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Abstract
Using a broad-based assessment for understanding what teachers learn in historic site-based professional development (HSBPD), this study follows 29 teachers from a HSBPD at Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello to see how their work at historic sites affected their practice upon return to their classrooms. Influenced by the Interconnected Model of Teacher Growth and Complexity theory, this study considers the complex outcomes of teachers as individuals, professionals, and learners in communities of practice. Results explore a range of outcomes related to content, pedagogical content knowledge, working with peers, interactions with the historic site, and a willingness to reconsider historical information. The discussion offers a consideration of the network of HSBPDs as a cumulative system and the ways in which teachers’ on-site work can deepen our understanding of working with complex historical sources and make larger curricular changes.
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Historic sites¹ are complex semiotic and curricular spaces designed to teach visitors about the people and/or events on which the site’s import rests (Burgard & Boucher, 2018; Van Leeuwen, 2005). Visiting an historic site is not a neutral experience, and teachers who attend historic site-based professional development (HSBPD) are not neutral agents in it. Like all other visitors, they navigate personal histories/heritage(s), identities, knowledge, beliefs, and more to assign meaning to their encounters (cf. Cameron & Gatewood, 2003; Doering & Pekarik, 1996; Drozdzewska, Nardi, & Waterton, 2016; Gatewood & Cameron, 2004; Goldberg, 2013; Grever, de Bruijn, & van Boxtel, 2012; Kello, 2016; Klein, 2016; Knowles, 2018; Levy, 2017; Reich, Buffington, & Muth, 2015; Rosenberg, 2007; Rosenzweig & Thelen, 1997; Sather-Wagstaff, 2011; Schwartz, 1991; Van Boxtel, Klein, & Snoep, 2011). Yet they are unique among visitors, in that they join peer teachers—also idiosyncratically navigating the “free choice learning” (Falk, Dierking, & Foutz, 2007) environment of the historic site—to work with historians, curators, museum educators, etc., to extract something that will affect their knowledge and teaching of history. From this collaborative space, they return to their particular contexts and apply what they have learned. Given these layers of complexity, it is not surprising that we know little about what teachers take from HSBPD and use in their classrooms.

The current research landscape for teaching and learning at historic sites is best thought of as a research archipelago: many small-scale, disconnected works with different questions, methods, research paradigms, for different audiences, that do not speak to each other, or add up to a larger whole. Dominating this landscape are atheoretical descriptive works (e.g., Fortney & Sheppard, 2010; McRainey & Moisan, 2009) and visitor studies programs/events/exhibits, with little generalizable beyond those specific circumstances (DeWitt & Storksdieck, 2008; Dudzinska-Przesmitzki & Grenier, 2008; Falk & Dierking, 1995). There is a growing body of research centered at historic sites, but it has largely focused on student and/or augmented learning with emerging technologies (e.g., Johnson et al., 2017; Klein, 2016; Lee, Hicks, Henriksen, Mishra, & Cain, 2015; Price, Jewitt, & Sakr, 2016; Savenjie & de Bruijn, 2017). Yet, each year, millions are spent in public (e.g., NEH Landmarks of American History and Culture program), nonprofit/foundation (e.g., George Washington’s Mount Vernon), and personal funds to send history teachers to HSBPDs without clear outcomes.
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To change this landscape, we need broad-based research about what teachers take from HSBPDs that connects to their larger work as teachers. This research seeks to address that gap. This article reports on the second round of Y1 data from a 3-year Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) National Leadership Grant project to develop a broad-based assessment for use at HSBPD programs. This study follows 29 teachers who participated in a history-focused institute, at Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello, to explore how HSBPD affects their classroom work.

Research Site

The present study was conducted at Monticello, Thomas Jefferson’s plantation home in Charlottesville, VA. Meaning, “little mountain,” Monticello offers panoramic views of the Virginia Piedmont. Named a UNESCO World Heritage Site Monticello is today a beautiful setting (UNESCO, 2018). That beauty cannot be divorced from its history as a plantation built and dependent upon enslaved labor, which Jefferson depended upon for his livelihood and his public pursuits. It is a site of difficult history.

Over the last three decades, interpretation at Monticello has increasingly wrestled with the interconnectedness of Jefferson and the 600 enslaved persons whose lives and work made Jefferson’s life and work possible. The most public of these changes has been the integration of the historical (Gordon-Reed, 1997) and DNA evidence (Foster et al., 1998) identifying Jefferson as the father of the children of the enslaved woman, Sally Hemings. Archeological, documentary, and architectural research has guided the restoration of the slave quarters and work sites along Mulberry Row, and recently Sally Hemings’s room. Corresponding educational programs urge visitors to consider the full, often uncomfortable, story of the mountaintop plantation. It is into this complicated space that teachers come for professional development (PD).

Conceptualizing Teacher Learning at HSBPD

The challenge of conceptualizing learning in HSBPD is determining how to position the question about teachers who encounter the historic space as individual learners, interacting with peers, for professional purposes, to use the experience/information gathered, in different roles and contexts. Focusing on the individual teacher as learner would build on existing research in cognition to explicate how teachers encounter artifacts and transfer that understanding/experience/process across contexts to students (Barnett & Ceci, 2002; Clark & Paivio, 1991; Mayer, 2009). Similarly, their work with museum educators could draw upon work modeling expert practices (Baron, 2012; Wineburg, 1991) and/or developing pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987). Their embodied experiences with the landscapes, objects, and historical persons, including the range of affective and numinous encounters participants report, require attention (cf. Cameron & Gatewood, 2003; Csikszentmihalyi & Robinson, 1991; Gatewood & Cameron, 2004; Latham, 2013).

However, teachers are individuals embedded in the learning community of HSBPDs, requiring understanding of their situated perspective in the communities of practice (Hutchins, 1995; Korthagen, 2010; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Zeichner, 2005). Furthermore, teachers are embedded in larger socio-cultural practices and systems beyond the historic site that require consideration; particularly related to their curricular choices and the influence working at/with historic sites has on their teaching of historical concepts/persons/event in relation to their students and the schools in which they work.

As this research is intended to provide a broad foundation for exploring HSBPD and the need for research across these learning perspectives, complexity theory and Clarke and Hollingsworth’s (2002) Interconnected Model of Teacher Growth influenced us. These allow for recursive interaction between knowledge, identity, and participation in communities (Zellermayer & Margolin, 2005), and consideration of HSBPDs as both part of and a subsystem within the constellation of teachers’ work. Accordingly, “learning in one system must affect and be enacted and supported in another system. Rather than seeing [HSBPD] as isolated events, ‘effective’ teacher learning requires multiple and cyclic movements between the systems of influence in teachers’ worlds” (Opfer & Pedder, 2011, p. 386). Neither complexity theory nor the Interconnected Model preclude drawing upon differently situated works, rather view them as complimentary ways to explore the same circumstances at different levels of analysis (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Greeno & Engstrom, 2014). Accordingly, we offer this research as an invitation to a recursive process in which knowledge about teaching and learning based on teachers’ interactions with historic sites is coproduced and mutually informing.

