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Abstract

The field of education has recognized the importance of disciplinary literacy in middle and high school classroom instruction. In order to prepare teacher candidates to teach discipline specific literacy skills, teacher preparation programs must address their preconceived beliefs and attitudes regarding literacy instruction. This multiple case study examined changes in four teacher candidates’ understandings, beliefs, and attitudes about teaching social studies through a disciplinary literacy approach over the course of their three semester secondary social studies cohort experience. Findings show that for teacher preparation programs to change teacher candidate’s beliefs and attitudes, the following must be considered: (a) prior knowledge; (b) modeled historical thinking activities; (c) explicit disciplinary literacy instruction; (d) practice in the field; and (e) student-teacher relationships. These findings could have implications for teacher preparation programs, or professional development for middle or high school teachers, with the intent to improve teachers’ understandings, beliefs, and attitudes regarding disciplinary literacy. Further research is needed to study the lasting impacts of such teacher preparation programs on graduates’ classroom instruction.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In 2013, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) released *Social Studies for the Next Generation: Purposes, Practices, and Implications of the College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies Standards*. Acknowledging current tendencies in social studies education “to favor breadth over depth, or factual minutia over understanding” (Lee & Swan, 2013, p. xxi), the *C3 Framework* looks to “re-envision the purpose and instructional practices of social studies education” (p. vii). Literacy instruction is essential to this process. NCSS has declared that, “disciplinary literacy is necessary for success in social studies subjects and is an essential component of the preparation of students for college, career, and civic life” (Lee & Swan, 2013, p. xxvi). This study addresses the role of teacher education in re-envisioning the purposes and practices of social studies education. I conducted a study designed to examine changes in teacher candidates’ beliefs and attitudes about teaching social studies at the secondary level through a disciplinary literacy approach. In this chapter, I examine the problem, state my research questions, and define essential terms. I then offer my theoretical framework, my researcher biases, and note the significance of the study.

Problem Statement

There is an overall reluctance amongst middle and high school teachers to integrate literacy into their content instruction (Alger, 2009; O’Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995). Summarizing the research on the topic, Draper (2002) observed, “content-area teachers believe that (a) it is someone else’s responsibility to teach reading and writing, (b) they lack the ability and/or training to teach reading and writing, and/or (c) they do not have the time to provide literacy instruction along with their full content curriculum” (p. 357-358). Traditionally, middle
and high school teachers place importance on content transmission (Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001). Such traditional approaches to content instruction do not support literacy instruction (Alger, 2007; O’Brien et al., 1995), viewing literacy as an optional set of strategies existing outside of the context of the content (Alger, 2007; Cadiero-Kaplan & Smith, 2002).

Disciplinary literacy challenges traditional approaches to content instruction by viewing reading and writing as “contextually dependent practices” (Buehl, 2011, p. 13); thus, literacy cannot be viewed as optional. Such a change in thinking would impact teacher preparation programs. As Johnson and Watson (2010), and Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) noted, in order for middle and high school teachers to teach complex, discipline specific literacy skills in classrooms, teacher preparation programs must prepare them to do so. However, as previously noted, research shows that traditional approaches used in classrooms do not emphasize literacy. Moreover, teacher candidates’ experiences as students in traditionally taught content classes can hinder their willingness to view literacy as essential to teaching in the content areas (Holt-Reynolds, 1992). Hence, in order to prepare teacher candidates to teach discipline specific literacy skills, teacher preparation programs are faced with the challenge of addressing teacher candidates’ preconceived attitudes and beliefs regarding literacy instruction.

**Research Questions**

This study examined changes in teacher candidates’ beliefs and attitudes about teaching social studies through a disciplinary literacy approach over the course of their three semester secondary social studies cohort experience. The following questions guided this study:
1. How do teacher candidates describe their understandings of social studies literacy over the course of their cohort experience?

2. How do teacher candidates describe their beliefs and attitudes towards teaching social studies literacy over the course of their cohort experience?

3. How do teacher candidates describe attributing factors to changes in their understandings of, and beliefs and attitudes towards, social studies literacy?

**Defining Terms**

A number of key terms were central to this research. For this reason, I identified definitions for each that provided structure and confines when analyzing the data and reporting findings. The following definitions were used for this research:

**Literacy**

Literacy has been defined in many ways (Draper, 2002). For this study, I employed Irvin, Buehl, and Klemp’s (2007) definition of literacy as any reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, representing, or thinking event. However, I chose to omit viewing and representing on survey questions as I felt they required explanation that I could not provide at the time surveys were completed.

**Disciplinary Literacy**

Educators have not yet agreed upon a clear definition of disciplinary literacy or its implications for classroom instruction, curriculum design, and teacher education. Heller and Greenleaf (2007) suggested that the goal of content instruction should be to “introduce
students to the ways in which experts in the core academic disciplines look at the world, investigate it, and communicate to one another about what they see and learn” (p. 11). While Heller and Greenleaf (2007) did not use the term disciplinary literacy, I believe their description of the role of literacy in the content areas reflects the essence of disciplinary literacy. Disciplinary literacy targets the complex and specific literacy skills of each discipline by emphasizing the knowledge and abilities possessed by those who create, communicate, and use knowledge within the disciplines (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012).

**Social Studies Literacy**

Literacy skills specific to the discipline of social studies are considered social studies literacies. For this study, and in adherence to NCSS, the term social studies literacy encompassed the specific literacy skills needed to understand, create, and communicate knowledge in civics, economics, geography and history and recognize that social studies also includes psychology, sociology, and anthropology.

In the *C3 Framework* (2013), NCSS identified specific social studies literacies “essential for success in college, career, and civic life,” and categorized these literacies as either “inquiry” or “disciplinary literacy” (p. xxiii). C3 inquiry literacies include: (a) questioning; (b) selecting sources; (c) gathering information from sources; (d) evaluating sources; (e) making claims; (f) using evidence; (g) constructing arguments and explanations; (h) adapting arguments and explanations; (i) presenting arguments and explanations; (j) critiquing arguments and explanations; (k) analyzing social problems; (l) assessing options for action; and (m) taking
informed action. C3 disciplinary literacies include: (a) using deliberative processes; (b) participating in school settings; (c) following rules; (d) making economic decisions; (e) using economic data; (f) identifying prices in a market; (g) reasoning spatially; (h) constructing maps; (i) using geographical data; (j) classifying historical sources; (k) determining the purpose of a historical source; and (l) analyzing cause and effect in history.

**Historical Thinking and Reading Like a Historian**

In 2001, Wineburg explored the concept of historical thinking by asking, “What is it exactly that historians do when they ‘read historically?’” (p. xii). Wineburg, Martin, and Monte-Sano (2011) further developed these ideas for classroom use in middle and high schools by creating classroom lessons that utilized social studies literacy skills when analyzing selected primary and secondary sources (Wineburg et al., 2011). In social studies education, the phrases *historical thinking* and *reading like a historian* are used to describe a framework for middle and high school students to use when analyzing historical documents. Students are often prompted to read like a detective and utilize the following skills: questioning, sourcing, contextualization, close reading, and corroboration. I considered these skills, and the inquiry and disciplinary literacy skills identified by NCSS, to be social studies literacies.

**Literacy Skill**

The terms *skill* and *strategy* are used inconsistently throughout the field of education (Afflerbach, Pearson & Scott, 2008). The ambiguity is increased when we consider the various types of skills and strategies encompassed by the broad category of *literacy*. Afflerbach et al.
(2008) clarified the differences between reading skills and reading strategies. I will apply their definitions when defining literacy skill, literacy strategy, and literacy instruction.

Skills are acquired, automatic actions that can be enhanced with practice (Afflerbach et al., 2008). Considering Irvin, Buehl, and Klemp’s (2007) definition of literacy, I embraced the concept of literacy skills as the acquired, automatic actions that take place when reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, representing, or thinking. I consider the literacies outlined in the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013), Reading Like a Historian (Wineburg et al., 2011), and Thinking Like a Historian (Wineburg, 2001) disciplinary literacy skills of the social studies.

**Literacy Strategy**

Strategies are actions deliberately applied to improve skills (Afflerbach et al., 2008). The goal is for users to find strategies that work and to apply them regularly to the point where it is “effortless and automatic” (Afflerbach et al, 2008, p. 368). Afflerbach et al. (2008) noted that strategies represent intention, whereas well practiced skills are “executed in the same manner across situations” (p. 368). When applying a strategy, the user negotiates “the goal, the means, and the path to connect them... in every situation” (Afflerbach et al., 2008, p. 368). I defined literacy strategies as deliberate actions applied for the purpose of improving literacy skills (automatic actions that take place when reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, responding, or thinking).
Literacy Instruction

Afflerbach et al. (2008) described reading instruction in a way that I believe applies to the broader sense of literacy instruction. Emphasizing the need for explicit instruction regarding both skills and strategies, Afflerbach et al. (2008) acknowledged that skills are acquired by the effective use of strategies. Afflerbach et al. (2008) described the reading instruction process as follows:

Reading instruction can follow a regular cycle of modeling, explaining, and guiding (all features of learning strategies) that leads to independent practice and fluency. If practice does not lead to fluency then more diagnostic and strategic teaching is warranted. Once the strategy has been learned and transformed into a fluent skill, teachers should introduce more challenging strategies and texts (p. 370).

I believe this process can be used to teach all literacy strategies. An essential element in this description of instruction is diagnostic teaching, which I equated to assessment. Ongoing assessment enables teachers to introduce strategies that are appropriate for students’ individual skills development (Afflerbach et al., 2008).

To truly define literacy instruction as applied in this study, the distinction of disciplinary literacy must be addressed. The goal of disciplinary literacy instruction is for students to have opportunities to engage in the knowledge production and communication unique to each discipline (Buehl, 2011; Moje, 2010/2011). Based upon the work regarding disciplinary literacy by Buehl (2011), Moje (2010/2011), Johnson and Watson (2010), and Shanahan and Shanahan (2008), and the work in literacy instruction by Heller and Greenleaf (2007) and Afflerbach et al.
(2008), I identified competencies that I believe are necessary for disciplinary literacy instruction. To provide disciplinary literacy instruction, teachers must be able to (a) identify the discipline specific literacy skills appropriate for their teaching context; (b) identify strategies that will enhance these skills; (c) design instructional plans that foster skills development through a cycle of modeling, explaining, guiding, and assessing, and; (d) effectively implement these plans in their classrooms.

Theoretical Framework

Given my interest in change in teacher candidate’s beliefs and attitudes, I looked to the social sciences to provide the definitions and framework to define my research. Lewin’s (1947a) three-step change model contributed to my overall theoretical framework for this study. Lewin’s model has been heavily utilized throughout the social sciences as a way to determine the variables that impact human behavior (Schein, 1996). It is important to note that Lewin (1947a; 1947b) spoke in terms of human behaviors. The three-step change model does not provide solid definitions of the terms belief or attitude. Rokeach’s (1968) comprehensive definitions of belief and attitude provide the specificity needed to explore my research questions. In order to fully explain my theoretical framework, I will first explore Rokeach’s (1968) definitions of belief and attitude and then apply these definitions to Lewin’s (1947a) three-step change model.

Rokeach (1968) broadly defined beliefs as “inferences made by an observer about underlying states of expectancy” (p. 2). Since a belief itself cannot be directly observed, its existence must be inferred from a person’s actions (Rokeach, 1968). These actions are human
behaviors, such as spoken words and physical actions. Not all beliefs equally impact behavior. An individual possesses a multitude of beliefs that impact their behavior at varying levels (Rokeach, 1968). Therefore, in order to study the beliefs that lead to particular behaviors, one must look at attitude. An attitude is a “relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner” (Rokeach, 1968, p. 112). Observable human behaviors occur as a result of the cognitive and affective properties of the beliefs comprising the attitude. Thus, when applying Lewin’s (1947a) model to identify variables impacting behavior, beliefs and attitudes are some of the variables. Overall, it is important to remember that behaviors, our words and actions, are a result of our beliefs and attitudes. In order to understand behaviors, we must understand the beliefs and attitudes directing them.

According to Lewin (1947a), when considering how to create change in human behavior, “one should not think in terms of ‘the goal to be reached’ but rather in terms of a change ‘from the present level to the desired one’” (p. 32). In doing so, the total circumstances have to be examined in order to determine and analyze forces working to promote and hinder a behavior (Lewin, 1947a). Forces that promote change by pushing an individual in the desired direction are considered driving forces. Forces hindering change are considered restraining forces (Schein, 1996). My goal was to examine the “total circumstances” surrounding teacher candidates, including the forces that drive and hinder change. Working within the framework that teacher candidates’ beliefs and attitudes significantly contribute to their behaviors, examining candidates’ beliefs and attitudes identified driving and restraining forces towards change.
Step 1: Unfreezing

Lewin (1947a) described social norms and habits as an equilibrium between driving and restraining forces; otherwise called a “force field.” In order for change to occur, the existing force field maintaining an individual’s behaviors must be dismantled (Lewin, 1947a; Schein, 1996). Thus, the first phase in Lewin’s (1947a) three-step change model is to “unfreeze” the existing habit or social custom. This unfreezing can be achieved by increasing driving forces, decreasing restraining forces, or a combination of the two (Kritsonis, 2004-2005; Schein, 1996).

This is not a simple process. Lewin (1947a) and Schein (1996) emphasized the discomfort experienced by individuals when social norms and habits are challenged. Schein (1996) asserted that “all forms of learning and change start with some form of dissatisfaction or frustration generated by data that disconfirm our expectation or hopes” (p. 60). Individuals must accept the disconfirming data as valid and relevant in order for the driving force of “survival anxiety” necessary for change to be felt (Schein, 1996, p. 60). Hindering this process is “learning anxiety,” or “the feeling that if we allow ourselves to enter a learning change process... we will lose our effectiveness, our self-esteem, and maybe even our identity” (Schein, 1996, p. 60). Ideally, the coursework and experiences provided through a teacher preparation program are meant to be driving forces to unfreeze teacher candidates’ force fields. In addition, teacher candidates are presented with data meant disconfirm unwanted previous assumptions about teaching and learning and confirm wanted assumptions. At the same time, the program should also be providing support and “psychological safety” to allow teacher candidates to
“accept the information, feel the survival anxiety, and be motivated to change” (Schein, 1996, p. 61).

**Step 2: Movement**

The second phase requires “movement” to the desired level of behavior (Lewin, 1947a). Once an individual has become unfrozen, or motivated to change, they may be able to entertain new perspectives (Schein, 1996). However, unfreezing does not equate change. Rather, it creates the conditions necessary for change to be possible. Moreover, unfreezing does not predict or control the direction of the change (Lewin, 1947a; Schein 1996). Assuming a teacher preparation program is able to unfreeze teacher candidates’ beliefs and attitudes, candidates should experience movement towards new behaviors. The nature of those new behaviors is influenced by driving and restraining forces.

**Step 3: Freezing**

Lastly, to achieve permanency the new force field requires “freezing”, or balancing the driving and restraining forces holding it in place (Lewin, 1947a). This is an essential step that needs to occur after the change takes place in order for the change to be sustained overtime (Kristonis, 2004-2005). This step ensures that new behaviors are integrated as habit and social norm. In a teacher preparation program, the freezing would be evident in the teacher candidate’s planning and instruction.
Volition

While Lewin’s (1947a) change theory provides a useful framework for categorizing and labeling aspects change within a teacher preparation program, I found that it did not fully address the significance of volition, or intrinsic motivation to change. Piaget (1952) addressed volition when explaining the roles of assimilation and accommodation in belief change. He proposed that beliefs change occurs when individuals, through interaction with their environment, become dissatisfied with existing beliefs and respond by assimilating and accommodating new experiences into existing cognitive frameworks (Sosu & Gray, 2012). Schema refers to the building block of intelligent behavior, a way of organizing information to make sense of the world. Assimilation refers to the adapting a new idea or concept to fit within an existing schema. Accommodation involves altering existing schema to adapt to a new ideas or concept. Cognitive development involves an ongoing attempt to find balance between one’s environment and the mind, or balance between assimilation and accommodation. (Flavell, 1996).

Lewin (1947a) claimed that this cognitive balance needed to be disrupted, or unfrozen, for change to occur. However, he did not address the need for the individual to commit to change. Piaget noted, “everything that answers a need for the organism is material for assimilation” (1952). Sometimes this need is necessary for survival, thus prompting a necessity for assimilation. In other circumstances, basic survival is not tied to assimilation; such is the case with teacher preparation. In this situation, change is tied to teacher candidates’ intrinsic desire to assimilate or accommodate new ideas. Thus, while a teacher preparation programs
can foster an environment that unfreezes social norms, change requires intrinsic motivation that can only come from the teacher candidate.

The Social Field

One cannot look at changes in personal beliefs and attitudes without acknowledging the social structures that impact us. Lewin (1947a; 1947b) recognized that individuals reside within social groups and that the social norms, or status quo, determined by the group greatly impacts an individual’s behavior. To change a social equilibrium, “the constellation of the social field as a whole has to be studied and so reorganized that social events flow differently” (Lewin, 1947a, p. 32). According the Lewin (1947a; 1947b) when an individual is part of a group, that individual is constrained by the overall value systems of the group. In order for an individual to change, the overall value systems of the group must be changed. This impacts all three levels of Lewin’s (1947a) change model. Candidates in a teacher preparation program are members of a variety of social groups that impact individual behaviors and each of these social groups could impact behaviors in a number of ways.

Researcher Perspectives

My experiences as a high school social studies and reading teacher led me to develop the belief that strong, discipline specific literacy instruction was needed in high school content area classrooms. My experiences leading professional development sessions targeting literacy instruction in the content areas resulted in my opinion that too many teachers were ill prepared to deliver such instruction. These experiences led me to my doctoral studies. I wanted to further my own understanding of literacy instruction and to help teacher candidates
incorporate literacy instruction in the content areas. At the onset of my studies, I was introduced to the concept of disciplinary literacy. The guiding principles behind disciplinary literacy immediately resonated with my beliefs about teaching and learning. The more I read, the more optimistic I became about the future of education. As a doctoral student at the university in which this study was conducted, I have had the opportunity to teach secondary and middle level social studies methods courses, as well as a middle level disciplinary literacy course. These experiences, and my review of research on the topic, have further solidified my belief that all teachers should teach through a disciplinary literacy approach. I am of the opinion that teacher education coursework must explicitly emphasize the significant role literacy plays in content acquisition and understanding. Additionally, I believe teacher candidates should understand the literacies unique to their disciplines and be able to support students’ development of such literacies.

Significance of the Study

There is currently limited research regarding how a teacher education course specifically addressing disciplinary literacy might impact teacher candidates’ beliefs and attitudes about teaching literacy. This study adds to the general body of knowledge in this field by providing in-depth qualitative data regarding changes in teacher candidates’ beliefs and attitudes over the course of their three semester secondary social studies cohort in a teacher preparation program. Using a multiple case study design, I provide rich, in-depth descriptions of the lived experiences that have impacted participants’ understandings, beliefs, and attitudes about learning and teaching social studies literacy. This data could inform university instructors and
program coordinators as they plan and design teacher education coursework. Ultimately, improved teacher preparation programs would increase teacher efficacy for literacy instruction and in turn result in improved education for students.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Incorporating Disciplinary Literacy into Teacher Preparation Programs

Literacy instruction for students at the middle and high school levels needs to improve (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010; Fisher & Ivey, 2005; Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012). In 2009, Wise observed an increase in the literacy rates of elementary students over the previous 30 years. However, during the same period literacy rates amongst adolescents (middle and high school students) had remained stagnant (Wise, 2009). To better understand this phenomenon, one must compare both the academic literacy demands of elementary and adolescent students and the type of instructional support they receive. Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) demonstrated that as students advance through middle and high school the literacy skills required of them become more complex, more technical, more discipline specific, and less generalizable, compared to the basic and highly generalizable skills taught in the elementary grades. Yet, advancement in grade level coincides with declining literacy support in the classroom, where rare occurrences of literacy instruction are often relegated to the general reading strategies associated with content literacy (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008).

