual reflection” (p. 5). A large number of studies that fit these three models report on the use of observation (in particular, the use of video viewing), both in teacher training and professional development. In an extensive literature review, Gaudin and Chaliès (2015) discerned the positive effects of video viewing on teacher motivation and cognition, and a study of mathematics teacher’s participation in video club meetings where they observed and discussed recordings from each other’s classrooms showed positive impacts on their instructional practices (Sherin & Van Es, 2009). Observation plays a key role in the widely used Lesson Study approach, where colleagues design lesson plans collaboratively and observe each other’s teaching before amending their plans (Lewis et al., 2006). In fact, peer observation of teaching is recognized at all school levels as an important factor in professional development, as the study of Drew et al. (2017) bears out. They reviewed the observation instruments in use in Australian universities for various purposes, among them, to enable reflective practice. Few domain specific instruments
are in use but among the ones in use is the observation of the mathematical quality of instruction and aims at the professionalization of math teachers (Learning Mathematics for Teaching Project, 2011).

Directing the view towards observation and history teaching, there are studies that report on the use of observation for specific purposes in either the initial training or professionalization of teachers. An example is the investigation of how teachers promote historical contextualization (Huijgen et al., 2019). Reisman and Enumah (2020) performed a case study where they investigated whether the use of classroom video to identify opportunities for student discourse could enhance teacher understanding and facilitation of historical discussions based on documents. They detected a positive relationship between the two skills, identifying the aforementioned opportunities and the capability to enact such discussions. Video viewing was used in a study to assess the PCK of preservice teachers (Waldis et al., 2019) and when describing quality history teaching (Gautchi, 2015).

The literature on video viewing in initial or in-service teacher training describes several objectives in its use, as follows: “(a) show examples of good teaching practices, (b) show characteristic professional situations, (c) analyze the diversity of classroom practices from different perspectives, (d) stimulate personal reflection, (e) guide/coach teaching, and (f) evaluate competencies” (Gaudin & Chaliès, 2015, p. 47). These objectives can be linked to the personal domain and the domain of practice of the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth.

The observation instrument, i.e., Teach-HTR is an external source that informs teachers about HTR (what it is in terms of concrete activities, e.g., contextualizing, identifying causes and consequences and sourcing) and about instructional strategies (e.g., communicating objectives and demonstrating HTR). Therefore, it may contribute to a) the teachers’ knowledge about HTR and the teaching of it, as well as beliefs about the importance of teaching HTR, b) professional experimentation/enactment of the teaching of HTR, c) reflecting on their own teaching strategies/their own teaching of HTR and d) reflecting on the students’ ability to engage in HTR/the development of this ability. Thus, the instrument brings together the external domain, the domain of practice and the personal domain of the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth.
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2.4 Aims and research question

The aim of this study is to investigate whether the observation instrument Teach-HTR can be used by preservice and in-service history teachers to promote their professional growth regarding teaching HTR. Our research question is as follows: How can the use of an observation instrument enhance the professional growth of history student teachers and history teachers in the teaching of historical thinking and reasoning?

2.5 Method

To answer our research question, two case studies were conducted. The first case study focused on the professional development of experienced teachers in Iceland. The second case study was conducted in the context of teacher education. Due to the small number of student teachers in history education in Iceland, this study was conducted in the Netherlands. The data were analyzed according to the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002). Furthermore, hindrances to professional growth are also examined. Both studies are exploratory qualitative ones (Miles & Huberman, 1994), meant to gather information and indications of to how using the observation instrument Teach-HTR enhances the professional growth of history student teachers and history teachers in the teaching of historical thinking and reasoning.

3. The use of Teach-HTR in a professional development program

The first case study focuses on experienced teachers and the possibility of using the Teach-HTR observation instrument to enhance their professional growth in the teaching of HTR.

3.1 Participants

Four female teachers in two upper secondary schools in Iceland were asked to participate in the study. Two of them, i.e., Signý and Helga (pseudonyms were assigned), belonged to a sample from a larger study when the Teach-HTR instrument was tested (Gestsdóttir et al., 2019), the other two, i.e., Ása and her colleague, belonged to the professional network of the
first author. During the process, Ása’s colleague had to step down and could not be replaced by another history teacher. A colleague from another social subject helped by observing Ása’s first round of teaching and performing a semistructured interview afterwards. All the participants agreed to the use of any materials of the study for research purposes. Table 1 shows an overview of their backgrounds and the categories of Teach-HTR they chose to focus on during the PD. It is worth mentioning that Icelandic upper secondary school teachers enjoy considerable autonomy and the national curriculum guide does not make specific requirements regarding either the content or approach in history teaching. Historical thinking and reasoning is neither addressed in the initial teacher training nor in published teaching materials (Gestsdóttir et al., 2019).

