CHAPTER 29

Historical Reading and Writing in Secondary School Classrooms

Jeffery D. Nokes

Peek into any history classroom and you might encounter a wide range of reading and writing activities. In one class, students might be writing answers to questions on a worksheet while wandering the classroom viewing historical photographs hanging on the walls. In another class, students could be creating an outline of notes as they read a passage from their textbook. In a different setting, students might be reacting to a documentary video about a historical controversy by writing their opinion in a reflective journal. Students in another class might be listening to their peers give oral presentations that include projected images and written descriptions of historical events. Still others might be comparing the accounts given in two primary source documents in order to write a persuasive essay. Others could be filling out a graphic organizer as they listen to their teacher lecture. Most people would acknowledge that reading and writing are common in history classrooms. However, not all of the reading and writing that takes place there should be considered historical reading and writing. Instead, historical reading and writing are the literate acts of historians, replicated, to the extent possible, by students in history classrooms.

The twenty-first century dawns with unprecedented access to information, both historical and related to other fields. In an instant, a pocket-held electronic device can be used to find any historical fact taught in any secondary history classroom. The same device could also be used to access misinformation cleverly disguised as facts. Reading and writing in a digital Information Age require critical literacies that mirror to a great extent the reading and writing of historians. Although the comprehension of historical concepts remains a vital

J.D. Nokes (✉)
History Department, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT, USA

M. Carretero et al. (eds.), *Palgrave Handbook of Research in Historical Culture and Education*, DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-52908-4_29

outcome of history instruction, the retention of trivial facts is less necessary than ever. Instead, the ability to judge the reliability of a source, the inclination to cross-check information, and the skills to persuade others that an interpretation is sound—all basic elements of historical reading and writing—have emerged as essential twenty-first century literacy skills. Wineburg explains, "Today our iPhone supplies … information in a split second. What our iPhones cannot do, however, is distinguish solid from spurious evidence, or discern a cogent argument from a stupefying cloud of smoke and mirrors" (Nokes, 2014: xii). The skills associated with historical reading and writing are not just helpful in building historical content knowledge, which indeed they are, but are essential literacies for surviving and thriving in the age of the Internet. Every student needs to be able to read and write like a historian to some extent.

Many reading researchers, particularly those interested in content area literacy, ground their work upon the theories of James Gee (1989). Gee explained the concept of a *discourse community*, a group of people who, because of their association and identification with each other, share common language norms, values, beliefs, and practices. He explained that discourse communities have unique epistemologies, acknowledged and valued texts, purposes for reading and writing, and norms for communicating. Using Gee's definition, historians make up a discourse community with distinctive ways of being, associating, reading, thinking, and writing. Likewise, secondary school classrooms develop into discourse communities, with successful students figuring out the expectations for being, reading, writing, and communicating. The thesis of this chapter is that there are benefits from tailoring reading and writing in history classes to match, to an extent that makes sense, the norms of historians. Students who participate within a historian-like discourse community reap rewards in terms of content, skill, and dispositional development.

In order to promote this idea, I will (a) consider the reading and writing norms of historians, (b) contrast conventional history classrooms with reconceptualized classrooms that more closely match the discourse community of historians, (c) summarize research on students' responses to instruction that promotes participation in a historian-like community and (d) provide suggestions for research.

Historians' Reading and Writing Norms

In order to recreate the discourse community of historians in secondary classrooms, teachers must consider *what* historians read and write, *how* historians read and write, and, most importantly, *why* historians read and write.

What *Historians Read and Write*

Historians read a wide variety of texts. Some travel to distant locations where they search archival repositories to gather evidence that will help them solve historical mysteries. Their hope is to discover primary sources, firsthand accounts, that are both reliable and relevant to their questions. Other historians conduct interviews of individuals who have personally experienced his-

torical events. Others pour through family papers, church records, land claim maps, old photographs, manuscript census forms, and ships' manifests in order to reconstruct family histories. A colleague of mine analyzes television programs from the 1950s and 1960s, comparing those produced on opposite sides of the Iron Curtain. The types of texts historians read include a diverse array of evidence depending on the questions they seek to answer. The historian-philosopher Collingwood contended that "of all the things perceptible to [a historian] there is not one which he might not conceivably use as evidence on some question, if he came to it with the right question in mind" (1993: 247).

Should historians' analysis of non-written or even non-linguistic evidence be considered "reading?" Do historians "read" an oral history, a historic photograph, or a television program? Building upon Gee's notion of discourse communities, researchers of new-literacies (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Kress, 2000) and of content area literacy agree that the notion of text should be defined broadly (Draper, Broomhead, Jensen, Nokes, & Siebert, 2010) to include the resources that are valued by practitioners within disciplines (Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). In response to current literacy theories, then, the notion of historical reading should be expanded to include the analysis of any evidence. Because historians use such a wide array of linguistic and non-linguistic, and print and non-print texts, reading and writing in history involves much more than words on paper. Still, most historians privilege written primary sources above other resources. Even as the notion of reading is expanded, reading in the traditional sense maintains a highly valued position in history.

In addition to evidence and primary source accounts, historians read secondary sources, second-hand accounts produced by fellow historians. Historians read primary and secondary sources for different purposes. They use secondary sources to ground their research in the existing body of knowledge. In order to find the "gap on the book shelf" that their research will fill, historians must stay abreast of their colleagues' work. Additionally, secondary sources lead them to interesting questions and useful evidence. An awareness of secondary sources helps historians understand how they and their work fit into the discourse community of historians. To answer the question of *what* they read, then, historians engage in traditional reading, surveying the work of their colleagues as well as analyzing primary sources. In addition, they engage with non-traditional forms of text of a nearly limitless variety based upon their research interests and the available evidence.

