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Abstract
This investigation examined the effectiveness of two instructional approaches for enhancing historical reading and writing outcomes among 39 students who were identified with specific learning disabilities, or at-risk for academic failure in reading and/or writing (Tier 2 and 3). These students were part of a larger investigation with 151 sixth- and seventh-graders from six intact social studies classrooms. Students in both conditions participated in three, week-long historical investigations, used the same instructional materials, engaged in 320 min of discussion, and crafted historical essays from source documents. The two instructional approaches varied in the types of questions used to facilitate small group discussions. Experimental groups were taught two historically-related schemes and the critical questions that accompany each scheme, while comparison groups used traditional comprehension questions. Results showed that although instructional approach did not significantly influence students’ historical knowledge, learning schemes, critical questions, and focused practice in discussion was critical for enhancing their historical writing.
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Introduction

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for literacy in history and social studies continue to raise the academic bar for all students. One focus of the CCSS is the development of reading, writing, thinking, and language skills unique to, and necessary for authentic historical understanding. Many experts argue that these skills cannot be cultivated through traditional techniques (Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). Rather, there is a need for specialized content-area instruction and the use of learning tools that align with the literary goals (Bulgren, Deschler, & Lenz, 2007). Research over the last three decades confirms the relationship between struggling readers and writers and poor performance in content area subjects (Allinton, 2012; Nystrand, 2006; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). The more critical question is what instructional approaches can best facilitate the development of disciplinary literacy among struggling learners?

This study was designed to contribute to the understanding of instructional conditions that promote disciplinary literacy skills among students with disabilities. Focus was placed on the instructional methods that accelerate the reading/writing development of struggling academically. Given the requirements to develop skills in these areas, the primary objective is to evaluate the methods and strategies that can be applied directly in the classroom.
This investigation contrasts the differences between using a generic form of instruction and an approach that emphasized discipline-specific ways of reading, writing, and thinking. The goal was to measure the students’ interpretation and application of the content information being taught. The two instructional approaches chosen to be included in the study provided students with tools to facilitate the understanding of complex ideas communicated in historical documents. A traditional instructional process was compared to one involving specific disciplinary schemes, critical questioning, evaluation of the reliability of source documents, and practice using these techniques in discussions.

Research Questions
The participants’ performance using the two approaches was compared within the context of the following two questions:

1. What are the unique predictors of pre-instructional performance on historical reading and writing measures among middle school students who are either identified with or at-risk for reading and writing difficulties?
2. Does the relationship between overall reading and writing ability, historical knowledge, and performance on historical reading and writing measures vary as a function of the types of discussions that occur in social studies classrooms?

Methods

Participants
The population of this study was comprised of a sample that consisted of 151 sixth and seventh grade students at a large middle school in south central Pennsylvania. A total of 39 students were considered struggling readers and writers and part of the district’s tiered-model approach to intervention. Nineteen of these students had been identified with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) in reading and/or writing and received special education services through an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). The remaining 20 students were at-risk for academic failure and received interventions in the areas of reading and writing. The sample was 61% male, 71.9% White, 26% African American, 1.5% Hispanic, and 0.6% Asian. Thirty-five of the students received free or reduced-cost lunch, and all were proficient speakers of English.

Design
A total of 151 sixth- and seventh-grade students were assigned to one of six social studies classrooms prior to the investigation. Students within each classroom were then randomly assigned to two instructional conditions, and randomly assigned a second time to form small groups of six to eight students. There were two experimental and two comparison groups in each of the six classrooms resulting in 12 experimental and 12 comparison groups. The 24 total groups contained between one and two students who struggled with reading/writing activities. Descriptive characteristics for struggling readers and writers measured before the start of the investigation are provided in Table 1.

Instructional materials for four topics of historical investigation included two primary sources, a secondary source on the historical context, and a question that related to the historical controversy.
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Each of the four historical topics were explored across five, 40-50 minute week-long sessions. The daily activities are described below.

**Building background knowledge**
The first two days of each investigation sequence was used to develop students’ background knowledge. On the first day, teachers introduced the historical question and provided background information about major characters, events, and trends of the event. On the second day, primary source documents were examined, important features highlighted, and students were prompted to record notes in response packets.

**Group Discussion**
Days three and four of each instructional sequence focused on group discussion. Students in each classroom participated in one of four discussion groups (two experimental and two comparison groups). Nine different teachers facilitated the four small group discussions. To control for teacher effects, teachers rotated conditions and groups at the end of each historical investigation.

