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The efficacy of incorporating literacy instruction into content area instruction to facilitate learning is well documented. Integrating reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills into the social studies classroom is needed to increase student comprehension of nonfiction text, to better prepare students for literacy tasks associated with postsecondary training, and to engage in the work required by an increasingly demanding job market. However, we have limited information about how incorporating all four literacy skills into social studies instruction will influence student understanding of social studies content and how the use of these skills influences student writing about social studies concepts and ideas.

The purpose of this feasibility study is to provide evidence of how integrating reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills into eighth-grade social studies instruction facilitates student understanding of content material and ability to write about social
studies content. In this within-subjects paired-samples research study, 197 eighth-grade participants received instruction in a social studies content area and in argumentative writing. Data from a criterion-referenced social studies pre and posttest and data from pre and post instruction writing samples were analyzed to evaluate the influence of the integration of literacy tasks in middle school social studies classrooms on content area knowledge acquisition and argumentative writing quality. Analysis of the Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) data using regression analysis showed that there was a statistically significant increase in the students’ performance on the CRT after the students engaged in tasks emphasizing reading, writing, speaking, and listening during the social studies instruction. Analysis of the writing rubric scores using Cohen’s d showed statistically significant differences exist between the students pre and post essay scores. These results suggest that having students engage in reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks and in explicit writing instruction and production during a social studies unit facilitates their content knowledge acquisition, improves the overall quality of students’ argumentative writing, and more specifically, improves the organization and development of that writing. It is recommended that further research be conducted to determine the best way to group students for collaboration when incorporating reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks within content area instruction.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

As an eighth-grade teacher, Alice has taught social studies for the past 5 years in a rural school district. She has a passion for teaching history and plans lessons that involve cooperative groups to encourage discussion and reenactments of historical concepts and events to provide students with hands-on learning experiences. As recommended, Alice utilizes both primary and secondary documents. Alice integrates materials and ideas she gathers as she attends social studies workshops and professional development trainings throughout the school year and in the summer. This is time consuming, but she believes that planning and teaching these types of lessons will inspire her students and help them to learn how to critically examine historical themes and events.

With the recent adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS, National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010a), social studies teachers like Alice are now expected to formally implement literacy instruction into the social studies curriculum. Like many teachers, Alice feels overwhelmed and frustrated with the instructional changes. She already spends many hours designing interactive and engaging social studies lessons. She does not want to redesign her entire curriculum to accommodate literacy instruction because of the planning time it will take and the history content material that will likely be left out so as to incorporate assignments that focus more heavily on literacy skills.
Moreover, Alice does not fully understand how all the four components of literacy, speaking, listening, reading, and writing, can be used in concert, and how the use of these components can help her differentiate instruction in her classroom. Although her school does emphasize writing across the curriculum, she has never purposely incorporated speaking and listening skills into her teaching. Alice’s school does emphasize writing with a format called CBEAR, which stands for the parts of a well written paragraph and essay: Claim, Background, Evidence, Analysis, and Review. The claim is the opinion or thesis the writer is proposing. The background includes the information the readers of the essay should know for the writer’s claim or evidence to make sense. The evidence includes specific quotes or information that supports the claim. The analysis is an explanation of what the evidence means and how it proves the claim. The review restates the claim in a new way and summarizes the main points of the claim or connects it to the next idea.

Alice reviews this writing format for the social studies essays she assigns to her students each term, so she believes she is fulfilling the mandate to include literacy in her curriculum. Why should she have to add further literacy objectives involving speaking and listening skills to her very long list of social studies content objectives? Aren’t any other literacy skills something students should be learning in their English classes? Alice is experiencing the frustration many teachers feel when new educational standards are adopted.

The adoption of new educational standards such as the recently adopted CCSS require much of teachers without any guarantee of training and/or support (S. Brown,
2014; Flett & Wallace, 2005; Flores, 2005; Kirk & Macdonald, 2001; Meister & Jenks, 2000). In such cases, teachers are typically provided with little evidence as to how these new standards and curriculum based upon them will influence student learning or how they will or should influence teacher instruction. This makes it difficult for teachers to “buy in” to the new standards (Burke & Adler, 2013; Fifield, 2014; Flett & Wallace, 2005; Pyhältö, Pietarinen, & Soini, 2013), which can lead to less than effective instruction. The most recent example of a comprehensive standards adoption is the CCSS, which are a set of standards designed to help teachers focus their instruction on the specific skills students need to be college and career ready. These skills include being able to read and write effectively, think critically, and analyze and solve problems (CCSS, What Parents Should Know, 2016). In order to achieve these goals, the English Language Arts (ELA) CCSS require that social studies teachers implement literacy standards and objectives within their social studies content area instruction. This not only requires social studies teachers to learn a brand new set of standards and skills to teach, but it also requires them to incorporate the teaching of reading and writing skills within their social studies courses when time to cover content area knowledge is already limited and constrained.

In addition to time limitations, there are many additional challenges that arise with a shift like this in curricular emphasis and responsibility. One challenge has to do with teacher identity. These new standards require social studies teachers to teach literacy skills, which is essentially asking them to revise their perspective of the role teachers play as content area specialists. Social studies teachers have been trained, in large part, with
the understanding that they are “conveyors of content, the breadth of which is ever-increasing in their respective curricula” (Topping, Wenrich, & Hoffman, 2007). Second, many secondary teachers do not have sufficient knowledge, abilities, or preparation for integrating literacy instruction into their content area instruction (S. Cantrell, Burns, & Callaway, 2009; Gilles, Wang, Smith, & Johnson, 2013). Third, teaching literacy is time intensive, and secondary teachers may believe that there is not enough time to teach both literacy and social studies content (Beyer & Brostoff, 1979; Jacobs, 2002; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). Fourth, many secondary social studies teachers do not have the resources needed to teach literacy in discipline-appropriate ways (Lee & Swan, 2013). Finally, there has been a lack of content area literacy training for teachers addressing specific literacy strategies and instructional methods in social studies (Martell, 2010).

As daunting as this may seem, all of these challenges can be addressed. The first step is to help teachers understand the historical and educational context for the addition of literacy skills instruction within the content areas. For example, low reading achievement scores measuring a student’s ability to read and write proficiently is an ongoing concern. The National Assessment of Educational Policy (NAEP), the largest nationally representative and on-going assessment of American students, is administered every two years to fourth and eighth graders and is “designed to measure students’ reading comprehension by asking them to read selected grade-appropriate materials and answer questions based on what they have read” (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2016, para. 1). According to NAEP, reading scores rose in the 1990s, remained steady between 1998 and 2002, and then decreased between 2002 and 2005. For the next
10 years, scores rose until 2015 when the reading percentile scores of eighth graders decreased back to the 2011 level. These scores are still higher than the scores in 1992 when the reading assessment was first introduced, but any decrease is a concern. Overall, only “34% of students in 8th grade were at or above proficient, but 82% of African-American students and 78% of Hispanic students are reading below proficiency compared to 45% of their Caucasian peers reading below proficiency” (Children’s Literacy Initiative, 2016, para. 1).

The ability to write competently is closely connected to the ability to read a variety of texts. The writing portion of the NAEP is administered to eighth and twelfth grades annually and, prior to the NAEP computerized writing test, average writing proficiency scores on the NAEP writing test increased modestly between 1998 and 2002 for eighth graders, but there were no significant changes in twelfth grade scores. From 2002 to 2007, both eighth and twelfth grade proficiency scores on the NAEP writing assessment increased (Child Trends Data Bank, 2012). The writing portion of the NAEP was administered for the first time by computer in 2011 to eighth and twelfth graders, and items on this national assessment require students to communicate in one of three ways: to persuade, to explain, or to convey experience. In 2011, 24% of students in both grades 8 and 12 performed at the proficient level in writing, with female students scoring higher than male students. Fifty-four percent of eighth graders and 52% of twelfth-graders performed at the Basic level in writing in 2011 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). This means that the majority of tested students could not write in a way that showed significant “analytical, evaluative, or creative thinking” (National Assessment of
These scores are one measure of a student’s ability to read and write proficiently, skills that are vitally needed to participate in the world’s global market and to meet the increased demand for skilled labor in the areas of service, information, and technology (Wimberly & Noeth, 2005). Therefore, students must have the literacy skills necessary to make the transition from secondary education to postsecondary education or training, or directly to the job market. Many students in the U.S., however, are falling short of being college and career ready. Only 66% of 2011 high school graduates in the U.S. met the college readiness benchmark in English (American College Test [ACT], 2013). Among high school seniors in 2006, a full 40% who had enrolled in postsecondary education needed remedial courses (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). This lack of preparation for postsecondary education and today’s job market is one of the reasons behind the recent adoption of CCSS, a set of standards designed to rectify this deficit (Barnett & Fay, 2013).

Furthermore, the ACT maintains the clearest differentiation in reading between students who are college-ready and those who are not is their ability to comprehend complex text (ACT, 2007). In an attempt to better prepare students, the CCSS emphasize nonfiction reading and writing across the content areas, including the ability to analyze text and generate evidence-based propositions and arguments (see ELA, Writing-CCSS, Grade 6-8, http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/WHST/6-8/). From the perspective of social studies teachers, the kind of critical thinking skills needed to evaluate content-area text, such as primary documents, include proposing a defensible
thesis and subsequently writing a well-organized and persuasive essay. These skills are considered essential aspects of citizenship in a democratic society (Resnick, 1987). Not only is critical thinking defined as a higher-order cognitive skill, but it can also be viewed as “the acquisition of the competence to participate critically in the communities and social practices of which a person is a member” (Ten Dam & Volman, 2004, p. 359). Students need a certain level of reading and writing ability to become discerning consumers of the vast amount of information available to them and to be able to use that information to make educated decisions as citizens.

To date, however, many social studies teachers have assumed that students already have the literacy skills needed to access the information needed to help them remain informed or have been expecting English teachers to provide this instruction (Applebee & Langer, 2011). With the adoption of the CCSS, the intent is for every teacher to understand the implications of literacy education and for every teacher to think of himself/herself as a literacy instructor. In a discussion regarding the relationship between educational policymaking and teaching, Shanahan (2014) emphasizes the obligation teachers have to “make a serious effort to understand the purposes and requirements of literacy education policies” (p. 11). Researchers can facilitate this understanding by providing teachers the rationale and substantiation for including literacy practices in content areas.

There is evidence to suggest that delineating the positive effects of new standards adoption can foster teacher support for these changes (Donaldson, 2014). Presenting social studies teachers with the research-based evidence to support the addition of literacy
objectives into the social studies curriculum is necessary for them to understand how literacy instruction can help their students learn subject matter (Beyer, 1982), and how teaching both content and literacy skills can be integrated (Giroux, 1979). Not only will this information support teachers when integrating reading and writing instruction into their social studies instruction, they can also gain pedagogical knowledge about effective strategies to use when expanding their instruction to include literacy skills. Information such as this can help teachers understand that they are able to integrate literacy practices into their curriculum without sacrificing content (Ventre, 1979).

There is plenty of evidence to support the efficacy of incorporating literacy instruction into content area instruction. For example, research suggests that students’ academic content learning improves with instruction that includes text-processing activities such as summarizing and generating questions (McCulley & Osman, 2015). There is also research evidence that articulates the importance of including specific kinds of writing within social studies instruction. For example, R. Cantrell, Fusaro, and Dougherty (2000) studied seventh grade students who used an adaption of the K-W-L strategy (what the student knows, what the student wants to know, and what the student learns from reading) to write in journals. They found that the students using the K-W-L strategy demonstrated greater content knowledge on a teacher-constructed multiple choice posttest assessing students’ knowledge of content from the social studies textbook when compared to students who wrote only summary entries in their journals which involved steps similar to the SQ3R (survey, question, read, recite, review) writing strategy. In the R. Cantrell et al. (2000) study, the students were asked to turn chapter
headings and subheadings into questions after they had read a portion of their textbooks. After this they were instructed to answer the questions in their own words in their journals. Both the K-W-L and SQ3R writing strategies helped students learn social studies content. However, having students engage in K-W-L writing required them to write responses both before and after reading. The researchers suggested that using writing strategies to help students learn content is more useful when these strategies help students activate prior knowledge and help them set their own purposes for reading.

Another study examining the effect of summary writing on content knowledge acquisition was undertaken by Taylor and Beach (1984), where 114 seventh-grade students were assigned to one of three groups: (a) an experimental group receiving instruction and practice in a hierarchical summary procedure used after reading social studies text, (b) a conventional group receiving instruction followed by answering and discussing questions after reading social studies text, or (c) a control group receiving no special instruction. Researchers found that students who wrote a hierarchical summary of social studies text performed better on a recall measure of previously unfamiliar information than did the conventional group or the control group.

However, it is also important for content area teachers to understand that literacy encompasses not only reading and writing, but also speaking and listening. These aspects of literacy have not had as much attention or emphasis placed on them as reading and writing have, and so in many ways, speaking and listening have been neglected in the social studies classroom. Nevertheless, due to the Speaking and Listening Standards outlined in the ELA CCSS, a new or renewed emphasis is being placed on these specific
literacy skills. For example, Anchor Standard 1 states that students should “prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively” (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010a, p. 22). In fact, Fisher and Frey (2014) recommend that students be given the opportunity to effectively learn, develop, and practice speaking and listening skills with at least “50% of the instructional minutes devoted to content area learning be used for collaborative conversations with peers” (p. 65).

Incorporating more speaking in tandem with reading and writing during social studies instruction may increase not only student reading and writing achievement, but content knowledge as well. This is especially true for English learners who need supportive and collaborative environments to increase their language skills by speaking with and listening to peers as they simultaneously endeavor to learn content knowledge (Dobao, 2012; Fernández Dobao & Blum, 2013; Shehadeh, 2011; Storch, 2005; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2007). Moreover, several researchers have explored the benefits of implementing collaborative writing within a social studies course where students work together in pairs or small groups to discuss their ideas before writing, and they have found plenty of evidence to suggest that these collaborative discussions have influenced English learners’ language development as well as the accuracy and content of their writing as they attend high school or college (Dobao, 2012; Shehadeh, 2011; Storch, 2005; Wissinger, 2012). Having students discuss their understanding and thinking about social studies content and concepts and how these ideas can be portrayed in writing can
give “learners…time to work out the details with one another [and]…allows them to use academic and social language as they consolidate their understandings” (Ross & Frey, 2009, p. 77).

**Problem Statement**

Integrating reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills into the social studies classroom is needed to increase student comprehension of nonfiction text and to better prepare students for literacy tasks associated with postsecondary training and to engage in the work required by an increasingly demanding job market. However, we have limited information about how incorporating all four literacy skills into the social studies instruction will influence student understanding of social studies content and how the use of these skills influences student writing about social studies concepts and ideas. Additionally, teachers need more information about how best to implement this integration in effective and efficient ways so that student learning can increase.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this feasibility study was to provide evidence of how integrating reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills into social studies instruction facilitates student understanding of content material and ability to write about social studies content. A number of studies document the positive effects of integrating writing instruction and social studies content on students’ ability to write more historically accurate essays and to demonstrate increased content knowledge (De La Paz, 2005; De La Paz & Felton, 2010;
Monte-Sano, 2008, 2011; Monte-Sano, De La Paz, & Felton, 2014; Reynolds & Perin, 2009; Sielaff & Washburn, 2015; Wiley & Voss, 1999). We need more information about how emphasizing speaking and listening, in addition to reading and writing, enhances student mastery of social studies content and whether this emphasis contributes to improved student writing. More specifically, the primary goal of this feasibility study was to examine how the specific use of reading, writing, speaking, and listening with eighth grade students influenced students acquisition of social studies content knowledge and ability to compose argumentative essays as outlined in the ELA CCSS.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in this study.

1. Does the emphasis on reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction influence students’ learning of content knowledge as indicated by a criterion-referenced social studies assessment?

   Null hypothesis: There is no statistically significant relationship between an emphasis on reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction and students’ performance on a criterion-referenced social studies assessment.

2. In what ways does the emphasis on reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction and explicit instruction on writing an argumentative essay influence the quality of middle school students’ argumentative writing as indicated by individual student essay scores calculated using an Argumentative Essay Rubric based on the six traits of writing and the CCSS writing standards?

   Null hypothesis: There is no statistically significant relationship between an emphasis on both reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction and explicit instruction in writing with the quality of middle school students’ argumentative writing as indicated by individual student essay scores calculated using an argumentative essay rubric based on the six traits of writing and the CCSS writing standards.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this literature review is to provide context for the inclusion of literacy strategies in content area instruction. The chapter begins with a review of the literature on the specific literacy components that are included within the Common Core State Standards: Grades 6-12 Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, & Technical Subjects and how these literacy components have been used to date within discipline specific classrooms. Until now, the majority of research studies have examined content area instruction when only one or more of the literacy components is examined. Next, a specific collection of research is curated to determine the relevant data regarding content area instruction that has included more than one literacy component. Literature review procedures and inclusion/criteria are also provided. Finally, a description of the theoretical framework used in the present study to examine the integration of reading, writing, speaking and listening strategies into middle school social studies instruction is articulated.

Teaching Social Studies Content and Literacy Skills

The main goal of adopting any pedagogical strategy is to increase students’ skills and learning. In a nationwide attempt to achieve this goal, the CCSS were written with an emphasis on integrating literacy standards across the content-areas. Teachers should understand the reasoning behind the adoption of these standards and the implications of implementing these standards to their content area instruction so that they can make more
meaningful and informed teaching decisions. In the following section, studies that contribute to understanding the reasoning and implications of implementing these standards are reviewed. Studies that outline the role of teachers in implementing new standards and content teachers’ perceptions of teaching literacy are also reviewed to lay a foundation on how best to support teachers as they integrate literacy strategies in their content-area classrooms.

**Influence of the Common Core State Standards**

The CCSS are a framework of objectives written in collaboration with teachers, school administrators, university professors, and individuals associated with education companies or nonprofit organizations such as the College Board. These objectives were designed to help educators teach students to read and write competently, problem solve, use technology, and think critically so that they can be prepared to meet the demands of the today’s global market (Wimberly & Noeth, 2005). An increased demand for skilled labor in the areas of service, information, and technology makes these skills, especially literacy skills, very relevant to today’s students. To further facilitate students’ learning in reading and writing, the new standards also require content area teachers, including social studies teachers, to teach literacy skills.

These expanded literacy objectives in the CCSS are necessary because many students in the U.S. are not considered college and career ready by the time they leave high school. For example, only 66% of 2011 high school graduates in the U.S. met the college readiness benchmark in English (American College Test [ACT], 2013). Among
high school seniors who had enrolled in postsecondary education by 2006, a full 40% took remedial courses (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). The creation of the CCSS was the National Governors’ Association’s (NGA) reaction to concern about the lack of preparation for postsecondary education and the job market.

The difference between the CCSS and other top-down educational reforms is that the CCSS have combined the goals and justifications for former educational reform including “creating common educational standards, preparing students for college, stressing quality education for all students, and increasing rigor in schools” (Wallander, 2014, pp. 10-11). A number of national organizations, in addition to the NGA, took part in the drafting of the standards including the Council of State School Officers (CCSSO), Achieve (a nonprofit education reform group the new standards require that social studies teachers to teach literacy skills in social studies), the International Reading Association (IRA), the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), and members from two of the largest teachers’ unions in the country, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the National Education Association (NEA).

Included in the CCSS are suggestions for teaching rigorous literacy standards, but detailed lesson plans are not included. Therefore, teachers are expected to use their training and expertise to implement the literacy objectives in their classroom in ways that promote the critical thinking and reasoning skills necessary to succeed in a demanding global economy. Eslinger (2012) maintained that teachers are more likely to implement new standards and curriculum when they are provided with a measure of professional autonomy to make decisions about the specific implementation and instruction of the new
standards. However, this freedom to design and create lessons can also be difficult for social studies teachers who were not trained to teach literacy skills.

The implementation of the CCSS, however, offers an ideal opportunity to combine the advantages of a centralized (top-down) orientation of educational change and a decentralized (bottom-up) orientation of educational change. “Combined strategies which capitalize on the center’s strengths (to provide perspective, direction, incentives, networking, and retrospective monitoring) and local capacity (to learn, create, respond to, and feed into overall directions) are more likely to achieve greater overall coherence” (Fullan, 1994, p. 20). The CCSS are standards adopted from a centralized, top-down organization of state representatives who researched and networked to provide shared direction and perspective. In addition, the CCSS offer educators a framework of standards which can be used to implement a variety of teaching methods, techniques, and strategies from the bottom-up based on the availability of resources and the needs of students. With the implementation of the ELA CCSS, content area teachers have an opportunity to creatively and purposefully incorporate literacy into lessons that are designed to meet the state content objectives.

**Implications of the CCSS for Social Studies Education**

The adoption of the CCSS affects social studies instruction in ways that can be viewed as both advantageous and challenging. During the recent standards-based reform movement, evidence suggests that social studies in both the elementary and secondary school curriculums have become increasingly marginalized when compared to other
subjects (Bolick, Adams, & Willox, 2010; Fitchett, Heafner, & Lambert, 2014; Rock et al., 2012). Lack of statewide assessments, perceived lack of administrative support, and the lack of emphasis on the social studies content in teacher-education methods courses are among the factors cited for this marginalization (Babini, 2014; VanFossen, 2005).