Table 1
Participants and their selected categories of the Teach-HTR observation instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Teaching Experience Years</th>
<th>Selected Categories of Teach-HTR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ása</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multiple perspectives (4) Whole class discussion (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signý</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Multiple perspectives (4) Using sources to support HTR (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helga</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Using sources to support HTR (3) Whole class discussion (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Professional development program

Figure 1 provides an overview of the PDP. It is based on design principles that can be found in the literature. In their review, Van Veen, Zwart and Meirink (2012) argued that an effective PD should be strongly linked to the daily practices, content and pedagogical content knowledge of the teachers, be active and inquiry-based, include collegial learning, should last for a considerable amount of time (which cannot be determined more precisely) and be in line with school policy and national policy. Our program includes these elements. The lessons of the teachers were analyzed in advance and they were given the opportunity to select which
categories of HTR they wanted to develop further; thus, our PDP work is embedded and directly related to each teachers’ practices, lesson content and PCK. After the categories had been selected and HTR in general was discussed in the first interview, we provided the teachers with the appropriate reading materials. Having teachers working closely together in dyads doing student-related work includes collegial learning (Desimone, 2009; Van Veen et al., 2012). The PD stretched over two semesters, with 10 months between the first interview with the teachers and the final interview in the following school year. The teachers’ participation in this research is in line with school policy and national policy (Desimone, 2009; Van Veen et al., 2012) since upper secondary school teachers in Iceland are supposed to dedicate 80 hours per year to professional development (Kjarasamningur Kennarasambands Íslands og fjármála- og efnahagsráðherra f.h. ríkissjóðs, 2014). An essential feature of an effective PDP is when the teacher’s role is that of an active learner, which is contrary to the traditional passive participation in PDP (Imants & Van Veen, 2010). Active learning emphasizes the teacher’s agency in regard to determining their working and learning goals and may include observing or being observed, as our PD entails, followed by a dialogue where the teachers can actively reflect on their practices. Our program requires such communication after each lesson. Effective peer observation and the ensuing discussion are key factors in identifying certain classroom practices and opportunities for teaching and learning that may gradually develop towards more complex and sophisticated teaching strategies (Drew & al, 2017; Reisman & Enumah, 2020; Sherin & Van Es, 2009). Active learning also provides opportunities to try out new teaching practices, which is the backbone of our PDP (Borko, 2004; Desimone, 2009; Garet et al., 2001; Imants & Van Veen, 2010; Ingvarson et al., 2005). Promoting the agency of the teachers was our aim when we asked the teachers to set clear goals for themselves based on the analysis of two of their lessons. The Teach-HTR observation instrument is goal-oriented. Hence, the program shares some elements with the Peer Assisted Teaching Program used in higher education in Australia, where peers collaborate to set development goals and design strategies to reach them (Carbone et al., 2015; Drew et al., 2017).
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**Figure 1**

*An overview of the professional development program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-intervention</th>
<th>Preparation stage (January)</th>
<th>Round 1 (May)</th>
<th>Round 2 (October)</th>
<th>Post-intervention (October)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two lessons of the teacher</td>
<td>Goals within two categories of Teach-HTR</td>
<td>Lesson plan designed, focusing on one category of Teach-HTR.</td>
<td>Lesson plan designed, focusing on the other selected category of Teach-HTR.</td>
<td>The researcher does a final retrospective interview with the teacher, based on the observations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysed by the first researcher, using Teach-HTR, to map out their teaching of HTR.</td>
<td>The researcher provides preparative reading materials that fit the selected categories.</td>
<td>A lesson taught, observed by a peer.</td>
<td>A lesson taught, observed by a peer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓ Results of the analysis and HTR discussed in an interview with the researcher.</td>
<td>The two teachers discuss the lesson in a semi-structured interview that is recorded and shared with the researcher.</td>
<td>The two teachers discuss the lesson in a semi-structured interview that is recorded and shared with the researcher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓ Lesson plan revised.</td>
<td>↓ Lesson plan revised.</td>
<td>↓ Lesson repeated, observed by the researcher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓ Lesson repeated, observed by the researcher.
3.3 Data collection and instruments

The following data was collected: First, the first author observed two lessons of each teacher with Teach-HTR. Based upon these observations, the teachers chose two categories of the instrument they wanted to develop further. This choice was discussed in an interview. Third, the teachers made lesson plans for the developed lessons. Fourth, peer interviews were conducted after teaching. After the first round of teaching, the colleagues interviewed each other, using the guidelines provided by the researcher. The recorded interviews were then shared with the researcher. Fifth, the lesson plans for the second round of teaching in the following school year were developed. Sixth, observations with Teach-HTR of this second lesson were performed. The first author observed and analyzed the second round of teaching. Finally, the researcher conducted a semistructured interview with each teacher to search for indications of professional growth or change in their PCK. Among other things, they were asked what they had learned from their item of choice, what had contributed the most to their learning or professional growth and about their views of the teaching of HTR.

