2016-07-01

# What is Being Said about Historical Literacy in Literacy and Social Studies Journals: A Content Analysis

Kiera Beddes
*Brigham Young University*

# What Is Being Said About Historical Literacy in Literacy and Social Studies Journals: A Content Analysis

Kiera Beddes

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Roni Jo Draper, Chair
Jennifer J. Wimmer
Jeffery D. Nokes

Department of Teacher Education

Brigham Young University

July 2016

ABSTRACT

What Is Being Said About Historical Literacy in
Literacy and Social Studies Journals:
A Content Analysis

Kiera Beddes
Department of Teacher Education, BYU
Master of Arts

The Common Core State Standards and the National Council for the Social Studies Career, College and Civic Life (C3 Framework) Standards have recently prompted renewed emphasis on literacy, particularly in history; therefore it is important to analyze and compare what exactly the teacher educators of leading journals are saying about historical literacy. This study examines the literacy messages for the history classroom in *The Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy (JAAL)* and *Theory and Research in Social Education (TRSE)* from 2010-2015. An emergent, qualitative content analysis was used to analyze data from these journals. Results from this study indicate definitions on historical literacy vary between journals, with more articles concerning historical literacy were found in *TRSE* than *JAAL.* Both journals focused on elements of historical literacy over the whole concept. Both journals overlooked historical writing in favor of other elements of historical literacy. Historical literacy is addressed differently for distinctive intended participants. Implications from this study concerning teacher educators and history teachers are examined and possibilities for further research are also discussed.

Keywords: historical literacy, content analysis, C3 Framework, Common Core State Standards, Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Theory and Research in Social Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Roni Jo Draper, of the McKay School of Education at Brigham Young University. I am profoundly grateful for the opportunity to work with her, as her work in content-area literacy was one of the primary reasons I pursued this degree in the first place. I'm not only grateful for her expertise in this process, but also her example personally and professionally. I honestly want to be her when I grow up.

I would also like to express so much gratitude to my committee, Dr. Jenni Wimmer and Dr. Jeff Nokes. Without their expertise, perspective and advice, I would have been utterly lost. Thanks as well, to Dr. Nokes for taking a chance on a poor college sophomore in my undergrad to be your TA and allowing me to learn about history teaching and historical literacies from an expert. That experience has guided much of the research in this thesis.

Many thanks must go to the other faculty at the McKay School that served a part of my priceless education and to BYU Graduate Studies as well as the McKay School for the very generous support in terms of scholarships. I will always be grateful.

I am also grateful to my coworkers, faculty, administration and students for their patience with me while I was teacher and student simultaneously. Lastly, many thanks to my family and friends who continued to support me, even when I had to ignore them for weeks on end.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ..... ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... iv

LIST OF TABLES ..... vii

Chapter 1: Introduction ..... 1

Statement of Problem ..... 2

Research Question ..... 4

Statement of the Purpose ..... 4

Rationale ..... 5

Chapter 2: Literature Review ..... 7

Content-Area Literacy ..... 8

Disciplinary Literacy ..... 10

Historical Literacy ..... 13

Theoretical Framework ..... 15

CCSS and NCSS on Literacy ..... 17

Content Analysis ..... 20

Chapter 3: Method ..... 23

The Researcher ..... 23

Content Analysis ..... 24

Data Sources ..... 25

Data Collection and Analysis ..... 27
Step 1: Collecting the articles. ..... 27
Step 2: Using theoretical framework to isolate historical literacy articles. ..... 28
Step 3: Uncovering general themes. ..... 30
Step 4: Collecting literacy messages ..... 33
Step 5: Determine findings. ..... 33
Step 6: Addressing trustworthiness and reliability. ..... 34
Chapter 4: Findings ..... 36
Definitions of Historical Literacy in *JAAL* and *TRSE* ..... 37
Definite examples of historical literacy in *JAAL* and *TRSE*. ..... 38
Indefinite examples of historical literacy in *JAAL* and *TRSE*. ..... 43
Elements of Historical Literacy in *JAAL* and *TRSE* ..... 47
Writing in *JAAL* and *TRSE*. ..... 48
Historical Thinking in *JAAL* and *TRSE*. ..... 50
Historical Reading in *JAAL* and *TRSE* ..... 51
Intended Participants for Historical Literacy in *JAAL* and *TRSE* ..... 53
Students. ..... 54
Teachers. ..... 55
Teacher educators. ..... 56
Discrepant Data ..... 56
Summary of Results ..... 58
Chapter 5: Discussion ..... 60
Defining Historical Literacy is Complex and Variable ..... 60

Elements of Historical Literacy Favored over the Whole ..... 62

Intended Participants for Historical Literacy are Varied ..... 63

Limitations ..... 63

Implications for Further Research ..... 65

Conclusion ..... 66

References ..... 67

APPENDIX A: List of Articles Chronologically Ordered from *TRSE* used in Methodology ..... 74

2010 ..... 74

2011 ..... 74

2012 ..... 74

2013 ..... 75

2014 ..... 76

2015 ..... 76

APPENDIX B: List of Articles Chronologically Ordered from *JAAL* used in Methodology ….77

2010 ..... 77

2011 ..... 77

2012 ..... 77

2014 ..... 78

2015 ..... 78

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 *Numbers of Articles per Year per Journal* ..... 27

Table 2 *Examples of Coding and Categorization of Historical Literacy Messages* ..... 32

Table 3 *Definite and Indefinite Historical Literacy in JAAL and TRSE* ..... 38

Table 4 *Elements of Historical Literacy Emphasized in JAAL and TRSE* ..... 48

Table 5 *Intended Participants in Historical Literacy in JAAL and TRSE* ..... 54

## Chapter 1: Introduction

I sat in my English department professional learning community (PLC) meeting, wincing a little as I listened to one of the more traditional history teachers who dropped by to ask about how to teach vocabulary. Even though I had earned my degree in History teaching, I spent the last three years teaching mostly English. Simply giving the students a list of words to make them memorize the definitions had never been a part of my instruction as an English teacher, so I was at a loss for how to advise this teacher from another discipline.

"The best way to teach vocabulary is to teach in context. It also depends why you want the students to know the vocabulary," explained the English department chair.

"They need to know every one of these unit vocabulary words!" the history teacher said waving his sheet of 80+ vocabulary words for the Roaring Twenties. My eyes bulged looking at the list. "If they don't know the vocabulary, they can't learn from the textbook!"

"Okay, being realistic here, what do the students *really* need to know?" I piped in. "In this long list of words, there are essential to know terms, and terms that are just merely good to know. The important thing is to make the distinction for the students."

The teacher shook his head; adamant that every single word on that list was essential and he was convinced there was a simple "English" way to make students learn it.

At the heart of this story is a teacher who wanted to help his students learn the vocabulary of the discipline of history. As I pursued my undergraduate degree, I learned about disciplinary literacy; learning to read, write, and think like an expert in the field, instead of just general literacy strategies superimposed on the different content-areas. I pondered on why Mr. Smith's concept of vocabulary instruction in his history classroom bothered me. It seemed like his idea

of students demonstrating literacy in history differed drastically from mine. I wondered what was being said about historical literacy, and if there were many definitions different from mine.

This brief experience illustrates why this study was important. I had experience where two teachers did not see eye to eye over a simple matter of teaching vocabulary in history. What if there were more discrepancies in how historical literacy was presented? One way to find out was to look at what exactly was being said about historical literacy.

**Statement of Problem**

Literacy in the content-area classroom is a subject of debate, as teachers continue to be reluctant to implement it in their classrooms (Bean & O'Brien, 2012; Moje, 2008; O'Brien, 1995; Siebert & Draper, 2008). This confusion is partially due to the major shift since 2008 in what is considered literacy in the content-area classroom (Moje, 2008; Siebert & Draper, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008); additionally, this expanded notion of literacy has been supported by such educational reforms as Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and College, Career, and Civic Life Social Studies State Standards (C3 framework) from the National Council for Social Sciences (NCSS) since 2010 (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers [NGAC]; NCSS, 2013). Moje (2008) stated, "With this research base, it may seem odd that secondary schools and teacher education programs have not been more successful in developing integrated secondary literacy programs" (p. 97). She is not alone in this opinion. Other researchers over the last 50 years have made similar statements (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; U.S. Department of Education, 1957).

Researchers know that content-area teachers are reluctant to implement literacy instruction in the classrooms; however, researchers are unsure of the reasons why content-area teachers are so reluctant. Siebert and Draper (2008) argued, "perhaps literacy messages have not

been formulated appropriately to appeal to and address the needs of content-area teachers" (p. 230). While Siebert and Draper were looking specifically at literacy messages addressed to mathematics teachers, the idea that literacy messages might not specifically address the needs of content-area teachers poses a problem for history teachers as well (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2011).

Monte-Sano (2008) noted, "History educators still know little about the relationships between teaching and learning with regard to evidence-based writing and reasoning" (p.1048). History teachers are often content experts, but are not as prepared to teach the literacies of the discipline (Seixas, 1998). Nokes (2010a) argued, "one reason for the lack of literacy instruction in content classes may be that content area teachers are inadequately prepared to provide it" (p. 494). Perhaps part of the reason why teachers are reluctant to integrate literacy in content-area classrooms is because they are still confused by what is actually meant by literacy, especially in history (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2014). Nokes (2011) discussed some ways to overcome the barriers preventing students from reading like historians.

It is this source of confusion that is the focus of this thesis. To really understand what is being said about historical literacy, a detailed analysis of teacher-educator research in recent years must be conducted. Wineburg (1999) argued that historical thinking is not something that comes naturally to students, just as teaching historical literacy does not come naturally to teachers. Discussion on the nuances between these two terms will be discussed later, however, both have to be explicitly taught to students and teachers; therefore, first, what is currently being said needs to examined.

Limited qualitative content analysis based research have examined how literacy is described for history teachers. Most content analyses in the social sciences have looked at student-centered texts (e.g., textbooks, online texts, primary sources). On the other hand, there

are several examples of content analyses that have investigated literacy, specifically with a focus on scientific or mathematical literacy (Erdogan, 2012; Shea, 2015; Siebert & Draper, 2008). These content analyses in math and science primarily focused on texts with teachers in mind (e.g., methods textbooks, or curriculum), and revealed how literacy was discussed in these fields. This study examined literacy messages in texts aimed at teacher audiences such as research articles, to illustrate what is being discussed about historical literacy.

History teachers, history teacher educators, and literacy teacher educators alike will benefit from this research because it exists in a space between literacy and social science fields where little research has been done before. This research is especially relevant considering the recent changes in the field of literacy, the shift from content-area literacy towards disciplinary literacy, and the renewed attention on literacy in secondary education, especially in history from both CCSS and C3 framework (NGAC; NCSS, 2013).

**Research Question**

This study addressed the following research question: Given the renewed emphasis on literacy from the CCSS and the NCSS for the Social Studies C3 Framework, what are the historical literacy messages from 2010-2015 in *The Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* (*JAAL*) and *Theory and Research in Social Education* (*TRSE*) for the history classroom?

**Statement of the Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to compare the types of the historical literacy messages through a content analysis of two leading journals, from literacy teacher educators in *JAAL* and history teaching teacher educators in *TRSE* in the years since the CCSS and NCSS C3 framework were implemented.

**Rationale**

This problem is important because of the emphasis of literacy in the CCSS and NCSS C3 framework, and the impact the CCSS has had on classrooms across the nation (Conley, 2012; Drew, 2012; Fang & Pace, 2013; Hinchman & Moore, 2013). Reform in education is nothing new, but the CCSS have the potential for significant impact on teachers, teacher educators, and students, especially when it comes to how literacy is implemented in the schools (Kibler, 2015) because it specifically addresses literacy in multiple content-areas, but especially in history. The CCSS were introduced in 2010 with the majority of states choosing to adopt the standards. Even though it is relatively recent, choosing to limit this research to the CCSS era (2010 to 2015) helped focus attention on literacy messages from history teacher educators and literacy teacher educators alike.

One of the hallmarks of the CCSS is the focus on literacy within the disciplines. "Because students must learn to read, write, speak, listen, and use language effectively in a variety of content areas, the standards promote the literacy skills and concepts required for college and career readiness in multiple disciplines" (NGAC, 2010, "English Language Arts Standards," para. 2). From the CCSS website, "promote the literacy skills…in multiple disciplines" (NGAC, 2010, "English Language Arts Standards," para. 2). Not only are there literacy standards within the English Language Arts (ELA) core, but also there is a section entirely dedicated to literacy in history and the social sciences. It is this focus on literacy, specifically disciplinary literacy, that the CCSS has changed in recent years. Conley (2012) noted, "the rhetoric associated with disciplinary literacy has changed because of the Common Core State Standards" (p. 141).

The CCSS may have changed the discussion, but it was not the only example of reform for the secondary history classroom. Even though CCSS mention literacy in history, researchers have noted the concern over social sciences as part of the ELA core instead of a distinct section of it own right. Starting in 2010, the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013) was conceptualized to connect to what the CCSS began, and added specific literacy expectations for the social sciences (p. 12). The C3 framework from the NCSS was introduced in response to the CCSS, and both educational standards provide a recent timeframe to work in understanding what is being said about historical literacy by teacher educators in *JAAL* and *TRSE*. The emphasis from the CCSS and C3 framework on historical literacy illustrates how necessary it is to understand what teacher educators are saying about historical literacy in the years since CCSS and C3 framework have been put into effect.

Since the implementation of the CCSS with its emphasis on disciplinary literacy, along with the C3 framework, history teachers have more incentive to incorporate historical literacy into their classrooms, and teacher educators have more incentive to discuss what historical literacy looks like. Historical literacy is important because the CCSS and C3 framework emphasize literacy in history. Because of this importance, interested parties have more reasons to talk about historical literacy, it is vital to understand what exactly is being said. It is important to analyze the historical literacy messages from these different sources to get an idea what the overall message about literacy in the history classrooms is.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

As has been stated earlier, literacy instruction in the content-area classroom has been a subject of debate for many years. There has been a prevailing opinion that general reading strategies are necessary for secondary students navigating content-area texts (Bean, Readence, & Baldwin, 1985; Herber, 1970). Especially as instruction at the secondary level becomes more specialized both in format and content, students need to be equipped with specialized literacy skills geared toward accessing the increasing complex texts at the secondary level, instead of general reading strategies (Bean, 1996; Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008).