In order for adolescents to acquire the complex, discipline specific literacy skills required to raise their literacy rates, they must be provided with instructional support. Moreover, literacy support cannot be left to reading and language arts teachers alone (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010). Support must come from content area teachers, as they are best suited to provide discipline specific instruction (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010). Therefore, middle and high school teachers must be prepared to teach the literacy skills specific to their discipline areas.
Traditionally, middle and high school teachers have been educated to conduct literacy instruction from a content literacy, or content reading approach. Content literacy research dates back to the work of Harold Herber in the 1970s and is focused on cognitive strategies for text processing (Moje, 2007). Through this lens, literacy instruction is viewed as a set of skills or tools to be applied across content areas (Moje, 2007; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012). However, it has been argued that this emphasis on elementary level skills fails to acknowledge the increased literacy demands of middle and high school content (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010), nor the “perspectives, purposes, or constraints faced by content-area teachers” (Fisher & Ivey, 2005, p. 5).

At the same time, research has revealed an overall reluctance amongst middle and high school teachers to integrate literacy into their content instruction (Alger, 2009; O’Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995). Generally, middle and high school teachers place importance on content transmission and relegate reading instruction to the elementary level (Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001). Traditional approaches to content instruction do not support literacy instruction (Alger, 2007; O’Brien et al., 1995), viewing literacy as an optional set of strategies existing outside of the context of the content (Alger, 2007; Cadiero-Kaplan & Smith, 2002). Additionally, an overemphasis on textbook reading causes students to view reading as boring which causes teachers to circumvent reading assignments (Fisher & Ivey, 2005). Furthermore, teacher candidates’ beliefs about teaching, resulting from their experiences as students in traditionally taught content classes, can hinder their willingness to view literacy as essential to teaching in the content areas (Holt-Reynolds, 1992).
Recent research in literacy instruction suggests a movement away from a content literacy approach towards a disciplinary literacy approach, promoting the specific literacy practices privileged in given disciplines (Fang & Shleppegrell, 2010; Draper 2008; Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012). The fields of content literacy and disciplinary literacy have different approaches to literacy learning and thus do not share the same guiding principles (Moje, 2008). Shanahan & Shanahan (2012) summarize these differences as follows:

Content area literacy focuses on study skills that can be used to help students learn from subject matter specific texts. Disciplinary literacy, in contrast, is an emphasis on the knowledge and abilities possessed by those who create, communicate, and use knowledge within the disciplines. (p. 8)

The goal of disciplinary literacy is for students to have opportunities to engage in the knowledge production and communication utilized in the disciplines (Buehl, 2011; Moje, 2010/2011). Transitioning from a content literacy to a disciplinary literacy approach in middle and high school education would require changes in how educators teach and are prepared to teach. Disciplinary literacy views reading and writing as “contextually dependent practices” (Buehl, 2011, p. 13); thus, literacy cannot be viewed as a generic set of skills or tools. In order to identify these contextually dependent practices, Moje (2008) encouraged educators to “examine and challenge what it means to learn in the...disciplines (p. 99), arguing that such a change in thinking may lead to a more compelling argument for teaching literacy in the content areas.
Such a change in thinking would impact teacher preparation programs. As Johnson & Watson (2010) and Shanahan & Shanahan (2008) noted, in order for middle and high school teachers to teach complex, discipline specific literacy skills in classrooms, teacher preparation programs must prepare them to do so. However, before such teacher preparation can occur, additional research needs to address the following questions: (a) What are the literacy skills utilized by members of disciplinary communities? (b) How can teacher preparation programs best prepare middle and high school teacher candidates to teach literacy in their discipline? (c) How can these skills be taught in middle and high school social studies classrooms? (d) Will a disciplinary literacy approach to teaching increase literacy learning for adolescent students? (e) Will a disciplinary approach to literacy instruction in teacher education classes lead to increased teacher implementation?

This review of literature examines the existing research regarding disciplinary literacy in order to provide a framework for constructing disciplinary literacy components of middle and high school teacher preparation programs with a specific focus on social studies. The ultimate goal is to enable teachers to increase the literacy abilities of adolescent students.

Search Strategy

This study was designed to survey the existing research in the field of disciplinary literacy related to the framing of disciplinary literacy components of middle and high school teacher preparation programs with a specific focus on social studies. The body of data consisted of empirical studies reported in peer-review journal articles between 2002 and 2012. The search was limited to articles published in English.
An electronic search was conducted using the online databases Academic Search Complete, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), Education Full Text, Teacher Reference Center, Education Research Complete, and PsychINFO. I conducted the search using the terms *disciplinary literacy* and *content literacy* as all text search criteria. The results of this search were narrowed based upon a review of abstracts to determine relevance to my topic. Relevance was determined based upon an abstract’s perceived coherence with one or more of my research purpose questions: (a) What are the literacy skills utilized by members of disciplinary communities? (b) How can teacher preparation programs best prepare middle and high school teacher candidates to teach literacy in their discipline? (c) How can these skills be taught in middle and high school social studies classrooms? (d) Will a disciplinary literacy approach to teaching increase literacy learning for adolescent students? (e) Will a disciplinary approach to literacy instruction in teacher preparation classes lead to increased teacher implementation? The references of these articles were then reviewed to identify additional articles based upon the same criteria. As a result, 25 studies were identified.

**Analysis Procedures**

My analysis of the 25 articles included in this review was guided by four research questions:

1. What research problem was examined in each study?
2. What theory (or theories) framed the work?
3. What methodologies were used to conduct the investigation?
4. What were the study’s major findings?
A synthesis of research findings regarding disciplinary literacy may be useful to a variety of groups – including middle school, secondary, and teacher candidate educators, curriculum specialists, and researchers. Middle and high school educators may find useful approaches to address the literacy demands of their disciplines. Teacher candidate educators may utilize this information to create discipline specific literacy courses, or content courses integrated with disciplinary literacy. Curriculum specialists might use this information to structure middle school and secondary level curriculum addressing the specific literacies of disciplines. Researchers can use the information to structure future studies to progress the field of disciplinary literacy. Ultimately, it is my hope that this review of literature furthers efforts to improve the literacy learning experiences of middle and high school students.

In the following sections, I provide the outcomes of this review which fell into three categories: defining literacy within the disciplines, preparing teacher candidates to teach literacy in the disciplines, and teaching disciplinary literacy in middle and high school classrooms. Within each category I discuss limitations, the significance of findings, and implications for teacher education and further research. I end with final conclusions.

Defining Literacy within the Disciplines

This review begins by examining the question What are the literacy skills utilized by members of disciplinary communities? Johnson and Watson (2011), Shanahan and Shanahan (2008), and Shanahan, Shanahan, and Misischia (2011) examined disciplinary literacy by looking at how experts – 15 university professors – utilized and defined literacy within their respective disciplines. All three studies used a qualitative approach consisting of interviews and
discussions with teacher educators and university professors representing specific disciplines. Johnson and Watson (2011) examined literacy in mathematics and geography. Shanahan and Shanahan (2008), and Shanahan, Shanahan, and Misischia (2011) examined literacy in mathematics, chemistry, and history and included additional insights from practicing secondary level teachers. These studies were driven by the following questions: How is knowledge constructed in a discipline? What are the literacy tools or skills required for such knowledge construction?

Johnson and Watson (2011) found that within geography, knowledge is constructed through inquiry and finding and describing patterns through time and space. Geographers ask questions derived from observed patterns to discover the processes that created the patterns. This requires one to examine the relationships between physical locations and the human actions occurring there, bridging the fields of human geography and physical geography. Knowledge in the field of mathematics also generates from inquiry and patterns; however, mathematicians find and generalize patterns (Johnson & Watson, 2011). Mathematics literacy involves understanding and interpreting numbers, graphs, and symbols (Johnson & Watson, 2011; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008) and recognizing the connections between them (Johnson & Watson, 2011). To be literate in mathematics, one must obtain an ability to logically think through an argument (Johnson and Watson, 2011) and be cognizant of precise word choice (Johnson & Watson, 2011; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Shanahan, Shanahan, & Misischia, 2011).
DISCIPLINARY LITERACY IN SOCIAL STUDIES

In chemistry, knowledge is created through experimentation and the generalization of outcomes based on experiment conditions; thus, understanding the details of experiments is important (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). Literacy in the field of chemistry involves visualization (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008) and the transformation of information from one form to another (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Shanahan, Shanahan, & Misischia, 2011).

Knowledge in history comes from document analysis (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). In history, reading is an interpretation of historical events (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008); thus the context and bias of both the author and reader must be considered (Shanahan, Shanahan, & Misischia, 2011). Literacy in history emphasizes critical analysis (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Shanahan, Shanahan, & Misischia, 2011) and the recognition of cause and effect relationships (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008).

Discussion

Findings from all three studies suggest that literacies within these disciplines (geography, mathematics, chemistry, and history) require interdisciplinary knowledge and utilize specialized critical thinking skills, texts, languages, and vocabularies. Although limited by quantity and the small number of disciplinary experts consulted, these studies demonstrate that practitioners in these disciplines construct knowledge through the use of different literacy skills. This suggests that in order for middle and high school students to become literate in the disciplines, teacher preparation programs should reflect the literacy skills and knowledge construction used by discipline experts (Johnson & Watson, 2011; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Shanahan, Shanahan, & Misischia, 2011).
With these finding in mind, one possible step in improving literacy instruction for middle and high school students is the creation of teacher education curricula based on the literacy practices used by discipline experts (Johnson & Watson, 2011; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). Such curricula should include greater emphasis on disciplinary expertise so that teachers understand how knowledge is constructed in their discipline and are adept at the literacy practices used to construct such knowledge (Johnson & Watson, 2011). Another possible step is the creation of middle and high school curricula focused on the literacy practices of each discipline. This would encourage teachers, and teacher educators, to promote knowledge construction in the classroom by utilizing literacy skills specific to each discipline. To promote such change, additional research involving identifying the specific literacies of disciplines must occur.

Preparing Teacher Candidates to Teach Literacy in the Disciplines

Teacher Educators

I identified three approaches taken to address the next research question: How can teacher preparation programs best prepare teacher candidates to teach literacy in their discipline? The first approach includes studies focused on teacher educators in teacher preparation programs. Draper, Broomhead, Jensen, and Nokes (2012) and Draper, Adair, Broomhead, Gray, Grierson, Hendrickson, Jensen, Nokes, Shumway, Siebert, and Wright (2011) utilized participatory action research as teacher educators collaborated to improve literacy instruction in their secondary teacher preparation programs. Wold, Young, and Risko (2011)
used quantitative and qualitative measures to identify the most influential qualities of literacy teacher educators in teacher preparation programs.

Draper et al. (2012) and Draper et al. (2011) reported on the individual experiences of members of the Literacy Study Group formed by teacher educators at Brigham Young University. The Literacy Study Group, comprised of a literacy teacher educator and secondary level teacher educators from various content areas (12-14 total), formed out of a shared desire to understand and clarify how literacy theories and instructional practices could be applied to individual content area teacher candidate preparation programs (Draper et al., 2012; Draper et al. 2011). Over the course of the four year collaboration, participants demonstrated changing conceptions of literacy in the disciplines, including broader notions of text and changes in teaching practices or expressed intent to change practices to include literacy in their methods courses (Draper et al., 2012; Draper et al. 2011).

Wold et al. (2011) created and conducted an online survey of 61 elementary (n=15) and secondary (n = 16) teachers identified as highly successful literacy teachers to solicit their notions of qualities of effective literacy teacher educators. Participants were generated from a list of teachers who had received teaching awards or grants from the International Reading Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, or the Chief State School Officers of the 50 states in the United States (Wold et al., 2011). Participants completed an online survey consisting of multiple choice and open ended questions inquiring about the qualities of an effective literacy teacher educator who impacted their practice (Wold et al., 2011). Semi-structured follow-up interviews were conducted via telephone to clarify responses (Wold et al.,
Results showed that mentoring qualities and interpersonal skills were the most critical qualities in teacher educators: with modeling instruction, building teacher candidate’s knowledge foundations, and using constructive feedback identified as the second most influential aspects (Wold et al., 2011).

Discussion

Draper et al. (2012) and Draper et al. (2011) demonstrated that peer collaboration amongst teacher educators can improve understandings of disciplinary literacy and increase its integration into teacher preparation instruction. Additionally, Wold et al (2011) showed that quality teaching practices in teacher preparation programs can influence the literacy instruction provided to elementary and secondary level students. These findings emphasize the importance of reflective teaching practices, where educators analyze their own teaching through personal reflection, peer and student feedback, and collaboration. In regards to teacher preparation programs, these findings suggest that peer collaboration amongst teacher educators could improve educator’s understandings of disciplinary literacy, and that teacher educators should be encouraged and supported to continually evaluate and improve their teaching practices in order to provide and model quality instruction for teacher candidates.

Facilitating Self Discovery

Olson and Truxaw (2009), Conley, Kerner, and Reynolds (2005), and Pytash (2012) explored the question How can teacher preparation programs best prepare teacher candidates to teach literacy in their discipline? by stressing the need for teacher candidates to understand
the correlation between literacy and content in the disciplines. With this goal in mind, these qualitative studies examined the results of teacher candidates’ participation in specifically designed assignments or experiences promoting self discovery regarding literacy instruction. The emphasis on self discovery required teacher candidates to actively discover aspects of literacy specific to their discipline by engaging with discipline specific texts and contexts. It should be noted that in each study the authors were the instructors of the teacher preparation courses in which the participants were enrolled. Therefore, results could have been influenced by the position of the researchers to impact the grades of the participants.

The assignments designed by Olson and Truxaw (2009) and Conley et al. (2005) emphasized authentic classroom experiences. Olson and Truxaw (2009) examined the development of 24 teacher candidates’ discursive metaknowledge regarding literacy instruction in science and mathematics by creating an experience where teacher candidates observed and analyzed the literacy demands embedded in classroom activities. Conley et al. (2005) also provided an authentic experience for teacher candidates (N = 125): a literacy-focused adolescent tutoring program within an existing teacher preparation program. However, Conley et al. (2005) included the realities of urban schooling as part of their emphasis. Both studies analyzed the participants’ written reflections regarding their experiences. Olson and Truxaw (2009) identified three categories of metaknowledge obtained by teacher candidates as a result of participation: (1) how textual authority shapes reading, (2) how literacy practices are dialogic, and (3) how literacy practices are contextual (Olson & Truxaw, 2009). Conley et al. (2005) found “numerous examples” of teacher candidates exploring adolescent literacy (p. 28), providing evidence that such an approach provided authentic opportunities for teacher
candidates to identify the literacy needs of students and then develop appropriate literacy practices based upon those needs within the complicated context of urban schools (Conley et al., 2005).

Pytash (2012) required 41 teacher candidates to identify the literacy practices unique to genres within their discipline and then write an original piece within that genre. Analysis of the following documents generated by teacher candidates provided data: questionnaires, correspondence with professionals, completed units of study, written reflections, and focus group interviews (Pytash, 2012). Pytash (2012) found that the completion of the assignment changed teacher candidates’ perceptions of how they would teach writing in their disciplines.

Discussion

As stated in the introduction, traditional content literacy courses presenting literacy instruction as a set of generic strategies has not been an effective vehicle for promoting quality literacy instruction. Fueled by this reality, the authors of these studies took a different approach and embraced the idea of disciplinary literacy. As a result, they found self discovery to be an effective way to further teacher candidates’ understandings about disciplinary literacy (Conley et al., 2005; Olson and Truxaw, 2009; Pytash, 2012). These findings suggest that teacher candidate education programs should incorporate authentic experiences where students involve themselves with disciplinary texts. However, given the limited quantity of studies addressing this concept, more research needs to be conducted to determine effectiveness and best practices.
Impacting Teacher Candidate Attitudes and Beliefs Regarding Disciplinary Literacy

The third approach to answering the question *How can teacher preparation programs best prepare teacher candidates to teach literacy in their discipline?* focused on the beliefs and attitudes of teacher candidates. Acknowledging that the beliefs and attitudes of teachers and teacher candidates heavily influence classroom instruction, the following studies were conducted to gain insights into the existing beliefs and attitudes of teacher candidates regarding disciplinary literacy (Gritter, 2010; Shaw, Barry, & Mahlions, 2008), determine possible reasons for such attitudes and beliefs (Lesley, Watson, & Elliot, 2007), and explore methods to alter them (Alger, 2007; Freedman & Carver, 2007; Nokes, 2010).

Utilizing different methods, Gritter (2010) and Shaw et al. (2008) used metaphors to describe teacher candidates’ beliefs about literacy instruction. Gritter (2010) interviewed ten teacher candidates to learn about their beliefs pertaining to the relationship between disciplinary knowledge, good disciplinary teaching, and how to best teach literacy in their discipline. Responses were analyzed for adherence to the following: Labaree’s (1996) distinction of *hard* versus *soft* and *pure* versus *applied* knowledge, O’Brien, Moje, and Stewart’s (2001) metaphors for teaching (teaching as telling and controlling, teaching as celebrating experience, and teaching as transforming and transgressing), and Scribner’s (1984) metaphors for literacy (literacy as adaptation, literacy as power, and literacy as a state of grace). Shaw et al. (2008) used Yamamoto, Hardcastle, Muehl, and Muehl’s (1990) questionnaire to identify metaphors that encapsulated the beliefs of 22 preservice secondary teachers. Participants were asked to select predetermined metaphors that best illustrated their beliefs about teaching and
to provide written responses explaining their selections (Shaw et al., 2008). A type-case model was used to identify overall metaphorical categories (Shaw et al., 2008).

Gritter’s (2010) results showed that teacher candidates generally held teacher centered notions of knowledge and teaching and regarded the transmission of specific sets of hard knowledge to students as the indicator of good teaching. However, participants tended to embrace literacy as a state of grace: a more student centered pedagogy regarding literacy within their disciplines (Gritter, 2010). In contrast, Shaw et al. (2008) found that most participants identified themselves as nurturers, who focused on providing an environment conducive to students’ learning. Additional popular metaphors included “guide”, emphasizing the teacher as a facilitator and acknowledging some level of student choice, and “promote learning”, emphasizing the need for students to become independent thinkers and accommodating various learning needs (Shaw et al., 2008).

Lesley (2011), Lesley, Watson, and Elliot (2007) and Alger (2007) also explored the attitudes and beliefs of teacher candidates. These studies engaged teacher candidates in literacy activities during teacher preparation classes in order to learn more about their identities as readers (Lesley, 2011; Lesley, Watson, and Elliot, 2007) or to challenge preconceived notions about literacy (Alger, 2007).

Lesley (2011) and Lesley et al. (2007) explored the idea that attitudes and behaviors towards required school reading influenced teacher candidates’ engagement in content literacy courses. Using Gee (2005) as a framework, Lesley (2011) focused on teacher candidate’s identities as readers and their Discourse models about reading and writing. Lesley et al. (2007)
looked at the metacognitive awareness of teacher candidates. Following Walker and Bean’s (2004) research regarding adolescent student engagement and multiple texts, Lesley et al. (2007) created and engaged her students in a thematic unit designed to present information about a set topic.

Using qualitative methods, Lesley (2011) analyzed written literacy narratives constructed by 114 teacher candidates at the beginning of their content literacy course. Lesley (2011) found that in general, the participants viewed literacy as (a) school related, (b) a skill that does not improve beyond elementary school, (c) an ability defined by standardized tests, (d) forced and boring, and (e) rarely used as a tool for exploration, creativity, or thinking. Lesley et al.’ (2007) examined classroom observation field notes, student researcher debriefing sessions, a follow-up focus group interview, and participant generated reader-responses (N = 47). The data was analyzed and coded around a predetermined set of cognitive strategies. Lesley et al. (2007) found that most of the participants relied on a limited number of metacognitive strategies with the majority not demonstrating metacognitive awareness; exhibiting characteristics of struggling readers. In addition, limited amounts of self-monitoring were observed, and over half of the participants engaged in pseudoreading practices (Lesley et al., 2007). A number of participants labeled themselves as nonreaders, and a number viewed reading as unnecessary to their content area (Lesley et al., 2007).