3.4 Data analysis

The interviews were coded according to the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth to detect indications of change in the four domains (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002). Comments about how the observation instrument supported either their reflection on the teaching of HTR or their enactment of it were searched for. The comments regarding the knowledge, beliefs and attitudes about teaching and learning were assigned to the personal domain, for example “this deepens my understanding of using different perspectives.” The comments regarding sources of information, stimulus or support, be it the instrument or reading materials, were coded as change in the external domain, for example when one teacher referred to the instrument as “a present given to me … which makes it easier to teach historical thinking …” The changes to the domains of practice and of consequences, i.e., salient outcomes, were also discerned, for example when a teacher described the whole class discussion: “Different discussion, deeper discussion. And the students become, they are surprised because obviously they are not used to this in their lessons.”
The outcomes of the coding for one interview were discussed with an experienced researcher who was not involved in the study. Instances of disagreement were few and agreement about the final coding was reached. In the lesson plans, we searched for HTR competences in the lesson goals, such as one teacher’s goal to engage students in a whole class discussion that required HTR, and checked whether the teacher or student activities or assignments were connected to HTR activities or teacher behavior that is included in our observation instrument. One teacher’s intention to use primary sources from World War 1 is an example that is linked to category 3 of the instrument. Statements from the interviews and lesson plans are used to illustrate the results.

### 4. Results

Here, we describe the indications of the professional growth of Ása, Signý and Helga. It is necessary to mention here that Helga’s position differed from the positions of the others. Early in the program, it became apparent that despite several conversations with the researcher while planning the first lesson, she misunderstood several aspects of the project. This is known from other studies on professional development (e.g., Reisman & Enumah, 2020). Until the end of the project, she was unable to follow the steps of the intervention and was solely concerned with the overall structure of her courses or lesson content, i.e., the choice of sources, but none of the sourcing activities. Her partner, Signý, did not seem to realize this and although the interview protocol was followed after the first lesson, questions were either left unanswered or misunderstood (e.g., when it came to the contextualization of sources, they discussed the context of the activity as a whole; the evaluation of sources was understood as the evaluation of the students’ performance). Helga did not share her lesson plans in advance, so opportunities to steer them towards teaching HTR were missed. Hence, her lessons, as well as the final interview, did not provide much information about her professional growth related to the teaching of HTR. The emphasis of the results section will therefore be more on Ása and Signý. Table 2 shows the changes that occurred in the teaching of the selected categories of Teach-HTR.
Table 2

Results of the analysis by Teach-HTR of all the lessons of each participants, pre- and post-intervention. Only the selected categories are shown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ása</th>
<th>Signý</th>
<th>Helga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The teacher uses historical sources to support HTR.  

|       | 2   | 3   | 1   | 4   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   |

4. The teacher makes clear that there are multiple perspectives and interpretations.  

|       | 1   | 2   | 4   | 3   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 1   |

7. The teacher engages students in a whole class discussion that requires HTR.  

|       | 1   | 2   | 1   | 4   | 3   | 1   | 1   | 1   |

4.1 Change in the personal domain

With regard to the personal domain, we detected changes in the teacher’s knowledge of instructional strategies to enhance students’ HTR (whole class discussion, activities that enhance HTR, e.g., using primary sources), their beliefs about the importance of HTR (connecting learning objectives directly to HTR) and how students can learn it.

Ása and Signý both declared that by using the Teach-HTR instrument they had gained knowledge of and adopted new instructional strategies. Ása said that the intervention had added considerably to her professional development and deepened her approach to HTR. She reported how she had gained knowledge about the use of whole class discussions as a way to promote HTR and how the instrument had enhanced her ability to use it as such. Of the three
teachers, Ása was most receptive to the PD program and experienced definite professional growth.

Signý started from the idea that she was already quite able to teach HTR. She did not perceive the PD program as beneficial to her knowledge of or ability to teach HTR. She nevertheless conceded that it was good to be reminded of including HTR and that it was in fact quite complicated, stating the following: “Even though I feel I’m always doing it [teaching HTR] I may have learned that I am not – this may be not as easy as one thinks.” In fact, the instrument provided new ideas regarding how to use (primary) sources to teach HTR, which she had found challenging before. Both Ása and Signý used sources, asked historical questions, provided arguments and counter arguments and contextualized. These instructional strategies, all accentuated during the PD program, are parts of the observation instrument. Signý frequently referred to her knowledge of student understanding and how they learned, e.g., where, in her lesson plans, she was prepared for the problem of students not being able to use prior knowledge to contextualize. As a less experienced teacher, Ása seemed to have added considerably to her knowledge of student learning, and she used the instrument when preparing lessons that focused on HTR produced tasks that affected the students differently from history teaching that emphasizes factual knowledge.