The adoption of the CCSS has the potential of bringing social studies back to the forefront among other subjects because of the literacy and critical thinking standards and objectives that are now expected to be taught across content areas. Statewide assessments aligned with the CCSS will measure a student’s ability to analyze information and defend arguments based on evidence gleaned from a variety of disciplines such as the social studies, thus allowing the social studies curriculum the prospect of receiving the same status and emphasis as the language arts curriculum (Kenna & Russell, 2014). The CCSS place an emphasis on teaching central topics deeply instead of trying to cover a wide range of information superficially. Historically, effective social studies instruction has integrated both an emphasis on inquiry learning (Newmann & Oliver, 1970; Parker, 2001; Wiggins & McTighe, 2005), and the memorization of facts. Beck and Eno (2012) state that “student-centered learning, particularly in the form of inquiry, leads to much deeper, authentic understanding of social studies issues” (p. 84). By emphasizing deep understanding, the CCSS essentially reinforce best practices associated with social studies. These best practices include using strategies in the social studies classroom that teach students to “use content knowledge to answer essential questions, to understand issues in depth, and to solve problems effectively in the context of active citizenship in a democratic society” (Stern, 2005, p. 53).
Role of Teachers in Implementing Standards

The overall quality and effectiveness of standards is irrelevant, however, if teachers do not teach and implement those standards successfully in the classroom. A portion of that effectiveness depends on the perspective that teachers have about their role as educators. Teachers are trained as professionals whose job is to make decisions based on their pedagogical and content knowledge. Teachers believe it is their responsibility to assess the needs of students and implement standards in ways that meet those needs. Standards need to be written so that teachers can make implement them using a variety of methods and approaches. More specifically, the standards need to be written in a way that gives enough detail for teachers to understand the concrete skills and strategies that students need to be taught, but also written in a way that is broad enough to allow for adaptation based on a teacher’s and the students’ background and experience.

When teachers make meaningful and informed teaching decisions, classroom instruction is more likely to be effective. Thus, teachers need to understand the reason why standards have been adopted and what their role is in implementing these standards. The educational theorist John Dewey (2012) emphasized that teachers are the most important part of the curriculum, an opinion shared by a number of education researchers (Öztürk, 2012; Smagorinsky et al., 2002; Zimmerman, 1992). The implementation of standards is dependent on teachers who interact daily with students. After reviewing research on evidence-based teaching practices, Stanford University Professor Darling-Hammond (2000) concluded that “reliance on curriculum standards and statewide
assessment strategies without paying due attention to teacher quality appears to be insufficient to gain the improvements in student outcomes sought” (p. 3). The pedagogical skills and knowledge of teachers and their opinion about what they teach directly influences the quality of teaching and the level of learning by students.

When expecting teachers to implement standards, it is important that school leaders understand the teachers’ view of their role in education. Preservice teachers take methods and foundations courses in education departments and subject-matter courses in discipline departments. They must also take courses in educational theory, curriculum, and pedagogy as well as participate in a number of practicums and supervised teaching situations in order to become licensed educators. Preservice teachers learn not only how to teach, but how to write and implement lesson plans which include numerous strategies and techniques aimed at involving and inspiring diverse groups of students with a disparate range of abilities. Due to this specialized training and practice, teachers envision themselves as professionals who are curriculum developers, not just implementers of educational standards (Silberstein & Ben-Peretz, 1987).

Teachers believe that it is their responsibility to use their training and experience to assess the needs of the students in their classrooms and modify their instruction accordingly. In a study to determine how teachers adapt curricula to meet the needs of their students within a system of standard- and objective-based instruction, Meidl (2013) found that teachers “opted-out” of implementing all changes in standards when there was a disparity between their beliefs about what is effective and the practices they are directed to employ, a state she terms “pedagogical dissonance” (p. 8). Pedagogical dissonance is
closely related to *cognitive dissonance*, a term first coined by Leon Festinger in 1957, which refers to the imbalance that exists between an individual’s ideas and beliefs and their life experiences (Leonard, 2002). Pedagogical dissonance occurs when teachers “draw on [their] intuition and professional experience” to alter a prescribed lesson, “leading to new and possibly more effective means of teaching” (Bush, 2000, p. 89). Bush cited an example of a 10th-grade English teacher who modified a unit on poetry by using a picture of Alaska in a tour book to teach imagery. The teacher’s intuition prompted him to utilize the picture of Alaska as a heuristic intended to produce a better lesson; the English teacher “used this intuition and professional knowledge to create and test a new pedagogy to replace the old” (p. 89).

This kind of lesson modification occurs when new curriculum is adopted and mandated. Fisher (2006) found that a variability of implementation occurs when new standards are adopted and concluded that it is essential to distinguish between the espoused theory and the “theory in use” in the classroom. Both British teachers in her study were expected to implement changes associated with the National Literacy Strategy, “a framework of prespecified objectives for each semester’s teaching in text, sentence and word level work which is delivered via a structured hour long session” (Fisher, 2006, p. 425). One teacher responded by focusing her pedagogy more on the new objectives while the second teacher reacted by increasing her teaching of phonics and her use of big books. Fisher also found that despite changing how they planned and organized their teaching, changing the content of their teaching, and even changing the range of aspects of literacy that they taught to include more phonic teaching and a wider
range of texts, “each teacher remained largely consistent in their pedagogical stance” (p. 433). So, despite the fact that most educational standards reform emanates from the top-down, “[t]he most important relationships in educational reform are those of teachers to the curriculum and teachers to themselves” (Zhu, 2010, p. 375). There is a “need to take into account teacher knowledge, self-efficacy, and abilities when developing and implementing curriculum” (Burke & Adler, 2013, p. 14).

The implementation of new standards is dependent on teachers who interact daily with students. “As long as the teacher, who is, after all, the only real educator in the school system, has no definite and authoritative position in shaping the course of study, that is likely to remain an external thing to be externally applied to the child” (Dewey, 2012, as quoted in Kliebard, 2004, p. 74). Teachers must not only accept the new standards enough to implement them, but also internalize them so that the change will be sustained (Kirk & Macdonald, 2001; Martell, 2010). For this to occur, the objectives and practices based on the new standards must not be so strict and rigid that teachers’ knowledge and abilities are excluded from the teaching process (Burke & Adler, 2013; Fisher, 2006; Griffith, 2008; Noboa, 2013), but at the same time they must contain enough “conceptual clarity and detailed guidance” on aspects of the recommended practices that local authorizes, schools, and teachers can implement them (S. Brown, 2014, p. 33).

The new standards must also intersect with the teachers’ beliefs regarding best teaching practices (Meidl, 2013) and provide a measure of autonomy in its implementation (Costello, 2012; Eslinger, 2012). “Collaboration and greater autonomy
can lead to greater professionalism and richer instructional outcomes” (Burke & Adler, 2013, p. 9). Irrespective of the curricular changes that are adopted, it is the teachers who ultimately decide what is taught and how it is taught (Ozturk, 2012; Smagorinsky et al., 2002; Sturtevant, 1996). Regardless of the systemic and organizational changes that are directed from the top down, it is the teacher who ultimately enacts the policies and implements the new standards in the classroom by interacting with students on a day-to-day basis. “Without teacher cooperation, no text—indeed, no law—would make a difference” (Zimmerman, 1992, p. 19). Without her accepting or even embracing these changes, the curricula or pedagogy will not be altered, a fact that remains germane when analyzing the implementation of the CCSS. “In the long run, even more than some of the other “reform” strategies, like charters and value-added testing, I think common core is ultimately going to rise and fall on the commitment and engagement of teachers,’ said Jeffrey R. Henig, Professor of Public Policy and Education at Teachers College, Columbia University” (as cited in Ujifusa & Sawchuk, 2014, p. 2).

Despite the possible benefits of enhancing the instruction of social studies with the introduction of the literacy objectives in the CCSS, these changes in standards place greater demands on social studies educators. Teachers of secondary social studies courses are now charged with teaching nonfiction reading and writing skills in addition to the social studies content. Many of these teachers do not have a background in teaching literacy skills and are reluctant to incorporate literacy strategies into their curriculum because they feel ill prepared or inadequate to the task (Fordham, Wellman, & Sandmann, 2002; Gilles et al., 2013; Greenleaf, Jimenez, & Roller, 2002). Many teachers
also feel that their content instruction will suffer because of the time and instructional
demands imposed on them by adding literacy skills to their already long list of learning
objectives (Jacobs, 2002; Kenna & Russell, 2014).

Additionally, secondary teachers’ beliefs about literacy instruction are complex,
and influenced by their past and present relationships and literacy experiences
not view content area literacy as new content to teach or as new pedagogy to implement,
but instead social studies teachers should view literacy as curriculum situated within
historical, social, and political contexts. They also suggest that social studies teachers ask
themselves, “How is literacy shaped by the curriculum and how does it shape the
curriculum?” (p. 457). It may be that this increased emphasis on literacy standards is
changing the perception of content area teachers towards their role as educators. S.
Cantrell et al. (2009) recently found that most content area teachers believed that literacy
was integral to their content area and that they considered themselves as both content and
literacy educators.

Perceptions of Teaching Literacy in the Content Areas

The emphasis on literacy standards during the past four decades has changed the
perception of content area teachers and their role as educators. A substantial number of
studies investigating the attitudes, beliefs, and use of literacy strategies by content area
teachers have been published during this time (Barry, 2002; Bintz, 1997; Christophe,
2011; Darvin, 2006; Hall, 2005; Haque, 1976; Jackson & Cunningham, 1994; Lewis &
Wray, 1999; Ness, 2009; Ratekin, Simpson, Alvermann, & Dishner, 1985; Spor & Schneider, 1999, 2001; Sturtevant & Linek, 2003; Ulusoy & Dedeoglu, 2011). In a study investigating the reading awareness, perception, and attitudes of 148 junior high and high school teachers (Haque, 1976), the teachers were found to have a more positive than negative view of content area literacy. The majority of them also felt responsible for the reading instruction in their classes. Similar results were found in a study of 342 secondary teachers in England where 96% of these teachers agreed, “all secondary teachers have a role to play in improving literacy” (Lewis & Wray, 1999, p. 275). When questioned, 435 K-12 classroom teachers from three states in the U.S. reported being receptive to learning content reading strategies (Spor & Schneider, 1999).

In a review of the research examining content area teachers’ attitudes and beliefs about the teaching of reading within their subject area, Hall (2005) found that, although having a positive attitude towards teaching reading is an important factor in changing teacher practices, a positive attitude is not necessarily sufficient in and of itself to induce change. Stating a belief in literacy instruction does not mean that teachers actually apply the practices in their classrooms. In a study by Ness (2009) in which the researcher observed eight middle and high school teachers, four of whom taught social studies, she found that reading comprehension instruction comprised only 3% of the 2400 minutes she observed. Yet, all of the participating teachers stated that reading was an integral part of their classroom instruction. When queried, one of the educators explained that reading aloud and answering the questions in the book were the methods she used to help students comprehend the text. No teacher in the study was able to explain how to model,
explain, or coach students on how to apply reading strategies to their independent reading.

Another study provides similar evidence. Stieglitz (1983) reported that although teachers who took a single course on integrating content area literacy into their instruction developed more positive attitudes towards teaching reading and writing, and that these attitudes were sustained over time, these teachers did not implement reading and writing practices in their classrooms in higher numbers after taking the course. Expressing support for literacy in the classroom does not mean that content area teachers are actually utilizing specific reading and writing practices, and utilizing them effectively. Spor and Schneider (2001) surveyed 92 beginning teachers (with between 1-6 years of teaching experience) from the Midwest and found that many of them were not familiar with the reading strategies contained in the survey. The teachers indicated that of the ten literacy strategies listed, the level of their familiarity and interest in these strategies ranged from 14% to 75%, and that less than half of them actually implemented the strategies in their classrooms (p. 263).

In surveys assessing U.S. secondary teachers’ use of writing in their content area classrooms (Applebee & Langer, 2011; Gillespie, Graham, Kiuhara, & Hebert, 2014; Graham, Capizzi, Harris, Hebert, & Morphy, 2014; Kiuhara, Graham, & Hawken, 2009), researchers found evidence that supports this idea. The majority of teachers in each of these studies agreed that writing is a strategy that should be taught and/or utilized across the content areas. However, most of the teachers also reported that they used effective writing practices infrequently (Graham et al., 2014; Kiuhara et al., 2009) or that the
writing practices they did use required little analysis and interpretation (Kiuhara et al., 2009), the construction of new understanding (Applebee & Langer, 2011), or the use of technology (Gillespie et al., 2014; Graham et al., 2014).

Similar results were reported by Ulusoy and Dedeoglu (2011) who found that the majority of first through eighth grade teachers who completed open-ended survey questions and interviews about their beliefs regarding literacy reported that they felt all teachers should teach reading and writing. However, the respondents also indicated that they did not feel as if teachers actually acted in accordance with these beliefs. One male social studies teacher, who had been teaching for 6 years, stated that time limitations and an overloaded curriculum were reasons why he did not have students engage more frequently in literacy activities. Another respondent blamed a lack of reading and writing courses in her training and a lack of support from parents as reasons why she did not utilize more reading and writing strategies in her classroom. The authors of this study point out that, even though a number of classroom teachers indicated that they had not taken reading and writing courses in their undergraduate education, the preservice teacher programs did indeed include courses on the topics of reading and writing. The authors speculated that the teachers may have failed to internalize the literacy practices taught in these courses and thus do not remember taking the courses. Perhaps the literacy strategies and practices were not tied into their content area subjects in meaningful ways for them to retain these instructional strategies and techniques.

In a more recent study examining secondary content area teachers’ attitudes toward teaching reading, Norton-Ejnik (2012) found that positive attitudes towards
teacher content area reading instruction were correlated with the teachers’ orientation to teaching and learning. She quotes Beswick (2004) who stated “it is insufficient to assist teachers to develop beliefs that are considered helpful without attending to other beliefs that may hold in relation to specific contexts” (p. 117 as quoted in Norton-Ejnik, 2012, p. 53). In this case, Norton-Ejnik found that teachers who believed in and practiced more learner-centered instruction were more open to incorporating content area reading instruction into their classrooms than those educators who practiced a more passive, teacher-centered method of instruction. The wide ranging results from these studies demonstrate that promoting a positive attitude towards content area reading is a multifaceted construct and one that depends a number of factors, including the teachers’ orientation towards teaching, and the method, duration, focus, and type of content area reading strategy instruction they receive.

Because of the many demands made on teachers to address content material in their classrooms, even the most dedicated content area teachers may fail to teach reading strategies or to use effective instructional practices utilizing reading in their classrooms. It is important for teachers to have evidence of the effectiveness of teaching reading and using reading practices in their classrooms. If teachers have research-based examples of literacy strategies that can be implemented into their content area instruction effectively, they may be more willing to include these practices in their own classrooms.

The present study was influenced by the literature regarding the need for social studies teachers to understand and teach literacy strategies. To address this need, the researcher met with the teachers in training sessions before and during the student
instruction to explain the nature of the research, the theory behind the inclusion of literacy in social studies instruction, and to review the effective strategies for teaching using reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks that were included in the instructional unit (see Figure 1). The teachers and researcher also discussed how to group students to facilitate the most productive interaction and discussion between students. It was very important that the teachers understood the components that make up literacy: reading, writing, speaking, and listening. An examination of each of the literacy components is included in the next section.

Figure 1. Graphic organizer of literacy tasks.
Content area reading instruction emerged as a distinct subject of interest for both practitioners and researchers in the early 1900s and continued to be a topic of investigation up through the middle of that century (Moore, Readence, & Rickelman, 1983). William S. Gray of the University of Chicago was a predominant figure in the origin of content area literacy as a significant topic of research and instruction. He also helped popularize the slogan, “Every teacher a teacher of reading” (Moore et al., 1983, p. 424). The subject of social studies had a place in the evolution of content area reading. Ernest Horn (1937) was one of the leaders in designing and expanding content area reading instruction, and his 1937 text, *Methods of Instruction in the Social Studies*, had an impact on future researchers.

One of the past debates regarding content area reading instruction centered on whether reading skills should be taught separately from the subject content in direct, skills-centered instruction or whether “in the school all the reading should be a direct means of intensifying, enhancing, expanding and relating the thought evolved by the study of subjects” (Parker, 1894, p. 19 as quoted in Moore et al., 1983, p. 427). A century later, this question remains a central issue in content area literacy instruction, along with other questions that focus on related issues. How distinct or similar are the reading demands across various content areas or even in the various components of a single discipline such as social studies (e.g., geography, psychology, economics, etc.)? Is the ultimate goal of content area reading instruction to direct students in learning information or to help students become independent learners by teaching them to utilize reading
strategies? (Moore et al., 1983).

The interest in content area reading reemerged in the 1970s with the cognitive revolution in psychology and with the publication of Herber’s (1970) text, *Teaching Reading in Content Areas* (Moore et al., 1983). More recently researchers have examined the use of reading interventions with secondary students in discipline specific areas such as science and social studies. Some of these interventions are multifaceted and incorporate a number of reading comprehension strategies in an effort to increase student learning and understanding of text. Fang and Wei (2010) studied the effects of infusing reading in the science instruction of middle school students. Teachers explicitly taught reading strategies in randomly assigned sixth grade science classes for an average of 15 to 20 minutes per week for the entire school year. The reading strategies taught included predicting, thick and thin questioning, concept mapping, morphemic analysis, recognizing genre features, paraphrasing, note taking, and think-pair-share. The students in the experimental classes were also encouraged to read and respond to one quality science trade book per week. At the end of the year students in the experimental group had significantly higher increases in their scores on a standardized reading test including the scores on the vocabulary and comprehension subsections. They also scored significantly higher on a criterion-referenced science test.

Park and Osborne (2007) studied the use of the content area reading strategies (CARS) in secondary agricultural courses to determine the effect of the strategies on students’ content comprehension and motivation to read. The reading strategies included prereading strategies such as K-W-L, Making Predictions A to Z, and anticipation guides;
during-reading strategies such as think-aloud protocols and graphic organizers; and post reading strategies such as summaries, discussion webs, and the Cube It! Strategy in which students consider a text from a variety of perspectives by rolling a six-sided cube with different activities described on its sides and then completing the activity that comes up. When the secondary students in the study were assessed, the results did not suggest that the use of CARS had any significant effect on the students’ learning of agricultural science content knowledge as compared to a control group’s learning. The students in the control group were taught the same science lessons using lessons that included taking notes, using organizers, cooperative activities, concept mapping, prediction guides, internet searches, demonstrations, discussions, think-pair-share discussions, and summaries of reading. Since multiple learning strategies were implemented in the science instruction in both the experimental and control groups, it is difficult to isolate the effects of any one of the specific reading strategies associated with the CARS program to determine if it had any effect on content knowledge learning.

A different set of strategies designed to assess content acquisition were a part of the Promoting Acceleration of Comprehension and Content through Text (PACT) social studies reading strategy instruction. PACT was examined in a set of studies (Swanson, Wanzek, Vaughn, Roberts, & Fall, 2015; Vaughn et al., 2013; Wanzek, Swanson, Roberts, Vaughn, & Kent, 2015) to determine if the use of the five components of instruction that focused on improving comprehension through text reading, connecting new text-based learning to prior learning, and applying new knowledge to unique problem-solving activities completed in cooperative groups had an effect on middle and
high school student text comprehension and social studies content learning. The use of cooperative groups provided students with opportunities to engage in text-based discussions and to provide text-based evidence to support ideas. Findings revealed that the treatment students in all three studies outperformed the comparison students on all three outcome measures (content knowledge, content reading comprehension, and standardized reading comprehension). Although cooperative discussions were a part of this study, the discussions were implemented to facilitate reading comprehension, not as a precursor to writing.

Other researchers concentrated on one aspect of reading comprehension. Two studies examined the effects of reading comprehension strategy instruction that focused on vocabulary in content areas (Kaldenberg, Watt, & Terrien, 2015; Snow, Lawrence, & White, 2009). Snow et al. studied a cross-content vocabulary intervention program called Word Generation. The teachers in the intervention classes spent 24 weeks teaching five academic words each week to urban middle school students using prescribed activities related to math, social studies, and science. These activities focused on deep reading, comprehension of current-events topics, productive classroom discussion, developing arguments, and producing persuasive essays in an attempt to teach vocabulary. Results of a curriculum-based assessment showed that the students in schools implementing the program learned more of the targeted words than students in comparison schools. Kaldenberg et al. considered 20 studies that focused on reading instruction in science for secondary students with learning disabilities. The data from the meta-analysis showed that teaching students the meaning of vocabulary words found in science texts had a
greater impact on the comprehension of text for students with learning disabilities than the other non-vocabulary interventions. The explicit vocabulary interventions used in the studies included the use of repetition, practice, and semantic mapping (highlighting the relationship between the words and content).

An examination of the research on incorporating reading instruction in secondary science and social studies classrooms suggests that explicitly teaching students any evidence-based reading strategy will have positive effects on their reading comprehension and content area learning. What is less clear is which reading strategies are most effective, how each strategy should best be integrated into the content instruction, and how often the strategies should be incorporated into the instruction.

The present study was influenced by the literature regarding content area reading strategies. Specific questions were included on the Analysis Tool Organizers as part of the instructional unit. These organizers were designed to facilitate students’ understanding of the texts as the students searched each reading and image for the answers to specific questions and then individually recorded their responses to these questions. This process was designed to help students summarize their learning from the reading (McCulley & Osman, 2015).

**Content Area Writing**

As with reading, the promotion of the use of writing in the social studies classroom is not new; in 1979 an entire issue of the social studies journal, *Social Education*, was devoted to the rationale and practices of using writing to learn in social studies classes. In the introduction of this issue, the guest editors outlined four reasons
that social studies teachers should utilize writing as a learning strategy: (1) meaningful writing occurs in content areas such as social studies; (2) it is impossible to separate writing and content; (3) learning occurs during writing as new insights are gained; and (4) “Writing is thinking. As one writes, he or she must distinguish relevant from irrelevant information, generate and evaluate inferences, make relationships, arrange data and assertions in a pattern, and so on” (Brostoff, 1979, p. 176).

Nevertheless, many social studies teachers have expressed feeling overwhelmed with the thought of adopting the CCSS ELA objectives and fully implementing these literacy skills, including writing, into their social studies courses. Secondary social studies teachers may believe that they do not have sufficient knowledge needed to incorporate effective literacy instruction into their content area instruction (Bintz, 1997; S. Cantrell et al., 2009; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, & Cziko, 2001; Ness, 2009) or that there isn’t enough time to teach both literacy and social studies content (Ness, 2009; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). Moreover, teachers may not understand how literacy instruction can help their students learn subject matter (Knighton et al., 2003), or they may not have the resources and materials needed to teach literacy in discipline-appropriate ways (Lee & Swan, 2013).