Just as historians use a variety of types of evidence to answer historical questions, they create a number of different types of texts. Historians produce monographs, charts, maps, diagrams, visual presentations, journal articles, web sites, textbooks, lectures, and countless other products. Just as the notion of *reading* and *text* should be expanded, the notion of *writing* must also be considered more broadly to include all discipline-focused creations of historians (Draper et al., 2010).

Regardless of the specific format that historians' writing (defined broadly) assumes, their products generally include a mix of narration, description, and

persuasion or argumentation. Historians' writing includes the formulation and justification of an original research question; a review of research on similar questions, with a focus on the flaws or gaps that their current study intends to correct or fill; an explanation of the process used to gather and analyze evidence; the imaginative development of an interpretation; and the written explanation and defense of that interpretation (Gaddis, 2002). Further, in ongoing conversations with their peers, historians review (often in writing) one another's work. Thus, historians' writing integrates questioning, description, narration, critique, analysis, and persuasion.

In addition to the writing of professional historians, amateur historians (sometimes in consultation with historians) produce public histories. Public histories are intended for the general populace rather than for historian audiences. They include museum exhibits, historic building restorations and displays, historical fiction, movies set in the past, popular books, and other texts produced to entertain and/or nurture an awareness of heritage. Public histories often lack the academic rigor expected of professional historians. Though these texts are on the fringe of what is accepted by the discourse community of historians, because they are commonly encountered and are extremely influential (Rosenzweig & Thelen, 1998; Wineburg, 2007) historians remain aware (and usually critical) of them.

To summarize, historians write not only traditional types of texts in the form of monographs and articles, but they also produce lectures, visual presentations, maps, diagrams, and many other genres of text. Much historical reading and writing, especially that of professional historians, involves the construction and defense of evidence-based interpretations of past events (De La Paz, 2005; De La Paz & Felton, 2010; De La Paz, Ferretti, Wissinger, Yee, & MacArthur, 2012; Foster & Yeager, 1999; Levstik & Barton, 2015; Monte-Sano, 2008, 2010). Public histories, often produced by amateur historians, provide an additional example of historical writing.

How *Historians Read and Write*

As mentioned, the discourse community of historians has guidelines for reading and writing—guidelines that are generally taught implicitly to history graduate students. Because the reading strategies that historians use are rarely discussed explicitly and often become automatic (i.e. used without conscious awareness), as historians mature in their careers they have a difficult time explaining to non-historians how they read and write. Wineburg reported, "as a guild, historians have been uncharacteristically tight-lipped about how they [work with historical texts]" (2001: 63). This is not because they are secretive or exclusive, but in large part because they do not spend a great deal of time worrying about the historical thinking of people outside their discourse community. However, a few non-historians have investigated how historians read.

The psychologist, Sam Wineburg (1991), pioneered research on historians' reading. He found that they use three heuristics for making sense of written

evidence. First, they pay attention to the source of each document, noting the text type (e.g. textbook, journal, deposition, or novel); the author(s) (including their position, involvement, potential biases, etc.); the audience; the timing of the text production in relation to the events it describes; and the perceived purpose of the text. Historians comprehend the text's content with the source in mind, reading, for example, a transcript of a defendant's court testimony differently than they would a private diary entry or the transcript of a government official's press conference. Second, historians keep the context in mind as they read, considering the physical and social milieu surrounding both the event and the production of the account. In their mind's-eye they might selectively imagine an election year motivation, racist undercurrents, the weather conditions during a battle, a policy-maker's religious background, or other relevant contextual factors that influence an author's perspective and a document's content. Third, historians compare and contrast across documents, noting and trying to explain both similarities and differences. No nugget of information, no matter how important to their argument, is accepted without cross-checking it against other evidence. Wineburg concluded that these three heuristics for making sense of historical texts, *sourcing*, *contextualization*, and *corroboration*, form the foundation of historical reading.

Other researchers have added to the list of reading strategies historians use, particularly for working with non-linguistic evidence. Baron (2012), who studied historians' analysis of historical sites, identified their use of *origination*, a strategy that blends sourcing and contextualization in a manner that is more appropriate for analysis of places; *Intertectonality*, which, similar to corroboration, involves comparing a historic building with others built in a similar time for similar purposes; *stratification*, which involves considering how an object in continuous use must be understood in terms of contextual strata, or how it has been used and altered in different eras; and *supposition*, the consideration of absent evidence. Other researchers highlight historians' use of *perspective taking* (Lee & Ashby, 2001; Levstik, 2001) or *historical empathy* (Baron, 2012; Davis, Yeager, & Foster, 2001; Lee, 2005), the imaginative process of viewing circumstances as a historical character would. Historians imaginatively fill in gaps in evidence with logical inferences (Collingwood, 1993), are skeptical about interpretations, and remain open to new evidence that is constantly being uncovered (Britt, Rouet, Georgi, & Perfetti, 1994). Historical reading involves the integrated use of these specialized reading strategies. In keeping with Gee's (1989) research, historians have their own ways of reading.

In addition to reading strategies historians employ, researchers have theorized about the cognitive processes involved in constructing historical understandings from texts. These theories are based upon a model of narrative reading, proposed by Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983). They suggest that as a reader encounters a text he develops a *text base* that captures the passage's literal meaning, and a *situation model* that preserves the narrative as understood by the reader—the story taking shape in the reader's mind. The situation model emerges as the text base interacts with the reader's background knowledge.