Even though Helga certainly reported professional growth during the PDP and was even planning further studies at the end of it, this growth was more generic and applied to content, rather than the teaching of HTR. She felt inspired and expressed a will “to shake it all up somehow, go deeper into this line of thinking …”

4.2 Change in the domain of practice and the domain of consequences

Tangible changes took place in the domain of practice as Signý and Ása changed their teaching approach; Signý used assignments with sources to teach HTR and Ása conducted whole class discussions and promoted multiperspectivity. Ása wanted to strengthen the role multiperspectivity plays in historical interpretation. In her first round of lessons, where the topic was the interwar period in Germany, she used indications and examples of teacher behavior from the instrument to design an assignment which reached deeper than her previous attempts to demonstrate multiperspectivity. Likewise, prior to the PD program, Ása had struggled with instigating class discussions. Now, she conducted successful whole class
discussions that asked for HTR, where the topic was two disputed criminal cases from the 70’s in Iceland and Northern-Ireland. She used elements of teacher and student behavior that were described in the instrument to ask students repeatedly for historical argumentation and to compare the different aspects of the two cases, contextualizing and emphasizing the importance of avoiding presentism. Signý also experienced changes. In her second round of teaching, she focused on working with historical sources to support HTR. She managed to use several elements of the instrument, such as to source, investigate, compare information from different sources and use information from sources as evidence in an interpretation. In Signý’s first round of teaching she focused on multiperspectivity but she struggled to differentiate the concept from the content and her scores on the Likert scale went from 2 to 3. As demonstrated, Helga rarely showed behavior that could be coded by the instrument.

Changes could also be discerned in the domain of consequences (salient outcomes). Ása and Signý both designed new and different assignments and experienced positive reactions from their students when teaching HTR. This came as a surprise to Signý, despite her long experience, as the following quote demonstrates: “The students are enthusiastic, more enthusiastic than I expected, to investigate sources, contextualize them and investigate, put them in the context of what we are doing. As if, yes, if the learning material makes more sense to them.” In particular, Ása mentioned that students who had struggled in a previous history course where factual details were emphasized felt differently now when using another approach: “He thought this was fantastic, he loved doing history that way. He asks for lessons like this, discussions are his strong side.” Ása pressed her students to base their remarks on evidence and felt that their capability to do so was stronger than before. When she used the Teach-HTR instrument and attempted to address historical topics in a different manner, she felt her students were surprised and reacted positively, because it was different from the teaching they were used to. Both Ása and Signý were under the impression that the student’s understanding of the historical circumstances under discussion had increased, although evaluating it systematically was beyond the remit of the PDP.

4.3 Relevant sources of growth

In a final interview, both Ása and Signý reported that the observation instrument had added the most to their professional growth in teaching HTR during the PD program and put it on a
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par with the positive reactions of their students. Ása described how the instrument had helped her to operationalize her teaching of HTR and increased her confidence in that respect, stating the following: “I see the instrument as a fantastic present that I have been given, you see, it helps me deepen and makes it easier for me to teach exactly historical thinking, the categories I selected.” Both teachers also pointed out the positive impact of the examples that accompany the instrument and the reading materials. The apparently increased motivation of the students seemed to reinforce Ása’s determination to further develop her teaching of HTR and Signý spoke even more strongly on that point. Both teachers experienced a considerable reinforcement of their beliefs regarding the importance and possibility of enhancing the student’s HTR and expressed intentions to change their teaching approaches accordingly.

4.4 Possible hindrances to growth

The analysis by the instrument revealed some hindrances to growth. Signý’s certainty that she was already familiar with teaching HTR seemed to reduce her use of opportunities to add to her skills. In the final interview, she denied having adding much new to her knowledge of how to teach HTR, despite on the same occasion describing the positive reaction of her students to different types of assignments. Her conceptualization of HTR seemed focused on source work and general skills and using the instrument did not seem to stimulate her growth of understanding its nuances. In the interviews, as well as in the lesson plans, she seemed to find it complicated to distinguish between the historical content of the lessons and elements of HTR (an example from a lesson plan is as follows: Which aspect of historical thinking are you teaching today? Answer: The war in former Yugoslavia 1991 – 1999). Her familiarity with the terminology did not help her identify how her colleague, Helga, struggled with teaching HTR. Helga’s hindrance might be that when it came to HTR, her understanding of history as a discipline was not prominent enough to incorporate this new way of thinking of it. Teaching history was always discussed in very generic terms, without any references to domain specific elements. An example was her first round of lessons, which was devoted to using sources to support HTR. She used evidence from a variety of sources, but only for their content and not for reasoning. No regard was given to their provenance and no attempt was made to accomplish any of the six activities described in the Teach-HTR instrument.
5. Conclusion

From this case study, it can be concluded that the Teach-HTR instrument influenced the knowledge and beliefs of experienced teachers regarding the teaching of HTR. The instrument enabled both Ása and Signý to employ different instructional strategies, which consequently changed their beliefs about student learning. It enhanced Ása’s confidence towards teaching HTR and Signý realized that the aims of her school’s history courses did not include HTR. When applying the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth, reflective links between the domains appear. In the personal domain, the teachers gained knowledge about instructional strategies and various approaches to the teaching of selected elements of HTR. They built their beliefs about student learning on new ideas as they experimented with assignments and whole class discussions (domain of practice). When presenting new and different assignments, they experienced positive responses from the students, which indicated student learning (domain of consequences), consequently reflected in the personal domain. Regarding the external domain, the most important resources for professional growth were the instrument, seeing the (positive) responses of their students and the reading materials. Both teachers confirmed that the instrument’s framework of the teaching of HTR was helpful when it came to actual practice, and Ása felt that the PDP had provided her with tools for more creative teaching than before. However, Signý seemed to have a different conceptualization of historical thinking and reasoning compared to the conceptualizations underlying the instrument. Her ideas focused on using historical sources, primarily to enhance an in depth exploration of content. During the PDP she had little opportunity to engage in discussions about particular HTR strategies because she collaborated with Helga who focused less on aspects of teaching HTR. Furthermore, the case of Helga suggests that the amount of disciplinary understanding of history and its constructive nature might affect the outcome of this PDP.

