

Beyond Reading Comprehension and Summary: Learning to Read and Write in History by Focusing on Evidence, Perspective, and Interpretation

CHAUNCEY MONTE-SANO

*University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland*

ABSTRACT

Basic reading comprehension and summary tend to be the focus in social studies and history classrooms, if reading and writing are included at all. But such a focus inhibits a conception of history as an interpretive discipline grounded in evidence that is analyzed, not simply accepted. Understanding the past is impossible without such historical reasoning, as is advanced literacy. This study examines the discipline-specific literacy instruction of one history teacher and the simultaneous growth in his students' historical reasoning and writing. Student data included pre- and post-instruction writing samples as well as regularly assigned essays, interviews, and annotations of readings. Teacher data included observations, interviews, and artifacts such as assignments and feedback from one term of a required 11th-grade U.S. history course. Analysis included developing codes based on patterns, testing propositions, and searching for alternative explanations. Through a focus on historical evidence use, perspective, and interpretation students learned to construct more accurate, grounded interpretations of the past. Three teaching strategies emphasized these aspects of historical thinking: annotating primary source readings; regular informal writing prompts that focused on historical perspectives followed by writing prompts that called for a synthesis of major issues; and feedback focused on evidence use and accuracy of interpretation. This study suggests that discipline-specific ways of reading and writing can help students understand history and learn to think historically while developing advanced literacy skills.

INTRODUCTION

When teachers assign reading and writing in history classrooms, the focus typically involves basic reading comprehension and summary of information (Kihara, Graham, & Hawken, 2009). Such literacy instruction inhibits students' historical reasoning and understanding. The very nature of history is interpretive; as a consequence, there are multiple accounts of any historical event or issue written by people in real situations with particular interests. The perspective of the author of an account and the context in which that author was situated make an indelible mark on the account

© 2011 by The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

Curriculum Inquiry 41:2 (2011)

Published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc., 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA, and 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK

doi: 10.1111/j.1467-873X.2011.00547.x

itself—these subtexts must be detected for complete understanding of a historical account. As such, a sole focus on the main idea of a single text in history makes understanding the past virtually impossible.

Literacy experts have also signaled the need to help adolescents move beyond basic comprehension and written expression toward analytical thinking and logical reasoning. The International Reading Association (IRA) recommends that adolescents learn strategies such as “questioning themselves about what they read . . . recognizing how a text is organized . . . judging their own understanding; and evaluating authors’ ideas and perspectives” (Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999, p. 5). Yet, reports on the state of adolescent literacy (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Graham & Perin, 2007) tell us that very few adolescents demonstrate such skills. Based on results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), only 5% of adolescents tested in reading could interpret an author’s point as expressed in a document, consistently provide supporting examples for their conclusions about a document, make connections between multiple texts, or recognize that a text’s author had a purpose in writing a particular document (NCES, 2007). As for writing, only 2% of the adolescents could claim a position and consistently support it with well-chosen reasons and examples, or extend the main idea in an essay (NCES, 2003). The 2005 Rand Report also highlights the low proficiency rates in NAEP reading and writing results, and notes the wide disparity among socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic groups (McCombs, Kirby, Barney, Darilek, & Magee, 2005). The majority of adolescents tested may be able to read and comprehend the literal meaning of documents or claim a position in writing, but they are unable to consistently support arguments with evidence.

One solution, as Moje (2008) has argued, is to foreground the disciplines in literacy instruction. Several other literacy experts have also called for integrating literacy and the disciplines (e.g., Conley, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). Such an emphasis highlights the ways of thinking and knowing in a discipline as key to learning how to reason, read, write, and discuss. As Moje, Ciechanowski, Kramer, Ellis, Carrillo, and Collazo (2004) argue, an integral part of learning a discipline involves learning the oral and written language of the discipline.

But how do we teach disciplinary literacy, specifically in history? Thus far, content area literacy research has focused on strategies that can be used across content areas—summarizing, outlining, or using graphic organizers are classic examples. Such strategies do not approach reading and writing from a disciplinary perspective, nor do they capture the essence of a particular discipline. Often, little consideration of specific content is given in these content area approaches. By contrast, this study examines the ways in which one teacher teaches historical thinking concepts and writing at the same time, using discipline-specific literacy strategies. This study explores the consequences of his approach for learning historical writing as seen through whole-class performance and student case studies.

BACKGROUND

Defining History and Historical Thinking. Many people tend to view history as a fixed story comprised of predetermined facts—indeed as a *single* story of the past (Seixas, 1993). Laypeople usually do not appreciate the idea that historical narratives are constructed from evidence that has been questioned, pieced together, and interpreted (Holt, 1990; Rosenzweig, 2000). Classroom research confirms that students tend to view history as established facts—as reality, not interpretation (VanSledright, 2002). Consistent with this conception is the belief that one does not interact with or question evidence, nor offer counter-evidence that challenges the story of the past (Linenthal & Engelhardt, 1996). Many people tend to view the past through a “presentist” lens in which they regard evidence from the past in the context of their own lives (cf. Gitlin, 1995; Seixas, 1993). School history instruction in the United States typically reflects this common conception of history and embraces memorization of facts rather than investigation (Page, 1991; Ravitch & Finn, 1987). Because this view of history leaves little room for making sense of historical texts, questioning evidence, or developing one’s own interpretation, it may be difficult to learn to think historically in such classrooms.

Seixas’s (1999) description of “doing the discipline” highlighted an alternative vision of history education that embraces teaching students how historical accounts are constructed and where historical knowledge comes from, rather than accepting historical accounts delivered by authorities (e.g., the teacher or textbook) as truth. Historical reasoning begins with questioning records of the past. As the philosopher of history R. G. Collingwood (1943) wrote,

The scientific historian never asks himself: “Is this statement true or false?” . . . the question he asks himself is: “What does this statement mean?” . . . It is the equivalent, rather, to the question “What light is thrown on the subject in which I am interested by the fact that this person made this statement, meaning by it what he did mean?” (p. 275)

Any question put to evidence is directed toward trying to understand the meaning of the evidence as it relates to the historical inquiry. Particular approaches to historical texts facilitate this reasoning process. As Wineburg (1991) found, historians source, corroborate, and contextualize evidence as they make sense of the past. Sourcing involves noting authors of historical documents as well as their intentions and assumptions. Contextualization includes situating a historical document in the time and place in which it was created. Corroboration involves comparing multiple historical documents to facilitate sense making and determine acceptable facts. The iterative process of moving between these kinds of questions and evidence eventually leads historians to make a case for a particular interpretation of the past.

By reading and thinking in these ways, historians seek to understand the uniqueness of specific events, given the time and place of occurrence and the people involved (cf. Mink, 1987). To the historian, an event can only be understood by situating it in context—the time, place, people involved, and circumstances of its happening. J. H. Hexter (1971) has stated, “The historical analyst who disjoins his abstractions or generalizations from the actualities of the past—the ‘when,’ the ‘where,’ the ‘who,’ the ‘how many’ . . . is likely to sacrifice understanding of the past” (p. 177). Indeed, the environment and circumstances in which a historical event occurred are as important as the event itself. In sum, historical reasoning includes analyzing evidence, understanding the meaning of evidence, and using evidence to construct and explain historically plausible accounts of the past. Historians typically express these accounts as written arguments.

The Schools Council History Project in the United Kingdom has been one of the most formidable efforts to integrate historical thinking and disciplinary history into the school curriculum (Shemilt, 1980). The work of British researchers who have followed this project has been particularly helpful in identifying the changes from novice to expert historical thinking among adolescents (Lee, 2005; Lee & Ashby, 2000; Lee & Shemilt, 2003; Shemilt, 1983). For example, where novices see history as fixed information, experts see history as constructed accounts based on evidence that has been situated in context and interrogated for its reliability.

The current Benchmarks of Historical Thinking project in Canada defines six concepts that are essential to understanding history: establish historical significance, use primary document evidence, identify continuity and change, analyze cause and consequence, take historical perspectives, and understand moral dimensions of history (Seixas, 2006). These concepts define major components of historical thinking, identify what adolescents should learn in history class, and provide the basis for learning tasks and assessments. My own approach to history privileges several concepts from both of these projects, including the use, interrogation, and contextualization of evidence in the process of analyzing and constructing historical accounts. Both projects have had national and international influence in advancing the teaching of historical thinking to children and adolescents (e.g., Denos & Case, 2006).

Although in the United States individual teachers have written about teaching history from a disciplinary stance (e.g., Bain, 2005; Holt, 1990; VanSledright, 2002), large-scale change has not been forthcoming. Instead, these individuals stand out as models of how one might teach for historical thinking in the absence of full-scale support for doing so. But for the community of history educators, there is yet room to explore how teachers teach particular historical thinking concepts and what helps learners move from one level of historical thinking to the next.

Research on Literacy in History Classrooms. Because a disciplinary approach to history privileges analysis and interpretation of historical texts, it naturally leads to an emphasis on reading, writing, and thinking more than a focus on conventional school history might do. Given the nature of historians' work, history supports ways of thinking that are the foundation of advanced literacy. For example, historians analyze evidence, weigh conflicting accounts, consider the influence of bias, and develop evidence-based arguments. These are similar to the areas in which 65% of 12th-grade readers and 76% of 12th-grade writers performed below grade level (i.e., below "proficient") on recent NAEP tests (NCES, 2003, 2007).

Historical literacy research indicates that the kinds of texts students work with influence their reasoning processes. Rouet, Britt, Mason, and Perfetti (1996) found that when students read primary documents, they were more likely to evaluate the genre of the document and cite passages in their writing (as opposed to reading historians' monographs or textbooks). Paxton (2002) found that historical texts with "visible authors" (primary documents or historians' monographs in which an authorial voice was clearly present) increased the chances that students would interact with the texts as they read. Hynd-Shanahan, Holschuh, and Hubbard (2004) found that college students who discussed how historians read and the nature of historical texts were more able to read for historical meaning. When it came to multiple texts, the sophistication of students' epistemological beliefs (Braten & Stromso, 2006) or level of disciplinary expertise (Rouet, Favart, Britt, & Perfetti, 1997) also influenced their ability to synthesize ideas across texts. Research confirms that students use their own background knowledge of historical topics to make sense of texts (Perfetti, Britt, & Georgi, 1995; Wolfe & Goldman, 2005). Together, these studies suggest that tasks that represent the work of historians, conflicting historical sources, background knowledge, and an understanding of the discipline promote historical thinking.

However, students do not naturally tend to read like historians (Wineburg, 1991). In reading historical texts, they often focus on the literal meaning of documents and miss intertextual reading strategies that would promote interpretive work (Afflerbach & VanSledright, 2001; Stahl, Hynd, Britton, McNish, & Bosquet, 1996). In one study of reading multiple texts, students were unlikely to notice source information unless explicitly instructed to do so (Britt & Aglinskas, 2002). Nor do students tend to write as historians do; in one study, more students listed and arranged facts than analyzed facts (Greene, 2001). Yet, with instruction that emphasizes historical thinking and argument students' writing can demonstrate disciplinary thinking (Monte-Sano, 2010).