Consequently, we needed a methodology that allowed consideration of “multiple causalities, multiple perspectives, and multiple effects that constitute complex activity within and between complex systems and subsystems from the perspectives of interacting agents” (Opfer & Pedder, 2011, p. 396). We used Q-methodology, which quantifies subjectivity, allowing researchers to capture the complex qualitative stories, attitudes, and values that teachers embody. Q utilizes an interactive elicitation tool, known as a concourse that guides participants through a metacognitive reflective process that asks them to consider multiple factors in relation to each other. As “a small-sample technique that can lend statistical validity to the qualitative interpretation of subjective data” (O’Leary, Wobbrock, Riskin, 2013, p. 1941), Q addresses the persistent issue of HSBPD’s small sample sizes.

Q-methodology’s data collection tool, called a Q-Sort, is comprised of statements—known as the concourse (Brown, 1980)—that participants rank on a normal distribution curve. To ensure focal content, skills, and dispositions connect to
larger professional contexts (Borko, 2004; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Hochberg & Desimone, 2010; National Research Council, 2000; Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007; Vermunt & Endedijk, 2011), we drew upon standards created by teacher education professional accrediting/affinity groups to ground the concourse. These standards sets, in combination, provide a foundation for understanding what the field deems essential across areas of interest.

The concourse addresses four areas relevant to history teachers’ professional lives as they intersect with HSBPD. We used the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Core Teaching Standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education’s (NCATE; 2008) Professional Standards for Teacher Preparation Institutions for statements related to professional dispositions, pedagogy, and content knowledge; National Council for the Social Studies’s (NCSS; 2013) C3 Framework for Social Studies State Standards for historical, economic, geographic, and civic content knowledge and analytical skills development; and the Ethical Dimension from Seixas, Morton, Colyer, and Fornazzari’s (2013) Big Six Historical Thinking Concepts (Table 1).

### Table 1. Concourse Item National Standard Correlates.

| Areas for assessment | Standard set | Standard items |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Content knowledge    | NCSS C3 Framework for Social Studies State Standards | D2.H.1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 16-17 |
|                      | NCATE Professional Standards for Teacher Preparation Institutions | D2. Eco.10-13 |
|                      | InTASC Core Teaching Standards | D2. Civ.3 |
|                      |                         | D3.1-2 |
| Historical thinking and analysis | NCSS C3 Framework for Social Studies State Standards | D2.H.3, 7-10, 16-17 |
|                      | NCATE Professional Standards for Teacher Preparation Institutions | D3.1-2 |
|                      | Seixas, Morton, Colyer, and Fornazzari’s Big Six Historical Thinking Concepts | 1a, Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions; Diversity 4 Content Knowledge 4.0 |
| Pedagogical content knowledge | NCATE Professional Standards for Teacher Preparation Institutions | 1a, 1b, 1d, Learner Development; 4, Content Knowledge |
| Professional dispositions | InTASC Core Teaching Standards | 4o, Content Knowledge; 7o, Planning For Instruction; 9n, Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; 10c, k, r, Leadership and Collaboration. |

Note. NCSS = National Council for the Social Studies; NCATE = National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education; InTASC = Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium.

Method

Participants

Twenty-nine U.S. teachers from 20 states and one U.K. teacher participated in the study (Table 2). The participants averaged 15.3 years in the classroom (range 3-35; mode 5), most often held a master’s degree (BA/BS: 2; MA/MAT/EdM: 22; PhD/EdS: 5). Participants were asked to identify their preferred racial/ethnic and gender descriptors. Twenty-two identified as female and seven as male. The racial/ethnic composition of the participating cohort echoes the larger U.S. educator population (U.S. Department of Education, 2016), approximately 82% (n = 24) of the participants identified as White and 18% (n = 5) of the participants identified as Latina (1), Latina/White (1), Hispanic (1), Caribbean/East Indian (1), or Arab (1). Twenty-five participants taught U.S. History/Social Studies in Grades 5 to 12. One taught K-12 social studies. Three were Library/Media instructors.

Participants should be seen as self-selecting and motivated in a well-resourced program. Participants applied to participate in the Monticello Teacher Institute (MTI), situated at Monticello, Charlottesville, VA. The Monticello education staff managed the application process. All 29 accepted participants agreed to participate in the research.

Participants participated in lectures, discussions, and tours as a cohort, and worked independently in the archive to create curriculum/materials. Many participants identified themselves as “PD junkies” or “History Nerds” who sought out HSBPD annually.

Q-Methodology

Q-methodology is a systematic and rigorous quantitative study of subjectivity (McKeown, 1990). Subjectivity defined as a person’s communication of his or her point of view on any matter of personal or social importance. Q-methodology’s
**Table 2.** Pre/Post/Post-Post Factor Loadings.

| Participant | Race   | Gender | YT | Grade | Teaching specialty | Highest degree | Sorter  | Loading by factor |
|-------------|--------|--------|----|-------|--------------------|----------------|---------|------------------|
| 1           | White  | M      | 8  | HS    | U.S. history       | MEd            | 1 Pre   | .207             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 1 Post  | -.089            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 1 PPost | .655X            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .0882            |
| 2           | White  | F      | 35 | MS    | U.S. history       | MA             | 2 Pre   | .362             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 2 Post  | .314             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 2 PPost | .506X            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .275             |
| 3           | White  | F      | 12 | HS    | U.S. history       | MA + 15        | 3 Pre   | .058             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 3 Post  | .264             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 3 PPost | .392             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .372             |
| 4           | Hispanic| F     | 5  | MS    | U.S. history       | MA             | 4 Pre   | .409             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 4 Post  | .329             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 4 PPost | .031             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .621X            |
| 5           | White  | M      | 5  | HS    | U.S. history       | MA             | 5 Pre   | .741X            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 5 Post  | .282             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 5 PPost | .141             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .075             |
| 6           | White  | F      | 11 | K-12  | Social studies     | MA             | 6 Pre   | .512X            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 6 Post  | .453             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 6 PPost | .137             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .311             |
| 7           | White  | F      | 23 | MS    | Special education  | EdS            | 7 Pre   | .144             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 7 Post  | .452X            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 7 PPost | .060             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .225             |
| 8           | White  | M      | 6  | MS/HS | History/politics  | PhD            | 8 Pre   | .537             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 8 Post  | .086             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 8 PPost | .643X            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .026             |
| 9           | White  | F      | 13 | MS    | Early American     | MA             | 9 Pre   | .475             |
|             |        |        |    |       | history            |                | 9 Post  | .376             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 9 PPost | .272             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .469             |
| 10          | White  | F      | 15 | K-12  | Librarian          | MA             | 10 Pre  | .602X            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 10 Post | .459             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 10 PPost| .241             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .125             |
| 11          | White  | F      | 9  | MS/HS | American culture   | BA             | 11 Pre  | .626X            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 11 Post | .316             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 11 PPost| .113             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .069             |
| 12          | White  | F      | 29 | HS    | U.S. history       | EdS            | 12 Pre  | .769X            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 12 Post | .272             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 12 PPost| .189             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .058             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         |               |
| 13          | Latina | F      | 29 | HS    | U.S. history       | EdS            | 13 Pre  | .096             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 13 Post | -.258            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 13 PPost| .347             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .468X            |
| 14          | White  | F      | 14 | HS    | History           | MA             | 14 Pre  | .447X            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 14 Post | .342             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 14 PPost| .343             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .233             |
| 15          | Arab   | F      | 26 | MS    | U.S. history       | MA             | 15 Pre  | .253             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 15 Post | .299             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 15 PPost| -.031            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .353             |
| 16          | White  | F      | 16 | UES   | All               | MEd            | 16 Pre  | .609X            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 16 Post | .016             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 16 PPost| .263             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .225             |
| 17          | White  | F      | 9  | HS    | U.S. history       | MA             | 17 Pre  | .324             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 17 Post | .205             |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                | 17 PPost| .576X            |
|             |        |        |    |       |                    |                |         | .253             |