Social studies teachers need to understand the research regarding the inclusion of writing strategies in content area classrooms and how integrating specific kinds of writing effects students’ learning. Researchers have studied the use of a number of writing strategies in social studies classrooms including journals, hierarchal summaries, argumentative essays, and writing that follows a series of specific steps. Other
researchers have examined small collaborative group writing activities and the effect this strategy has on student writing. The results of these studies can help teachers recognize the need for the inclusion of writing strategies in their classrooms. In addition, these studies can provide specific examples to teachers so that they can have the knowledge and direction they need to integrate effective writing instruction and writing tasks into their own content area instruction.

An examination of the research that has studied the use of writing in the social studies classroom can assist social studies teachers who need support in understanding the advantages of implementing the writing objectives of the ELA CCSS into social studies coursework. This field of research can also demonstrate how the ELA CCSS writing standards and skills can be effectively incorporated into the social studies curriculum and that these standards are not meant to replace the existing social studies curriculum or standards. Giroux (1979) stated that using writing in the social studies classroom not only “help[s] to teach students some of the fundamental relationships between writing and thinking, but it also helps students learn social studies content by increasing their ability to think interpretively and critically about such content” (p. 193).

One such study (R. Cantrell et al., 2000) compared the effects of two different types of journal writing on the content learning of seventh graders; one type of writing was an adaptation of the K-W-L (what the student knows, what the student wants to know, and what the student learns from reading,) strategy and the other was an adaptation of the SQ3R (survey, question, read, recite, and review) strategy. The SQ3R writing strategy is a reading comprehension method named for its five steps: survey,
question, read, recite, and review. Students are taught to *survey* the text to look for the title, headings, captions, and introductory and concluding paragraphs; then they are taught to turn the title and headings into *questions* while also questioning themselves about what they already know about the subject of the text; third, students begin to *read* the text, looking for answers to the questions they wrote, using any captions or graphic aids to help their comprehension; after every section in the text, they are taught to *recite* by orally asking themselves questions about what they have just read, taking notes in their own words, and then underlining or highlighting important points in the section; finally, students are taught to *review* by using a number of note taking, flashcards, and outlining processes (http://www.studygs.net/texred2.htm). The K-W-L group demonstrated greater content learning on a posttest than did the students who used the SQ3R writing strategy in their journals.

Another study (Taylor & Beach, 1984) utilized writing instruction that focused on having students write a hierarchical summary of social studies text that included an outline of key ideas, main idea statements, and one to two supporting ideas. The hierarchical summary group performed better on a recall measure of previously unfamiliar information then did the conventional reading instruction group or the control group. Additionally, 1 week later on a passage covering information relatively familiar to students, the hierarchical summary group outperformed the other two groups as well.

To date, much of the research on the use of writing instruction in secondary social studies classrooms has focused on teaching students how to develop historical thinking or reasoning through argumentative writing and the use of multiple primary and secondary
sources (De La Paz & Felton, 2010; Gil, Bråten, Vidal-Abarca, Strømsø, 2010; Monte-Sano, 2008; Sielaff & Washburn, 2015; Wissinger, 2012). In all of these studies, the researchers reported that teaching students to write argumentatively had a positive influence on a students’ ability to write more historically accurate and higher quality persuasive essays. This research has relevance for current social studies teachers because the first ELA CCSS writing objective for grades six through eighth (CCSS ELA-LITERACY. WHST. 6-8.1A) requires that students understand the process of writing arguments focused on discipline-specific content. The second writing objective requires that students write informative or explanatory texts, including the narration of historical events (CCSS ELA-LITERACY. WHST. 6-8.2A). Thus, students are also required to write a summary about historical events.

With the adoption of the CCSS by the majority of states, there are a number of recent studies researching the implementation of argumentative and/or summary writing in the secondary social studies classroom. Some of these researchers have compared the use of different writing genres in social studies and how these types of writing influence student mastery of content information. For example, when researchers compared the effects of argument and summary writing in helping students learn content knowledge, they found that argumentative writing was more effective helping students with a strong prior-knowledge base learn how to construct arguments (De La Paz & Wissinger, 2015; Gil et al., 2010) and that argument writing helped students “gain more conceptual and causal understanding of the subject matter” (Wiley & Voss, 1999, p. 301). In contrast, summary writing was also found to help students retain social studies content information
more readily (Wiley & Voss, 1999), to help students comprehend and integrate source
documents in their writing more effectively than with argument writing (Gil et al., 2010),
while still facilitating a student’s ability to think historically (De La Paz & Wissinger,
2015).

Two studies examined the effectiveness of journal writing in conjunction with the
K-W-L comprehension strategy (R. Cantrell et al., 2000; Jennings, 1991) in learning
social studies content. Jennings found that “journal writing was more effective than
summarizing in most measures of comprehension” (p. 75) when both were used with an
interactive and student-centered model of instruction. R. Cantrell et al. found that journal
writing that required both before and after-reading written responses facilitated the
learning of social studies content better than students who only responded in their
journals after reading content material. These results suggest that the efficacy of using
writing strategies in social studies classes depends greatly on the genre of writing that is
introduced as well as the method of instruction used to teach that genre.

Some attention has also focused on the use of specific instructional strategies,
including the Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) framework (De La Paz,
2005; De La Paz & Felton, 2010; Sielaff & Washburn, 2015), the How to Write Your
Essay (H2W) framework (Monte-Sano et al., 2014), the dialectical framework
(Wissinger, 2012), or instruction on text structure (Reynolds & Perin, 2009). The results
in each of the studies confirmed that having students learn a series of steps as part of a
writing strategy helped students produce longer, more persuasive essays with more
complex arguments in a U.S. history class. In addition, teaching students a writing
strategy that incorporated an organized framework helped teachers in their ability to “skillfully adapt the curriculum to better meet students’ needs and push students’ thinking” (Monte-Sano et al., 2014, p. 540).

In the present study, the design of the instructional unit was also influenced by the research on content area writing. The unit included a series of steps that the teacher first modeled and then had students complete (De La Paz, 2005; De La Paz & Felton, 2010; Reynolds & Perin, 2009; Sielaff & Washburn, 2015; Wissinger, 2012). These steps included the use of the Analysis Tool Organizers and the argumentative essay organizer. The students were asked to write an argumentative essay that had a meaningful purpose within the social studies content area. The tasks in the unit were designed to help students distinguish significant and pertinent information from extraneous facts. The instructional unit was designed to direct students through the process of generating and evaluating claims, drawing connections between facts, and arranging the resulting assertions into a cohesive essay (Beyer & Brostoff, 1979).

The researcher designed the unit after taking part in a National Endowment for the Humanities workshop designed around the topic of how collective memory can be interpreted by the writings, memorials, monuments, and images that members of the public choose to display, view, and discuss. The workshop used examples of how the legacy of the Civil War as a “lost cause” that has been passed down through the journal writings, images, and monuments of the south. The researcher used this framework to have students interpret the causes of the failure of the early American colony of Jamestown. Specifically, the events and context of Jamestown’s failure were organized
and presented to students centered around four theories: environmental, geographical, political/social, and economic.

A review of the research on the use of writing instruction in the social studies classroom offers social studies teachers the chance to understand some of the writing methods and strategies that can help students learn and understand content while developing their abilities to interpret and reason about historical events. However, understanding how the grouping of students during writing assignments in a social studies classroom and the influences of these writing contexts on the mastery of social studies content knowledge remains unexamined. Although researchers have studied the major genres of writing students engage in while learning social studies and some of the methods social studies instructors use to integrate writing into their classrooms, little research has been conducted on how teachers group students when learning to write, how students might use speaking and listening as part of working in a group, and how the use of literacy strategies in small groups affects the quality of student writing.

The most common grouping strategies teachers use for writing instruction is either (a) to have students work independently or (b) to have students collaborate together as they write. Collaborative writing in the classroom involves students working together in pairs or small groups. The word \textit{collaborate} comes from the Latin noun \textit{collateral, col} meaning additional, plus \textit{labor} or work, and the suffix –\textit{ate}, which is added to the noun to form a verb or an action. The resulting word means to work with another; to cooperate (dictionary.com).

Several qualitative studies provided in-depth descriptions of the intricate
interactions of small groups or classes of secondary students as they learned to support each other’s writing, whether it be writing about science concepts, fantasy fiction, or a literary arts journal (Broderick, 2014; Rish, 2015; Rish & Caton, 2011). Schultz (1997) also used qualitative techniques such as field notes, interviews, and discussions with students and teachers to paint a picture of an urban elementary classroom where collaborative writing helped students develop their own voices and ways of writing. The journals of and interviews with secondary science preservice teachers (Syh-Jong, 2007) served as data sources in a qualitative study examining college students’ construction of science knowledge through collaborative talk and writing. According to Harris (1992), when truly collaborating, partners or small groups work together from start to finish and produce a joint product. “In cooperative-learning settings students see a variety of other students in various stages of mastery of the cognitive task, and peers provide support and assistance to one another” (Stevens, Slavin & Farnish, 1991, p. 10).

The present study examines a distinct form of collaborative writing wherein students collaborate with peers in learning to write individual essays, or collaboratively learn to write. Harris (1992) differentiated the two terms: “Collaborative writing thus refers to products of multiple authors while collaboratively learning about writing involves interaction between writer and reader to help the writer improve her own abilities and produce her own text - though, of course, her final product is influenced by the collaboration with others” (p. 370). The present study examines the integration of speaking, listening, reading, and small collaborative group writing activities to determine the contribution that all the literacy components have together on students’ ability to
produce their own texts.

In the present study, to maximize the benefits of collaborative learning which incorporate speaking and listening tasks, students first read and discussed the background information regarding Jamestown together in small groups of three students. The students then read and examined four sets of images, documents, monuments, and film clips during subsequent class sessions, also in small groups of three. As part of these collaborative small group interactions, students were given Analysis Tool Organizers (see Appendix B) with questions about the nature of the evidence and how each image, document, monument, or film clip related to the cause of Jamestown’s failure. In each session the students worked in these small groups to review and discuss each piece of evidence and record their answers on the organizer. The study also maximized the benefits of collaborative learning by having students work together in small groups to plan the writing of an argumentative essay. The students shared their thesis statements, their reasons or claims, and their choice of evidence along with the significance of the evidence. By communicating about each aspect of their essay in small groups, students were given the chance to identify what they understood, recognize the gaps in their interpretations of the information, appreciate other points of view, and make decisions about their choices in the writing process (A. Brown & Campione, 1986; Dale, 1994).

**Content Area Speaking and Listening as a Precursor to Writing**

Dialogue between peers during writing corresponds with both Vygotsky’s assertion that learning is a deeply social act and Bruffee’s (1995) advocacy of the
dialogic view of writing. The use of dialogue and discussion in learning to write (as opposed to just commenting on or editing fellow students’ writing) has been examined in the intermediate grades in only a few studies. Freedman (1992) sought to understand the optimal conditions under which “peer response groups” can succeed as students collaborate as they write. She observed 95 group meetings of two ninth-grade classes where the students were assigned to either responding to writing (where students composed something outside class and brought it to the group for feedback) or composing collaboratively. Freedman concluded that peer response groups vary widely in how they are used in a classroom and that the more effective function was that of coauthoring because that was the task where true collaboration takes place.

Dale (1994) studied collaborative writing interactions in a ninth-grade classroom where students were instructed in writing three argumentative essays working in collaborative groups of three students each. Again, the students wrote these essays as coauthors, not as individual writers. The study sought to examine the amount of talk and engagement that occurred as the students “engaged in actively expressing their ideas, elaborating their inner speech, and creating and modifying their own thinking” (Dale, 1994, p. 338). Results suggest that the most successful essays were written by students who were able to use speaking and listening as tools to generate and discuss ideas as well as evaluate their writing choices.

A few researchers have studied the use of dialogue as a tool in teaching individual writing. A. Brown and Campione (1986) found the following:

Understanding is more likely to occur when a student is required to explain, elaborate, or defend his or her position to others; the burden of explanation is
often the push needed to make him or her evaluate, integrate, and elaborate knowledge in new ways. (p. 1066)

In a study specifically designed to examine the effect of training secondary students to critically discuss their writing, Davies and Meissel (2016) examined the group conversations of students in three secondary schools during a film unit and a geography unit. Students were trained to use Quality Talk, a discussion framework designed to help students use questions and elaborated explanations to increase their ability to write with a more critical analytical stance. Students were taught to challenge arguments shared in the small group discussions by asking their fellow students “authentic, uptake, and high-level questions” (p. 343). This questioning technique helped the students evaluate their evidence to support a point and to reflect on their own perspectives. One student noted that he “was able to hear my thoughts out loud and see its strengths and weaknesses” (p. 356). Results suggest that these discussions yielded an improvement in the quality of their post discussion texts because of a greater use of critical analytical thinking following the intervention.

The limited research on the use of dialogue and discussion as a precursor to writing suggests that students who engage in speaking and listening strategies as a part of the prewriting process produce texts that are more thoughtful and more analytic. The present study examines the use of speaking and listening activities as part of the process that students engage in to critically discuss the evidence they use to reflect on their choice of evidence to support a thesis in individually writing an argumentative essay.
Summary

Students need to be proficient in reading, writing, speaking, and listening for them to be college and career ready. The ELA CCSS outline the specific literacy skills that students need to succeed in school and beyond. A review of the research reveals that content area teachers may have some confusion about their role in teaching literacy. Some of this confusion stems from the fact that secondary teachers receive their primary training in a content area, not specifically in teaching literacy skills. Understanding the reasoning behind the adoption of the ELA CCSS and the implications of implementing these standards to their content area instruction can help teachers reassess their role as literacy educators. It is important for teachers to have evidence of the effectiveness of teaching reading and writing and using speaking and listening practices in their classrooms. If teachers have research-based examples of literacy strategies that can be implemented into their content area instruction effectively, they may be more willing to include these practices in their own classrooms. The purpose of the present research study is to provide one such piece of evidence and to provide examples of specific literacy strategies.

Integration of Literacy Components

Research Procedures

The purpose of this section of the literature review is to examine the available research that has examined the integration of reading, writing, speaking and listening skills into content area instruction in secondary classrooms. An initial search on the
Internet using the Google Scholar search engine and using the terms “reading, writing, speaking, and listening” along with the terms “content area instruction”, “secondary education”, and “middle school” yielded 2,780 results. Four hundred fifteen of these studies or books referred to the CCSS (2010). This is to be expected because the CCSS define literacy as being composed of these four skills.

Next, a comprehensive review of the research literature concerning literacy skills and content area instruction included a search of the following databases: Education Source, Education Full Text, Academic Search Premier, Primary Search, Professional Development Collection, Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection, PsycINFO, Teacher Reference Center, and TOPICsearch. The following descriptors were used for these searches: “reading, writing, speaking, and listening” or “speaking or listening or reading or writing”; “content area learning” or “content area instruction” or “disciplinary literacy” or “social studies”; “literacy instruction”; and “middle school” or “secondary education” or “high school”. The initial search yielded 185 articles, 133 of which were published in academic journals.

**Inclusion Criteria**

The studies included in this preliminary review of the literature had to meet the following inclusion criteria.

a. The studies were published in peer-reviewed journals.

b. The participants of the studies were primarily middle or secondary students who were proficient in English.

c. The studies examined either both speaking and listening or both reading and writing in a content area using an experimental or quasi-experimental design.
Because the present study is focused on the integration of literacy components in conjunction with each other, this part of the literature review focuses on those studies that have utilized and sought to study at least two of the literacy components. Three studies met the inclusion criteria and were included in this literature review introduction (see Table 1). Reed, Swanson, Petscher, and Vaughn (2014) conducted the first study examining the effects of teacher read-alouds on student silent reading with a group of bilingual high school seniors and its impact on learning social studies content. The second study was conducted by Larson (2014) who explored the roles of vocabulary and literacy engagement in working with ninth-grade biology students. The third study examined the effects of a literacy-based forensics unit on secondary students’ achievement in science. Guzzetti and Bang (2010) compared the science learning of students whose teachers incorporated reading and writing into their lessons with the learning of students who received traditional whole-class lecture and lab science instruction.

**Overview of the Studies**

The reading process changes as students advance through the grades. However, very little research has been undertaken to study the different reading strategies needed by older students in order to effectively learn information within a particular discipline or content area (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). In addition, the literacy skills being taught and emphasized should include more than only reading strategies as adolescent learners need all literacy skills. The CCSS (2010) delineates literacy standards based upon four areas: reading, writing, speaking and listening. Three published research studies were
Table 1

Studies Examining Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening in Content Area Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/dates</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Literacy components</th>
<th>Research question(s)/hypotheses</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Treatment intervention</th>
<th>Data collection and analysis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guzzetti &amp; Bang, 2010</td>
<td>The Influence of Literacy-Based Science Instruction on Adolescents' Interest, Participation, and Achievement in Science</td>
<td>the reading of a wide range of academic texts and narrative texts into their science lessons and they also incorporated student writing such as science fiction stories and reflective journals</td>
<td>What are the effects of a literacy-based forensics unit on secondary students’ achievement in science? What impact does a literacy-based unit that incorporates both academic and everyday texts have on students’ attitudes toward science?</td>
<td>The participants (N = 287) consisted of an experimental group of 140 students, 79 who were females and 61 who were males. Another 147 students composed the control group.</td>
<td>The forensic unit was literacy based by incorporating a wide range of academic and everyday texts as reading activities and by allowing students to author their own texts</td>
<td>A district-constructed measure, the Chemistry Knowledge and Scientific Inquiry Skills Test (see Appendix) that was formulated to measure students’ achievement of two of the strands of the state standards for eleventh-grade chemistry.</td>
<td>Students in the experimental group who were instructed using the forensic science unit had statistically significant gains from pretest to posttest on the Chemistry Knowledge and Scientific Inquiry Skills Test as compared to the control group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed et al. (2014)</td>
<td>The effects of teacher read-alouds and student silent reading on predominantly bilingual high school seniors’ learning and retention of social studies content</td>
<td>the effects of teacher read-alouds (TRA) compared with the effects of student silent reading (SR) on the mastery of a history text</td>
<td>What effect does teacher read aloud or student silent reading have on grade 12 students’ social studies content learning immediately as well as at 1-week and 1-month delay? What method for reading text do students perceive to be more beneficial?</td>
<td>Students in 6 senior-level English classes taught by two different teachers at an urban high school. The twelfth-graders (N = 123) consisted of 77 males and 46 females, where over 90% of the students qualified for free/reduced-price lunch.</td>
<td>In the TRA treatment group, the instructor directed the students to follow along as she read the text out loud. In the SR condition, the students independently read the passage sections silently for the same amount of time.</td>
<td>The students were given a content/background knowledge assessment consisting of 15 items that was developed by the researcher to assess background knowledge prior to intervention and content knowledge after the 5-day treatment period. The content test was 10 matching items worth one point each and 5 open-set response items worth two points each, allowing for total scores ranging from 0 to 20.</td>
<td>Students learn and retain information and content-based vocabulary equally well when they read informational text silently as when the teacher read the text to them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/ date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Literacy components</th>
<th>Research question(s)/ hypotheses</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Treatment intervention</th>
<th>Data collection and analysis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larson (2014)</td>
<td>Exploring the roles of the generative vocabulary matrix and the academic literacy engagement of ninth grade biology students</td>
<td>What is the impact of the intervention on understanding, learning, and engagement compared to a control group? For students receiving the intervention, what changes in motivation occur across the unit, and what are overall perceptions of the intervention? What is the relationship between students’ use of vocabulary/language in writing and conceptual understanding?</td>
<td>(N = 222) ninth grade biology students who were recruited from nine total classrooms from two suburban high schools. Treatment group - 144 students in the intervention condition and 78 students receiving traditional direct whole class biology instruction.</td>
<td>The EngageALL intervention included the Generative Vocabulary Matrix (GVM). The comparison group received traditionally organized instruction directed toward identical school district curriculum goals using the same biology textbook.</td>
<td>The teacher-administered measures included student written science “article” essays collected at the completion of the unit of study. Other measures included observation field notes, participants’ journal reflections, and student work documents collected throughout the intervention.</td>
<td>Students in the EngageALL intervention classrooms performed at significantly higher levels of Academic Vocabulary/Language Use compared to the control group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
located that experimentally or quasi-experimentally investigated the use of at least two of the four literacy components (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) in classrooms with secondary students in a science or social studies class.

**Literacy components studied.** Reed et al. (2014) studied the effects of teacher read-alouds (TRA) compared with the effects of student silent reading (SR) on the mastery of a history text. All four of the literacy components were utilized in both conditions regardless of the group assignment. Students were randomly assigned to either the TRA or SR conditions where speaking and listening consisted of opportunities to turn and talk to a peer partner, reading (where students either followed along with the teacher reading aloud or read silently), and writing where students took notes after consulting with a peer partner when asked questions to check comprehension.

In the second study, Larson (2014) primarily sought to explore a generative vocabulary matrix and the academic literacy engagement of secondary biology students. Again, all four of the literacy components were utilized in this quasi-experimental, mixed-method study where classes from two high schools were randomly assigned to either treatment or comparison conditions. Students in the treatment condition were given multiple opportunities to read, write, speak, and listen. These included writing activities such as “think-write-pair-share,” where students wrote questions and conclusions in an inquiry notebook, and students wrote an article and defended their claim with scientific evidence; reading activities such as students reading interactively with the class and students annotating text; speaking and listening activities such as students circling words and telling a partner why words were selected, students sharing words with the class, and
students discussing with a partner conclusions about a video from multiple perspectives.

In the third study, Guzzetti and Bang (2010) had the teachers in the experimental classrooms incorporate the reading of a wide range of academic texts and narrative texts into their science lessons and also incorporate student writing such as science fiction stories and reflective journals. In addition, students in the experimental classrooms completed graphic organizers and concept maps for various topics, which introduced vocabulary and relationships with science concepts. Although the emphasis in the experimental classrooms was on incorporating reading and writing activities, the students also participated in small group and whole-class discussions designed to clarify science concepts and address students’ misconceptions. Therefore, all four literacy components were incorporated into the experimental classrooms in this study as well.