The nature of tasks and instruction influence the development of students' argumentative writing in history classrooms. De La Paz (2005) found that middle school students who were instructed in how to read sources, plan arguments, and compose arguments produced more accurate and

persuasive essays regardless of their incoming skills. In previous work (Monte-Sano, 2008), I found that a combination of explicit instruction with guided and independent practice in reading historically and evidence-based writing coincided with improvements in students' argumentative essays. Other forms of scaffolding such as structured reading activities and oral debates improved high school students' abilities to write persuasive essays (Felton & Herko, 2004). Writing argumentative essays while using multiple texts has been shown to foster content understanding (Wiley & Voss, 1999) and synthesis of information (Young & Leinhardt, 1998).

Research on Literacy Across Content Areas. Since the early 1900s, educators have focused on content-area reading instruction, although persistent issues remain such as whether to teach reading in separate skills-based classes or within the content areas and how to identify the demands of reading in specific school subjects (Moore, Readence, & Rickelman, 1983). More recently, two Carnegie Corporation initiatives have synthesized research on reading and writing to address adolescent literacy in the nation's schools. In *Reading Next*, Biancarosa and Snow (2006) recommend 15 elements of effective adolescent literacy programs such as explicit comprehension instruction, text-based collaborative learning, intensive writing, and ongoing formative assessment. One element calls for content teachers to integrate reading and writing skills that are particular to their subject areas, but the example shared focuses on more general aspects of reading such as word identification, self-questioning, visual imagery, and paraphrasing. In *Writing Next*, Graham and Perin (2007) offer 11 ideas for adolescent writing instruction such as teaching writing strategies, summarizing, pre-writing, inquiry activities, or sentence combining. They, too, have one suggestion for content area teachers: writing-to-learn content area material. Together, these reports indicate that explicit modeling, active student engagement, practice, integrating reading and writing, and feedback all support the development of adolescent literacy; however, the suggestions for content area teachers are limited. There are some literacy experts, nonetheless, who have begun to embrace and explore the discipline-specific nature of reading and writing (Conley, 2008; Moje, 2007, 2008; Moje et al., 2004; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008).

Yet, few studies of writing are rooted in the historical perspective. Literacy research in history emphasizes reading far more than writing or particularly the intersection of historical thinking and writing. There is often little content in content area research, but rather an emphasis on literacy strategies that cut across content areas. This study connects the historical discipline with literacy to advance discussions about developing adolescent literacy in one subject: history. Several questions guide this work:

1. What are the instructional practices of a teacher whose stated focus is historical thinking and writing?

2. What aspects of historical thinking and writing does this teacher emphasize?
3. What progress do this teacher's students make in historical writing?

This report examines student learning from a whole class and presents three case studies from within that class. It uses one teacher's practices to illustrate the interchange between pedagogy and learning to write historical essays.

METHOD

This study is an embedded case study design (Yin, 2003). Analysis of whole-class and case students' learning focused on writing samples, reading annotations, and interviews. Analysis of teaching included writing opportunities, reading opportunities, use of class time, and teacher feedback. Comparisons of teaching and learning identified teaching practices that coincided with students' growth in evidence-based historical writing.

Participants. Mr. Lyle and his students were part of a larger project on teaching evidence-based writing in history classrooms (Monte-Sano, 2008, 2010). For that project I interviewed and observed teachers to find those who fit three criteria that seemed likely to promote students' evidentiary writing in history: an advanced degree in history, a focus on writing, and an inquiry orientation toward history. Lyle had an advanced degree in history, he talked about and modeled teaching history as an inquiry-based subject, and he reportedly gave students writing opportunities at least once a week. I chose to focus on him alone in this report because his practices were unusual in the field of history—he used reading and writing to advance his students' disciplinary understanding.

I selected the largest of Lyle's required 11th-grade Civil War sections for this study to include more student participants. All 17 students from this class participated in the study, though pre- and post-instruction writing samples were collected from only 15 due to absences. This article gives descriptive data on the pre- and post-instruction writing samples of all 15 students who participated. It focuses on the three case study students in depth. The students were selected for three reasons: (1) their scores on the pre-instruction writing samples were at or below the average for their class, (2) the change in scores from pre- to post-instruction writing samples was representative of the majority of the class, and (3) changes in their writing over time illustrate important aspects of Lyle's pedagogy.

Setting. Mr. Lyle taught U.S. history at The Pacific School, a small independent school in a large urban area. He had been teaching for 25 years. He taught an average of 13 students per class and had the freedom to define his own curriculum. The school year was divided into three 11-week

terms, each equivalent to a semester in a public school. Within each term, a block schedule provided two or three 70-minute periods and one 150-minute period per week. The school philosophy emphasized independent learning, inquiry, and investigation. Students did not receive grades at Pacific; instead, they and their parents received written evaluations of their academic work every 6 weeks.

The structure of Lyle's course allowed students to investigate a historical problem from multiple perspectives—the causes of the Civil War. Students began their study by examining the realities of the war and what it meant for the country. The death and destruction that occurred during the Civil War primed students to go back and investigate the central question of the course: "Why did the Civil War happen?" As they began their inquiry, Lyle advised students: "You need to launch yourselves backwards and imagine a world that was different" (field notes, August 30, 2004). After exploring the setting of the Civil War, Lyle used three units (i.e., the heritage of the American Revolution, the opponents and defenders of slavery, and the politics of sectionalism) to investigate why the Civil War happened. He asked questions such as: How did the making of the U.S. Constitution favor the North or South or leave the issue of slavery unresolved? What were the perspectives of abolitionists and supporters of slavery? What were the perspectives of politicians on sectional issues? How did these perspectives clash? All of these questions guided students' reading of primary documents. Every reading offered a clue to the overarching inquiry.

Compared to portrayals of typical history classrooms in the United States (cf. Cuban, 1991; NCES, 2002), Lyle's approach was unusual in eliminating the textbook, focusing overwhelmingly on primary documents, and using excerpts of historians' monographs. Lyle's students read an average of 10 pages a day. Although students read primary and secondary sources, 82% of pages read and 92% of class time focused on primary documents. There was no traditional textbook; instead, Lyle created compilations of primary documents. In discussing the role of primary documents, Lyle remarked,

I think it gets them to understand the motivation, the context of the document . . . [authors are] not writing this stuff because they have a contract for [a] textbook, they're writing this because at that particular point, with Garrison in 1829, he had something to say about slavery. . . . I think you're giving them the head and the heart of somebody back then in a way that if you don't have primary sources, then you've just got facts, no matter how well a textbook is written.

Primary documents for each unit represented different perspectives on the same topic and allowed students to delve deeply into the content and consider the complexities and nuances of topics. Excerpts from monographs made up the rest of the reading (e.g., James McPherson's [2003] *Crossroads of Freedom: Antietam, the Battle That Changed the Course of the Civil War* and Carol Berkin's [2002] *A Brilliant Solution: Inventing the American*

Constitution). Together, these primary and secondary readings familiarized students with the context of the Civil War and ways of thinking about the world that dominated the era.

Student Data Sources. The pre- and post-instruction writing samples were the first and last in-class essays assigned by Lyle during the 11-week course. All students were given the same amount of time to complete each task and to complete the readings for the assignments given the night before. Both of the assignments asked students to consider what a primary source could tell them about the author of that source and the times in which that author lived.

The first in-class essay focused on Cornelia McDonald, a Southern woman who lived during the Civil War. The final in-class essay focused on Abraham Lincoln. One inconsistency arose when the first in-class essay was based on only one document written by McDonald, but the last essay was based on two documents written by Lincoln. The length of the readings was roughly equivalent, although the difference in the number of documents made the post-instructional reading slightly more difficult.

The fact that Lyle did not devote class time to testing at the beginning and end of the term meant that the pre- and post-instruction writing samples were Lyle's own assignments. They were not equivalent assessments in that they focused on different topics. Administering the same instrument twice, or counterbalancing and correlating two instruments, would have afforded a greater assurance of internal validity (Krathwohl, 1993). Even so, using the same instrument sometimes results in problems, since contextual changes over the course of multiple administrations can influence results (Krathwohl, 1993). Although historians normally do not write essays based on one or two documents, they analyze and reason about individual documents (cf. Collingwood, 1943; Hexter, 1971; Mink, 1987; Wineburg, 1991); those processes are captured by the writing samples. The strengths of the pre- and post-instruction writing samples were their ecological validity related to use in an actual classroom and their potential for exhibiting historical thinking and writing.

On average, one essay per week from work regularly assigned by Lyle was collected from each of the case study students. A total of 13 writing samples were collected for each case study student, including pre- and post-instruction writing samples. The samples were gathered following Lyle's feedback—in this case, written comments on students' interpretations and evidence use throughout their essays—and therefore serve as artifacts of teaching practice as well. In addition to essays and feedback, case study students shared their annotations of readings and discussed their work in three interviews.

Student Data Analysis. The pre-instruction writing sample served as a baseline from which to assess change over time. An analytic framework of

historical thinking (cf. Collingwood, 1943; Hexter, 1971; Lee & Shemilt, 2003; Mink, 1987; Shemilt, 1983; Wineburg, 1991) guided the analysis of students' historical reasoning over the course of a year. Within this framework, historical reasoning includes analyzing evidence, interpreting the meaning of evidence, and using evidence to construct and explain historically plausible accounts of the past. Historical reasoning involves attention to perspectives, sources of evidence, historical context, causal relationships, and comparison of evidence in putting together a written argument about the past. Propositions developed from individual case studies were tested on all the writing samples and led to the creation of a historical reasoning rubric ($r = .83$; Appendix A). Students were given a score of 1–5, 1 being the lowest. This rubric was used to chart individual progress and assess the growth of the entire class.

In assessing the essays for the historical reasoning criteria, I sought the following: whether the evidence provided supported students' interpretations; the degree to which students accounted for documentary evidence in their claims; the extent to which students explained the historical perspective being asked about; and whether students placed evidence in context, accounted for biases in their sources, recognized causal relationships, and qualified their arguments. These criteria are consistent with research on students' historical reasoning, especially that of Lee (2005), Lee and Shemilt (2003), Levstik and Barton (2008), Seixas (1994), Shemilt (1983), VanSledright (2002), and Wineburg (1991). Students were judged not so much on the content of their interpretations as their use of evidence in forming and supporting that interpretation, and their recognition of historical perspectives and the context of particular times.