Students in the experimental groups were taught the *Argument from Expert of Opinion* and *Argument from Consequences* schemes and a series of critical questions that accompanied each scheme in their small groups. Critical questions for the *Argument from Expert Opinion* were (a) Is the author a reliable source? (b) Is the information the author is stating similar or different with what other authors are stating? and (c) Is what the author is stating based on sound evidence? Questions that accompanied the *Argument from Consequences* were (a) What are the good/positive consequences that are likely to happen if we follow through with the decision? and (b) What are the negative consequences that are likely to happen if we follow through with the decision?

The experimental instruction leveraged argumentation schemes and critical questions as cognitive scaffolds for students to make more informed decisions and gain a better understanding. Teachers also emphasized that schemes and critical questions were tools to enable them to identify limitations in the ‘other-side’ argument and promote their ability to write rebuttals. Teachers modeled the use of schemes and critical questions to examine each source, gradually turning over more responsibility to students. As students progressed into each investigation, teachers were coached to serve as facilitators of discussions by prompting students when necessary, and redirecting and correcting misconceptions. Discussions were concluded with a review and debriefing about notable student findings and questions.

Students in the comparison groups also discussed the historical controversies on the third and fourth day of each week in small groups. These students engaged in six discussions, for about 240 minutes across topics and responded to a pre-existing set of comprehension questions developed to promote understanding. The questions prompted students to identify major historical actors, determine the author’s purpose and position, identify main ideas, and record details that support the main ideas. These questions provided a clear comparison to those used in the experimental condition.

**Argumentative Writing**
Students in both conditions wrote historical arguments on the final day of each sequence. They were encouraged to use document sets, and the notes in response packets and were given 40
minutes to complete their written responses. Participants with disabilities were provided with the specified accommodations. To clarify the argumentative writing process, those in both conditions were introduced to a graphic organizer (De La Paz & Graham, 1997; De La Paz, 2005) and teachers modeled how to use this method and transfer information from response packets into their essays. Support materials were faded from instruction to promote greater independence.

Student learning outcomes were assessed using five outcome measures: (a) reading comprehension, (b) historical knowledge, (c) quality of writing [PSSA Technical Report, 2010], (d) historical thinking [Monte-Sano & De La Paz, 2012; Monte-Sano, De La Paz, & Felton, 2014], and (e) essay length. When analyzing the results for the entire population, (n=167) significant effects favored the experimental groups on content knowledge, and historical thinking measures.

Disciplinary literacy among struggling learners
The focus of this analysis was on the 39 students considered struggling readers/writers and their performance on the historical reading comprehension, and writing measures. The purpose was to isolate this group of students and determine how the two instructional approaches interacted with their unique learning characteristics. Although 6th and 7th grade students who participated in the experimental approach in past studies demonstrated significant gains in content knowledge and historical writing compared to their peers (Wissinger & De La Paz, 2015), it was uncertain whether or not these tools would have the same effect on struggling readers/writers.

Despite randomly assigning students to conditions, then again to groups of six to eight students within each condition, we were concerned that instructional features that occurred outside of the investigation would confound the relationship between instruction conditions and the development of historical reading/writing abilities. To control for these effects, a multiple regression was used to fit outcome data for the 39 struggling readers and writers.

Measures

Criterion measures
Two criterion measures were selected to represent students’ historical reading/writing ability. The first was an analytic rubric measuring the extent to which student’s exhibit historical thinking in their essays. Students’ essays were scored on the basis of four components: substantiation, perspective recognition, contextualization, and rebuttal (Monte-Sano & De La Paz, 2012). Substantiation emphasized the extent to which students provided support of a written claim. Perspective recognition focused on students’ ability to articulate the points of view. Contextualization examined the placement of the arguments in the appropriate time, place, and setting. Rebuttal highlighted whether ‘opposing-side’ claims were clearly presented, and explicitly rebutted and/or discredited. These aspects of historical reasoning have been identified in the literature as essential to historical writing (De La Paz, 2005; De La Paz & Wissinger, 2014; Monte-Sano, 2010: Monte-Sano & De La Paz, 2012).

Two raters were trained to score the rubric using sample papers from previous investigations. Once an acceptable reliability rate was achieved, all of the essays in the data set were scored resulting in the following reliability: historical thinking total score(s) = 87.6%, and for each analytic trait
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(for substantiation Pearson $r=.98$, for perspective $r=.99$, for contextualization $r=.95$, for rebuttal $r=.83$).