**Participants.** Reed et al. (2014) studied students in six senior-level English classes taught by two different teachers at an urban high school. The 12th graders \( N = 123 \) consisted of 77 males and 46 females, where over 90% of the students qualified for free/reduced-price lunch. Eleven of the students were Caucasian and 112 participants were Hispanic. Eighty-eight of the Hispanic students (72%) reported that Spanish was their first language but that they considered themselves to be bilingual. All 123 students were considered proficient in English and were randomly assigned to the TRA or SR conditions. Eleven students (18%) reported being native English speakers in the TRA condition, and 21 (34%) reported being native English speakers in the SR condition.

Larson’s (2014) study \( N = 222 \) consisted of 9th-grade biology students who were recruited from nine total classrooms from two suburban high schools. In contrast to the
participants in the previous study, these students were predominantly middle class with a range of income levels and ethnic backgrounds including 79.2% White students, 11.0% Hispanic students, 5.6% Asian students, 1.4% Black students, and 2.8% Multiracial students. The treatment group included five classrooms from the first school and one classroom from the second school, totaling 144 students in the intervention condition. Two classrooms from the first school and one classroom from the second school comprised the comparison group, totaling 78 students receiving traditional direct whole class biology instruction.

The participants in the Guzzetti and Bang (2010) study \(N = 287\) consisted of an experimental group of 140 students, 79 who were females and 61 who were males. Another 147 students composed the control group. Between the two schools, 22% of the students were classified as Hispanic, 7% were classified as African American, 6% were Asian, and 2% were American Indian. The majority of eleventh graders were classified as white (82% in the experimental school and 72% in the control school).

**Treatment or intervention.** Reed et al. (2014) had two graduate students deliver the U.S. history lessons to both groups. Both conditions utilized the same printed materials, which consisted of a daily packet containing vocabulary previews, passage segments separated by comprehension checks, and a daily test of content knowledge. The vocabulary previews introduced one or two words per day with a picture or graphic to illustrate the word(s) on the same page. The word(s) was printed in large font with the Spanish equivalent in parentheses directly underneath. There were two sentences applying the word in context and two questions for peer partners to discuss. For example,
a picture of Stephen F. Austin appeared with the term *impresario* along with the question: “How did Stephen F. Austin’s ability to speak Spanish help him become a successful impresario?”

The packet also included 400-850 word passages written slightly below students’ current grade-level (10th-12th grade level on Flesch-Kincaid scale). A comprehension check appeared as a stop and think question with 4-6 questions included per day (e.g., How did Santa Ana rise to power?) Students were told to discuss the questions with a peer and make notes about the possible responses to the questions on a separate page, which was provided for them. The instructors in both groups directed the vocabulary preteaching, read the subheadings and first sentences, read the comprehension questions for each section, provided feedback to students during the time allowed for discussion, and monitored the daily quizzes.

The only difference between the TRA treatment group and the SR group was in how the students read the written passages. In the TRA treatment group, the instructor directed the students to follow along as she read the text out loud. Each section was read within a set timeframe that was monitored with a timer. In the SR condition, the students independently read the passage sections silently for the same amount of time that the instructor was given to read aloud in the TRA treatment group.

In contrast to the Reed et al. (2014) study where graduate students delivered the history lessons, Larson (2014) collaborated with all of the teachers of the treatment group to create the lesson plan activities during professional development that took place over four half-day sessions. The teachers of the classes delivered the lesson by utilizing
PowerPoint slides that directed instructional activity and ensured consistency across each intervention classroom. The researcher observed all instructional sessions to ensure adherence to the lesson plan. The researcher monitored the sessions by using an observation protocol listing each instructional component in the teaching sequence. She also recorded observations and insights in a reflective journal.

The EngageALL intervention included the Generative Vocabulary Matrix (GVM), so both this study and the previously described study included a vocabulary component. The intervention sequence for the treatment group in Larson’s study (2014) was aligned with the four phases of interest development. The first step was “Situate the inquiry: Make it real and relevant.” This included an inquiry-provoking activity such as the teacher dressing in a surgical gown to observe germs under a black light. This activity served to provoke meaningful discussion using the Think-Write-Pair-Share technique. Students then identified key words and concepts as they read a text and wrote the words on sticky notes. These notes were used to generate a vocabulary matrix in the class, which served as a tool for scaffolding student discussion and writing. The second step was “Investigate and construct knowledge: Keep it engaging.” This step had students engage in a meaningful group activities designed to build knowledge through peer collaboration while becoming personally involved in a critical inquiry about a real-world problem. An example of this would be for students to simulate a pandemic by placing stickers on the arms of classmates. The third step was “Select and synthesize knowledge: Support autonomy.” In this step, students discussed a question related to the unit in their small groups so that they could start generating a claim. They then worked independently
to select relevant books and articles to help them identify evidence to support the claim. Students were given opportunities to share their individual findings with their peers. The last step was “Generate and demonstrate knowledge: Support critical literacy.” In this step, students were encouraged to defend their position to a classmate with an opposing viewpoint, making sure to refer to the GVM and the evidence they have collected. The students then worked in small groups to create mini-posters for the school hallway that made a case for their position using scientific evidence.

The comparison group received traditionally organized instruction directed toward identical school district curriculum goals using the same biology textbook for the course that was utilized in the treatment group. The purpose of both the treatment and comparison group instruction was to increase students’ conceptual understanding of bacteria and viruses through a Cell Processes unit. The traditional instruction consisted of ACT Science Test readiness practice, teacher lectures with PowerPoint slides, whole-class question/answer periods, students copying PowerPoint content into their notes, independent reading of the textbook, the viewing of a video clip, and student use of graphic organizers.

Guzzetti and Bang (2010) designed their study to include an experimental group, which utilized a literacy-based forensics unit that was designed by a chemistry teacher in the Southwestern United States. The unit consisted of 15 daily lesson plans which included daily objectives, bell work or a question for students to respond to in writing at the beginning of each lesson, the main lesson plan, handouts, homework, and written materials. The lessons incorporated the reading of a wide range of academic texts and
narrative texts and also incorporated student writing such as science fiction stories, reflective journals, and graphic organizers. In addition, students were engaged in a variety of hands-on forensic activities such as the analysis of fingerprints, blood spatter, handwriting, and dental impressions. These analyses required students to engage in inductive and deductive reasoning, and literacy strategies such as discussion of tentative solutions with each another, writing their ideas about what happened, and filling in missing gaps in crime stories related to these analyses.

The control teachers in this study did not incorporate any forensic activities into their lessons but did concentrate on activities which were laboratory based. They taught lessons structured around essential questions that addressed the same state standards as the forensics unit including physical properties of matter and scientific inquiry skills. One of the essential questions was “How does chemistry affect my life?” Each of the control teachers described their instruction as inquiry and modeling based, citing such as activities as having students ask questions about science, develop procedures for testing ideas, gather data, note trends, make extrapolations, and share theories to explain observations. They used a textbook as a reference volume on only two occasions and did not have students read any other trade or informational books as part of their instruction.

**Data collection and analysis.** Reed et al. (2014) had graduate students administer a number of pretest measures to establish the baseline equivalence of the treatment groups. These reading comprehension measures included the Kaufman brief intelligence test-2 (KBIT-2), the Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation listening comprehension (GRADE), the Test of Silent Contextual Reading Fluency (TOSCRF),
and the Woodcock Johnson II spelling. The students were also given a content/background knowledge assessment consisting of 15 items that was developed by the researcher to assess background knowledge prior to intervention and content knowledge after the 5-day treatment period. The content test consisted of 10 matching items worth one point each and 5 open-response items worth two points each, allowing for total scores ranging from 0 to 20.

Larson (2014) compared student demographics of the treatment and comparison classrooms and also compared past achievement in reading using the EXPLORE Reading Test and writing using the ISAT Writing Test before instruction began. Pearson Chi Square Tests revealed no statistically significant distributional differences between the treatment and comparison groups except for gender. Since there were more males in the control group, gender was controlled for during data analysis by obtaining partial correlations.

The teacher-administered measures included student written science “article” essays collected at the completion of the unit of study, and experience sampling form survey data (student self-report questionnaire). The “article” essay assignment had students choosing a position about the efficacy of hand washing and then supporting their claim with relevant scientific evidence. Other measures included observation field notes, participants’ journal reflections, and student work documents collected throughout the intervention.

Guzzetti and Bang (2010) compared pretest and posttest data for the Chemistry Knowledge and Scientific Inquiry Skills Test, a district-constructed measure which was
formulated to measure students’ achievement of two of the strands of the state standards for eleventh-grade chemistry. “These strands included scientific testing or designing and conducting controlled investigations and evaluating appropriate resources; making observations and forming predictions, questions, and hypotheses; understanding physical and chemical properties of matter; analyzing, drawing conclusions, and making refinements; evaluating experimental designs; analyzing data to explain results or propose further investigations; and communicating results of investigations” (Guzzetti & Bang, 2010, p. 49). The researchers reported that they also compared students’ scores on an end-of-unit teacher test. However, a copy of the questions is not included and no results of this measure are reported anywhere in the study. All three studies included a student survey to determine students’ attitudes towards and perceptions of the instruction’s effectiveness.

**Results.** Reed et al. (2014) found that students did learn and retain information and content-based vocabulary equally well when they read informational text silently as when the teacher read the text to them. They concluded that compensating for the decoding by reading aloud may not necessarily improve student comprehension of text. They did, however, point out that both groups were actively engaging with print and implementing practices that included monitoring student reading, monitoring student understanding through questioning, and instructing students to provide text-based evidence for their answers. Even though the authors do not specifically mention the other aspects of literacy instruction in their conclusions, it is important to note that the students in both the TRA and the SR groups also engaged in discussion about the text with peer
partners and so engaged in the speaking and listening components of literacy as well the reading and writing components.

Larson (2014) reported that students in the EngageALL intervention classrooms performed at significantly higher levels of Academic Vocabulary/Language Use compared to the control group. This measure was highly associated with the comprehension of biology concepts. Larson suggested that “receptive and expressive cognitive discourse in the context of motivated learning experiences may account for the significant results in the present study” (p. 317). The researcher also suggested that the use of the GVM was key in building student background knowledge and expanding their schema for biology because it provided students with a scaffold for discussing content knowledge. The students’ conceptual understanding was measured by their science essays using the analytic Persuasive Writing Rubric of the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT; Illinois State Board of Education, 2009). The writing was evaluated on five features: focus, support/elaboration, organization, conventions, and integration, and each feature was scored on a six-point scale except for conventions which was scored on a three-point scale. This writing rubric was not included in the published study.

Guzzetti and Bang (2010) reported that students in the experimental group who were instructed using the forensic science unit had statistically significant gains from pretest to posttest on the Chemistry Knowledge and Scientific Inquiry Skills Test as compared to the control group. The researchers attributed these results to the literacy strategies that were integrated into the science instruction used with the experimental
group as part of the inquiry-based curriculum. They specifically cited the opportunities that students had to work together and collaborate with their peers as they interacted with a variety of texts and the opportunities the students had to journal their reflections about science learning, author their own science fiction, and edit and critique their peers’ writing on a blog.

The results from the three studies suggest that the integration of all four literacy components in content area instruction, whether it be in social studies or science, increases students’ content knowledge acquisition. All of the studies offered opportunities for students to engage in reading informational science or social studies texts. All three studies also incorporated significant opportunities for students to engage in discussions (speaking and listening) with peer partners about the content before writing about what they had learned in notes, journals, narrative stories, posters, or essays. The study that incorporated the Generative Vocabulary Matrix (Larson, 2014) was the only one of the three studies that evaluated a student written essay as part of the results. The forensic unit study (Guzzetti & Bang, 2010) included a variety of writing opportunities including journal reflections, a science fiction story, and a blog while the Reed et al. (2014) only had students write notes after discussing questions related to the reading.

**Conclusions.** Although literacy strategies were a part of the instruction, the emphasis in the Larson (2014) study was on increased student engagement and motivation to learn science. The study did not aim to measure the effect of literacy techniques on student knowledge discrete from the science activities that were part of the EngageALL intervention model also included in the intervention classes. The emphasis in
the Guzzetti and Bang (2010) study was also on measuring students’ engagement and interest in learning science. Although one measure of achievement was reported as part of the data collection, no student writing scores were reported or analyzed as part of the results.

The emphasis in the Reed et al. (2014) study was on comparing teacher read-alouds to student silent reading, not on the integration of all four literacy components. Although speaking and listening tasks were included in the study, the only writing produced by students was notes, and these were not evaluated as results in the study. In addition, the results from the Reed et al. are less generalizable to a broad population of high school students because of the demographically narrow participant population of economically disadvantaged students whose first language was Spanish.

These three studies are far from conclusive when examining the influence of the integration of literacy components in the content area secondary classroom. There is a need for more experimental and quasi-experimental studies to evaluate the efficacy of including reading, writing, speaking, and listening in secondary content area classes and its effect on student content knowledge acquisition and student writing quality.

**Theoretical Framework**

In this section, I review the theoretical framework that was employed for the feasibility study. The emphasis on reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction and its influence on student writing can be better understood using the social constructivist view of learning which is embodied within the social cultural theory.
The idea that learning is situated within a social context is grounded in the work of Vygotsky (1962, 1978), who believed that learning takes place in concert with more knowledgeable others in a community of learning. When that community of learning is within a classroom context, the knowledgeable other is the teacher who directs and guides the students as they seek to acquire and understand new learning. In some cases, the more knowledgeable other might also be peers in the classroom. “As learners participate in a broad range of joint activities and internalize the effects of working together, they acquire new strategies and knowledge of the world and culture” (Palincsar, 1998, p. 351-352). According to Vygotsky (1978), social interaction involving cooperative or collaborative dialogue promotes cognitive development. These social interactions must occur over a sufficient period of time and with adequate support for the learning to indeed become internalized, or in the case of collaborative writing, for students to acquire new content knowledge and writing skills.

Vygotsky emphasized the importance of social interaction occurring within goal-directed activities. Other researchers have elaborated on what this might look like in a classroom. “In order for social interaction to lead to development, it has to be situated within activities that have a clear goal, such as joint problem-solving activities” (Eun, 2008, p. 139). Moreover, “providing opportunities for children to interact with others forces them to think and to communicate about their thinking” (Dixon-Krauss, 1996, p. 79). Including specific reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks as a part of a discipline specific unit gives students opportunities to recognize, articulate, and solidify their understanding of content material in preparation for writing. These reading, writing,
speaking, and listening tasks can be organized into the goal-directed process of peer collaborative writing where peers collaboratively construct meaning within a social context. According to Vygotsky (1978), development or learning occurs when the social interactions become psychological concepts in the individual through the process of mediation. Vygotsky’s theory of collaboration proposes “a strong connection between cognitive development and social and affective development” (Dixon-Krauss, 1996, p. 80).

Bruffee (1995), an advocate of the dialogic view of writing, believes that “social conversation has a pivotal role in the planning, production, and revision of texts” (Amirkhiz, Bakar, Baki, Hajhashemi, & Samad, 2012, p. 198). It is by discussing ideas with others that a learner’s knowledge and beliefs become framed and solidified in his or her mind so that the individual can subsequently express these ideas on paper. In this feasibility study, the social constructivist theory is used as the framework to explore the benefits of integrating the literacy components of reading, writing, speaking, and listening into social studies instruction and its effect on students’ writing.

**Summary**

Although a major goal of teachers in the primary grades is to teach students how to read and write, the emphasis in middle school shifts to teaching students how to use reading and writing as tools for learning content (Shanahan, 2014). Middle school students were specifically selected for this study because of the nature of reading and writing demands that occur in the intermediate grades (Reynolds & Perin, 2009), and the
opportunity middle school teachers have to incorporate literacy strategies into the curriculum as a means of teaching content.

Teachers need to understand the historical and educational context for the addition of literacy skills instruction within the content areas and how the inclusion of these standards will help them teach social studies content. Teachers also need to understand that the CCSS offer them a way to adapt their current pedagogical practices by including literacy strategies, and that these strategies will enhance their content area instruction by providing students with opportunities to develop skills in problem solving and critical thinking. If social studies teachers have a positive attitude towards teaching literacy and learn to effectively utilize evidence-based literacy strategy instruction, they will be able to successfully incorporate the CCSS into their classrooms.

A limited number of studies that have focused on each of the specific literacy components that make up the Common Core literacy standards and their use in discipline specific areas have been completed. Research on incorporating reading instruction into secondary science and social studies classrooms has focused primarily on multi-facetted strategy programs to improve reading comprehension (Park & Osborne, 2007; Swanson et al., 2015; Vaughn et al., 2013; Wanzek et al., 2015) or teach vocabulary (Kaldenberg et al., 2015; Snow et al., 2009). Studies examining the inclusion of writing in secondary social studies classrooms have included research on summary, journal, or argumentative writing (R. Cantrell et al., 2000; De La Paz & Wissinger, 2015; Gil et al., 2010; Jennings, 1991; Taylor & Beach, 1984; Wiley & Voss, 1999) as well as writing frameworks designed to teach students to write by following a series of steps (De La Paz, 2005; De La
Paz & Felton, 2010; Monte-Sano et al., 2014; Reynolds & Perin, 2009; Sielaff & Washburn, 2015; Wissinger, 2012). A few studies have examined the grouping strategies teachers use for writing instruction journal (Broderick, 2014; Rish, 2015; Rish & Caton, 2011; Schultz, 1997), however none of these have examined the grouping of students during writing assignments in a social studies classroom.

The use of discussion to help students generate and improve their writing has been investigated in a few content areas (Dale, 1994; Davies & Meissel, 2016; Freedman, 1992), but not in secondary social studies classrooms. Three published research studies were located that experimentally or quasi-experimentally investigated the use of the four literacy components (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) in classrooms with secondary students in a science or social studies class (Guzzetti & Bang, 2010; Larson, 2014; Reed et al., 2014). However, only one of these studies measured student writing (Larson, 2014), while two of the studies emphasized student engagement and motivation, not the acquisition of content knowledge (Guzzetti & Bang, 2010; Reed et al., 2014).

The emphasis on reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction and its influence on student writing can be better understood using the social constructivist view of learning which is embodied within the social cultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978). Students in the present study collaborated with their peers in learning to write by engaging in reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks designed to help them discover, elaborate, and organize knowledge as they wrote an argumentative essay. This feasibility study provides teachers with examples of reading strategies which can both be implemented into their content area instruction and also give students the literacy
tools they need to learn content. This research also provides insight into the use of small
groups in teaching students to write and the use of speaking and listening as part of
working in small groups. It also examines how the use of literacy strategies in small
groups affects the quality of student writing. Presently, there is a lack of research
studying the integration of speaking, listening, reading, and small collaborative group
writing activities and how the contribution of these literacy components affects students’
ability to produce their own texts. Although some research has been undertaken which
examines the use of speaking and listening activities as part of the process that students
engage in to critically discuss the evidence they will use to write, no studies have had
students reflect on their choice of evidence to support a thesis in individually written
argumentative essays.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Research Design

The purpose of this feasibility study was to provide evidence of how integrating reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills into eighth-grade social studies instruction facilitates student understanding of content material and ability to write about social studies content. Based on limitations and gaps identified in the research literature, and in review, the following research questions were addressed in this study.

1. Does the emphasis on reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction influence students’ learning of content knowledge as indicated by a criterion-referenced social studies assessment?

   Null hypothesis: There is no statistically significant relationship between an emphasis on reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction and students’ performance on a criterion-referenced social studies assessment.

2. In what ways does the emphasis on reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction and explicit instruction on writing an argumentative essay influence the quality of middle school students’ argumentative writing as indicated by individual student essay scores calculated using an Argumentative Essay Rubric based on the six traits of writing and the CCSS writing standards?

   Null hypothesis: There is no statistically significant relationship between an emphasis on both reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction and explicit instruction in writing with the quality of middle school students’ argumentative writing as indicated by individual student essay scores calculated using an Argumentative Essay Rubric based on the six traits of writing and the CCSS writing standards.

This feasibility study utilized a within-subjects paired-samples research design, meaning that the data were collected from the same group of participants, with two
assessments being collected at two points in time. The collection of quantitative data included: (1) a criterion-referenced social studies pre and posttest that was analyzed using a paired-samples $t$ test and linear regression analysis and (2) pre and post instruction writing samples that were analyzed using a writing rubric and compared using a paired-samples $t$ test and Cohen’s $d$, a test of statistical significance. These two assessments were examined to determine whether the integration of literacy skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) into social studies instruction influences the acquisition of student content knowledge and the quality of student argumentative writing.

In this study, a group of middle school students were active participants in the social studies instruction of a designated history unit (the early American colony of Jamestown) and were taught about each stage of the argumentative writing process. Both the history content and writing instructional task are required standards for eighth grade students in Utah, the state where this study is situated. The students completed a criterion-referenced pretest (see Appendix J) and wrote an argumentative essay (see Appendix K) in their social studies classes before the Jamestown unit instruction. Students then completed reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks as part of the unit instruction prior to taking the same criterion-referenced content assessment (see Appendix J) and then writing a second argumentative essay (see Appendix C). The criterion-referenced pre and post tests were compared to determine the effects of the intervention on students’ content learning. The preinstruction essays were compared to post instruction essays written by the same students to determine the differential effects of the intervention on the quality of their argumentative writing as demonstrated by a
students’ ability to pose a defensible thesis and provide evidence to support it. An outline of the collected quantitative data and at what point in the study it was collected is outlined in Table 2.

The researcher envisioned this investigation as a feasibility study rather than as an experimental study for several reasons. The researcher decided it was more equitable to provide every middle school student in the study with an opportunity to engage in the literacy skills rather than have a control group that did not benefit from the application of speaking, listening, reading, and writing strategies to learn social studies content. Aside from this ethical consideration, the researcher also determined that the results would be statistically stronger if the pre and post scores were from the same participants because it eliminated the need to match for factors such as social economic status, reading level, ethnicity, gender, or other possible confounding variable (Crowder, 1990).