Alger’s (2007) work was framed by the idea that teaching is entrenched in a cycle influenced by the traditional factory model of education, which views literacy as a set of strategies and perpetuates white, middle class dominance. Attempting to break students out of
this cycle, Alger (2007) utilized themed literature circles addressing literacy and social justice in order to change teacher candidates’ entrenched beliefs about teaching. Sources of data included three different written assignments per participant. Of the 18 participants, 15 indicated that the experience had changed or added to their belief systems, and almost all of the participants indicated intent to take action and integrate content, literacy instruction, and social justice (Alger, 2007).

Freedman and Carver (2007) and Nokes (2010) designed teacher preparation courses that integrated the material taught in content methods courses with the content of literacy courses to emphasize the discipline specific nature of literacy instruction. The participants in Freedman and Carver’s (2007) study were 32 teacher candidates enrolled in integrated methods and content literacy courses in two separate semesters (n = 17; n = 15). Within this context, the authors examined how teacher candidates developed their understandings about their roles as teachers of literacy, and how the integration affected their moral and intellectual dimensions of teaching (Freedman & Carver, 2007). Nokes (2010) integrated literacy instruction into his social studies methods course and sought to discover if the integration promoted the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed for teacher candidates to provide literacy instruction in their future classrooms. Nokes (2010) collected data from 119 participants over the course of six consecutive semesters.

By analyzing a variety of participant written assignments using various coding systems, both studies showed that integrating content and literacy instruction increased teacher candidates’ understanding of disciplinary literacy and proclivity to teach it (Freedman & Carver,
2007; Nokes, 2010). Freedman and Carver (2007) discovered that deliberately linking the content of a general methods course and a content literacy course promoted deep and concrete thinking regarding adolescent literacy. Additionally, the focus on literacy in the methods course promoted more detailed thinking about the plan/teach/assess/reflect process (Freedman & Carver, 2007). The overwhelming majority of Nokes’ (2010) participants demonstrated a solid knowledge base of history specific literacy pedagogy, a disposition viewing disciplinary literacy instruction as important, an ability to critique the literacy instruction observed in field placements, and an intent to integrate content and literacy instruction in their future classrooms.

Discussion

These studies offer several implications for educating teacher candidates about disciplinary literacy. Lesley (2011) and Lesley et al. (2007) highlight major concerns regarding teacher preparation by illustrating a lack of metacognitive awareness, negative attitudes about reading, and narrow perceptions about reading amongst teacher candidates. As students advance through the ranks of schooling, the reading crisis spreads from high school to college. As Lesley et al. (2007) demonstrated, teacher candidates might themselves be struggling readers. Therefore, the literacy needs of college students must be addressed by answering the following questions: Are teacher candidates adequately literate in their disciplines? How are college instructors advancing the disciplinary literacy knowledge of their students? and, Are teacher candidates being supported as they gain literacy skills pertaining to the discipline of education and their content disciplines?
Nokes (2010) showed that discipline specific literacy instruction can have a positive impact on not only teacher candidates’ disposition towards literacy instruction, but also a positive impact on their knowledge regarding literacy in their discipline and literacy pedagogy relevant to their discipline. Additionally, Gritter (2010) identified that teacher candidates demonstrated more student centered tendencies when discussing literacy instruction as compared to content instruction. Taking into consideration Freedman and Carver’s (2007) findings, it appears that emphasis on literacy within the disciplines encourages teacher candidates to embrace student centered pedagogy. Alger (2007) offers additional support to this notion by demonstrating how a focus on literacy can promote notions of teaching for social justice.

It should be noted that Shaw et al.’s (2008) findings indicating that secondary teacher candidates viewed themselves as student-centered contradicted Gritter’s (2010) study. This reveals a limitation in that the instruments for data collection and demographics of the participants were not the same. One must consider the type of teacher education instruction received by all participants, as it may have influenced participants’ beliefs prior to the study. Also, in many of these studies the researchers were the participant’s instructors, warranting concerns that responses may have been skewed by the influence, or perceived influence, of the researchers on the participant’s grades.
Teaching Disciplinary Literacy in Middle and High School Classrooms

Characteristics of Effective Literacy Teachers

As previously stated, the purpose of this review is to provide a framework for constructing disciplinary focused literacy components of middle and high school teacher preparation programs. Having addressed the questions *What are the literacy skills utilized by members of disciplinary communities?* and *How can teacher preparation programs best prepare teacher candidates to teach literacy in their discipline?*, the next section address the questions *How can these skills be taught in middle and high school social studies classrooms?* and *Will a disciplinary literacy approach to teaching increased literacy learning for adolescent students?* In addressing this question, the following studies illustrate characteristics of effective literacy teachers in middle and secondary classrooms (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008; Sturtevant & Linek, 2003).

Cantrell and Callaway (2008) used a teacher efficacy framework when examining the interview responses of 16 sixth and ninth grade teachers who were participating in a year-long professional development program intended to help teachers embed literacy strategies into their content areas. As the purpose of the study was to identify factors that supported and inhibited content literacy, the participants were chosen for their high or low implementation of content literacy practices (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). Through cross case analysis, Sturtevant and Linek (2003) focused solely on content teachers who were considered high implementers of quality literacy instruction. Participants were nominated by administrators and vetted by researchers to ensure quality practices and representation across contents, grade level, and
community context. Sturtevant and Linek’s (2003) social constructivist approach sought to understand the perspectives and practices of nine participating teachers in grades sixth through twelve.

Though their approaches differed, Cantrell and Callaway (2008) and Sturtevant and Linek’s (2003) findings overlapped. Cantrell and Callaway (2008) found that all participants expressed concern about their ability to address the needs of struggling readers. However, high implementers of content literacy practices had a higher sense of general efficacy and greater persistence as compared to low implementers. Additionally, high implementers believed that all students could learn and that the teacher shared the responsibility of motivating students (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). Sturtevant and Linek (2003) found that quality content literacy teachers were strongly concerned about the needs of students, establishing relationships with students, and with their development into life-long learners. Additionally, their instruction was student centered and engaged students in thinking, problem solving and discussion (Sturtevant & Linek, 2003). In both studies, high implementers demonstrated an ability and willingness to seek out resources and a willingness to change their teaching practices as they continued to learn about their profession through experience and professional development (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008; Sturtevant & Linek, 2003).

In contrast, low implementers focused on limitations and felt that teachers lacked the power to make a difference in student’s learning (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008). With a focus on content, low implementers viewed content literacy as an add-on that detracted and was not relevant to the content. However, despite a lack of efficacy and persistence, low implementers
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did incorporated literacy into their classroom, just at much slower rates as compared to high implementers (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008).

Discussion

These findings offer evidence that teacher preparation programs should bolster teacher efficacy for teaching literacy within the disciplines in several ways. First, teacher preparation programs should build teacher candidate’s knowledge of disciplinary literacy. As Cantrell and Callaway (2008) observed, all participants eventually incorporated literacy practices into their instruction upon participation in supportive professional development. This suggests that exposure to literacy education in the content areas can impact classroom practices. Second, teacher preparation programs should promote student centered learning. Sturtevant and Linek (2003) showed that the instructional practices of effective literacy teachers focused on building the critical thinking skills of individual students. Third, teacher preparation programs should encourage teacher candidates to adopt attitudes and beliefs promoting the following ideas: learning is an ongoing process for students and teachers, all students can learn, and that literacy is an essential aspect of learning content. Such ideas encourage teachers to have the persistence to work through barriers and meet the needs of students by growing as professionals (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008; Sturtevant & Linek, 2003).

Disciplinary Literacy Practices in Social Studies Classrooms

This final section illustrates effective, and ineffective, disciplinary literacy teaching techniques in middle and high school social studies classrooms by examining studies focused on
teacher practices and student work samples. All studies were framed by theories of disciplinary literacy regarding the teaching of history which emphasize historical thinking through the use of discipline specific approaches when analyzing texts: specifically, sourcing, contextualization, and corroborating sources (Wineberg, 1991, 1994, 2001).

Damico, Baildon, Exter, and Guo (2009) conducted their study in an international school in Taiwan. The 70 participants were ninth grade students in an Asian Studies Social Studies curriculum. Damico et al. (2009) investigated how students access and use cultural resources and knowledge when analyzing texts by creating and implementing a Web-based assignment where students analyzed two primary sources about the Taiwan Straits through fours lenses: descriptive, academic, critical, and reflexive. The authors posed that these lenses promoted metacognitive practices common to content literacy and emphasized the discipline specific practices of sourcing, contextualization, and corroborating sources (Damico et al., 2009). Using a constant comparative method of analysis, students’ written responses to the prompt “What affects the way I read this site?”, were coded by two authors. The vast majority of students’ responses reflected contextual factors, and most of the students were able to support claims for why information on each site were or were not convincing (Damico et al., 2009).

Nokes, Dole, and Hacker (2007) used a quantitative pretest-posttest, quasi-experimental nested design where four instructional interventions were implemented to test the effectiveness of heuristic-focused instruction (sourcing, corroboration, and contextualization) versus content-focused instruction with the use of multiple documents or history textbooks. Participants included 246 students ages 16 and 17 from eight different history classrooms in
different schools. Each classroom was randomly assigned one of the following interventions to implement over three weeks: (a) traditional textbooks and content instruction, (b) traditional textbooks and heuristic instruction, (c) multiple texts and content instruction, or (d) multiple texts and heuristic instruction. Pre and post tests measured students’ understanding of content and use of heuristics. Findings demonstrated that compared to instruction using traditional textbooks, instruction using multiple texts resulted in higher scores regarding history content and greater use of sourcing and corroboration (Nokes et al, 2007).

Monte-Sano (2011) and Girard and Harris (2012) used semester long case studies of social studies classrooms emphasizing disciplinary literacy to illustrate effective and ineffective teaching practices. Monte-Sano (2011) observed an eleventh grade Civil War class comprised of 17 students. Student produced data included writing samples, reading annotations, and interviews (N = 15). Teacher produced data included writing and reading opportunities, use of class time, and teacher feedback. Analysis of 13 evidence based historical writing from each participating student was used to determine student growth. Girard and Harris (2012) observed a World History course comprised of 23 eleventh and twelfth grade students. Data consisted of videotaped and audio-taped class sessions, field notes, lesson artifacts (including work samples from 18 students), teacher interviews, and interviews with a sample of students. The author’s focused on the effectiveness of a teacher created scaffolding tool: a worksheet used for each unit prompting students to record sources, identify key points from sources, describe patterns and ideas to a historical problem on a global scale, and record their thinking (Girard & Harris, 2012).
Monte-Sano (2011) found that students improved over the course of the semester and attributed the improvement to the following teaching practices: emphasis on annotation while reading; use of historical thinking as an approach to literacy; and interweaving reading, writing, and historical thinking supported by continuous feedback. Girard and Harris (2012) found that most students did not effectively complete and/or use the teacher created scaffolding tool. The authors contributed the ineffectiveness of the tool to a lack of instructional support in connecting historical concepts to global concepts, ineffective wording and focus of questions, and not enough explicit support regarding use of the tool (Girard & Harris, 2012).

De La Paz (2005) and Monte-Sano (2008) used quantitative and qualitative methods to explore the impacts of different teaching methods on students’ writing. De La Paz (2005) studied 70 eighth grade students at the same school who participated in a 12 day integrated social studies and language arts unit designed to promote historical reasoning skills (sourcing, identifying conflict, and author bias) and argumentative writing skills using the self-regulated strategy development model (SRSD). Data for quantitative analysis included demographic information and pre and post student generated argumentative essays scored by trained teachers on the basis of length, persuasive quality, number of arguments, and historical accuracy. Data for qualitative analysis included interviews with 25 students and the participating teachers. Monte-Sano (2008) observed the practices of two high school U.S. history teachers who expressed a desire to improve students’ writing. Quantitative data included the pre and post tests of 42 students. Qualitative data for analysis of teacher instruction included teacher interviews, observations, teacher feedback, and classroom artifacts (Monte-Sano, 2008).
Results of qualitative analysis in De La Paz’s (2005) study showed that students felt confident in their ability to detect bias in text and construct an argumentative essay and showed increased understanding about how historians reason about the past, but did not feel they developed overall understanding of the historical events in question. Additionally, the historical reasoning strategy had limited impact on students, understanding of the inquiry process. Quantitative analysis through ANOVA testing revealed that in comparison to 62 students in a control group who did not receive an intervention, the students in the experimental group wrote papers with significantly more arguments and had greater historical accuracy (De La Paz, 2005). Monte-Sano’s (2008) qualitative analysis of teachers’ practices noted different styles: One promoted a disciplinary literacy approach through analytic writing and small group work focused on understanding historical sources while the other promoted a traditional approach through lecture, memorization and little reading and writing. Monte-Sano’s (2008) quantitative analysis showed that students taught through a disciplinary literacy approach showed overall improvement, with 81% improving in argumentation and 75% improving in historic reasoning. The students taught through traditional approach began the year with higher scores but ended with lower scores, with only 8% improving in both argumentation and historic reasoning, and roughly one quarter of them had declining scores (Monte-Sano, 2008).

As has been demonstrated by the previous studies historical understanding tends to be taught and evaluated through argumentative writing. However, structuring a prompt as argumentative does not ensure disciplinary thinking as students do not understand such writing in the same way as experts (Monte-Sano & De La Paz, 2012). With this understanding, Monte-
Sano and De La Paz (2012) sought to discover if the structure and focus of writing prompts affects the quality of students’ historical reasoning. The authors created four reading and writing tasks using the same historical texts and randomly assigned one task to each of 101 tenth or eleventh grade students in one of 11 Modern World History classes at a high school. Each writing prompt approached the topic from a different angle and focused on a specific aspect of historical thinking and was scored by trained raters based upon overall quality and historical reasoning. All students received the same overview and instruction in preparation for completing the assigned prompt and a basic knowledge quiz assessing student learning indicated that all students approached the writing prompt with virtually the same knowledge level. Findings showed that “when considering students’ knowledge of the topic, their reading comprehension or the primary sources, and the types of writing prompts, only the writing prompts significantly influenced student performance” (Monte-Sano & De La Paz, 2012, p. 288).

In addition, students’ abilities to recognize and reconcile historical perspectives significantly improved when writing tasks emphasized sourcing, corroboration, and causal analysis. Students asked to write historically situated in the first person produced the lowest scored essays (Monte-Sano & De La Paz, 2012).

Discussion

Limitations of these studies must be considered. For example, each study was conducted in unique classroom environments. The particular instructional styles, methods, and tools of each classroom could not be accounted for in each study. In addition, each classroom is situated in an environment that can support or detract from overall learning. For example,
Monte-Sano (2008) recognized that the structure of a course lends to the possible implementation of inquiry. Instructional goals (De La Paz, 2005) and students’ prior experiences with disciplinary literacy impact learning and are often outside of a teacher’s realm of control. Monte-Sano (2011) acknowledged that while the teacher she studied effectively provided literacy rich instruction, the course in question was dedicated to a single historical event (The Civil War) and the school in general emphasized literacy, small class sizes, and extended blocks of instructional time. When studying education, context cannot be ignored. With this in mind, future research needs to consider such factors when studying the effectiveness of disciplinary literacy instruction. In particular, research regarding curricular structure and focus and overall school structure needs to be conducted in order to identify barriers and supports to disciplinary literacy instruction.

While there were limitations, these studies still illustrated effective and ineffective aspects of instruction that can impact students’ disciplinary literacy skills in social studies classrooms, and therefore offer implications for the creation of disciplinary literacy oriented teacher preparation programs. While it was demonstrated that meaningful disciplinary literacy instruction can positively impact students’ historical thinking skills (Damico et al., 2009; De La Paz, 2005; Monte-Sano, 2008), studies also showed that not all types of disciplinary literacy instruction positively impact students by illustrating how the tools and teaching methods employed can impact student learning in various ways (Monte-Sano, 2011; Girard and Harris, 2012). Importantly, it was demonstrated that effective disciplinary literacy instruction interweaves literacy and content (Monte-Sano, 2011). Additionally, the use of multiple texts was found more effective in promoting historical thinking compared to sole reliance on
traditional textbooks (Nokes et al., 2007). Finally, the specific wording of prompts can influence students’ thinking (Monte-Sano & De La Paz, 2012). With this in mind, teacher preparation programs should present content with a focus on discipline specific literacy skills while promoting the use of instructional methods and tools found to effectively impact students’ thinking. Before this can occur, more research needs to be conducted in order to identify instructional methods and tools that best promote students’ understanding of the literacy unique to each discipline.

Conclusions

This review of literature examined the existing research regarding disciplinary literacy in order to provide a framework for constructing disciplinary literacy components of middle and high school teacher preparation programs. The research questions for this review where as follows: (1) What are the literacy skills utilized by members of disciplinary communities? (2) How can teacher preparation programs best prepare middle and high school teacher candidates to teach literacy in their discipline? (3) How can these skills be taught in middle and high school social studies classrooms? (4) Will a disciplinary literacy approach to teaching increased literacy learning for adolescent students? (5) Will a disciplinary approach to literacy instruction in teacher education classes lead to increased teacher implementation? Through the presentation and discussion of research in three categories (defining literacy within the disciplines, preparing teacher candidates to teach literacy in the disciplines), and teaching disciplinary literacy in middle and high school classrooms, I addressed four out of my five research questions. In addition, I used the research to present implications for future research.
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and for constructing disciplinary literacy components of middle and high school teacher preparation programs

However, my search failed to produce studies regarding my last research question: Will a disciplinary approach to literacy instruction in teacher preparation classes lead to increased teacher implementation? The ultimate goal of middle and secondary teacher candidate education is to positively impact the learning experiences of adolescent students. Teacher educators strive to produce quality teachers so that they in turn provide quality instruction to their students. Therefore, teacher educators need to know if their instruction has such an impact. As stated in my introduction, research has revealed an overall reluctance amongst middle and high school teachers to integrate literacy into their content instruction (Alger, 2009; O’Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995). However, it is not known if a transition from content literacy to disciplinary literacy would impact this trend. This being said, before research can be conducted in this area, disciplinary literacy components of middle and high school teacher preparation programs must be created and implemented. Furthermore, the effectiveness of such programs to influence teacher candidates’ instruction needs to be examined.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Qualitative Paradigm

Qualitative researchers are interested in “understanding how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences” (Merriam, 2009, p. 5). Qualitative research often takes an inductive, interpretive approach assuming that reality is socially constructed (Merriam, 2009; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000), and seeks to understand that reality from the perspectives of the participants (Hatch, 2002; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). “In interpretive research, education is considered to be a process and school is a lived experience” (Merriam, 1998, p. 4). This study embodies these ideas by seeking an understanding of how teacher candidates construct meaning and acquire beliefs and attitudes regarding teaching and learning from their experiences in a teacher preparation program. Within a teacher educator program, the participants influence one another and therefore impact each other’s understandings. Each teacher candidate is impacted by their interactions with professors, peers, mentor teachers, students, as well as past experiences with former teachers, parents, and peers. These interactions create socially constructed realities (Merriam, 2009). Thus, in order to understand these realities a researcher must seek out participant perspectives (Hatch, 2002) and observe the natural settings in which the realities are constructed (Hatch, 2002).

Merriam (2009) identifies the following as key to qualitative research: focus on meaning and understanding, researcher as primary instrument, an inductive process, and rich descriptions. In the following section, I will illustrate this study’s focus in meaning and
understanding by describing my multiple case study design. The inductive process used throughout the study, as well as the rich descriptions I generated, will be addressed as I describe my data collection and analysis methods.