In recent years, researchers and federal initiatives like *Reading Next* (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006), and *Writing Next* (Graham & Perin, 2007) have drawn the spotlight more toward adolescent literacy, and the gaps that exist in helping adolescents learn to navigate increasingly complex texts. However, the idea that general literacy strategies are enough, even at the secondary level, is still a pervasive thought. Disciplinary literacy acknowledges the work done by content-area literacy, and builds on the notion that by looking to the discipline for strategies, skills, and dispositions, students will comprehend and contribute in more authentic ways than before.

This literature review focuses on four main areas of interest that this research intersects: content-area literacy, disciplinary literacy, historical literacy, and the implications of the CCSS and NCSS C3 framework on literacy instruction. To understand the research question, what exactly are the historical literacy messages from history teaching educators and literacy teacher educators, given the renewed emphasis on literacy from the CCSS and the NCSS C3 Framework since 2010 to the present, a clear understanding of these topics and how they connect is essential. Researchers can have a better idea specifically what is being said about historical literacy

instruction in the history content-area classroom at the secondary level, by identifying the literacy messages present in texts geared toward teachers through content analysis.

**Content-Area Literacy**

It is important to define content-area literacy, understand what it afforded teachers in the secondary classroom, and how it differs from disciplinary literacy. Content-area literacy was one of the first concepts to address adolescents' need to navigate increasingly complex texts, starting in the 70s with Herber. Herber (1978) argued,

> Too often our skills instruction is not based on the principle of simulation, the idea that students must be shown how to use specific skills. Rather, it is based on the assumption that students already possess the skills we are supposed to teach them (p. 31).

He identified one of the major failings prior to content-area literacy approach to adolescent literacy was that too often, teachers assumed that students already knew how to do certain things to access increasingly complex texts at the secondary level. Content-area literacy emphasized the need to instruct adolescents not only the *what* of the content, but also the *how.* Alvermann and Phelps (1994) stated, "students are denied the kind of instruction that leads to active and independent learning" when they are not also taught how to access specialized texts.

There are a variety of definitions of content-area literacy. Herber (1978) defined content-area literacy as, "the set of concepts that comprise the curriculum, and it is the information imbedded in those concepts that the student should master" (p. 4). Bean (1996) elaborated "The focus on teaching strategies in the content areas…. has expanded to include other forms of communication, particularly writing and discussion" (p. 629-630). McKenna and Robinson (1990) stated, "Content literacy can be defined as the ability to use reading and writing for the acquisition of new content in a given discipline" (p. 184), and Vacca and Vacca (1993) reasoned

"*Content literacy*--the ability to use reading and writing to learn subject matter across the curriculum" (p. xiii). Likewise, Alvermann and Phelps (1994) said "content literacy, or the ability to use reading and writing strategies to learn new content" (p. 45). For the purpose of this paper, I define content-area literacy as using general literacy strategies that teachers can teach to students to improve students' comprehension of a variety of texts found within the different content-areas.

Content-area literacy afforded content-area teachers benefits they did not have before. Moje (2008) explained, "in many cases solutions have focused on training [secondary school subject area teachers] to use literacy practices and to teach reading strategies within their content instruction" (p. 96). Content-area literacy focuses on reading strategies and this was not a bad thing. Content-area literacy allowed teachers and researchers to examine the literacy needs of adolescents and approach them in a systematic, purposeful way (Draper, 2002a). It allowed content teachers to make intentional decisions in their curriculum and instruction, and helped students learn how to access the material. Content-area literacy gave students the tools to become independent learners.

However, there are some limitations to content-area literacy. Even though content-area literacy was a start, it faced resistance from content-area teachers. Herber (1978) explained, "Content-area teachers resist; because they do not want to become reading teachers nor do they want to divert time from their curriculum to teach reading. Because they are coerced into it, little comes from their efforts" (p. 3). Content-area literacy was not integrated into the classroom because many content-area teachers felt that they are not responsible to teach literacy skills. The phrase "every teacher a teacher of reading" was one that not many content-area teachers identified with (Draper, 2010; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008).

Content-area literacy emphasized reading strategies, but mostly so students could access content found in textbooks. Content-area literacy emphasized the use of textbooks and other supplemental material that were not real-world texts, nor authentic to the disciplines. This was a criticism Bean (1996) pointed out in the *Handbook of Reading Research* that content-area literacy created an over-reliance on the textbook and the teacher as the source of information. Alvermann and Phelps (1994) argued that "content literacy instruction will become even more important as teachers struggle to make textbooks accessible, relevant, and interesting to their students" (p. 45). By placing the textbook, and the teacher to some extent, at the center of the curriculum, educators prevented students from the opportunity of engaging disciplinary texts on their own level to learn the information for themselves. These limitations are what disciplinary literacy seeks to address.

It is important to understand the difference between content-area literacy and disciplinary literacy because they focus on different things. Disciplinary literacy "builds an understanding of how knowledge is produced in the disciplines, rather than just building knowledge in the disciplines" (Moje, 2008, p. 97). Disciplinary literacy goes beyond the textbook, looking to what exists outside the classroom in the various disciplines and implementing it in the classroom as authentically as possible. The distinction between content-area literacy and disciplinary literacy will be explored more in the following section.

**Disciplinary Literacy**

To fully comprehend disciplinary literacy, it is essential to understand the differences between content-area literacy and disciplinary literacy, what is meant by the term disciplinary literacy, and lastly, what disciplinary literacy affords teachers in the secondary classroom.

Content-area literacy and disciplinary literacy are sometimes used interchangeably even though they are different concepts. Both concepts address the idea that adolescents require more specific instruction as they encounter more specialized content and increasingly difficult texts. Content-area literacy, while utilizing "literacy skills common to many tasks" (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008, p. 44) cannot help students' access learning at the same level as disciplinary literacy. Content-area literacy is more closely tied to the classroom and the textbook. Disciplinary literacy uses skills that are specialized to the subject matter at hand and once incorporated, help students not only learn the content, but also gives them the "identity kit…on how to act and talk as to take on a particular role that others will recognize" (Gee, 1989, p. 1). Disciplinary literacy goes beyond the classroom to engage students with real-world texts and skills to more closely mirror the discipline the students are learning. Students who are taught disciplinary literacy will able to read, write, think, and talk like someone in that field. Additionally, they will have the skillset to critically evaluate knowledge within the discipline, and contribute to the field as well.

Content-area literacy, on the other hand, is more focused on incorporating literacy strategies into the content, adapting these strategies to the content rather than identifying literacies within the discipline that students need to learn how to navigate and create (Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). The primary critique of content-area literacy is the over-reliance on generic literacy strategies. "Strategies can be shortcuts through content because they are generic to any text, primarily used for the purpose of creating better readers and writers overall" (Lent, 2016, p. 3). However, as adolescents advance through secondary schooling and into college, generic strategies fall short of helping students becoming truly literate. Literacy is more than comprehension and content knowledge. Disciplinary knowledge does more than just

build content knowledge, it also produces or constructs it (Lent, 2016; Moje, 2008). Since 2008, the research shifted away from content-area literacy towards disciplinary literacy, although there are still those who argue for an integrated approach, of both content-area literacy and disciplinary literacy (Brozo, Moorman, Meyer, & Stewart, 2013; Heller, 2010).

*Disciplinary literacy* is the term preferred in much of the current research, specifically as it is more focused on the literacies that are particular to each of the disciplines. For the purpose of this study, *disciplinary literacy* refers to the skills and dispositions needed to read, comprehend, and produce texts and products specific to that discipline. This is more than simply being able to decode words on a page and it is more than simply incorporating broad literacy strategies to specific content-areas (Wineburg, Reisman, & Gillis, 2015). Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) defined it as "advanced literacy instruction embedded within content-area classes such as math, science, and social studies" (p. 40). What it means to be literate in a calculus class is much different than what it means to be literate in a drama class. This definition also means more than just reading about the curriculum. Unlike content-area literacy, disciplinary literacy shies away from generic reading strategies, , focuses on specific skills, strategies, and attitudes needed to fully comprehend the content-area through subject specific texts. "Disciplinary literacy is not the application of strategies to the disciplines; it is a way of learning that drills deeply into the very essence of what it means to come to know content" (Lent, 2016, p. 6). Disciplinary literacy also looks beyond the classroom to how people interact with the discipline in authentic ways.

One of the principal affordances of disciplinary literacy is how it helps students becoming producers of knowledge, rather than just consumers. For example, Draper (2010) argued, "without these specialized literacies, students may be relegated to the position of reading

and writing about what others are doing rather than participating in the activities of creation, inquiry, expression and problem-solving" (p. 2). Likewise, Conley (2012) argued that with disciplinary literacy, "young people gain access to knowledge in the disciplines so that they can fully participate that in the construction, critique, and change of knowledge" (p. 141). Instead of merely superficially engaging with the content, disciplinary literacy allows students to become creators and critics of knowledge, and knowledge production. With disciplinary literacy, students play a much more active role in learning. School becomes much more than learning the facts of a content area, but also learning the process by which knowledge is created. Students learn the "conventions for communicating and representing knowledge and ideas and ways of interacting, defending ideas, and challenging the deeply held ideas of others in the discipline" (Moje, 2008, p. 100). When disciplinary literacy is incorporated fully into the curriculum, it allows students to engage with the content in much more complex, interesting, and authentic ways and allows them to become part of the discussion in contributing to the field.

It is, therefore, important to know what teachers are being told about literacy specific to their discipline. Literacy in history is unlike literacy in English or literacy in math or science. Because historical literacy requires students to read, write, and think in ways that are entirely specific to the discipline, it is essential to understand the peculiarities of what it means to be literate in history.

**Historical Literacy**

To really appreciate historical literacy, it is necessary to define it and examine how it is more specific than the broader term of disciplinary literacy, and different than content-area literacy. This study examined literacy messages specifically in history. For the purpose of this research, historical literacy is defined as the ability to comprehend, critique, and create texts in

discipline-specific ways and co-opt historians' habits of mind (Draper, 2010; Nokes, 2010b; Wineburg, 1991).

Historical literacy is more than general comprehension and summary skills that are often associated with content-area literacy; but similar to disciplinary literacy, historical literacy makes use of discipline-specific texts, strategies and practices within the field of history. Nokes (2010b) defined historical literacy as, "reading, analyzing, and thinking in ways similar to methods used in historical inquiry by archeologists and historians" (p. 56). Monte-Sano (2011) described historical literacy as "making sense of historical texts, questioning evidence, [and] developing one's own interpretation" (p. 214). Both of these definitions align with a disciplinary literacy approach to historical inquiry, specifically, they go beyond just comprehending content, but extend into knowledge production within the discipline. Simply put, historical literacy is discipline-specific knowledge: learning to read, think, and create like a historian.

Often in the research, the term historical thinking is used almost interchangeably with historical literacy; however, these are two distinct terms. Historical thinking is the cultivation of certain habits of the mind, or heuristics that help them make sense of the past. Wineburg (1999), a leading researcher on historical thinking, argued that historical thinking is unnatural. "[It] is neither a natural process nor something that springs automatically from psychological development…it actually goes against the grain of how we ordinarily think" (p. 491). The field of history is often relegated to facts and figures, names, and dates. Wineburg argued that history is more than statistics; history is about how we think about the past, where we get our information, and why it matters. Gewertz (2012) stated "educators have been trying to free history instruction from the mire of memorization and propel it with the kinds of inquiry that drive historians themselves" (p. 11). Only by using the texts historians use, engaging in the

types of activities that historian do, and the ways historians think, can teachers and students in the history classroom say they are engaging in historical literacy. Much of what happens in history starts in the mind. Historical thinking skills are closely integrated with other elements of historical literacy, like reading, writing, and speaking.

Historical thinking is just one part of historical literacy. Historical thinking refers to the habits of mind that historians use when they encounter texts within the discipline; however, historical literacy encompasses the thinking skills, reading skills, writing, and communicating skills of a historian. These heuristics, in addition to the discipline-specific texts, mean that literacy in history is a different kind of literacy than the other content areas. "Thus, in history classrooms where literacy instruction occurs, students are invited into the community of practice and learn how to negotiate and create the texts that are valued by historians" (Nokes, 2010b, p. 57). Historical literacy is not just ways of thinking; it is also ways of reading, ways of writing, and ways of doing history.

Texts that are used in the history discipline are unique, and require different skill sets that go beyond general literacy. A student in the ideal history classroom will encounter texts from a variety of sources, past and present, and from a range of disciplines. Brown and Swope (2010) argued that skilled readers of history differ from general readers in their approach of the text. Because of the requirements of the history discipline, historical literacy for adolescents in the history classroom is a unique concept.

**Theoretical Framework**

Disciplinary literacy forms the overall theoretical framework for the study, with historical literacy being the specific lens through which I analyzed the data. Disciplinary literacy formed the foundation of my understanding about adolescent literacy, and is essential to my

understanding of how students learn. As has been demonstrated through this literature review, disciplinary literacy affords teachers and students the opportunity to become an active participant in the disciplinary discussion. "A goal of building disciplinary literacy is to help young people gain access to knowledge in the disciplines so that they can fully participate that in the construction, critique, and change of knowledge" (Conley, 2012, p. 141). As Conley noted in this quote, disciplinary literacy is more than just a consumption of knowledge. When students become fully literate in the discipline, they are able to critique and contribute to the knowledge base. By using disciplinary literacy as the framework to approach the analysis of the historical literacy messages in these research journals, it is easier to identify what is currently being said to history teachers.