### Table 2

**Data Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Pre instruction</th>
<th>Post instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative essay</td>
<td>Writing Quality - Writing Scores from Rubric</td>
<td>September 15, 2017 – essay assigned and students given class time to complete</td>
<td>October 6, 2017 – essay assigned and students given class time to complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>September 18 and 19, 2017 – students given class time to complete</td>
<td>October 10-12, 2017 – students were given part of class each of these days to complete the essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>September 22, 2017 – essay due</td>
<td>October 13, 2017 – essay due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT (Criterion Referenced Test)</td>
<td>Content Knowledge – Multiple Choice Test Scores</td>
<td>September 22, 2017</td>
<td>October 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants

The social studies teachers for this study were both recruited from the same middle school located in a rural community in the Mountain West. One teacher was a veteran teacher of ten years and serving as the social studies department head, while the other teacher was a novice teacher who had only taught for two years. The participants of the study were the students in the teachers’ eighth grade history classes in the fall of the 2017. One teacher taught two sections of eighth grade history while the other teacher taught five sections of eighth grade history. The participants consisted of seven mixed-ability eighth grade social studies classes with between 33 to 37 students each for a total of 239 possible students. Consent forms were sent home with students two weeks before instruction of the Jamestown unit began, and 197 consent forms were returned with guardian signatures granting consent for the students to participate in the study. Thirteen students returned permission forms denying consent, and 29 students did not return the consent forms (N = 197). Participants who failed to complete both the pre and post CRT were excluded in the analysis of the CRT data (N = 178). Participants who failed to complete both the pre and post essay were excluded in the analysis of the essay score data (N = 165).

The middle school students in the study ranged in age from between 13 to 14 years old, except for one student who was 12 years old. Table 3 provides additional demographic information that was gathered for the 197 students who participated in the study after obtaining parental consent.
### Table 3

**Student Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # students with individualized education plans (IEPs)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP - specific learning disability</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP – intellectual disability</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP - high functioning autism</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP - serious health impairment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free or reduced lunch status</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English proficiency</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study Procedures**

The researcher met with the two middle school teachers for a training session in which the teachers were instructed on the scope and sequence and expectations for the instructional unit. The teachers were able to discuss and clarify any questions they had regarding instruction of the unit. Procedures on how to infuse the four literacy tasks (speaking, listening, writing, and reading) into social studies instruction and how to model the argumentative writing essay to support students as they construct argumentative essays of their own were emphasized.
The participants of the study were the students in one teacher’s fourth and fifth period eighth-grade history classes and the other teacher’s five eighth-grade history classes during the fall of the 2017-2018 academic year. Every student in these seven classes received an Informed Consent Letter along with the Letter of Information to have signed by a parent or guardian before students began participating in the study. The students and parents were informed that the unit of study would be taught in all classes to all students regardless of whether consent was given to use the assessment results in the study. If the student was categorized in the school district’s online student grading and record keeping platform, as an English Language Learner, then a Spanish copy of both the Letter of Information and the Informed Consent Letter were sent home with the student as well.

The researcher found primary or secondary documents that supported the four points of view regarding the failure of Jamestown and included them as the evidence in the unit for the students to read, assess, and evaluate. The teachers were given binders with printed class sets of all the source material and student readings for the unit. This included eight copies of each of the documents in three of the four evidence folders and the background information: the background information on Jamestown (see Appendix D), images with explanations (see Appendix E), articles (see Appendix F), and monuments (see Appendix G). The fourth folder, flip clips, was uploaded to the shared google folder so that the two teachers could make the links available to their students when the time came to evaluate the film clip evidence (see Appendix H). The teachers were instructed by the researcher on the use of the film clips and the process that students
would utilize to complete the organizer for that part of the unit.

A schedule was determined based on conversations between the teachers and the researcher. After discussing the individual literacy tasks and the time it would take for the students to accomplish each of the lessons, the researcher and the teachers made modifications to the original schedule (see Table 4). The researcher and teachers also reviewed the role of teachers when working with small cooperative works and how to encourage participation within those groups by reviewing the Teacher Role Card (see Appendix I). The teachers were trained on how to group students to maximize participation in the small groups (Dobao, 2012), classroom management procedures to facilitate on-task behavior by students working in small groups (Langer, 2001), questions that can be used to redirect students to assigned tasks and to facilitate discussion in the small groups, and specific praise to encourage small group discussion (Dale, 1994).

Table 4

Table 4: Instructional Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task in unit instruction</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective Memory discussion and Jamestown Background</td>
<td>Wednesday - September 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories of Why Jamestown Failed</td>
<td>Thursday - September 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Write/Four Corners Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images discussion in small groups</td>
<td>Friday - September 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images discussion continued</td>
<td>Monday – October 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monuments discussion in small groups</td>
<td>Tuesday – October 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents discussion in small groups</td>
<td>Wednesday – October 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Clips discussion in small groups</td>
<td>Thursday – October 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Peer Assessment on groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time given to students to work on essay</td>
<td>Friday – October 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay organization and grading discussed</td>
<td>Monday – October 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay work time for part of class</td>
<td>Tuesday – October 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay work time for part of class</td>
<td>Wednesday – October 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay work time for part of class</td>
<td>Thursday – October 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final class period given students for essay</td>
<td>Friday – October 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher and teachers discussed possible ways to group students. The researcher suggested forming each group of four students based on the ability level of the students with one high achieving student, one struggling student, and two average-performing students. This suggestion was based on the implicit understanding that the teachers know their students’ ability and behavior. The teachers responded positively to the grouping suggestions. The teachers and researcher also discussed the most effective ways to model how students should review the images, journal entries, articles, and film clips and how to help them discuss the explicit questions included with each analyzing organizer. The researcher emphasized the need for each teacher to monitor the discussions of the groups by walking around the classroom, listening to the discussions, and offering prompts when needed.

The ELA CCSS chosen for this eighth-grade social studies unit includes reading informational text (RI), writing (W), and speaking and listening (SL) standards. See Table 5 for the specific literacy standards required for eighth graders and emphasized in this study. These standards are representative of the type of disciplinary literacy tasks emphasized in the ELA - CCSS for history and social studies. The Utah Social Studies Standard targeted in this unit is included in Table 6.

**Intervention Procedures**

The social studies unit consisted of 10 lessons originally designed to be taught over the course of 10 days (one lesson per day) using the lesson plans outlined in Appendix B. However, the researcher underestimated the amount of time the teacher
Table 5

*ELA CCSS for Informational Texts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA CCSS standard number</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RI.8.1</td>
<td>Cite the textual evidence that most strongly supports an analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI.8.6</td>
<td>Determine an author’s point of view or purpose in a text and analyze how the author acknowledges and responds to conflicting evidence or viewpoints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.8.1</td>
<td>Write arguments to support claims with clear reasons and relevant evidence. a.) Introduce claim(s), acknowledge and distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and organize the reasons and evidence logically. b.) Support claim(s) with logical reasoning and relevant evidence, using accurate, credible sources and demonstrating an understanding of the topic or text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL.8.1</td>
<td>Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 8 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly. d) Acknowledge new information expressed by others, and, when warranted, qualify or justify their own views in light of the evidence presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL.8.3</td>
<td>Delineate a speaker’s argument and specific claims, evaluating the soundness of the reasoning and relevance and sufficiency of the evidence and identifying when irrelevant evidence is introduced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

*Utah Social Studies Content Standard*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utah eighth-grade social studies standards</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Number 4</td>
<td>Students will analyze European colonization and settlement of North America.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would need to introduce the literacy tasks and for the students to complete the literacy tasks. The teachers also had additional classroom tasks that had to be completed by the students during the same time as the Jamestown unit of instruction. See Table 6 for the timeline of actual instruction for the unit.

The students received instruction on how to write the argumentative essay and were engaged in reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks centered on the social studies unit topic in preparation for writing the argumentative essay over the course of two and a half weeks before taking the final criterion-referenced content knowledge assessment.

During the first half of the social studies unit, the teachers were directed to provide instruction to the whole class after which the students were to work collaboratively in small groups of four students to perform the reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks each day. This actually took the teachers and students 7 days to complete. During the last half of the unit, the teachers were instructed to model the steps for writing an argumentative essay to the whole class. After the students received instruction, they were to work individually during each of these 5 days/lessons to write their essays. This actually took place over 6 days instead of the five originally envisioned in the unit. Finally, students were divided into their small groups to discuss the list of questions targeting the writing lesson objectives assigned for each day (see Appendix B). The teachers were to encourage the students to analyze and question each other’s writing by taking turns asking each other the questions and answering them. The teacher was to move from group to group, monitoring the quality of the discussions and encouraging
students to offer supportive comments to help students improve their essays. See Appendix I for the directions given to the social studies teachers on providing feedback to students. See Appendix B for a list of discussion questions students asked one another each day.

Each day’s instruction included speaking and listening tasks. On Day 1 the students engaged in the “Talking Box” activity; students talked to the wall as if it was another student to verbally articulate why their preliminary choice of the cause of Jamestown’s failure was the most valid interpretation. On Day 2 the students gathered in small groups of four students to discuss the four images and photographs in Appendix E and what the images showed, how they related to Jamestown’s failure, and to which cause or causes each imaged related. The students recorded their observations on a graphic organizer as a part of their discussion. On subsequent days, the students participated in similar discussions in small groups about the written articles/documents, the monuments, and the film clips.

After the small group discussions and note-taking were completed for each of the four types of evidence, the students engaged in a “Choose a Corner Argument”; the teacher put up signs identifying each corner of the classroom as one of the causes of Jamestown’s failure. Each student standing in the corner of the cause he/she had decided to defend. The speaking portion of the activity involved each student having the opportunity to speak by sharing his/her reasoning for choosing the corner with the class. After each individual student had spoken and the other students in the class had listened to his/her arguments, the students in the class were given the opportunity to change their
corner if they had been persuaded differently.

During the writing instruction section of the unit, students engaged in additional speaking and listening tasks. After using their notes to complete the evidence portion of the writing organizer (Appendix B), the students met in small groups to share their thesis statements briefly with other students. On subsequent days, the students participated in small group discussions where they were able to share the claims and evidence to support their thesis statements.

Data Collection and Analysis

Criterion Referenced Social Studies Test

The researcher collected the data using a pre and posttest design. The students took the CRT (Appendix J) before and after the social studies content unit was taught (Appendix B). The researcher used the CRT instead of a standardized social studies test to ensure that the test measured the content and knowledge that was covered specifically in the Jamestown social studies unit. The researcher designed the CRT questions based on the key ideas and objectives from each day’s instruction. To establish validity, three social studies educators reviewed the measure to determine the face validity of each item. The social studies educators who reviewed the CRT agreed that the questions were well-designed and adequately assessed the content of the social studies unit regarding Jamestown. The researcher of this study designed the Jamestown social studies unit as part of the curriculum to teach Standard 4 of the Utah eighth-grade social studies standards: Students will analyze European colonization and settlement of North America.
The researcher designed the CRT to determine whether or not the emphasis on reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction influenced the students’ learning of content knowledge. The first hypothesis for the study stated that there was a statistically significant relationship between an emphasis on reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction and students’ performance on a criterion-referenced social studies assessment.

The researcher analyzed the scores of the pre and post CRT using a paired-samples $t$ test and linear regression analysis. The researcher used the paired-samples $t$ test to determine whether there is a mean difference between the pre CRT scores the students received before engaging in the literacy strategies and the post CRT scores the students received after engaging in the reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks. The statistical assumptions for using a paired-samples $t$ test are that the dependent variable is continuous (interval/ratio); the observations are independent of one another; the dependent variable should be normally distributed and should not contain any outliers (Rietveld & van Hout, 2017).

The statistical assumptions for using a paired-samples $t$ test are met in this study. In this study the dependent variable is the CRT scores which are numeric and continuous from 0 to 15. The students received the scores independent of one another. When graphed as a histogram, the pre CRT scores are approximately bell-shaped and normally distributed. When graphed as a boxplot, the pre CRT scores do not reveal any outliers. The alpha level used to determine statistical significance of the paired-samples $t$ test was $p = 0.001$. 
The researcher used linear regression to determine the relationship between the CRT scores (dependent variable) and time (whether the scores were received before or after the unit instruction (independent variable). The statistical assumptions for using linear regression are that the relationship between the dependent and independent variable is a linear function and that the error terms in the model are normally distributed, mutually independent, and have uniform variance (Nimon, 2012; Wells, 1998).

The statistical assumptions for using linear regression are met in this study. The resulting linear pattern shows that the linear assumption is met. When the standardized residuals are plotted against the standardized predicted values, the residual plot indicates that there is a random distribution of values across the scatterplot. This is another way to demonstrate that the function is linear and also to demonstrate that the residuals are not correlated and normally distributed (Wells, 1998). The students received the scores independent of one another. The alpha level used to determine statistical significance for the linear regression statistical test was $p = 0.001$.

**Argumentative Essay**

The summative assessment for the unit was an individual argumentative essay written by each student addressing the question that corresponded to the Jamestown unit of instruction covered by the teacher: The failure of Jamestown can best be understood by viewing it through a(n) _____________ perspective (see Appendix C for the various perspectives). Each student’s teacher and the researcher scored the essays in six categories using a 30-point rubric (Appendix A) after which the researcher averaged the two scores. The researcher compared the average score of this essay to the average score
of an essay each student wrote prior to the start of the intervention instruction. For the pre-instruction essay topic, each student was asked to write an argumentative essay addressing the reasons why the penny should or should not to be produced (see Appendix K).

The researcher of the present study chose to compare the average overall scores, the average organization scores, and the average development scores after reviewing the results of several writing studies. In a study investigating the effectiveness of collaborative writing in second language classrooms, Shehadeh (2011) determined the quality of the writing by using a holistic rating procedure that included content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. After analyzing the results, Shehadeh determined that collaborative writing had an overall significant effect on students’ writing but that the effect varied from one writing skill area to another. Specifically, the effect was significant for content, organization, and vocabulary, but not for grammar or mechanics. In a study examining students’ persuasive writing, Stapleton and Wu (2015) determined that the quality of arguments in the essays written by high school students were best evaluated using a rubric containing only those elements having to do with claims and data (or evidence) for those claims. These elements correspond with the categories of organization and development in the present study. Based on the similarity of the research parameters of these studies and the present study, the researcher of the present study determined that the most relevant aspects of the argumentative writing essay and the features most directly targeted by the intervention in this study were organization and development.
The researcher compared the average scores of the pre and post intervention essays using the rubric to determine if there were any differences in writing quality. The form of the essay and the instructional scaffolds used in the writing lessons align with the ELA- CCSS Writing Standard 8.1: Write arguments to support claims with clear reasons and relevant evidence. An argumentative essay question is an ideal prompt for students to use to critically assess an historical event(s) from a number of perspectives because multiple primary sources can be used by the students to provide evidence to support their claims.

The researcher evaluated the writing quality of these essays using a thirty-point rubric that includes organization, development of ideas, sentence fluency, style/voice, word choice, and conventions (see Appendix A). The writing rubric that was used to examine the argumentative essays is correlated with the CCSS ELA.LITERACY. WHST.8 and the Six Traits Writing Rubric (Education Northwest, 2017). The Six Traits Writing Rubric includes the same categories used to assess the argumentative essays of all students in the school where this study is situated. The writing of the eighth-grade students engaged in this study had been evaluated using these categories for the past two years in this middle school, so the students were familiar with the writing format and expectations associated with writing an argumentative essay. Each categorical level contains a detailed definition of criteria for that level of performance. According to Doğan and Uluman (2017) “rubrics have the advantage of giving feedback for students while enhancing objectivity in scoring for teachers. This ultimately contributes to a more standardized and objective determination, not varying from rater to rater” (p. 633).
The researcher chose the argumentative essay summative assessment to determine the effects that emphasizing reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction and explicit instruction has on the quality of middle school students’ writing as indicated by individual student essay scores calculated using the Argumentative Essay Rubric. The second hypothesis for the study stated that there was a statistically significant relationship between an emphasis on both reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction and explicit instruction in writing with the quality of middle school students’ argumentative writing.

Two reviewers, the teacher of the class and the researcher, analyzed the pre and post instruction student writing using a writing rubric. The researcher then averaged the two scores. The researcher then compared these pre and post writing scores using a paired-samples $t$ test and Cohen’s $d$. The researcher used the paired-samples $t$ test to determine whether there is a mean difference between the pre essay scores the students received before engaging in the literacy strategies and the post essay scores the students received after engaging in the reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks. The statistical assumptions for using a paired-samples $t$ test are that the dependent variable is continuous (interval/ratio); the observations are independent of one another; the dependent variable should be normally distributed and should not contain any outliers (Rietveld & van Hout, 2017). Cohen’s $d$ is a statistical test of effect size to indicate the difference between two means. The statistical assumption for using Cohen’s $d$ is that the sample be normally distributed.

The statistical assumptions for using a paired-samples $t$ test and Cohen’s $d$ are
met in this study. In this study the dependent variable is the essay scores which are numeric and continuous from 1 to 30. The students received the scores independent of one another. When graphed as a histogram, the pre essay scores are approximately bell-shaped and normally distributed. When graphed as a boxplot, the pre essay scores do not reveal any outliers. The alpha level used to determine statistical significance of the paired-samples $t$ test was $p = 0.001$. 
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Criterion Referenced Social Studies Test

Nineteen students did not take both the pre and post CRT test because of absences or failure to turn in the pre or post assignment \((N = 178)\). The pre and post CRT scores were compared using a paired-samples \(t\) test to determine the mean difference between the scores. The mean of the post CRT scores for the 178 students who completed both tests \((M = 13.7, SD = 1.9)\) was higher than the mean of the pre-essay scores \((M = 6.4, SD = 2.1)\). The average gain in test scores after students participated in the social studies unit instruction was 7.3 points \((M = 7.3, SD = 2.5)\). According to the results, participants improved their score on the CRT after participating in the reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks embedded in the unit, \(t\) \((177) = -38.5, p = 0.000\) (Table 7).

Table 7

\textit{t-Test Results of Criterion Referenced Test}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Average CRT score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest mean score ((M))</td>
<td>6.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest mean standard deviation ((SD))</td>
<td>2.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest mean score ((M))</td>
<td>13.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest mean standard deviation ((SD))</td>
<td>1.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean difference</td>
<td>7.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean difference standard deviation ((SD))</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(t) test ((t))</td>
<td>38.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of significance ((p))</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher also analyzed the data from the 178 students who completed both the pre and post CRT test using linear regression to determine the relationship between the CRT scores (dependent variable) and time (whether the scores occurred before or after the unit instruction [independent variable]). The researcher converted the data into long form with pre and post test scores coded as a predictor. The researcher regressed the score on the variable of time. The researcher calculated a simple linear regression to predict the post CRT score based on time (scores before or after the unit of instruction). The researcher found a significant regression equation, $F(1, 354) = 1192.5, p < 0.000$. Students’ predicted post CRT score is equal to $-0.871 + 7.3$ (pre CRT score) points. Students’ post CRT scores increased 7.3 points for each pre CRT point. The simple correlation, $R = 0.878$, indicates a high degree of correlation. The total variation in the CRT scores that can be explained by time (or the unit of instruction that occurred during that time) is very large: $R^2 = 0.77$. In other words, results suggest that the unit of instruction that occurred during the time between the pre CRT test and the post CRT test accounts for 77% of the total variation in the CRT scores. The researcher disaggregated the students’ scores by teacher and the researcher compared the effects using linear regression. The results suggest that no statistically significant differences exist between the scores of the two teachers’ students.

The $p$ value for the repeated measures linear regression was 0.000, and since $p < 0.001$ (significance level), the null hypothesis is rejected; a relation does exist between the time the CRT was given and the results. The data suggest that there was a statistically significant increase in the students’ performance on the CRT after the students engaged
in literacy tasks emphasizing reading, writing, speaking, and listening during the social studies instruction. In other words, chance alone is unlikely to explain the difference in the scores.

**Argumentative Essay**

Thirty-two students did not complete both a pre and post essay because of absences or failure to turn in the pre or post assignment \(N = 165\). The researcher evaluated the raw scores of each rubric category which were calculated using the six-point writing rubric (see Appendix A). The researcher gave each category from 1 to 5 points for a total possible essay score of 30 points. The six categories included organization, development of ideas, sentence fluency, word choice, conventions, and style/voice. The researcher purposely chose to examine essay organization and development scores because of the nature of the writing and the specific categories included in the six-trait rubric which was correlated with the ELA CCSS. The teacher of each class and the researcher scored the essays independently after which the researcher averaged the two scores.

The intraclass correlation (ICC) is an estimate of interrater reliability and was calculated for both the pre and post scores to determine how closely the raters, the teacher of the class and the researcher, scored the essays. ICC estimates and their 95% confident intervals were calculated using IBM SPSS statistical package version 25 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL) based on a mean-rating \(k = 2\), absolute-agreement, 2-way mixed model. A moderate degree of reliability was found between the teachers’ and the researcher’s total
The average measure ICC was 0.717 with a 95% confidence interval from 0.103 to .877, $F(165)= 5.865, p < .000$. A moderate degree of reliability was also found between the teachers’ and the researcher’s total post essay scores. The average measure ICC was 0.766 with a 95% confidence interval from 0.477 to .875, $F(165)= 5.690, p < .000$.

In an overview of guidelines to improve the consistency of reporting the results of interrater reliability, Shweta, Bajpai, and Chaturvedi (2015) stated that an ICC score of 0.70 is sufficient for a measure of inter-rater reliability used for research purposes.

One student wrote a pre essay that scored low in both organization and development. An excerpt of the essay is included here.

Pennies are an essential piece in life without them we would go into complete chaos. Pennies have sever [sic] hundred uses to them and i’m [sic] only going to scratch the surface for some of them in this article but I hope it gives you a wider idea about pennies and their uses.

