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The preparation of future teachers of young children should incorporate attention to the developmental markers at the heart of developmentally appropriate practice and ground early childhood subject matter learning in disciplinary perspectives, engagement, and thinking essential for later disciplinary learning. With this focus in mind, I described an instructional sequence designed to engage teacher candidates in historical reasoning tasks where they considered the conceptual resources they used to support their own historical reasoning as a point of entry for considering the conceptual resources young children have at their disposal. I presumed that such a comparison would allow candidates to develop the kind of content knowledge for teaching, enabling them to best leverage children’s historical reasoning as a means of deepening children’s historical knowledge and understanding. The analysis indicated that candidates began to construct initial developmental trajectories of children’s historical reasoning and raised pedagogical questions suggesting they began to envision themselves as teachers of historical inquiry.
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As generalists, teachers of young children may not be versed in the modes of disciplinary thinking and inquiry essential for designing intellectually challenging, yet developmentally appropriate learning experiences. Such experiences are the foundation upon which later disciplinary learning and understanding is built. In this manuscript, I consider the alignment between principles of developmentally appropriate practice and frameworks of early childhood social studies curriculum. My perspective is filtered through the lens of supporting children’s development of disciplinary thinking. The preparation of early childhood educators should simultaneously address the developmental markers at the heart of developmentally appropriate practice (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009) and ground early childhood subject matter learning in disciplinary perspectives, engagement, and thinking essential for later disciplinary learning (National Council for the Social Studies [NCSS], 2013).

Following this contextual framing, I describe an instructional sequence that includes a pre-assessment followed by instructional tasks focused on concepts of time, historical noticing, chronology, and the simultaneity of history. This sequence also includes a summative analysis and discussion. Each instructional component was designed to lead teacher candidates into a deeper consideration of conceptual resources and barriers influencing their own historical reasoning. I presumed this process would help candidates better understand the work those resources and tools do, thus providing an insight that would serve as an important first step in identifying the tools available to children.

The core principles of developmentally appropriate practice include sensitivity to children’s age-related learning resources and challenges, responsiveness to individual children’s
growth, and knowledge of cultural means and affordances (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009). Teachers of young children should know teaching and learning must be based on the behavior, skills, and thinking typical of learners across the early childhood years. Additionally, early childhood educators must be attuned to the unique interests, abilities, and developmental progress of the children in their classroom. Finally, they seek to understand what is culturally important to the children and families in their care and the communities where they live.

Prospective teachers must build connections among the principles of developmentally appropriate practice a developmental understanding of the subject matter content. A specialized view of subject matter is required to inform instructional decisions and related pedagogical practices supporting early learning. This complex set of ideas is sometimes referred to as content knowledge for teaching (Ball, Thames, & Phelps, 2008). Content knowledge for teaching is useful for and usable in the work teachers do as they design and implement instruction for student learning (Stylianides & Ball, 2008). It requires both knowledge about and knowledge of the content, as well as an understanding of how knowledge in the field is generated and modified. It requires deep understanding of the typical conceptions and misconceptions that children bring with them to the classroom or develop as they learn within a subject (Ball & Forzani, 2010).

**Frameworks Informing Early Childhood Social Studies**

The expanding communities framework has dominated elementary social studies since its introduction over 80 years ago, framing content in a series of ever widening spheres starting with the self (Kindergarten) and expanding to families (Grade 1), neighborhoods (Grade 2), communities (Grade 3), and so on. This developmental model is grounding in familiar contexts for children. A critique offered by Bruce Frazee & Samuel Ayers suggests, this model lacks substantial content, especially in the early elementary grades… [The model] impedes content knowledge because of its trivial and repetitious sequence… but more damagingly [the model does] not even begin to lay the groundwork for later study of history (2003, pp. 112)

A more viable starting point for organizing early childhood social studies curricula has emerged that emphasizes cultural universals, basic human needs, and social experiences found in all societies, both present and past (Alleman & Brophy, 2001; Brophy & Alleman, 2003). Like the expanding communities framework, a cultural universals approach is related to young children’s daily lives. The cultural universals approach explicitly builds upon children’s first-hand experience by comparing aspects of their daily lives with those of others across place and time (National Center for History in the Schools, 1996).