Although disciplinary literacy is the overall theoretical framework for the study, historical literacy served as the specific lens utilized to analyze the data. The two terms are connected because disciplinary literacy is an umbrella term under which all the specific literacies of the different disciplines fall. Historical literacy is specific to what it means to be literate in history. Through my undergraduate experience, I was taught in a preservice history teacher course that emphasized historical literacy, and this concept became a central part of how I view history education. My experience in my undergrad classes and in my history classroom contributed to how I define historical literacy. Based on the earlier discussion of historical literacy, it is defined as the ability to comprehend, critique, and create texts in discipline-specific ways and co-opt historians' habits of mind. Using this definition of historical literacy influenced how I engaged with the data, and what I considered to be historical literacy messages and what was not.

It is important to understand how content-area literacy, disciplinary literacy, and historical literacy intersect and how they influenced this study. Another essential element was the impact of such educational policies like CCSS and C3 framework. Bain (2012) argued that just as the demand for increased literacy grows for adolescents, the amount of specialized literacy instruction decreases. This is clearly demonstrated by the types of classes students are required to take at the secondary level. They have highly specialized course content in mathematics, science or language arts that are often tested on the state and federal level. Teachers of these content-areas are worried about coverage, and may overlook the specialized literacy instruction necessary to truly understand and engage with the discipline. Students may read more complex texts, as the CCSS recommend, but they do not have the discipline-specific skills to make sense of the texts in meaningful ways. Reading and writing like a historian is unnatural as Wineburg (1999) and Nokes (2011) argued and therefore, this is an argument for the inclusion of historical literacy instruction in the history classroom. Before teachers can effectively implement historical literacy in their classroom, it is important to look at what literacy messages they are receiving if they access professional research journals. In recent years, historical literacy has been emphasized in nationwide policies such as the CCSS and the C3 Framework from the NCSS.

**CCSS and NCSS on Literacy**

Two major changes on the political and educational landscape were the introduction of the CCSS and the introduction of the C3 framework from the NCSS in 2010. Various reports came out in recent years highlighting the inadequacy of secondary education to prepare students for life after high school in a 21st century world (Bain, 2012; Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Graham & Perin, 2007; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). In response to these gaps in secondary education,

the CCSS were created specifically to prepare students for career and college readiness. The CCSS is the most recent wide-scale educational initiative to be adopted by the majority of the United States.

Although maybe less well-known than the CCSS, the NCSS C3 framework (2013) "recognizes the important role that the Common Core State Standards for ELA/Literacy play in defining K-12 literacy expectations in most states…the C3 framework connects to and elaborates on the ELA/Literacy Common Core Standards for social studies inquiry" (NCSS, p 12). The C3 framework builds on the emphasis in disciplinary literacy that the CCSS introduced and together, they illustrate a renewed importance on literacy, especially in the history classroom.

On the CCSS website, there is a focus on complex, discipline-specific texts within the different contents and advocates students reading informational texts because "students must be immersed in information about the world around them if they are to develop the strong general knowledge and vocabulary they need to become successful readers and be prepared for college, career, and life" (NGAC, 2010, Key Shifts in English Language Arts, para. 3). However, the CCSS seems to have been written from an ELA perspective. Even though the standards attempt to address disciplinary literacy, simply reading informational texts about the content does not accomplish this. The ELA Standards also include "Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects" standards (NGAC, 2010, p. 1) which can send the message that the literacy practices of one content-area fits well enough for the other subjects similar to content-area literacy (Bean & O'Brien, 2012), when that is simply not the case.

In conjunction with current research, the CCSS acknowledge that there are literacies specific to the different disciplines, but does not specifically use the terms *disciplinary literacy* or *content-area literacy*. For example, "The literacy standards allow teachers of

ELA history/social studies, science, and technical subjects to use their content-area expertise to help students meet the particular challenges of reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language in their respective fields" (NGAC, 2010). Yet, because the history literacy standards are embedded in the ELA core instead of separately, some English teachers may feel like they are suddenly responsible for much more than their already extensive curriculum. This is not meant to be a critique of the CCSS. The relevant issue it that the CCSS emphasize literacy, so teachers feel the need to emphasize it in their classrooms.

Nevertheless, there is not just one type of literacy. As has been demonstrated in the literature, literacy in history is not like literacy in mathematics or science or ELA (Brown & Swope, 2010; Girard & Harris, 2012; Nokes, 2010b; Wineburg, 1991). Yet, the way the CCSS present literacy in the secondary classroom resembles content-area literacy instead of disciplinary literacy because of the similar phrasing between the ELA and History and social science literacy standards. Because the CCSS emphasize literacy in history to some degree, secondary teachers may feel more obligated to incorporate literacy instruction in the classroom. Even though content-area teachers have been reluctant in the past to implement literacy in their curriculum (Moje, 2008; Nokes, 2010a; Siebert & Draper, 2008), such reluctance may change because of the newly placed emphasis on literacy in the CCSS (Kibler, 2015).

The NCSS created the C3 framework in response to these concerns over how the CCSS presented literacy standards for the social sciences. The C3 framework is not a departure from the CCSS, indeed, it shares common goals with the CCSS, but it does delve deeper into the particulars of literacy in the social sciences. Regardless of how the CCSS talk about literacy, the fact remains that literacy is a significant factor in the CCSS. Because literacy is emphasized so much in the CCSS and again, reemphasized in the C3 Framework, these policies become a useful

marker in the history of disciplinary literacy research. The CCSS serve as a clear shift in literacy expectations in the classroom, and the years since its implementation are a good time frame for analyzing the types of literacy messages toward history teachers.

**Content Analysis**

As the literature has demonstrated, disciplinary literacy may have had an impact on the secondary classroom with such vehicles like the CCSS and the C3 Framework. This review is limited in scope as it cannot cover in depth all the research on literacy, even limited to one discipline such as history, but this review does illustrate the issues and how these concepts contribute to the study of literacy messages to history teachers.

One way to investigate what is being said regarding historical literacy is to examine the types of literacy messages present in the current research. Content analysis is one way to analyze a large volume of text, so I could look at specific ideas. It has been used in a variety of ways from looking at the frequency a certain word or phrase mentioned in a text (Friedman, 2006; Shear, 2015; Yilmaz, 2008) to analyzing how certain ideas are portrayed in a text (Siebert & Draper, 2008; Silva et al., 2008). The use of content analysis to examine the ways literacy has been done before in other content areas. For example, in math, science and technology (Huysman, 2012; Siebert & Draper, 2008; Skophammer & Reed, 2014), but content analyses of literacy in history was much more difficult to locate.

For example, Draper's (2002b) study identified literacy messages embedded in nine different secondary methods textbooks. These messages were aimed at preservice teachers who would use the methods textbooks in their teacher preparation programs. Draper's study helped to identify reasons that teachers are still reluctant to implement content-area literacy, "despite the slogans, the legislation, and the coursework" (p. 357). Content-area teachers were reluctant

because of the sometimes negative or non-existent literacy messages found in these textbooks Draper closed her study with a call for further research by stating that "literacy educators together with content-area educators should look for ways to form research partnerships that enable them to learn from and with each other" (p. 381). This study looks to see the interaction between literacy educators and history teacher-educators in a common area of expertise. Here is an area that needs further exploring, to identify the places where there may be discrepancies between what history teaching experts are saying about literacy and what literacy experts are saying about literacy in history. Even though Draper focused on literacy messages in methods textbooks for preservice math teachers, her study serves as an appropriate place to start this research study.

These studies have been extremely useful, however, I wanted to see what is currently being said about historical literacy from people who are currently researching and discussing historical literacy. Therefore, it is important to look at what literacy messages are being said in journals such as *JAAL* and *TRSE*, especially given the CCSS renewed emphasis on literacy in the curriculum.

This study used content analysis to examine the historical literacy messages presented to history teachers from literacy teacher educators, and history teacher educators. Comparing messages from the two different groups is essential because it illustrates what is currently being said about historical literacy. As the literature has shown, literacy in history is unlike literacy in the other disciplines. These different concepts in the literature show how historically, literacy messages differ from one another and how the same might be true for literacy messages today, especially in the years since the CCSS were implemented because of the renewed emphasis on literacy in the core. With the implementation of the CCSS and the introduction of the C3

framework, the emphasis on literacy in the history classroom has never been so widespread, or so heavily promoted. It is therefore important to recognize what exactly is being said about literacy in history from these different groups of teacher educators.

# Chapter 3: Method

*Given the renewed emphasis on literacy from the CCSS and the NCSS for the Social Studies C3 Framework, what are the historical literacy messages from 2010-2015 in JAAL and TRSE for the history classroom?* To closely examine the types of historical literacy messages that are present in journal articles from *JAAL* and *TRSE* from 2010 to 2015, I used a latent content analysis, which "involves interpreting the underlying meaning of the text" (Thayer et al., 2007) and used emergent coding which simply means that codes were not established *a priori,* but rather as a result of this analysis (Neuendorf, 2002). Content analysis was used in an exploratory way: to look closely at a text, look at what is being said on a surface level, and to look closer to evaluate previously overlooked meanings (Thayer et al., 2007).

As was explored in the literature review, literacy in history has been highly emphasized in the CCSS and NCSS C3 standards, however, it was not clearly specified what exactly was currently being said about historical literacy. It is important for researchers and educators to be aware of the types of historical literacy that are being presented in professional teacher texts as that can contribute to the effective implementation of these literacy standards, especially in history, where the discipline requires different reading, writing, and thinking skills than in other content-areas.

## The Researcher

The method of content analysis was beneficial in order to build on what prior research has done and conduct a closer examination of texts tailored for history teachers. I wanted to scrutinize literacy messages addressed to history teachers because I am a part of both worlds, as I have degrees and classroom experience in both English teaching and history teaching. Additionally, during the course of my master's program, I was involved in several literacy-

focused classes. I brought to the research the analytical habits of a historian combined with the literary criticism experience of an English teacher. My background as an English and history teacher contributed much to this research, as it is essentially a literary analysis. Even though my background is an advantage in this analysis, it does impact how and what kinds of things I notice as literacy messages. As was noted earlier, using historical literacy as my theoretical framework influenced what I considered as historical literacy messages.

**Content Analysis**

The content analysis methodology was ideal to answer the research question, what are the historical literacy messages from 2010-2015 in *JAAL* and *TRSE* for the history classroom because "content analysis can expose hidden connections among concepts, reveal relationships among ideas that initially seem unconnected, and inform the decision-making processes" (Thayer, 2007, p. 267). By analyzing and comparing these messages, I was able to see a clearer picture of what teacher educators recommended to teachers in history classrooms came to the fore. Similar to Siebert and Draper's (2008) content analysis of math textbooks, messages were the unit of analysis, not merely words or sentences. I wanted to look at the content of the message, not just the frequency. Anything could be a "message" because I was looking at the idea behind the message (i.e., how historical literacy was used). As I analyzed the data, segments that related to how history was taught, understood, and produced were identified as a message regarding historical literacy, even if the phrase "historical literacy" was not explicitly found within the portion. Messages varied in length, and were categorized according to content.

In this latent content analysis, articles from two leading research journals from the years 2010 to 2015 were analyzed for historical literacy messages. The research question guiding this analysis was: *Given the renewed emphasis on literacy from the CCSS and the NCSS for the*

*Social Studies C3 Framework, what are the historical literacy messages from 2010-2015 in JAAL and TRSE for the history classroom?*

This study analyzed the type of literacy messages that were addressed to history teachers from two different groups of teacher educators: literacy teacher educators and history teacher educators. Again, I was not particularly interested in the frequency of literacy messages, but rather what is being said. By analyzing these texts, I hoped to uncover a new way of looking at these literacy messages for the history classroom.

**Data Sources**

I used qualitative content analysis to determine what types of historical literacy messages were presented in two different sources in the years after the CCSS went into effect, one journal dedicated to content-area literacy, *JAAL,* and another journal focused on history teaching, *TRSE*.

The International Literacy Association publishes *JAAL* solely for teachers of older learners with a focus on literacy. Other literacy journals such as *The Reading Teacher* or *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy,* while published for teachers, deal with a much younger age group that typically do not have the same concerns as teachers of adolescents do. In fact, "*The Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* is the only literacy journal published exclusively for teachers of older learners" (ILA website, "Journals," 2016). *JAAL* is published online and in print six times per year from July through May. *JAAL* is a practitioner journal, which means a wider audience reads the articles, rather than those written merely researcher-to-researcher.

The journal *TRSE's "*purpose is to foster the creation and exchange of ideas and research findings that will expand knowledge and understanding of the purposes, conditions, and effects of schooling and education about society and social relations" (NCSS, 2016). The College and University Faculty Assembly of National Council of the Social Studies publish it quarterly.

*TRSE* is a research journal. Unlike *JAAL*'s emphasis on readability for a wider audience, *TRSE* focused on the research. The difference, between *JAAL* and *TRSE* intended audience, is an important one to note.

To answer the research question, what are the historical literacy messages from 2010-2015 in *JAAL* and *TRSE* for the history classroom, meant that I had to look where these types of historical literacy messages would most likely be found. *JAAL* has much to say about literacy for adolescents, which include content-area literacy and disciplinary literacy, and disciplinary literacy is an issue that mostly concerns adolescents in secondary education. This makes *JAAL* an important resource to find these literacy messages from literacy teacher educators. On the other hand, *TRSE* is a great resource to find what history teacher educators have to say about literacy in history. It is a journal dedicated to research in history education. An integral part of teaching history, as Wineburg (2006) and Nokes (2010a) have argued, is to teach the literacies that are inherent within the discipline.

I focused on the years 2010 to 2015 because of the CCSS's emphasis on literacy, and since the CCSS was implemented in 2010, that year served as the oldest marker for articles in these journals. This is not meant to be a comprehensive study, so the five-year limit served as the most recent snapshot of what researchers are saying about literacy in history in both of these journals. People interested in historical literacy would most likely use either of these journals as resources, which is why they serve as the sources for the articles used in this study.

*JAAL* publishes six volumes a year, whereas *TRSE* publishes four volumes a year. Even though *TRSE* publishes fewer issues per year than *JAAL*, more articles concerning historical literacy were found in TRSE, see Table 1. The most plentiful year for historical literacy in both journals was 2013.