Some researchers have proposed that historical reading shares some processes and outcomes with narrative reading, notably the text base and the situation model. However, acknowledging that reading multiple, contradictory, fragmented, and conflicting accounts is more complex than reading a single narrative, Wineburg (1994) and Britt and her colleagues (1994) propose two ways of conceptualizing historical reading. Wineburg (1994) suggests that in addition to the text base and situation model, readers construct a *documents model*, which captures their assessment of the reliability and usefulness of various accounts. Additionally, Wineburg suggests that mature historical readers construct *hypothetical situation models*—alternative narratives that are simultaneously retained in case newly encountered evidence requires the reader to modify an emerging interpretation. Exposure to new evidence might lead an individual to make minor changes to a situation model, to add details, or to replace a situation model altogether by what had previously been a hypothetical situation model. Readers iteratively use their situation model(s) to evaluate and filter new accounts to which they are exposed and use new accounts to test, revise, and/or refine their situation model(s).

Britt and her colleagues also contend that a single situation model is insufficient when working with historical evidence (Britt et al., 1994). Instead, they contend that readers must construct separate representations of what each author has stated, keeping in mind the agreements and disagreements across texts. A mature reader's cognitive representation of texts acknowledges each source of information and the interrelationship between the evidence and arguments they bring to a historical controversy. An accomplished reader notices the arguments made by authors as they integrate facts, evidence, and claims within their accounts. A skilled historian constructs an integrated *argument model* that pulls together factual reports, personal opinions, and evidence from multiple sources. Thus, the construction of an argument model requires the ability to understand arguments made by each single author and to synthesize arguments into an interpretive evaluation of the arguments made by each author.

Needless to say, both models show that historical reading can strain the limits of an individual's working memory, particularly a novice who is trying to learn the ins and outs of historical thinking as she engages with evidence and explores previously unfamiliar content (Nokes, 2011). Of course, historians do not spend a great deal of time thinking about how they are doing all of this—they just do it. Psychologists and literacy researchers are the designers of these models of reading. Still, historians judge their colleagues' work based upon whether norms for reading have been followed.

Although some aspects of the writing processes can be inferred from historians' products, how historians write has not been studied as extensively as their reading. Young and Leinhardt contrast students' writing with historians' unique *knowledge transforming* arguments, explanations, and descriptions. They suggest that historians use "rhetorical strategies of the disciplinary genre to transform disparate pieces of information into a coherent argument" (1998: 29). These rhetorical strategies include using *evidence-supported claims*,

evidence-based rebuttals of opposing claims, and the systematic *use of documents* through paraphrasing and/or direct quotation in order to support claims (De La Paz & Felton, 2010). In spite of some awareness of these tactics, the writing process of historians remains somewhat unexplored. Though we can infer that historians' writing is purposeful, audience-driven, and argumentative, the specific heuristics historians use to write have not been studied extensively and represent a topic for future research.

Why *Historians Read and Write*

Historians read and write to answer questions, to construct new knowledge, to develop richer and more accurate interpretations of past events, and to share their work with others. Historians sometimes share their products with students, legislative committees, or television or radio audiences, but their most valued writing is produced for fellow historians, who provide a critical review based upon disciplinary standards, then initiate new studies in response. Through this dialogical process, historians establish and maintain the standards for research, publishing, and success within their discourse community. Their work inspires additional questions and research by their colleagues.

The questions historians address deal with issues that have been ignored, answered inadequately, or answered incorrectly by their peers. To start with, historians must determine what, in the vastness of the past, is significant enough to be studied. Their reading often begins by exploring what other historians have written. Once determined, they must persuade their colleagues that certain questions are worth asking. Their writing often begins with this goal in mind. Thus, historians' research is intended to initiate or contribute to an ongoing dialogue with fellow historians. Their reading and writing cannot be understood without considering the discourse community that creates the context for their work.

Historians' questions shape the manner in which they go about finding answers. Questions worth asking do not have answers that can be "googled" or found intact online. Historians must gather evidence from many sources to construct answers that they know will be interrogated by their peers. No relevant piece of evidence can be ignored if the historian is to meet disciplinary norms. Historians read as they analyze the evidence and write as they take notes and conceive and develop their interpretations. The purposes of their reading and writing revolve around their long-term goals of formulating an evidence-based interpretation and defending their ideas against their peers' critical reviews (Gaddis, 2002).

The purpose of historians' questions also shapes the manner in which they share their answers. Although historians often produce an engaging narrative with rich descriptions of people and events, a historian's success with colleagues depends upon argumentation and persuasion. The historian must persuade her peers that others have ignored or mishandled the questions she addresses. The historian must convince others that she has been thorough in searching for

evidence. She must prove to her peers that her analysis meets disciplinary standards using (though generally not speaking explicitly about them) the analytical strategies described above. The historian must convince her peers that evidence that contradicts her interpretations has been considered fairly and not simply dismissed. Finally, the historian must persuade others that her conclusions are justified and that they represent a contribution to the field. Maps, charts, diagrams, and visual aids are often created for this purpose. Historians' reading and writing, from start to finish, is intended to create a product that will contribute to historians' dialogue on a question of interest by persuasively introducing a fresh interpretation. Historians' reading and writing, then, represents participation in a dialogue within the discourse community of historians. This is *why* historians read and write.