The second criterion measure was a 12 item, multiple-choice historical knowledge measure. Student’s historical knowledge score was the number of correct responses out of the 12 items. The six general education teachers corrected the 12 item measure for their respective classrooms. A random subset of the assessments (25%) was scored by a second rater. The interrater reliability was 100%. The historical knowledge measure was administered one-week before the start of the investigation and again after instruction ended.

**Predictor measures**

Eight measures were included as potential predictors of historical reading/writing ability. The measures were organized into three categories: (a) reading and writing ability, (b) social studies and history knowledge, and (c) instruction.

**Reading and writing ability**

Three standardized measures were used to assess reading/writing ability: the *Gates MacGinitie Reading Test – Fourth Edition* (GMAT-4) (MacGinitie et al., 2002), the essay composition subtest of the *Wechsler Individual Achievement Test - Third Edition* (WIAT-III) (Psychological Corporation, 2009), and students’ English language arts scores on the Pennsylvania State System of Assessments (PSSA). Test retest reliability coefficients of the GMRT-4 for 6th – 7th grade is .89-.93 (MacGinitie et al., 2002). The WIAT-III Essay Composition Subtest for grades 3 – 12 was also group administered by grade level. Students were provided a prompt and given 10 minutes to craft an essay. Age-based reliability coefficients for students ages 8 – 19 for the essay composition subtest are 0.78 (theme development and text organization) and 0.84 (word count), respectively.

Student scores from the reading portion of the PSSA were also used as a measure of reading ability. The PSSA is a standards-based criterion-referenced assessment used to measure a student’s attainment of the academic standards (PSSA Technical Report, 2010). The PSSA reading assessment has two major reporting categories: Comprehension and Reading Skills, and Interpretation and Analysis of Fictional and Nonfictional Text. The reading assessment employs two types of test items: multiple-choice and open-ended. These items are designed to measure students’ comprehension of the content. The overall test score reliability values for the PSSA have been in the low 0.90s for reading (PSSA Technical Report, 2010).

**Social studies and history knowledge**

Two measures were used to assess general social studies knowledge: pretest scores from the 12 item historical knowledge assessment, and report card grades. The historical knowledge assessment was administered before the start of instruction. Scores from the measure were also used to categorize students into low (1) and high (2) prior knowledge groups. Groupings were based on whether students were a standard deviation above or below the mean. Student report card grades were used as the second predictive measure. Grades were provided by classroom teachers and converted to numerical scores ranging from 1 (“F”) to 5 (“A”).
**Instruction**

The third category of predictor variables represented instruction that occurred both in- and outside of the study. In addition to the two different instructional approaches that occurred within the six social studies classrooms, two instructional variables occurred outside of the study and included: level of remediation, and participation in afterschool reading and writing programs.

The level of remediation referred to the intensity of interventions struggling readers and writers received outside of the investigation. All 39 students in the sample received daily supplemental reading and writing instruction. Students who were involved in supplemental intervention and ongoing progress monitoring outside of the regular education classroom were coded.

The second instructional variable that occurred outside of the study was afterschool reading/writing programs. Students reading two or more years below grade-level qualified for afterschool reading and writing support. Students involved in afterschool reading/writing programs were coded (1), while nonparticipants were coded (0).

**Results**

**Bivariate correlations**

Bivariate correlations were performed to examine the relationship between WIAT-III essay composition subtest, GMAT-4 Reading Comprehension, PSSA English/Language Arts, historical knowledge, social studies grades, instructional condition, level of remediation, and participation in afterschool programs. Table 1 summarizes these results. As predicted, a significant moderate-to-strong relationship was found between the two standardized measures of reading/writing ability (WIAT-III and GMAT-4 scores) and pre-instructional ability in history (history grades, and prior historical knowledge; p < .01). Significant relationships were also indicated between performance on the two standardized measures of reading/writing ability and level of intervention (r = .312, p < .05) and participation in afterschool reading/writing programs (r = .343, p < .05). These findings are consistent with much of the research on general reading and writing abilities.

Table 1.

*Correlations between predictor variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 WIAT-III</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 GMAT - 4</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.524**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 SS grades</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.649**</td>
<td>.485**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Remediation</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.335*</td>
<td>.353*</td>
<td>.341*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Afterschool</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.452**</td>
<td>-.477**</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 H. knowledge</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.326*</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**.Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

**.Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**
Results also indicated no significant relationships present between WIAT-III (r = .096, p > .05), GMAT-4 (r = -.091, p > .05), social studies grades (r = -.089, p > .05), or prior historical knowledge (r = .146, p > .05) when the two instructional conditions were compared, suggesting that students were comparable in terms of reading/writing ability, and social studies knowledge before the start of instruction.