Table 1

*Numbers of Articles per Year per Journal*

| Year | TRSE | JAAL | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2010 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 2011 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 2012 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| 2013 | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| 2014 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| 2015 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Total | 20 | 13 | 33 |

**Data Collection and Analysis**

Various criteria were employed to narrow the data for this textual analysis.

1. The data were limited to a time frame from 2010 to 2015.
2. Articles within that time frame were limited to those dealing with literacy and history
3. Articles that had been identified that dealt with history, but not with historical literacy as operationally defined above, were eliminated from the analysis.
4. Lastly, articles that specifically addressed historical literacy were analyzed for historical literacy messages.

**Step 1: Collecting the articles.** After identifying which data sources to be used, I accessed both journals from the Brigham Young University (BYU) journal library on campus and the online archives of both of these journals. The time frame of 2010 to 2015 narrowed possible articles considered for inclusion in this study to the CCSS era. This time constraint is pertinent due to this study's emphasis on disciplinary literacy from the CCSS and NCSS. Considering the amount of time covered in this research, 2010-2015, hundreds of articles were published between JAAL and TRSE. The time frame generated 369 articles from JAAL and 598 articles from TRSE.

Another criterion for narrowing the data was whether or not an article had anything to do with literacy and history from the 2010-2015 time frame from both journals. BYU had physical copies of both *JAAL* and *TRSE* from 2010-2011, so I used the table of contents, article abstracts, and a physical search of the journals to find articles of possible interest. There were no more physical copies available after 2011, so I accessed both journals from the organizations' online archives.

Online, I went through each journal, filtered the articles for the time frame, and went through each volume and each issue one at a time: looking at the table of contents for titles of interest and skimming abstracts of articles that may be connected to the research question. Articles that were within the time frame and adequately centered on literacy and history were then downloaded to my computer as well as saved to Google Drive. In addition to the handpicked articles, I created an EBSCO search limited by time frame and journal to collect any article that referenced history and literacy, using the keywords: history and literacy, that I may have missed. However, the purpose of going through each journal issue by issue from this time frame was to catch any articles that may have escaped a simple keyword search. As a result of phase one data collection, I had collected 26 articles from *TRSE* and 38 articles from *JAAL* for a total of 64 articles in need of further analysis. During this step of data collection and analysis, the net was widely cast to collect any articles that might be of interest.

**Step 2: Using theoretical framework to isolate historical literacy articles.** This step of data collection and analysis was intended to cull a more specific subset of articles from the 64 articles gathered from the initial data collection process. In order to accomplish this, I used my theoretical framework, using an established definition of historical literacy, to filter unrelated articles. For the purpose of this research, historical literacy was defined as the ability to

comprehend, critique, and create texts in discipline-specific ways, and co-opt historians' habits of mind. The established definition of historical literacy included these specific characteristics:

1. Discipline-specific knowledge
2. Learning to read like a historian
3. Evidence of historical thinking
4. Focus on creation, (e.g., learning how to write like a historian)

I employed these four characteristics of historical literacy to highlight literacy messages that caught my attention. However, I did not identify any emerging themes at this time.

Following the initial collection of the articles from *JAAL* and *TRSE*, I downloaded all of the articles from my Google Drive to a web-based program for managing research data and PDFs. To begin the analysis of the articles, I sorted the articles into two folders based on journal type. I conducted a preliminary exploratory analysis (Creswell, 2012) by reading through each article, highlighting literacy messages that initially caught my attention, and using my theoretical framework, with the established definition of historical literacy to determine whether or not an article warranted further analysis.

While I read, I kept notes in the web-based program about things I noticed, (i.e., literacy messages about historical reading, thinking, or writing). After reading the article, I assigned it a particular grade on a four-point scale. If an article contained three of the four characteristics of historical literacy, it was retained for further analysis. Often, articles that were generally about literacy or disciplinary literacy, without enough of an emphasis on historical literacy only ranked one or two on the four-point grading scale, and I made a note in the web-based program to cut the article from further analysis. Reading each article in its entirety to determine if it actually dealt with historical literacy in any meaningful way helped me decide which articles to keep for

further analysis. I used the theoretical framework during the data collection process, so when reading through the articles it was apparent that many could be cut because they did not talk about historical literacy to the extent that was needed for in-depth analysis.

Based on my definition of historical literacy, there were four criteria used to filter the 64 combined articles gathered during the initial data collection. Those articles that met at least three of four criteria were included in this study. Anything that had two or fewer of the criteria was excluded from the study. After applying the theoretical framework using the established definition of historical literacy, I had 33 articles (13 articles from *JAAL*, and 20 articles from *TRSE*) that I used to conduct this research looking at how historical literacy is addressed in two major research journals in the years since CCSS and C3 framework have been implemented.

**Step 3: Uncovering general themes.** In using the web-based program during the data collection process to narrow articles from the 64 to the 33 articles, I had already highlighted literacy messages that initially caught my attention through the preliminary exploratory analysis (Creswell, 2012). After I filtered the articles to the 33 final articles total, I conducted the first phase of data analysis using a limited subset of the data to isolate emergent themes. As I highlighted the historical literacy messages I noted in the articles, I made notes in my research journal and within the web-based program about the reoccurring themes I found in each article individually and general patterns based on each article I read overall.

As I read through the articles, historical literacy messages tended to have many of the same types of content, related primarily to my definition of historical literacy. I started to cluster these messages into similar groups, which eventually became the different categories used in data analysis. Using emerging coding, "in which a coding scheme is established after all responses are collected; then, systematic content analysis is conducted applying this scheme to

the responses" (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 194), and through reflective cycles of analysis, I determined where each of the identified historical literacy messages belonged.

Messages were not mutually exclusive; therefore a message categorized in the literacy category could also be found in whole, or in part, in another category. A category had to have more than two messages for it to remain a viable category type. For this study, there were ten general categories: reading, writing, thinking, literacy, content knowledge, distinct definition, indistinct definition, students as audience, teachers as audience, and teacher educators as intended participants. Categories from the first phase of data analysis included: literacy, reading, thinking, writing, and content knowledge. These categories came as a result of the first phase of data analysis. See Table 2 for examples of coding and categorization of historical literacy messages in these journals.

In Table 2, for example, when talking about historical reading, Nokes (2010c) in *TRSE* talked about how students "approach" a text, so while this historical literacy message did not explicitly state "historical reading" I considered it a historical literacy messages because it referenced how students engage with materials in a history classroom, and therefore falls under the umbrella of historical literacy. However, the example of a historical literacy message categorized as reading from *JAAL* in Table 2, is more explicit, referring to "historic building analysis…as a bridge…between historical artifact analysis…and traditional text(s)" (Baron, p. 463). Even though this historical literacy message is referring to an unusual type of artifact, (e.g., historical buildings), it is centered around a theme of reading and comprehending which I considered part of historical reading, an essential part of historical literacy and labeled it as thus.

Table 2

Examples of Coding and Categorization of Historical Literacy Messages

| Code | Example | Journal |
|---|---|---|
| Historical reading | " Historical building analysis is a potential bridge between a broad range of historical artifacts and the key ways traditional text is read within the discipline, addressing recent calls to build the "effective, subject specific literacy strategies" that will "develop relevant content and literacy skills in tandem" (Zygouris- Coe, 2012 , p. 35)" (Baron, p. 463). | JAAL |
| | "They would teach students to approach texts with a critical eye, encouraging students to use historical reasoning as they read"(Nokes, p. 516). | TRSE |
| Historical thinking | "Young people's perspectives about the social world, like those of historians and teachers, are shaped by their identities as members of families, communities, regions, and nations, as well as by their affiliations with racial, ethnic, religious, and other groups" (Damico, p. 327). | JAAL |
| | "historical empathy is also a difficult construct to clearly define because engaging in empathy implies affective goals that extend beyond the cognitive aspects of how we think historically" (Endacott, p. 6). | TRSE |
| Historical writing | "Educators argue that all secondary students need high-quality writing instruction that provides authentic purposes for writing in a variety of forms (Coker & Lewis, 2008; Graham & Perin, 2007); however, preservice teachers also need to be engaged in writing to apply this knowledge in their future classrooms. If teacher educators want preservice teach with a disciplinary eventually teachers to literacy instruction perspective, then teacher educators need to provide opportunities in which they live disciplinary literacy through their own reading and writing assignments" (Pytash, p. 529). | JAAL |
| | "To write evidence-based arguments from primary source documents, students must engage in a host of interrelated activities driven by the purpose of the writing task...Students must interpret the writing prompt, read documents for information and evidence as it relates to the prompt, and write with a rhetorical plan that organizes and reconciles the evidence that they have collected from the documents" (De La Paz, p. 231). | TRSE |
| Literacy | "Together, reading/language arts and content-area teachers can create opportunities to share their language and pedagogical practices, discovering the common and unique features of their areas of expertise to devise practices that build students' skills, proficiencies, and critical engagement with text" (Boyd, 20). | JAAL |
| | "Secondary civics and government classes would seem like an obvious forum in which to acquire these skills, but research suggests that these courses often overlook this type of disciplinary knowledge in favor of generic instruction on civic ideals and structures of government" (Journell, p. 30). | TRSE |
| Content knowledge | " To read and write in each discipline, core knowledge cannot be neglected. Without such as vocabulary and activated prior knowledge, students will not understand what they are reading and writing" (Pytash, p. 534). | JAAL |
| | "As adults impose certain historical narratives on students, then, space exists for the children to redefine those narratives as parts of their own knowledge assemblages, extending themselves by joining a larger societal discourse, part of which refuses or recasts dominant cultural messages. They learn to play resistantly" (Chappell, p. 249).<br>"Students must not only be able to recognize and recall information, they must be able to understand its significance, place it in a temporal sequence, and connect it to other events" (Breakstone, p. 460). | TRSE |

**Step 4: Collecting literacy messages.** For the next step in data collection and analysis, I copied the historical literacy messages I found from my prior round of data collection and analysis into a table in a Google document with the different categories I noted from the previous step. Within this Google document table, I could then compare the historical literacy messages found within each article easily across the board. I needed to see if the categories uncovered in the previous step were viable patterns, so for this recursive cycle of analysis, I returned to the data by dividing the articles by year, starting with the beginning of my time frame in 2010 and working towards 2015. After each year, I noted in my research journal general trends, patterns and questions that came up as a result of the analysis.

Data analysis was conducted in chronological order from oldest to most recent to make note of any changes that occurred over time within the journals and between them. Once this step was completed, the Google document table was 93 pages long, containing historical literacy messages from the 33 articles that were selected for analysis. This may seem extensive, but compared to the hundreds of pages of these 33 articles combined, it demonstrates the reduction process of the data the content analysis methodology facilitated.

By comparing the historical literacy messages in a table, I discovered which types of messages were more present in an article and where there were gaps. These gaps are addressed in further detail in Chapter 4.

**Step 5: Determine findings.** Again, content analysis requires multiple cycles of data analysis. After collecting the historical literacy messages in a table, I engaged in another recursive cycle of looking at the data, isolating patterns, and making sense of the data. Upon feedback from my committee, I decided to eliminate articles that were book reviews because I wanted to isolate unique messages instead of a review of someone's original work. This

eliminated four articles from my count of 33, leaving me with a final total of 29. A complete listing of the articles selected for analysis can be found in Appendix A and Appendix B. Within these 29 articles, I uncovered three general findings:

1. Definitions of historical literacy varied between journals and even within the journals, so defining historical literacy was difficult and complex.
2. Because of the noted complexity, elements of historical literacy were addressed far more often than the whole concept.
3. Intended participants for historical literacy are varied.

**Step 6: Addressing trustworthiness and reliability.** The last step in data collection and analysis was to compare my findings with the feedback from a critical friend to attend to trustworthiness and reliability in my research. Due to the qualitative nature of this study, I was the main interpreter of the data. Therefore, the findings are subject to some level of bias. To alleviate undue amounts of bias, another reader was recruited to analyze and code some of the data. I asked a friend who is university educated, but in a different field to analyze and code a subset of the data. The fact that they are educated in a different social science field contributes to the validity because they could look at an article and objectively determine whether or not it qualified as historical literacy, based on the given definition.

They were given at an even numbered subset of the articles used for data analysis, one article from each journal for each year. This would equal roughly a third of the articles used in this study. This critical friend was given my definitions of historical literacy, content-area literacy, and disciplinary literacy along with categories that had been identified in phase two of data analysis and were asked to highlight any historical literacy messages found in the articles, coding them as they saw fit within the categories provided. The reader was given a week and a

half to read and code the subset of data. After receiving their feedback, I compared their highlighted literacy messages from the articles with my own and calculated a percentage of comparability between the articles that we read, analyzed, and coded.

The goal was to have 80% compatibility between what they noticed as historical literacy based on the definition stated in this research and what I highlighted and categorized as historical literacy and its components. 80% compatibility between what they highlighted as literacy messages as well as my own analysis for 12 articles, more than a third of the data, demonstrated a reliable analysis on my part, and demonstrated the trustworthiness of my findings, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

## Chapter 4: Findings

*Given the renewed emphasis on literacy from the CCSS and the NCSS for the Social Studies C3 Framework, what are the historical literacy messages from 2010-2015 in JAAL and TRSE for the history classroom?* To answer this question, I analyzed historical literacy messages through a content analysis of two leading journals, from literacy teacher educators in *JAAL* and history teaching teacher educators in *TRSE* in the years since the CCSS and NCSS C3 framework were implemented.

In recent years, research trends have shifted towards disciplinary literacy, of which historical literacy is a part. I expected to find both literacy teacher educators and history teaching teacher educators discussing historical literacy in slightly different ways because as the literature shows, literacy in the secondary classroom has been debated and competing views of what kind of literacy to incorporate into the classroom continue today. A latent qualitative content analysis of historical literacy messages in the years since the CCSS and C3 framework, confirmed this prediction.

Using my definition of historical literacy, this study examined how historical literacy was used in these research journals. I uncovered three general findings:

1. Definitions of historical literacy varied between journals and even within the journals, so defining historical literacy was difficult and complex. Results from this study indicated definitions of historical literacy vary between journals, *JAAL* tended to focus more broadly on disciplinary literacy, instead of focusing solely on historical literacy while *TRSE* tended to have more specific definitions of historical literacy. Only six articles addressed a complex view of literacy that included reading, writing, thinking, and content knowledge construction, all of these were found in *TRSE*.