A cultural universals approach engages students in comparing and contrasting across time and place. The focus of these comparisons can be aspects of children’s everyday life and can emphasize their first-hand knowledge and experiences (e.g., with toys, family structure, homes, food, etc.). The approach has potential for engaging students in disciplinary reasoning, but is not guaranteed to succeed. Building on young learners everyday experiences is a plus, but it is essential that the curriculum proactively establish the groundwork for the shift to disciplinary study in the upper elementary years. We, otherwise, miss the opportunity to build a coherent trajectory of powerful Pre-Kindergarten-12 social studies. The cultural universals approach affords a ready foundation for building toward an emphasis in historical inquiry, a focus that becomes increasingly important in later schooling.

**Disciplinary Practices Fostering Historical Thinking**
Effective social studies teaching engages learners in authentic historical inquiry (National Center for History in the Schools, 1996; NCSS, 2013). Historical thinking skills aligning with a cultural universals approach include the development of chronological thinking, historical comprehension, and historical argumentation. Young children engage in chronological thinking as they distinguish between past and present, create picture time lines of their own life experiences, or consider examples of continuity and change across a variety of contexts (National Center for History in the Schools). Children begin building historical comprehension as they are exposed to a variety of historical narratives and consider the historical context as they retell the story conveyed in the narrative. These youth engage in historical argumentation as they compare and contrast different information presented in historical stories about the same historical events or people (National Center for History in the Schools).

If we expect teachers to engage children in the disciplinary practices involved in doing history, it is imperative for teachers to have parallel opportunities to engage in the doing of history and to enhance their content knowledge and facilitate pedagogical skill development. Teachers need to recognize how children are likely to reason historically. This includes an awareness of the most powerful disciplinary tools for children, knowledge of which subject matter concepts and big ideas are challenging for young learners, and which reasoning tools children are likely to use when they are engaged in historical reasoning tasks. Teachers need to know how best to leverage students’ reasoning to support further historical inquiry and how to deepen children’s historical knowledge and understanding in developmentally appropriate ways.

Preparing Teachers for Developmentally Appropriate Disciplinary Rich Social Studies

The instructional sequence described below was designed to engage prospective early childhood teachers in historical reasoning tasks to: 1) deepen their understanding of the nature of historical inquiry and 2) apply their personal understanding of historical inquiry as they envisioned themselves as teachers of historical inquiry. The instructional sequence began with a four-question pre-assessment. Candidates’ responses were discussed throughout the instructional sequence. I drew upon insights from the pre-assessment to refine the instructional sequence and incorporated data from the pre-assessment as I elaborated on specific instructional tasks.

Concepts of Time

In the first class session (80 minutes) following the pre-assessment, candidates considered their responses to two prompts from the pre-assessment: 1) list 5 things that happened a long time ago, and 2) list as many time words (units or markers of time) as you can think. We considered the informal idea of a long time ago. I recorded candidates’ closest to now events on the whiteboard. Examples ranged from, “My grandparents were married” to “Columbus discovered America.” The process was repeated for the events farthest from now, being recorded on the other side of the whiteboard. The second list included events like, “The dinosaurs became extinct” and “The writing of the Declaration of Independence.” If needed, I called on specific students to ensure that at least one item on the closest to now list (e.g., Columbus discovered America) happened prior to at least one item on the farthest from now list (e.g., the writing of the Declaration of Independence). Candidates compared the two lists, shared observations, discovered that from the class perspective a long time ago ranged from 55 years ago to 65 million years ago, and concluded that a long time ago is not a useful way to talk about time. Some candidates considered how frequently they use the phrase a long time ago in their everyday talk, prompting others to note that young children often refer to events happening in a
previous week or the prior day as a long time ago. This conversation provided a foundation for constructing a more precise and useful way for talking about time.