(continued)
Table 2. (continued)

| Participant | Race                | Gender | YT  | Grade | Teaching specialty | Highest degree | Sorter | Loading by factor |
|-------------|---------------------|--------|-----|-------|-------------------|----------------|--------|------------------|
| 18          | White               | M      | 21  | MS    | Social studies    | MA+75          |        | .168             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .259             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | −.154            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .473X            |
| 19          | White               | M      | 9   | HS    | American history  | MA             |        | .765X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .107             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .033             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .299             |
| 20          | White               | F      | 24  | MS    | Social studies    | MA             |        | .053             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .319             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .692X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .335             |
| 21          | White               | F      | 22  | PreK-5| Library media    | EdS            |        | .301             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .375             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .103             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .481X            |
| 22          | White               | F      | 22  | K-5   | Library media    | MA+60          |        | .149             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .235             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .638X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .205             |
| 23          | White               | M      | 37  | HS    | Ancient history  | MA             |        | −.002            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .611X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | −.024            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .486             |
| 24          | White               | M      | 8   | MS    | U.S. history     | MA             |        | .384             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .682X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .194             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | −.048            |
| 25          | Caribbean/          | F      | 8   | MS    | U.S. history     | MA             |        | .412             |
| East Indian |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .538X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .213             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | −.096            |
| 26          | White               | F      | 16  | MS    | Social studies   | MA             |        | .427             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .548X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .149             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .202             |
| 27          | White               | F      | 3   | MS    | History          | MA             |        | .572X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .242             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .441             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .169             |
| 28          | White               | F      | 5   | HS    | U.S. history     | BS+30          |        | .496X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .440             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .289             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | −.084            |
| 29          | White/              | F      | 5   | HS    | U.S. history     | MA             |        | .585X            |
| Latina      |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .161             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .241             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .250             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .736X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .130             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .294             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .121             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .549X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .271             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .586X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .246             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .041             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .371             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .577X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .253             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .218             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .274             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .563X            |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .009             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .441             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .406             |
|             |                     |        |     |       |                   |                |        | .563X            |

Note. Bold numbers indicate the factor that each participant loaded on after an analysis of the sorts was completed. YT = years taught; HS = high school; MS = middle school; UES = upper elementary school.

Advantages over Likert-type scale surveys rest on using “forced choice” which brings personal values and experiences into the ranking process. In a traditional Likert-type scale survey, participants could rank everything at the same position on the scale without differentiating between them. In Q-method, participants rank the statements against each other on a worksheet that arranges them into a normal distribution curve (Figure 1). Next, they are interviewed about why they ranked statements as they did. These interviews allow for holistic interpretation of the data that can reveal patterns missed via other means.

Administration of Q-Sort

Participants received the concourse, a set of 60 index cards, with a single statement written on each. Participants sorted cards into three piles: Most Like Me (MLM), Least Like Me (LLM), and Neutral, based on the prompt: “PD at historic sites affects my development as a teacher by . . . .” Next, participants ranked the 60 statements on a forced distribution worksheet (Figure 1) ranging from +6 (MLM) to −6 (LLM). Participants placed MLM statements on the worksheet in the +6 column on the far right, the three MLM statements into...
the +5 column and so on until all statements from MLM pile were placed on the worksheet. This was repeated with the LLM (−6, −5, etc.) and Neutral statements (0, −1, +1). As participants were not required to create three equal piles, statements ranked as +2 or −2 should be interpreted as low positive/negative, high neutral. We urged participants to rank statements based on their daily work, rather than what they believed was important, but did not enact. The prompt of “flossing your teeth daily” was offered to help weigh statements they knew to be “right” against what they actually did. Follow-up interviews asked (a) why participants ranked their MLM and (b) LLM statements as they did, and (c) to describe their experience doing the sort.

Frequency

The Q-Sort was administered at three intervals: (a) Pretest, on site, on the first day of the institute prior to instruction; (b) Posttest, on site, on the last day of the institute after instruction/tours ended; and (c) post-post test, completed via Skype, in participants’ homes or classrooms, 6 months post-HSBPD. Interviews were conducted at the conclusion of each sort.

Data Analysis

We used Q-Methodology software PQ-Method (Schmolck, 2014) to analyze correlations among sorts, Eigen values, rotated factors, factor loadings, z scores, and rankings of Q statements in each factor (type or pattern). Centroid factor analysis was used to obtain an initial estimate of potential factors. Interpretable factors were selected among factors of eigenvalues greater than 1.

A four-factor solution was retained with more than seven defining sorts for each factor. Ranks for statements on each factor, distinguishing (statements with statistically significant factor scores; \( p < .05 \)) statements, z scores and consensus statements (statements that do not distinguish between any of the factors), demographic information, and comments from open-ended questions were utilized for a complete interpretation of factors.

Results

Four factors were named. Type 1: Historical Pedagogical Content Knowledge (14% of variance; 12 sorts), Type 2: Learning From Experts (10% of variance; seven sorts), Type 3: Monticello-Focused Affective Experience (19% of variance; 20 sorts), and Type 4: Reconsidering the Past (15% of variance; 13 sorts).

Analysis for Q-methodology is holistic, meaning that patterns of attitudes are observed utilizing the Q-Sort and interview data. The present study focused on how the participants perceived their HSBPD experience from pre-sort at the start of the institute (A), to the post-sort at institute’s end (B), to the post-post sort administered 6 months later, when teachers were back in their classrooms (C). The factors that emerged in this (ABC) data vary from those in the pre/post data (AB) (Baron, Sklarwitz, Bang, & Shatara, 2019). While many
distinguishing statements from (AB) rank as +6 or −6, many (ABC) statements rank between +3 and −3, offering a more sober view of what teachers retained from HSBPD, rather than what is exciting about being at the historic site (see Table 3).

**Factor 1: Historical Pedagogical Content Focus**

Factor 1 was the largest of the four factors in the post-post administration. Across all administrations, participants loading on this factor represented the widest range of years teaching, but below the cohort average (Factor 1 Average 12.8 years; range 3-35; Mode 5), grade level (2 K-12; 1 Elementary; 4 Middle School; 1 Middle School/High School; 6 High School), and education (BS-EdS). There was a higher than the cohort average ratio of female to male participants (13-1).

In comparison to on-site evaluations (7), nine participants loaded on Factor 1. Of these nine, four loaded on Factor 1 across three administrations (Table 4). Three elements remained once back in their classrooms: the value of reflective space to consider their practice, opportunity to build a network of content-area peers, and pedagogical tools to provide their students with different perspectives on the history they study. Less important were history content and professional dispositional statements about needing a “break” from their peers, with whom they were once again in daily contact. Statements indicating pedagogical strategies and materials gathered were far more significant once back in their classrooms.