Reconceptualized Secondary History Classrooms

History classes in secondary schools, like historians, form a discourse community, with students—especially successful students—adopting the expected ways of being, associating, reading, thinking, and writing. The norms in conventional history classrooms differ from those of historians, including the epistemic stance learners take, the texts that are privileged, the roles of various participants, and the purposes for reading and writing. Classroom activities, assignments, interactions, and assessments reinforce these norms. The purpose of this section is to reconceptualize history classrooms where reading and writing matches, to an extent that is reasonable, the norms of the discourse community of historians. Table 29.1 summarizes how history teachers might re-imagine their classrooms as places where students read and write *what*, *how*, and *why* historians read and write.

To begin, students must assume a historian-like epistemic stance, counter to the norms of most history classrooms (Bain, 2005; VanSledright, 2002). Students must understand that history is not a single narrative of the past. Instead, they must begin to see history as interpretations of past events that have been constructed from evidence. Students' reimagined role in learning history is not merely to commit to memory a canonized narrative, but to construct evidence-based interpretations of the past. Until students begin to understand the nature of history, they cannot participate in a historian-like discourse community. Additionally, students must begin to see texts in a new light. In conventional classrooms, texts are typically used to convey information to students, which they accept at face value and attempt to commit to memory as-is (Paxton, 1997). In contrast, historians view texts either as evidence or as interpretative accounts. The historian critiques the texts and accepts and/or rejects their content. Students cannot participate in a historian-like discourse community unless they view historical texts not as conveyors of information but as evidence or interpretive accounts.

Additionally, the instructional objectives in reconceptualized classrooms differ from those in conventional classes. Traditionally, history instruction

Table 29.1 Reading and writing in conventional history classrooms and in reconceptualized classrooms

	Conventional classroom	*Reconceptualized classroom*
Nature of learning history	Committing to memory the canonized narrative of what happened in the past. The narrative is transmitted from teacher/text to student.	Students using evidence to construct, share, and defend interpretations of the past that are open to criticism, alternative perspectives, and reinterpretation. Content learned during exploration.
Instructional objectives	Retention of vast historical information and comprehension of historical concepts.	Retention of historical concepts and metaconcepts; building of historical reading, writing, and thinking skills; development of critical dispositions.
Type of texts	Textbooks and expository texts. Limited use of primary sources as illustrations.	Primary and secondary sources and artifacts representing multiple perspectives. Cautious and critical use of textbooks.
Role of texts	Convey information.	Evidence useful to answer historical questions and/or accounts that share interpretations.
Role of teacher	Provide information, help students manage information, assess students' recall of information.	Model authentic questioning, provide background knowledge and evidence, nurture historical thinking skills, guide students' research, and assess students' content knowledge and historical thinking skills.
Role of students	Absorb information through lectures or reading assignments, understand and manage information, retain information.	Ask questions; skillfully weigh evidence; develop, explain, and defend interpretations; critique others' ideas. Construct conceptual and metaconceptual understandings.
Purpose of writing/ speaking	Display historical content knowledge, and sometimes apply historical concepts to current issues.	Argue a claim based on the skillful use of evidence and content knowledge, review peers' interpretations, and apply historical concepts to current issues.
Role of assessments	Measure and provide feedback on students' mastery of instructional objectives (see above).	Measure and provide feedback on students' mastery of instructional objectives (see above).

focuses almost exclusively on the survey of vast historical information, with some teachers nurturing students' understanding of substantive concepts (such as *revolution*, *democracy*, and *reform*). In reconceptualized classrooms, teachers replace some instructional objectives associated with transmitting historical information with instruction on historians' reading, thinking, and writing. Instructional objectives continue to include important concepts, but also include metaconcepts—ideas associated with historical thinking rather than historical content (such as *evidence*, *causation*, and *account*) (Lee, 2005; van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008). In reconceptualized classrooms, teachers instruct students *how* and *why* historians read, giving them ample opportunities to practice working with *what* historians read. Additionally, teachers nurture in their students critical dispositions such as curiosity, healthy skepticism, and a

demand for evidence. As objectives change, so must assessments. Educators and educational researchers are discovering that it is much more difficult to assess students' mastery of skills and dispositions than it has been to assess their content knowledge (Ercikan & Seixas, 2015; VanSledright, 2014).

Further, historians base their work, in large part, upon their relationships with their colleagues. The primary purpose of their communication is to participate in this dialogue with fellow historians. In contrast, in conventional classrooms students rarely have deep, sustained dialogue with their peers about originally developed ideas. The most important academic relationship for students is with their teacher, who is generally the only evaluator of their work. The teacher is the sole audience for their writing and the individual whose feedback means the most to students' academic success. In reimagined classrooms, students' independently developed, evidence-based interpretations are subject to peer review. During debriefing sessions at the conclusion of document-based activities students are called upon to defend their conclusions both orally and in writing (Reisman, 2012). Writing and speaking are not simply meant to display the retention of facts or to express their opinion, as in conventional classrooms, but to persuasively defend their interpretations as a historian would. Classmates are expected to critically review their peers' ideas. History classrooms provide an ideal setting to recreate, at the level of sophistication possible, a historian-like discourse community with students developing, defending, and evaluating historical interpretations. Admittedly, little research has been conducted on the effectiveness of classrooms that recreate this historian-like discourse community (Reisman, 2012; VanSledright, 2002).