We next considered the list of time words generated during the pre-assessment. Working in groups, candidates reviewed their lists and sorted terms into categories. Every group included a clock time category (e.g., seconds, minutes, hours); a calendar time category (e.g., day, week, month, year, yesterday, today, tomorrow); and an historical time category with terms like decade, century, and millennium. Some groups placed remaining time words in a single category, whereas others sorted them into categories like topics studied in history (e.g., the Great Depression, the Colonial Era, the Victorian Period), or an unnamed group with terms like era, eon, and epoch.

After grouping time-related words, candidates considered the characteristics of different units of time. General ideas about absolute and relative time emerged from this discussion, allowing me to define more formally these terms. We agreed that absolute time represented units of time for which the duration is defined (e.g., there are 60 seconds in a minute, there are 7 days in a week) and that relative time was often defined by the context (e.g., yesterday only makes sense in relation to today). Candidates noted preschoolers and kindergarteners typically begin each morning with a classroom discussion of the calendar and wondered, “Is calendar time really a part of social studies?” and “How does reviewing the calendar every morning help children understand time?”

Candidates were then asked to consider one of three short dialogs between a child and an adult. The verbatim dialogs (Figure 1) provided an opportunity for candidates to consider what the child’s concept of time might be. The candidates divided into pairs and were assigned specific dialogs to discuss. Each pair read their dialogs aloud and shared their insights with the class. Those assigned the same dialog built on the insights or presented an alternative. After discussing the dialogs, candidates developed generalizations regarding children’s concepts of time.

The candidates noted that although children may be familiar with units of time (e.g., that today, tomorrow, and yesterday refer to the unit of day and that a year is made up of many days), these young children had difficulty shifting their thinking about time from one unit to another, as Ashley did in the first dialog. Candidates also recognized children did not have a strong internal sense of duration or passage of time, as illustrated by Jacob in the third dialog. They further recognized the everyday use of time language may have interfered with children’s internalization of concepts of time (e.g., we use phrases like in a minute to mean soon and not literally 60 seconds; we use a long time ago in variable ways). They organized these generalizations into a hypothetical developmental trajectory of children’s concepts of time that could be used later to engage children in historical thinking. As a result of this work, candidates came to understand that naming and defining units of time are easier then sensing the duration of time. They understood that a child’s use of time-related words did not guarantee that child understands the concept of duration.
Figure 1, Dialogs between Children and Adults regarding Time analyzed by Teacher Candidates. **Historical Noticing and Chronological Reasoning**

Candidates subsequently engaged in tasks designed to make visible the historical reasoning strategies they use when their own ability to draw on prior knowledge is limited. The purpose was to help candidates imagine how young children, whose general knowledge of time events is much weaker, reason during challenging tasks.

We began with a set of 16 black and white photographs deliberately chosen to invite inferences about content, time, and place. The set includes subsets of photos that share common elements (e.g., people, cars, other technologies from different time periods) thus encouraging comparisons across photos. Some photos contained incongruous information (e.g., a 1960s

---

**Dialog 1: Conversation occurred on Ashley’s 4th Birthday**

Adult: Happy Birthday, Ashley! How old are you today?
Ashley: Four
Adult: Wow! How old were you yesterday?
Ashley: Just three
Adult: So yesterday you were three (Ashley nods her head yes), and today you are four (Ashley continues nodding yes), does this mean that tomorrow you will be five?
Ashley: No (noticeable pause) it will take twenty and twenty and twenty and more twenties days before I am five.

**Dialog 2: Conversation between a mother and her 5-year old son on a Saturday morning**

Mother: Matthew, do you want to clean your bedroom today or tomorrow?
Matthew: Tomorrow
Mother: Okay
Matthew: (softly chuckles)
Mother: What's so funny?
Matthew: It’s funny that tomorrow it will be today and not tomorrow, so tomorrow will never come.