**Regression analysis**

To understand how these predictors affected performance multiple regression techniques were used to investigate the role of reading/writing ability, social studies and historical knowledge, and instruction on the two criterion measures at pre-and posttest. Table 2 summarizes the model-building process for historical writing that accounts for students’ reading/writing ability, content knowledge, and instructional variables before the start of the investigation.

*Model 1.* This model displays reading and writing ability: WIAT-III, GMAT-4, and PSSA English/Language Arts.

*Model 2.* This model added social studies and content knowledge, specifically prior historical knowledge, and report card grades in social studies.

*Model 3* This model added instructional condition, and level of remediation, and participation in afterschool reading and writing programs.
Table 2.
Regression models investigating the role of general reading and writing ability, historical knowledge, and instruction on historical reading and writing measures prior to the start of the investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Historical Knowledge</th>
<th>Historical Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.47 (2.33)</td>
<td>3.18 (2.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading &amp; writing ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSSA-R</td>
<td>-.001 (.002)</td>
<td>-.001 (.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMAT-4</td>
<td>.649 (.311)**</td>
<td>.695 (.321)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIAT-III</td>
<td>.003 (.031)</td>
<td>.014 (.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies grades</td>
<td>-.141 (.375)</td>
<td>.142 (.379)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior knowledge</td>
<td>-.372 (.431)</td>
<td>-.394 (.430)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of remediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterschool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .10, ** p < .05
As outlined in the method section, historical writing was determined by the analytic quality of students’ essays. Model 3 proved to be the best fitting model tested accounting for nearly 40% of the explained variation (F = 2.411, p < .05). However, only level of remediation outside of the investigation had a significant effect on students’ historical writing scores prior to instruction. On control for the other variables in the model, the unstandardized regression coefficient (β) for level of remediation was 2.327 (t = 2.39, p = .024). This suggested that students who received one supplemental period (30 minutes) of reading/writing instruction once per day, as opposed to twice (60 minutes), scored an average of 2.33 points higher on their historical thinking essays prior to instruction. Similarly, for each one-point change in participation in afterschool reading/writing programs, there was an associated 1.31 change in performance on the historical writing measure. Accounting for the influence of reading/writing ability, social studies and historical knowledge, instructional condition, the level of remediation students received, and participation in afterschool reading/writing programs were the best predictors of historical writing ability prior to instruction. To summarize, Table 2 displays the model-building process using the historical knowledge assessment as the outcome measure. Here, the baseline model accounted for 16% of variance (F = 7.106, p < .05). The addition of social studies knowledge in Model 2, or instruction in Model 3 did not significantly change the overall variation explained (R² = .179, p > .05; R² = .195, p > .05 respectively). As predicted, GMAT-4 had the most significant effect on historical knowledge (t = 2.64, p = .012). On control for other variables, a one-point change in GMAT-4 was associated with a .56 change in performance on the historical knowledge measure before the start of instruction.

**Posttest**

Table 3 summarizes the model-building process explaining performance on historical writing at posttest while accounting for students’ reading and writing ability, social studies knowledge, and instruction. Model 1 displays the simple effect of reading/writing ability. The association explained 18% of the variation in historical writing, and indicated that general reading and writing ability did not have a significant impact on performance (F = 2.38, p > .05). Similarly, the inclusion of content knowledge to the model explained an additional 5% of variation, suggesting that students’ prior knowledge and social studies grades (F = 1.88, p > .05) were not significant factors in students’ ability to craft historical essays.