The thought of converting classrooms into these reconceptualized discourse communities might seem overwhelming. However, such a change might involve only minor modifications to the activities already being used. If, for instance, a teacher normally has students create an outline as they read a passage from their textbook, he could follow up by providing a primary source that gives an alternative perspective. Students could then go back through their outline notes and highlight with different colors the information that was common to both accounts, disagreements between accounts, and information found in only one account but not the other. Students could then discuss and explain the differences between the accounts. After attempting to write a synthesized account, students could critique one another's ideas about how best to fuse the two perspectives. By making this addition to the lesson, the textbook will have assumed a different role, becoming just one of many accounts. Students too assume a different role—critiquing rather than merely gleaning information from their textbook. And peers assume a new role as they exchange ideas in a critical dialogue. The historical content is constructed as it is debated, becoming a by-product of an activity that is designed to nurture sourcing, corroboration, and healthy skepticism. The call to reconceptualize history instruction is not a demand to discard current practices but to make minor or major changes that will create a more historian-like discourse community in the classroom.

Secondary Students' Responses to Instruction on Historical Reading and Writing

My contention from the start of this chapter is that students who participate within a historian-like discourse community reap rewards in terms of content, skill, and dispositional development. This assertion is based on two notions. First, conventional instruction that focuses exclusively on content coverage through textbook study and lecture has historically yielded little long-term learning. Research of nearly a century laments students' poor retention of historical facts (Bell & McCollum, 1917; Romano, 2011). And modern studies have shown that without instruction on historical reading and writing, students do not develop historical reading, thinking, or writing skills (Braaksma, Van Drie, & Van Boxtel, 2015; Nokes, Dole, & Hacker, 2007). Additionally, conventional history instruction is uninspiring, boring, and unmemorable (Rosenzweig, 2000; Rosenzweig & Thelen, 1998). Second, research on unconventional instruction that nurtures historical reading and writing shows the positive impact of such methods. This section will summarize some of that research.

Much research has been conducted on students' historical thinking, with ground-breaking study beginning in the United Kingdom by Ashby, Lee, and Shemilt (2005) and continuing with Van Drie and Van Boxtel in the Netherlands (2008) and Seixas and his colleagues' work in Canada (Seixas & Morton, 2013). Meanwhile, Wineburg (1991, 1998), Barton and Levstik (2004), VanSledright (2002) and numerous others have added insights from the United States. Historical reading and writing assume a prominent if not central position in nearly all studies on historical thinking. Based upon the foundation of research on historical thinking, a growing body of research is shedding light on the way students work with historical evidence and is leading to instructional procedures that improve students' ability to read and write like historians.

In this section, I will consider four fields of research: (a) what students do with historical texts without instruction, (b) the impact of historical reading instruction on students, (c) the impact of historical writing instruction on students, and (d) inviting students to participate in a historian-like discourse community.

What Students Do With Historical Texts Without Instruction

As mentioned, Wineburg (1991) conducted a pioneering study on historical reading. The historians and high school students in his study engaged in think aloud protocols while using a number of texts to evaluate three paintings of the Battle of Lexington. Wineburg carefully selected texts that represented a range of resources used to learn about history including primary sources, a textbook passage, and historical fiction. Gee's (1989) treatise on discourse communities

makes Wineburg's findings unsurprising though important. The students read like students, favoring the textbook, reading to absorb information, and feeling uncertain about what to do with conflicting facts—a dilemma never encountered when reading textbooks or listening to lectures. In contrast, historians read like historians, favoring primary sources and reading to participate in an imagined dialogue. Historical reading was contingent upon understanding the task, the purpose of reading, and the nature of history as a discipline, understanding the students, in the absence of instruction, did not possess.

Students' blind acceptance of written content has been documented by other researchers. Paxton (1997) analyzed students' cognitive processes when reading conventional textbook accounts or revised accounts that included a "visible" author. He concluded that conventional textbook accounts lead students to view historical reading and writing as a process of "skilled plagiarism"—simply gathering and retelling information about the past with little room for interpretation, revision or unique insights. Interestingly, revised textbook accounts that were written in first person, addressed the reader directly or indirectly, admitted uncertainty, offered evaluations of ideas, or used other metadiscourse, more frequently inspired young readers to form a mental representation of the author, ask questions, make connections, and critique authorial ideas—precisely the types of things historians do as they read (Paxton, 1997).

That the nature of the text can inspire more historian-like reading, even without instruction, was also the conclusion of Wiley and Voss (1996, 1999), who, in a series of studies, found that students who were assigned to write argumentative essays after reading multiple accounts produced more sophisticated essays than their peers who wrote from a single source or who wrote reactions or summaries. However, research shows that students spontaneously use historians' reading strategies only rarely and under ideal circumstances. More commonly, students only use historians' heuristics when they are taught them explicitly and are given numerous opportunities to practice.

Researchers have studied students' responses to different formats of textual evidence in the absence of instruction on historians' heuristics. For example, Seixas (1993) investigated high school students' analysis of feature films set in historical eras. He found that students judged films by their quality, "realism," and conformity to modern values rather than their historical accuracy or reflection of historic norms. Others researchers found that when high school students are asked to evaluate the reliability of different types of sources they doubt the trustworthiness of feature films (understanding that films blend fact with fiction) but subsequently accept and use information from films without reservation (Marcus, Paxton, & Meyerson, 2006). Others have tracked students' development of strategies for analyzing photographs, finding that maturing students increasingly use clues to identify the time period when a photograph was taken, and to consider the photographer's purposes (Foster, Hoge, & Rosch, 1999). These same researchers found that a young person's background knowledge played a central role to their ability to make inferences about the lives of the people shown in photographs. Further research is needed

on the way students respond to various other genres of historical evidence. In general, across genres and across ages, students struggle to engage in historical reading and writing when they have not been taught explicitly how to do so.