2. Because of the noted complexity, elements of historical literacy were addressed far more often than the whole concept. Both journals focused on elements of historical literacy, like historical reading, thinking or writing, instead of the whole concept. For example, in *JAAL* when focused on historical literacy, much of the literacy messages centered on reading in history, while *TRSE* focused more on historical thinking skills.

3. Intended participants expected to engage in historical literacy varied. In both journals, historical literacy is problematic for different intended participants because literacy teacher educators and history teaching teacher educators understand historical literacy differently, and thus how they discuss it for students, for teachers and for other teacher educators altered slightly.

**Definitions of Historical Literacy in *JAAL* and *TRSE***

There were two categories of historical literacy classifications, definite and indefinite. See Table 3 for a numerical breakdown of classifications per journal. Definite historical literacy messages were clear, had concrete boundaries and holistic. Well-defined examples from both journals were broad enough to encompass all of the separate elements of historical literacy. For example, Nokes (2010c, *TRSE*) in his definition of historical literacy addressed the big picture and the whole concept of historical literacy instead of just a small part. When articles used a definite concept for historical literacy, it allowed for more complexity of understanding.

However, indefinite historical literacy messages were more limiting. Vague indefinite concepts were restricted in scope of how they discussed historical literacy. When definitions of historical literacy were narrow in focus, it did not allow for the same in-depth discussion of historical literacy as a whole concept. For example, *JAAL* articles tended to touch on historical literacy in passing in favor of a larger discussion of disciplinary literacy. Indefinite examples in *TRSE* did not clearly define of historical literacy because they seemed to be working from a

commonly shared assumed understanding of the concept and therefore had no need to clarify it in the articles.

The data show just how differently historical literacy is defined in *JAAL* and *TRSE*. This answers the research question, what are the historical literacy messages from *JAAL* and *TRSE* in two ways. First, part of the research question is what is being said about historical literacy, and based on the data examined here, there is much to say about historical literacy. On the other hand, despite what is currently being discussed about historical literacy, there could be more. Of the hundreds of articles published in *JAAL* and *TRSE*, only 29 articles dealt with historical literacy in any meaningful way. Secondly, this finding illustrates the issue of having multiple definitions of historical literacy from different groups, literacy educators and history teacher educators. It is clear that these groups see historical literacy differently, which is problematic for how history teachers are supposed to learn and incorporate it into the classroom.

Table 3

*Definite and Indefinite Historical Literacy in JAAL and TRSE*

| | TRSE | JAAL |
|---|---|---|
| Definite | 10 | 7 |
| Indefinite | 6 | 6 |
| Totals | 16 | 13 |

**Definite examples of historical literacy in *JAAL* and *TRSE*.** Over half of the articles from *TRSE* clearly identified what was historical literacy. Five of the 10 articles in *TRSE* that had a definite view of historical literacy went beyond just defining what historical literacy is, but specifically looked at all of the elements that are incorporated in the concept. These five articles were the only ones in the entire data set to not only define historical literacy, but also specifically address all of the elements of it. On the other hand, *JAAL* offered definite constructions of historical literacy about 50% of the time. Seven of the 13 *JAAL* articles feature specific

definitions of historical literacy, but these definitions were almost always used in conjunction with a discussion on disciplinary literacy. As has been demonstrated in the literature review, *historical literacy* and *disciplinary literacy* are often used synonymously, but they represent two different concepts. When they are paired so closely together as they were often in *JAAL*, it could lead to misunderstanding in the two notions.

Historical literacy is all-inclusive, as it is reading, writing, thinking, acting, and seeing in discipline-specific ways. In the following examples from *TRSE,* these authors were able to address this complexity in their articles by using a clear, definite idea of historical literacy: Nokes (2010c), Girard (2012), Stanton (2012), De La Paz (2014), Nokes (2014). For example, Nokes (2010c) defined historical literacy in complex, yet broad terms. This allowed him to address the whole concept instead of just a small part. Within this quote, Nokes discussed reading "historical reading is fundamentally different than other types of reading…value primary sources…The work of historians is to sift through the layers of bias by comparing multiple primary and secondary sources" (p. 520), thinking "historical literacy is the ability to glean appropriate information about the past from resources of many genres," (p. 520), content knowledge "to not simply possess knowledge, but to know how to build it," (p. 520), and writing "Historians develop expertise in using written evidence, supplemented by artifacts, to construct theories and understandings of people in the past…to develop theories that explain past events" (p. 520). His definition of historical literacy, although extensive, allows for the complex inherent in the concept and focuses on all the parts of being historically literate, not just one element.

Stanton (2012) continued this theme of broad definitions of historical literacy when he stated:

> Many exciting developments … including an increased emphasis on the use of primary source documents…and culturally responsive education…These two trends, especially when associated with historical thinking, promote a more complete and socially just view of events within history education. (p. 342)

Stanton combined "exciting developments…increased emphasis on use of primary source document…culturally responsive education…[and] historical thinking" (p. 342) to illustrate the complexity of historical literacy.

De La Paz (2014) also grounded her definition of historical literacy within the disciplinary literacy research and includes reading, writing, and thinking in her definition when she stated:

> Here, we look to more recent conceptions of disciplinary literacy (Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008) that highlight the importance of moving beyond basic and intermediate literacy instruction to focus on discipline-specific ways of reading and writing and the kinds of disciplinary thinking embedded in them. When it comes to reading, we consider Wineburg's (1991) identification of sourcing, corroboration, and contextualization, as historical ways of reading and analysis, and De La Paz and Felton's (2010) and Monte-Sano's (2010) ideas about the disciplinary use of evidence in students' historical essays. In other words, we focused on ways of reading, thinking, and writing that are foundational to historical analysis rather than more general literacy strategies that might apply to many content areas. (p. 230)

As the only recurring author in *TRSE* regarding historical literacy, Nokes (2014) summarily described "Historical literacy" involves reading and writing in historically appropriate ways. It includes skillfully negotiating the texts and evidence that historians employ and

creating texts or speech that passes peer review (Nokes, 2013; Wineburg, et al., 2011)" (p. 377). When historical literacy is well defined, complexity is welcomed. Historical literacy is described in nuanced ways; definitions of historical literacy often incorporated specific descriptions of different elements like historical reading, writing, thinking, and content knowledge.

These examples from *TRSE* show how specific definitions of historical literacy allow much more insight into the topic by covering all aspects of it, not just a small part. These examples also show how it the authors offered more than just a simple definition of historical literacy, but specifically addressed all of the aspects of it, which allowed for more exploration of the complexity of the term.

*JAAL* also used specific definitions of historical literacy. Seven of the 13 *JAAL* articles feature specific definitions of historical literacy. In these examples from *JAAL,* these authors also offered fairly clear definitions of historical literacy. For example, Shanahan (2013) stated "historians create knowledge by gathering evidence for their claims using documents and artifacts from the past and by reading other historical accounts, you will understand why historians insist that they are interpreters of history rather than chroniclers" (p. 94). While this definition is certainly more specific than the broader definitions of disciplinary literacy, it only focuses on reading like a historian, unlike the more complex definitions of historical literacy found in *TRSE*. The definition of Wineburg, Reisman, and Gillis (2015) also seemed to focus solely on historical reading. They stated "Disciplinary literacy calls on students to bring the full weight of their intellect to the act of reading. In addition to sourcing and contextualization, acts of corroboration, and close reading are crucial to making sense of historical texts" (p. 637).

Fang (2014) contended "becoming historically literate means not just learning about events, facts, and historical figures through reading and comprehending but, more important,

developing a sophisticated understanding of historical time, agency, and causality by asking significant questions, assessing authors' perspectives, evaluating evidence across multiple sources, making judgments within the confines of the context in question, and determining the reliability of different accounts on the same event" (p. 445). Fang's definition built on Shanahan's (2013) definition, adding thinking to historical reading as part of being historically literate. Baron (2015) goes a step further to include a creation aspect in historical literacy with "making meaning." "Greater emphasis on disciplinary literacy in the classroom, the particular ways of knowing, thinking, and making meaning inherent to particular disciplines (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008), requires literacy and history educators to consider the particular ways that meaning is constructed in the domain of History" (p. 462). Baron (2015) reached out to the two audiences that this research would be of interest to, asking both "literacy and history educators to consider the particular ways that meaning is constructed in…history," but this definition of historical literacy is very similar to disciplinary literacy which could lead to confusion differentiating between the two terms.

All of these examples from *JAAL* demonstrate specifically how historical literacy was defined. Unlike some of the *TRSE* articles, *JAAL* definitions of historical literacy while clear, did not encompass all of the elements of historical literacy, tending to focus on one part. Overall, in both journals, there seemed to be a fairly clear dividing line between definitions of historical literacy that were definitive and specific versus ones that were vague or simply a definition of disciplinary literacy. For the most part, in *JAAL*, what divided the definitions of historical literacy was if it was simply of a larger discussion on disciplinary literacy, or if it had specific ideas about literacy in history.

**Indefinite examples of historical literacy in *JAAL* and *TRSE*.** Not all of the *TRSE* articles were as elaborative in their definitions of historical literacy as six of the 16 articles in *TRSE* did not clearly define historical literacy (see Table 3). Despite not clearly defining historical literacy, often they would incorporate at least one of the elements, such as historical thinking. Even if an article addressed elements of historical literacy, there was often no concrete definition of historical literacy, leading me to question whether these authors were working under a common definition of what historical literacy, or whether they were so focused on a part, they neglected to look at the whole concept. There were many articles from *TRSE* focused on historical thinking (i.e., Breakstone, 2014; Brooks, 2011; Chappell, 2010; Endacott, 2010; Goldberg, 2013; Marcus, 2012; and Swan, 2013; see Appendix A for full reference) or historical empathy. Historical thinking, of which historical empathy is a sub category, is an important element of historical literacy, but it does not illustrate the whole picture. Without a clear definition of historical literacy, essential elements like writing were neglected.

The following examples from *TRSE* illustrate the problems with indefinite messages about historical literacy. In one interesting case, Pace (2011) described teachers using literacy skills within history lessons, but seemed to be particularly cautious about such integration. "Many teachers and scholars advocate focusing on literacy skills within history lessons. This study reinforces the importance of attending to the ways integration of subjects occurs and the possible trade-offs regarding quality of curricular content" (p. 57). Most articles that had a clear, broad view of historical literacy were positive about the potential impact on student learning. Mathews (2012) definition of historical literacy focused solely on the element of historical reading. He stated:

> When students are taught to read like historians and evaluate source and context, they must also learn to be critical consumers of what they read (VanSledright & Kelly, 1998) … Yet fostering skills in disciplinary reading might not necessarily help students interrogate perspectives and address these issues. Therefore, students must also learn to take a critical stance when analyzing primary and secondary sources. (p. 418)

Likewise, Dewitt (2013) focused on one part of historical literacy, specifically historical thinking, when he described, "social studies as inquiry, with the purpose of such studies to develop critically thinking citizens who can avail themselves of the rich content of the social sciences to make informed decisions for the public good" (p. 385). Dewitt's example is interesting because he cited the NCSS C3 Framework, which as was discussed earlier, these standards emphasized historical literacy in its entirety, not just in its separate elements. However, this example shows how he only focused on one part of historical literacy, (i.e., "inquiry") without addressing the other parts of a complex concept. Dewitt's example did not address the full complexity of the C3 framework and historical literacy, focusing only on "inquiry" and historical thinking. Despite being a journal dedicated to learning in the social science classroom, these articles illustrate how sometimes, historical literacy was not well defined. The implications of this will be discussed further in the next chapter.

Unlike the five authors in *TRSE*, however, authors in *JAAL* did not have an article that addressed all the elements of historical literacy. Either the definition was too broad, (i.e., focusing on disciplinary literacy instead of specifically historical literacy); or when authors in *JAAL* did discuss historical literacy, they focused on only one or two elements instead of the larger concept. Literacy messages in five of the 13 *JAAL* articles are more about disciplinary literacy than anything specific to historical literacy (i.e., Boyd, 2012; Fang 2013; Gillis, 2014;

Wilson, 2011; and Wineburg, 2015; see Appendix A for full reference). The following examples demonstrate the indefinite nature of the historical literacy messages found from authors in *JAAL*.

For example, Fang (2013) edited a Content-Area Literacy column that transitioned to a disciplinary literacy column circa 2013. Shanahan (2013) differentiated between content-area literacy and disciplinary literacy by saying:

> In disciplinary literacy, the discipline itself and the ways of thinking in that discipline determine the kinds of strategies to use in order to understand texts. This differs from content-area literacy, in which the strategies one knows determine how reading ensues. (p. 94)

This distinction is important, as more and more articles featured disciplinary literacy instead of content-area literacy. Within the time frame of this study, Fang's column featured many more discussions on disciplinary literacy. His definition of disciplinary literacy was broad enough to incorporate any of the disciplines when he stated:

> Proponents of disciplinary literacy recommend that literacy instruction be anchored in the disciplines and advocate explicit attention to discipline-specific cognitive strategies, language skills, literate practices, and habits of mind. In a disciplinary literacy model, are expected to use specialized then, students' literacy skills, strategies, and practices to engage in disciplinary learning and socialization. (p. 628)

Pytash's (2012) definition worked well with Fang's by going over three basic tenets of disciplinary literacy when she stated, "According to Moje (2008), there are three instructional tenets of disciplinary literacy: (1) discourses and practices in disciplinary learning and literacy (2) identities and identifications in disciplinary learning and literacy and (3) knowledge in disciplinary learning and literacy" (p. 52).