**Dialog 3: Conversation between a father and his 6-year old son**

Jacob: Dad, will you help me build my Lego?
Father: Sure, just a minute
Jacob: (Waits for a bit of time) Never mind, I'll go ask Mom.
Father: No, I'll help you with your Lego, just give me a minute to finish what I'm doing.
Jacob: But your minutes are really, really long.
photo of three men standing in front of a museum exhibit of a carriage from a much earlier time period).

Each candidate examined 5-6 photographs from the larger set and addressed the following questions: What do you see in or notice about the photo? What do you wonder about the photo? and, What knowledge or prior experiences are you drawing on to make sense of the photo? Each photo was printed on the top of an 8.5” x 11” sheet of paper and candidates were asked to respond to these questions directly below the photograph. Candidates then worked with others who examined the same set of photos sharing insights, questions, and conjectures about each photo. While not explicitly asked to date the photos, candidates’ often referred to time (e.g., this looks just like my grandma’s kitchen; this reminds me of The Brady Bunch). As they talked to their peers, candidates recognized they did not notice the same things and that their inferences and conclusions about each photo differed. Candidates also recognized that explanations based on prior experiences seemed more compelling than others. To solidify these insights, I asked each group to share with the class the photo from their set that generated the most varied perspectives. The resulting discussion highlighted individual group perceptions (e.g., surprise at the varying perspectives of group members, an articulation of connections found to be most compelling), consolidating these ideas as insights that can be leveraged in future learning.

In preparation for the next class, candidates re-examined the same 5-6 photos and addressed these questions: When do you think this photo was taken? What ideas from your notes or your peers were most influential in your determination? What, if any information did you discount? In class, candidates worked in groups that collectively examined and discussed all 16 photos. Making use of their notes, candidates placed the 16 photos in order, based on the dates assigned by group members. Determining a chronological sequence was not always straightforward, because some photos were assigned a specific date (e.g., 1935) whereas others were identified with a general time period (e.g., the Roaring 20s). As candidates constructed their sequence there was often debate about when particular events happened, especially when broad time markers were used to date a photo and when candidates did not agree when the event actually happened (e.g., World War I). When they used decade markers (e.g., the 60s) candidates tended to draw more heavily on what they knew about social changes and characteristics of the time period (e.g. hippies, free love, Woodstock), rather than events that occurred within the actual years between 1960-1969.

After placing the photos in sequence, groups evaluated whether their sequence looked right. Within each group, there was typically much discussion about the sequence of photos that led each group to re-sequence one or more photos. As groups finished with this review and adjustment, candidates wrote the final agreed-upon date on each photo. In the closing discussion, we reviewed how and why candidates dated the photos as they did. Nearly all candidates admitted that one of the first things they thought about each photo was the time period it depicted. Whether candidates described using a range of time (the ‘30s, WWI) or dating each photo with a specific year, the majority acknowledged they were not confident about the accuracy of the dates assigned to each photo. Candidates considered how they determined if the original sequence looked right. Candidates described several strategies: making familial or pop cultural connections (e.g., comparisons to a grandparent’s house or movies they associated with a particular time); assigning a labels to photos (e.g., This looks like it might be from the
Historical Contemporaries and the Simultaneity of History

The next task challenged candidates to consider a particular time across places and through different lenses. In preparation for class, candidates were given four sets of photos, with each set containing 5 images. Candidates were asked to identify which image was NOT a contemporary of the other four in the set and to construct an evidence-based argument supporting their claim. One set focused on architecture and included images of the Leaning Tower of Pisa, Cliff Dwellings of the Ancestral Pueblos of Mesa Verde, Chartes Cathedral, the Taj Mahal, and Stirling Castle. Candidates were asked to identify the building not initially constructed during the same time period as the others. Because the images were not labeled, candidates had to inspect the buildings themselves. The other sets of images focused on artists, world leaders from the late 18th century, and world leaders from the mid-20th century (see Appendix A for a list of the images used).