6. The use of Teach-HTR in initial teacher training

We also wanted to explore whether the instrument could be used in initial teacher training, as student teachers differ considerably from experienced teachers in regard to pedagogical content knowledge, a prerequisite for teaching HTR (Achinstein & Fogo, 2015; Harris & Bain, 2011).
6.1 Participants

A teacher educator and seven Master’s students in history teaching at a Dutch university were asked to participate in the study. The teacher educator decided how the instrument could be integrated in a course on subject specific pedagogy (Dutch: vakdidactiek) at the final stages of the training program. Since the teaching of historical thinking is required in the Dutch curriculum, students had already devoted at least six lessons to it in their coursework before the study, as well as touching upon it in previous courses.

6.2 Procedure

Each student designed and taught one lesson focusing on HTR, which was observed by another student. The students used the Teach-HTR instrument to analyze each other’s lessons. Pre- and postquestionnaires were used to investigate student’s ideas of HTR and their perception of their ability to teach it before and after the intervention. The students also had group discussions with their course teacher. An overview of the program is shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2

An overview of the training program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-measurement (January)</th>
<th>Teaching (Jan-Feb)</th>
<th>Observing (Jan-Feb)</th>
<th>Discussing (March)</th>
<th>Post-measurement (March)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A questionnaire that measures task value, self efficacy and feelings of competence for teaching HTR. Students explain what they can do to teach HTR.</td>
<td>Designing of a lesson plan to teach HTR.</td>
<td>Observation of a student colleague, teaching HTR.</td>
<td>Lessons and observations discussed in a course meeting with teacher.</td>
<td>A questionnaire that measures task value, self efficacy and feelings of competence for teaching HTR. Students describe what they have learned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.3 Data collection and instruments

The intervention lasted from January to March 2020. All the data were collected by the university teacher and were sent to the researchers. The task value, i.e., the value that they attach to learning how to teach HTR and how interesting it is, was measured using a questionnaire with the following three items: a) I think I will be able to use what I learned about the teaching of HTR in my lessons, b) I enjoy teach historical thinking and reasoning in my lessons and c) understanding how to teach historical thinking and reasoning is very important to me. These items were adapted from a longer list of items measuring task value in the manual for the use of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ) (Pintrich et al., 1991) and were measured on a 7-point Likert scale. The student teacher’s perceived competence for teaching HTR was measured (inspired by Voet’s and De Wever’s (2016) questionnaire on inquiry-based learning in history) with one general item, as follows: I expect to do well on the teaching of historical thinking and reasoning. The students responded to this statement on a 7-points Likert scale. This was followed by eight questions, each of which referred to a category in the observation instrument, e.g., “At the moment, to what extent do you feel able to formulate learning objectives that focus on historical thinking and reasoning?” and “At the moment, to what extent do you feel able to make clear that there are multiple perspectives and interpretations?” These were measured on a 5-points Likert scale. In addition, the students explained in their own words what they could do, as teachers, to enhance students’ HTR. Furthermore, the lesson plans designed by the student-teachers and peer-observations were analyzed. The procedure was discussed with their teacher in a course meeting. Finally, a postmeasurement questionnaire was given, consisting of a modified version of the previous questionnaire and several questions in a Learner Report-format (e.g., “From the Teach-HTR instrument I learned …”, “It was a challenge for me to …”, see Appendix 3). This format is useful when identifying educational objectives that are difficult to measure (Janssen & Rijlaarsdam, 1996; Van Kesteren, 1993). As we have only one lesson plan from each student, we are only able to describe what they did, rather than identify change. The individual students were discussed with the teacher educator for further clarification. After the program, there was a final retrospective interview with the teacher educator. In this interview, the teacher educator described and reflected on the course meeting in which the use of the observation instrument was discussed. Furthermore, the interviewer
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asked some clarification questions about the lesson plans of individual students. Table 3 shows the instruments that were used for the data collection and their connection with the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>What is being measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premeasurement students</td>
<td>Personal domain (knowledge and beliefs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Questions about task value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Questions about feelings of competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students explained in their own words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what they, as teachers, could do to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enhance students’ HTR abilities (teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior and elements of HTR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmeasurement students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Questions about task value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Questions about feelings of competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final interview with the teacher educator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
<td>Domain of practice (professional experimentation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection on the teaching of the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of a peer’s lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postobservation discussion with a peer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmeasurement students</td>
<td>Sources of growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learner Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final interview with the teacher educator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Data analysis