**Multiple Case Study Design**

A qualitative case study richly describes and analyzes a particular phenomenon in order to enhance our understanding of that phenomenon (Merriam, 1998). Yin (2009), Merriam (1998), and Stake (2000) describe several types of case studies; all include a category for multiple (Yin, 2009; Merriam, 1998) or collective (Stake, 2000). Using Yin’s (2009) terminology, I define a multiple case study as a study that collects and analyzes data from several cases and enables the researcher to explore differences within and between cases.

This multiple case study describes and analyzes the phenomenon of changes in teacher candidates’ beliefs and attitudes about teaching social studies through a disciplinary literacy approach over the course of their three semester secondary social studies cohort experience. Guided by Merriam (1998), Yin (2009), and Stake’s (1995) depictions of multiple case study research, I investigated the phenomenon through the lived experiences of four teacher candidates. Each of the four teacher candidates are considered separate cases. More information regarding these participants will be provided later in this chapter. As illustrated by Yin’s (2009) holistic, multiple-case design, each case in this study was examined within its unique context. For this study, the context refers to the individual experiences of each participating teacher candidate, including their background experiences as middle and high school students, their experiences as students in cohort courses, and their experiences in their
field placements. The intent of this study was largely descriptive in that it presented a detailed account of each phenomenon, or case (Merriam, 1998). Yet, there is also an evaluative aspect (Merriam, 1998). By conducting a cross-case analysis, common factors impacting participants’ beliefs and attitudes about teaching social studies literacy were discovered. These common factors could be used to influence teacher preparation programs seeking to improve teacher candidates’ capacities to incorporate literacy in their classroom instruction.

**Research Context**

This study took place at a university that offers a four-year secondary education integrated social studies program through its education department. According to the program’s published description, the secondary education integrated social studies program prepares education students to teach social studies to adolescents and young adults in grades seven through twelve through course work in social studies, geography and political science, as well as course work in educational and professional studies. The program also requires education students to participate in a variety of field experiences in urban and suburban classrooms.

In December 2013, I received approval from the Internal Review Board (IRB) to conduct this study. The full IRB submission can be found in Appendix A. I then collected and analyzed data from the first and second semesters of the participant’s cohort. Data was collected during the first semester, spring of 2014, and analyzed over the summer months as a pilot study. I presented the pilot study and its findings to my committee in September of 2014. Based on feedback from my committee, I refined my theoretical framework and data analysis.
procedures. Additional data was collected throughout the fall and spring semesters of the 2014-1015 academic school year. Once data collection was completed, I analyzed all three semester’s worth of data throughout the 2015-2016 academic year.

**Cohort Courses**

During their second year of the program, education students who meet requirements for advancing in the program must apply for admission into the professional cohort. Once admitted into the cohort, education students are considered teacher candidates and take professional education courses and complete student teaching requirements over the course of three semesters. The following cohort courses were specifically targeted in this study: Introductory Methods Secondary: Social Studies, Intermediate Methods Secondary: Social Studies, Advanced Methods Secondary: Social Studies, and Disciplinary Literacy in the Secondary School. The Methods courses, Introductory, Intermediate, and Advanced, occurred over the three consecutive semesters of the cohort. The Disciplinary Literacy course occurred alongside Intermediate Methods during the second semester. In addition to coursework, teacher candidates are placed in field experiences throughout cohort. During these field experiences, teacher candidates observe and collaborate with a mentor social studies teacher at a secondary placement. Teacher candidates assist with teaching duties and are also required to teach at least several lessons. Student teaching occurs throughout the third semester; at which point the teacher candidate assumes full teaching responsibilities for at least three class periods at their field placement under the guidance of their mentor.
Historical Thinking Activities

During Introductory Methods, candidates engaged in five historical thinking activities. These activities were designed to engage students in the literacy skills employed by experts in the social studies fields, and reflected a number of literacies outlined by C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013), Reading Like a Historian (Wineburg et al., 2011), and Thinking Like a Historian (Wineburg, 2001). The first of these activities was “The Artifact Bag and Museum of Me” (Hicks & Lisanti, 2010), for which each candidate filled a bag with artifacts representing their life and constructed an accompanying narrative of themselves. Candidates then anonymously shared bags, and were directed to analyze the items and generate a narrative answering the question, “Who is this person?” Candidates then compared their autobiographical narratives with the narrative generated by a peer. The purpose of this activity was to “illuminate for students that historical interpretation is never as static nor refined as it appears in the textbooks” (Hicks & Lisanti, 2010).

Candidates also engaged in three historical thinking activities from the Social Science Education Consortium (2011): Teaching History Activity: Empathy and Perspective, Teaching Government Activity: Simulated School Board Hearing, and Teaching Psychology Activity: Controversy Around Testing. These activities addressed the following questions:

What is the core subject matter of our discipline? How do scholars in the discipline go about their work? What are the controversial issues? What is problematic about the discipline? What is most important for students to learn about the discipline? How can
the methods of the discipline be useful in teaching the discipline? (Social Science Education Consortium, 2011)

An activity from HistoricalThinkingMatters.org addressing the Spanish American War was part of the course as well. This activity was designed for use in a secondary classroom. Assuming the role of a secondary student, candidates had to analyze primary documents through close reading, using provided guided questions and graphic organizers as supports, to answer the question, “Why did the United States invade Cuba?” This activity required candidates to utilize historical thinking skills. It also engaged them in an activity created for use in a middle or high school classroom.

**Disciplinary Literacy**

All candidates in the secondary teacher preparation program in the disciplines of social studies, science and math enroll in the same section of Disciplinary Literacy in Secondary Schools their second semester. The central purposes of the course, as written on its syllabus, is to:

1. Understand the processes of inquiry and literacy as they pertain to particular content areas;
2. Gain instructional approaches and evaluation strategies that best promote literacy learning and content acquisition for children in the secondary grades;
3. Apply this knowledge as they help students develop literate behaviors; and,
4. Evaluate, analyze, and synthesize their new knowledge to assess student learning.
Researcher Access

The sampling for this study was purposeful and convenient (Patton, 2015). It was purposeful in that the questions guiding this research required sampling from a secondary social studies teacher preparation program that addresses disciplinary literacy. It was convenient because I am currently a doctoral student at a university where such a program exists. During my time as a doctoral student at this university, I have had the opportunity to teach secondary and middle level social studies methods courses, as well as a middle level disciplinary literacy course. However, I was an instructor in the secondary program at the time of this study.

At the time the study began, the instructor of the social studies methods courses was new to the university. Since I had previously taught the Introductory and Intermediate Methods courses in the university’s secondary social studies program, I was invited to share insights regarding structure, content, assignments, and instruction. While such conversations led to a positive professional relationship between me and the social studies methods instructor, I had limited input on course structure, content, assignments, and instruction. I also have a strong professional relationship with the instructor of the disciplinary literacy course included in this study. Having a shared interest in disciplinary literacy and teacher education, we have collaborated on projects and discussed course structure, content, assignments, and instruction. However, we have never taught the same course within the same program and therefore have retained autonomy in our course planning. My position as a doctoral student at the university,
and my professional relationships with course instructors, provided me with access to potential participants.

**Participants**

This study included three categories of participants: general, focal, and faculty. The participants were recruited and selected during the spring 2014 semester. All accepted teacher candidates in the secondary education integrated social studies cohort were asked to complete pre and post surveys and consent to classroom observations over the duration of their cohort coursework. The surveys were only associated with this study and were not used as assessments for the courses. Those candidates who consented to the survey and classroom observation portion of the study were considered general participants.

During the initial pre survey administered at the beginning of Introductory Methods, participants were asked to consent to participation in the interview portion of the study. I chose focal participants from those who self-selected to participate in this portion of the study. The intent was to choose participants who indicated a variety of beliefs and attitudes towards teaching and learning in social studies. Seven participants self-selected to participate in the interview portion of the study. After reviewing their survey responses with my advisor, the decision was made to include all seven individuals as focal participants since they represented a range of gender, age, and beliefs and attitudes. These seven focal participants were interviewed throughout the spring 2014 and fall 2014 semesters. However, I decided to discontinue interviewing two of the participants going into the spring 2015 semester as one individual left the secondary social studies cohort and another was a graduate student, and was
therefore an outlier in the study. I discontinued interviewing a third participant after he left the program after the fall 2015 semester. The interview data collected from these three individuals was not part of the data analysis for this study. As a result, four individuals, two females and two males, were the focal participants for this study. At the time of their first interview during the spring 2014 semester, their ages ranged from 20 to 27 years.

Two faculty members were asked to participate in the instructor interview portion of the study. The first faculty member was the current instructor of record for all three secondary social studies methods courses included in the cohort. The second faculty member was the instructor of record for the disciplinary literacy course included in the cohort. Both faculty members were asked to consent to interviews and classroom observations. Data from the methods instructor was collected during the spring 2014, fall 2014, and spring 2015 semesters, and data from the disciplinary literacy instructor was collected throughout the fall 2014 semester. The data from faculty participants was used only for purposes of context. Data from faculty interviews was not utilized during data analysis.

Data Collection

This study employed a multiple case study design (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009) to examine the phenomenon of changes in teacher candidates’ beliefs and attitudes about teaching social studies through a disciplinary literacy approach over the course of their three semester secondary social studies cohort experience. The intent of the study was descriptive and evaluative (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009), as I intended to describe the overall experiences of each focal participant and evaluate the cohort program by identifying factors that influenced
participants’ beliefs and attitudes about teaching social studies literacy. Each participant was treated as a unique case with unique surveys, interviews and artifacts. Instructor interviews, overall survey results, and observations provided the broad context in which the individual cases were analyzed.

The following types of data were collected over the duration of the study: surveys, instructor interviews, focal interviews, classroom observations, and artifacts. Table 1 outlines the data collection plan by noting the correlation between the academic semester, course, data type, and participant involvement. The amount and type of data collected are indicated on the data collection plan.

**Surveys**

For this study, surveys provide context of the overall knowledge, understandings, and beliefs of the entire cohort of which the focal participants are a part. Survey results were used to generate possible interview topics and questions, and as supporting documentary material for the interview, observation, and artifact-based findings of the study (Merriam, 1998; Merriam, 2009).

While the surveys utilized were completed in written form, as opposed to oral interview questions, they consisted of structured questions and were used as one component of overall assessment. Three sets of pre and post surveys were administered to general and focal participants over the course of the study. The surveys were designed under the guidance of my academic advisor to provide deeper contextual understanding for the overall study. During the first semester, pre and post surveys using a Likert scale were administered (see Appendices B
and C). The Likert scale included the following options: Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, and Strongly disagree. Survey data was used to provide descriptive information about participants, including their experiences as middle and high school students as well as their general understandings, attitudes, and beliefs about teaching social studies literacy and how these attitudes and beliefs changed over the course of their first semester in the cohort. The surveys also served as discussion points during focal interviews.

During the second semester, a short answer pre survey was administered to general and focal participants (see Appendix D). Due to scheduling conflicts, the corresponding post survey (see Appendix E) could not be administered at the end of the fall semester, and was instead administered during the second week of the spring 2015 semester. Prompts asked participants to provide specific knowledge about targeted aspects of social studies literacy, such as types of texts used in the social studies fields, skills employed by social studies experts, and their knowledge of literacy strategies. Data from these surveys were used to monitor participants’ knowledge of social studies literacy and instructional practices that support its use in the classroom. The surveys also served as discussion points during focal interviews.

Finally, during the third semester general and focal participants were asked to complete short answer pre and post surveys regarding their application of literacy instruction in the classroom (see Appendices F and G). The pre survey was administered during the second week of the semester. The participants were student teaching during the third semester and had greater control over their instructional decision making as compared to previous semesters. Therefore, the third set of surveys asked participants to elaborate upon their abilities to
incorporate social studies literacy into their instruction, supports and challenges when incorporating literacy instruction, and their beliefs and attitudes about teaching social studies literacy. The surveys also served as discussion points during focal interviews.

**Interviews**

Interviews are a key form of qualitative data collection (Merriam, 1998; Rubin & Rubin, 2012), especially when conducting intensive, in-depth case studies of selected individuals (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009). “Interviewing is necessary when we cannot observe behavior, feelings, or how people interpret the world around them” (Merriam, 1998). In this sense, interviews provided vital data for this study by providing participants with opportunities to share their feelings, interpretations, attitudes, and beliefs when describing their lived experiences as teacher candidates. The data garnered from interviewing can challenge assumptions, portray ongoing social processes, and capture change (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). I anticipated that data collected through interviews in this study would challenge assumptions held about teacher education, portray the social process of preparing to enter the teaching profession, and capture the changes in teacher candidates’ beliefs and attitudes about teaching literacy in social studies.

**Instructor interviews.**

Instructor interviews occurred throughout all three semesters for the purpose of providing context for the study (see Table 1). Data from these interviews were not formally analyzed. The primary purpose for these interviews was to discover the goals and objectives of the targeted courses; the instructors’ understandings, beliefs and attitudes about teaching
social studies literacy; intended instructional methods; and assignments and assessments targeting disciplinary literacy.

**Participant interviews.**

Through repeated interviews across time (Rubin & Rubin, 2102), I gathered the rich, descriptive data required for qualitative research. Seidman’s (2013) in-depth, phenomenological interviewing methods influenced the interview portion of this study. Seidman (2013) endorses a three interview series process in which the first establishes context, the second garners details of the experience from the participant’s point of view, and the third requires participants to reflect and make meaning of the experience within the context of their life. In this study, initial interviews conducted during the first semester established context by focusing on the participants’ former experiences as students. Interviews conducted towards the end of the first semester, throughout the second semester, and those that occurred in the middle of the third semester garnered details of the experience from the participants’ points of view. Ultimately, participants were asked to reflect and make meaning of their overall experience towards the end of the third semester. Due to the nature and duration of this study, Seidman’s (2013) methods could not be exactly replicated; however, his emphasis on the transitory nature of human experience, reflection, and subjective understanding through context were applied.

As Seidman (2013) states, “That we get at ‘lived experience’ primarily through language connects to some of the basic fundamentals of interviewing research” (p. 18). Therefore, I allowed ample opportunities for participants to use language to share their experiences. All
interviews were semistructured in order for participants to describe and reflect upon their unique experiences (Merriam, 1998; Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Prepared questions and topics steered the conversation towards the research questions of this study, but participants had leeway to explore their experiences and make meaning through conversation. Wording of questions and the order in which topics are addressed remained flexible, allowing the researcher to respond to emerging developments throughout the interviews (Merriam, 1998). Interview guides were prepared for each interview and included structured questions and a list of topics to be explored (see Appendix H).

**Classroom Observations**

In qualitative research, observations provide firsthand encounters with the phenomenon of interest in its natural setting (Hatch, 2002; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009). My role as observer as participant (Merriam, 1998) allowed me to gain insider status while having minimal impact on the natural setting. In this study, observations were used for three purposes. First, observations allowed me to better understand the phenomenon from the perspectives of the participants (Hatch, 2002). Observations allowed me to use my knowledge and expertise regarding course content and pedagogy to interpret events firsthand (Hatch, 2002; Merriam, 1998). Finally, knowledge of the context served as reference points in interviews (Merriam, 1998).

This study included observations of the following courses: Introductory Methods Secondary: Social Studies, Intermediate Methods Secondary: Social Studies, Advanced Methods Secondary: Social Studies, and Disciplinary Literacy in the Secondary School. I asked course
instructors to identify class sessions addressing disciplinary literacy and scheduled my observations based upon these recommendations. The purpose was to observe how participants were responding to instructional methods and assignments targeting disciplinary literacy. The observations also served as discussion points during focal interviews, as I asked how specific class activities impacted participants' understandings, beliefs, and attitudes about teaching social studies literacy.

Artifacts

For this study, artifacts were used to gain insight into participants' learning and thinking, and to stimulate participant reflection during interviews (Hatch, 2002). “Artifacts are objects that participants use in the everyday activity of the contexts under examination” (Hatch, 2002). In this sense, the artifacts I collected were materials not created specifically for the study (as opposed to the surveys mentioned earlier). The types of artifacts collected in this study are described by Yin as (2009) as documentation, and by Hatch (2002) as unobtrusive data.

I collected artifacts from focal and instructor participants. These artifacts included lesson plans, lesson materials, syllabi, and various assignments created for the following courses: Introductory Methods Secondary: Social Studies, Intermediate Methods Secondary: Social Studies, Advanced Methods Secondary: Social Studies, and Disciplinary Literacy in the Secondary School. Artifacts also included instructional materials and lesson plans focal participants implement during their field placements but were not submitted and graded through one of the aforementioned courses. The purpose for artifact analysis was to gain insights into how participants’ understandings, beliefs, and attitudes about teaching social
studies literacy changes over the cohort experience. Artifacts allowed ideas and understandings to be captured throughout the cohort and then reflected upon during interviews. Lesson plans, specifically, were collected as they served as data regarding how participants incorporated literacy instruction in their planning.

**Data Management**

Good case study research protects the human subjects involved, including the privacy and confidentiality of those who participate (Yin, 2009). Therefore, this study utilized a data management plan to guarantee privacy and confidentiality. Transcriptions of interview recordings were completed by me or university approved personnel. All paper copies of data were stored in a secure location and will be destroyed after completion and publication of the study. All electronic copies of data were kept on a password protected laptop and will be deleted five years after completion and publication of the study.

All data remained confidential. Participants only put their names on surveys if they chose to opt into the interview portion of the study. This process allowed me to use the information provided by focal participants on the surveys during interviews. Participation in the student interview portion of the study as well as the instructor interviews remained confidential, and all interview and artifact data were masked with pseudonyms. Only myself and my faculty advisor know the correlating name of the participant connected to the pseudonym.
Table 1

*Data Collection Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Introductory</td>
<td>pre surveys (16)</td>
<td>general, focal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>post surveys (15)</td>
<td>general, focal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>instructor interview (1)</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>focal interviews (12)</td>
<td>focal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>classroom observations (2)</td>
<td>general, focal, faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>artifacts: course syllabus, lesson materials for observed classes, 3 focal participant lesson plans</td>
<td>focal, faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>pre surveys (15)</td>
<td>general, focal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>instructor interview (1)</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>classroom observations (2)</td>
<td>general, focal, faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>focal interviews (8)</td>
<td>focal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>artifacts: course syllabus, lesson materials for observed classes, 3 focal participant lesson plans</td>
<td>focal, faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary</td>
<td>instructor</td>
<td>instructor interview (1)</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>interview (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>classroom observations (3)</td>
<td>general, focal, faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>artifacts: course syllabus, lesson materials for observed classes</td>
<td>focal, faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>post surveys (12)</td>
<td>general, focal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>pre surveys (12)</td>
<td>general, focal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>post surveys (12)</td>
<td>general, focal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>instructor interview (1)</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>focal interviews (8)</td>
<td>focal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>classroom observations (2)</td>
<td>general, focal, instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>artifacts: course syllabus, lesson materials for observed classes, 4 focal participant lesson plans</td>
<td>focal, instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

The following were collected in paper form: consents, surveys, artifacts, and interviewer notes. Electronic data included audio recordings of interviews, interview transcriptions, video recordings of classroom observations, artifacts, and interviewer notes. Data analysis took place in paper and electronic formats.

According to Yin (2009), in a multiple case study, there are two stages of analysis: within case analysis and between case analysis. For the within-case analysis, each case was analyzed separately. To complete this task, I employed Hatch’s (2002) steps of inductive analysis which follows this sequence: (1) identify frames of analysis, (2) create domains, (3) code, (4) reread data and refine domains, (5) determine support for domains and search for outliers, (6) complete analysis within the domains, (7) search for themes across domains, (8) express relationships within and among domains, and (9) select data that supports these findings. Saldaña’s (2016) description of descriptive coding provided specific guidance during the coding process.