Benjamin Franklin once said that a “penny saves is a penny earned.” But what if there is no pennies to save and to earn. The penny has been around for as long as we had truancy [sic] in the states but what would happen if we take it away? There would be no more basic money counting assignments and fewer penny jars. What would we call the penny bank? A nickel bank? It would be a completely different Country without that little Abraham lincoln [sic] head on a Copper and Zinc coin. Now the penny may not be worth a lot but it can be used for a lot of different purposes. For example, if you want to get a cheap souvenir somewhere and there is a penny press, BOOM! Awesome souvenir for one cent. What if you are one of those little rides that take a penny or several and only take a penny. Would you take the time to change out the rides so they take dimes or nickels?

If we were to get rid of pennies it wouldn’t be the end of the world but it would be a disaster for most people because pennies are needed for everyday things from pocket change to your pay day in the big apple.

In this example the student used some of the evidence he was given, but he fails to organize the facts and develop the evidence into a cohesive argument for keeping or
eliminating the penny. This same student wrote the post essay and scored a five in organization and a four in development based on his ability to present a clearly stated claim and supporting evidence with analysis. An excerpt of his final essay is included here.

There are similarity [sic] between “Star Wars rogue one” and the Jamestown colony. The similarity is that they all DIED! Thats [sic] right they all died. They came to the new world and instantly started to die. There are many theories to why this happened but we don’t quite know which one is true. This essay will put those theories to the test and truly see what happened to the Jamestown colony.

Interesting there are 4 different theories on jamestown [sic] that are very well proven by facts and history; economics, political/social, geographical, and environmental. This handful of theories are the most likely theories on what happened at Jamestown. I will go over these to get a very deep sense on what went on in Jamestown. The failure of Jamestown can best be understood by viewing it through the political/social perspective. Altho [sic] the political/social theory sounds great, the geographical theory has evidence too.

The political/social theory is the theory that there were problems between borders. The natives living around the Jamestown colony were not happy with the new arrivals. They wanted them gone if not dead. The colonists on the other hand were expecting the natives to welcome them with open arms and to feed them, shelter them and supply them with materials needed to survive. The colonists were prepared for only a few things. To fight the spanish [sic], and to get rich by finding gold.

The british [sic] were expecting to fight the spanish [sic]. They had the weapons and resources at hand just to fight the spanish [sic]. But they instead ended up fighting the natives. The british and the spanish were not the best of friends at the time they fought over everything, gold, land, religion. The British brought their muskets and their metal plate armour [sic] with them to Jamestown. They came prepared to fight the spanish with equal power. But instead they had to fight the natives for land and for the sake of survival. The natives had their own arsenal of weapons, they used bows and arrows and they were way faster than the english [sic] colonists. In fact in the time it took one colonist to reload t heir weapon after a shot a native could unleash ten arrows with deadly accuracy.

The British came to find gold not to survive. They expected that when they got there the natives would feed them and supply them....

The natives by Jamestown were not pleased that the new people came to their
land and started making houses and forts. It was an invasion of some sorts to the natives. The natives needed to protect their land so they started killing the colonists off hoping the would leave and never return....

This student improved in his ability to present a claim and provide evidence as he developed the argument for the claim. Another student wrote a pre essay that scored a three in both development and organization. Her post essay scored a five in organization and a five in development based on her ability to present a clearly stated claim and supporting evidence with analysis. An excerpt of her final essay is included here:

Back when American was just getting started, Jamestown was formed. This colony had many struggles which eventually lead to its demise. Except, no one really knows what happened to Jamestown, but there are a few theories. One is the environmental theory. Jamestown was formed in 1607. Their main objectives were to find gold and silver, find the lost colony of Roanoke, passage to the Orient, and establish a settlement. This was not what they got when they arrived. The environmental theory is that the environment around Jamestown was really bad, so that’s why Jamestown didn’t succeed.

The theory that fits best to the colonist’s untimely demise is most likely the environmental theory. During the time the colonists were there, there was a horrible drought which would have lead to many other issues. The drought was the worst one in 8—years. This is apparent through image #1 where it presents tree rings which show that there was a drought. This would have cause [sic] a lot of problems like shortage of food, water, and diseases would have spread much easier because of lack of good hygiene.... Since there was a drought, the colonists had to go to the James rive to drink which only made it worse because it was extra salty from the drought too....

Each student’s teacher and the researcher scored both the pre essays and the post essays for the six traits in the rubric. The researcher averaged the two scores, and then compared the pre and post essay scores using a paired-samples $t$ test to determine the mean difference between the scores. The mean of the post essay scores for the 165 students who completed both essays ($M = 19.4$, $SD = 5.3$) was higher than the mean of the pre-essay scores ($M = 14.5$, $SD = 5.5$). The standard deviation of the means also
decreased from the pre to post essay. In other words, the students’ scores were more alike after the intervention than at the start and closer to the group mean after the intervention occurred. This could be interpreted to mean that the intervention was effective in meeting the needs of each individual in the mixed-ability classroom so that the students’ ability to write both improved as a group and was more clustered together (George, 2005).

The average gain in essay scores after students participated in the social studies unit instruction and engaging in the reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks embedded in the unit was 5.0 points (\(M = 5.0, SD = 4.4\); Table 8). The \(t\) test was significant, \(t(164) = -14.6, p < 0.000\). The results suggest that statistically significant differences exist \((p < 0.001)\) between the students pre and post essay scores and so the null hypothesis is rejected; a relation does exist between the time during which the instructional unit was taught and the increase in essay scores. The data suggest that there was a statistically significant increase in the students’ performance on the essay after the students engaged in literacy tasks emphasizing reading, writing, speaking, and listening during the social studies instruction. The Cohen’s effect size for this analysis \((d = 0.907)\) was found to exceed Cohen’s (1988) convention for a large effect \((d = 0.80)\). The students’ scores were disaggregated by teacher and the effects were compared using a paired-samples \(t\) test. The results suggest that no statistically significant differences exist between the scores of the two teachers’ students. There were also no differences in scores disaggregated by differences in economic status or ethnicity.

The researcher also compared the pre and post organization category scores of the essay using a paired-samples \(t\) test to determine the mean difference between the scores.
Table 8
*t Test and Cohen’s d Results of Essay Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total average essay score</th>
<th>Organization score</th>
<th>Development Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre essay mean score (M)</td>
<td>14.500</td>
<td>2.300</td>
<td>2.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre essay standard deviation (SD)</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post essay mean score (M)</td>
<td>19.400</td>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>3.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post essay standard deviation (SD)</td>
<td>5.300</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean difference</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean difference standard deviation (SD)</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t test (t)</td>
<td>-14.600</td>
<td>-15.500</td>
<td>-12.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of significance (p)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect size (Cohen’s d)</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean organization score for the post essays ($M = 3.3, SD = 0.82$) was higher than the mean of the pre-essay organization scores ($M = 2.3, SD = 0.9$). The average gain in the organization category of the essay scores after students participated in the social studies unit instruction and engaging in the reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks embedded in the unit was 0.94 points ($M = 0.94, SD = 0.78$). Results suggest that participants significantly improved the organization of their writing after participating in the reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks embedded in the unit, $t(164) = -15.5, p = 0.000$ (Table 8). The researcher found that the Cohen’s effect size for this analysis ($d = 1.162$) exceeded Cohen’s (1988) convention for a large effect ($d = 0.80$).

The researcher also compared the pre and post development category scores of the essay using a paired-samples $t$ test to determine the mean difference between the scores. The mean development of ideas/focus score scores for the post essays ($M = 3.1, SD =$
0.9) was higher than the mean of the pre-essay development of ideas/focus scores \( (M = 2.3, SD = 0.95) \). The average gain in the development category of the essay scores after students participated in the social studies unit instruction and engaging in the reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks embedded in the unit was 0.78 points \((M = 0.78, SD = 0.8)\). Results suggest that participants significantly improved the development of their writing after participating in the reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks and the explicit writing instruction embedded in the unit, \( t(164) = -12.7, p = 0.000 \) (Table 8). The researcher found that the Cohen’s effect size for this analysis \( (d = 0.865) \) exceeded Cohen’s (1988) convention for a large effect \( (d = 0.80) \).

These results suggest a statistically significant change in the essay scores across time (pre and post instruction). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected; there is a relationship between an emphasis on both engaging students in reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks during social studies instruction and explicitly instructing students in writing, with the quality of middle school students’ argumentative writing as indicated by individual student essay scores calculated using an Argumentative Essay Rubric based on the six traits of writing and the CCSS writing standards.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The findings from the two research questions in this study showed that integrating literacy tasks into an eighth-grade social studies unit can be undertaken in such a way that student content knowledge acquisition and argumentative writing quality are increased. In this discussion, I first review the significant literature regarding the needs of social studies teachers as they implement the ELA CCSS and the purpose of this study. I then consider the two research questions and the significance of the findings associated with each question. Next, I discuss how the findings of this study contribute to the existing research examining the integration of the four components of literacy into content area instruction with a particular emphasis on the sometimes-neglected areas of speaking and listening. I then consider the role of speaking and listening as students engage in literacy tasks that are designed to help them collaboratively learn to write. Next, I review and discuss how the major findings from this study fit into the social constructivist theory and the implications of this research on educational practices. Finally, I discuss some limitations of this study and recommendations for further research on the integration of literacy into content area instruction.

Teaching Social Studies Content and Literacy Skills

The ELA CCSS require that social studies teachers implement literacy standards and objectives within their social studies content area instruction. In effect, this means that social studies teachers must teach literacy skills. To accomplish this, social studies
teachers need five things.

1. A new perspective regarding the role they play in implementing the ELA CCSS (Topping et al., 2007) and why literacy instruction is important in all content areas (Beyer, 1982);

2. Knowledge and direction on how to integrate literacy instruction into their content area instruction (R. Cantrell et al., 2009; Gilles et al., 2013);

3. The belief that integrating literacy skills into content area instruction will affect content area instruction in positive ways;

4. Examples of instructional methods that are effective, efficient, and timely (Giroux, 1979); and

5. Content area literacy training addressing specific literacy strategies and instructional methods in social studies.

Educating social studies teachers about literacy strategies begins with helping them understand that literacy is not solely comprised of reading and writing, but also involves speaking and listening. Anchor Standard 1 of the ELA CCSS states that students should “prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively” (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010a, p. 22).

Purpose of this Study

This study was undertaken to give practitioners, including teachers and curriculum developers, more information about how to best implement the integration of literacy strategies and skills in content area instruction. It is also meant to give educational practitioners specific ideas about effective and efficient methods that can be implemented in the classroom to increase student content learning and to improve their
literacy skills. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to provide evidence of how integrating reading, writing, speaking and listening skills into eighth-grade social studies instruction facilitates student understanding of content material and students’ ability to write about social studies content. The researcher utilized a within-subjects paired-samples research design, meaning that the data was collected from the same group of participants, with two assessments being collected at two points in time. This helped control for many variables associated with comparing one student’s work to another student’s work. The collection of quantitative data included: (1) a criterion referenced social studies pre and posttest that was analyzed using a paired-samples $t$ test and linear regression analysis and (2) pre and post instruction writing samples that were analyzed using a writing rubric and compared using a paired-samples $t$ test. The study included 197 eighth-grade students in seven U.S. history classes taught by two teachers in a rural middle school located in northeastern Utah.

**Research Questions and Findings**

The first hypothesis for the study proposed that there would be a statistically significant relationship between an emphasis on reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction and students’ performance on a criterion-referenced social studies assessment. The statistical analysis of the quantitative data from the present study revealed that there were statistically significant differences in both student CRT scores and student essay scores from before and after the unit of instruction in the eighth-grade social studies classroom. A paired-samples $t$ test was used to determine that there
were statistically significant differences in the CRT scores of students after they engaged in reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks as part of a social studies unit about the failure of the Jamestown Colony compared with their scores on the CRT before the unit of instruction. A linear regression analysis showed that there was a high degree of correlation between the increase in CRT scores and engagement in the unit of instruction. Results suggest that having students engage in reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks and engaging in explicit writing instruction and production during a social studies unit facilitates their content knowledge acquisition.

The second hypothesis for the study proposed that there would be a statistically significant relationship between an emphasis on both reading, writing, speaking, and listening during social studies instruction along with explicit instruction in writing with the quality of middle school students’ argumentative writing. Quantitative results suggest that participants significantly improved their writing scores after participating in the reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks embedded in the social studies content unit. A paired-samples \( t \) test was used to determine that there were statistically significant differences in the average essay scores of students after they engaged in literacy tasks as part of a social studies unit compared with their scores on their essay scores before the unit of instruction. Specifically, students’ essay organization and essay development showed statistically significant increases after the students engaged in the unit of instruction.

A measure of the significance, Cohen’s \( d \), was used to determine that there was a significant interaction between the unit instruction and average essay scores as well as
significant interactions between the unit of instruction and increases in essay organization and development. This unit instruction included both literacy tasks centered around social studies content and explicit writing instruction. This evidence supports the hypothesis that engaging students in speaking, listening, reading, and explicit writing tasks as part of a social studies unit really does influence the overall quality of students’ argumentative writing, and more specifically, on their organization and development of that writing.

**Integration of Literacy Components**

The quantitative data discussed in the current study showed that there were statistically significant differences on scores for the students’ pre and post assessments. Three studies included in the previous literature review showed similar results to the current study. These three published research studies investigated the use of the four literacy components (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) in classrooms with secondary students in a science or social studies class (Guzzetti & Bang, 2010; Larson, 2014; Reed et al., 2014), although none of the three studies assessed the quality of students writing before and after interventions.

The inclusion of speaking and listening tasks is of special interest because little research has been undertaken to determine how all four literacy strategies have been used in a unified effort to increase student learning in a content area classroom. Researchers have studied how speaking and listening to peers has helped English language learners increase their language skills as they learn content knowledge (Dobao, 2012; Fernández
Researchers have also studied how collaborative discussions have influenced English language learners’ language development and content of their writing (Dobao, 2012; Shehadeh, 2011; Storch, 2005; Wissinger, 2012). But none of these studies took place in middle school classrooms where the students’ first language was English.

In the Larson (2014) study, one step of the intervention had students discuss a question related to the unit of study in their small groups to help them generate a claim. They then worked independently to evaluate written materials and identify evidence to support this claim. Afterwards, the students were encouraged to defend their position to a classmate with an opposing viewpoint. In this study, the researchers made some attempt to have students collaboratively discuss information with other students to generate ideas and solidify understanding before writing individual science essays. The Larson study provided two opportunities for speaking and listening literacy tasks as part of the intervention.

In the present study, students worked with in small groups to read, critically discuss, and evaluate four different types of evidence, and then critically discuss and answer questions on an organizer regarding that evidence. They also worked in small groups to share their argumentative essay thesis statements/claims and reflect on their choice of supporting evidence. The present study was designed to provide multiple opportunities for students to engage in dialogue and discussion with their peers as a precursor to writing their individual argumentative essays. These speaking and listening tasks were part of a unified attempt to integrate the four literacy components (reading,
writing, speaking, and listening) in a systematic way as a means for students to learn content and enhance their writing.

The Larson (2014) study was the only one of the three published studies which included the four literacy components in which the researcher evaluated a writing sample. Each student in the biology study was prompted to write a persuasive article about handwashing using scientific evidence. The students’ conceptual understanding was measured by their science essays using the analytic Persuasive Writing Rubric of the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT; Illinois State Board of Education, 2009). The writing was evaluated on five features: focus, support/elaboration, organization, conventions, and integration, and each feature was scored on a 6-point scale except for conventions which was scored on a 3-point scale. In effect, the only measure of content knowledge or ‘conceptual understanding’ included in the study was the science essay. Students in the treatment classrooms performed at significantly higher levels of conceptual understanding of biology content than did students in the comparison classrooms.

Authors of the other two published studies also assessed some aspect of content knowledge, although this was not the emphasis of their studies. Guzzetti and Bang (2010) reported that students in the experimental group who were instructed using the forensic science unit had statistically significant gains from pretest to posttest on the Chemistry Knowledge and Scientific Inquiry Skills Test as compared to the control group. The researchers attributed these results to the literacy strategies that were integrated into the science instruction used with the experimental group as part of the inquiry-based
curriculum. They specifically cited the opportunities that students had to work together and collaborate with their peers as they interacted with a variety of texts and the opportunities the students had to journal their reflections about science learning, author their own science fiction, and edit and critique their peers’ writing on a blog. Although these opportunities for speaking and listening were not formally structured, the researchers encouraged students to interact with one another by discussing science content and then commenting on their writing.

In the third study, Reed et al. (2014) found that students learned and retained information and content-based vocabulary equally well when they read informational text silently as when the teacher read the text to them. The students had to answer questions after reading the text or having the text read to them as they followed along, depending on the condition they were assigned. Students were told to discuss the questions with a peer and make notes about the possible responses to the questions. As in the other two published studies, researchers recognized the importance of including speaking and listening as part of the literacy process.

In the present study, students’ background knowledge of the content was compared with their content knowledge after participating in the literacy tasks embedded in the social studies unit. The results showed that the students performed at statistically significantly higher levels on the CRT after engaging in the reading, writing, speaking, and listening strategies in the unit. The results of the present study confirm the findings of the three published studies that suggest that engaging in literacy tasks (include speaking and listening tasks) helps students learn content.
Collaboratively Learning to Write

In addition, the present study examines the integration of speaking, listening, reading, and small collaborative group writing activities to determine the contribution that all the literacy components have together on students’ ability to produce their own texts. Students in the present study collaborated with their peers in learning to write by engaging in reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks designed to help them discover, elaborate, and organize knowledge as they wrote an argumentative essay.

Results of previously published studies of American history classes (De La Paz, 2005; De La Paz & Felton, 2010; Reynolds & Perin, 2009; Sielaff & Washburn, 2015; Wissinger, 2012) suggest that teaching students to use a series of steps as part of a writing strategy helped students compose longer, more persuasive essays with more complex arguments.

In this study, the teachers modeled the writing process step by step and had the students share each component of their essays with other students in small groups. This included the modeling, writing, and sharing of their thesis statements, claims, evidence, and concluding paragraphs (Appendix B). Most of this information was taken from the evidence charts the students completed as they read, reviewed, and took notes together in small groups (Appendices E-I). The results from the present study confirm the findings of the previously published studies regarding the use of strategies prescribing an explicit series of steps to help students write in social studies classrooms. Specifically, students improved their overall essay scores as well as their scores in essay organization and development. The researcher chose to purposely examine essay organization and development because of the nature of the writing and the specific categories included in
the six-trait rubric which was correlated with the ELA CCSS.

The students in the middle school who participated in this study were eighth graders who had been trained in the writing process using the same level of prescribed steps during their previous two years at the school. CBEAR is the writing structure implemented by the teachers across content areas: Claim, Background, Evidence, Analysis, and Review. This writing structure was used in this study as well, so there was no reason to expect that students would improve the organization or development of their essays to a significant extent because they used the same template to organize and develop their writing in the study that they had always used in the middle school. The only difference was having the students engage in the literacy tasks associated with the unit including the opportunities given to them by the teacher to collaborate in small groups by reviewing and evaluating evidence, and discussing thesis statements, claims, evidence, and concluding paragraphs.

This research study provides insight into the use of collaborative small groups in teaching students to write and the use of speaking and listening as part of working in small groups. It also provides evidence on how the use of all four literacy strategies in small groups affects the quality of student writing. Results suggest that the students’ essay organization and development scores increased because students were given opportunities to reflect on their choice of claims and evidence to support a thesis in individually written argumentative essays. In addition, the unit implemented in this study provides teachers with examples of literacy strategies which can be implemented into their content area instruction to both facilitate student learning of content knowledge and
student argumentative writing.

**Theoretical Framework**

Vygotsky (1978) believed that purposeful social interaction involving cooperative or collaborative dialogue promotes cognitive development. This study used the social constructivist theory as the framework to design the lessons used to explore the benefits of integrating the literacy components of reading, writing, speaking, and listening into social studies instruction and its effect on students’ writing. The researcher integrated systematically embedded speaking and listening tasks as well as reading and writing tasks within the social studies unit to encourage students to discuss and reflect on the information they were learning. Students were encouraged to use these opportunities for discussion as a way of planning, evaluating, and revising their argumentative essays. The results of this study suggest that this not only benefited their writing but also helped them by solidifying their understanding of the content of the unit. “Providing opportunities for children to interact with others forces them to think and to communicate about their thinking” (Dixon-Krauss, 1996, p.79).

**Implications**

The results of this study offer several implications for educational practice. One implication is that the integration of literacy strategies detailed in the framework of the Common Core State Standards is theoretically sound and results in practical, effective pedagogical practices. In this era of accountability, educational theories, programs, and
curricula are sometimes adopted and discarded very quickly because educators are looking for a “quick fix” and immediate results. The present study offers evidence that curriculum based on the Common Core State Standards can help students learn and use literacy strategies to help them understand content and that these standards can be used across content areas. Educators do not need to look for trendy, ready-made programs to find effective curriculum and instead they can adapt their already existing lessons and units to include the literacy strategies outlined in the CCSS.

Another implication is that including speaking and listening tasks as a part of literacy is effective in helping students solidify their learning and voice their thinking. The students in the middle school classes involved in this study were already familiar with using reading and writing tasks as a part of social studies learning. The real difference in the strategies implemented in this study were that speaking and listening skills were integrated alongside the reading and writing strategies utilized in the social studies unit of instruction. It was the integration of all four literacy strategies in tandem that helped students learn the content and improve their writing.

The results of this study offer implications to teachers of other disciplines. Other content area teachers can use the framework of the social studies unit used in this study to design a similar unit for use in their classrooms. Speaking, listening, reading, and writing tasks can be assigned to students who could discuss, read, and write about the reasoning behind science, engineering, or math concepts. The students could research, discover, and persuade others about the content they learn in these classes as they read essays and articles, watch and listen to film clips and podcasts, journal or write essays, explore
critical questions, and use collaborative dialogue to learn with their peers.

The results of this study also offer implications for writing lessons and teaching curriculum across grade levels. Teachers in high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools can integrate the literacy skills delineated in the CCSS to help them teach content in thought-provoking, meaningful ways. They can adapt any unit of instruction to include these skills. Students will come to understand that using speaking, listening, reading, and writing strategies is effective for exploring ideas and concepts across many disciplines and problems.