Participants conceptualized one of the distinguishing statements for this factor, Statement 31: *Helping me to integrate diverse perspectives into my curriculum*, in several ways. Most interpreted it to mean incorporating perspectives of women and African American historical agents into their curriculum. Many sought to provide these perspectives for students who lived in communities that were predominantly White, for example, Participant 5:

I think perspective is really important in my classroom because my classroom is not very diverse. We are 98% White in my school, so they have no perspective outside their own and we don’t get multiple perspectives in the classroom. By trying to integrate different perspectives throughout history I hope then kids are able to step outside themselves a little bit and see things from other perspectives.

There was a desire to think differently regarding their personal understandings and reflections on teaching (Statement 44). (e.g., Participant 16: “I work with people who are very like-minded. [Northwestern State] isn’t known to be terribly diverse and I live in a not very diverse part of [Northwestern State]. Getting other people’s perspectives and feedback, that’s a big reason why I come to these things. It is to get different perspectives and different ways of looking at things.”)

Repeated exposure to Monticello’s main house and adjacent slave quarters on Mulberry Row was cited in helping participants expand the range of voices integrated in their curricula. While many were aware that Jefferson was a slaveholder, seeing the disparity between where the Jefferson and enslaved families lived and worked illuminated the complex interwoveness of their narratives. Once back in their classrooms, participants noted an intensity to this perspective that stayed with them and informed their teaching on a range of subjects within American history. For example, Participant 25, who loaded on Factor 1 in the post/post-post, noted as follows:

My experience really shaped how I teach Jefferson. Previously, I would teach about Jefferson, but I did not really frame it in the context of his life at Monticello. After seeing Monticello and the [online resources], you could have kids see the perspectives from somebody who is enslaved to someone who is visiting Jefferson. Just going through the house you can compare it to the [Mulberry Row] cabins. I was thinking of the kitchen and where it’s located [under the house], the perspectives of the enslaved people who worked there. I was thinking there was even a narrative to how the rooms were set up. All that is powerful in just describing the day-to-day life of the time-period.

This points to the online resources’ role in bridging HSBPD work and classroom activities. The story Participant 25 referred to about “how the rooms are set up” relates to the degree of control Thomas Jefferson exerted over the physical plant at Monticello. In particular, his daughter Martha, who ran the plantation in his absence, a complex enterprise involving multiple business and personal arrangements, could not move her bed across her bedroom without Thomas’s permission. Permission he did not give. This speaks to the powerful encumbrances gender norms imposed upon the residents of Monticello and how guided exploration of the physical environs illuminated such issues.

Participants noted their peers’ perspectives were an essential part of the HSBPD experience, particularly the building of a network of content-area peers (Statements 43 and 55). For many participants, HSBPD offers respite from the isolation of being the only person in their buildings who teach particular subject matter. (e.g., Participant 5: “I think that’s the most valuable thing because so many of us don’t really have a chance to bounce ideas off of other people.”) Participants were motivated to work with content-area peers and build ongoing relationships, so they could continue to work through curricular issues once they returned to their classrooms.

**Factor 2: Learning From Experts**

Across three administrations, Factor 2 was the most stable of the factors in terms of participants and distinguishing statements. Three of the six participants loaded on Factor 2 across three administrations; two loaded on it either pre- or post-
Table 3. Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement.

| No. | Q statements                                                                 | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4  |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1   | Providing the true story of American history                                  | −5  | −2  | −2  | 1  |
| 2   | Helping me establish a clearer chronology of the events of the Revolutionary Era and Early Republic | −3  | 0   | −1  | 0  |
| 3   | Demonstrating how the complex conditions of a plantation economy affected real people | −2  | 4   | 2   | −3 |
| 4   | Helping me recognize that Monticello offers a true picture of life in the Early Republic | −3  | 0   | −1  | −1 |
| 5   | Helping me recognize that Monticello represents the authentic work and values of the people who lived and worked there | −2  | 2   | 2   | −1 |
| 6   | Providing immediate access to the places and objects related to Monticello to improve my understanding of the people who lived there | −1  | 5   | 6   | 0  |
| 7   | Letting me compare life then and now                                          | −1  | 0   | 0   | 0  |
| 8   | Helping to simplify what I know about historic events related to Jefferson and Monticello | −2  | −1  | −1  | −2 |
| 9   | Demonstrating how representing the perspectives of a single dominant culture offers a clear national narrative. | −4  | −4  | −4  | −6 |
| 10  | Showing the continued influence of the Declaration of Independence in American life | 0   | −1  | 1   | 5  |
| 11  | Helping me to see the superiority of America’s culture to other world cultures | −6  | −6  | −6  | −6 |
| 12  | Helping me to understand how landscape, architecture, and natural resources shaped life for people at Monticello | −2  | 4   | 5   | −1 |
| 13  | Showing how new evidence changes our understanding of historical events and persons over time | 3   | 5   | 3   | 3  |
| 14  | Illustrating how each time we teach a story we change it based on what evidence we emphasize | 1   | 2   | 0   | −3 |
| 15  | Demonstrating how historical questions are framed by contemporary issues       | 2   | 1   | −2  | 6  |
| 16  | Helping me consider evidence from multiple perspectives and develop a reasoned argument about the past | 5   | 5   | 1   | 5  |
| 17  | Providing opportunities to judge people in history against contemporary standards | −4  | −3  | −4  | −3 |
| 18  | Helping me recognize that much of what I see at historic sites is shaped by professional historians | 0   | 1   | −2  | 4  |
| 19  | Making me less confident that I know the whole story of Jefferson and his time | −4  | −3  | −3  | −4 |
| 20  | Demonstrating that what we don’t know about historical events and persons is as significant as what we do know | 2   | 2   | −1  | −1 |
| 21  | Helping me consider the historical context of people’s motives and actions in the past | 3   | 6   | 1   | 4  |
| 22  | Clarifying that what happened in the past and our interpretation of it are not the same thing | 0   | 3   | −3  | 2  |
| 23  | Giving me the tools to use new technology in the classroom                   | −2  | −2  | 2   | 4  |
| 24  | Helping me develop critiques of “common knowledge” about historical events and persons | 2   | 1   | 0   | −2 |
| 25  | Making it clear that we cannot understand the motivation of people from the past in studying history, and shouldn’t try | −6  | −6  | −5  | −5 |
| 26  | Working with history practitioners helps me develop a more critical eye toward historical evidence | 4   | 3   | 0   | 0  |
| 27  | Helping me question what I think I know about historic events and persons     | 3   | 3   | 0   | 0  |
| 28  | Helping me recognize that an historic site can serve as a microcosm of larger historical realities | 0   | 4   | 2   | 2  |
| 29  | Allowing me to see that the “power of place” is critical for informing the historical narrative | 0   | 6   | 4   | 2  |
| 30  | Making me more comfortable with the lack of clear and finite answers in historical study | −1  | 0   | −3  | −4 |
| 31  | Helping me to integrate diverse perspectives into my curriculum               | 4   | 1   | 1   | 6  |
| 32  | Modeling how to integrate historical content and concepts in ways that draws upon students’ family and community experiences | −1  | −1  | −2  | 1  |
| 33  | Helping me select and develop appropriate strategies for teaching the complexities of history to my students | 4   | 1   | 5   | 2  |
| 34  | Giving me tools to provide my students with multiple perspectives from which to view historical events | 6   | 4   | 5   | 4  |
| 35  | Modeling how to address difficult or controversial topics in the classroom    | 1   | −1  | 0   | 3  |
| 36  | Giving me tools to engage students with diverse cultural backgrounds          | −1  | −1  | −1  | 4  |
| 37  | Seeing new history/social studies teaching techniques modeled                | 0   | 0   | 2   | 3  |
| 38  | Helping me simplify historical content for my students                       | 0   | 0   | −2  | −1 |
| 39  | Helping me design activities that support student learning                   | 3   | 3   | 4   | 5  |
| 40  | Providing strategies for how to create learning experiences that draw upon students’ communities of origin | −2  | −2  | −3  | 0  |
| 41  | Modeling how to frame substantive historical questions for my students        | 1   | 1   | 0   | 1  |
| 42  | Providing opportunities for me to collaborate with and provide feedback to peer-teachers | 4   | −1  | 4   | −2 |
| 43  | Giving me the opportunity to build a network of peers who share my content interests | 5   | −2  | 6   | 0  |
| 44  | Providing opportunities to actively reflect on my teaching practice           | 6   | 2   | 3   | 2  |
| 45  | Encouraging me to consider how my core values are part of how I select topics for and teach my course content | 0   | 0   | −1  | −3 |
| 46  | Giving me the opportunity to build a network of peers and mentors with culturally diverse perspectives | 2   | −2  | 3   | 1  |
| 47  | Strengthening my ability to use technology featured at historic sites (e.g., web pages) in my teaching | −3  | −2  | 4   | 3  |
| 48  | Providing opportunities to receive constructive feedback from peer-teachers    | 1   | −3  | 1   | −2 |
Helping me clarify my own perspective on content and teaching techniques by working with teachers with perspectives different from my own.