Again, definitions in *JAAL* tended to have a broad focus, such as Gillis (2014) who argued:

> Being a 'teacher of secondary literacy' is more accurately being a teacher of discipline appropriate literacy practices, and this cannot be divorced from sufficient content knowledge to understand the epistemology and philosophy of the field from which the text is drawn. (p. 621)

The definitions above are broadly focused on disciplinary literacy, instead of specific to historical literacy although they use many of the same elements. Similarly, Wilson (2011) offered a broad definition that is not very specific to historical literacy although the article mentions historical literacy, she offers a definition of disciplinary literacy instead. She stated:

> A text can be any instance of communication that is used to convey meaning—such as a mineral that students examine to ascertain its properties, a map that students search to locate trading routes, and the written and spoken words that serve as instructions to perform discipline-specific tasks on these texts—all of which instantiate what it means to 'do earth science' or 'do history' (for instance) at a given point in time. (p. 436)

Boyd (2012) described how "Multiple forms of texts used across these lessons also show how images (symbols of globalization), charts (solubility graph), and diagrams (cell diagram) play a role in signifying disciplinary concepts" (p. 20), briefly mentioning texts specific to history before broadening the definition to include other disciplines.

These examples illustrate the closest definitions to historical literacy found in these articles from JAAL. These examples are focus much more on disciplinary literacy as a concept instead of focusing specifically on historical literacy. As is demonstrated in these quotes, historical literacy was mentioned in passing in favor of a broader conversation on disciplinary

literacy. These examples from *JAAL* and *TRSE* underscore the importance of this finding about definitions of historical literacy. When historical literacy is well defined, it allows for a better analysis of historical literacy, and all of its components. Even more important is a clear definition and specific attention to the many parts of historical literacy, like Nokes (2010c), Girard (2012), Stanton (2012), De La Paz (2014), and Nokes (2014). Without acknowledging the breadth of material historical literacy encompasses, essential elements are neglected and thus can lead students to fall short of being truly literate.

**Elements of Historical Literacy in *JAAL* and *TRSE***

Historical literacy is a complex idea as has been illustrated by the evidence above. Depending on the intended participant, historical literacy can mean many different things. Intended participant is my term that refers to the group the author sees engaging in historical literacy. For the purpose of this study, historical literacy is defined as the ability to comprehend, critique, and create texts in discipline-specific ways and co-opt historians' habits of mind.

Because of this complexity, articles would often focus primarily on one or two elements of historical literacy, such as reading in history or historical thinking, instead of the whole concept. Evidence from the data shows what types of historical literacy messages were most prevalent in an article, demonstrating what the overall focus of the article was. See Table 4 for a summary of the types of elements that were primarily emphasized in each journal. As was introduced earlier, the more complex the definition of historical literacy, the more elements the articles were able to address.

Table 4

*Elements of Historical Literacy Emphasized in JAAL and TRSE*

| Element | *JAAL* | *TRSE* |
|---|---|---|
| Reading | 6 | 0 |
| Writing | 2 | 1 |
| Thinking | 0 | 9 |
| Literacy | 5 | 6 |
| Total | 13 | 16 |

This finding answers the research question in two ways: first by illustrating what exactly is being said about historical literacy in the current research, it demonstrates what about historical literacy each journal emphasizes. This is important to know because it gives a good indication of what topics in connection to historical literacy have been covered well. This leads to the second reason this finding answers the research question, more importantly, it highlights where there are gaps in the current research, and these gaps are most apparent in the historical literacy messages regarding writing in history. This has significant implications for the classroom especially in terms of the theoretical lens of disciplinary literacy. If students are not producing, they are only consuming, which falls short of being truly literate in the discipline.

The way in which each of the elements of historical literacy was used in the data will be discussed in the following section, starting with writing, thinking, then reading.

**Writing in *JAAL* and *TRSE*.** Of all the elements of historical literacy, writing was the least focused in all the articles. Only three articles focused mostly on writing: De La Paz (2014) in *TRSE*, Gritter, (2013), Pytash (2012) in *JAAL*. When writing was addressed in other articles, it was included as almost an afterthought. This is significant because of what is means to be

truly literate in a discipline. As was noted in the literature review, disciplinary literacy allows students to participate in the conversation about the discipline, by critiquing and creating knowledge, not just reading or writing about what other people have done or said (Draper, 2010). Findings of the current research indicated just how lacking the discussion is on writing in history and the implications for the history classroom are significant.

For example, at the end of Baron (2015) a *JAAL* article, there was a brief recommendation for historical writing. Baron wrote "Assessing Historical Writing: Following either Building Analysis on its own or in conjunction with a SAC, ask students to write a summative essay in which they present their position on the main question posed" (p. 470). In the entire article, most of the historical literacy messages were focused on reading, and despite having a clear definition of historical literacy, writing was still an afterthought, instead of integrated throughout. Writing should be incorporated throughout to be truly literate in history.

Similarly, in Damico (2010), a *JAAL* article, there was a mention of writing as well, however briefly, "The writing tool within the lenses also functions as a response log, providing students with opportunities to document and view their thinking" (p. 329). Even then, it is not referencing writing as an act of creating knowledge, but rather as a way to process historical thinking. In Wilson (2011), a *JAAL* article, packaged historical reading and writing together, "When definitions of text are expanded beyond printed words, reading and writing instruction includes explicit attention to the characteristics of multimodal representations" (p. 441), however, reading was discussed much further in depth elsewhere in the article.

Lastly, Fang (2014) discusses how historical knowledge is created through reading and touches on other elements of historical literacy that are important, like historical thinking, however, he did not go into depth about what it means to create in history, merely hinted at it. In

Fang (2014), a *JAAL* article, he used verbs like *developing*, *assessing*, and *evaluating* which could reference writing, but most likely represent historical thinking. There was no exploration of what it means to create as a historically literate person, instead focusing on reading and thinking.

This lack of discussion on creation in history is worrisome because if the field only focuses on reading and thinking, as has been evidenced by this research, then students are expected to read and think about what other people have done or said, with no opportunity for them to create their own knowledge and share it with a wider audience.

**Historical Thinking in *JAAL* and *TRSE*.** Unlike writing, historical thinking was a major focus in the discussion on historical literacy in both *JAAL* and *TRSE*. Nine of the 16 *TRSE* articles primarily focused on historical thinking; almost all of the articles mention historical literacy in one way or another. More than half of the *TRSE* articles within this time period were focused on historical thinking. However, in *JAAL* none of the articles focused solely on historical thinking. Most often, historical thinking was included in the overall discussion of historical literacy.

The phenomenon of using historical literacy and historical thinking synonymously is interesting because of how often the two terms are used interchangeably even though they are two distinct concepts. In *TRSE,* Nokes (2014) acknowledged how the two concepts are intertwined.

> Historical literacy is a vital element of historical thinking, and historical thinking is essential in historical inquiry. Because of the significant overlap between the concept of historical literacy and historical thinking, the terms are used somewhat interchangeably in current research and throughout this article. (p. 377)

Despite the prevalence of using historical thinking and historical literacy synonymously, this research tried to delineate the differences as much as possible.

The following examples illustrate the tendency to focus on historical thinking, over the larger concept of historical literacy. In *TRSE,* Girard (2012) argued, "history shares the difficulty of understanding parts without knowing the whole, and may help account for the challenges students face in engaging in historical thinking, reading, and writing" (p. 233) The challenge is the same for teacher educators when discussing historical literacy. This may be the explanation why so much focused on historical thinking because all together it is too much to think on and therefore it is much easier to focus on a part. In *TRSE*, Marcus' (2012) article on how teachers use museums in the history classroom focused on the historical thinking skills that may or may not be engaged by going to a museum. "Simply bringing students to a museum and relying on a prepackaged set of experiences does not guarantee that students will develop historical empathy or the ability to analyze historical evidence" (p. 89). The majority of the focus is on historical thinking, although literacy could just as easily have been incorporated in addition to historical thinking.

**Historical Reading in *JAAL* and *TRSE*.** Six of 13 articles, or almost half, of the *JAAL* articles, when discussing historical literacy focused on historical reading. This could be because although *JAAL* is about adolescent literacy, the journal still leans toward reading because of the ELA perspective of the audience and teacher educators that contribute. Interestingly enough, none of the articles in *TRSE* focused primarily on reading in history. Rather, reading was discussed most often in conjunction with historical thinking, with the historians' habits of mind being the forefront of the discussion. As has been demonstrated throughout this study, historical literacy is more than just reading.

The following examples from *JAAL* highlight the tendency to focus on reading in history over the larger concept of historical literacy. For example, Damico (2009) in a *JAAL* article, focused on reading in history, "disciplined inquiry in social studies and content area literacy instruction, especially cognitive reading strategies instruction" (p. 326). Later in the same piece, "The lenses promote disciplinary literacy in social studies—that is, metacognitive reading strategies with disciplinary practices, primarily drawn from the discipline of history" (p. 328). Both of these examples from Damico demonstrate a particular interest in reading strategies in history, but not any other elements of historical literacy. There was a special emphasis on "reading strategies" found in history instead of looking at the entirety of what it means to be literate in history.

In *JAAL*, even though Wilson (2011) said that disciplinary reading is more than just content-area literacy, the article was still primarily focused on reading, at the expense of the other elements of disciplinary literacy. "Disciplinary reading instruction can entail more than comprehension strategy instruction; it can also entail encouraging students to take a broad view of the uses and forms of texts in each discipline" (p. 441). In *JAAL*, historical reading tended to sound like content-area reading, even though authors would often cite a clear definition of disciplinary literacy.

For example, Gillis (2014) cited Moje's (2008) definition of disciplinary literacy, but then discussed several general strategies, choosing "strategies that accomplished my content objectives and adapted them to fit my teaching style, context, and content" (p. 615). It is not wrong to use strategies in the classroom, but it needs to be clear for what purpose students are expected to use these strategies for. This indicates a trend of using general literacy strategies instead looking to the discipline for inherent ways of doing history. Only addressing one or two

elements of historical literacy is significant because it means essential elements are ignored or deemphasized. This has important implications for the history classroom.

**Intended Participants for Historical Literacy in *JAAL* and *TRSE***

During the second phase of data analysis, it occurred to me that historical literacy was talked about differently depending on whether the researchers were discussing students, teachers or other teacher educators, and how those different groups engaged with historical literacy. The overall definition of historical literacy may be the same for each of these intended participants, however, how they engage with historical literacy is different and worth noting. This illustrates how important is to know what is being said about historical literacy so further research can look at how historical literacy is taken up by these different groups based on these historical literacy messages.

This finding answers the research question in three main ways. First, it is important to see for whom historical literacy is intended. Teachers, students and teacher educators have different expectations and perceptions when it comes to historical literacy. I demonstrated a clear analysis of the intended participants in Table 5. See Table 5 for the different groups identified and the numbers associated with each. Secondly, this finding illustrates the focus of the field. As demonstrated by Table 5, *JAAL* focused heavily on teachers as the intended participants in historical literacy, while *TRSE* focused students as the intended target for historical literacy. Lastly, this finding highlights the differences between intended groups. Becoming aware of these differences could be key in understanding what historical literacy looks like in the classroom. This section will look at the findings for the intended groups for historical literacy, starting with students, teachers, then teacher educators.

Table 5

*Intended Participants in Historical Literacy in JAAL and TRSE*

| | *JAAL* | *TRSE* |
|---|---|---|
| Students | 3 | 9 |
| Teachers | 7 | 4 |
| Teacher Educators | 2 | 3 |

**Students.** Without a clear grasp of historical literacy or experience teaching the disciplinary practices inherent in the discipline, teachers struggle to teach it to students. Wineburg (1999) described historical thinking as an unnatural act that students struggle to comprehend. Historical thinking and also, historical literacy is easier to understand when it has been scaffolded well from teachers.

In *JAAL*, Stockdill and Moore (2011) demonstrated how students can gain a better grasp of historical literacy in the classroom, when

> Teachers…engage students in authentic historical inquiry in which they identify questions, respond to these questions by using multiple texts, and then produce their own historical accounts that answer their questions. During this process, teachers can help students consider who produced the texts and the contexts, in which they were produced, compare and contrast the different writings, and generate their own accounts of events. (p. 626)

Even though the audience of the Stockdill and Moore article is other teachers or teacher educators, it discusses how historical literacy is to be taken up by students. Students are the intended participants of historical literacy in this case, even if they were not the intended audience.

**Teachers.** Historical literacy is problematic for content-area teachers because they are not literacy specialists. The research shows that how teachers understand historical literacy has a direct impact on how they incorporate it in the classroom. In *TRSE*, Nokes (2010c) explained, "Recent research shows that history teachers' understanding of reading processes influences whether students are given instruction on historical reading and reasoning (Monte-Sano & Cochran, 2009)" (p. 517).

Girard (2012), also from *TRSE*, corroborated this notion, "Likewise, recent teaching standards…emphasize the importance of teachers' understandings of the central concepts, debates, tools of inquiry, ways of thinking, and the structures of their disciplines" (p. 231). He went on to suggest, "more research is needed regarding the ways in which teachers might offer support for students' historical thinking, reading, and writing…including how teachers introduce and encourage students to use them, and what sense students make of these supports" (p. 231).

In *TRSE*, Marcus (2012) described

> Most teachers have expansive content knowledge in their specialty and an expertise in formal pedagogy; many teachers have a more limited knowledge of a museum's specific content focus and may have minimal training or expertise about how to successfully support and incorporate museum visits into their instruction. (p. 74)

This reaches at the heart of the problem for historical literacy especially for teachers. Many educators have extensive content knowledge, but not as many have experience in disciplinary knowledge, or in other words how to incorporate historical literacy into the classroom. Nokes (2010c) also noted how ill-prepared teachers are to teach historical literacies, "Further, the lack of historical process instruction may indicate that the preparation of history teachers may not adequately qualify them to teach historical processes" (p. 536).

One way to help teachers gain an understanding of historical literacy is to have them turn to the CCSS and the disciplinary literacy practices outlined within them. In *JAAL*, Shanahan (2013) said:

> Learning how to teach disciplinary literacy also means taking a good look at the Common Core State Standards…These standards value the distinct literacy practices of history/social studies and science and technical subjects in grades 6 through 12. (p. 96)

**Teacher educators.** Lastly, within this study, historical literacy was referenced for teacher educators, a small, but important group. In *TRSE*, Nokes, (2010) noted that teacher educators need to make sure they are helping preservice teachers focus on the right content, processes, not just product. He said, "Wineburg (2005) contends that the current focus on building encyclopedic content knowledge in preservice teachers inhibits efforts to help them learn historical processes and to consider how these processes might be taught to their students" (p. 517). Nokes went on to show how "history teacher educators…must build among teacher candidates a solid commitment to teaching historical literacy" (p. 536).