Following Hatch’s (2002) suggested use of ongoing data analysis, I reviewed previously collected data prior to each new data collection period to establish “frames of analysis,” which were recorded in my researcher notes. This process “put rough parameters” (Hatch, 2002) on how I would later view the data. These parameters allowed me to determine if the acquired data related to my research questions. With this information, I was able to tailor my interview questions, surveys, and requests for artifacts to maximize acquisition of relevant data. Once all data from all participants was collected, I focused my attention on one of the focal participants.
Analyzing the data from this participant, I created “cause-effect” “domains” (Hatch, 2002). The creation of domains allowed me to set aside data not related to my research questions. For example, complaints about communicating with supervisors did not have a cause-effect relationship with participant’s’ changing beliefs and attitudes about literacy instruction, therefore this data was set aside.

The next step involved coding the remaining data. Employing “descriptive coding” methods, I identified words or short phrases that summarized a section of the data (Saldaña, 2016). After initial coding, data was reassembled by codes. By using the same codes throughout all of the data, I was able to track “longitudinal participant change” (Saldaña, 2016) by separating the coded data by semester and then analyzing changes over time. I then reread the data and refined the domains, determining the “richness and importance” of each domain as it related to my research questions (Hatch, 2002). This process allowed me to search for outliers and determine support for domains (Hatch, 2002). When “there was not enough data to support the existence” of a domain, the domain was removed from the data set. Likewise, when I discovered data that did not “fit with or run counter to” the cause-effect relationships of the domains, the data was removed (Hatch, 2002).

Next, I completed analysis within the domains, looking for “new links, new relationships, new domains” (Hatch, 2002). Following Hatch’s (2002) suggestion, I created an outline of the domains based upon their cause-effect relationships with participants’ changes in understandings, and changes in beliefs and attitudes. This aided my capacity to search for themes across the domains and identify any relationships within and among domains (Hatch
2002). These themes became the categories by which I structured each case. This processes also further illustrated how the participant’s understandings, beliefs, and attitudes changed over the course of the three semesters, which later aided in the identification of factors that influences changes during cross-case analysis. Finally, I selected data that supported these findings. This data was used when generating the case study for the participant.

This process was repeated for each case. Through this process, I constructed six broad categories, one of which contained three sub-categories. Those categories were: (a) Prior Experiences; (b) Initial Beliefs about Teaching Social Studies Literacy; (c) Changing Beliefs about Literacy Instruction, (d) Changing Beliefs about Teaching as a Profession, (e) Changing Beliefs about Teaching All Learners; and (f) Belief in Student-Teacher Relationships. The category “Changing Beliefs about Literacy Instruction” was divided into the following subcategories: (a) First Semester: Historical Thinking Activities; (b) Second Semester: Disciplinary Literacy; and (c) Third Semester: Student Teaching.

Once all four case studies were completed, I conducted cross-case analysis (Yin, 2009; Merriam, 1998). This process involved repeating steps seven through nine of Hatch’s (2002) steps of inductive analysis: (7) search for themes across domains, (8) express relationships within and among domains, and (9) select data that supports these findings. I began by comparing the identified themes of all four cases and identified common factors that impacted participant’s understandings, beliefs, and attitudes about teaching social studies literacy. I then expressed relationships among the common factors by creating an outline reflecting the longitudinal nature of the study. In other words, I noted during which semester each factor...
occurred and then analyzed the relationships between the factors. Finally, I selected supporting data to include when describing each case. Chapter Four presents each case, the cross-case analysis, and a discussion of my findings from this process.

**Researcher Biases and Study Limitations**

In qualitative research, it is important to acknowledge the role of the researcher as part of the construction of understanding. As a high school social studies and reading teacher, I developed the belief that strong, discipline specific literacy instruction was needed in high school content area classrooms. I also developed the opinion that too many teachers were ill prepared to deliver such instruction. As a doctoral student at the university in which this study was conducted, I have had the opportunity to teach secondary and middle level social studies methods courses, as well as a middle level disciplinary literacy course. However, I was not an instructor in the secondary program at the time of this study. Based upon my experiences as a teacher and a review of research, I am of the opinion that teacher education coursework must explicitly emphasize the significant role literacy plays in content acquisition and understanding. Additionally, I believe teacher candidates should understand the literacies unique to their disciplines and be able to support students’ development of such literacies. Recognizing this bias, I opted to keep a reflexive journal to record my thoughts and reflections throughout the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Ideally, I would have observed the participants as they taught at their field placements. However, time and scheduling constraints did not permit such observation. Therefore, I had to rely on participants’ self-reporting to gather data regarding implementation in the field. This
reliance was a limitation of the study. To counter this limitation, I collected lesson plans created by the participants and utilized at field placements as data regarding implementation. I analyzed these lesson plans for evidence of literacy instruction and prompted participants to describe their experiences implementing them in the classroom. The analysis of the lesson plans, the participants’ descriptions of their implementation, and the interview discussion that emerged from the analysis and description provided data regarding implementation in the field.

**Trustworthiness**

In qualitative research, trustworthiness is determined by credibility, transferability and dependability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Qualitative research assumes that reality is “holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing” (Merriam, 2009, p. 213). Therefore, credibility is not measured as an absolute truth or reality, but as an accurate interpretation of perspectives of those involved in the phenomenon under study (Merriam, 2009). Finally, transferability must be determined by the reader judging if the findings apply to their own situation (Merriam, 2009).

A number of measures were taken to guarantee trustworthiness in this study. The use of multiple case study design is in itself a strategy for increasing trustworthiness, as multiple cases allow for cross analysis (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009). Triangulation of multiple data sources for each case (interviews, observations, surveys, and artifacts) ensured credibility and reliability by corroborating the same phenomenon (Hatch, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009). The longitudinal nature of this study also ensures credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009), as the phenomena was examined over three semesters. When reporting findings, rich, thick descriptions are provided, including setting and participant
descriptions, adequate evidence with direct participant perspectives, and various documents (Merriam, 2009). Finally, the researcher’s position, or bias, (Merriam, 2009) was fully examined and reflected upon through data collection and analysis.

This multiple case study takes an inductive, interpretive approach assuming that reality is socially constructed (Merriam, 2009; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000), and seeks to understand that reality from the perspectives of the participants (Hatch, 2002; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). “In interpretive research, education is considered to be a process and school is a lived experience” (Merriam, 1998, p. 4). Through the collection of a variety of data over the course of three semesters, and through the application of Hatch’s (2002) steps of inductive analysis, this study embodies these ideas by seeking an understanding of how teacher candidates construct meaning and acquire beliefs and attitudes regarding teaching and learning from their experiences in a teacher preparation program.
Chapter 4: The Findings of the Multiple-Case Study

This chapter highlights four teacher candidates with whom I worked on this research. The chapter begins by describing the structure of the cases. I then present the four cases and follow them with the cross case analysis. Finally, I provide a discussion of the findings and concluding remarks regarding the implications of the findings.

Structure of the Cases

The structure of the cases is designed to provide a rich and detailed depiction of each participant. Given that data were collected over three semesters, most of each case follows chronological order in order to illustrate the participant’s changes in beliefs and attitudes over time. Each case begins by introducing the participant through their “Prior Experiences.” This category overviews experiences the participant had prior to beginning the teacher preparation program that influenced their beliefs and attitudes about teaching social studies. Then the participant’s “Initial Beliefs about Teaching Social Studies Literacy,” are presented. This category illustrates the participant’s existing understandings, beliefs, and attitudes regarding teaching social studies literacy at the start of the study.

The next category, “Changing Beliefs about Literacy Instruction,” is a map of the participants’ changing beliefs. Within this category, there are three subcategories: (1) “First Semester: Historical Thinking Activities,” (2) “Second Semester: Disciplinary Literacy,” and (3) “Third Semester: Student Teaching.” The titles of the subcategories highlight influential aspects of the teacher preparation program by the semester in which they occurred: Historical thinking activities presented throughout the first semester in Introductory Methods, the Disciplinary
At this point in each case, the categories no longer follow chronological order.

“Changing Beliefs about Teaching as a Profession” explains how the participant’s views of what it meant to teach were altered throughout the study. Next, the participant’s “Changing Beliefs about Teaching All Learners” is presented. In this category, the participant shares how they came to view the challenges and expectations of teaching students with a variety of needs.

“Belief in Student-Teacher Relationships” shows how the participant’s relationships with their teachers and students influenced their beliefs and attitudes regarding social studies instruction. Finally, each case ends with a brief “Summary” of the participant.

**Case One: Mary**

**Mary’s Prior Experiences**

Mary, a friendly and talkative white female, was twenty years old at the start of the study. She was raised approximately 160 miles away from the university in and just outside of a small city with a population of approximately 40,000. Her home was in the midst of a predominately rural area and was approximately 93% white. Mary described her upbringing in a positive manner. She was close with her family, and as the oldest sibling, she conveyed a sense of responsibility towards her siblings. Her family connections were apparent when she expressed concern about her younger brother’s struggles with math. She attributed his struggles to new teaching methods being forced upon students and teachers by the Common Core, which she described as “awful, to say the least.” When describing her middle and high
school years, she recalled a “fun,” close knit atmosphere where “we all knew each other.” Her small graduating class included approximately 53 students. Mary was involved in soccer and had numerous friends. Mary “took school pretty seriously” and described herself as a hard worker who earned good grades. She attributed her academic achievements to her work ethic, which was instilled by parents and grandparents who wanted her to be academically successful to increase her future opportunities. She also referenced the “very tight” and “close” relationships with her peers and teachers as factors for her academic success. Mary was instilled with the belief that if you work hard, opportunities would present themselves. Mary seemed happy, positive and eager to learn. She was quick to establish friendly and comfortable relationships with the others, and spoke freely about her experiences and thoughts.

Based upon her data, the teaching methods utilized by her middle and high school teachers would be considered traditional and content-focused. She recalled a large amount of worksheet assignments: “[Students] just sat and took notes and did worksheets. After the chapter we’d always finish the end of the chapter review...then there was a test. Just repeat after every single chapter.” Mary did not recall being taught to read outside of her advanced English class where she reported mainly reading and discussing fictional texts. Outside of English, Mary did not remember engaging in classroom conversations: “I mostly remember our teacher would ask questions and we would raise our hand and answer...It was not very much open ended discussion.” She had minimal experiences with social studies texts other than textbooks. She remembered her favorite high school history teacher bringing “primary documents into his class, but it was never a ton out at once or very consistently.” According to Mary, students were “expected to read them. We never were told how to dissect the historical
document really.” It was a college history professor who first required Mary to dissect primary
documents. This course challenged her to think historically through class discussions where she
and her peers would address the “backgrounds” of the documents.

Mary had always “really enjoyed history” and had an interest for government, which she
ascribed to her academic success in those classes: “I was better, like naturally gifted at history
and government and social studies and stuff like that.” Mary enjoyed reading biographies and
was drawn to historical narratives: “I think that’s what a lot of history is. Even if I’m lecturing,
I’m telling you how something happened. I’m telling you a story.” For Mary, social studies
evoked passion. When describing former teachers and professors, she remembered those that
taught social studies as being the most passionate about their content.

Mary’s Initial Beliefs about Teaching Social Studies

Thinking about why she wanted to teach, Mary noted, “I always knew I wanted to help
people and be in peoples’ lives, I guess, and I’ve always wanted to coach, too.” Mary “always
had a way with being able to explain things to people.” She considered teaching to be a “joy”
because she could “teach somebody something they didn’t know and…show them maybe how
they came to that conclusion.” Mary emphasized the importance of classroom conversations
and making connections between history and current, real life events in social studies
classrooms. She recognized that, despite not truly experiencing academic conversations as a
student, she wanted to utilize them as a teacher. From the start of the study, Mary held a
perspective that the educational methods employed by her middle and high school teachers
were not the most ideal and effective for a diverse population of learners. Mary credited this
realization to her education courses at the university: “I understand now after learning about how teaching, it’s not exactly the best way to reach everybody because not everybody learns like that.” She felt that her middle and high school placement in advanced courses and above average grade point average did not reflect her true academic abilities: “It didn’t necessarily mean I was smart or anything.” She believed she thrived at worksheets and textbook driven question and answer assignments because she was a very organized list maker. However, looking back she did not believe she learned much from those assignments and she “just liked them because they’re easy.” Mary attributed her beliefs about teaching to her 15 years spent as a student in a classroom.

Pondering her ability to teach students to read, she noted that although she had never envisioned having to teach students to read, she had been “thinking about that question a lot more than I would have been when I first came to college.” The idea of having to teach student to read concerned her, and she struggled to choose her words as she explained:

I’m not fully confident that I can really teach reading at this point. I don’t really - and I think to a certain extent - I don’t want to say that they’re unteachable, like teaching an old dog new tricks thing, but if you typically learn how to read by the third grade... if these kids are a product of somebody who’s lacked that foundation, it’s going to be very hard to get back around to that.

Mary felt it was her job as a social studies teacher to prioritize content. Teaching literacy was not a social studies teacher’s responsibility: “I don’t want to say it at times – like really heartless and selfish – but I’ve got to focus on my stuff too because [students] need to know my stuff as
Mary believed there was a separation between social studies content and literacy: “I think [social studies teachers] should be just more focused on social studies content versus the reading and writing content.” Over time, she became even more adamant about her belief that most reading instruction should occur in English language arts classes. On a survey given at the end of the first semester, Mary wrote, “Literacy simply put, is the ability to read, understand, and write – whether or not it deals with social studies. Most literacy skills are developed through English/language arts classes.”

As for using primary sources with the students at her placement, Mary stated, “if they’re having a hard time understanding new English, I would have a hard time getting them to understand old English.” Regarding writing instruction, Mary felt “writing was writing” no matter the content. For Mary, “Writing as a historian is a lot more dry. You obviously can’t spice it up as much. You really can’t use feelings with it.”

Mary did not feel that struggling readers could not learn social studies content: “Just because a person can’t read doesn’t mean they’re not going to be good at history. You just need to find a way around that.” Mary continued to reference the idea of using workarounds to avoid having students read texts throughout the study. Her examples of workarounds included the use of video, songs, images, and reading texts aloud. However, from the beginning of the study Mary also referenced adoptions like shortening texts and altering the language of texts, as well as providing guiding questions as possible strategies for struggling readers.
Mary’s Changing Beliefs about Literacy Instruction

First semester: Historical Thinking Activities.

Introductory Methods was the first course cohort students took specifically focused on teaching social studies. The course emphasized how to teach history and geography. Literacy was never the explicit focus of these activities. When referencing these activities at the end of the first semester, Mary focused on the realization that learning required skill development: “[Introductory Methods] really emphasized critical thinking and just digging a little deeper into the subject and not just taking it at face value.” When asked about teaching geography, Mary shared, “I can learn pretty quick where something is, but I don’t think that means I’m necessarily knowledgeable in it.”

At the end of the first semester, Mary shared that she wanted to teach her future student to read like historians:

I would want to teach my students how to read a historical document, like how to analyze it, how to dig into the material and actually get what [the teacher] want[s] out of it then also something else out of it. Personally, I never had that... I would read a historical document like a story and it’s not like that.

Mary referenced how her methods professor modeled how to teach students to read like historians, and she felt she could in turn teach her students to do so based on his modeling:

“[The Methods professor] just said, ‘This is how you have to read, like, the historical document,’ and I think if you did that, like right away, then [students would] be good for the year.” Mary
also realized that engaging students in meaningful classroom conversation required skill development. While she entered teacher preparation wanting to utilize classroom conversation, she lacked the ability to do so: “I don’t think that we are necessarily taught how to [have a classroom conversation].”

By the end of the first semester, Mary was speaking about skills instruction more frequently, but did not speak of literacy instruction. Nor did she feel like she understood literacy: “I feel that as a literate person, I know what being literate means and I can spot when a person is illiterate, but I can’t explain what literacy is really.” When sharing a lesson plan she created, Mary did not list ‘reading’ or “writing’ as required skills, despite the lesson's focus in primary document analysis and a written comparison of the documents. When asked about this, she said, “That’s my bad for being I guess, just ignorant to the fact that I’m a good reader and I think I take that for granted at times because there are students that struggle with reading.”

**Second semester: Disciplinary Literacy.**

Mary’s understanding of literacy and literacy instruction increased over the second semester. She credited Disciplinary Literacy for much of this change. At the beginning of the semester, Mary defined disciplinary literacy as, “Vocabulary and skills. Things that are needed to kind of survive in a certain discipline.” By the end of the semester, Mary definition changed to, “Basically everything within your discipline.” On a Disciplinary Literacy assignment, she wrote, “Literacy helps assure that the students actually learn the material.” Mary was able to see how social studies literacy was different in comparison to other content areas. She
articulated how different content areas developed different skills. Social studies skills included, “How to analyze and how to make connections between events,” knowing that different texts are read in different ways, “how to judge bias”, and “being able to see different viewpoints.” Mary also learned that literacy strategies and tools support students as they read disciplinary texts. Delineating between reading and literacy, Mary said: “You can be literate in a field without reading a ton or knowing how to read a lot of different texts. You can still know a lot about that field and can still learn.”

Mary was able to make connections between what she learned in Disciplinary Literacy, and the unit planning occurring in Intermediate Methods. She stated, “A lot of the historical thinking things, a lot of the analyzing texts, things like that, a lot of the media stuff and group work… group discussion… I’m seeing that connect with what [the Disciplinary Literacy professor is] saying.” In addition, she realized that in order to use those activities in a secondary classroom, you would have to have a “vocabulary scaffold at the beginning. Kind of, ‘this is what some of the words you’ll come across are.’” She offered the Possible Sentence strategy (Buehl, 2011) learned in Disciplinary Literacy, as a strategy that would work. Mary also recognized the use of vocabulary instruction at her field placement:

My favorite thing that I’ve noticed is a lot of the teachers in my building will explain something in a way that’s very... heavy with vocabulary... very disciplinary. Then they will re-explain... so [the students] can kind of see, ‘Oh, he already said this, just in a different way,’ and they kind of make that connection on their own.
Another connection Mary made was the significance of Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom, 1956) when writing objectives: “[Bloom verbs] sets that bar for what is important... It shows educators kind of what their students should be able to do.” When learning about new social studies standards and their emphasis on Bloom Taxonomy verbs, she realized “it actually had a lot to do with literacy.” She realized that the focus on Bloom verbs emphasized skill development instead of content memorization. Mary no longer felt skills, such as reading like a historian, only needed to be taught at the beginning of the school year. On a Disciplinary Literacy assignment, she defined literacy as, “an ongoing skill that needs to be practiced.” At the end of the second semester, Mary stated, “I don’t think skills can be taught in one lesson...I think the skills should be taught all throughout the year.” However, Mary also expressed frustration regarding the expectation that teachers address the needs of all learners. She doubted any teacher’s capacity to realistically support struggling students in a class with diverse abilities. She stated, “[struggling students] get kind of steamrolled in the process because you are not going to take the 29 other kids that already know this skill and push them to the wayside just so you can start to teach it to these two.”

Mary remained adamant about the importance of communication in a classroom. She felt it should be a “requirement in high school classes,” citing the increased use of social media as detrimental to meaningful conversation and debate. Throughout the second semester, she began to speak more specifically about how it related to social studies. Mary stated:

Realistically, if you’re a decent social studies teacher, at one point or another you’re going to be talking about a semi-controversial topic... and I think being able to teach
[students] how to talk about real issues, teaching them that it’s okay to talk about real issues if you stay calm and don’t explode on someone.

When asked what literacy skills she hoped to develop with her students at her field placement, Mary focused on having students make connections between the past and modern day. When asked how she would support students, she talked about using timelines because, “you can see... [events] overlap and see like, ‘oh, this event led to that event’ and so on.” She also spoke of guiding questions, “to get them thinking about the...topic”. She added, “I think a good question definitely makes a student think. It wouldn’t just be bound in the reading...don’t ask what color the sky is. Make them think about a situation and...make a connection.”