The discussion elicited candidates’ prior knowledge of artists, architecture, and world leaders. We discussed the set(s) of images candidates found the most challenging or the easiest and their confidence in their claims. Interesting insights emerged as candidates considered what they found useful in their background knowledge, what they considered challenging, and what affected the confidence in their claims. Most candidates believed it would be easiest to identify the outlier among the world leaders because their prior history coursework focused on political history, i.e., the names, policies, and accomplishments of world leaders. They found it difficult to connect their prior knowledge to the images. While many candidates expressed confidence about their claims regarding the world leaders, they acknowledged their confidence stemmed not from prior knowledge about world leaders, but rather from their analysis of the quality of the photographic images. Even when candidates could name a building, artist, or world leader, they admitted their knowledge often went little deeper than naming. Most candidates, for example, identified the Mona Lisa, but fewer could name the artist, and fewer still could place the artist within a particular time-period. These details would have helped candidates’ identify the Mona Lisa as the outlier among the artists.

We discussed each set of images in turn. Two candidates who disagreed about the outlier in a group were asked to present their arguments, providing evidence that made their reasoning explicit. Others reacted to the arguments presented, adding evidence to support or refute the claim as they shared their background knowledge. Not everyone agreed that the knowledge shared was accurate, and indeed, it was not. After the arguments were presented, I labeled the images by naming the building, artist, and world leader, providing just enough information to spur additional questions: Where was Prussia and when did it exist? What was the Mogul Empire? When did Leonardo da Vinci live? Using their smartphones, candidates sought answers to these questions and within minutes, correctly identified the outliers.

Candidates explained why it was difficult for them to identify the outlier. Many discussed their lack of background knowledge. They noted that, in many cases, it was not a lack of relevant knowledge, but that it was difficult to connect the knowledge they had to the inferences they generated. Candidates characterized their background knowledge as static and inert. They either knew something or they did not, making it difficult to use the knowledge they had to fruitfully reason about the images and the tasks.
Another key insight was the role that perceived progress over time played in candidates’ historical reasoning. For example, when candidates had limited background knowledge to draw upon, they paid special attention to cues they associated with evidence of progress (e.g., Cliff Dwellings of the Ancestral Puebloans of Mesa Verde look more primitive than the other buildings in the set). Realizing that this reliance led to faulty claims in the historical contemporaries’ task, candidates wondered if their over-reliance on this strategy in previous tasks might also have led to errors.

Candidates’ Construct Content Knowledge for Teaching

The final activity required candidates’ to write a summative report of their experiences across tasks in the instructional sequence. Doing so required candidates to synthesize experiences, ideas, and insight across several tasks and was intended to help candidates rethink these concepts of time and historical reasoning to solidify their content knowledge for teaching. Before composing their analyses, candidates read about the historical reasoning tools children naturally use (Barton, 2002) and compared and contrasted Barton’s findings with the candidates’ own first-hand experiences engaging in historical reasoning. Candidates listed the reasoning tools they used and considered their lists in relation to children’s use of the same strategies. This comparison allowed candidates to elaborate on the benefits and limitations of the tools. Because the historical reasoning tools used by teacher candidates were highly consistent with the historical reasoning tools Barton found children use when engaged in similar tasks, the article helped facilitate candidates’ analyses. The final in-class activity of the instructional sequence provided an opportunity for candidates to share the insights and connections they elaborated upon in their written report with each other. The discussion below draws both from the in-class discussion and the written analyses.