For the closed questions measuring task value, self-efficacy, and feelings of competence, mean scores were calculated. The open questions were coded according to the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002). The question about how they
could enhance the students’ HTR was coded by items present in the Teach-HTR instrument, to determine which aspects or components of HTR were addressed. An example is one student’s explanation of how he might contextualize new historical knowledge and help pupils use argumentation appropriate to the time period being studied. In addition, they were coded to identify types of teaching behavior. The learner report-questions in the postquestionnaire were analyzed to discern the main hindrances and sources of growth, such as a student saying he learned the most from observing the lesson of a peer and using the instrument. As in the first case, the lesson plans were analyzed, searching for elements of the instrument in the lesson goals, as well as in the teacher and student activities. Peer lesson observations, followed by written reports of post-observation discussion were used to get a clearer idea of the lessons the students designed and how they enacted them.

7. Results

In this chapter, we will discuss the general results of all the students before taking a closer look at two of them, Joke and Jan (pseudonyms were assigned). They were chosen because initially, Joke was considerably less confident than Jan, so it was interesting to compare the effects of the intervention on their development as history teachers. The results regarding the domain of consequences (salient outcomes) were not a formal part of the program, but indications could be derived from the description of the observed lessons.

7.1 Change in the personal domain

The questionnaires presented information on the students’ beliefs, knowledge and attitude, i.e., the personal domain. The value the students gave to learning about HTR stayed the same in the pre- and postmeasurement, i.e., 5.9 out of 7 points. Their feelings of competence towards teaching HTR increased slightly, i.e., from 3.9 to 4. The scores of all students’ responses are presented in Table 4. Another element of the personal domain, i.e., teacher knowledge, appeared in the prequestionnaire where the students described their knowledge of HTR and its teaching. They were asked to list as many things as possible that they, as teachers, were able to do to enhance students’ HTR abilities. They mentioned 0-4 items of HTR that they could teach (av. 2.3) and 2-4 types of teacher behavior (av. 3.1).
Both Joke and Jan were of the opinion that it was important for them to learn how to teach HTR, assigning 6 (Joke) and 7 (Jan) points to the statement, similar to the rest of the students. This task value statement received the highest score. Joke and Jan gave the same responses to how important it was to them to understand how to teach HTR and its usefulness. Their answers differed when it came to how much they enjoyed teaching HTR in their lessons. Joke was more positive than Jan (6 points vs. his 5 points) and more interested in learning to teach HTR (same score). However, she was less confident regarding being able to use what she learned about the teaching of HTR (5 points vs. his 7 points). The postquestionnaire revealed that all Joke’s scores increased, signifying a change in the personal domain, except for one that stayed the same (I think I will be able to use what I learned about the teaching of HTR in my lessons). In the postquestionnaire, Joke assigned 7 points to both how much she enjoyed teaching HTR and to the importance of understanding how to teach HTR. Jan’s response to how much he enjoyed teaching HTR stayed the same (5 points) in the pre- and postquestionnaires. His view of the importance of understanding how to teach HTR decreased from 7 points to 5.

Regarding teacher knowledge, Joke mentioned working on historical empathy, causal reasoning and contextualization and referred to three types of teacher behavior, as follows: working with sources, assignments and explicit teaching of cause and consequences. Jan described causal reasoning, change and continuity, historical perspectives and the evaluation of sources. He linked them to four types of teacher behavior, as follows: lecturing/asking questions, assignments, working with sources and providing explicit instruction on skills. He also expressed the view that explicit attention was neither required to cover HTR nor is it complex, since HTR is a natural part of historical narratives.

Joke felt an increased ability to provide explicit instruction on HTR skills and engage students in HTR through individual and group tasks (from 2 (unable) to 4 (able)). Moreover, she now felt completely able to use historical sources to support HTR. Nevertheless, her confidence towards formulating learning objectives that focus on HTR and engaging students in HTR by a whole class discussion diminished from 4 to 3. Jan’s perception of his ability to teach HTR was very pronounced. In the prequestionnaire, he was the only student who felt completely able (5 points) to carry out all the items in question. He was also the only student whose confidence diminished according to the postquestionnaire. In the analysis of his lesson, he received the highest score (4 out of 4) in 5 out of 7 categories of the instrument. However, his
reflections after the observation of his lesson show that although he was content with how he taught HTR, he was aware that he might have paid more attention to the pupils’ difficulty with it. In the words of Jan himself: “The final discussion mainly revealed that historical thinking is receiving excellent attention, but that there is an important point for improvement. The point is that students do not at all or hardly understand how to tackle a question that requires HTR. But otherwise HTR receives plenty of explicit attention …”

Table 4

Average scores of student teachers’ answers in pre- and post-questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value (3 items, points out of 7)</th>
<th>Feelings of competence (8 items, points out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1 Joke</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2 Jan</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 Change in the domain of practice