**Third semester: Student Teaching.**

During Mary’s third semester of teacher preparation, she saw limited literacy instruction at her field placement. State mandated standardized tests were a focus at Mary’s field placement, and according to Mary, this resulted in mostly content review and lessons about how to answer test questions: “We’re teaching them... this is how you have to write to do well on the test. This is the kinds of things that you need to look for.” When asked about literacy based lessons that were not focused on standardized tests, Mary spoke about writing requirements, stating, “Literacy wasn’t so much stressed. We accepted a lot more with spelling and grammar issues.” For Mary, assignments that did not stress spelling, structure and grammar did not qualify as literacy focused. Mary also spoke of a variety of work arounds utilized in her classroom, due to the students’ disinterest in reading. Mary explained, “[the students] really don’t like reading at all... but they loved being read to... They just don’t like to
sit down and read.” Mary talked about using various forms of media, such as videos, in lieu of reading words on a page. Written classroom texts were mostly limited to summarized secondary sources. Mary also spoke about a research assignment requiring students to find sources online. However, she did not identify this as a literacy based assignment. She spoke of using guided notes or reading questions as literacy supports in the classroom, and emphasized the use various levels of questions: “We have a mix of like it’s found in the reading and critical thinking to kind of separate who needs extra attention.”

When Mary began thinking about literacy instruction incorporated in her classroom, she was initially of the belief that literacy based lessons were scarce. However, after some thought, she spoke of a group project in which students would have to “write a song and make a music-video type thing, There’s a poem involved or something… so there’s going to be a lot of different literacy strategies and literacy tools that we use.” She then recalled a primary document analysis assignment she taught. She thought the assignment would be really challenging due to the complexity of the written texts involved, so she altered the text by removing “all the unnecessary stuff.” She had one group examine one text, and another group examined a second text and provided a graphic organizer “set up to answer questions.” She then had the students write a speech to use in a mock debate. According to Mary, “The lesson went really well. They didn’t find it as challenging as I thought they would... At the end of the lesson they said they really liked it... So that was kind of my big win.”

At the end of the study, Mary focused on the challenges of teaching students to read historically by analyzing documents:
Up until 10th grade, they’d had nothing but textbook stuff... We looked at Gandhi and compare him to Martin Luther King, which is a pretty easy comparison... When you haven’t ever done that before, looking at two totally different people and two totally different countries was shell shocking for them. We watched the first part of the movie Gandhi and had them analyze the movie... It was interesting to see them work through that. That has a different discourse than their textbook does.

Mary also described her struggles engaging students in classroom conversation. Despite students feeling comfortable enough to ask questions, she was unable to facilitate meaningful classroom discussions. Mary was not equipped with strategies for promoting meaningful academic conversations.

By the end of the teacher preparation program, Mary no longer felt all writing outside of English was basically the same. In fact, she emphasized the need to teach her students to write historical essays. Mary shared her lack of preparation for historical writing upon entering college: “I’d written papers for English, but... never had to write one for history.” She believed students should be taught how “how to set it up... chronologically... or by time period”, and how to “properly cite things” and include “factual information.” Mary felt, “Our job is to prepare kids for college... and you can’t do that without having them write.” When asked how she intended to support her students to improve their writing, she was unable to provide strategies other than consulting an English teacher for support.

On the final survey of the study, when asked to describe how the inclusions of literacy instruction impacted their beliefs and attitudes about teaching, Mary wrote:
[It] strengthened my idea that literacy is important in the classroom and that especially in [social studies] every piece of history that they examine has their own unique style so it is important for the students to know the differences in documents, songs, speeches etc.

Overall, Mary conveyed an attitude that it was important to include literacy instruction in social studies. She expressed the desire to engage her students in literacy based activities such in critical thinking, conversations, and document analysis in order to build essential skills. However, Mary demonstrated limited knowledge of how to accomplish this through the application of specific literacy strategies.

Mary’s Changing Beliefs about Teaching as a Profession

By the end of the first semester, Mary’s beliefs about teaching as a profession had changed. Her Introductory Methods course made her consider the large amount of pedagogical knowledge attributed to teaching:

I used to think, especially coming in as a freshman, I was in school for 13 years... I’ve sat in a class and watched a teacher for 13 years, I can do this. This is going to be easy because I can be just like them. After learning what all goes into it...I have a whole new perspective on it... You actually have to know this stuff... there’s a lot more that goes into it than just standing up and talking.

Mary credited her engagement in the historical thinking activities in class for as a factor for this change in beliefs.
Regarding disciplinary literacy, Mary came to realize, “It’s a lot more research and science based than I thought.” She shared how she used to think that graphic organizers “never really served a purpose other than to keep all your thoughts in one spot,” and teacher’s used group work as an excuse to not to talk to students. Mary learned that different literacy tools develop different skills and that, “a lot of the stuff teachers use is put in place for a reason.”

**Mary’s Changing Beliefs about Teaching All Learners**

Mary expressed frustration regarding students at her urban placement. When comparing the students to her own high school experience, she noted, “They seem to be not as interested...not to be as driven.” She expressed sympathy for the teachers who were “doing their best... and they are just not getting the result that they need or the results that they want.” She was also surprised by the literacy abilities of her students: “I’ve been in a classroom now where there are high schoolers that are struggling to read and to write and their sentences and their grammatical things are very challenged compared to what I grew up with.” At the same time, she was grateful for the opportunity to experience the world outside of her comfort zone: “I’m pretty glad I came [to this university] for school because it’s giving me a lot better perspective on... education as a whole.” Mary acknowledged she had grown up secluded from people who did not share her race, class, and general beliefs and values. As a result, she didn’t understand the life experiences of those who lived outside of her home town.

Mary took an urban society course the first semester of our study. This course had an impact on her views regarding minorities and students of low economic status. Despite finding the class challenging because it required her to analyze her personal beliefs, she believed she
learned from it: “[Urban Studies was] kind of interesting just to really explore why people are in the situation they’re in because originally I would have took the attitude of like, ‘Oh, people are there because their parents are lazy, they’re lazy.’” Having realized her own misconceptions, Mary didn’t want her future students to be misinformed: “How I was saying like poor people are poor because they’re lazy... and the belief that everybody has a fair shot to go to college. Now realizing that all of those things are wrong... people let me believe that!” Mary felt that social studies teachers should convey accurate information regarding the world and social issues.

Despite this realization, Mary continually separated herself from the students at her field placement. Although she demonstrated genuine concern for their education and wanted them to succeed, she continually referred to the students as existing on a different plane than herself. For example, Mary articulated her fears that she would not be able to connect with the students at her placement. She initially thought, “There’s no way. I’m totally different than them. I grew up in a totally different area than they did. I’m not from the city. I don’t know anything about this.” However, she felt she managed to establish good relationships with students over time. “For me and my cooperating teacher, we both have really good relationships with all the kids. We have a really good relationship with each other. So, it’s like a really light and fun atmosphere.” Additionally, when discussing how to facilitate classroom conversations, Mary noted that the students at her placement did not have what she felt was the appropriate disposition for appropriate conversation. She stated, “We’re in a situation where you would have to teach kids how to politely talk to one another and accept other people’s views and digest everything.”
Mary’s Belief in Student-Teacher Relationships

Relationships between students and teachers were very important to Mary. When talking about middle and high school, her college professors, her cohort peers, her mentors at her field placements, and her students, she referred to relationships when defining her experiences. She used terms such as “fun”, “comfortable”, and “laid back” to describe teachers she admired and the classroom environments they created. By “establishing personal connections,” these were the teachers she wanted to emulate in the classroom and spoke about observing how they taught. The Methods professor was one of these teachers. Mary spoke highly of the classroom environment he created where students were “free to express their views,” and “no one holds back.” As a result, she held his instruction in high regard.

She also admired her mentor teachers and felt she learned a great deal by observing them. For example, Mary noted that one mentor, “always asks questions to make sure that the kids are keep it up and always caps [the lesson] off with some sort of activity.” However, her mentor teachers did not always exemplify quality literacy instruction, such as their heavy reliance on workarounds. She praised one mentor for using a lot of non-reading activities because “[students] can still get their points and get their high grade but not necessarily have to read as much or do as much writing.”

Summary of Mary

When Mary began the teacher preparation program, her perception of teaching was mainly influenced by the traditional and content-focused instruction she experienced as a high school student. Over the course of the three semester study, Mary’s original perception of
teaching was challenged by her college professors. She was introduced to skills-based instruction through historical thinking activities and challenged to expand her view of teaching social studies to include literacy instruction. As a result, Mary grappled with creating a new perception of teaching. At the same time, her mentors at her field placements reinforced her original traditional, content-focused perception. Thus, Mary did not witness the instructional techniques lauded by her professors occurring in an actual classroom setting. In addition, Mary’s initial experiences viewing teaching as a teacher, instead of a student, occurred in a school environment she perceived to be much different from her own middle and high schools. Overall, Mary was confronted by new experiences throughout the study that impacted her beliefs regarding teaching social studies.

**Case Two: Travis**

**Travis’s Prior Experiences**

Travis, a chatty and affable white male, was 23 years old when the study began. Travis spent a large portion of his childhood in areas near the university. His suburban middle school housed approximately 900 students, over 90% of which were white. He attended high school in a different suburb on the opposite side of town. The high school served approximately 1,500 students, 90% of which were white. Travis was a self-declared “very talkative person” who was quick to engage in conversation and bring light-hearted humor to a situation. Growing up, Travis faced some hardships. His family moved several times, requiring Travis to make new friends and adjust to new schools. In middle school, Travis was bullied because he was an “outcast.” Furthermore, after Travis began college, his father lost his job, putting an economic
strains on the family. Yet even when discussing hardships from his past, Travis was quick to focus on the promise of a bright tomorrow.

According to Travis, his middle school experience consisted of “worksheets, worksheets, worksheets.” The textbook was the focus of most assignments, and traditional teaching methods were the norm. Travis never minded the assignments. He generally enjoyed school and excelled to the extent of being placed in honors courses. In high school, several of Travis’s teachers strayed from traditional lecture and worksheet lessons. Travis spoke fondly of his “favorite high school teacher”, a history teacher who did “different activities” and “made it fun.” Travis enthusiastically recalled Jeopardy style review games, and could still perform mnemonic devices, such as acronyms and dances, that he learned from this teacher. While some of his high school teachers still relied heavily on traditional and content-focused methods, others had students writing and performing critical thinking activities: “We did a lot of critical thinking things. Way more than I ever had to do in middle school.” Travis remembered learning the fundamentals of essay writing in English, which supported future assignments in American Literature and American History. Travis’s social studies classes relied mainly on textbooks, but he recalled a few social studies assignments where students analyzed primary sources to learn about historical figures. In social studies, he learned to view situations from multiple perspectives and to debate. Travis did not recall engaging in discussions in his high school classes: “There was no real discussion ever... It’s not like how college classes are.”

In the sixth grade, Travis received after-school reading support, “like a tutoring thing,” to improve his comprehension skills. Aside from that, he did not recall being taught to read. Travis
attributed learning to read to round robin and popcorn readings in the classroom: “We did how every other middle school does it. Like, you read out loud.” According to Travis, “[Students at my schools] were never necessarily taught to read critically. I was never taught to read critically until I came [to the university].” Travis credited two university history professors with teaching him to read critically. One history professor, “always told us to make notes or highlight stuff as we’re reading, and I never did that before.” Not only did this strategy help Travis remember what he read, “but also it helped with like, ‘Oh, why did this happen?’… Ever since then, if I have a question about something, I’ll underline it and I’ll be like, ‘I need to look that up later.’” Travis’s Historical Thought and Methods professor also impacted how he read: “I never really thought about really reading bias either until that class.”

Travis applied these historical reading skills to his personal reading. He mainly read news articles, “because books, it seems, just take more time.” Travis considered himself to be a strong reader in history, but clarified by stating:

It just depends... If you’re not interested in it, it’s going to be way harder to read it. If I’m interested in it, which most of the time with history stuff I’m interested, so it’s really easy for me to get into a reading and read it. If it’s something I’m not interested in at all, I have the hardest time getting into it. I’m a slow reader as is, so if I don’t like something, I never remember it or anything.

**Travis’s Initial Beliefs about Teaching Social Studies**

Travis was passionate about wanting to teach. At first his desire to teach stemmed from his love of the content: “I’ve always been a history nerd.” Travis admitted that teaching was a
good fit for him, “because I love talking. I just love being in front of people... I like to see them kind of get to where I’m going.” Over time, he came to realize he wanted to teach for reasons other than just love of content and talking. Travis realized he really wanted to influence kids: “The more I kind of thought about it, like I’d love to be a teacher. It was at first the love for history, and then the more I thought about it, I was like, ‘I want to be a teacher.’” Travis pursued this passion, despite his parent’s disapproval. They wanted him to pursue a more lucrative career. Nevertheless, Travis remained committed to teaching:

I just love the whole process of it, because I like the fact that we’re able to not just teach content. You’re also teaching how [students are] going to live their life. Not how exactly, but you’re kind of instilling things to help them succeed later on, and I’ve always loved that because you’re not just like, ‘Oh, you need to know why we fought World War I’. It’s also like, ‘Oh, but if you use this and you think this way, it can help you be more successful in the future.

Influenced by a concept presented in Introductory Methods, Travis adopted the belief that social studies teachers were supposed to “try to make people better citizens overall.” According to Travis, if a social studies teacher does their job “correctly”, the following should occur:

After a student goes through a [social studies] class, they should be able to make connections with various parts of history together, but also encompass political science, sociology, psychology, geography, everything. Yeah, they should be able to draw conclusions on one subject but look at it from different perspectives.
Introductory Methods had a significant impact on Travis’s beliefs. After only a few weeks of class, the course had altered how he viewed social studies education: “I never really thought about the whole making a better citizen thing until [Method’s instructor’s] class and then that just made way more sense than what I was used to thinking.” Travis also recognized that traditional methods, such as textbook-based worksheets and a reliance on lecture, were not the most effective practices. According to Travis, such methods were, “pretty much the opposite of what we talk about in [Introductory Methods]”. Furthermore, Travis believed students in middle in high school should be taught to read historically:

> It’s important... [the Introductory Method’s professor] has been saying this too. If you know how to read historically, you can apply that to anything you read... Like when I read CNN.com or something like [and think], ‘This that’s a bunch of B.S’…. that’s from learning to read historically. I look and see where there’s bias and all that. If I didn’t have that, I would be like, ‘Oh, this makes a lot of sense.’

While Travis was enjoying his field placement because he was allowed “to do whatever I want in the classroom,” he noted how reliance on traditional methods had a negative impact on student learning: “[The mentor] is just lecturing all the time... [The students] are doing open book tests. They open the book and go through the book and write down like... Alexander Hamilton did blank...I hate that... because it doesn’t challenge the students at all.”
Travis’s Changing Beliefs about Literacy Instruction

First semester: Historical Thinking Activities.

Early in the first semester, when speaking about literacy instruction, Travis focused on how students used texts to find answers to questions. In addition, whether discussing his childhood experiences or his experiences at his field placement, he referenced having students read aloud as a form of literacy instruction. On the written survey given at the end of the first semester, Travis defined literacy as: “Being literate means that you are able to read and write. Not only the basics but you are able to read and write critically.” When explaining what it meant to be literate in social studies, Travis wrote, “Being literate in social studies means you are able to read a variety of texts from the disciplines and can also write and analyze critically.”

On the same survey, Travis indicated that Introductory Methods increased his knowledge about what it meant to be literate in social studies and also his ability to incorporate literacy instruction and strategies into his teaching. Later on, when explaining these survey responses, Travis explained how well literacy instruction was stressed Introductory Methods:

We talked a lot about reading, like, primary sources, and reading historically, and thinking historically, and everything. That’s where I got my definition [of social studies literacy] was from Methods, is that you should be able to read and write critically, and then teach your students to do so.
Travis expounded upon what it meant to read critically: “If you’re reading... the basics... you understand the words. If you’re reading it critically you’re going to be like, ‘Oh, this doesn’t make sense. Why is this here?’” Travis also shared his thoughts about writing instruction:

That’s another thing from Methods too, is that we learned just a lot about like writing and everything, and that writing shouldn’t always be through English. That you can actually teach writing through history, like if they can learn how to analyze history and write it down. Like the very first thing we did, that Artifact Bag thing. We had to write a narrative, and all of us were awful at it. Learning from history class, in my opinion, it’s so much easier to learn how write a narrative than it would be through English... just because history is a narrative... Most writing shouldn’t exactly be done through English because there’s so much benefit for history classes as well.”

Travis also credited Introductory Methods with his new beliefs that a “wide variety” primary documents should be used in history classes. Travis was adamant about teaching students to look for and understand bias when reading: “Really, you should read everything critically because nothing is going to be straight up, like, neutral.” In fact, he felt that in social studies classes students should spend most of their time reading primary documents and listening to one another, “because it’s vital for [students] to develop their own way of speaking, and they should also learn to listen to their peers because that’s going to carry on... making people a better citizen.”
Second semester: Disciplinary Literacy.

At the beginning of the second semester, Travis defined disciplinary literacy as, “How you read or analyze something in your discipline.” At the end of semester, he defined it as, “Your ability to read or think in a lens that focuses on your discipline. In my case historical thinking, or analyzing historical texts.” To Travis, literacy was “kind of like how you think. It’s not just reading because you have to be able to speak... write [your thoughts] down, think about something, listen to other various sources.” He thought literacy strategies were “different ways how you try to promote literacy, such as a graphic organizer... [students] are able to read more carefully such as placing things to a graphic organizer or the KWL chart or anything like that.” When speaking about incorporating literacy instruction in the classroom, Travis focused on graphic organizers because they were useful for “promoting critical thinking, historical thinking.” Travis had not thought about literacy as skills, but after some reflection he stated, “I would say comprehension is probably a literacy skill and [student’s] ability to analyze anything, like any reading they get.” Travis used the verb analyze often, to the point where he noticed and stated, “I use [analyze] a lot in my lesson plans,” and “It’s hard to describe [what social studies experts do] without using analyze again.” Travis defined analyze as looking at things and “making connections...how one thing relates to another...so that [students] are actually able to look at different times in history and make those connections.” However, he had never recognized that many of the Bloom Taxonomy (Bloom, 1956) verbs required in objective writing, such as analyze, were literacy skills. Travis offered the following as an example of how he taught students to analyze:
It was *The Declaration of Man*, I handed [the students] that and I told them to highlight whenever they thought something was an enlightenment idea, and then on the back there was a graphic organizer that had all the enlightenment thinkers, and they would have to write down what section of [the document] was [similar to an Enlightenment thinker] and why they thought it was like that.... That’s forcing [students] to look at something... so it’s visual...[Students] are actually going to be thinking [about] what an Enlightenment thinker is and how it influenced [the document].

In addition to graphic organizers, Travis provided Possible Sentences (Buehl, 2011), KWL, and think-pair-share as examples of literacy strategies and was able to explain their basic use. Travis saw the value of these strategies as assessment tools: “Like you know where your students are at a certain point. That’s the biggest thing I’ve taken away from [Disciplinary Literacy] so far has been that.” According to Travis, he was aware of many literacy strategies prior to the Disciplinary Literacy course, but the course provided him with their specific names, “the official lingo.”

At the beginning of the second semester, Travis felt Disciplinary Literacy mostly just provided him with the terminology for concepts he was already using. By the end of the semester, Travis admitted that prior to taking Disciplinary Literacy, he “wasn’t very literacy minded.” “I would just be like we are going to read this.... [Disciplinary Literacy] caused me to look at more at textbook structure. Some of [the texts] might not have worked for kids who have struggled reading.” However, he was still confused by some of the concepts addressed in Disciplinary Literacy to the point where it “hurt his head”.
Aside from graphic organizers, Travis did not observe any examples of literacy instruction at his field placement. At the beginning of the semester, he spoke mainly of observing the mentor and relying on lectures, but he wanted to see and implement some of the methods and strategies discussed in his coursework. Travis shared that he wanted students to use the Possible Sentence strategy (Buehl, 2011) a strategy presented in Disciplinary Literacy, rather than just looking up definitions to “the blue words” in the textbook’s glossary. At the end of the semester, Travis spoke about utilizing more primary sources: “I don’t necessarily like to use the textbook, but I am not comfortable getting rid of it completely. I am weaning off its use. I’d like to lean heavy on primary sources.” Travis had taught several lessons using primary sources and utilized guided questions to facilitate student analysis, particularly the recognition of bias, and wanted to continue this practice throughout the third semester.