Reinforcing my belief that technology offered by historic sites is too difficult to use in the classroom.

Providing opportunities to refine my current teaching techniques.

Helping me develop a caring and supportive network of peers.

Giving me tools to support students with exceptionalities (e.g., physical, language-based, or intellectual disabilities).

Giving me tools to support multi-lingual students (e.g., English language learner [ELL]).

Providing me with refreshing time to spend with peers.

Providing me with a space in which I feel safe to make mistakes and express opinions.

Demonstrating how difficult it is to have discussions with people who disagree with me.

Providing a break from unsupportive peers with whom I usually interact.

Helping me develop goals for improving my content knowledge and teaching.

Recognizing that history is a construction.

Table 3. (continued)

| No. | Q statements | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|-----|---------------|---|---|---|---|
| 49  | Helping me clarify my own perspective on content and teaching techniques by working with teachers with perspectives different from my own | 2 | 0 | 2 | −1 |
| 50  | Reinforcing my belief that technology offered by historic sites is too difficult to use in the classroom | −5 | −5 | −6 | −5 |
| 51  | Providing opportunities to refine my current teaching techniques | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 52  | Helping me develop a caring and supportive network of peers | 2 | −4 | 1 | −2 |
| 53  | Giving me tools to support students with exceptionalities (e.g., physical, language-based, or intellectual disabilities) | −3 | −3 | −4 | 0 |
| 54  | Giving me tools to support multi-lingual students (e.g., English language learner [ELL]) | −4 | −5 | −4 | 2 |
| 55  | Providing me with refreshing time to spend with peers | 3 | −3 | 0 | −2 |
| 56  | Providing me with a space in which I feel safe to make mistakes and express opinions | −1 | −4 | −2 | −3 |
| 57  | Demonstrating how difficult it is to have discussions with people who disagree with me | −5 | −5 | −5 | −5 |
| 58  | Providing a break from unsupportive peers with whom I usually interact | −3 | −4 | −5 | −4 |
| 59  | Helping me develop goals for improving my content knowledge and teaching | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 60  | Recognizing that history is a construction | 1 | 2 | −3 | −1 |

Table 4. Factor 1: Loading Participants

| Other factor pre | Factor 1 pre | Factor 1 post | Factor 1 post-post | Other factor post | Other factor post-post |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Participant 2   | Participant 2 | Participant 5 | Participant 5       | Participant 2    | Participant 6         |
| (Factor 3)      |              |               |                     | (no factor)      |                       |
| Participant 5   | Participant 5 | Participant 5 | Participant 5       | Participant 6    | Participant 6         |
| Participant 6   | Participant 6 | Participant 10| Participant 10      | Participant 6    | Participant 6         |
| Participant 10  | Participant 10| Participant 11| Participant 11      | Participant 6    |                       |
| Participant 11  | Participant 11| Participant 6 | Participant 6       | Participant 6    |                       |
| Participant 12  | Participant 12| Participant 16| Participant 16      | Participant 6    | Participant 6         |
| (Factor 2)      | Participant 12| Participant 16| Participant 16      | Participant 6    |                       |
| Participant 14  | Participant 14| Participant 16| Participant 16      | Participant 6    |                       |
| Participant 16  | Participant 16| Participant 19| Participant 19      | Participant 6    |                       |
| Participant 19  | Participant 19| Participant 25| Participant 25      | Participant 6    |                       |
| Participant 25  | Participant 25| Participant 26| Participant 26      | Participant 6    |                       |
| (Factor 2)      | Participant 26| Participant 26| Participant 26      | Participant 6    |                       |
| Participant 26  | Participant 26| Participant 27| Participant 27      | Participant 6    |                       |
| Participant 27  | Participant 27| Participant 28| Participant 28      | Participant 6    |                       |
| (no factor)     | Participant 27| Participant 28| Participant 28      | Participant 6    |                       |
| Participant 28  | Participant 28| Participant 29| Participant 29      | Participant 6    |                       |
| (Factor 4)      | Participant 29| Participant 29| Participant 29      | Participant 6    |                       |
| Participant 29  | Participant 29| Participant 29| Participant 29      | Participant 6    |                       |
| (Factor 4)      | Participant 29| Participant 29| Participant 29      | Participant 6    |                       |
| Participant 29  | Participant 29| Participant 29| Participant 29      | Participant 6    |                       |
| (Factor 4)      | Participant 29| Participant 29| Participant 29      | Participant 6    |                       |

well as the post-post. Similarly, the distinguishing statements remained constant with one addition (Statement 18) indicating the importance of historians in shaping the site (Table 5). Participants chose as MLM historical content and analysis statements. Participants’ LLM statements were items that identified simplistic conceptualizations of history or working closely with peers.

Participants who loaded on Factor 2 averaged 20 years teaching (range 8-37) were more likely to hold terminal degrees (PhD/EdS), equally likely to be female or male, which skews more male, relative to the rest of the cohort. These participants attended HSBPD to engage with disciplinary experts, sought those experiences on site, and held that view upon return to their classrooms. Participant 6 exemplified this perspective:

The reason I go to these PDs is to work with the experts. To watch and observe how do they observe and interpret evidence. How do they form a historical perspective? [I’m interested in] seeing how they work with the evidence, how all of the different disciplines from archaeology to interpretation to site tours all work together.
Across three administrations, participants loading on Factor 2 held the most sophisticated views of history, as a discipline, its role in classrooms and society, including a sense of history and historic sites as constructions based on changing information, in the statements participants chose as Most Like Them as well as in their rejection of the statements indicating Least Like Them. For example, Participant 23 chose as LLM Statement 25:

\[
\text{making it clear that we cannot understand with certainty the motivation of people from the past in studying history.}
\]

I believe that we can understand in part [historic agents'] motivation and that’s why you study history. You dig deeper into the lives or narratives, and people and incidents will be revealed in some way. Why study dates and facts? People make history. I think we can discover something more about the human condition that will help us understand the current human condition in which we are in.