The results also offer implications for professional development aimed at helping teachers implement the CCSS literacy standards and for new teacher education programs. The two teachers involved in this study had differing levels of experience; one was a relatively new educator while the other had over ten years of experience. Yet the results of the students’ content knowledge acquisition and writing improvement did not differ across the two teachers’ classrooms. This suggests that providing any teacher sufficient training and support in integrating literacy skills across the curriculum can result in measureable effects.

**Limitations**

There were some possible limitations associated with this study. This study utilized a within-subjects paired-samples research design, meaning that the data were collected from the same group of participants on two separate occasions. This helped control for many variables associated with comparing one student’s work to another
student’s work. However, the students were exposed to the questions in the CRT to assess their background knowledge before the intervention began, so they knew the content of the questions as they engaged in learning the material in the social studies unit. This may have affected their post CRT scores.

Another limitation was that there was no researcher observation of the two teachers who implemented the unit. The teachers’ opinions of some of the literacy strategies might have affected the time and effort spent on those particular strategies. The teachers reported to the researcher as they progressed through the unit however it is not known how faithfully they followed each specific protocol in the unit.

Another limitation was the attrition of the writing sample; 32 of the 197 participants failed to complete either a pre or post essay resulting in a 16% attrition rate for the writing assessment. This can be attributed to absenteeism to some extent because the writing assignment took multiple days to complete. This level of absenteeism for the school is typical for this district which ranges from 7% to 9%. The failure of 32 students to complete both parts of the assignment is a concern.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

One focus of this study that could be adapted for further research is the participants. This study was conducted with eighth-grade middle school students. Further research could be conducted to determine the effects of integrating literacy into content area instruction with a high school population. The participants of this study were already familiar with the writing organizer and writing rubric used in this study. Further research
could be conducted to assess the effects of integrating literacy tasks with students in schools where writing is not already emphasized to determine the effect of the intervention on content area learning of students with limited writing experience.

Another aspect of the study that could be adapted is in the kind of writing that was targeted in the social studies unit. Instead of having students write an argumentative essay, researchers could have them write either narrative and expository texts. Researchers could also compare the pre and post essays of classes who wrote differing kinds of texts to determine how different genres of writing are affected by specific literacy tasks embedded in content area instruction.

The data collection and analysis are other features of the research that could be adapted. Future research could include state writing assessment results as a measure of writing quality to compare the long-term effects of explicit writing instruction in conjunction with other literacy tasks to determine if an improvement in writing ability is maintained in those students who have participated in the intervention. Percentile ranks from the students’ previous state writing assessments could serve as the baseline data. Further research could also be conducted utilizing a qualitative measure such as interviews and surveys of the teachers and students involved in the integration of literacy skills in content area classrooms to determine their perceptions of and engagement in the process. The results could be included along with the quantitative measures used in this study.

It is recommended that further research be conducted to determine the best way to group students for collaboration when incorporating reading, writing, speaking, and
listening tasks within content area instruction. A study could be carried out comparing the interaction and collaboration of a variety of small group configurations of students who are instructed to engage in literacy tasks. This could be done to help teachers understand the most effective way of grouping and encouraging students to engage in literacy tasks as part of content area instruction.

**Conclusions**

The findings in this study support previous research regarding the efficacy of teaching students to write argumentatively. Previous studies show that modeling and teaching a series of writing steps had a positive influence on a students’ ability to write more historically accurate and higher quality persuasive essays. The findings of this study suggest that incorporating reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks within a unit that includes as its main goal the writing of an argumentative essay increases the overall quality of the student writing including essay organization and development.

The findings of this study also support previous research regarding the efficacy of having English language learners participate in speaking and listening tasks as means of improving their language skills while learning content knowledge. The findings of the present study suggest that emphasizing speaking and listening tasks, in addition to reading and writing tasks, in content instruction enhances student mastery of social studies content and contributes to improved student writing. The findings of this study that are new to this research is that the systematic integration of all four literacy components, speaking, listening, reading, and writing, in content area instruction
improves both content knowledge acquisition and writing organization and development.

For social studies teachers this means that existing units of content instruction can be modified and enhanced by integrating reading, writing, speaking, and listening tasks into the unit. It also means that socials studies teachers can be confident that the initial effort and time it requires to modify the social studies units is worth it. The teachers have an example of such a unit included in this study to help them conceptualize the kind of instruction that can take place when literacy strategies are integrated into content area curriculum. They can be confident that the integration of literacy will not detract from the objectives they are required to teach as part of their content, but that including literacy tasks can augment and enrich that content. The implementation of literacy skills instruction into the middle school social studies classroom can serve as a support and reinforcement for social studies teachers as they facilitate the learning of content and writing skills by their students.
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Appendix A

Scoring Rubric
Scoring Rubric for 6 Trait Writing Correlated with Common Core Standards
Used in Current Study

Sources: CCSS ELA.LITERACY.WHST.8 (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010a), Utah Compose Writing Rubrics (Measurement Incorporated, 2017), and Six Trait Writing Rubric (Education Northwest, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Common Core WHST 1a</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>The thesis statement is clearly stated. The counterclaim is acknowledged. The response moves smoothly from purposeful introduction to effective conclusion. Effective transitions contribute to unity. There is a strong progression of ideas from beginning to end.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of Ideas/Focus and Conclusion Common Core WHST 1b WHST 1e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The thesis statement/claim includes an argument, but the counterclaim may be vague. The writer uses some transitions to show the relationships among ideas. The response moves somewhat smoothly from beginning to conclusion. The paper seems complete. There is a progression of ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The thesis statement/claim takes a position on the question but does not include the counterclaim. The response moves from introduction to conclusion, but it may have some interruptions. Some transitions are present, but they may be artificial and interfere somewhat with the flow of ideas. There is an attempt at progression of ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The thesis statement/claim includes an argument, but it is vague or inadequate. No counterclaim is included. The response may have insufficient writing to organize. Transitions may be confusing. The progression of ideas is disrupted by repetition, gaps, or random ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>There is no thesis statement/claim, or it is not clear. There is little organization to the paper. The response may have insufficient writing to organize. Transitions may be confusing. The progression of ideas is seriously disrupted by repetition, gaps, or random ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Supporting evidence is presented, but not fully developed. The writing is generally focused on the topic and purpose. Analysis is logical and relevant but may not be fully explored. The conclusion states the interpretation in a clear manner. The argument (thesis statement) is presented. | Supporting evidence is presented, but not fully developed. The writing is generally focused on the topic and purpose. Analysis is logical and relevant but may not be fully explored. The conclusion states the interpretation in a clear manner. The argument (thesis statement) is presented. | Supporting evidence is accurate and clear but is copied directly from the text or may not be convincing. The writing is somewhat focused on the topic and purpose. Analysis is logical and relevant but stated awkwardly. The conclusion states the interpretation of the argument (thesis statement) but does not otherwise support the argument presented. | Some evidence supports the reasons, but it may not be stated clearly, or some evidence is inaccurate. The writing is related to the topic but does not have a clear focus. Analysis is present, but logical, irrelevant, or unclear. There is a conclusion, but it does not or address the argument (thesis statement) presented. | Evidence is not accurate or does not support the stated reasons. The writing is not focused on the topic and purpose. There is no analysis of the evidence. There is no conclusion. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence/Fluency Common Core WHIST 1c</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The writer uses words, phrases, and clauses to create cohesion and clarify the relationships among the argument, reasons, and evidence.</td>
<td>The writer uses words and phrases, which help to promote cohesion and to signal the relationships among the argument, reasons, and evidence, but there may be no transitions and few if any, clauses.</td>
<td>The language used in the essay only minimally creates cohesion and only somewhat establishes the relationship among the argument, reasons, and evidence. There are errors in sentence construction which create confusion and make it difficult to understand.</td>
<td>The language used in the essay does not create cohesion and confuses the relationship among the argument, reasons, and evidence.</td>
<td>The language used in the essay does not create cohesion and confuses the relationship among the argument, reasons, and evidence.</td>
<td>The language used in the essay does not create cohesion and confuses the relationship among the argument, reasons, and evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Choice Common Core WHIST 1c</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The writer uses precise words and phrases that strongly enhance the specificity of support and elaboration. The writing is interesting to read.</td>
<td>The words are well chosen and enhance specificity of support and elaboration. The writer uses some interesting words and phrases.</td>
<td>Word selection is a mix of general and specific and may not enhance support and elaboration.</td>
<td>The writer does not use words or phrases that make the writing clear to the reader.</td>
<td>The writer uses word choices that are confusing, unclear, or inappropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventions Common Core WHIST 1c and 1d</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are few or no errors in punctuation, capitalization, grammar, and spelling.</td>
<td>There are a few errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.</td>
<td>Errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling are more frequent.</td>
<td>There are many errors in grammar, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation.</td>
<td>The errors in grammar, capitalization, spelling, and punctuation interfere with the reader’s understanding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style/Voice Common Core WHIST 1d</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The writer’s viewpoint is evident. Writes with a clear sense of audience. The essay establishes and maintains a formal style.</td>
<td>The writer’s viewpoint is somewhat clear. The writing is individual and expressive. Most of the essay uses a formal style.</td>
<td>The writer’s viewpoint is apparent intermittently. The essay is written in a combination of formal and informal styles.</td>
<td>The writer’s viewpoint is unclear. Intended audience is unclear. The majority of the essay is written in an informal style.</td>
<td>The writer seems uninterested in what he or she is writing about. Writer does not clearly present thoughts or ideas about topic. Essay is written in an informal style.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Lesson Plan
Lesson Plan

Collective Memory: Interpretations of the Causes of Failure of Jamestown

Utah Social Studies – U.S. History I

Utah Core 8th Grade Social Studies Standard 4:
Students will analyze European colonization and settlement of North America.

8th Grade Common Core Reading Informational Text Standards
8.1  Cite the textual evidence that most strongly supports an analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.
8.6  Determine an author’s point of view or purpose in a text and analyze how the author acknowledges and responds to conflicting evidence or viewpoints.

8th Grade Common Core Writing Standards
8.1  Write arguments to support claims with clear reasons and relevant evidence.
   a) Introduce claim(s), acknowledge and distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and organize the reasons and evidence logically.
   b) Support claim(s) with logical reasoning and relevant evidence, using accurate, credible sources and demonstrating an understanding of the topic or text.

8th Grade Common Core Speaking and Listening Standards
8.1  Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 8 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly.
   d) Acknowledge new information expressed by others, and, when warranted, qualify or justify their own views in light of the evidence presented.
8.3  Delineate a speaker’s argument and specific claims, evaluating the soundness of the reasoning and relevance and sufficiency of the evidence and identifying when irrelevant evidence is introduced.

Goal:
This unit is designed to be taught as a part of the study of the colonization of North America. Students will gain an understanding of the four major interpretations of why the colony of Jamestown, the first permanent, stable English settlement in North America, failed and write an argumentative essay aimed at justifying one of these interpretations.
using evidence from primary and secondary documents.

**Objectives:**

To understand that the failure of Jamestown can be viewed from a number of perspectives as evidenced by collective memory. Collective memory can be interpreted by the writings, memorials, monuments, and images that members of the public choose to display, view, and discuss.

**Materials:**

One printed set of images (4 sheets) for every 12 students; one printed set of journal entries (4 sheets) for every 12 students; one printed set of monument pictures (4 sheets) for every 12 students

**Anticipatory Set/Hook:**

- Collective memory – the ways in which a people who share a common event represent it. This is passed down through art, history, films, monuments, the celebration of national holidays, etc.

- Using the example of Thanksgiving or another national holiday, discuss the difference between what we do remember and what we should remember. How might Native Americans and Euro Americans remember the holiday differently?


**Procedures:**

**Day 1:**

Activity 1: (25 minutes)

- The teacher has the students read the background information on Jamestown (Appendix D) in small groups of 3. The teacher then introduces the four major theories of why Jamestown failed to the whole class:

  **Environmental:** Jamestown failed because of the environmental challenges associated with limited resources brought on by a severe drought which led to starvation and disease.

  **Geographical:** Jamestown failed because of the geographical location of the colony near the James River estuary which resulted in contaminated water and disease.

  **Political/Social:** Jamestown failed because of the political and social
relationship with the Powhatan Indians who first supplied the colonists with food, but periodically attacked and withheld resources from them. The lack of leadership among the colonists also contributed to the downfall of Jamestown.

Economic: Jamestown failed because of the economic nature of the colony’s charter from the Virginia Company and the failure of the colonists to sustain themselves.

Activity 2: (25 minutes)

- The teacher introduces the argumentative writing prompt, “The failure of Jamestown can best be understood by viewing it through an ____________ perspective.”

- The teacher reviews the argumentative essay writing format (see Appendix C).

- Students are then asked to choose the cause they believe makes the most sense to them and brainstorm why they chose it. Students are given 5 minutes to jot down ideas.

- Students are then asked to choose a place in the classroom in front of a wall. They find a point on that wall to use as their “Talking Box”. They then have to talk to the wall and convince the wall that their cause is the most valid interpretation of why Jamestown failed.

Day 2:

Activity 1: (25 minutes)

- **Gathering Evidence.** The teacher shows the four different sets of images and instructs students in groups of three to discuss which set of images correlates with each of the four causes. (Appendix E)

- One of each of the four sets of images is rotated throughout the groups every 5 minutes until each group has discussed each of the four pages.

- Hand out the Analysis Tool for Images and Photographs to each student to make notes as they discuss the following questions. (Appendix E)

- **Small group discussion questions:**
  - What and who do each of the images show?
  - How does the image relate to Jamestown’s failure?
  - Which cause or causes does the image relate to?
  - Why do you say this?
Activity 2: (25 minutes)

- **Gathering Evidence.** The teacher shows four different documents and instructs students in groups of three to read and discuss which document correlates with each of the four causes. (Appendix F)

- One of each of the documents is rotated throughout the groups every 6 minutes until each group has discussed each of the four pages.

- Hand out the Analysis Tool for Documents to each student to make notes as they discuss the following questions. (Appendix F)

- Small group discussion questions:
  - Who wrote this document? What was his/her role at Jamestown?
  - What aspects of the Jamestown settlement does each document discuss?
  - Which cause or causes does this document relate to?
  - Why do you say this?

**Day 3:**

Activity 1: (25 minutes) **Gathering Evidence.** The teacher shows the four different pictures of monuments, read about them, and instructs students in groups of three to discuss which monument correlates with each of the four causes. (Appendix G)

- One of each of the monument pictures is rotated throughout the groups every 5 minutes until each group has discussed each of the four pages.

- Hand out the Analysis Tool for Monuments to each student to make notes as they discuss the following questions. (Appendix G)

- Small group discussion questions:
  - What and/or who do each of the pictures show?
  - How does the monument relate to Jamestown?
  - Which cause or causes does the monument relate to?
  - Why do you say this?

Activity 2: (25 minutes)

- **Gathering Evidence.** The teacher shows the four different sets of film clips and instructs students in groups of three to discuss which film clip correlates with each of the four causes. This is done after each set of film clips. (Appendix H)
• Hand out the Analysis Tool for Film Clips to each student to make notes as they discuss the following questions. (Appendix H)

• Small group discussion questions:
  o What and/or who do each of the film clips show?
  o How does the film clip relate to the failure of Jamestown?
  o Which cause or causes does the film clip relate to?
  o Why do you say this?

Day 4:

Activity 1: (50 minutes)

• **Choose A Corner Argument.** The teacher puts up signs identifying each corner of the classroom as one of the causes discussed during the previous classes. Each student is asked to stand in the corner of the cause he/she has initially chosen to defend.

• Each student is given the opportunity to share his/her reasoning for choosing the corner. After each student has spoken, students are given the opportunity to change their corner if they have been persuaded differently.

Day 5:

Activity 1: (35 minutes)

• The teacher hands out the argumentative writing essay organizer (Appendix C) to each student. The students must decide which cause to include in the writing prompt on line 1.

• The students then read the notes on their organizers from the past week to fill in the evidence they will be using to provide evidence for their claim.

Activity 2: (15 minutes)

• Using their organizers, students will meet in groups of 3 to share their claims and briefly share the evidence they will use to support this claim.

Days 6-10: 50 minutes each day

Students will write their argumentative essays. These will serve as the summative assessment for the unit.
**Day 6: Defining Essay Terms and Modeling Essay**

**Activity 1: 25 minutes**

- The teacher will introduce the essay prompt and the essay terms (e.g. thesis statement, reason or claims, evidence, analysis and relevance, and concluding sentence).
- The teacher will model how to write the thesis statement (Appendix C).
- Students will write their thesis statements.

**Activity 2: 25 minutes**

- Students will share their thesis statements with their small groups, and the group members will then ask and answer the following questions:
  - Does your thesis statement answer the investigation question and clearly state your argument?
  - Is your thesis statement the main idea and argument of your whole essay?
  - Will you be able to support your thesis statement with reasons and evidence?

**Day 7: Identifying Evidence and Categorizing it into Reasons – modeling**

**Activity 1: 25 minutes**

- The teacher will introduce the rules of evidence (Appendix C).
- The teacher will model how to use a T-chart for organizing evidence and then summarizing reasons for why Jamestown failed from a political/social perspective; the teacher will repeat this process for the opposing viewpoint.
- Students will make their own T-charts and begin organizing the evidence and summarizing the reasons for their interpretation of the essay prompt (thesis statement).

**Activity 2: 25 minutes**

- Students will share one reason or claim that they plan to use in their paper in their small groups and then share one example of evidence that proves their claim. Group members will ask the following questions:
  - Does the reason or claim support your thesis statement?
Does your evidence support your reason or claim?

**Day 8: Identifying and Organizing Evidence and Categorizing it into Reasons**

**Activity 1: 25 minutes**

- The teacher will review the previous day’s lesson and then encourage students to complete their T-charts containing their reasons and evidence. The teacher will then have students select the three strongest reasons in their chart.

- The teacher will model for the students how to organize their reasons and evidence using the Essay Organizer (Appendix C).

- The students will begin their Evidence Gathering Charts.

**Activity 2: 25 minutes**

- Students will share a second reason or claim that they plan to use in their paper in their small groups and then share one example of evidence that proves their claim. Group members will ask the following questions:
  - Explain in your own words what this evidence means.
  - How does your evidence support your reason?

**Day 9: Organizing Reasons and Evidence**

**Activity 1: 30 minutes**

- The teacher will have students complete and review their Evidence Gathering Charts from the previous day.

- The teacher will have the students review the Essay Organizer (Appendix C) and model how to complete the Frame using the information in their Evidence Gathering Charts.

- The teacher will review the elements of the essay referring to the rubric (Appendix A) as a guide.

- Students will complete the Essay Organizer (Appendix C) by transferring their reasons and evidence from the analysis organizers.

**Activity 2: 20 minutes**

- Students will share a third reason or claim that they plan to use in their paper in their small groups and then share one example of evidence that proves their claim. Group members will ask the following questions:
o Explain in your own words what this evidence means.

o Why do you think this evidence is significant or important enough to include in your essay?

**Day 10: Using Graphic Organizer to Write Essay**

Activity 1: 35 minutes

- The teacher will model how to use the completed Jamestown Failure Organizer (Appendix C) to write their essays.

- Students will write their essays using the Argumentative Essay Rubric (Appendix A as a guide).

Activity 2: 15 minutes

- Students will share their concluding paragraphs with the group, and the group members will ask the following questions:

  o Does your concluding paragraph restate the thesis statement of your essay?

  o Does the concluding paragraph restate your three reasons or claims in different words?

  o Does the concluding paragraph summarize your argument persuasively?
Appendix C

Essay Organizer
We have been studying the Jamestown Colony and the four major theories of why Jamestown failed. These include environmental, geographical, political/social, and economic reasons. As a student, you will use the documents, images, monuments, and film clips you have been studying to explain one interpretation of Jamestown’s failure. Argue for the theory that best supports why Jamestown failed. Make sure to include a counterclaim.

The four major theories of why Jamestown failed:

**Environmental:** Jamestown failed because of the environmental challenges associated with limited resources brought on by a severe drought which led to starvation and disease.

**Geographical:** Jamestown failed because of the geographical location of the colony near the James River estuary which resulted in contaminated water and disease.

**Political/Social:** Jamestown failed because of the political and social relationship with the Powhatan Indians who first supplied the colonists with food, but periodically attacked and withheld resources from them. The lack of leadership among the colonists also contributed to the downfall of Jamestown.

**Economic:** Jamestown failed because of the economic nature of the colony’s charter from the Virginia Company and the failure of the colonists to sustain themselves.
Introduction Paragraph

Hook

Interesting Facts

Thesis/Claim (what are you trying to prove)

The failure of Jamestown can best be understood by viewing it through a/an _____ perspective.

Counterclaim (acknowledge the other side)

Transition to body paragraph

Claim: (similar to your thesis)

Background: (what should we know about Jamestown)

Supporting evidence:  
Supporting evidence:  
Supporting evidence:  

Analysis:  
Analysis:  
Analysis:  

Response to claim:
Counterclaim Paragraph

Counterclaim: (the other side of the argument)

Rebuttal: (refer back to your original claim)

Concluding Paragraph

Response to the original thesis/claim in a statement

Counterclaim reviewed

Finally, the conclusion the reader should have reached (mic drop)
Appendix D

Jamestown Background
Jamestown Background

The text used can be found at: http://www.pbs.org/wnet/secrets/death-jamestown-background/1428/
Appendix E

Images
“This map shows a rough approximation of Powhatan’s [political/social] span of control in Tsenacommacah when the English arrived in 1607. Powhatan lacked the technology to block access to lands in the middle of his territory (Tsenacommacah), once the Susan Constant, Godspeed, and Discovery arrived. To the Algonquians, the English were “tassantassas” or trespassers in Tsenacommacah - but the Europeans were able to use their advanced technology (sailing ships) to go up Powhatan’s Flu (James River) and settle right in the center of Powhatan’s turf.