**Third semester: Student Teaching.**

On a survey given at the beginning of the third semester, Travis wrote about why literacy instruction was important: “I believe it is important for students to be able to read/think like a historian. It is vital because it can help students look at society and their life in a whole new light.” On the same survey, Travis expressed a desire to incorporate KWL charts, think-pair-shares and jigsaw readings into his instruction at his field placement. He believed these strategies would help students “look at primary/secondary sources so they can get a better feel for aspects of history.” Travis also wrote about the existing barriers to literacy instruction at his field placement:
These may be students at different reading levels. You may have students who can barely read and when this occurs it can severely impair their learning. They may not understand certain words and therefore may not comprehend what exactly is occurring, not only in the reading but in the class as well. The same can be said about ESL students.

Later in the semester, Travis spoke about how he adapted his lesson plans for struggling readers: “When I try to do primary source work...I usually print out a class copy, and then I read aloud, and then we kind of discuss it, and then they’ll have to write something.”

Travis was excited to teach an upcoming primary source lesson that involved WWII artifacts:

One day is going to be a primary source that they read and then they have to write how life as a teenager was in WWII. Like, they have to write like a page, and then another one... hopefully that would be something awesome... Then the next [primary source] is... a foot locker from a WWII veteran and there’s stuff in there.

When asked to describe the literacy demands of this assignment, Travis responded:

[Students] are going to have to analyze the artifacts in order to kind of set that into a story...it’s a creative narrative. They’re taking that analysis that they pull from all the items they’re going to be looking at... and placing it into a creative setting.

Travis had thought about how he should support students throughout this lesson. He was fairly confident that the students had done this sort of analysis before. He also spoke of a printed guide for the students that included guided questions: “It’s not like they’re going off and doing
whenever. There’s a structure to what they need to look for and there’s also structure on what they need to have in the narrative.” Travis added: “[My mentor and I] don’t just say, ‘All right, look at the trunk.’ We say like, ‘What’s on the outside of the trunk... What is inside the trunk... What type of clothes are in there?’” Regarding the decision to assign a creative narrative, Travis stated:

With this group of kids anyway, they would be bored to death if I told them to just write like a report on it. There’s quite a few kids in there that I’ve seen their English scores versus their History scores, and a lot of them like to write. They like to write really creatively, because I’ve done something like this in the past before where I had them write. It was for WWI. I had them write a letter to a loved one as if they were in trench warfare. They wrote about that and then I saw a lot of them liked it. [The WWII trunk] assignment will be kind of a similar idea to that, but applying it with like something kind of completely different.

At the end of the semester, Travis was pleased that he taught a number of lessons utilizing “a wide variety of primary sources”, KWLs, and graphic organizers. Many of these lessons culminated in writing assignments where students had to utilize information garnered from primary source analysis. For Travis, these experiences “really strengthened my ideas of beliefs about teaching. I believe there is a lot of good that can come from analysis of sources... the skill of analysis can be applied almost anywhere.” Travis believed that the only way to improve students’ literacy abilities was to have them practice “time and time again.” Travis also
believed in the importance of modeling. Whether it involved writing, reading, or speaking, he felt students needed to see a strategy in action in order to fully understand the expectations.

Travis was disappointed that he was not able to implement “more cooperative learning stuff” in the classroom, such as think-pair-shares or jigsaws. Additionally, he would have preferred giving students more challenging guided reading questions as compared to the surface level questions given by the mentor teacher. Travis believed students should “not just to sit here and find the answers in a book and write it down. That isn’t going to do anything. You actually have to go in there and think.” He also wished he could have taught the students at his placement how to format a research report. When reading students’ reports, Travis noted “their structure was just terrible. Structure and just normal grammar and spelling.” Travis wanted to support students by providing an example report and a “guided outline saying, ‘What is your main topic going to be?’ If he were to just assign them to make an outline, “it’s going to be terrible.”

Travis would have also liked to teach the students at his placement how to give a presentation because, “You’re going to need [presentation skills] no matter what in life.” According to his observations, the students at his placement had not been taught presentation skills. Travis wanted to stress the importance of “eye contact”, “clarity of speech”, and looking “professional” by modeling what a good presentation should look like. He would provide rubrics specifying each of these presentation elements and then model them so students would “know exactly what to do.”
Travis’s Changing Beliefs about Teaching as a Profession

The Methods professor had a significant impact on Travis’s beliefs about teaching and learning: “Just because he gives us so much... just gives me a whole new way to actually look at how I teach. Like ways that I’ve never even bothered to consider.” Travis also found himself observing the Method’s professor teaching style and methods: “He's just so influential with how he teaches and everything... I want to teach that way.”

Travis’s Changing Beliefs about Teaching All Learners

Travis’s field placements were at schools located in economically struggling, urban areas. Travis “loved” his mentor at his first field placement. According to Travis, the mentor had “been in the game for a while” and was burnt out after years of “stressful [teaching] jobs.” This mentor relied on lecture, worksheets, and open book tests. While Travis did not think the mentor was an example of an “ideal teacher,” he expressed conflicting messages regarding the mentor’s attitude. Travis said he could “see were he’s coming from” when describing the mentor’s decision to “just do what [he’s] got to do now” because “[he doesn’t] want to do this anymore.” However, Travis also called the mentor’s attitude, “a bit of a cop out” because, “[the mentor] was in a stressful situation and everything, but I feel like you shouldn’t sacrifice your teaching because of it.”

Both of Travis’s field placements served predominately African American students in low-income areas of the city. Recognizing he was a white male in a position of authority, Travis was uncomfortable discussing current events regarding race relations with his students. Travis appreciated the support he received from the Method’s professor regarding discussing race in
high school classrooms. The Methods instructor addressed this issue by assigning several readings and facilitating a candid class discussion. Afterwards, Travis felt more confident about discussing race at his placements and in future classrooms.

**Travis’s Belief in Student-Teacher Relationships**

Travis believed in the importance of establishing good student-teacher relationships. Due to the limited amount of time spent at his filed placement first semester, Travis was unable to establish what he considered to be solid relationships with the students: “I haven’t been able to build a straight up good rapport with everyone just yet. That’s not going to happen this year.” He was able to establish stronger relationships with students at his field placement second and third semester, and these relationships gave him the confidence and ability to implement more challenging assignments.

Travis’s relationship with his Method’s professor was also very influential. Throughout all three semesters, Travis declared that his Method’s professor was “awesome” and that he learned something significant from him “every week.” Travis stated, “[The Method’s professor has] given us a wide variety of things that we should do for students to make them actually interested in the subject.” Travis appreciated this instructor’s honesty and willingness to share stories from his own teaching experiences, even if they were unflattering: “He’s so honest with us about his good, bad, and ugly stories.”
Summary of Travis

Travis began the teacher preparation program looking to become a teacher who engaged his students in fun, critical thinking activities. He recognized some of the faults of traditional and content-based teaching, and was searching for alternative methods. Over the course of the three semester study, Travis was introduced to skills-based instruction through historical thinking activities and challenged to expand his view of teaching social studies to include literacy instruction. As a result, Travis adopted a teaching philosophy based on creating better citizens who applied social studies skills in the real world. At the same time, his mentors at his field placements relied on traditional, content-focused methods. Thus, Travis did not observe skills based instruction in the classroom. As a result, Travis’s concepts of skills-based instruction were solely based on the modeling provided by his Methods’ professor in a college classroom.

Case Three: Adam

Adam’s Prior Experiences

Adam, a married white male with a preschool age child, was 27 years old when the study began. Throughout the study, Adam engaged in unprompted and prompted reflective practices. According to Adam, he was often “guilty of over thinking things.” He shared openly about his experiences and his unconventional path to teaching. Adam recognized that, being older than his cohort peers and having already had a career, he approached things differently and held different perspectives: “I feel like I’m somewhere between the students and the professor. I’m in the middle.” According to Adam, a former professor once advised him, “If you
ever think about wanting to be a teacher, just start acting like a teacher.” Adam took this advice, and thus had reflected upon his past educational experiences through a teacher’s lens prior to beginning the teacher preparation program.

Adam grew up near the university in an affluent suburb that was approximately 90% white. His mother was a teacher and his father an engineer. Adam described his family as financially well-off, noting they had enough money to travel extensively. According to Adam, throughout his childhood his family had visited nearly every part of the country at least once. Adam spoke of his family with respect, sharing anecdotal stories about his wife and child, and disclosing that he informed his mom each time he made the Dean’s List. As a child, Adam attended a small Christian school with a class size of 44 students, kindergarten through senior year. He enjoyed his time there, noting that he hated being sick and missing school, and praised the “really close” relationships between students and teachers. According to Adam, “everyone knew everyone, and it wasn’t even just by face. Most people, you knew their names.” He recalled times when he wanted to do well in class as not let down teachers he admired and described a school environment where students felt comfortable talking to teachers about personal struggles. Adam spoke of the friendships and comradery amongst students despite their varying socio economic status. His school was located outside the community in which he lived, and served a number of surrounding communities of varying socio economic classes: “Most of my friends lived in [a different suburban area] which was lower income level... we all had our own different dynamics. We all visited each other’s houses... Rich kids were friends with the poor kids. Money never really came up.”
Adam was a self-described “lousy student” with a “C average” who graduated high school near the bottom of his class. Throughout high school Adam did not feel connected to the content taught in class, which didn’t “affect me in the real world.” Adam frequently watched informational television programs: “I still have probably 50 VHS tapes that I would record The History Channel.” He was “really interested in so many things outside of school,” especially World War II military history. In fact, he recalled being excited about WWII as an upcoming topic in a high school history course, only to be disappointed by the time allotted to the topic: “I remember being like, ‘Oh, this is the biggest thing. Everything led up to World War II and everything has been a consequence’, and we spend two days on it... It felt like the carpet was pulled out from underneath me.”

Having no clear plan or path upon graduating high school, Adam spoke to an advisor at a regional college associated with the university. Having “no idea” what to study, the advisor suggested electronic media based upon his interest in movies. Adam stated, “I did it. I enjoyed it. I excelled in it. I got a lot of awards.” His degree in electronic media led to a job with a production company making American documentaries, ranging from “a set on moon landings” to “some museum in Tennessee about railroads.” Adam “really liked that it was historical,” and gravitated towards projects of a historical nature. During this time, Adams’ interest in American history grew. He accumulated a collection of WWII memorabilia and gave talks about it at local schools. Taking note of this, his high school principal recruited him to help plan and teach a course leading up to a WWII focused class trip to Normandy, France. Adam fondly recalled how good it felt to engage the students and their parents while visiting various sites in France. Adam also became an avid reader across a variety of topics, but read about American history the
most. He wrote a book about WWII that was in the peer review stage during the time of the study.

Beginning when he was in high school, Adam’s mother and several former teachers believed he would become a teacher. For a while, Adam dismissed the notion; but he changed his mind because of his wife’s urging and his experiences teaching English as a second language to adults. The position did not come with any training, so Adam had to develop his own lessons and materials. At the time of the study, Adam had taught ESL for three years and enjoyed it: “Even in adults, I’ve seen completely different ways that they learn.” For Adam, teaching was about individual students. He relished opportunities to work one-on-one with people. Regarding teaching, Adam exclaimed, “I enjoy it. So that’s fun. I really enjoy just making people understand things, whether it’s something in American history or teaching the students about baseball. There’s just something about that.”

**Adam’s Initial Beliefs about Teaching as a Profession**

Adam described the majority of his middle and high school teachers as “lousy” because they were focused on classroom management and relied heavily on lecture and other traditional methods. Adam described one history class to sum up what he remembered about the methods employed by his middle and high school teachers:

All I remember is being in a dark classroom with an overhead projector... Basically all we would do... every day we just took notes. What’s really bad... me and a handful of others, who were really slow writers, readers and writers, if [the teacher] would flip the overhead to the next page and we weren’t done with it, then [the teacher] would take
the ones we hadn’t finished… and me and five or six others would have to go out in the hallway and finish.

Reflecting on this experience from the perspective of a teacher, Adam criticized this practice because “[the teacher] wasn’t doing anything. We were just copying the notes,” and also, “It was really alienating the slow kids who couldn’t keep up and we were literally out of the classroom as a result.” Adam contrasted these methods with those of his former high school geometry teacher: “It was like the classic case of the new teacher coming in, real energetic, real loud, real active” who had “students out in the hallways doing different projects.” Even as a high school student, Adam noted a clear distinction between the geometry teacher and the other teachers, noting that “classroom management was not really [a concern]” because the geometry teacher “kept everyone engaged.”

Adam believed that instruction should be engaging, and the teacher’s approach impacted the level of engagement: “People have to be passionate about what they do.” Pulling from his past, he frequently thought about lessons from the perspective of a disengaged student. Adam also believed that students learned better when they felt connected to the world around them.

There needs to be some kind of dynamic for the students and the teacher that basically fosters an idea to the kids that they’re part of this world, part of this country. That whether they like it or not they matter… that they have a choice of how much they contribute to their society or just to themselves, to their own life.
Getting to know students was essential in this endeavor. Adam frequently spoke about relating difficult concepts to things students were interested in. He enjoyed opportunities to work with individual students and spoke enthusiastically about opportunities were he was able to expand student’s thinking and understanding one-on-one: “That’s why I want to be a teacher, just because I enjoyed giving those little lessons.”

According to Adam, he had always been a “super slow reader”: “For example, to this day, if I’m reading something and want to take a note, even coming back to it, I can’t find my place.” He “never liked reading out loud in class. Which happened all the time.” Adam recognized that his reading struggles should have been addressed in school: “I don’t remember teachers working with me on it, or [learning to read] being part of the curriculum.” When asked if he was taught to read as a college student in the Historical Thought and Methods course, Adam was reflective about his answer:

Taught to read? I guess, let me think about this differently. When you first asked me, I was thinking literal technical retaining what I’m reading and that kind of thing. In that context, no. But in the context of learning to read meaning from a historical viewpoint, like what the author is trying to say, how they are saying it, in that context, yeah.

Adam’s Changing Beliefs about Literacy Instruction

First semester: Historical Thinking Activities.

The historical thinking activities presented in Introductory Methods appealed to Adam. One such activity, *The Artifact Bag and Museum of Me* (Hicks & Lisanti), required students to
write a descriptive narrative about an unknown person based upon artifacts. Adam saw value in
the activity as an engaging way to learn about historical thinking. He even shared the activity
with a former history professor as something that was a “tangible way to really convey the
overarching theme for [historiography].”

On the initial survey of the study, Adam indicated that he believed literacy instruction
should occur in social studies classrooms and that he intended to teach students how to read a
variety of texts. During his first field placement, he took a historical thinking activity presented
in Introductory Methods and taught it at his placement: “I went in and did it... The discussion
we had was really cool because I understood through the difficult reading they still managed to
grasp the general idea.”

At the end of the first semester, when asked to define the term literacy on a written
survey, Adam responded, “Able to read and analyze and understand content.” On the same
survey, when asked to explain what it meant to be literate in social studies, Adam responded
with the same answer. When explaining these responses, Adam spoke in terms of being
“culturally literate”: “I think for students and/or citizens to be literate they need to be able to
read, analyze, understand and I may even add explain or regurgitate... of a given topic,
citizenship.” Adam was influenced by the historical thinking activities presented in Introductory
methods: “That has definitely affected how, I definitely want [students] to read primary
sources.” Adam acknowledged that a social studies teacher has to teach students to effectively
read primary documents and new articles since students were, “just so used to this quick, fast
answer.” He stated, “I’d like to prepare kids to not be intimidated by a large article if that’s what’s going to give them more information.”

Throughout the first semester, Adam often referenced writing when discussing literacy. He preferred essay over multiple choice questions in social studies: “If it’s an essay question... I have more room to adapt and shift my thoughts and think how things are connected.” He noticed that students at his placement lacked writing skills and felt it was his responsibility as a teacher to improve these skills: “If I was teaching geography class, I would probably make them write, not so much for geography but just to develop that skill as a human being.”

**Second semester: Disciplinary Literacy.**

Adam wanted students to become better readers in social studies. In particular, he wanted students to read primary sources and articles, noting that “a textbook only exists in the high school classroom.” Recognizing the complexities of social studies texts, he felt it was important to give students a purpose for reading and to “guide them through.” He spoke about wanting to, “I’d like to prepare kids to not be intimidated by a large article with authentic texts.

Adam defined disciplinary literacy as, “The students being able to... not only know how to read, whether it’s historical documents, whether it’s just the textbook, whether it’s just a question, and being able to understand that process and think critically think about it.” To illustrate this point, he recounted a lesson presented on the first day of Disciplinary Literacy. The professor provided him with a text on an unfamiliar topic and demonstrated how someone could correctly answer questions about the topic by copying from a text, despite understanding very little about it. To this point, Adam added, “Literacy is being able to... put in words, be able
to explain it. Not regurgitate it but be able to process it and explain it to yourself or someone else.” Adam personally related to “regurgitating” from a text: “That’s how I got through my [high school] social studies classes. That’s why I don’t remember anything from [high school] social studies classes.” He connected this understanding to Intermediate Methods: “We started talking about geography and how most map exercises are identifying maps or understanding maps, but… kids aren’t asked to use the map skills.” For Adam, literacy instruction meant, “Having kids do something. Use what they’ve learned.” To Adam, disciplinary literacy included: “The language, the vocab, the comprehension, the understanding and everything within the subject. Today we were talking about the electoral college… they need to be able to explain what that is, what it’s for, how it’s used, or even model how it works.”

Adam utilized separate objectives for skills and content when lesson planning, noting the importance of not focusing merely on content. He recognized that social studies skills, such as making inferences, summarizing, drawing conclusions, having opinions, and recognizing perspectives, were a part social studies literacy. While Adam saw the purpose for literacy instruction in social studies, he was frustrated by how it was presented in Disciplinary Literacy: “It’s just stuff I’ve already thought about but I haven’t thought about it in the way of the books or [the Disciplinary Literacy professor] explains.” Adam found it difficult to articulate this position and struggled to put it in words: “It’s almost like… someone’s telling me how to walk. Like, I don’t know all the terms and I don’t know what exactly is happening, but I know that I can do that in the classroom.” Adam immediately questioned this response, by adding, “Or maybe I don’t do it in the classroom. I get lost in all the heavy. It’s difficult... because I’m coming
away feeling like all this is just so abstract.” He was, “still waiting to get more out of that class.” Those feeling did not change over the course of the second semester.

Regarding students at his field placement, Adam recognized that a lack of “basic” and “content” vocabulary was hindering their ability to understand texts and concepts: “If you give me a paragraph with three sentences, I guarantee there’s five words they never heard of.” Adam believed that the educational system had failed these students: “It’s just so basic what these kids missed out on. They were just passed on...[I’m] just frustrated.” Adam recognized the varying literacy needs of students, noting that it was difficult to discuss and define literacy because the literacy needs of students were vast and individualized. He saw himself in a number of the students at his placement. When addressing the needs of his classroom, he thought about what would have engaged or helped him as a student. This reflection led him to realize that the majority of literacy strategies presented in coursework relied on writing, and as a student, he would have preferred to speak: “I just see [the strategies] not working... I don’t know if discussion is a strategy, but I think it is and I think it works.” Adam clarified this point by acknowledging the variety of learning styles in each classroom: “I know if I do those [literacy strategies] in class I’m going to get a good majority of the kids to do it, but there’s going to be some kids where I’m just not going to get what - I’m going to miss their literacy.” By the end of the semester, he still wasn’t aware of any literacy strategies that were discussion based. He did mention a few strategies that he might use, such as annotation with symbols, jigsaw, and vocabulary notebook where students “write their own definition”, but overall he felt, “like a lot of the strategies I want to use are not necessarily talked about in the books, so I feel like I am doing a lot of these [Disciplinary Literacy] assignments only for assignments.”
Third semester: Student Teaching.