Model 3 tested the individual contributions of instruction both in and outside the investigation. The addition of the three instructional variables resulted in a significant change in overall variation (ΔR² = .200, p < .05) and therefore proved to be the most robust model (F = 15.35, p < .05). On control for the other variables, only instructional approach had a significant effect on students’ historical writing (B = -2.17, p = < .05), indicating that students in the experimental groups scored 2.17 points higher on their historical essays than students in comparison groups after instruction ended. These findings underscore that learning and focused practice, using historically-related schemes and critical questions in small group discussions, appears to enhance the historical writing of struggling learners. Perhaps the most important finding was that level of remediation, and participation in afterschool programs did not have a significant influence on students’ historical writing performance at posttest. These two findings suggest that for the participants in this study at posttest, the methods of instructional support chosen for use in this study were more critical to student success than the other remedial or supportive services.
Table 3. Regression models investigating the role of general reading and writing ability, historical knowledge, and instruction (both in- and outside the investigation) on historical reading and writing measures at posttest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Historical Knowledge</th>
<th>Historical Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.05 (1.77)</td>
<td>-.305 (1.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading &amp; writing ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSSA-R</td>
<td>.001 (.001)</td>
<td>.001 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMAT-4</td>
<td>.333 (.235)</td>
<td>.329 (.235)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIAT-III</td>
<td>.039 (.023)</td>
<td>.061 (.026)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies grades</td>
<td>-.480 (.275)</td>
<td>-.559 (.289)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior knowledge</td>
<td>.013 (.316)</td>
<td>.146 (.328)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion condition</td>
<td>-.250 (.305)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of remediation</td>
<td>.507 (.328)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterschool</td>
<td>-.013 (.354)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.436***</td>
<td>.484***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.436***</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .10, ** p < .05, *** p < .001
Table 3 also summarizes the model-building process using the historical knowledge measure after instruction ended as the outcome measure. The baseline predictors together explained almost 44% of variance in student’s historical knowledge (F = 9.02, p < .001). Although the addition of prior historical knowledge accounted for a minimal change in the overall variation explained (ΔR² = .048) in Model 2, the increase was significant (F = 6.18, p < .001). This finding aligns with the literature on prior knowledge, and suggested that students who had stronger background knowledge before the start of instruction retained more information about the four historical topics than students with less background knowledge. Finally, WIAT-III scores also became significant predictors (B = .061, p < .05). Model 3 was the best fitting model helping to explain 53% of the overall variance in students’ historical knowledge (F = 4.25, p < .05). However, controlling for other variables in the model, none of the eight predictors had a significant effect on reading comprehension in Model 3.

**Discussion**

In summary, these results indicated that involvement in more intensive reading/writing support outside of the investigation was the most reliable predictor of performance among struggling readers and writers. Each research question is examined below.

Research Question 1: What are the unique predictors of pre-instructional performance on historical reading and writing measures among middle school students who are either identified with or at-risk for reading and writing difficulties?

Although the findings related to the unique predictors of discipline-specific reading/writing ability were consistent with those reported in the literature (National Center for Education Statistics, 2005), the more important question was to address whether struggling readers/writers were capable of learning schemes and critical questions, and integrating them into historical reading and writing activities. In that regard, this study does reinforce previous findings suggesting that the use of specified teaching methods positively effects student outcomes in historical writing (Joanssen & Kim, 2010; Wissinger & DeLa Paz, 2015).

We also found no evidence that students obtained reliably different outcomes due to instructional approach, however, students writing ability, was a significant predictor of historical knowledge. These findings are also consistent with those reported in the literature (Bangert-Drowns, Hurley, & Wilkinson, 2004). Even among struggling learners, students who possessed more advanced skills in writing outperformed their peers. To summarize, students who entered the investigation with stronger background knowledge and writing skills were more successful in developing the advanced literacy skills needed to read historical source documents for understanding.

Research Question 2: Does the relationship between overall reading and writing ability, historical knowledge, and performance on discipline-specific historical reading and writing measures vary as a function of the types of discussions that occur in social studies classrooms?

The analysis of the historical writing measure indicated that instructional methods were the most significant predictor of historical writing quality at the end of the six-week investigation. This finding reinforces and extends previous findings related to diverse learners and those with low to average writing abilities (De La Paz, 2005; De La Paz & Felton, 2010). The inclusion of all three
instruction variables resulted in a 20% increase in variance explained, however, only instructional approach was significant. This suggest that students who struggle with basic reading and writing activities, and perform poorly in social studies are able to learn and write about historically-related schemes and critical questions with appropriate scaffolding, and focused practice in discussion.

Conclusions

Developing advanced literacy skills is critical to the educational and employment success of our youth. Unfortunately, although we know enough to improve disciplinary literacy skills in our schools (Carnegie Council on Advancing Adolescent Literacy, 2010), much less is understood about how discipline-specific instruction in the social studies and history can be shaped to meet the unique needs of struggling learners. This study identified one approach that had a significant impact on the development of historical reading/writing skills among diverse learners who have traditionally struggled in the classroom. This suggests that given the right instructional conditions, it is quite possible to help adolescents with significant reading limitations acquire the advanced literacy skills needed to read and write in historically-valued ways. These findings must be interpreted cautiously given the brevity of the study (i.e., 6-weeks), however, the findings do point out the benefits teaching students to interpret, critique, and produce written texts in ways that align with critical standards, and to learn more deeply the subject matter and practices of the historical community.
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