Pytash (2012), in *JAAL*, said:

> To meet the literacy needs of young adults, secondary teachers must be prepared to teach specialized literacy practices unique to their discipline. This challenges teacher educators to conceptualize a curriculum in which secondary preservice teachers learn to teach the demands of their content area in addition to particular aspects of their discipline that involve literacy. (p. 52)

**Discrepant Data**

One of the articles in *TRSE*, (Pace, 2011) looked at the impact of NCLB on literacy in the history classroom. It is interesting to note that NCLB seemed to focus on content-area literacy

instead of disciplinary literacy. Maybe CCSS contributed to a more complex view of text or did the shift to disciplinary literacy in 2008 contribute to CCSS?

Pace's article in *TRSE* is also discrepant because although it addresses almost every category of historical literacy (reading, writing, thinking, and literacy) it did not offer a concrete definition of historical literacy, neither did it cite disciplinary literacy researchers like Moje, Shanahan and Shanahan, Wineburg, or Nokes. "A few teachers embraced the goals of raising test scores and developing skills in literacy, but in the lowest performing school with the most students of color, academic literacy skills training interfered with exploration of history" (p. 32). The use of the word "interfered" is very interesting because historical literacy is presented at odds with the exploration of history, which is interesting considering how using historical literacy allows students to not only explore history, but learn how to contribute to it too.

Here is another unusual use of content-area literacy instead of disciplinary literacy, especially in 2013, from Gritter (2013) in *JAAL*,

> Good content area literacy teaching structures to students' language support provides so they can express content area concepts in class with expertise (Walqui, 2006). When academic language is explicitly taught to students, classroom discourse and disciplinary writing become more sophisticated. Spoken language begins to mirror written language (Gibbons, 2002). With more sophisticated language available as communicative resources, students are able to improve their writing in content area genres (Schleppegrell, Greer, & Taylor, 2008). (p. 408)

This is interesting because this article seems to still use a content-area literacy perspective of historical literacy instead of disciplinary literacy, which is unusual considering the late date. By 2013, most researchers were working with a well-constructed definition of at least

disciplinary literacy, if not historical literacy. These discrepant cases reiterate the need for research of this kind. If historical literacy is discussed in so many different ways, what does that mean for the history classroom? What kind of literacy are history teachers using? This study contributes to the first step in answering these questions by looking at what is has been said regarding historical literacy.

**Summary of Results**

This research set out to answer the question, *given the renewed emphasis on literacy from the CCSS and the NCSS for the Social Studies C3 Framework, what are the historical literacy messages from 2010-2015 in JAAL and TRSE for the history classroom?* Through this study, I determined that historical literacy is discussed in different ways between these two journals. Overall, historical literacy was not discussed as often as it should be because definitions of historical literacy continued to vary widely.

First, *JAAL* and *TRSE* used different definitions of historical literacy, with *TRSE* articles more specific to the discipline of history. Discipline experts did not focus on the big picture, often forgoing concrete definitions of historical literacy, choosing instead to focus on parts of the whole such as empathy or thinking. However, *JAAL* articles used a broader definition of *disciplinary literacy* instead of specifically *historical literacy*. Some of the content in the *JAAL* articles that discussed disciplinary literacy was tailored toward the history classroom.

Secondly, both journals discussed more of the separate elements of historical literacy rather than the overall concept. This part and parcel approach to historical literacy meant that essential elements are neglected like writing. Usually, it is packaged with reading or thinking without really focusing on how students can mimic discipline-specific ways of writing and producing authentic historical knowledge. Literacy experts acknowledged that reading and

writing in history are unique to the discipline, but did not provide proof of what these distinct differences looked like and how they can contribute to students learning history, instead choosing to discuss the broader concept of *disciplinary literacy*.

Lastly, depending on the intended participants, *historical literacy* was referenced different for students, teachers, and other teacher educators. These results indicated that although there has been a renewed emphasis in historical literacy in the years since the CCSS and C3 framework, there were still significant differences between these two groups of teacher educators. The implications for the history classroom will be discussed further in the next chapter.

# Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine the nature of the *historical literacy* messages through a content analysis of two leading journals, from literacy teacher educators in *JAAL* and history teacher educators in *TRSE* in the years since the CCSS and NCSS C3 framework were implemented. The findings of this study revealed that while literacy teacher educators and history teacher educators both discussed historical literacy, there were enough differences between these two groups to hold significant implications for the history classroom. Using my definition of *historical literacy*, (i.e., the ability to comprehend, critique, and create texts in discipline-specific ways and co-opt historians' habits of mind), this study examined how historical literacy was used in these research journals. I uncovered three general findings:

1. Definitions of historical literacy varied between journals and even within the journals, so defining historical literacy was difficult and complex.

2. Because of the noted complexity, elements of historical literacy were addressed far more often than discussing the whole concept.

3. Intended participants for historical literacy were varied.

This chapter focuses on a discussion of the historical literacy messages uncovered through this study; and the implications these messages may have for history teachers, literacy teacher educators, history teacher educators, and the history classroom.

## Defining Historical Literacy is Complex and Variable

First, definitions of historical literacy varied between journals and even within journals. More than half of the articles in *TRSE* and *JAAL* had definite terms for historical literacy. Even when the articles had vague descriptions, most of the articles used *disciplinary literacy* as a basis for discussing what happens in the history classroom. This indicates that at least disciplinary

literacy is a commonly understood concept in the current research and when researchers discussed *historical literacy*, they often had clear definitions for the concept.

There were a few notable exceptions to this rule, discussed in the discrepant data section, which indicates that *content-area literacy* continues to have an impact in the research. The fact that most of the articles in *JAAL* and *TRSE* used *disciplinary literacy* generally could mean that historical literacy could become more common in the research as more and more researchers focus more specifically on historical literacy instead of disciplinary literacy. This study is not a correlation study, so it cannot prove that CCSS or the C3 framework caused this to happen, but it is a trend that is worth noting and could have an impact in the history classroom.

Despite the evidence that showed about half of the data had clear definitions of historical literacy, there was still enough variety within those definitions. Defining historical literacy was difficult. Most articles had a general definition of historical literacy and many shared common elements. However, if definitions of historical literacy continue to vary widely, from non-existent to complex, it will be more difficult to see historical literacy in practice, because there is no common consensus. When historical literacy was well defined, it broadened the scope to include all the elements of historical literacy and opened up to the complexity of the concept.

Additionally, historical literacy is multifaceted. It is more than just reading or just thinking, but rather an integrated mix of many different skills, dispositions and knowledge bases. This study illustrated that complexity with the variety and quality of definitions of historical literacy found in these articles. Of the 29 articles, only five had a broad enough definition to incorporate most of the elements of historical literacy. The other articles, while incorporating some elements of disciplinary literacy, only focused on one or more elements of historical literacy specifically. When research does not clearly define historical literacy or only focuses on

one or two elements, intended participants could get conflicting perceptions of what historical literacy is and what is looks like in practice.

**Elements of Historical Literacy Favored over the Whole**

Secondly, because of the noted complexity, elements of historical literacy were addressed far more often than discussing the whole concept. Most articles acknowledged this complexity. This supports research that said, "historical thinking…is neither a natural process nor something that springs automatically from psychological development" (Wineburg, 1999, p. 491). Thinking about historical literacy is difficult, especially when you are considering the whole concept. However, maybe this same complexity overwhelms teacher educators, so they look at a piece of historical literacy instead of the whole. To paraphrase Aristotle in his *Metaphysics* , the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. Focusing the different elements of historical literacy is valuable and needed, but there is much greater value in the concept as a whole.

Focusing primarily on only one of the elements of historical literacy allows for more in-depth analysis. There were many articles that focused on historical thinking, especially in *TRSE.* Most of the articles in *JAAL* that dealt with only one element of historical literacy, focused on historical reading. It is understandable why authors in the current research on historical literacy would only focus on one part of the larger concept.

However, a large part of *disciplinary literacy*, and therefore in *historical literacy*, is the ability to create and critique knowledge in the field (Draper, 2010; Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Wineburg, 2015). Because of the sole focus, usually on historical thinking (*TRSE*) or historical reading (*JAAL*), both journals overlooked historical writing. Current research is very capable at looking at how students process information as historians but do not

attend to how students can create like historians. Without looking at the whole concept of historical literacy, valuable components of what it means to be literate in a field are ignored.

For instance, only three articles of the 29 analyzed, De La Paz (2014), Gritter (2013), and Pytash (2012), focus on writing in history. In the other articles, writing was mentioned very little. When historical writing was mentioned, it was almost as an afterthought. Historical literacy is not only reading and thinking. While those skills are vital to learning content material, if students only engage with content at this level, they remain consumers of information (Draper, 2010). *Historical literacy* allows students to become part of the discipline, to become creators of knowledge, to become active participants (Wineburg, 2015). Research must push to this next level of historical literacy research to look at creating creators of knowledge because anything less is a disservice to 21st century learners (Wineburg, 2006).

**Intended Participants for Historical Literacy are Varied**

Lastly, historical literacy was discussed differently depending on the intended participants. *Historical literacy* was examined in different ways when referring to how students used it, compared with how teachers used it, or even other teacher educators. On some level, this was to be expected because each group is starting from a unique perspective. However, with the differences between how *historical literacy* is described for different types of people, it might create incongruences in how *historical literacy* is perceived, and how it should be implemented in secondary classrooms. Therefore, it is vital for the research to clarify not only what is meant by historical literacy, but also what it looks like in actual classrooms.

**Limitations**

There were some limitations in this study that have to be taken into consideration when addressing the findings. First, for the purpose of this research, the scope of texts analyzed was

limited by the year (only articles from 2010 through 2015 were open for analysis). The content analysis was also limited by the sources; only two professional journals were used in the research. There are legitimate reasons why this was done, as was discussed earlier in the methodology chapter, but it does present a limitation. This research represents a small fraction of current opinion on literacy; it is not a comprehensive analysis of all the research. Still, such an analysis provides valuable insight into what literacy messages were presented to teachers in that time frame and could be the starting point for further research regarding *historical literacy.*

Secondly, with regard to the journals that were used in this study, it is important to note the differences in audience and style. *JAAL* is a practitioner journal. Teacher educators wrote for in-service teachers. *JAAL* articles were typically one third of the length of *TRSE* articles, and focused on readability. Whereas, *TRSE* articles focused on the research, describing in-depth studies and used a more formal tone than *JAAL*. *TRSE* is a research journal, written by teacher educators primarily for other teacher educators.

Both journals were chosen for specific reasons—for their standing in their respective fields, for their audiences in literacy and history and for the focus on adolescents and secondary education. However, some may claim that comparing literacy messages across such disparate styles is equivalent to comparing apples and oranges. Because of my specific definition for *historical literacy*, I feel I was able to account for the differences in style, audience and content. Despite the noted differences between the journals, I was able to analyze what is being said about historical literacy. Additionally, the differences between journals can actually serve as a benefit for the study because it tracks how different audiences talk about the same topic of historical literacy, and serves as a comparison point between both journals.

**Implications for Further Research**

The purpose of this study was to determine the nature of the historical literacy messages in current research through a content analysis of two leading journals, from literacy teacher educators in *JAAL* and history teaching teacher educators in *TRSE* in the years since the CCSS and NCSS C3 framework were implemented. This study has been an attempt to reveal messages within the current field of research concerning historical literacy. This research has a number of implications for further research.

First, more work is needed in historical literacy, especially in writing. Because of the differences in definitions of historical literacy, it seems to indicated that there needs to be more work to come to a general definition of historical literacy. With a more thorough definition of historical literacy that attends to the complexity of the concept, areas that were demonstrated to be weaknesses can get the attention and focus they need. As this study has demonstrated, writing in history is a weakness in both *JAAL* and *TRSE*. Without writing in historical literacy, students fall short of becoming truly literate.

Second, there needs to be more holistic work regarding historical literacy. The majority of articles in this study focused on one particular element of historical literacy, which is understandable considering how all-encompassing complete literacy can be. However, it is not impossible, for as demonstrated in this study, there were articles that managed to look at the whole issue of historical literacy, and not just parts. It is fine to focus on a part as long as there is more acknowledgement of the bigger issue and that the focus on the part does not lose sight of how it all connects together.

Lastly, more work is needed to help everyone, all the intended participants in historical literacy to be on the same page. This research demonstrated how historical literacy is used

differently depending on the intended participants. This is fine, as long as everyone is working towards the same goal. This study illustrated how historical literacy is referenced within these articles. Now, knowing what is being said in the current research, the field can go into greater depth into why that is the case.

**Conclusion**

This study has argued that since the adjustment in focus from content-area literacy to disciplinary literacy in popular research journals for adolescent literacy, and since the implementation of the CCSS in 2010, historical literacy has been emphasized in policy and in research unlike ever before. As a result, teachers and teacher educators feel the need to incorporate historical literacy more in the history classroom. However, before that could be done, it was necessary to look at what was being said in current research.

This study found that, for the most part, teacher educators are really clear on what disciplinary literacy is. *Historical literacy*, however, still needs to be clarified as definitions vary between journals and between different groups of teacher educators. Literacy teacher educators in *JAAL* still tend to overly focus on reading in historical literacy, even though it is dedicated to all aspects of adolescent literacy. Likewise, history teacher educators tend to focus overwhelmingly on historical thinking, which as this study has demonstrated, is only one part of a much larger concept. Both *JAAL* and *TRSE* hardly discuss writing in history, which is an important element of disciplinary literacy, being able to produce knowledge within a field.

Future research has many avenues of inquiry to explore, from looking at what it means to create new knowledge in the field of history, to more holistic research on historical literacy instead of the many parts, to more research on incorporating all intended participants to the same level of understanding in regards to historical literacy.