Historical Reading Instruction

There is a growing body of research showing the positive impact of explicit instruction of historians' reading strategies on students both in terms of content and skill development. For instance, my colleagues and I investigated the effects of different formats of classroom instruction intended to teach sourcing, corroboration, and contextualization to high school students (Nokes et al., 2007). After one month, students who had participated in ten lessons (which included instruction on historians' heuristics with opportunities to practice with primary sources) employed sourcing and corroboration significantly more frequently than their peers who had received conventional instruction during the same period. It turned out that contextualization was more difficult for students to employ. Results of this and other studies show that students begin to use more sophisticated historical reading strategies when they are taught to do so in both classroom and computer-based environments (Britt, Perfetti, Van Dyke, & Gabrys, 2000). Reisman (2012) replicated these results in a larger study of 236 11th-grade students during an extended intervention involving frequent document-based activities and explicit instruction on historical reading, thinking, and writing. She found that such instruction improved students' general reading abilities, led to superior content retention, and nurtured students' historical reading, thinking, and writing. Her research demonstrated the vital link between students' use of historians' heuristics and their improved historical writing.

Historical Writing Instruction

Young and Leinhardt (1998) contend that students' writing often takes the form of a "memory dump" during which they simply tell what they know about the subject—a process described in general writing research as *knowledge telling* (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1987). This may result, in part, because many students fail to understand the nature of history and, subsequently do not comprehend an assigned historical writing task (Greene, 1993). Students' immature epistemic stance, reinforced by conventional, content-focused history instruction, helps account for their familiarity with school writing (for which a memory dump is satisfactory) rather than historical writing. However, Young and Leinhardt observed one Advanced Placement US History class over the course of a school year, paying particular attention to the way students' writing changed in response to historical writing instruction and opportunities to practice. They found that after four chances to write analytical essays using multiple pieces of historical evidence, and given feedback on each essay, students began to write more like historians.

In a series of studies spanning a decade, Susan De La Paz and her colleagues have investigated the results of explicit historical reading and writing instruction on students' writing. She found that eighth-grade students of varying academic abilities wrote more historically accurate and persuasive essays after receiving instruction on historical reasoning and persuasive writing (De La Paz, 2005). In a later study, she and a colleague showed that explicit writing strategy instruction, during which teachers (a) explained the valued features of historical writing, (b) provided models of exemplary writing, (c) thought aloud during the planning and revising processes, (d) provided reminders of key steps in the writing process, (e) allowed students to work in groups before working alone, and (f) gave opportunities for practice, resulted in significant improvements of 11th-grade students' writing (De La Paz & Felton, 2010). Following up on these studies, Braaxsma et al. (2015) found that instruction that focused on specific historical writing skills made a difference in 11th-grade students' use of metaconcepts in historical reasoning. General writing instruction made no such difference. Their findings make it doubtful that Language Arts teachers, lacking disciplinary expertise, are qualified to nurture students' historical writing. It is up to history teachers to do this.

Researchers have discovered common errors students make when attempting to write like a historian. For example, when attempting to support a claim with evidence, some students draw on sources indiscriminately by citing strong and weak accounts with equal confidence (Monte-Sano, 2008). These findings demonstrate the reading/writing connection, with students' writing woes stemming from poor reading practices. Further, rather than allowing their interpretation to emerge from the evidence, many students establish their interpretation intuitively and subsequently seek support from the documents for their predetermined opinion (Monte-Sano, 2008). Students who have a difficult time understanding documents form their interpretation based on prior experience and everyday knowledge rather than the evidence they cannot comprehend (De La Paz et al., 2012). In spite of these common errors, eighth and 11th-grade students exhibited basic argumentative writing skills upon which teachers could build more sophisticated historical argumentation (De La Paz et al., 2012). There is substantial research showing the positive impact of historical writing instruction on students, both mainstream students and students with disabilities (Bouck, Englert, Heutsche, & Okolo, 2008).

Students in a Historian-Like Discourse Community

Unlike the growing body of research on the response of individual students to instruction on historical reading and writing, little has been done to study efforts to create a historian-like discourse community in classrooms or to investigate peer interaction during document-based activities. Two studies have begun to explore these questions. After working to foster the historical reading, thinking, and writing skills of a fifth-grade class for a year, VanSledright (2002) found that students' immature epistemological stance often interfered

with meaningful discussions on historical evidence. He argued that the focus on the literal comprehension of authorial meaning in elementary instruction impeded students' ability to understand history as a discipline. These findings were replicated in a study I conducted a few years ago (Nokes, 2014). When I asked fifth-grade students at the start of the school year where history came from, I was met with puzzled looks. When I followed up with questions about what they would see if they followed a historian around for a day, most of these youngsters had no idea. Some believed historians spend their time listening to lectures, watching the History Channel, or browsing the Internet, particularly Wikipedia. They saw historians recycling stories about the past without contributing anything new. In short, they projected school-like discourse standards onto the work of historical inquiry. Encouragingly, by the end of the school year, after weekly document-based lessons, explicit instruction on the nature of history, and many class discussions around historical evidence, the majority of these same fifth graders described historians traveling to archives to search for primary source documents, puzzling over artifacts and other evidence, thinking about the source of the evidence they analyzed, or working like a detective to figure out what happened in the past. They had a better understanding not only of what historians do, but also of the nature of historical inquiry. This understanding placed them in a better position to make interpretations and to think critically about their classmates' ideas during document-based lessons.