In addition to looking at all students' pre- and post-instruction writing samples, I analyzed student case study data. I examined the students' paths and way stations in progressing from basic to proficient performance, how students worked with the curriculum materials provided by Lyle, and what students did with the opportunities Lyle gave them. Analysis of case students included multiple passes through each student's portfolio, writing memos, highlighting key passages of student work, arranging excerpts of student work by code, developing and testing propositions, refining propositions based on evidence, and complex time series analyses based on qualities relevant to each individual case (cf. Yin, 2003). In addition to looking at the work chronologically, students' work on similar tasks (e.g., Abolitionist Panel essay) was compared, allowing analysis of what students did, what the teacher asked for, and what assignments and corresponding materials allowed for (i.e., the potential of assignments).

Teacher Data Sources and Analysis. Teacher data were collected from interviews, observations, feedback, and classroom artifacts (Table 1). Observations focused on what students did during class, how the teacher represented history, and opportunities to learn historical reasoning and

TABLE 1
Teacher Data

Teacher data	When collected	How analyzed
<i>Interviews</i>	September, October, December	—Within and across case pattern coding —Testing propositions, searching for alternative explanations
<i>Observations</i>	Weekly (12 visits totaling 25 hours)	—Within and across case pattern coding —Time series analysis —Testing propositions, searching for alternative explanations
<i>Assignments & Materials</i>	Daily	—Chronological and thematic data displays —Within and across case pattern coding —Time series analysis —Testing propositions, searching for alternative explanations
<i>Feedback</i>	For every essay collected (weekly + pre- and post-instruction writing sample)	—Chronological and thematic data displays —Within and across case pattern coding —Testing propositions, searching for alternative explanations

writing. Field notes and data summary charts were completed during and after every observation. Feedback included Lyle's oral feedback in class and in one-on-one conferences, and written feedback on essays. Feedback data were gathered to understand how Lyle diagnosed student work, where he directed students' attention, and what his explicit and implicit messages were about history, writing, and evidence. Interview questions explored Lyle's goals, views of student progress, his sense of students' needs, and the reasoning behind his instructional decisions. Artifacts collected included course syllabi, readings, reading and writing assignments, daily activities, and teachers' written feedback.

I organized the field notes and interview data chronologically and then transcribed them. I used memos to track key ideas, highlight illustrative excerpts of class, and note what to look for in future observations. Once initial patterns were identified, I transcribed excerpts from all of the teacher data that related to these patterns in challenging and supporting ways. As I analyzed the teacher data, I looked for the strategies Lyle used to teach history and writing, how he represented history and writing, and what aspects of historical thinking and writing he emphasized in his practices. Tracking patterns in assignments, readings, observations, and feedback led to the development of propositions that were tested and refined with multiple data passes (cf. Miles & Huberman, 1984). Codes included examples, text or page number references, sourcing, contextualization, corroboration, history as interpretation, scaffolding, questioning, evidence,

perspective, and reading and writing instruction. Triangulating all of the teacher data using these codes led to synthesis and revision in the case of challenging evidence. Data displays helped with this process, showing the amount of time Lyle devoted to a particular topic, the number of writing assignments per topic, the readings per topic, and key components of assignments. Data displays also allowed for time series analyses based on key elements of the teacher's practices related to these propositions (e.g., use of primary sources, modeling of reading strategies, or scaffolding for writing assignments; Yin, 2003). These analyses led me to identify three major teaching strategies Lyle used, each of which he confirmed in the final interview.

FINDINGS

Overview of Student Development in Lyle's Class. The 15 students' pre- and post-instruction writing samples indicated overall improvement (Table 2). Thirteen of Lyle's students improved in historical reasoning. The remaining students' scores did not change from the pre- to post-instruction writing sample (two students did not improve in historical reasoning). However, over the course of the term, most improved in historical reasoning. Seven of 15 improved in historical reasoning by one point, six improved by two points.

Three of these students were selected as case studies. With regard to their initial writing samples, Linda and Ben both scored a 2 and Abigail scored a 3 for historical reasoning. The incoming class average in historical reasoning was a 3 ($SD = .85$). With regard to their growth, Linda and Abigail improved by one point in historical reasoning and Ben improved by two points in historical reasoning; the average growth in historical reasoning was 1.3 ($SD = .7$) points. Lyle consistently emphasized three particular concepts of historical thinking: using evidence, recognizing perspectives,

TABLE 2
Number of Lyle's Students in Each Rubric Level on
the Pre- and Posttest (n=15)

<i>Criteria</i>	Historical Reasoning	
	Pretest	Posttest
<i>Test</i>		
ONE	0	0
TWO	5	0
THREE	5	2
FOUR	5	7
FIVE	0	6
<i>Mean (SD)</i>	3 (.85)	4.3 (.7)
<i>Overall Change (SD)</i>		1.3 (.7)

and constructing interpretations. Three teaching strategies in particular illustrated the relationship between the improvement in the students' work and instruction. These strategies also epitomize Lyle's focus on historical thinking: annotations, writing prompts, and feedback.

Abigail: Learning About Evidence Use, Perspective Recognition, and Interpretation Through Annotating Historical Documents. By the end of the term, Abigail not only included quotations in her writing, as she had done previously, but also used them to support and explain points and elaborate on her arguments. The change in evidence use coincided with growth in recognizing and explaining historical perspectives. Whereas her earlier essays reported information, later ones constructed interpretations.

One teaching strategy that paralleled Abigail's growth was the use of annotations. On the first day of class, Lyle outlined the expectations that Pacific students would annotate while reading as they had done since freshman year (Figure 1). In annotating, students underlined words or wrote notes, questions, and ideas in the margins. Judging by their course readers, most students annotated daily.

In discussing his goals for the class, Lyle explained the role of annotating documents when he said,

I also want them to become better readers, closer, more careful readers. To see that the value in that, and the joy of that, is to break down the material. That's why I have them annotate. I want them to have dialogue with themselves as they read. I want them to raise questions to themselves as they read whenever they're reading. . . . I wanted to slow them down . . . to have a dialogue with both themselves and the author . . .

ANNOTATIONS:

When you do start reading, you will need to annotate. I see annotations as a chance to slow yourself down and to read more thoughtfully, mindfully, and intentionally. It is an opportunity to sort out the material as you read and to understand what you do know and what still is puzzling. If you do not understand a passage, a paragraph, a sentence, write a '?' next to it. I will check your annotations periodically and they will be factored into my assessment of your performance.

I will definitely help you with and check your annotations. You can annotate in one of two ways or a combination of the two.

1. Annotate as you read.
2. Purposefully underline and circle a few words here and there—and write a few key words here and there, as well. Then return to the reading and annotate more fully.

FIGURE 1. Excerpt from Reading Guidelines handout.

Lyle's practice of annotating directly linked reading and writing for improved comprehension. Students interacted with and began the process of interpreting texts.

Lyle helped his students learn to annotate by giving specific directions, analyzing text together in class, and giving feedback on their annotations. In one instance, Lyle asked students to mark the phrases in the Constitution that protect Southern interests with a big "S." Such a directive gave students a purpose for reading the document, and connected their reading to a larger inquiry. Most class sessions focused on documents students read for homework. The teacher reinforced this idea of asking questions of a text: "When you read these things you have to pore over it and ask yourself, 'does this make sense?' You've got to have a dialogue with yourself. . . . When you read this you had to say to yourself, you had to run out of your room and say to your dog, 'What does this mean?'" Feedback based on student annotations supported their growth. When one student had trouble supporting his arguments with evidence, Lyle examined his annotations and found that he was not making notes in the margins of his reader:

I do look at their annotations and I try to see what kind of conversation they're engaging in with the document. And so I was looking at his book and there were no annotations. . . . He said "I've never done this before, I've never had to do this before, I don't know how to annotate, I don't know what to say." . . . I tried to tell him there are lots of different kinds of annotations and you could identify what you think is the major idea here of the paragraph and put that down. . . . Or you could also express a sense of wonderment . . . you could put a little exclamation point . . . or a question or a question mark. . . . So I said there are ways in which you can interact with this.

The reference to "a conversation" with the text indicated that reading in this class was not about gathering and seeking information, but rather about interacting with a text to construct meaning. Writing in the margins was a tangible aspect of that interaction.

At first, Abigail's annotations included highlighted or underlined passages; her few marginal notes focused on defining words or clarifying meaning. Two weeks into the course the class read *The Virginia Resolutions*, an early colonial protest against the Stamp Act written by Patrick Henry in June 1765. Abigail's comments on this document (Table 3, row 1) indicate solid reading comprehension and an ability to paraphrase, but remain focused on basic comprehension (see Appendix B for the primary source with Abigail's annotations).

Over the next weeks, Abigail's annotations on James Madison's notes from the Constitutional Convention demonstrated an awareness of historical perspectives. Madison's notes report what the delegates said as they debated the various aspects of a new Constitution and read almost like a play with many actors. Although Abigail did not identify the author, her

TABLE 3
Examples of Abigail's Annotations on Three Documents

Topic	Excerpts From Abigail's Annotations
Stamp Act Resolves (week 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Ppl. of colonies should have same rights as ppl. in England" (2)¹ • "General Assembly" (2) • "Only the General Assembly can impose taxes" (2) • "Any power who defies this resolution is committing an illegal act" (2) • "Ppl. who differ in views are 'the Enemy'" (2) <p>Source: <i>The Virginia Resolutions, Patrick Henry, 1765</i></p>
Constitutional Convention (week 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "He stays true to racist convictions but acknowledges Mr. Butler's point" (94) • "Basically saying look how hard it is for us to come to a consensus; think how much harder it will be for the legislature (more reps & states' rights advocates)" (96) • "He suggests that they tax the states based on the number of free inhabitants" (98) • "Arguing that in this case people and wealth are interchangeable" (100) • "B/c he is from S. Carolina and doesn't want to lose rep." (102) • "Mocking Mason (discrediting Mason's points)" (126) • "He wanted it to be made clear that it was for these states that they were allowing the slave trade to continue for a period of time." (135) • "B/c he is from South and wants to keep the trade as long as possible" (134) • "Wants to be more explicit about the import tax on slaves" (135) <p>Source: <i>Records of the Federal Convention, James Madison, 1787</i></p>
Abolitionism (week 7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "See opening speech in <i>The Liberator</i>" (78) • "'All men are created equal'—Declaration of Independence (78) • "W.L. Garrison saying that if America isn't working right, it's their own fault→b/c they function through elected officials" (79) • "Some prejudice manifest here" (81) • "And he is able to comprehend the atrocities of slavery" (83) • "Says the 3/5 clause will only encourage the slave trade and slavery; will also undermine the abolitionist movement" (83) • "He thinks it unjust that their society should be regulated by decrees established in a different time, a time of crisis under the Articles of Confederation" (84) • "Though he is a religious man, he is able to criticize the imperfections of Christianity" (87) • "Regards the issue of slavery from both the slave's and the whole nation's perspective" (88) <p>Source: <i>Fourth of July Address at Park Street Church, William Lloyd Garrison, 1829</i></p>

¹Page numbers in parentheses refer to the page number in the book of primary documents compiled by Mr. Lyle.

annotations recognized the interests of the different delegates at the Convention and the fact that these historical actors were in conversation with one another (Table 3, row 2). Over the 59 pages read by the class, she made 32 statements that recognized a delegate's point of view, mostly in the last half of the document. Abigail's annotations on Madison's Convention notes show increasing awareness of perspective, including the interests and motivations of people in the past.