## References

Alvermann, D. E., & Moore, D. W. (1991) Secondary school reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research Vol. II.* (pp. 951-983). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Alvermann, D. E., & Phelps, S. F. (1994) *Content reading and literacy: Succeeding in today's diverse classrooms*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Aristotle. (1952) *Metaphysics.* In Ross, W. D., & Smith, J. A. (Eds.) Oxford: Claredon Press.

Bain, R. B. (2012). Using disciplinary literacy to develop coherence in history teacher education: The clinical rounds project. *History Teacher*, *45*, 513-532.

Bean, T. W. (1996) Reading in the content areas; Social constructivist dimensions. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 629-644). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bean, T., & O'Brien, D. (2012). Past and future directions in content area literacies. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56*, 275-278. doi:10.1002/JAAL.00138

Biancarosa, C., & Snow, C. E. (2006). *Reading next—A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Brozo, W. G., Moorman, G., Meyer, C., & Stewart, T. (2013). Content area reading and disciplinary literacy: A case for the radical center. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *56*, 353-357. doi: 10.1002/JAAL.153

Conley, M.W. (2012). Foregrounding the disciplines for teacher preparation in secondary literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56, 141–150. doi: 10.1002/jaal.00115

Draper, R. J., (2002a). School mathematics reform, constructivism, and literacy: A case for literacy instruction in the reform-oriented math classroom. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy. 45*, 520-529.

Draper, R. J. (2002b). Every teacher a literacy teacher? An analysis of the literacy-related messages in secondary methods textbooks. *Journal of Literacy Research, 34*, 357-384. doi: 10.1207/s15548430jlr3403_5

Draper, R. J., Broomhead, P., Jensen, A. P., Nokes, J. D., Siebert, D., & National, W.P. (2010). *(Re)imagining content-area literacy instruction*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Drew, S. V. (2012). Open up the ceiling on the common core state standards: Preparing students for 21st-century literacy—now. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *56*, 321–330. doi: 10.1002/jaal.00145

Erdogan, M. N., & Koseoglu, F. (2012). Analysis of high school physics, chemistry and biology curriculums in terms of scientific literacy themes. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *12*, 2899-2904.

Fang, Z., & Pace, B. G. (2013). Teaching with challenging texts in the disciplines: Text complexity and close reading. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 57*, 104–108. doi: 10.1002/JAAL.229

Frandsen, K. J. (2006) *Reading and writing in science: How do the reform documents attend to the fundamental sense of science literacy* (master's thesis). Retrieved from BYU Scholars Archive. (Paper 786.)

Friedman, A. M. (2006). World history teachers' use of digital primary sources: The effect of training. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *34*, 124-141. doi:10.1080/00933104.2006.10473300

Gee, J. P. (1989). What is literacy? *Journal of Education*, *171*(1), 18-25.

Gewertz, C. (2012). History lessons blend content knowledge, literacy. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review, 78*(4), 11-16.

Girard, B., & Harris, L. M. (2012). Striving for disciplinary literacy instruction: Cognitive tools in a world history course. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 40*, 230-259. doi:10.1080/00933104.2012.705183

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools—A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Heller, R. (2010). In praise of amateurism: A friendly critique of Moje's "call for change" in secondary literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 54*, 267-273. doi: 10.1598/JAAL.54.4.4

Herber, H. (1978). *Teaching reading in content areas* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Hinchman, K. A., & Moore, D. W. (2013). Close reading: A cautionary interpretation. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *56*, 441–450. doi: 10.1002/JAAL.163

Huysman, M. (2012). *Beyond bells and whistles: Content area teachers' understanding of and engagement with literacy* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from *ProQuest LLC*. (ED550646).

International Literacy Association Journals. (2016). *Get Resources.* Retrieved from https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/journals

Kibler, A. K., Walqui, A., & Bunch, G. C. (2015). Transformational opportunities: Language and literacy instruction for English language learners in the common core era in the United States. *TESOL Journal*, 6:9–35. doi: 10.1002/tesj.133

Lent, R. C. (2016). *This is disciplinary literacy: Reading, writing, thinking, and doing... content area by content area.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

McKenna, M. C., & Robinson, R. D. (1990). Content literacy: A definition and implications. *Journal of Reading, 34*, 184-186.

Moje, E. B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*, 96-107. doi: 10.1598/JAAL.52.2.1

Moje, E. B. (2010). Response: Heller's "in praise of amateurism−A friendly critique of Moje's 'call for change' in secondary literacy." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy,54*, 275-278. doi: 10.1598/JAAL.54.4.5

Monte-Sano, C. (2008). Qualities of historical writing instruction: A comparative case study of two teachers' practices. *American Educational Research Journal*, *45*, 1045–1079. doi: 10.3102/0002831208319733

Monte-Sano, C. (2011). Beyond reading comprehension and summary: Learning to read and write in history by focusing on evidence, perspective, and interpretation. *Curriculum Inquiry, 41*, 212-249. doi:10.1111/j.1467-873X.2011.00547.x

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 Council for Social Sciences. (2016). Theory and research in social education. http://www. socialstudies.org/node/73

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common core state standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. Washington, DC: Author.

Nokes, J. D. (2010a). Preparing novice history teachers to meet students' literacy needs. *Reading Psychology, 31*, 493-523. doi:10.1080/02702710903054923

Nokes, J. D. (2010b). (Re)imagining literacies for history classrooms. In R. J. Draper (Ed.), *(Re)Imagining Content Area Literacy* (pp. 54-68). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Nokes, J. D. (2011). Recognizing and addressing the barriers to adolescents' "reading like historians". *History Teacher, 44*, 379-404.

Nokes, J. D. (2013). *Building students' historical literacies: Learning to read and reason with historical texts and evidence.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Neuendorf, K. (2002) *The content analysis guidebook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

O'Brien, D. G., Stewart, R. A., & Moje, E. B. (1995). Why content literacy is difficult to infuse into the secondary school: Complexities of curriculum, pedagogy, and school culture. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*, 442-463. doi: 10.2307/747625

Readence, J. E., Bean, T. W., & Baldwin, R. S. (1985) *Content area reading: An integrated approach* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Seixas, P. (1998). Student teachers thinking historically. *Theory and Research in Social Education. 26*. 310-341. doi:10.1080/00933104.1998.10505854

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 78*, 40-59. doi: 10.17763/haer.78.1.v62444321p602101

Shanahan, C., & Shanahan, T. (2014). The implications of disciplinary literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *57*, 628-631. doi: 10.1002/jaal.297

Shanahan, C., Shanahan, T., & Misischia, C. (2011). Analysis of expert readers in three disciplines: History, mathematics, and chemistry. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *43*, 393-429. doi: 10.1177/1086296X11424071

Shea, N. A. (2015). Examining the nexus of science communication and science education: A content analysis of genetics news articles. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *52*, 397-409. doi: 10.1002/tea.21193

Shear, S. B., Knowles, R. T., Soden, G. J., & Castro, A. J. (2015). Manifesting destiny: re/presentations of indigenous peoples in K-12 U.S. history standards. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *43*, 68-101. doi:10.1080/00933104.2014.999849

Siebert, D., & Draper, R. J. (2008). Why content-area literacy messages do not speak to mathematics teachers: A critical content analysis. *Literacy Research & Instruction*, *47*, 229-245. doi:10.1080/19388070802300314

Silva, K. M., Silva, F. J., Quinn, M. A., Draper, J. N., Cover, K. R., & Munoff, A. A. (2008). Rate my professor: Online evaluations of psychology instructors. *Teaching of Psychology*, *35*, 71-80. doi:10.1080/00986280801978434

Skophammer, R., & Reed, P. A. (2014). Technological literacy courses in pre-service teacher education. *Journal of Technology Studies*, *40*, 68-80.

Thayer, A., Evans, M., McBride, A., Queen, M., & Spyridakis, J. (2007). Content analysis as a best practice in technical communication research. *Journal of Technical Writing & Communication*, *37*, 267-279. doi: 10.2190/TW.37.3.c

Vacca, .R. T., & Vacca, J. L. (1993) *Content area reading* (4th ed.). New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Wineburg, S. (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*, 73-87. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.83.1.73

Wineburg, S. (1999). Historical thinking and other unnatural acts. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *80* (7), 488-499.

Wineburg, S. (2006). A sobering big idea. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87* (5), 401-402.

Wineburg, S., Reisman, A., & Gillis, V. (2015). Disciplinary literacy in history: A toolkit for digital citizenship. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 58*, 636–639. doi: 10.1002/jaal.410

Yilmaz, A. (2008). Use of primary sources in the sixth grade social studies course books. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 3,* 956-962.

# APPENDIX A:

## List of Articles Chronologically Ordered from *TRSE* used in Methodology

**2010**

Chappell, D. (2010). Training Americans: Ideology, performance, and social studies textbooks. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *38*, 248-269. doi:10.1080/00933104.2010.10473424

Endacott, J. L. (2010). Reconsidering affective engagement in historical empathy. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *38*, 6-47. doi:10.1080/00933104.2010.10473415

Nokes, J. D. (2010c). Observing literacy practices in history classrooms. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 38*, 515-544. doi:10.1080/00933104.2010.10473438

**2011**

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

Pace, J. L. (2011). The complex and unequal impact of high stakes accountability on untested social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *39*, 32-60. doi:10.1080/00933104.2011.10473446

**2012**

Girard, B., & Harris, L. M. (2012). Striving for disciplinary literacy instruction: Cognitive tools in a world history course. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *40*, 230-259. doi:10.1080/00933104.2012.705183

Marcus, A. S., Levine, T. H., & Grenier, R. S. (2012). How secondary history teachers use and think about museums: Current practices and untapped promise for promoting historical understanding. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *40*, 66-97. doi:10.1080/00933104.2012.649466

Mathews, S. A. (2011). Framing preservice teachers' interpretations of graphic novels in the social studies classroom. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *39*, 416-446. doi:10.1080/00933104.2011.10473461

Stanton, C. R. (2012). "Hearing" the story: Critical indigenous curriculum inquiry and primary source representation in social studies education. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *40*, 339-370. doi:10.1080/00933104.2012.723242

**2013**

DeWitt, S. W., Patterson, N., Blankenship, W., Blevins, B., DiCamillo, L., Gerwin, D., & Sullivan, C. C. (2013). The lower-order expectations of high-stakes tests: A four-state analysis of social studies standards and test alignment. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *41*, 382-427. doi:10.1080/00933104.2013.787031

Goldberg, T. (2013). "It's in my veins": Identity and disciplinary practice in students' discussions of a historical issue. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *41*, 33-64. doi:10.1080/00933104.2012.757265

Swan, K., & Hofer, M. (2013). Examining student-created documentaries as a mechanism for engaging students in authentic intellectual work. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *41*, 133-175. doi:10.1080/00933104.2013.758018

**2014**

Breakstone, J. (2014). Try, try, try again: The process of designing new history assessments. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *42*, 453-485. doi:10.1080/00933104.2014.965860

De La Paz, S., Felton, M., Monte-Sano, C., Croninger, R., Jackson, C., Deogracias, J. S., & Hoffman, B. P. (2014). Developing historical reading and writing with adolescent readers: Effects on student learning. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *42*, 228-274. doi:10.1080/00933104.2014.908754

Nokes, J. D. (2014). Elementary students' roles and epistemic stances during document-based history lessons. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *42*, 375-413. doi:10.1080/00933104.2014.937546

**2015**

Journell, W., Beeson, M. W., & Ayers, C. A. (2015). Learning to think politically: Toward more complete disciplinary knowledge in civics and government courses. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 43*, 28-67. doi:10.1080/00933104.2014.1001106

# APPENDIX B:

## List of Articles Chronologically Ordered from *JAAL* used in Methodology

**2010**

Damico, J., Baildon, M., Exter, M., & Guo, S. (2009). Where we read from matters: Disciplinary literacy in a ninth-grade social studies classroom. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 53*, 325-335. doi: 10.1598/JAAL.53.4.6

**2011**

Hall, L. A. (2012). How popular culture texts inform and shape students' discussions of social studies texts. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 55*, 296-305. doi: 10.1002/JAAL.00036

Stockdill, D., & Moore, D. W. (2011). Learning to link research, practice, and disciplinary literacies: An interview with Darin Stockdill. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 54*, 624-626. doi: 10.1598/JAAL.54.8.7

Wilson, A. A. (2011). A social semiotics framework for conceptualizing content area literacies. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 54*, 435-444. doi: 10.1598/JAAL.54.6.5

**2012**

Boyd, F. B., Sullivan, M. P., Popp, J. S., & Hughes, M. (2012). Vocabulary instruction in the disciplines. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56*, 18–20. doi: 10.1002/jaal.97

Fang, Z., & Coatoam, S. (2013). Disciplinary literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56*, 627–632. doi: 10.1002/JAAL.190

Gritter, K., Beers, S., & Knaus, R. W. (2013). Teacher scaffolding of academic language in an advanced placement U.S. history class. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56*, 409–418. doi: 10.1002/JAAL.158

Hynd-Shanahan, C. (2013). What does it take? the challenge of disciplinary literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 57*, 93–98. doi: 10.1002/JAAL.226

Pytash, K. E. (2012), Engaging preservice teachers in disciplinary literacy learning through writing. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 55*: 527–538. doi: 10.1002/JAAL.00062

**2014**

Fang, Z. (2014). Preparing content area teachers for disciplinary literacy instruction. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 57*, 444–448. doi: 10.1002/jaal.269

Gillis, V. (2014). Disciplinary literacy: "adapt" not adopt. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 57*, 614-623. doi: 10.1002/jaal.301

**2015**

Baron, C., & Dobbs, C. (2015). Expanding the notion of historical text through historic building analysis. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 58*, 462–471. doi:10.1002/jaal.384

Wineburg, S., Reisman, A., & Gillis, V. (2015). Disciplinary literacy in history: A toolkit for digital citizenship. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 58*, 636–639. doi: 10.1002/jaal.410