Professional experimentation belongs to the domain of practice. The results described in this chapter are based on only one lesson of each student, and since change per se can hardly be investigated, we focus on the teacher behavior that may have been instigated by the Teach-HTR observation instrument. We also use the learner reports to discern possible change. In most cases, these were the students’ first steps towards teaching HTR, which all but one took on. The following remarks are based on the lesson plans of six students. All the included items that form a part of the instrument in their lesson plans are as follows: four of them included HTR in their lesson goals (i.e., multiperspectivity or sourcing strategies) and they all
planned to engage their pupils in activities that asked for various elements of HTR, to various degrees (category 6 of the observation instrument). All but one planned to demonstrate HTR (category 2), the most common feature of history lessons (Gestsdóttir et al., 2019). Thus, their lessons seem to justify the increased confidence the students had towards teaching HTR. The peer observations revealed even more elements of HTR, but these are not included here, as the students were not specifically trained in using the instrument that way. According to the learner reports, the students added many elements to their teaching during the intervention, such as giving explicit instruction on how to think and reason historically (Jan) or how to work with sources to enhance HTR (student no 7).

As already mentioned, Joke’s confidence towards formulating learning objectives that focus on HTR and engaging students in HTR through whole-class discussions had somewhat diminished during the intervention. Joke chose a lesson on social and political issues of the 18th and 19th century, including a student assignment that focused on the historical significance of events and circumstances by using the diamond nine approach (Chapman, 2003). Part of the assignment was ‘Name the event you have put at the top of the diamond. Explain why you consider this event the most significant one.’ According to the observation of her peer, Joke managed to include many elements of HTR in the lesson, in fact, so thoroughly that the observer marked 3 or 4 (out of 4) points for six of the seven categories of the Teach-HTR instrument. The whole class discussion scored 2 points. The observation of Jan’s lesson produced similar results, although he mainly demonstrated HTR and engaged his students in an assignment and whole class discussion that asked for HTR. For example, Jan asked his students to assess the trustworthiness and representativeness of sources about enlightened absolutism. An observation of his lesson by another student includes the following remarks: “Around 45:00 the same about an assignment on the use of historical sources. Everything is discussed, the teacher gives explicit instruction about each reasoning step. Here the teacher also shows how to deal with a historical source. The same goes for arguing about sources. Here the teacher again shows very nicely how a student can deal with the source. The teacher encourages students to make up questions at the source and to formulate an argument.”
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7.3 Change in the external domain, relevant sources of growth

We were particularly interested in observing how the Teach-HTR instrument could lead to changes in the external domain, i.e., as a source of information, stimulus or support, and if it was a source of growth. The teacher educator, who already had experience using other observation instruments, confirmed that Teach-HTR was useful and could easily be integrated in teacher education. For him, it was important to know which challenges students faced when it came to the teaching of HTR, and he found the instrument helpful in this respect, stating the following: “I saw students reflect more on historical thinking after we had discussed their own classroom observations … They thought it was very helpful and useful.” The students appreciated the instrument’s concrete description of teacher behavior, how it provided insight into HTR skills and could be used as a checklist when lessons were designed. In the learner reports, the students elaborated on what they had learned from the instrument, and student no 6 stated the following: “From the instrument Teach-HTR I learned how different aspects of HTR can be observed and what concrete behavior to look for when trying to observe or indeed teach HTR,”; student no 5 added the following: “With these behavioral descriptions, you can take a more specific look at what you want to achieve in class and how to evoke this student behavior.” All the students saw the instrument as a source of growth according to the learner reports. Three students said they had learned the most from observing another student’s lesson using the instrument. Other sources of growth were the group sessions with their teacher and the reading materials.

Joke learned from the instrument how to consider other ways of including HTR in the lessons and how to use such an instrument when preparing a lesson. She felt she had learned the most from observing another teacher and the discussions with her peers and the course teacher. In his learner report Jan stated the following: “From the instrument Teach-HTR, I learned to include explicit instruction in my teaching of HTR. First, I just presented the students with questions concerning the different types of reasoning. Now, I’ve learned to explicitly instruct students how to think and reason historically.” He learned the most from reading about HTR and comparing it with the requirements of the national curriculum. Other students described their basic learning as “how to incorporate HTR even more into your lessons” or “how you as a teacher can demonstrate HTR” and said that the observation instrument provided overview and support.
7.4 Possible hindrances to growth

In the group discussion about Teach-HTR, the students mentioned that the instrument focused too much on teacher behavior, rather than to what extent the students engaged in HTR. Its basic structure, i.e., being teacher centered, was perceived as a drawback by some students. Despite the instrument being considered very concrete when it came to teacher behavior and the students said they learned much from observations using it, some found it somewhat abstract and asked for more examples. However, the main challenges the students faced did not have to do with the instrument but rather with the complexity of teaching HTR. This was corroborated by the reflections of their teacher. Both Joke and Jan said that their main challenge was including several items of HTR in the same lesson. Joke seemed almost apologetic that one category of the instrument was not observed in her lesson, and her peer consoled her in her notes (“This is okay. You simply cannot cover source analysis every lesson.”) Other students added that various sides of each HTR component could easily be overlooked in the hustle and bustle of classroom teaching.