By midterm, Abigail's annotations of William Lloyd Garrison's 1829 Address were typical of increased historical reasoning, especially her recognition of historical perspectives, motivations, and authors (Table 3, row 3; see Appendix C for the primary source with Abigail's annotations). By this point, Abigail's annotations show her corroborating sources (i.e., comparing Garrison to the Declaration of Independence and another Garrison document) as well as noting his ideas and worldview. Many of her comments also integrated important historical context such as the Articles of Confederation or the 3/5 clause. Such annotating continued through the rest of the term.

Initially, the quotations Abigail cited in her essays were those she had highlighted or underlined. By the time her annotations began to incorporate more comments on historical perspectives, she included her marginal notes in her essays in addition to quotations. She eventually used not only the highlighted passages but also her own marginal notations to set up and/or explain quotations (Table 4). At this midpoint in the term, Abigail explained her writing process: "I went back through all the readings, and um, and all my annotations, and um and my notes from class. And, you know, I thought: what was important about each of these people?" She explained this same process of looking to annotations along with the readings and class notes when writing essays in the final interview as well.

In writing about the Stamp Act Resolves, Abigail took the quotations she had highlighted while annotating and inserted them into her essay. In the first example, she used a quotation to state what the Stamp Act Resolves said, rather than explaining in her own words. In the second example she used a highlighted quotation and added her own words to introduce and explain it. Although her annotations of Garrison's Park Street Address focused more on interpretation and perspective, she only integrated into her essay the quotations highlighted while annotating. By the Phillips document, much of her thinking took place while reading and then was integrated into her essay, which included both underlined quotations and ideas from her marginal notes. She more fully explained the perspective she wrote about and used quotations to support her interpretation. The Wendell Phillips essay was written a week after the Garrison document (two-thirds through the term); the same trend continued in her annotations and writing to the end of the term. Abigail's pre- and post-instruction writing samples were consistent with these changes: her first in-class essay earned a 3 in historical reasoning; her final in-class essay earned a 4.

TABLE 4
Comparison of Excerpts from Abigail’s Annotations and Essays

Topic	Essay Excerpt	Annotation Excerpt
Stamp Act Resolves (week 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “All resolves printed by the thirteen colonies emphasized the need for ‘the General Assembly’ (2) to be the sole congress with the power to ‘lay Taxes and Imposts upon the Inhabitants (2) of the region concerned.’” • “The colonists acknowledge [sic] that they are a part of the British Empire, but in subsequent resolutions [sic] claim that it is impossible for the British to have complete control over every aspect of their existence: ‘And such Representation <i>there</i>, as the Subjects in <i>Britain</i> do actually and rightfully enjoy, is <i>impracticable</i> in <i>America</i>’ (9).” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underlined quotation cited in essay excerpt & wrote: “only the General Assembly can impose taxes” • Underlined quotation cited & wrote: “impracticable=impossible”
Wendell Phillips, Abolitionist (week 8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Phillips claimed that the movement was contending with the most ignorant and bewildered of souls, who had been immersed in a callous and cold-blooded institution, and were, of needs, to be dealt with according to simple and effective measures: ‘There are far more dead hearts to be quickened, than confused intellects to be cleared up,’ were his forceful and stirring words.” • “He further affirmed that he had never accused the slaveholders of crimes that they had not committed, and that his statements were therefore both just and equitable: ‘We have seldom, if ever, held him too account, except for the acts of which he and his own friends were proud’ (213).” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underlined quotation cited & wrote: “The ppl. w/which we are dealing are so ignorant as to comprehend no means but humiliation and ridicule” • Underlined quotation cited & wrote: “We have never wrongly accused anyone”

Linda: Learning About Evidence Use, Perspective Recognition, and Interpretation Through the Sequence and Types of Writing Prompts. Linda’s early writing was inconsistent: sometimes she accurately interpreted sources and identified historical perspectives, but more often did not. Only twice in the first seven essays did she cite sources or integrate specific evidence to support her ideas. By the second half of the term, however, Linda regularly integrated quotations into her writing to explain historical perspectives and events. Over the course of the term, her explanations of historical perspectives and contextualization of historical events had improved, along with her use of quotations to support ideas and interpretations.

Two teaching strategies coincided with Linda's growth: (1) regular informal writing opportunities that focused on a single historical perspective or issue followed by (2) periodic writing tasks that asked students to synthesize multiple perspectives and complex issues. The informal essays were typically completed in class and were analytical in nature, emphasizing close reading of the text. They gave students the chance to make sense of a single perspective or issue and to interact with the text. Of his focus on perspective, Lyle said,

I think that in order to understand history you have to understand people and their belief system. It's not just a matter of . . . fill-in-the-blank or do true/false: "Garrison was an abolitionist. True or false? True." Well, so what. I mean, I think you have to know that, but then you have to go to what does that mean.

Lyle's approach to history emphasized understanding the beliefs and intentions of people who lived in another time and place. His assignments reflected this focus. Here is one informal writing prompt that focused on a historical perspective:

Frederick Douglass & 5th July Speech. Closely, alertly, thoughtfully, and creatively survey the latest source, Frederick Douglass's 1852 speech in his adopted city of Rochester, New York. What is he aiming to do in this speech? How do you suppose he believed that this address would further and strengthen the abolitionist cause?

Such prompts were a routine part of class, comprising about two-thirds of the students' writing opportunities, and usually took place in the first 30 minutes of the period. These assignments asked students to begin a consideration of the past with an exploration of the evidence rather than depicting their own personal views. Lyle's instructions referred directly to the reading students did and guided students to use documents to help them make sense of the past.

During the first 4 weeks of class, three of the five informal writing prompts focused on historical issues while the other two explored specific historical perspectives. The issues-based informal prompts probed the main issues in the Civil War, the Revolutionary ideals embedded in the Stamp Act Resolves, and the key ideas in the Constitutional Convention. The two perspectives-based expository prompts ask about the views of Mrs. McDonald (a female Southern diarist) and those of a delegate to the Constitutional Convention. These perspective-based assignments were the only times when Linda cited text during the first month of class.

The first two rows in Table 5 represent early informal writing prompts, one on issues ("Philadelphia Journal"), the other on perspective ("Political Profile"). The prompts explore different pages in James Madison's report on the Convention proceedings. Although she could have supported her points with excerpts from the primary source, Linda did not cite textual

TABLE 5
Comparison of Informal Writing Prompts and Excerpts of Linda's Essays

Prompt	Mr. Lyle's Writing Prompts	Excerpt From Linda's Corresponding Essays
Expository, Issue	<p>Philadelphia Journal. You are the political editor of the esteemed daily, The Philadelphia Journal. Your job is to convey to your readers the business of the Convention. . . . In your story give an accurate picture of the issues, the positions, the strategy, the rationale, and the interchanges of the delegates. Read closely and alertly. Write an informative and lively piece.</p>	<p>The delegate's [sic] biggest concern as of late is the argument of how many delegates does a state get to have. The physically bigger states say that the bigger the state the more delegates it will have. The rich states believe that the best taxpayers should be awarded with the most delegates. The most populous states declare that the decision would go by the population. Although the overriding idea was to give equal representation between the states, they were also extremely picky in the number of representatives they were allowed. (week 4 of 11)</p>
Expository, Perspective	<p>Political Profile. Please write a one-page political profile of one or two delegates about whom you have been reading and studying. . . . Give the reader (me! And perhaps the rest of the class), your take on one or two delegates. Lastly, do quote—and cite the page number(s) in parentheses.</p>	<p>On the 22nd of August, 1787 Charles Pinckney rebuffed Mr. Elseworth's [sic] (Connecticut) statement about the moral issues concerning slavery by making a very general statement of slavery and it's [sic] history. "If slavery be wrong, it is justified by the example of the world. He cited the case of Greece, Rome & other antient States . . . In all ages half of mankind have been slaves. (p. 127)" One could translate this statement to mean that Mr. Pinckney was making a statement about how the issue was not a moral issue at all, or that slavery is just a way of life, and past argument. (week 5 of 11)</p>
Expository, Perspective	<p>W.L. Garrison & Religion. Using the three Garrison documents from pp. 78-97 (1. The Park Street Address on 4 July 1829; 2. the Opening Editorial of the Liberator on 1 January 1831; and, 3. the Declaration of Sentiments of the American Anti-Slavery Society in December 1833), please assess the place of religion in Garrison's thinking. What insights might your ideas provide in the study of the abolitionist movement? Please do not begin to write immediately—survey the reading and your annotations; take a few notes and then begin. (writing prompt, October 12, 2004)</p>	<p>The United States in 1829 was a deeply Christian society. It was smart of Garrison, whether he actually meant it or not, to use religion as a subject pertaining to slavery in his speeches. This topic spoke strongly, if not always positively, to the citizens. Garrison blames slavery on everyone; he states that it is not only the fault of the Southern slaveholders but of New England merchants and traders as well. He does not single anyone out in his speeches but takes the blame out on everyone, including, perhaps, himself as well. "We are all alike guilty. Slavery is strictly a national sin." (Page 86) People went to religion and Christianity for a sense of purity and innocence in their lives. Garrison is calling them on their mistake, by saying that no thing, not even religion can make slavery an innocuous deed. (week 7 of 11)</p>

TABLE 5
Continued

Prompt	Mr. Lyle’s Writing Prompts	Excerpt from Linda’s Corresponding Essays
Expository, Issue	<p>Sectionalism. What scary sectionalism ghosts and goblins frightened Americans in the 1820 Missouri crisis of 1819-1821 and in the rhetoric surrounding the Mexican War and its aftermath, including the 1850 debates? Did you find any politicians who were handing out the “Snicker Bar” (or “Reese’s Peanut Butter Cup”) of nationalism, trying to curb sectionalist feelings and appealing to the Union and to broader nationalism? (Please cite your sources)</p>	<p>Both sides, the north and southerners are firmly stubborn concerning who got to take control over this chunk of land. . . . John C. Calhoun embodied this stubbornness of the south, and his speech in the debates of 1850 sort of bathed golden light upon it: “How can the Union be saved? There is but one way by which it can with any certainty: and that is, by a full and final settlement, on the principle of justice, of all the questions at issue between the two sections. The South asks for justice, simple justice, and less she ought not to take.” (Page 12) Calhoun puts the south in the position of this innocence and uses this rhetoric of American ‘justice’ as a tactic. This kind of debate was threatening and dangerous to the northern cause. (week 11 of 11)</p>

evidence for the Philadelphia Journal prompt. She made several interpretive errors, confusing the geographic and demographic size of states, and stating that most were interested in equal representation, when many preferred proportional representation. Linda’s work here was vague and imprecise, representative of her early essays.