Candidates drew widely on their knowledge of objects, people, events, and factual information. Like the children in Barton’s (2002) study, teacher candidates noticed they identified some photos by labeling a certain periods of time (e.g., the Victorian Era) or by noticing features of clothing or other elements of daily life depicted in the photographs. Candidates found their ability to draw on their prior knowledge to be tenuous. As one stated, “I find that my factual knowledge is extremely limited and is not always a tool I can depend on. Sometimes what I think I know leads me astray.” Another candidate recognized she, like many children in Barton’s (2002) study, drew on knowledge gained outside of school: “I called more heavily upon my knowledge learned independently, which says something about the value of the information I gathered in and remember from school.” Candidates felt it was not primarily their lack of knowledge that inhibited their reasoning, but rather, they were unable to connect relevant pieces of information. As one explained:

In the historical contemporaries activity I generally knew about one of the images in the set, but this was not enough for me to reasonably identify the outlier, because I was unsure if the picture I had knowledge about related to any of the others or not. Candidates concluded that drawing on prior knowledge of objects, people, and events is powerful when one is able to connect elements of knowledge and when one is aware of the source of knowledge and able to judge whether the source might be misleading. One candidate explained, “One photo reminded me of That 70’s Show, but in doing so, I assumed that the time period depicted in the show is accurate.” When they were asked to place events in sequence, candidates made a connection back to the third question on the pre-assessment. Most of them easily connected the Boston Tea Party and the Signing of the Constitution to the Revolutionary
Period. They failed to see connections between other items. Candidates explained that now knowing Jesse Owens’ gold medals were awarded in Berlin in 1936 with Hitler in the stadium watching the ceremony made it easier to connect this event to WWII and the eventual bombing of Pearl Harbor. Candidates noted that the connection helped them place the events in relation to one another in time. Insights like these generated pedagogical questions like, “How does one construct learning activities to facilitate connections not just between units taught in school, but also connections between children’s experiences outside of school?” Questions like this suggest that candidates were beginning to imagine themselves as teachers of historical inquiry.

Like children, teacher candidates drew widely on their own direct experiences and the lived experiences of their parents and grandparents (Barton, 2002). Candidates noted that they have access to a much greater time span of experience than would young children. They also hypothesized that they were more likely than children to integrate the lived experiences of their peers into their own experience. Candidates agreed this tool would be useful in their future teaching. One wrote:

Although direct experience as a tool is limited to experiences and moments in the very recent past, it can be highly useful and perhaps less error-prone than some of the other reasoning tools and allows us to ground learning in children’s experience, something we know is important.

Candidates relied on examples of progress and development more than any other reasoning tool, but admitted this reliance might be troublesome. Candidates found it natural to compare cars or clothing from one photo to the next and to note changing styles. They readily characterized older items as being simpler, more primitive, or old-fashioned and newer items as being sleek, modern, or more complex. Characterizations can lead to accurate conclusions, but candidates recognized that this strategy often led them astray in the historical contemporaries’ task. In addition, candidates realized that new technologies are not simultaneously or universally adopted. One candidate said, “Just because farm machinery had been invented doesn’t mean that farmers didn’t still use horse-drawn plows.” Another noted the importance of place. Concerning a photo of London, England, she wrote:

Even though I thought this photo was depicting the Industrial Revolution, I didn’t consider the Industrial Revolution happened at different times in different places. I needed to know the chronology of industrial development and consider where the photo may have been taken to situate this accurately in time.

Another candidate generalized, “Some places develop faster than others, and progress does not always occur in a linear fashion.” Finally, one considered these insights in relation to the world children are growing up in today,

Imagine how much harder it will be for the children we will teach, who are growing up in the digital age, to imagine how progress moved much slower in the past relative to the speed at which it happens now.

This is an important insight; candidates anticipated that children’s direct experience with the pace and scope of progress, especially technological advancement, may make it difficult to challenge children’s expectations that progress tends to be linear and simultaneous.

Unlike children, candidates did not make extensive use of the strategies of anchoring and adjustment (Barton, 2002). That is, children often dated the most recent photo (fairly accurately) then assigned a standard unit of time (perhaps a decade or 20 years) as they counted back from one photo to the next. Candidates proposed their more robust concept of time explained their
limited use of this strategy. They believed their own deeper knowledge of both time and history were assets allowing them to recognize that the anchoring and adjusting strategy often produced mismatches between photos and proposed dates. Although candidates did not use this strategy to date photos, some described anchoring their thinking and reasoning around the images they could date with confidence. With the photo-sequencing task, for example, candidates identified and dated several iconic photos with confidence and used these to make decisions about the other photos. In contrast, Barton (2002) suggested children anchored only the most recent photo.