In contrast to other Factors, participants who loaded on Factor 2 chose statements for their LLM indicating professional goals for collaboration with their peers. Participant 7, who loaded on Factor 2 in the pre and post-post, summed up her position in response to her LLM Statements (Statements 57 and 58):

I frankly don’t care about what a lot of people think. I’m used to having a lot of people disagreeing with me at work. I just go about my day and do what I have to do. I don’t try to get away from people, but I don’t go out of my way to interact, so it doesn’t bother me if they don’t agree with me.

Other participants echoed Participant 7’s sentiment regarding relationships with peers. For them, being at the historic site was an opportunity to connect with the site and experts, not peers. This perspective is consistent with prior research indicating that teachers with predominantly content-oriented focus in PD were less likely to engage in...
reflective or collaborative activities (de Vries, van de Grift, & Jansen, 2014).

**Factor 3: Monticello-Focused/Affective Experience**

Throughout the administrations, there was considerable participant movement between Factor 1 and Factor 3. What ultimately distinguished Factor 3 in the post-post was equal prioritization of being at the historic site and working with peers (Table 6). Participants’ consensus statements drew from the declarative content (e.g., chronology) elements drawn from the social studies standards and the professional disposition standards, indicating they tended toward narrative historical understanding versus deep analysis/disciplinary structures, and emotive empathy versus historical empathy (Bryant & Clark, 2006). Participants who loaded on Factor 3 averaged 15.6 years in the classroom (range 8-24) were 4.1 female: male and skewed slight toward middle school/elementary teaching.

Factor 3 participants offered few explicit links to pedagogy/curriculum or critical appraisals of the site. Participants voiced imaginative and object-linked numen-seeking (Latham, 2013) views of the site. To wit, Participant 20 responding to Statement 29: Power of place as MLM during her post/post-

Statement 29: Power of place as MLM during her post/post-
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2016 U.S. presidential election, concluded weeks prior to the final administration, brought into focus many issues raised by Monticello’s complex racial history. The overriding sensibility of participants loading on Factor 4 was that history was not “finished,” but reinterpreted as new information emerged/events occurred. There was a humility about how little they could know about historical persons/events. Participant 21, loaded on Factor 4 across three administrations, in the reasoning she gave for her choice of her the MLM item (Statement 20) typified this perspective:

The more that I learn, the less I realize I know. The more I learn about history, it just brings up more questions than answers. I think that’s important to know about history: just when you think you’ve got it, you don’t.

Participant 15, who loaded on no other Factor in the previous administrations, loaded on Factor 4 in the post-post. For her, the national conversations surrounding the 2016 election were clarifying experiences. Responding to MLM statements (Statements 35 and 27),

Because of what is going on lately in the news it’s in the forefront of my mind in terms of the origins of slavery and racism. How racism is displayed so much more blatantly, whether it’s police
Baron et al.

or random people being emboldened by whatever is going on in the country. I started to see things a lot differently. So much has happened in the political world and historically, how eventful the last few months have been, it seemed like a lot longer. [Having been at Monticello] gives me a different viewpoint and helps me analyze things better. An old adage keeps coming up, the more I know the more I know I don't know. So it’s more, what have I missed? What don’t I know that can make me understand things a lot better?

Across all the administrations, four of the five institute participants who identified as People of Color (Latina, Hispanic, and Arab) loaded on Factor 4. They comprised more than half of the loading participants in the post-post administration. While the sample is small and the post-election moment was raw, it may point to the prioritization of People of Color to engage in an ongoing reevaluation of the past, as distinct from a greater willingness among White participants to accept prior historical knowledge as settled (e.g., Burgard & Boucher, 2016; Epstein, 1998, 2000; Rosenzweig & Thelen, 1997).

### Discussion

The current study begins to show the range and complexity of outcomes that teachers derive from HSBPD upon return to their classrooms. One of the ways participants repeatedly referred to their time in HSBPD was in relation to other site-based programs that they attended. Participants noted that these programs were an annual part of their PD plans. Greater attention must be paid to the network of historic sites that annually offer HSBPD. To understand the ways in which history practitioners are teaching teachers, we must begin to consider this network of programs as a system and to the cumulative effect that participation has on history teacher teaching and learning.

### Disciplinary Considerations: Place as Context

History educators across a range of perspectives note the essential role understanding historical context—situating persons and events in the full complexities of the time and place in which they lived/occurred—plays in studying history (e.g., Lévesque, 2008; Seixas et al., 2013; Van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008; Wineburg, 1998, 1991). However, teaching context and the context-dependent historical empathy/perspective taking have been notoriously difficult (contextualization: Britt & Aglinskas, 2002; Mosborg, 2002; Nokes, Dole, & Hacker, 2007; Reisman, 2012; historical empathy: Berti, Baldin, & Toneatti, 2009; Brooks, 2009, 2011; Cunningham, 2007, 2009; Endacott, 2010, 2014; Endacott & Brooks, 2013; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015).

Yet this series of studies is beginning to show the centrality of the “Power of Place” and its role in teachers’ deepening understanding of the complexities of the historic persons and the contexts in which they lived. The situatedness in the physical context of the historic site raised consideration of a range of historical contexts (cf. Boerman-Cornell, Kim, & Manderino, 2017; Wineburg, 1998), particularly, the social context in which enslaved and free people lived side-by-side. This aspect of the on-site work remained vivid once back in the classroom and permeated subsequent content presentations. However, as with Factor 3 participants, it did not automatically generate critical appraisals or contextually grounded historical empathy (Bryant & Clark, 2006; Endacott & Brooks, 2013).

Thus far, the literature on historical contextualization and empathy/perspective taking have focused on students’ capabilities (e.g., contextualization: Baron, 2016; Huijgen, van Boxtel, van de Griff, & Holthuis, 2017; Huijgen, van de Griff, van Boxtel, & Holthius, 2018; Van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008; empathy: De Leur, van Boxtel, & Wilschut, 2017; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; Savenije & de Bruijn, 2017).

### Table 7. Factor 4: Loading Participants.

| Other factor pre | Factor 4 pre | Factor 4 post | Factor 4 post-post | Other factor post | Other factor post-post |
|------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Participant 15   | Participant 4 | Participant 13 | Participant 13    | Participant 15  | Participant 4         |
| (no factor)      | Participant 13 | Participant 15 | Participant 15    | Participant 15  | (no factor)           |
| Participant 18   | Participant 18 | Participant 21 | Participant 21    | Participant 27  | Participant 28        |
| Participant 21   | Participant 27 | Participant 13 | Participant 13    | Participant 13  | Participant 29        |
| Participant 28   | Participant 28 | Participant 29 | Participant 29    | Participant 29  | (Factor 1)            |
| Participant 29   | Participant 29 | Participant 29 | Participant 29    | Participant 29  | (Factor 1)            |

![Table 7. Factor 4: Loading Participants.](image-url)
Missing is exploration of teachers conceptualization and enactment of these skills in their own learning and transfer to the classroom. The more complex problem remains in understanding how the embodied experience of Place helps teachers teach the content embedded in it from a distance (i.e., Monticello from their classrooms) and how they navigate their way back to that Place cognitively, conceptually, logistically, to draw out its lesson for themselves and for their students. Given the disciplinary and curricular connections, exploration of teachers’ development and understanding of historical context and empathy offer the clearest pathways to begin to answer this question.