The Political Profile prompt was given 3 days later, and resulted in an accurate picture of Charles Pinckney of South Carolina. In the excerpt cited here Linda included Mr. Pinckney’s words as reported by Madison to explain his rebuttal to another delegate. This was the second time she had cited a source; both occurred in informal essays on historical perspectives. She was able to position Pinckney in conversation with other delegates rather than as a static historical figure. She also offered a tentative explanation for Pinckney’s stance by offering two interpretations of his words.

After this Political Profile prompt, every informal writing prompt focused on a particular historical perspective, except for one that discussed the issue of sectionalism; thus, eight of nine informal writing prompts in the final 7 weeks focused explicitly on a perspective. In each essay Linda cited more sources and crafted grounded interpretations of historical perspectives. In response to the Garrison & Religion prompt (Table 5, row 3), Linda focused on Garrison’s perspective and explained his intentions and tactics (e.g., what he was trying to do, how he was trying to do it) with a quotation, explanation, and contextual information. At the end of the term, she continued to write evidence-based essays, even for the one

prompt that did not focus on a particular historical perspective (Table 5, row 4). The prompts focusing on historical perspectives appear to have helped Linda learn to include quotations, explain them, and develop strong interpretations of historical perspectives and issues. By the end of the term, this learning had extended over different prompts, not just those focusing on perspectives.

Once students wrote several informal essays on the different perspectives and discussed the sources multiple times in class, Lyle then assigned a second prompt: an interpretive synthesis of complex topics using a wider range of sources. These tended to be take-home assignments allowing students to pull together ideas regarding a topic they had been considering for an extended period of time. To complete them, students had to corroborate various documents related to one topic, read and see the documents together, and synthesize perspectives about which they had already written.

Consider this synthesis writing assignment, from the opponents and defenders of slavery unit:

Abolitionist Panel Discussion. You have gathered a group of three to five prominent abolitionists and one pro-slavery advocate to participate in a panel discussion on the abolitionist movement. Transport yourself back to antebellum America and make a serious inquiry into the movement and its leaders. Your obligation as moderator is to ask thoughtful, thought-provoking, tough, challenging questions of the panelists (and they, indeed, can ask questions of each other.) Your goal is to initiate a real conversation among the panelists that will illuminate the movement from many angles and perspectives. . . . Please cite all quoted passages with the page number in parentheses. . . .

The assignment directed students toward primary documents, and asked for citations of evidence. Previously, the students had spent 3 weeks reading and discussing sources authored by various abolitionists, including Frederick Douglass, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and the Women's Anti-Slavery Convention, plus a few by slavery supporters like John C. Calhoun and William Fitzhugh. Students had written about the abolitionists in six in-class informal assignments and one take-home synthesis of Douglass's *Narrative*.

The strongest sections of Linda's essay focused on historical figures she had already analyzed in writing (William Lloyd Garrison and Frederick Douglass). When she wrote about Garrison and Douglass, she integrated relevant and significant quotations and explained their views accurately. Although she made some errors in explaining John Quincy Adams and John C. Calhoun's perspectives, she did include some quotations from their speeches (it was the first time she had written about either figure).

The setup, an interpretive synthesis assignment given *after* several micro-level writing assignments on the same topic, scaffolded student writing. Lyle spoke directly about this in an interview:

So what I try to do is I try to build understanding one document at a time . . . so I do have a big question in mind that I want to ask at the end of the study of a particular set of documents or a topic. So I know where I'm going. So I'm using each one of the in-class essays to try to get them to see what those people said so they understand what that writer said, what's in that document. . . . So that at the end of 2 weeks you have maybe 20 documents or something like that and then I want them to do something with those 20 documents. But it's impossible to ask students after 2 weeks to do something with 20 documents if they haven't even done anything about any of them before. So then I want them to go back into their writing and to take—and to go back into their reading—so at least they know, “Ah, yes, I have written about this, I have something to say here.”

The sustained focus on historical topics allowed students to look at the same issue from multiple perspectives and deepen their content knowledge. Thus, when students wrote their interpretive synthesis pieces, they had former essays to work with, complete with feedback, annotated readings, and class notes.

Such a sequence—summative prompts, given after informal writing prompts on various historical perspectives—appeared to help Linda create coherent, grounded, contextualized arguments. Her first in-class essay earned a 2 for historical reasoning; her final in-class essay earned a 3. When asked how she improved over the course of the term, Linda said she was a better reader and more adept at analyzing history and making connections. When asked what helped her improve, Linda cited the informal writing prompts:

Honestly, when he assigns essays to like, you know, make the connections or . . . just like explain the temperament of Abraham Lincoln and why that was such a big deal. It's kind of like an exercise to get your ideas onto the paper not necessarily like you have to answer the question correctly, you know.

In talking about her writing process throughout the term, Linda regularly reported that she “just thought about it.” Absent a formal process for writing, these initial essays may have helped her clarify and organize her ideas before writing the interpretive assignments.

Ben: Learning About Evidence Use, Perspective Recognition, and Interpretation Through Teacher Feedback. In his first essay Ben included quotations from the text to support his interpretation of a historical figure; however, the evidence neither supported nor related to his claim. Ben misrepresented the historical figure, overstating the figure's position. By his final essay, Ben was able to interpret the positions of historical figures as expressed in the documents studied, provide supporting evidence for his own interpretation, and extend the main idea of the essay by discussing the person's beliefs. Ben included and explained relevant evidence to support his points. He also made historically accurate interpretations without generalizing.

TABLE 6
Patterns in Mr. Lyle’s Feedback on Ben’s Abolitionism Panel Paper

Type of Feedback	Historical Accuracy	Demand for Evidence	Interpretive Disagreement	Extension of Content
Example of feedback from Ben’s paper	“On and off. I’d say since about 1831 with a very sharp exchange 1819-1820 over Missouri—and then pretty quiet until 1831”	—“[You] should state some of his beliefs here.” —“Good but how: not yet officially but in other ways—spell these out because these will support his hope/plans for separation from the North.” —“Quote WLG and the women in their critiques of the American Protestant Churches.”	—“I’m not sure he would say this. For WLG it is more sickening that Americans do not find slavery sinful and abhorrent.” —“Argh! But he does! He is a pacifist—he says this time and again! How would a man who believes in a biracial society think it moral and wise to preach a race war??”	—“Ben—great—for Fitzhugh, slavery is a relationship between the master/parent and the slave/child.” —“Excellent. FD, WLG—all the abolitionists were terribly disappointed with the American Protestant churches, all of which were moral passive when confronted by the [abolitionists].”

Lyle’s regular oral and written feedback appeared to contribute to Ben’s growth over the course of the term. This feedback emphasized evidence-based thinking, reading comprehension, and historically astute interpretation of issues and perspectives. In feedback on student papers, Lyle stressed the use of accurate and compelling evidence, as well as plausible interpretation. Of his general approach to feedback, Lyle said, “What I tried to do on the commentary is I try to engage in a conversation with them and it’s not just ‘you’re right or wrong.’ But I try to raise some questions or say ‘this is a good idea.’” Lyle’s conversational approach is evident in his feedback, which covered his students’ pages (Appendix D).

Analysis of the feedback on Ben’s essays demonstrates patterns illustrated with examples from Ben’s Abolitionist Panel Discussion essay (Table 6). Witness the comments that “demand evidence” or engage in “interpretive disagreements”: Lyle directly corrected factual details, confronted misinterpretations, or requested evidence. His comments directed Ben to read the text more carefully and find excerpts to explicate his ideas. “Extension of content” comments went beyond the text by sharing contextual information and engaging in conversation. In addition to direct confrontations about evidence and interpretation, Lyle integrated an average

of five positive comments per essay, as well as personal comments that developed his relationship with Ben (e.g., references to an interest such as football).

Particularly striking in Lyle's early feedback was the repeated call for evidence to support ideas and explicit disagreements with Ben's interpretations. The first major paper asked students to describe a movie they would make of the Civil War based on the diary of Cornelia McDonald and several historians' monographs. Here Lyle wrote, "Good pt—but quote Mrs. McDonald—the reader of this paper does not just want your summary but rather both your voice and hers." Here Lyle asked Ben to quote the McDonald source three times to support his points. In an early interview Ben revealed his aversion to quoting sources:

I don't like quoting stuff. . . . I know it's something you have to do but I just prefer to just go on whatever I remember and whatever I thought about it instead of going back and trying to do—you know if it's wrong, it's wrong. Whatever.

Despite this resistance, Ben periodically included passages from sources. When he used an excerpt from a source for the movie essay, Lyle wrote, "Excellent use of an important passage." Despite the fact that the teacher challenged him repeatedly, Lyle also affirmed Ben's successes.

Two weeks later, Ben's essay on the Constitutional Convention ("Philadelphia Journal" prompt) continued to provoke criticism: "Quote one of the delegates from either one of these states—and, frankly, two statements probably should be quoted." More striking in Lyle's feedback were his disagreements with Ben's interpretations. In response to Ben's statement that the South "obviously" wanted to count slaves when determining representation in Congress, Lyle wrote,

Ben, I'm not sure you mean this—Southerners wanted their slaves to be counted in the population pool—The Chesapeake Southerners were comfortable with a 3/5 ratio; the Carolina and Georgia delegates demanded 5/5; and the Convention settled at the former number, 3/5, which was henceforth termed the federal ratio.

Four other comments challenged Ben's interpretation, and directed him to be more precise. When Ben claimed that Native Americans would be counted in the population, Lyle wrote, "No—read this closely. Indians were not counted in the population—They were regarded as living in separate nations." When Ben wrote that Ellsworth and Pinckney stated that slavery would eventually end, Lyle wrote, "They do?? What suggests to you that Pinckney's statement puts him close to the Ellsworth position?" He disagreed with Ben's inaccurate statements and repeatedly directed the student back to the text. In reviewing Lyle's feedback on his essays midterm, Ben was unsure of a few phrases Lyle wrote but he grasped the main point of Lyle's comments. He said,

So I guess it was kind of a Southern, kinda generalization. He wanted me to go into it a little more and support it a little bit. . . . So I think maybe he wants me to support those a little more before I say them . . . you don't want to make uh assumptions.