Suggestions for Future Research

Almost 25 years after Wineburg's (1991) pioneering study on historians' and students' historical reading, there are a number of important questions still unanswered about teaching history. For example, although Monte Sano (2008), De La Paz (2005), and other researchers have studied the teaching of historical writing, little has been done to investigate historians' writing processes. Do historians use heuristics when writing—heuristics that might be taught to students? Perhaps observing historians complete an abbreviated writing activity might reveal specific writing strategies that they use.

Additionally, during document-based lessons, students frequently interact in groups. Teachers have students work in groups to support each other through this challenging cognitive work. Because historical reading, thinking, and writing within this setting become a social process, it may provide an opportunity to foster the social literacies of historians. However, these social literacies have never been researched. How do historians read interactively, and do they use strategies that might be taught to students? Because historians view reading and writing in terms of their relationships with other historians—they read and write to participate in a dialogue—work must be done to research their social literacies. Additionally, studies could be conducted on the social literacies of students in classrooms where historical thinking is practiced. What does peer review look like in a secondary history classroom and what should it look like?

Currently, all research on historical reading and writing has focused on individual cognition, ignoring the social aspects of reading, thinking, and writing.

Additionally, as the objectives of history teaching change so must the assessments. Some good work on the assessment of historical reading and writing is being conducted (Erckican & Seixas, 2015; Seixas, Gibson, & Ercikan, 2015; Smith & Breakstone, 2015; VanSledright, 2014). However, much more needs to be done to develop reliable and valid assessments that are practical for teachers and researchers. The assessment of historical reading and writing is in great need of further research as the objectives of history teaching expand to include historian-like reading, thinking, and writing.

Increasing accessibility to information and misinformation makes historical reading and writing essential, not just for historians but for all members of society. Creating a discourse community within secondary history classrooms that recognizes and values what, how, and why historians read and write fosters historical literacy. Further research on historians' writing strategies, social reading within historical contexts, and the assessment of historical literacies will help teachers create classrooms where reading and writing follow disciplinary norms.

References

Ashby, R. A., Lee, P. J., & Shemilt, D. (2005). Putting Principles into Practice: Teaching and Planning. In M. S. Donovan & J. D. Bransford (Eds.), *How Students Learn: History, Mathematics, and Science in the Classroom* (pp. 79–178). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Bain, R. B. (2005). "They Thought the World Was Flat?" Applying the Principles of *How People Learn* in Teaching High School History. In M. S. Donovan & J. D. Bransford (Eds.), *How Students Learn: History, Mathematics, and Science in the Classroom* (pp. 179–213). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Baron, C. (2012). Understanding Historical Thinking at Historic Sites. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(3), 833–847.

Barton, K. C., & Levstick, L. S. (2004). *Teaching History for the Common Good*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bell, J. C., & McCollum, D. F. (1917). A Study of the Attainments of Pupils in United States History. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 8*(5), 257–274.

Bouck, E. C., Englert, C. S., Heutsche, A., & Okolo, C. M. (2008). Cognitive Apprenticeship into the Discipline: Helping Students with Disabilities Think and Act Like Historians. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, 6*(*2*), 21–40.

Braaksma, M., Van Drie, J., & Van Boxtel, C. (2015). Writing in History: Effects of Writing Instruction on Historical Reasoning and Text Quality. *Journal of Writing Research, 7*(1), 123–156. doi:10.17239/jowr-2015.07.01.06.

Britt, M. A., Perfetti, C. A., Van Dyke, J., & Gabrys, G. (2000). The Sourcer's Apprentice: A Tool for Document-Supported History Instruction. In P. Stearns, P. Siexas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning in History: National and International Perspectives* (pp. 437–470). New York: NYU Press.

Britt, M. A., Rouet, J. F., Georgi, M. C., & Perfetti, C. A. (1994). Learning from History Texts: From Causal Analysis to Argument Models. In G. Leinhardt, I. L.

Beck, & C. Stainton (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning in History* (pp. 47–84). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Collingwood, R. G. (1993). *The Idea of History*. Oxford: New York.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. New York: Routledge.

Davis, O. L., Yeager, E. A., & Foster, S. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 21–50). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

De La Paz, S. (2005). Effects of Historical Reasoning Instruction and Writing Strategy Mastery in Culturally and Academically Diverse Middle School Classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*, 139–156.

De La Paz, S., & Felton, M. (2010). Reading and Writing from Multiple Sources in History: Effects of Strategy Instruction. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 35*, 174–192.

De La Paz, S., Ferretti, R., Wissinger, D., Yee, L., & MacArthur, C. (2012). Adolescents' Disciplinary Use of Evidence, Argumentative Strategies, and Organizational Structure in Writing about Historical Controversies. *Written Communication, 29*(4), 412–454.

Draper, R. J., Broomhead, P., Jensen, A. P., Nokes, J. D., & Siebert, D. (Eds.). (2010). *(Re)imagining Content-Area Literacy Instruction*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ercikan, K., & Seixas, P. (Eds.). (2015). *New Directions in Assessing Historical Thinking*. New York: Routledge.

Foster, S. J., Hoge, J. D., & Rosch, R. H. (1999). Thinking Aloud About History: Children's and Adolescents' Responses to Historical Photographs. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 27*(2), 178–214.

Foster, S. J., & Yeager, E. A. (1999). "You've Got to Put Together the Pieces": English 12-Year-Olds Encounter and Learn from Historical Evidence. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 14*(4), 286. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/196371949?accountid=4488

Gaddis, J. L. (2002). *The Landscape of History: How Historians Map the Past*. Oxford: London.