The Question of Perspective

At the intersection of disciplinary content, pedagogy, professional dispositions, and personal experience rests participants’ engagement with and retention of different perspectives as a feature of HSBPDs. Consequently, participants’ conceptualization of those perspectives is layered, but point to a desire to think differently about a range of issues of national, curricular, disciplinary, and personal import.

It is necessary to consider how differently teachers think about either the past or the present after attending HSBPD and what action follows those thoughts. Within the concourse, several items identified different perspectives that participants could prioritize. While the entire cohort of teachers rejected positive framing of the superiority of American culture (Statement 11), “dominant culture,” or “national narrative” (Statement 9), the rankings diverge when considering the more active/interventionist idea of “integrating diverse perspectives” into their curricula (Statement 31) versus the more personal, slightly more passive notion of “considering multiple perspectives” (Statement 16) for themselves and their students (Statement 34). While there was broad appreciation for the consideration of multiperspectivity across all four factors, the greater the need for direct action, the softer the support.

We do not know how these considerations manifested changes in classroom action or curricular orientation. For example, while participants explicitly noted perspective shifts related to slavery or enslaved persons were those shifts sufficient to decenter the Whiteness of their curriculum or did they reify progress narratives in it. Given the cultural authority of historic sites, we must understand the ways they help teacher’s examine their own biases and redraw boundaries within the content they teach (cf. Burgard & Boucher, 2016, 2018; DiAngelo, 2011; Gutiérrez et al., 2017; Kennedy, 2016; Sleeter, 2001, 2016).

Promoting racial literacy goes far beyond the traditional mission of museums as purveyors of content and raises questions about the degree to which historic sites are interested in or prepared to engage in the social justice mission of teacher education (cf. Goodwin & Kosnik, 2013; Swennen, Jones, & Volman, 2011). The teacher education community must interrogate ways they can support historic sites and museum educators in this work.

Limitations and Next Steps

The sample is comprised of very experienced, self-selecting participants. Although this is a typical population for HSBPD, findings may not extend to PD with compulsory attendance. Furthermore, caution is necessary when considering the impact of PD in changing classroom practice. Even with motivated participants who embrace transformation, the obstacles teachers face in changing classroom practice can overwhelm even the most committed practitioner (Cohen, 1990). Furthermore, while Q-methodology offers a rigorous process for studying subjectivity, it relies upon participants’ self-reporting what they deemed important. While this study offers a window into participants’ interactions with historic spaces, it does not objectively address participants’ learning outcomes. Those must be investigated by other means.

Given the challenges of conceptualizing teacher learning at and with historic places, we recommend that researchers interested in this question begin by situating their work to focus on the lesson planning products that teachers produce as part of their HSBPD experiences. Critically, as the question of how teachers use HSBPD materials in classrooms centers on transfer (Baron, 2014; Barnett & Ceci, 2002) the next steps for investigation call upon cognitive works. Positioning research within the problem-solving literature, theorizing lesson planning as a nonrecurring, goal-directed, cognitive effort, in an ill-structured problem space (c.f., Anderson, 1987; Kim, 2012; Pretz, Naples, & Sternberg, 2003; Spector, 2010; Voss, Tyler, & Yengo, 1983), would give shape to questions of teacher learning at historic sites firmly within the professional purpose of their visit and the mental models they construct to manage the transfer of the information they gather on site back to their classrooms. Subsequently, exploring the sociocultural and embodied experiences of teachers, both at the site and again in their classrooms, within those models would then help us understand how the historical content, experiences, and reported perspective shifts are embedded within curricular and pedagogical enactment.

Conclusion

HSBPD offer teachers opportunities to engage as individuals, professionals, and in communities of learners with complex historical and professional resources. At historic sites like Monticello, which challenge visitors to consider difficult histories, where teachers volunteer to engage in discussions about it, there is considerable opportunity to reshape schools, curriculum, teacher education, and museum practice. This study offers an entry point for further examinations of what aspects of HSBPDs remain once teachers return to their classrooms and begin to change their classroom practice.
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Notes

1. We use the terms “museum” and “historic site” interchangeably as the assignation of one or the other often has more to do with individual institutional customs than any meaningful professional or educational delineations. These institutions include, but are not limited to, historic houses, battlefields, cemeteries/burial grounds, and so forth whose primary disciplinary focus are situated within history and the social studies (anthropology, civics, economics, geography, etc.) rather than art or science.

2. Q-method is used more frequently in political science and public health studies than in education, so we acknowledge that readers might require more elaboration about how Q works, the concourse development, validation process, and procedures for implementation. A fuller description of all of these elements is available in the first paper reporting on this project (Baron, Sklarwitz, Bang, & Shatara, 2019) and on the Project Website: www.teacherinsites.org/.

References

Anderson, J. R. (1987). Skill acquisition—Compilation of weak-method problem solutions. Psychological Review, 94(2), 192-210.

Barnett, S., & Ceci, S. (2002). When and where do we apply what we learn? A taxonomy for far transfer. Psychological Bulletin, 128(4), 612-637.

Baron, C. (2012). Understanding historical thinking at historic sites. Journal of Educational Psychology, 104(3), 833-847. doi:10.1037/a0027476

Baron, C. (2014). Structuring historic site-based history laboratories for teacher education. Journal of Museum Education, 39(1), 10-19.

Baron, C. (2016). Using embedded visual coding to support contextualization of historical texts. American Educational Research Journal, 53(3), 516-540. doi:10.3102/0020563415637347

Baron, C., Sklarwitz, S., Bang, H., & Shatara, H. (2019). Understanding what teachers gain from professional development at historic sites. Theory & Research in Social Education, 47, 76-107. doi:10.1080/00933104.2018.1489927

Berti, A. E., Baldin, I., & Toneatti, L. (2009). Empathy in history: Understanding a past institution (ordeal) in children and young adults when description and rationale are provided. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 34(4), 278-288.

Boerman-Cornell, W., Kim, J., & Manderino, M. (2017). Graphic novels in high school and middle school classrooms: A disciplin ary literacies approach. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. Educational Researcher, 33(8), 3-15.

Britt, M. A., & Aglinakis, C. (2002). Improving students’ ability to identify and use source information. Cognition and Instruction, 20, 485-522.

Brooks, S. (2009). Historical empathy in the social studies classroom: A review of the literature. Journal of Social Studies Research, 33(2), 213-234.