Ben had noted similar feedback about avoiding assumptions and generalizations in the first interview as well. Ben's explanation of Lyle's feedback was consistent with what the teacher wrote on both occasions. After this midpoint in the term, Ben made fewer generalizations in his writing. In his next essay, Ben integrated five quotations and accurately explained the position of Charles Pinckney. Lyle's feedback affirmed Ben's interpretation.

Lyle also offered feedback in whole-class discussions. During the 12 days I observed, every class focused on making sense of a text and using it to understand the past. When asked how he helped students support arguments, Lyle explained his approach to class sessions.

In our class discussions I think I would ask “. . . what do you think is happening here and why do you say what you're saying, what's the proof of your point?” . . . I try to get them to go back into the text . . . to not have them just get away with any kind of weak, fuzzy generalizations.

Lyle began text-based discussions by asking for students' interpretations, then immediately followed up by asking for the evidence that led students to reach their conclusions. Often discussions were based on what students wrote in class at the beginning of the period, allowing them opportunities to review their essays and get immediate feedback on evidence selection and interpretation. Here, Lyle opened a discussion on an in-class essay about Frederick Douglass:

Lyle: What did you say, what did you write, what ideas did you play around with in your paper?

Student: [shares his response]

Lyle: Really. You want to tell us where that is? [To class] I really want you guys to use the source book. [Waves Douglass's *Narrative* around in the air.]

Student: Okay, I, um, here it is. Um.

Lyle: Which page?

Student: Page 85.

Lyle: And tell us where on page 85.

When students shared their insights, Lyle immediately directed them to the text to ground their responses. In this way, Lyle communicated that only evidence-based interpretations were acceptable. In the three observed classes on abolitionism, Lyle asked students to share and explain the passages that supported their thinking an average of 10 times per class. This explicit instruction reiterated many of the same messages he wrote on students' essays.

Ben's essays during the Abolitionism unit were among his strongest. Ten days after the Political Profile essay, Ben wrote about William Lloyd Garrison and integrated five quotations to explain Garrison's perspective and Lyle affirmed several of Ben's points. When asked about the Garrison essay, Ben said, "I had a good amount of quotes . . . backing up the argument more." The week after, Ben had similar success with an essay on Frederick Douglass' 5th of July speech. Later that week, Ben continued to cite his sources in writing but fell into old practices when he misinterpreted parts of the Wendell Phillips's speech on the Abolitionist movement. Lyle pointed this out: "I don't think he says this—this is such a big assertion here that you need to support it. Show the passage—but I don't think you can here, Ben, because WP doesn't say it." When Ben made two misinterpretations of Garrison in his Abolitionist Panel essay (one week after the Phillips paper) Lyle pointed these out. Despite the errors, his Abolitionist Panel essay was extremely strong—Lyle noted Ben's good interpretations and use of the sources in 15 comments.

Although Ben's progress was not linear, overall his essays demonstrated improvement consistent with the feedback he received. Ben still made periodic errors in interpreting sources, but did so far less often, while showing good use of sources. He also consistently included quotations from sources. Ben's posttest showed marked improvement in citing relevant excerpts of sources and making sound interpretations of historical issues and figures; hence the two-point jump in historical reasoning (from a 2 to a 4) by the time of his final essay. Moreover, his understanding of historical writing seemed more sophisticated, as when he brought up the challenge of integrating evidence into his final paper for the class:

I feel that if you find something, you know, clear, that you know goes against your point, then you can't use it, or you make it in your essay, you know, you explain that. But you know, if it's something subtle like that, you know, then maybe you're misinterpreting or whatever. . . . I don't think anyone would do it if it were a real conflict.

Ben suggests that what he writes must reflect the evidence and if his points conflict he must either explain the conflict, reassess his interpretation, or drop the point. This is a far cry from where Ben started, resisting the use of any quotations. Ben's growth was consistent with Lyle's encouragement to read carefully, avoid assumptions, and ground his reasoning in evidence.

DISCUSSION

In Lyle's classroom, teaching historical thinking—specifically evidence use, perspective recognition, and interpretation—advanced students' historical writing. In one term, Abigail, Linda, Ben, and the majority of their classmates learned to write arguments that recognized historical perspective

and context, demonstrated close reading of text, and used evidence to support their reasoning. Three teaching strategies represent how Lyle integrated historical thinking and literacy instruction. Each case presented here demonstrates the power of each individual strategy; in reality, Lyle used all three strategies with the entire class simultaneously, which probably added to the impact of each strategy. Abigail's case highlights how annotations scaffolded the reading and writing process. Linda's case shows that the sequence and nature of assignments made a difference. Ben's writing illustrated the power of formative assessment and regular feedback. At no time in my observations did Lyle teach students the conventions of argumentative writing. Instead, annotations, regular informal writing prompts followed by summative prompts, and feedback occurred in concert with students' improved historical writing. But these were not simply strategies for teaching literacy, they were strategies primarily used to teach historical evidence use, perspective recognition, and interpretation. As such, it was not just the instructional techniques Lyle used but how he framed and employed them that supported students' development as historical writers.

The Overlap Between Lyle's Teaching and Adolescent Literacy. When Lyle asked students to annotate their readings, he pushed them to become active readers engaged with the text in many ways: asking and answering questions of themselves and the author, comprehension monitoring, making connections to prior knowledge and other texts, integrating reading and writing, and summarizing. These also happen to be widely endorsed reading comprehension strategies (cf. Alvermann, Phelps, & Ridgeway, 2007). Annotating resembles the practice of "talking to the text" (cf. Schoenbach, Greenleaf, Cziko, & Hurwitz, 1999), but differs in its emphasis on historical content and ways of thinking. Interacting with texts in Lyle's classroom emphasized the source and context of documents. The particularities of where he directed students' attention were historical in nature and supported their comprehension, inference, and interpretation skills. Unlike Lyle's classroom, typical history teaching in the United States involves reading the text with end-of-chapter questions (cf. Cuban, 1991; NCES, 2002). With such an approach, reading and writing are separate processes; careful reading is often overlooked.

The inquiry orientation of the course made interpretation a central goal. Lyle structured the course around several questions, all of which guided students' reading of primary documents as they sought to understand why the Civil War occurred. To investigate questions, Lyle typically asked his students to read and annotate documents that had bearing on these questions, write about the historical perspectives embedded in the documents during class, and then discuss and analyze the documents as a whole class. These discussions focused on how the documents advanced students' understanding of the time period and helped them develop

interpretations in response to the inquiry questions. Lyle's repeated calls for evidence in class discussions and his directives to cite texts in essays emphasized evidence-based thinking. Lyle fostered close reading as well as comprehension of the literal text and subtext, sending the message that claims must be supported by textual evidence—not a strong area for high school students on NAEP tests.

Writing annotations and essays several times a week reinforced the importance of writing to learn and portrayed writing as less risky than in classrooms where the only writing occurs on a unit test. Regular informal writing prompts gave students an opportunity to read documents carefully, comprehend them, and situate them historically. A solid understanding of sources and having informal essays about the meaning of individual sources in front of them likely made it easier for students to synthesize across sources when writing the interpretive take home essays. Such writing experiences enable students to work through their ideas, develop their content knowledge, and improve their thinking about that content (Langer, 1986).

The Historical Nature of Lyle's Literacy Practices. In guiding students' reading and writing, Lyle went beyond basic comprehension to embrace historical thinking as an approach to literacy. Historical reasoning complements several goals of adolescent literacy such as weighing conflicting accounts, considering the influence of bias, and developing evidence-based arguments—the very areas in which 65% of 12th-grade readers and 76% of 12th-grade writers performed below proficient on recent NAEP tests (NCES, 2003, 2007).

Lyle's literacy practices were grounded in historical reasoning and used as a vehicle to construct interpretations of the past. Historical interpretations depend on the public display of evidence (Evans, 1997). The inclusion of examples, details, and quotations exemplifies this aspect of reasoning. Further, historical interpretations must account for the available evidence (Hexter, 1971). This often involves altering interpretations to accommodate contradictory evidence. Comparing and contrasting documents is a visible manifestation of this way of reasoning. Lyle expected his students to make interpretations based on evidence to support their ideas in activities, assignments, and feedback. Because they had multiple primary and secondary texts to consult, students compared evidence and considered conflicting accounts, advancing the notion of history as interpretation. His practices targeted the very goals Lee and Shemilt (2003) and Shemilt (1983) outline in their progression models of thinking about historical evidence and accounts: understanding that history is composed of competing accounts that must be weighed by analyzing the evidence on which the accounts are based and situating evidence in historical context. Likewise, Lyle's practices targeted two key concepts from the Benchmarks of Historical Thinking project: "use primary source evidence" and "take historical perspectives" (Peck & Seixas, 2008; Seixas, 2006). Lyle's students

learned to read documents as sources of evidence, situating them in their historical context and making inferences about the past based on the documents. They also learned to recognize the differences between their world and the world of the people they studied, noting the particular influences on people in the past. As such, Lyle's practice is an example of teaching for specific historical thinking concepts.

Lyle's essays and discussion questions were deeply historical in nature. Most in-class essays and discussions focused on what a particular text could tell students about who wrote it or the times in which the author lived. This approach established primary sources as key to understanding another time, rather than devices for sharing judgments. Understanding the past, not each other's opinions, became the primary focus of the class. This approach necessitated a focus on historical perspectives and context.

Lyle asked such questions as "What is he aiming to do?" that directed students to consider Frederick Douglass and why he took actions in the context of his time. Students were not asked to evaluate or judge Douglass, but to understand him based on what they could learn from the primary source. Had Lyle instead asked "Should Douglass have given the 5th of July speech?" he might have encouraged students to judge Douglass based on their present-day beliefs rather than the text itself or the historical context of the document. Consideration of historical texts in Lyle's class focused on what a document indicated about a person from the past. Both the nature of reading and writing opportunities, and the ways in which students were guided to read and write, helped students learn to discriminate among various pieces of evidence in the construction of their own historical accounts.

As Moje and colleagues (2004) have said, it is often difficult to distinguish between content learning and content *literacy* learning, given that a key part of learning a discipline lies in the oral and written language of that discipline. Learning history in Lyle's classroom was as much about learning to talk, read, write, and think historically as it was about the Civil War content.

The Intersection of Reading, Writing, and Thinking in a History Class. What was notable about Lyle's practices was the intersection of reading, writing, and thinking and how they were interwoven and connected to history. Lyle's practice overlaid literacy-rich practices on a course firmly rooted in historical understanding. Annotating connects reading to writing; it focuses students on the text as they make marginal notes. In practice, students read with pen in hand and approach reading as a sense-making process. By requiring students to write questions and ideas, and to highlight text, annotations guide students to read closely and reason with the text. Abigail used her annotations as evidence when it came time to write essays. Lyle's assignments guided Linda to take evidence from sources and use it in her writing. They gave her a purpose for reading: to understand historical

figures and analyze their intentions and interests. The assignments also framed many writing exercises, especially the informal assignments, as opportunities to think and reason through the text. In Ben's case, feedback focused on how he read and used what he read in his writing; in effect, it forced him to connect reading and writing and attend more closely to the evidence in his interpretations. By focusing on understanding the Civil War and analyzing its historical perspectives, these students learned to read history—and thus construct better historical arguments.