8. Conclusion

The instrument added to the students’ professional growth according to the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth when used in conjunction with peer observation and discussion. The teacher educator confirmed the usefulness of Teach-HTR and the role it played in supporting his students’ teaching of HTR. In general, the students already valued teaching HTR and were positively disposed towards learning how to teach HTR. The instrument added to their knowledge of actual teaching behavior related to HTR (personal domain), although some students would have liked more concrete examples related to the categories of the instrument. The interaction between the personal domain and the domain of practice is visible. Before the intervention, the students could address several different types of teacher behavior in this context (usually 3-4), but fewer actual elements of HTR (0-4). According to the observations of their lessons, this number increased, as many items of the instrument were taught. Six of the students managed to prepare an assignment that asked for HTR, in addition to demonstrating it themselves (all but one). Joke taught HTR to a considerable extent in her lesson, according to the observation and analysis by her peer, and earned her growing confidence. Jan also emphasized HTR to a considerable extent in his
lesson. Nevertheless, he presents an interesting exception in that his confidence diminished during the intervention. In the prequestionnaire, his marks were the highest of all the students and he had quite clear ideas of the teaching of HTR. Since the domain of consequences lies beyond the scope of this study, it is only guesswork that he may have undergone some type of a reality check when he designed and taught a lesson devoted to HTR and realized how challenging it is to teach HTR.

9. Conclusion and discussion

Applying the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002) adds to the answer to our research question, i.e., How can the use of an observation instrument enhance the professional growth of history student teachers and history teachers in the teaching of historical thinking and reasoning? Both case studies described above add to the literature on how to teach historical thinking and reasoning. They confirm the utility of the Teach-HTR observation instrument in enhancing professional growth although there are a number of concerns.

Teach-HTR clearly influenced the personal domain (knowledge, beliefs and attitudes) of both the experienced and student teachers by drawing out some elements of the teaching of HTR, which then inspired their teaching practices. The instrument’s influences on the domain of practice manifested itself in new approaches and assignments in the case of the experienced teachers and in HTR centered assignments and teacher discussion in the case of the student teachers. It stimulated experimentation and initiated change. The instrument also contributed to the domain of consequences (salient outcomes) regarding the design of assignments in both cases and enhanced the motivation of students, according to the experienced teachers. As a source of information, stimulus and support, it evidently belongs to the external domain. The student teachers found it helpful in providing concrete examples of teacher behavior related to the teaching of HTR, and the experienced teachers found support when sharpening their focus on teaching particular elements of HTR. Several student teachers were positive about observing another student’s lesson using the instrument. In both case studies, the teachers and student teachers were not extensively trained in how to use the instrument. Such a training might add to the quality of the peer discussions.
The instrument was used to promote professional growth in different ways in the two cases. In the first case, the teachers participated in an approach that had already been developed by the researchers. In the second case, no particular approach was prescribed because the aim was to see how a teacher educator could integrate the use of the instrument in their regular practice. The students received coaching and strived to incorporate several items of HTR in their lessons, whereas the teachers had specifically chosen one element of HTR to focus on. We do not know what the results would have been if the student teachers had also focused on one category of choice in their lesson. More research is necessary to clarify how both approaches may be supportive, possibly in different ways. The instrument does not simply provide means and tools for teaching HTR but supports the beliefs of teachers and student teachers in the value of teaching HTR, which is of crucial importance (McCrum, 2013; Pajares, 1992). The complex interaction between beliefs and enactment is reciprocal in the sense that it is hardly beneficial to teach without realizing what lies beneath. Aided by some of the literature that the instrument is based on and peer reflections, particularly appreciated by the student teachers, it provided a solid footing for teaching HTR. However, as one of the experienced teachers used a limited conceptualization of HTR and some of the student teachers needed more concrete examples, it would be advisable to pay more attention to discussing the categories, the underlying literature and concrete examples to develop a rich understanding. Furthermore, peer observation and therewith post-observation discussion need to be carefully prepared, e.g. by training, if they are to provide reliable information.

The limitations of the current study must be acknowledged. The number of experienced teachers who participated was very small and unforeseen problems (one teacher had to end their participation and another one did not adhere to the form of the intervention) led to even less data than anticipated. When analyzing the student teachers’ data, many questions arose and it would have been better to include interviews in this second case study as well as in the first to be able to probe deeper and gain a better understanding of their motives and actions.

It can be concluded that an observation instrument such as Teach-HTR can easily be integrated in either teacher training or PDP. Thus, it can support those who are taking their first steps, as well as those who wish to take an honest look at their own teaching, especially if they belong to a learning community that offers the possibility of mutual reflection, which is an important element of professional change (Korthagen, 2017). It would be interesting to use the instrument with a larger group of teachers or student teachers over a prolonged period of
time to gain more knowledge of how professional change occurs when teachers wish to emphasize the teaching of historical thinking and reasoning.