Referencing the third and fourth questions from the pre-assessment, candidates mentioned their inability to consider the relationship between events across time (e.g., John F. Kennedy’s assertion that Americans would land men on the moon within 10 years and his assassination, which prevented him from seeing that claim become a reality) or to situate separate events in the same time (e.g., the U.S. Civil War and the construction of the Transcontinental Railroad) as elements that hindered and limited their historical reasoning. Candidates wondered how teachers could intentionally anchor instruction to help children build robust connections, and whether such connections would ultimately be useful for children as they reasoned historically.

Conclusion

This intentionally designed instructional sequence placed teacher candidates in situations where they needed to reason historically. It required candidates to critically scrutinize their background knowledge and prior experiences and enabled them to consider the influence of background knowledge and experience on their ability to reason historically. The intentional design helped the candidates build connections between their historical reasoning and that of young children. Novice teachers recognized similarities and differences, strengths and limitations, and the disciplinary integrity of the strategies they and children used. These connections led candidates to raise a variety of pedagogical questions that demonstrated that they have begun to view themselves as teachers of historical inquiry.

It is promising that these early childhood teacher candidates began to raise pedagogical questions as they considered their own reasoning strategies in relation to those observed in children. Building candidates’ content knowledge for teaching is a critical first step to effective, developmentally appropriate instruction. Yet, teacher educators cannot simply assume that novices can easily translate or apply their content knowledge for teaching into instructional practice. Although this work has shown that engaging teacher candidates in historical reasoning contributed to the development of their content knowledge for teaching, the scope of this work did not yet enter the realm of practice. New questions can be raised including Given a solid foundation upon which to build, what influence do insights regarding historical reasoning, disciplinary practice, and children’s thinking have on future early childhood teachers’ planning for and teaching of social studies? Do we see evidence in candidates’ planning that they intend to engage children in historical reasoning tasks, disciplinary practices, or elicit children’s thinking as a starting point for instruction? If candidates do develop intentions like these, what pedagogical supports need to be in place if they are to put these intentions into effective practice? Where in the shift from intention to enactment do novices encounter problems, and how do they respond in the face of these challenges? How would addressing questions like these better inform us in the task of preparing future early childhood teachers?
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Appendix A

Images Used for the Historical Contemporaries Task

Note. The information provided following the candidates sharing of their claims and evidence regarding the outliers is added in parentheses following the image.

The Architecture Set included images of the following buildings (the only additional information provided to the candidates was the name itself): The Leaning Tower of Pisa, the Cliff Dwellings of the Ancestral Puebloans of Mesa Verde, Chartes Cathedral, the Taj Mahal, and Stirling Castle.

The Artist Set included images of the following paintings: “Vase with 12 sunflowers” (Vincent Van Gogh), “Girl before a mirror” (Pablo Picasso), “Mona Lisa” (Leonardo da Vinci), “Girl with a watering can” (August Renoir), and “La Promenade” (Claude Monet).

The Late 18th Century World Leaders set included portraits of the following: Emperor Qianlong (Emperor Qianlong of China ruled when the Manchu Empire reached its greatest extent), President George Washington (George Washington was the First President of the United States), Frederick the Great II (Frederick the Great II was the King of Prussia when Prussia was one of the most powerful states in Europe), Shah Jahan (Shah Jahan was the leader of the Mogul Empire and built the Taj Mahal as a memorial for his wife), King George III (King George III was the King of England during the time of the greatest expanse of the British Empire).

The Mid-20th Century World Leaders set included photographs of the following: Sun Yat-Sen (The father of Modern China), Winston Churchill (Prime Minister of Great Britain); Franklin D. Roosevelt (President of the United States), Hideki Tojo (Prime Minister of Japan), and Benito Mussolini (Prime Minister of Italy).
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