Lyle's approach is anchored in the dual premise that how students read influences their writing, and how they write is an indication of that reading. Reading and writing are related, not separate processes. They are foremost rooted in thinking—not just in basic comprehension, but questioning texts, recognizing and evaluating authors' opinions. This level of skill resonates with the IRA position paper on adolescent literacy (Moore et al., 1999). Reading for subtext transcends basic literacy levels; here, literacy is also about critical thinking. Rather than separating reading, writing, and thinking into discrete, unrelated activities, Lyle integrates these processes in supporting ways. Instead of reading for homework and writing an essay about a general topic at the end of a unit 2 weeks later, students in Lyle's class use writing to examine a single reading and then use the reading to develop ideas to write about. The end game will be the mastery of analytical (in this case historical) thinking.

CONCLUSION

This study improves our understanding of what is possible in a literacy-rich history classroom. It highlights how students' disciplinary reasoning and evidence-based writing progressed in the classroom of a teacher who used reading and writing to help them learn and reason about history rather than simply summarize it. This integration of reading, writing, and historical thinking is unique in high school classrooms.

Clearly, the context of The Pacific School influences Lyle's practice. All students began the year with strong literacy backgrounds, small classes meet in multiple extended blocks of time, and there are no external demands on his curriculum. The school sends a majority of its students to college; Pacific is largely defined by its college preparatory focus. Materially, Lyle had access to such resources as course readers. A major implication of this study is the need to test Lyle's approach on a wider range of students in other academic contexts. But, Lyle's teaching still merits study simply because so many of his practices have never been documented in the historical thinking literature. Reading and writing were more than comprehension and regurgitation exercises in this classroom: they integrated historical thinking and served as a means to understanding the past. If more high school teachers integrated disciplinary thinking and literacy their students would become better readers, writers, *and* thinkers.

Most importantly, Lyle's teaching demonstrates that there are *discipline-specific* ways of reading and writing that can help students understand content, promote disciplinary thinking, and develop those critical skills in need of attention. Literacy instruction and disciplinary reasoning need not be kept in separate corners. Instead, by learning more about what it means to be literate in various disciplines, literacy instruction may be more effectively integrated into students' daily learning experiences.

If only 5% of the adolescents tested critically evaluate a source, and 2% consistently support arguments with evidence (NCES, 2003, 2007), it's time to embrace literacy instruction across content areas. This teacher's practice demonstrates that literacy instruction does not require abandoning disciplinary content or understanding. On the contrary, reading, writing, thinking, and content understanding may best be developed together.

REFERENCES

- Afflerbach, P., & VanSledright, B. (2001). Hath! Doth! What? Middle graders reading innovative history text. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44(8), 696–707.
- Alvermann, D., Phelps, S., & Ridgeway, V. (2007). *Content area reading and literacy: Succeeding in today's diverse classrooms*. Boston: Pearson.
- Bain, R. (2005). They thought the world was flat: Applying the principles of how people learn in teaching high school history. In M. S. Donovan & J. D. Bransford (Eds.), *How students learn: History in the classroom* (pp. 179–213). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Berkin, C. (2002). *A brilliant solution: Inventing the American Constitution*. New York: Harvest.
- 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. Retrieved April 2009, from <http://www.all4ed.org/files/ReadingNext.pdf>
- Braten, I., & Stromso, H. (2006). Constructing meaning from multiple information sources as a function of personal epistemology. *Information Design Journal*, 14(1), 56–67.
- Britt, M. A., & Aglinskias, C. (2002). Improving students' ability to identify and use source information. *Cognition and Instruction*, 20(4), 485–522.
- Collingwood, R. G. (1943). *The idea of history*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Conley, M. (2008). Cognitive strategy instruction for adolescents: What we know about the promise, what we don't know about the potential. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 84–106.
- Cuban, L. (1991). History of teaching in social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 197–209). New York: Macmillan.
- Denos, M., & Case, R. (2006). *Teaching about historical thinking* (P. Seixas & P. Clark, Eds.). Vancouver, BC: The Critical Thinking Consortium.
- De La Paz, S. (2005). Effects of historical reasoning instruction and writing strategy mastery in culturally and academically diverse middle school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 139–156.
- Evans, R. (1997). *In defense of history*. New York: Norton.

- Felton, M., & Herko, S. (2004). From dialogue to two-sided argument: Scaffolding adolescents' persuasive writing. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 47(8), 672–683.
- Gitlin, T. (1995). A dubious battle in Oakland. In *The twilight of common dreams: Why America is wracked by culture wars* (pp. 7–36). New York: Metropolitan Books.
- 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. Retrieved April 2009, from <http://www.all4ed.org/files/WritingNext.pdf>
- Greene, S. (2001). The question of authenticity: Teaching writing in a first-year college history of science class. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 35(5), 525–569.
- Hexter, J. H. (1971). *The history primer*. New York: Basic Books.
- Holt, T. (1990). *Thinking historically: Narrative, imagination, and understanding*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Hynd-Shanahan, C., Holschuh, J. P., & Hubbard, B. P. (2004). Thinking like a historian: College students' reading of multiple historical documents. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 36(2), 141–176.
- Kiuhara, S., Graham, S., & Hawken, L. (2009). Teaching writing to high school students: A national survey. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(1), 136–160.
- Krathwohl, D. (1993). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach*. New York: Longman.
- Langer, J. (1986). Learning through writing: Study skills in the content areas. *Journal of Reading*, 29(5), 400–406.
- Lee, P. (2005). Putting principles into practice: Understanding history. In M. S. Donovan & J. D. Bransford (Eds.), *How students learn: History in the classroom* (pp. 31–78). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Lee, P., & Ashby, R. (2000). Progression in historical understanding among students ages 7–14. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching and learning history* (pp. 199–222). New York: New York University Press.
- Lee, P. & Shemilt, D. (2003). A scaffold not a cage: Progression and progression models in history. *Teaching History*, 113, 13–23.
- Levstik, L., & Barton, K. (2008). *Researching history education: Theory, method, and context*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Linenthal, E., & Engelhardt, T. (Eds.). (1996). *History wars: The Enola Gay and other battles for the American past*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- McCombs, J., Kirby, S., Barney, H., Darilek, H., & Magee, S. (2005). *Achieving state and national literacy goals: A long uphill battle*. A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- McPherson, J. (2003). *Crossroads of freedom: Antietam, the battle that changed the course of the Civil War*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mink, L. (1987). *Historical understanding*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Moje, E. (2007). Developing socially just subject-matter instruction: A review of the literature on disciplinary literacy teaching. *Review of Research in Education*, 31(1), 1–44.
- Moje, E. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 52(2), 96–107.
- Moje, E., Ciechanowski, K., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and Discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(1), 38–70.

- Monte-Sano, C. (2008). Qualities of effective writing instruction in history classrooms: A cross-case comparison of two teachers' practices. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(4), 1045–1079.
- Monte-Sano, C. (2010). Disciplinary literacy in history: An exploration of the historical nature of adolescents' writing. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19(4), 539–568.
- Moore, D., Bean, T., Birdyshaw, D., & Rycik, J. (1999). Adolescent literacy: A position statement for the Commission on Adolescent Literacy of the International Reading Association. Retrieved July 2007, from http://www.reading.org/downloads/positions/ps1036_adolescent.pdf
- Moore, D., Readence, J., & Rickelman, R. (1983). An historical exploration of content area reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 18(4), 419–438.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2002). *The nation's report card: U.S. History*. Retrieved October 2009, from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2001/2002483.pdf>
- National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2003). *The nation's report card: Writing 2002*. Retrieved July 20007, from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pubs/main2002/2003529.asp>
- National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2007). *The nation's report card: 12th grade Reading and Mathematics*. Retrieved July 2007, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2007468>
- Page, R. N. (1991). *Lower track classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Paxton, R. (2002). The influence of author visibility on high school students solving a historical problem. *Cognition and Instruction*, 20(2), 197–248.
- Peck, C., & Seixas, P. (2008). Benchmarks of historical thinking: First steps. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 31(4), 1015–1038.
- Perfetti, C., Britt, M. A., & Georgi, M. C. (1995). *Text-based learning and reasoning: Studies in history*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ravitch, D., & Finn, C. (1987). *What do our 17-year-olds know?* New York: Harper & Row.
- Rosenzweig, R. (2000). How Americans use and think about the past. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching and learning history* (pp. 262–283). New York: New York University Press.
- Rouet, J., Britt, M., Mason, R., & Perfetti, C. (1996). Using multiple sources of evidence to reason about history. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88(3), 478–493.
- Rouet, J. F., Favart, M., Britt, M. A., & Perfetti, C. A. (1997). Studying and using multiple documents in history: Effects of discipline expertise. *Cognition and Instruction*, 15(1), 85–106.
- Schoenbach, R., Greenleaf, C., Cziko, C., & Hurwitz, L. (1999). *Reading for understanding*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seixas, P. (1993). Popular film and young people's understanding of the history of Native American-White relations. *The History Teacher*, 26(3), 351–370.
- Seixas, P. (1994). Students' understanding of historical significance. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 22(3), 281–304.
- Seixas, P. (1999). Beyond "content" and "pedagogy": In search of a way to talk about history education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(3), 317–337.
- Seixas, P. (2006). *Benchmarks of historical thinking: A framework for assessment in Canada*. The Center for the Study of Historical Consciousness. Retrieved September 20, 2009, from <http://www.histori.ca/benchmarks/documents/Benchmarks%20of%20Historical%20Thinking%20A%20Framework%20for%20Assessment%20in%20Canada.pdf>
- Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 40–59.

- Shemilt, D. (1980). *History 13–16 evaluation study*. Leeds, UK: Schools Council Publications.
- Shemilt, D. (1983). The devil's locomotive. *History and Theory*, 22, 1–18.
- Stahl, S., Hynd, C., Britton, B., McNish, M., & Bosquet, D. (1996). What happens when students read multiple source documents in history? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31(4), 430–456.
- VanSledright, B. (2002). Confronting history's interpretive paradox while teaching fifth graders to investigate the past. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(4), 1089–1115.
- Wiley, J., & Voss, J. (1999). Constructing arguments from multiple sources: Tasks that promote understanding and not just memory for text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(2), 301–311.
- Wineburg, S. (Ed.). (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(1), 73–87.
- Wolfe, M., & Goldman, S. (2005). Relations between adolescents' text processing and reasoning. *Cognition and Instruction*, 23(4), 467–502.
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Young, K. M., & Leinhardt, G. (1998). Writing from primary documents: A way of knowing in history. *Written Communication*, 15(1), 25–68.