Brooks, S. (2011). Historical empathy as perspective recognition and care in one secondary social studies classroom. Theory & Research in Social Education, 39(2), 166-202. doi:10.1080/00933104.2011.10473452

Brown, S. R. (1980). Political subjectivity: Applications of Q-Methodology in political science. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Bryant, D., & Clark, P. (2006). Historical empathy and “Canada: A people’s history. Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne De L’éducation, 29(4), 1039-1063. doi:10.2307/20054210

Burgard, K., & Boucher, M. (2016). Same story; different history: Students’ racialized understanding of historic sites. Urban Review, 48(5), 696-717. doi:10.1007/s11256-016-0374-9

Burgard, K. L., & Boucher, M. L. (2018). The special responsibility of public spaces to dismantle White supremacist historical narratives. In A. M. Labrador & N. A. Silberman (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of public heritage theory and practice (pp. 239-257). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Cameron, C. M., & Gatewood, J. B. (2003). Seeking numinous experiences in the unremembered past. Ethnology, 42(1), 55-71.

Clark, J. M., & Paivio, A. (1991). Dual coding theory and education. Educational Psychology Review, 3(3), 149-210. doi:10.1007/bf01320076

Clarke, D., & Hollingsworth, H. (2002). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. Teaching and Teacher Education, 18(8), 947-967. doi:10.1016/s0742-051x(02)00053-7

Cohen, D. K. (1990). A revolution in one classroom: The case of Mrs. Oublier. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12(3), 311-329. doi:10.3102/01623737012003311

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011). Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue. Washington, DC: Author.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Robinson, R. (1991). Flow: The psychology of optimal experience. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.

DeWitt, J., & Storksdieck, M. (2008). A short review of school field trips: Key findings from the past and implications for the future. Visitor Studies, 11, 181-197.
Levy, S. A. (2017). How students navigate the construction of heritage narratives. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 45*, 157-188. doi:10.1080/00933104.2016.1240636

Mayer, R. (2009). *Multimedia learning* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

McKeown, B. (1990). Q methodology, communication, and the behavioral text. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, 1(1). Retrieved from http://www.cios.org/EJCPUBLIC/001/1/00111.html

McRainey, L. D., & Moisan, H. (2009). Artifacts as inspiration: Building connections between museum educators and classroom teachers. In R. Ragland & K. Woestman (Eds.), *The teaching American history project: Lessons for history educators and historians* (pp. 240-264). New York, NY: Routledge.

Mosborg, S. (2002). Speaking of history: How adolescents use their knowledge of history in reading the daily news. *Cognition and Instruction, 20*(3), 233-358.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). *Professional standards accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/~media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/ncate-standards-2008.pdf?la=en

National Council for the Social Studies. (2013). *The College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for social studies state standards: Guidance for enhancing the rigor of K-12 civics, economics, geography, and history*. Silver Spring, MD: Author.

National Research Council. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

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*(3), 492-504.

O’Leary, K., Wobbrock, J. O., & Riskin, E. A. (2013, April 27-May 2). *Q-methodology as a research and design tool for HCI*. Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI ’13), Paris, France.

Opfer, V. D., & Pedder, D. (2011). Conceptualizing teacher professional learning. *Review of Educational Research, 81*(3), 376-407. doi:10.3102/0034654311413609

Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*(4), 921-958.

Pretz, J. E., Naples, A. J., & Sternberg, R. J. (2003). Recognizing, defining, and representing problems. In J. E. Davidson & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of problem solving* (pp. 3-30). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Price, S., Jewitt, C., & Sakr, M. (2016). Embodied experiences of place: A study of history learning with mobile technologies. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 32*(4), 345-359. doi:10.1111/jcal.12137

Reich, G. A., Buffington, M., & Muth, W. R. (2015). (Dis) union at 150: Collective memories of secession. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 43*(4), 499-527. doi:10.1080/00933104.2015.1100151

Reisman, A. (2012). Reading like a historian: A document-based history curriculum intervention in urban high schools. *Cognition and Instruction, 30*(1), 86-112. doi:10.1080/07370082.2011.634081

Rosenberg, E. (2007). The geography of memory: Walking as remembrance. *The Hedgehog Review, 9*(2), 54-67.

Rosenzweig, R., & Thelen, D. (1997). *The presence of the past: Popular uses of history in everyday life*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Sather-Wagstaff, J. (2011). *Heritage that hurts: Tourists in the memoryscapes of September 11* (1st ed.). Walnut Creek, CA: Routledge.

Savenije, G. M., & de Brujin, P. (2017). Historical empathy in a museum: Unitlng contextualisation and emotional engagement. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 23*(9), 832-845.

Schmolck, P. (2014). PQMethod 2.33. Retrieved from http://schmolck.userweb.mwn.de/qmethod/downloadwin.htm

Schwartz, B. (1991). Iconography and collective memory: Lincoln’s image in the American mind. *The Sociological Quarterly, 32*, 301-319. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.1991.tb00161.x

Seixas, P., Morton, T., Colyer, J., & Fornazzari, S. (2013). *The big six: Historical thinking concepts*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Nelson Education.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 1-22.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 94-106. doi:10.1177/0022487101052002002

Sleeter, C. E. (2016). Critical race theory and the whiteness of teacher education. *Urban Education, 52*(2), 155-169. doi:10.1177/0042085916668957

Spector, J. M. (2010). Mental representations and their analysis: An epistemological perspective. In D. Ifenthaler, P. Pirny-Dummer, & N. M. Seel (Eds.), *Computer-based diagnostics and systematic analysis of knowledge* (pp. 17-40). New York, NY: Springer.

Swennen, A., Jones, K., & Volman, M. (2011). Teacher educators: Their identities, sub-identities and implications for professional development. In T. Bates, A. Swennen, & K. Jones (Eds.), *The professional development of teacher educators* (pp. 138-155). London, England: Routledge.

UNESCO. (2018). *World heritage properties: Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville*. Retrieved from http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/126677

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *State of racial diversity in the educator workforce*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/highered/racial-diversity/state-racial-diversity-workforce.pdf

Van Bokxel, C., Klein, S., & Snoep, E. (2011). *Heritage education: Challenges in dealing with the past*. Available from www.erfgoednederland.nl

Van Drie, J., & Van Bokxel, C. (2008). Historical reasoning: Towards a framework for analyzing students’ reasoning about the past. *Educational Psychology Review, 20*(2), 87-110.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2005). *Introducing social semiotics*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Vermunt, J. D., & Endedijk, M. D. (2011). Patterns in teacher learning in different phases of the professional career. *Learning and Individual Differences, 21*(3), 294-302. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2010.11.019

Voss, J., Tyler, S., & Yengo, L. (1983). Individual differences in the solving of social science problems. In R. F. Dillon & R. R. Schmeeck (Eds.), *Individual differences in cognition* (pp. 205-232). New York, NY: Academic Press.
Wineburg, S. (1998). Reading Abraham Lincoln: An expert/expert study in the interpretation of historical texts. *Cognitive Science, 22*(3): 319-346.

Wineburg, S. 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.

Zeichner, K. (2005). A research agenda for teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.

Zellermayer, M., & Margolin, I. (2005). Teacher educators’ professional learning described through the lens of complexity theory. *Teachers College Record, 107*(6), 1275-1304.

**Author Biographies**

**Christine Baron** is an assistant professor of social studies and education at Teachers College, Columbia University.

**Sherri Sklarwitz** is the associate director of student programs at Jonathan M. Tisch College of Civic Life, Tufts University.

**Hyeyoung Bang** is an associate professor in the School of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Policy at Bowling Green State University.

**Hanadi Shatara** is a lecturer at the University of Wisconsin–La Crosse.