Gee, J. P. (1989). Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction. *The Journal of Education, 171*(1), 5–176.

Greene, S. (1993). The Role of Task in the Development of Academic Thinking Through Reading and Writing in a College History Course. *Research in the Teaching of English, 27(1)*, 46–75.

Kress, G. (2000). Design and Transformation: New Theories of Meaning. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures* (pp. 153–161). New York: Routledge.

Lee, P. J. (2005). Putting Principles into Practice: Understanding History. In M. S. Donovan & J. D. Bransford (Eds.), *How Students Learn: History, Mathematics, and Science in the Classroom* (pp. 31–77). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Lee, P., & Ashby, R. (2001). Empathy, Perspective Taking, and Rational Understanding. In O. L. Davis, E. A. Yeager, & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 21–50). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Levstik, L. S. (2001). Crossing the Empty Spaces: Perspective Taking in New Zealand Adolescents' Understanding of National History. In O. L. Davis Jr., E. A. Yeager, &

S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 69–98). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Levstik, L. S., & Barton, K. C. (2015). *Doing History: Investigating with Children in Elementary and Middle Schools*. New York: Routledge.

Marcus, A. S., Paxton, R. J., & Meyerson, P. (2006). "The Reality of It All": History Students Read the Movies. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 34*(4), 516–552.

Moje, E. B. (2008). Foregrounding the Disciplines in Secondary Literacy Teaching and Learning: A Call for Change. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 52*, 96–107.

Monte-Sano, C. (2008). Qualities of Historical Writing Instruction: A Comparative Case Study of Two Teachers' Practices. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*, 1045–1079.

Monte-Sano, C. (2010). Disciplinary Literacy in History: An Exploration of the Historical Nature of Adolescents' Writing. *Journal of Learning Sciences, 19*(4), 539–568.

Nokes, J. D. (2011). Recognizing and Addressing Barriers to Adolescents' "Reading Like Historians". *The History Teacher, 44*(3), 379–404.

Nokes, J. D. (2014). Elementary Students' Roles and Epistemic Stances During Document-Based History Lessons. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 42*(3), 375–413.

Nokes, J. D., Dole, J. A., & Hacker, D. J. (2007). Teaching High School Students to Use Heuristics While Reading Historical Texts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*, 492–504.

Paxton, R. J. (1997). "Someone With Like a Life Wrote It": The Effects of a Visible Author on High School History Students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*, 235–250.

Reisman, A. (2012). Reading Like a Historian: A Document-Based History Curriculum Intervention in Urban High Schools. *Cognition and Instruction, 30*(1), 86–112.

Romano, A. (2011). How Dumb Are We? *Newsweek, 157*(13/14), 56–60.

Rosenzweig, R. (2000). How Americans Use and Think About the Past: Implications from a National Survey for the Teaching of History. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives* (pp. 262–283). New York: New York University Press.

Rosenzweig, R., & Thelen, D. P. (1998). *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life* (Vol. 2). Columbia University Press.

Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1987). *Knowledge Telling and Knowledge Transforming in Written Composition. Advances in Psycholinguistics, 2*, 142–175.

Seixas, P. (1993). Popular Film and Young People's Understanding of the History of Native American-White Relations. *The History Teacher, 26*, 351–370.

Seixas, P., Gibson, L., & Ercikan, K. (2015). A Design Process for Assessing Historical Thinking: The Case of a One-Hour Test. In K. Ercikan & P. Seixas (Eds.), *New Directions in Assessing Historical Thinking* (pp. 233–245). New York: Routledge.

Seixas, P., & Morton, T. (2013). *The Big Six Historical Thinking Concepts*. Toronto: Nelson.

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching Disciplinary Literacy to Adolescents: Rethinking Content-Area Literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 78*(1), 40–59.

Smith, M., & Breakstone, J. (2015). History Assessments of Thinking: An Investigation in Cognitive Validity. In K. Ercikan & P. Seixas (Eds.), *New Directions in Assessing Historical Thinking* (pp. 233–245). New York: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.

Van Drie, J., & Van Boxtel, C. (2008). Historical Reasoning: Towards a Framework for Analyzing Students' Reasoning About the Past. *Educational Psychology Review, 20*, 87–110.

VanSledright, B. (2002). *In Search of America's Past: Learning to Read History in Elementary School.* New York: Teachers College Press.

VanSledright, B. (2014). *Assessing Historical Thinking and Understanding: Innovative Designs for New Standards.* New York: Routledge.

Wiley, J., & Voss, J. F. (1996). The Effects of 'Playing Historian' on Learning in History. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 10*, 63–72.

Wiley, J., & Voss, J. F. (1999). Constructing Arguments from Multiple Sources: Tasks That Promote Understanding and Not Just Memory for Text. *Journal of Educational Research, 91*, 301–311.

Wineburg, S. (1991). On the Reading of Historical Texts: Notes on the Breach Between School and Academy. *American Educational Research Journal, 28*, 495–519.

Wineburg, S. (1994). The Cognitive Representation of Historical Texts. In G. Leinhardt, I. Beck, & C. Stainton (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning in History* (pp. 85–135). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wineburg, S. (1998). Reading Abraham Lincoln: An Expert/Expert Study in the Interpretation of Historical Texts. *Cognitive Science, 22*, 319–346.

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Wineburg, S. (2007). Forrest Gump and the Future of Teaching the Past. *Phi Delta Kappan, 89*(3), 168–177.

Young, K. M., & Leinhardt, G. (1998). Writing from Primary Documents. *Written Communication, 15*, 25–68.