From the English perspective, Tsenacommacah was completely within the area claimed by the London Company through the First Charter issued in 1606. By right of discovery of lands unoccupied by Christians (and soon by right of conquest), the English could assert their ownership of Virginia. There was no need, from the English perspective, to buy a deed to the land from Powhatan.
In response to the English trespass, Powhatan practiced both crafty diplomacy and limited war. He carefully orchestrated his meetings with the English to establish his authority and to gain tactical advantages during negotiations. He did not mass his warriors and try to expel the English as soon as they arrived. He sought to take advantage of the new arrivals, and make the foreigners subordinate to his control.

One reason Powhatan did not try to destroy the Jamestown colony immediately: he saw value in having access to the European technology. He thought he could moderate the dangers of having an independent power within his area of control, while gaining prestige and power within the Native American communities through acquisition of English weapons and trade goods.”

http://www.virginiaplaces.org/nativeamerican/anglopowhatan.html

Image of a poster issued by the Virginia Company that advertised for volunteers to settle the New World can be found at:
http://www.smplanet.com/teaching/colonialamerica/colonies/jamestown

“From the beginning when the Virginia Company of London was formed, the overseas venture was an economic one. The Virginia Company advertised for volunteers to settle the New World with posters such as the one above. The colonists were told that if they did not generate any wealth, financial support for their efforts would end. Many of the men spent their days vainly searching for gold. Captain Newport led the efforts of the settlers to discover gold ore even when their efforts might have been better used toward acquiring food. They were not quick to learn how to grow food in their new environment and increasingly had to rely upon the Indians for corn and other crops. In addition, the colonists did not have the tools they needed since they were limited in what they could bring from England. Lumber was a resource that was plentiful in Virginia, and the location of Jamestown along the water where ships could dock should have been ideal for this industry. Yet, lumber turned out to be a very expensive commodity to ship. Wood extractives such as pitch and tar, soapash and potash were more practical but needed processing before shipping. Silk production, glassmaking and wine production were all industries which were attempted with varying degrees of success, yet none to the extent needed to make a profit for the Virginia Company. Within a few years, most of these early attempts, except for lumber products, were abandoned. Settlers continued to barter with the Indians, as they had from the beginning, to meet their daily needs.”

http://www.historyisfun.org/pdf/Life-at-Jamestown-Lesson-Plans/LifeatJamestown.pdf
**Primary Source Analysis Tool: Images and Photographs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBTAIN – Questions 1 and 2</th>
<th>REFLECT – Questions 3 and 4</th>
<th>DEFEND – Question 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What does each image show?
2. Who is in each picture?
3. How does the image relate to the failure of Jamestown?
4. Which perspective or perspectives (environmental, geographical, political/social, economic) does this image relate to?
5. Why do you say this?
Appendix F

Documents
Unearthed Trash at Jamestown Reveals Tough Times for Settlers
An Article from Science News, a magazine

Text found at: https://www.wired.com/2010/06/jamestown-trash/

Did Jamestown’s Settlers Drink Themselves to Death?
(from an article at the History Channel website)


**Political/Social**

Reprinted from *Travels and Works of Captain John Smith*, President of Virginia, and Admiral of New England, 1610. (Primary Source)

**[Original version]** What by their crueltie, our Governours indiscretion, and the losse of our ships, of five hundred within six moneths after Captain Smiths departure (October 1609-March 1610), there remained not past sixtie, men, women and children.

This was the time, which still to this day (1624) we call this the starving time; if it were too vile to say, and scarce to be believed, what we endured; but the occasion our owne, for want of providence industrie and government, and not the barrennesse and defect of the Countrie, as is generously supposed;”

**[Modern Version]** Six months after Captain Smith left, the cruelty of the [Powhatans], the stupidity of our leaders, and the loss of our ships [when they sailed away] caused 440 of the 500 people in Jamestown to die ...

We still call this time the “Starving Time.” What we suffered was too terrible to talk about and too hard to believe. But the fault was our own. We starved because we did not plan well, work hard, or have good government. Our problems were not because the land was bad, as most people believe.


**Text about the starving time was also used from:**


The Virginia Company

Text used from: http://historicjamestowne.org/history/virginia-company/
Primary Source Analysis Tool: Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVE – Questions 1 and 2</th>
<th>REFLECT – Questions 3 and 4</th>
<th>DEFEND – Question 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Who wrote this journal entry, letter, or document? What was his/her role in Jamestown?
2. What aspects of the failure of Jamestown does each document discuss?
3. What phrases or words do you think are important in this document?
4. Which cause or causes does this document relate to?
5. Why do you say this?
Appendix G

Monuments
Image of the wooden cross at Jamestown used from: https://reninassancemusings.wordpress.com/2014/02/28/jamestown-virginia-part-i-a-flashback-and-introduction/

Text with a description of the wooden cross obtained from: http://www.historyisfun.org/pdf/Life-at-Jamestown-Lesson-Plans/LifeAtJamestown.pdf

A description and image of the fort can be obtained from: http://www.smplanet.com/teaching/colonialamerica/colonies/jamestown

A geographical description of the fort can be obtained from: http://www.historywiz.com/exhibits/jamesfort.htm

Image of the fort can be obtained from: http://historicjamestowne.org/visit/plan-your-visit/fort-site/

A photograph and description of the Pocahontas statue/monument is available from: http://historicjamestowne.org/visit/plan-your-visit/monuments/

Political/social: “The Powhatan people were tribes or nations of Eastern Woodland Indians who occupied the Coastal Plain or Tidewater region of Virginia, which includes the area east of the fall line and the area we know today as the Eastern Shore. They were sometimes referred to as Algonquians because of the Algonquian language they spoke and because of their common culture. At the time the English arrived in 1607, ancestors of the Powhatan people had been living in eastern Virginia for as long as 16,000 years. The paramount chief of the Powhatan Indians was Wahunsonacock, who ruled over a loose chiefdom of approximately 32 tribes. The English called him “Powhatan.” The local chiefs paid tribute to Powhatan, and they received Powhatan’s protection in return. The Indians hunted and fished, with fish and shellfish in plentiful supply in the local waters. The soil beneath the forest was rich and appealing to those who wished to farm. The climate encountered by the English differed slightly from the climate we know in Virginia today, because in 1607 the northern hemisphere was experiencing a slightly cooler period known as the “Little Ice Age.” Winters were more severe and had fewer frost-free days per year in which to cultivate crops. Even so, there were many plants and roots available for gathering, and rich soil made cultivation of crops possible.

The Powhatan lifestyle was heavily dependent upon a seasonal cycle. Their planting, hunting, fishing and gathering followed the rhythm of the seasons. They raised vegetables, such as corn, beans and squash, with corn being the most important. They ate fresh vegetables in the summer and fall, and fish, berries, tuckahoe and stored nuts in the spring. Fishing was a spring and summer activity. When other food resources became low, they could gather oysters and clams. Food was most scarce during late winter through early spring when the stores of dried corn and beans from fall were nearly gone, and berries had not yet ripened. During the winter season when brush cover was sparse, the Powhatan Indians hunted and ate game. There was a lot of game in the area including raccoon, deer, opossum, turkey, squirrel and rabbit, among others. Some of these, such as
the opossum and raccoon, were strange and unfamiliar to the English, so they adopted the Powhatan names for them. Of all the game hunted, deer was the most important because it was used for food, clothing and tools. Through the centuries, the Powhatan people had learned to understand their environment and to adapt to it in a way which afforded them the necessities of life. In spite of George Percy’s description of the land during the first few days of exploration as a “veritable paradise on earth,” the English found it difficult to interact with the environment in a productive way.” http://www.historyisfun.org/pdf/Life-at-Jamestown-Lesson-Plans/LifeatJamestown.pdf

Background information about Pocahontas is available from: http://www.virtualjamestown.org/Pocahontas.html

A photograph of the statue of John Smith and background information is available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Smith_(explorer)

“Captain John Smith’s most famous adventures were as one of the first settlers of James Fort. Today his bronze statue stands within the outlines of the original fort and is one of the most recognized features of Historic Jamestowne. With a granite base, the statue measures 20 feet tall. The inscription on the base reads: “John Smith, Governor of Virginia, 1608” and features Smith’s adopted coat of arms and motto, vincere est vivere (“to live is to conquer”).” http://historicjamestowne.org/visit/plan-your-visit/monuments/

“John Smith became the person most likely to succeed in any personal encounters with the Indians, as he had done during the previous critical months. Smith, along with Newport, became the critical negotiator with Wahunsonacock. It was during these negotiations that thirteen-year old Thomas Savage was presented to the chief who received him as his son. In return, Wahunsonacock gave the English his trusty servant, Namontack. The hope was that these “go-betweens” would come to understand the language and culture of both groups and would be invaluable in future negotiations. Smith and Newport were successful in obtaining enough corn to last through the rest of that winter and early spring. By summer of 1608, the fort was rebuilt. John Smith reported that the settlers built a blockhouse at the entrance to the island, experimented with glass making and planted 100 acres of corn. Conditions at this new Jamestown seemed to improve when Smith became president in September of 1608. Captain Newport, ever mindful of the economic purpose of the Virginia Company, had sent the early settlers digging for gold ore, but Smith thought it folly to search for gold. Instead, he ordered laborers and gentlemen to plant crops and build shelters. He offered strict leadership, pronouncing, “he that will not worke shall not eate.” He trained men in military skills and dealt effectively with the Indians in trade and political negotiations, until his strong-armed tactics angered local tribes. One of his most important contributions was the exploration and mapping of the Chesapeake Bay area. Smith’s tenure as president lasted about a year. In October 1609, he was forced to return to England due to a gunpowder injury, and the colony again began to deteriorate.” http://www.historyisfun.org/pdf/Life-at-Jamestown-Lesson-Plans/LifeatJamestown.pdf
### Primary Source Analysis Tool: Monuments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observe – Questions 1 and 2</th>
<th>Reflect – Questions 3 and 4</th>
<th>Defend – Question 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What and/or who do each of the pictures show?
2. How does the monument relate to the failure of Jamestown?
3. What part of the monument catches your attention? Why?
4. Which perspective or perspectives does the monument relate to?
5. Why do you say this?
Appendix H

Film Clips
Film Clips

**Environmental Theory** –

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8u_IAH9bspU&t=23s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8u_IAH9bspU&t=23s) start at 14:00 until 15:33
(starvation and disease due to drought)

**Geographical Theory** –


[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8u_IAH9bspU&t=23s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8u_IAH9bspU&t=23s) start at 15:33 until 17:10
(brackish water of bay – saltwater poisoning)

**Economic Theory** –

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QUaOFbyWvhA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QUaOFbyWvhA) – Virginia Company and search for gold explained 2:35

Other options:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8u_IAH9bspU&t=23s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8u_IAH9bspU&t=23s) start at beginning until 2:30– Virginia Company – search for gold

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZINHFyVDp3s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZINHFyVDp3s) Begin at 0:30 until 2:00 – search for gold

**Political/social Theory** –

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8u_IAH9bspU&t=23s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8u_IAH9bspU&t=23s) - start at 7:51 until 10:20
(threat of Indians)

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZINHFyVDp3s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZINHFyVDp3s) start at 2:47 until 3:35 (lack of leadership and John Smith)
Primary Source Analysis Tool: Film Clips

1. What and/or who do each of the film clips show?
2. How does the film clip relate to the failure of Jamestown?
3. What part of the film clip do you think is most important? Why?
4. Which perspective or perspectives does the film clip relate to?
5. Why do you say this?
Appendix I

Teacher Role Card
**Teacher Role Card** (adapted from Yarrow & Topping, 2001)

**COOPERATIVE WRITING PROJECT: THE TEACHER’S ROLE**

The role of the teacher(s) during the Cooperative Writing Project is to support the processes of writing rather than give input to the content. There are four main components to the role: **monitoring, prompting, praising and trouble-shooting**. Except where co-operative working is specifically mentioned, everything applies equally to both individual and groups of writers. Try to divide your time fairly between pupils, whether they are working individually or in groups. If pupils ask for help with content, refer them to the graphic organizers they have filled out in their small groups.

**Monitor** whether pupils are following the procedures taught in the training sessions. Check that they are using the questions given them each day, analysis tool organizers, and the graphic organizers they have completed to monitor their work themselves, and that, in the cooperative group, writer and helpers are co-operating effectively. It will also be necessary, as usual, to monitor progress in relation to the time available for the task.

**Prompt** pupils when necessary by referring to the daily questions, or to explanations given during training. Remind them of the different levels of support the helper can give, and that it is for the writer to choose. You may need to remind them of time constraints and encourage them to move on. Prompt helpers to praise writers, e.g., for completing a section, having a good idea, providing reasoning for using specific evidence.

**Praise** pupils freely for keeping on task, for following procedures correctly, and for working well together. This will help to maintain motivation and self-esteem which are powerful factors in academic achievement.

**Trouble-shooting** may be necessary, especially in the initial stages of learning to work in pairs. Reassure pupils that it is natural to encounter problems working in a new way, and that you are there to help sort them out. Blame any difficulties on the newness or complexity of the procedures rather than on the pupils, and emphasize that working co-operatively will be a learning process for them.
Appendix J

Failure of Jamestown Test
Failure of Jamestown Test

Name _______________________ Period ________________
Teacher ______________

1. Which of the following is not a way that collective memory is passed down?
   
   a. Monuments  
   b. Holidays  
   c. Dreams  
   d. Art  

2. The charter for Jamestown colony (the permission from the government to build the colony) emphasized sending gold and resources back to England instead of having the colonists concentrate on feeding themselves and providing the other necessities of life for themselves. Which of the following theories interprets the failure of Jamestown as the result of the nature of the colony’s charter from the Virginia Company?
   
   a. Environmental  
   b. Geographical  
   c. Political/Social  
   d. Economic  

3. The geographical perspective is an interpretation of the failure of Jamestown that emphasizes which of the following?
   
   a. A severe drought caused a shortage of water and food which led to starvation and disease among the Jamestown colonists.  
   b. The location of Jamestown near the James River estuary resulted in the colonists using contaminated water and then falling sick with disease.  
   c. The Powhattan Indians first supplied the colonists with food, but periodically attacked and withheld resources from them. The lack of leadership among the colonists also contributed to the downfall of Jamestown.  
   d. The Jamestown charter from the Virginia Company made it clear to the colonists that they had to send gold and other resources back to England, so the colonists did not take the time to learn how to survive in their new home.
4. When the colonists first arrived, what was their main goal?
   a. to discover gold and other precious metals
   b. to learn to grow food in their new home
   c. to learn from the Powhatan Indians
   d. to make friends

5. The English chose to settle at Jamestown because:
   a. there was a good supply of drinking water.
   b. the water along the shore was deep enough for docking.
   c. the Powhatan Indians invited them to settle there.
   d. it was away from the James River.

6. This soldier of fortune offered strict leadership to Jamestown in September 1608 when he became president of the colony. He ordered laborers and gentlemen to plant crops and build shelters, proclaiming that “he that will not worke shall not eate.” What was his name?
   a. John Rolfe
   b. Christopher Newport
   c. John Smith
   d. Powhatan

7. The Virginia Company of London was granted a charter (permission) by King James I as a joint-stock company of merchants to establish a colony in North America with all the following characteristics except:
   a. the goal to find gold and silver to send back to investors in England.
   b. the goal to discover all the new plants and animals in North America.
   c. the power to appoint a council of leaders in the colony.
   d. the responsibility to provide settlers, supplies, and ships for the venture.

8. The Algonquian people, otherwise known as the Powhatan Indians, depended on which of the following to live:
   a. warring with other tribes
   b. trading with the colonists for tools and supplies from England
   c. planting, hunting, and fishing
   d. growing tobacco
9. Which environmental factor played the biggest role in the failure of Jamestown?
   a. large forests
   b. cold winters
   c. spring storms
   d. a major drought

10. Which of the following was not a major cause of death for the Jamestown colonists?
    a. drowning from spring storms and the rising of the James River
    b. attacks from the Powhatan Indians
    c. famine due to a shortage of food
    d. disease such as dysentery and typhoid

11. What is brackish water?
    a. water that contains large amounts of salt and bacteria
    b. water that is black
    c. water that is fresh
    d. water that is full of fish called brack

12. Which of the following was a reason that the Powhatan Indians let the English colonists settle in Jamestown?
    a. to get English money
    b. to get the gold the colonists found
    c. to get English weapons and goods
    d. to let the English rule over them

13. What was the shape of the James Fort built by the Jamestown colonists?
    a. a circle
    b. a square
    c. a hexagon
    d. a triangle
14. Which of the following reasons did Captain John Smith say was not a true issue that caused the failure of Jamestown?

a. the cruelty of the Powhatans
b. the fact that the land was bad
c. the stupidity of the leaders
d. the failure of the colonists to work hard or plan well

15. Which of the following is not true?

a. Pocahontas was the daughter of the Powhatan chief.
b. Pocahontas married Captain John Smith and moved to England.
c. Pocahontas delivered messages from Chief Powhatan to the colonists.
d. Pocahontas tried to help the colonists by exchanging food and supplies with them.
Appendix K

Preinstruction Essay Prompt
Preinstruction Essay Prompt

Grade 8 Argumentative Performance Task Choice #1: Penny
(Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, 2013)

Task:

In recent years, a heated debate has emerged about money in the United States. This particular debate is not about big economic issues, though. Surprisingly, it is about the economic pros and cons of producing and using pennies.

The controversies surrounding the production and continued use of pennies is one of the topics that will be part of an upcoming website project for your history class. As part of your initial research, you have uncovered four sources about the historical and economic impact of the penny.

After you have reviewed these sources, you will answer some questions about them. Briefly scan the sources and the three questions that follow. Then, go back and read the sources carefully so you will have the information you will need to answer the questions and finalize your research.

In Part 1, you will answer questions about the reading passages. In Part 2, you will write an informational article using information you have read.

Directions for Beginning:

You will now examine several sources. You can re-examine any of the sources as often as you like.

Research Questions:

After examining the research sources, use the remaining time in Part 1 to answer three questions about them. Your answers to these questions will be scored. Also, your answers will help you think about the information you have read and reviewed, which should help you write your argumentative essay.

Sources for Performance Task:

Part 1: ASSESSMENT ITEMS

1. Source #4 describes how some people want to eliminate the penny from the United States’ economy. Explain how the information in Source #2 adds to the reader’s understanding of the potential effects of eliminating pennies in the United States. Give two details from Source #2 to support your explanation.

2. All of the sources provide information about the penny. Which source would most likely be relevant to students researching the ways to reduce the cost of producing the penny? Justify your answer and support it with two pieces of information from the sources.

3. Look at the claims in the table. Decide if the information in Source #3, Source #4, both sources, or neither source supports each claim. Click on the box that identifies the source that supports each claim. There will be only one box selected for each claim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim</th>
<th>Source #3: Give a Penny - Save the Day</th>
<th>Source #4: The Ever-Changing Penny</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The penny has more value than what it can buy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounding price totals will cause an increase in prices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The low value of a penny is a good thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing the metals in the penny is a possible solution for people who want to keep the penny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2: Penny Argumentative Performance Task

4. Student Directions

You will now review your notes and sources, and plan, draft, revise, and edit your writing. You may use your notes and refer to the sources. Now read your assignment and the information about how your writing will be scored; then begin your work.

Your Assignment:

As a contribution to the website your history class is creating, you decide to write an
argumentative essay that addresses the issues surrounding the penny. Your essay will be displayed on the website and will be read by students, teachers, and parents who visit the website.

Your assignment is to use the research sources to write a multi-paragraph argumentative essay either for or against the continued production of the penny in the United States. Make sure you establish an argumentative claim, address potential counterarguments, and support your claim from the sources you have read. Develop your ideas clearly and use your own words, except when quoting directly from the sources. Be sure to reference the sources by title or number when using details or facts directly from the sources.

**Argumentative Essay Scoring:**

Your argumentative essay will be scored using the following:

1. **Organization/purpose:** How well did you state your claim, address opposing claims, and maintain your claim with a logical progression of ideas from beginning to end? How well did your ideas thoughtfully flow from beginning to end using effective transitions? How effective was your introduction and your conclusion?

2. **Evidence/elaboration:** How well did you integrate relevant and specific information from the sources? How well did you elaborate your ideas? How well did you clearly state ideas in your own words using precise language that is appropriate for your audience and purpose? How well did you reference the sources you used by title or number?

3. **Conventions:** How well did you follow the rules of grammar usage, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling?

**Now begin work on your argumentative essay.** Manage your time carefully so that you can

1. Plan your multi-paragraph argumentative essay.

2. Write your multi-paragraph argumentative essay.

3. Revise and edit the final draft of your multi-paragraph argumentative essay.

For Part 2, you are being asked to write a multi-paragraph argumentative essay, so please be as thorough as possible.

Remember to check your notes and your prewriting/planning as you write and then revise and edit your argumentative essay.

(Students will be provided with space to answer this question.)
Your assignment is to use the research sources to write a multi-paragraph argumentative essay either for or against the continued production of the penny in the United States. Make sure you establish an argumentative claim, address potential counterarguments, and support your claim from the sources you have read. Develop your ideas clearly and use your own words, except when quoting directly from the sources. Be sure to reference the sources by title or number when using details or facts directly from the sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role:</th>
<th>Audience:</th>
<th>Format:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Key Words:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Introduction Paragraph

**Hook**

**Interesting Facts**

**Thesis/Claim (what are you trying to prove)**

The United States penny should or should not continue to be produced.

**Counterclaim (acknowledge the other side)**
Transition to body paragraph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim: (similar to your thesis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background: (what should we know about Jamestown)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting evidence:</th>
<th>Supporting evidence:</th>
<th>Supporting evidence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis:</td>
<td>Analysis:</td>
<td>Analysis:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to claim:
### Counterclaim Paragraph

Counterclaim: (the other side of the argument)

Rebuttal: (refer back to your original claim)

### Concluding Paragraph

**Response** to the original thesis/claim in a statement

**Counterclaim** reviewed

Finally, the conclusion the reader **should have reached** (mic drop)
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