APPENDIX A: DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORICAL REASONING RUBRIC FOR WRITTEN WORK

Level	Historical Reasoning
5	The claim accounts for the evidence at the student's disposal. Essay explains how <i>multiple, contrasting</i> pieces of evidence generate the claim. Selection and analysis of evidence reveals an understanding of historical significance, causation or biases of sources pertinent to the topic. Explanation of the connection between claim and evidence <i>integrates</i> relevant historical context. Essay demonstrates an awareness of the tentative, complex nature of historical knowledge.
4	The claim accounts for <i>most</i> of the evidence at the student's disposal. Explains how <i>multiple</i> pieces of evidence generate the claim. Selection and analysis of evidence reveals a <i>developing</i> understanding of historical significance, causation or biases of sources pertinent to the topic. Explanation of the connection between claim and evidence <i>attends</i> to relevant historical context and avoids generalization. Essay demonstrates <i>some</i> awareness of the tentative, complex nature of historical knowledge.
3	The claim accounts for <i>some</i> of the evidence at the student's disposal. Selection and analysis of evidence reveals a <i>limited</i> understanding of historical significance, causation or biases of sources pertinent to the topic (e.g., the author may not explain how pieces of evidence relate and may not distinguish between primary and secondary evidence). The essay may <i>note</i> contextual factors; however the essay may still make <i>some</i> generalizations. Essay demonstrates a <i>limited</i> awareness of the tentative, complex nature of historical knowledge.
2	Claim attempts argument, but <i>may not account</i> for evidence at the student's disposal. Selection and analysis of evidence may reveal an understanding of history as a <i>compilation</i> of details. This may reveal <i>little or no</i> understanding of historical significance, causation, biases of sources, or context. Instead, most of the evidence is treated <i>equally</i> (e.g., selection of evidence may seem arbitrary, author may not distinguish between primary and secondary sources, etc.). May use contemporary values to judge the past. May use personal views, generalizations, absolutist language, or a-historical evidence (e.g., use of evidence from the present-day to support an argument about another time period).
1	The essay does not make a plausible historical interpretation in response to the question. If facts are included, they may take the form of a <i>summary</i> or <i>chronology</i> of the past. Selection and analysis of evidence may reveal an understanding of history as a <i>compilation</i> of details. This reveals <i>no</i> understanding of historical significance, causation, biases of sources, or context. Instead, the evidence is treated <i>equally</i> . May use contemporary values to judge the past. May use generalizations, personal views, absolutist language, or a-historical evidence to make a case.

APPENDIX B: SAMPLE OF ABIGAIL'S EARLY ANNOTATIONS ON PATRICK HENRY'S 1765 VIRGINIA RESOLUTIONS

WHEREAS the Hon. House of Commons, in England, have of late drawn into Question, how far the General Assembly of this Colony hath Power to enact Laws for laying of Taxes and imposing Duties, payable by the People of this his Majesty's most ancient Colony: For settling and ascertaining the same to all future Times, the House of Burgesses of this present General Assembly have come to the following Resolves:—

Resolved, That the first Adventurers, Settlers of this his Majesty's Colony and Dominion of Virginia, brought with them and transmitted to their Posterity, and all other his Majesty's Subjects since inhabiting in this his Majesty's Colony, all the Privileges and Immunities that have at any Time been held, enjoyed and possessed by the People of Great-Britain.

Resolved, That by two Royal Charters, granted by King James the First, the Colony aforesaid are declared and entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of natural born Subjects, to all Intents and Purposes, as if they had been abiding and born within the Realm of England.

Resolved, That his Majesty's liege People of this his ancient Colony have enjoy'd the Right of being thus govern'd, by their own Assembly, in the Article of Taxes and internal Police; and that the

same have never been forfeited, or any other Way yielded up, but have been constantly recognis'd by the King and People of Britain.

Resolved, therefore, That the General Assembly of this Colony, together with his Majesty or his Substitutes, have, in their Representative Capacity, the only exclusive Right and Power to lay Taxes and Imposts upon the Inhabitants of this Colony: And that every Attempt to vest such Power in any other Person or Persons whatever, than the General Assembly aforesaid, is illegal, unconstitutional and unjust, and have a manifest Tendency to destroy British as well as American Liberty.

Resolved, That his Majesty's liege People, the Inhabitants of this Colony, are not bound to yield Obedience to any Law or Ordinance whatever, designed to impose any Taxation whatsoever upon them, other than the Laws or Ordinances of the General Assembly aforesaid.

Resolved, That any Person, who shall, by speaking or writing, assert or maintain, that any Person or Persons, other than the General Assembly of this Colony, have any Right or Power to impose or lay any Taxation on the People here, shall be deemed an Enemy to this his Majesty's Colony.

Cap of ppl. —
should be
some way
in Eng. —

General Assembly

only
the General
assembly
can impose
taxes

ppl. who differ
in views are
the Enemy.

any power who
defies this resolution
is committing an illegal
act

APPENDIX C: SAMPLE OF ABIGAIL'S LATER ANNOTATIONS OF GARRISON'S 1829 PARK STREET ADDRESS

in a time of crisis he thinks it is clear we have our unjust laws & we have no society that we are not being visited by a curse of God's wrath. I think we should be clear about this. I think we should be clear about this. I think we should be clear about this.

inequality should no longer be tolerated. If it cannot be speedily put down—not by force, but by fair persuasion; if we are always to remain shackled by unjust Constitutional provisions, when the emergency that imposed them has long since passed away; if we must share in the guilt and danger of destroying the bodies and souls of men, as the price of your Union; if the slave States will haughtily spurn our assistance, and refuse to consult the general welfare; then the fault is not ours if a separation eventually take place. . . .

It may be objected, that the laws of the slave States form insurmountable barriers to any interference on our part.

Answer. I grant that we have not the right, and I trust not the disposition, to use coercive measures. But do these laws hinder our prayers, or obstruct the flow of our sympathies? Cannot our charities alleviate the condition of the slave, and perhaps break his fetters? Can we not operate upon public sentiment, (the lever that can move the moral world,) by way of remonstrance, advice, or entreaty? Is Christianity so powerful that she can tame the red men of our forests, and abolish the Burman caste, and overthrow the gods of Paganism, and liberate lands over which the darkness of Superstition has lain for ages; and yet so weak, in her own dwelling-place, that she can make no impression upon her civil code? Can she contend successfully with cannibals, and yet be conquered by her own children?—slaveholders?

Suppose that, by a miracle, the slaves should suddenly become white. Would you shut your eyes upon their sufferings, and calmly talk of Constitutional limitations? No; your voice would peal in the ears of the taskmasters like deep thunder; you would carry the Constitution by force, if it could not be taken by treaty; patriotic assemblies would congregate at the corners of every street; the old Cradle of Liberty would rock to a deeper tone than ever echoed therein at British aggression; the pulpit would acquire new and unusual eloquence from our holy religion. The argument, that these white slaves are degraded, would not then obtain. You would say, it is enough that they are white, and in bondage, and they ought immediately to be set free. You would multiply your schools of instruction, and your temples of worship, and rely on them for security. . . .

But the plea is prevalent, that any interference by the free States, however benevolent or cautious it might be, would only irritate and inflame the jealousies of the South, and retard the cause of emancipation. If any man believes that slavery can be abolished without a struggle with the worst passions of human nature, quietly, harmoniously,

he contends that racial prejudice is absolutely absurd and unwarranted

he says it will require hard work & perseverance

important point for rebuttal

APPENDIX D: SAMPLE OF LYLE'S FEEDBACK ON BEN'S ABOLITIONIST PANEL DISCUSSION ESSAY

Berger- Before we begin, I am now going to briefly introduce the participants. We have William Lloyd Garrison, born in 1805 in the city of Newburyport, Massachusetts. As a young child, he became involved in the anti-slavery movement. Possibly his greatest accomplishment was starting the famous anti-slavery newspaper, The Liberator. He also founded many anti-slavery societies, and gave many famous speeches on this cause. Mr. Frederick Douglass, one of the most foremost leaders of abolitionism, was born into slavery on the Lloyd plantation near Hillsboro, Maryland. He went through childhood and his teenage years with the determination for reaching freedom. He eventually used his intellect to escape slavery, and settle in New Bedford. He now gives many speeches against slavery. Mr. Wendell Phillips was born in Boston, in 1811. Mr. Phillips soon became great friends with Garrison and helped him with the Liberator. Some consider him in being the greatest anti-slavery orator to ever live. For pro slavery, we have George Fitzhugh who was born in 1806, in Virginia. We also have John C.

seems from South Carolina

Calhoun, who believes slavery is a positive good. Both are in strong favor for slavery, and think that it is the best thing for the nation at the present time. All right, enough prolonging, lets begin. Berger- The first question goes to Mr. John C. Calhoun. Mr. Calhoun, Do you agree with abolitionists, namely Mr. Garrison, that say that the Union and Slavery cannot exist with one another? Take 90 seconds for this, and appropriately, we will hear a response from Mr. Garrison. You will hear one ding when 15 seconds approaches, and 2 when your time is up. Plan accordingly so we can get to as many questions as possible.

you have to identify him he was the most famous Southerner and the fundamental

not he is

Calhoun- Yes, as a matter of fact, in a pro-slavery article, I wrote exactly that: "Abolition and the Union cannot co-exist" (312). I truly and firmly believe this. But I must say this with deep remorse, because more importantly, I do believe in the Union. I stand for it. Sure, there are things that I do not agree with that were passed by our American Congress, but that is all part of the process. I am an American, thus I stand for America. I would hate to see the union broken up over this issue. But unfortunately, it is pointing in that direction. I have thought about this a lot, and I have come to my senses that our country is extremely divided in today's times. You are either for slavery, or against it. Not many people have no opinion. And what it comes down to, is the fact that both cannot be in the same room together. I am not going to lie. It is tough for me to be sitting in the same room as these three abolitionists sitting across from me. And I am sure I can speak for them, in saying that they feel the same way about us. If I do not want to be sitting next to an anti-slavery advocate, how am I going to be able to live on the same soil with them. As pro-slavery people, we are surely not going to let slavery be abolished. We will not surrender our beliefs, and give up. I do truly hope that we can come to some kind of agreement and live in one country peacefully, but let us be real; this country is simply not big enough for the both of us.

great

well

good!!

he should state some of his beliefs here

Garrison- Well, like Calhoun, I said in a speech a while back that there will be, "No Union with slaveholders" (123). John's argument, is basically mine in reverse. It is impracticable for the Union to continue with these two very strongly opposed ideals. The division between the country is sickening. I do not understand how people that live on the same land, and share the

I'm not sure he would say this. For while it is more sickening that Americans do not find slavery painful + abhorrent