On a written survey given at the beginning of the third semester, Adam stated, that “students should be able to understand how language functions within social studies.” Adding, “students who struggle with disciplinary literacy may be alienated or assessed improperly.” He wrote that he intended to incorporate literacy in his instruction because, “It’s necessary for [student’s] mental and professional development.” Adam listed, “graphs and charts, citations, making and supporting arguments, forming new ideas/theories,” as skills used by experts in the social studies fields. He described literacy strategies appropriate for social studies as, “those that center on criticism, inquiry, organization.” He listed “reviewing” and “using vocabulary”, along with “examining how language meanings can shift depending on context” as ways he intended to incorporate literacy into his instruction. When asked for specific strategies he would use, Adam wrote, “Having students build a vocab list” and “Incorporating reading and writing strategies i.e. organizing”. When asked to share the barriers to incorporating literacy instruction into his student teaching, he responded “self-discipline”, which he explained as, “committing myself to follow through on implementing strategies.”

At the end of the third semester, Adam was given a survey with similar questions. He listed “KWL, think-pair-share-, various graphic organizers, [and] incorporating language questions into assignments” as strategies he utilized in his teaching throughout the semester. His responses focused largely on vocabulary, stating, “Throughout the semester I identified various words [content and general] and ideas that I addressed either through discussion or directly incorporated in lesson/assessments.” When asked how he intended to improve his
future students’ abilities to read, write, speak and think in the social studies, Adam wrote, “Lots of reading, lots of writing, much time spend on HOW to write. HOW to read. HOW to take notes etc.” During the last interview of the semester, Adam shared that his beliefs and attitudes about literacy instruction had not really changed, “but in terms of different tools and ways to approach it and strategies - that stuff has.” He shared how his mentor assigned Document Based Questions with 17 sources students could use, but failed to give explicit directions: “It was the perfect opportunity... It would have been a very teachable moment to go through like, ‘Hey guys... for today and tomorrow let’s just talk about a few of these sources, how to wrap your head around them, pick through, them... and model how to do that.” Adam spoke of several instances at his field placement where he took the time to model and teach how to “take notes” or use context clues to infer word meaning. He also made it a point to use a variety of texts other than text books. Overall, he believed he should continue to incorporate literacy into his future teaching, but was uncertain if constraints, such as time and forced curriculum, would limited his ability to do so.

**Adam’s Changing Beliefs about Teaching as a Profession**

Adam had already thought a great deal about teaching and learning prior to the study, but his Methods courses and Disciplinary Literacy provided terminology and frameworks. Speaking about Methods, Adam stated: “The Methods class has been really beneficial in terms of giving names to the different ideas that I’ve [had], being able to give me material to open a dialogue.” He also acknowledged that, “The more you learn, the more you realize you don’t know,” when discussing his confidence levels as a teacher. While his confidence increased
overall throughout the cohort, he realized that there was so much more to the professional
than he originally thought. In fact, he at one time saw himself pursuing a Master’s degree since
he felt there was so much more to learn about teaching.

Adam’s Changing Beliefs about Teaching All Learners

Adam had preconceived notions about urban schools. During the first semester of the
study, when speaking about his placement at a local urban school, Adam said:

These kids just don’t do very well. Which didn’t surprise me going into the urban setting.
I was expecting a certain dynamic... What I’m seeing is what I expected... Some of them
just can’t write. They won’t do the simplest of assignments. They just don’t have that,
which I’m sure goes back to their homes and neighborhoods.

At the same time, course work was challenging these notions. Later in the same interview,
when describing a challenging lesson he taught, Adam stated:

I was thinking, ‘This tough reading,’... I had four things for them to read... I was really
thinking about just going and maybe doing two of them. I had things I’ve learned [at the
university] and I’ve got to have high expectations. You don’t go lower because it’s urban
society or urban setting.

Adam was troubled by the hardships a number of his students faced: “My heart just breaks for
a few of them.... Nine of the kids in the school system that are homeless. I know they live with
someone, but the fact they don’t have permanent homes, permanent families.” Having seen
firsthand the injustices faced by his students, he began to question his role as their teacher:
Education is supposed to create these incredibly-minded democratic citizens. It’s like, where’s the line between that and getting these kids to just have a decent life?... My goal is not for this kid to go out and challenge the authority and the systems in place. It’s like, my objective for this kid is for this kid to be able to get a job, get an apartment and hopefully create some kind of foundation for this kid.”

Adam questioned the fairness of having the same expectations for all students, knowing that some of them faced extreme hardships at home: “There’s a few kids that...come from non-broken homes and you can see they have a system down. They can study. They can read. So maybe that kid I can have him worry about laws and stuff like that.” Overall, his experience in urban placements impacted his previous notions about expectations and progress:

I think when I very first thought of being a teacher, I’d be more, ‘Every kid has to do this, no exceptions’. Now it’s like, this kid, he’s had his head down for three weeks. Now he’s writing and he turns in something, that’s a start. I’m happy with that.

Adam was critical of his mentors at his filed placements, but was quick to explain how they were working under stressful circumstances, where new students were constantly added to the classes, attendance was erratic, and many teachers seemed “burnt out.” On several occasions, he addressed how too much time was spent on classroom management instead of instruction. As a result, he did not feel as if he was seeing what his professors wanted him to see: “A lot of this stuff [taught in coursework] would be a lot easier to stick and to understand if I was in a better environment.” At the same time, Adam could see himself teaching in a
struggling urban environment, so he didn’t, “want to go out to some school where everything is perfect.”

Adam’s Belief in Student-Teacher Relationships

From early on, Adam recognized the importance of student-teacher relationships. He articulated how close relationships led to a better learning environment. He recalled high school teachers and college professors who fostered relationship with students, and as a result, classroom management seemed simpler and students were more motivated: “My first mentor teacher I started off with... his entire week, all he did was just talk to the kids about himself, about what the kids want to do. He created this relationship and the kids were awesome.” Adam used his Methods courses as an exemplar of positive student-teacher relationships: “It’s like a group atmosphere ...I want that to be in the high school. Where it’s not like the teacher’s there and the students are here, and it’s two separate things going on. It needs to be this more fluid team.”

Summary of Adam

Adam began the teacher preparation program wanting to bring meaningful and engaging lessons into the classroom. Over the course of the three semester study, Travis was introduced to skills-based instruction through historical thinking activities, and teaching social studies with a literacy focus. These concepts resonated with Adam’s perceptions of quality teaching, complementing his previously formed ideas about addressing the needs of individual learners. As a result, Adam utilized literacy based instructional practices when designing and teaching lessons at his field placements.
Case Four: Rachel

Rachel’s Prior Experiences

Rachel, a cordial and soft-spoken white female, was 21 years old when the study began. Rachel was thoughtful, reflective, and chose her words carefully. She grew up in a suburb with a population of about 19,000, over 90% of which were white, located approximately 215 miles from the university. Rachel described her hometown as a “bigger small town” where “everyone knows everyone.” Rachel did not share much about her personal life aside from her relationship with her father. She spoke several times of her father’s encouragement and how she valued his advice. Rachel also revealed that in her spare time she enjoyed reading popular adult and young adult novels that are “fun and takes me away a little bit.”

Regarding middle school, the few memories Rachel had focused mainly on friends and the social aspects of school. She did recall “a lot of worksheets,” “memorization,” and “pretty good teachers.” According to Rachel, those teachers didn’t rely on a great deal of lectures and note taking: “It was more like group work, more activities like that.” However, Rachel did recall assignments reliant upon textbooks, such as copying vocabulary definitions from the glossary and fill in the blank worksheets.

Rachel’s memories of her experiences as a student focused on her high school, which served approximately 1,300 students. She spoke fondly of her high school experience. In fact, “she really liked high school” and didn’t want to leave. She recalled friendships with peers but focused on her positive relationships with a number of teachers, which played a “large role” in her positive high school experience. In fact, she believed her high school teachers “had a huge
influence” on her desire to teach. Her teachers’ methods were student centered and students were “hands on”: “The teachers would give [students] a guide and then we would be in control of [the learning].” Rachel remembered “going to the computer lab for most of my classes” were students would research questions in groups and then worked together to write about and present their findings. Rachel found the methods utilized by her high school teachers to be superior to the methods used in middle school.

Rachel believed her high school teachers taught her to read by teaching about text features and providing guided questions with reading assignments. She felt that her high school teachers further supported her reading development by pre-selecting web resources and explicitly teaching students how to conduct online searches. Rachel also recalled lessons involving reading primary sources were “the teachers would mostly be like, ‘Let’s read a few sentences. Stop. Ok, what did that mean? What’s your interpretation of it?’” Reflecting on these experiences, Rachel realized that her teachers were trying to teach her to read like a historian, but at the time they were not explicit about their purpose.

Rachel appreciated her high school teacher’s emphasis on creating positive classroom environments: “Because... if you dread walking into a teacher’s class... you automatically shut off, but if you have teachers who are personable and that actually care... that helped out a lot.” She believed that all students should feel safe and welcomed at school.

Even before college, Rachel understood that teaching came with challenges: “I know most people think [teachers]... just go from the textbook... I’m like, ‘No. It’s a lot of work and I don’t know if it’s going to be worth the pay.” For Rachel, the biggest deterrent to the teaching
profession was the salary. She worried about being able to support herself on a teacher’s paycheck. Ultimately, with her father’s encouragement to do “what makes you happy,” she decided to pursue her passion for teaching. Rachel believed that the world needed more passionate teachers, noting that among all of the great ones, “there’s always one or two that you’re like, ‘Why are you teaching? This isn’t for you.’

Rachel’s dad nurtured her love for social studies. Growing up, she recalled talking about “government issues, politics, and stuff like that” with him. Rachel and her dad traveled to Washington DC every year. When speaking about these trips, Rachel showed that her love of social studies went well beyond historical narratives:

We go check out the museums and we just go to every touristy spot and we do those historical things... I find it fascinating because even now it’s always changing. The times change. The cultures change... and that just fascinates me and there’s just so much out there that I want to know, I just want to keep my knowledge growing and I think social studies is a great way to do that.

Rachel considered herself knowledgeable and an able reader in the fields of social studies, as indicated on a survey given at the start of the study, but was quick to acknowledge there was much more for her to learn. She also recognized that there was more to social studies than just history. When describing her high school geography class, she stated:

We did a lot where you’d pull a map up on the board and be like, ‘Ok, this is where these places are,’ and we would do map quizzes, but then [the teacher] also went to the
cultural side to it, their government. [The teacher] kind of integrated a few different social studies aspects into it.

**Rachel’s Initial Beliefs about Teaching Social Studies**

Rachel believed that social studies lessons should be engaging and hands on. Her mentor at her first field placement did not share this belief and it negatively impacted Rachel’s experience at that school. According to Rachel, her mentor was a bad stereotype of a social studies teacher: “They’re male. They coach. They lecture.” In contrast to her mentor’s reliance on lecture and movies, Rachel developed and taught a lesson that required students to move around and interact with one another. It also allowed students to be creative and express their ideas through drawing. Student feedback was positive: “A lot of them said that they liked moving around. They liked having different seats. They liked being interactive. They liked doing different things rather than just sitting there taking notes.” Rachel was frustrated by her mentor’s aversion to students leaving their seats: “They’re in seventh grade. They need to get up! They need to move!”

Introductory Methods provided Rachel with methods and practices that promoted quality social studies teaching. As a result, Rachel recognized the high quality of the instruction she received in high school. Rachel referenced her experiences as a high school student when explaining her beliefs about teaching:

When I think back to what I did in high school, it was... reading primary sources. It was group work, the teacher facilitating. Like, yeah, there were some lecture days. That
needs to happen. But other than that, it was, ‘Think for yourselves. Why did this happen? You’re going to have a different view on it than someone else’.

As indicated on a survey given at the beginning of the first semester, Rachel strongly believed in utilizing a variety of texts when teaching social studies. The survey also revealed her strong intentions to teach her future students to read a variety of texts, write, and listen and speak to their classmates. The Historical Thought and Methods course taken earlier in her college career influenced these intentions. The course required her to read a number of primary and secondary sources and then “write book reviews on [them] and explain who the author was, what they were getting at.” She believed this process improved her own reading abilities. Discussion was another element of the course, as a result Rachel recognized how much she learned by listening to her classmates.

Rachel’s Changing beliefs about Literacy Instruction

First semester: Historical thinking activities.

Prior to spending time at her first field placement, Rachel had not considered the possibility that she would be teaching students to read. However, the realization that she would be teaching reading didn’t deter her from the profession: “I think if anything that helps me with my lesson plans.” Thinking about literacy allowed Rachel to consider the skills her lesson plans should focus on and to allot time for the instruction of those skills. Rachel credited Introductory Methods with improving her ability to support struggling readers, specifically the historical thinking activities. When describing how she would adapt the primary sources used in these activities for the struggling readers at her field placement, Rachel said:
I can ask [struggling readers] if they want to come in during their free periods or say after class, before class. Or even if I give them documents [I could] cut down and rearrange the words so that they have a better understanding. To take it down a few levels for them to at least know what we’re talking about. They can at least engage in conversation if they wanted to.

Rachel also cited the comprehension questions provided with the primary sources as reading supports: “The questions at the bottom... kind of made sure you were understanding what you were reading.” In addition, Rachel believed the discussion portion of historical thinking activities were key, “because I know students learn best from each other. They’re going to listen to each other more than they listen to me so they might as well... just get their ideas out there and... different perspectives.”

The historical thinking activities also improved Rachel’s own ability to read like a historian. By assuming the role of a student and completing these activities, Rachel was able to reflect on her own strengths and needs as a reader in social studies. When describing embedded supports in the activities, such as guided questions, Rachel said, “I was given more resources, so I think that was able to help me scaffold it towards myself.” Rachel believed that Introductory Methods made her more aware of what it meant to be literate in social studies: “I guess I didn’t really know the skills needed, and then when I found them out, I’m like, ‘Ok, I could do that.’” Introductory Methods also allowed her to recognize the skills she already possessed as a reader of history: “I took [Historical Thought and Methods] where you have to
learn to read and write like a historian. I guess I kind of reflected back on that class and I was like, “Ok, I did learn that.”

On a survey given at the beginning of the first semester, Rachel was neutral about the idea that students should learn skills in social studies classes. On the end of the semester survey, her response to this same statement changed to strongly agree. Her response changed because she realized that skills instruction was important “just to give the students the thought to start questioning more things.”

On the same survey, Rachel defined literacy as, “To be able to read and understand what one is reading.” She defined literacy in social studies as, “To be able to read critically and think like a historian, geographer etc.” On the survey, Rachel also strongly agreed that Introductory Methods provided her with strategies to incorporate, reading, writing, listening and speaking strategies into her instruction; despite acknowledging that literacy or reading instruction was never explicitly mentioned by name in Methods. Methods did provide Rachel with “a lot of resources...lesson plans, different ways to teach,” and emphasized “always have different activities for different learners.” Rachel applied this concept when creating a lesson plan for her field placement. Within the lesson she required students to read aloud and listen to one another. Students were also required to work individually and in groups to categorize key concepts, complete a graphic organizer, utilize a word bank, generate sentences, and illustrate key concepts through drawing.
Second semester: Disciplinary Literacy.

At the beginning of the second semester, Rachel spoke at length about various ways to incorporate literacy into her instruction. According to Rachel, “Helping students excel in literacy... will help them understand and learn within each context.” Despite not seeing literacy instruction at her second field placement, Rachel was able to articulate how she would improve lessons to focus on skills and struggling learners: “Let’s go with history. If [students] are doing a primary document, I would give [students] a sheet to go along with it to guide them how they should be thinking, like guiding questions, how they should be dissecting the document.”

Rachel believed that students should be taught to use “context clues” to determine the meanings of unfamiliar words. Rachel also spoke about strategies she might use when teaching:

If I were, let’s go with giving a lecture, I would give [students]a graphic organizer.... We would do a KWL chart, things to help them understand instead of me just talking to them. Even note-taking, that helps a little bit. But me personally, I would want to give [students] more to go on than that... Just like a vocab tracker where I give them, ‘Ok, here are the vocab words, write the definition.’ That way I can see what their understandings are because I can tell them something, but how they interpret it is going to be completely different.

On a survey given at the beginning of the second semester, in addition to the strategies mentioned above, Rachel listed giving “prior knowledge; anticipate terms/concepts [students] might have problems with” and “think-pair-share” as strategies she was comfortable incorporating in her instruction.
Rachel recalled using these strategies as a high school student: “A lot of these, I knew what they were and I’ve always used them, but I guess this semester I learned that they’re literacy strategies.” According to Rachel, she began using these strategies because she remembered her past teachers using them and that they were “kind of fun.” For Rachel, literacy strategies were “things I’ve always worked with, but never really knew why we did them.” The Disciplinary Literacy course introduced her to a few new strategies, but mainly just clarified why the strategies were utilized. Inspired by methods employed by her high school teachers, Rachel believed that a social studies teacher should improve student’s literacy by “showing them how to do it, but then giving them strategies to do it and then they would pick up the tools and resources you’re giving them to build their own understandings or opinions.” Rachel wanted students to use social studies tools and strategies outside of school. To achieve this, she understood the need for “incorporating things that are happening in the news into the class.” When her students watched the news, Rachel wanted them to be able “to pick out where they are getting it from. Who is the author? Kind of like, ‘Is this a lean? ...Was this media liberal or conservative?’ Make [students] question where they are getting their news from.”

**Third Semester: Student teaching.**

On a survey given at the beginning of the third semester, Rachel defined disciplinary literacy as follows:

Disciplinary literacy is the ability of teachers to help the students be able to understand develop skills needed to read and show they understand what they are learning. As a student they are being guided by the teacher’s tools to help them understand the
content and to look at it in a whatever context ex: historian, political science, geography, economy.

On the same survey, when asked how disciplinary literacy might impact student learning in social studies classrooms, Rachel wrote: “Students will gain tools/resources to better drive their learning and to critically think about the material in the point of view of an economist, geographer, historian etc.” Rachel also wrote: “I intend to first show/explain a tool or resource with the students and have them practice until they feel comfortable to use it on their own.”

Rachel also understood the value of literacy strategies as assessments:

Each student is at a different level of understanding. Some of them just read it and read it. Some of them read it and get some of it. Some of them read it and can’t tell you what they just read. They have their own interpretations of it and they are at different reading levels. It’s just, you kind of use these strategies to see where they’re at and to help them get to where you want them to be.

Rachel taught several literacy based lessons at her field placement. She utilized Possible Sentences (Buehl, 2011) when doing small group test preparation, Venn diagrams to compare and contrast ideas such as socialism and capitalism, KWLs to assess prior knowledge and misconceptions, and guided questions when analyzing primary sources. According to Rachel, literacy strategies were not always welcomed by students, who would complain when new strategies were introduced. However, thanks to her second mentor and Methods’ professor, Rachel anticipated this reaction: “The first time will be horrible. I’m going to be like, ‘Oh, I’ll never do this again…. But just stick with it. Just do it.” She paid attention to how her students
reacted and assessed their learning, “and as I kept going with each class I kept tweaking [the strategy lesson].”

Rachel felt her “just stick with it” approach would help her in the future when teaching lessons were students had to read a variety of texts, “pulling from newspapers, even photographs, maps, timelines.” Rachel wanted her future students to, “connect their opinions and their thoughts and saying, ‘I think this because,’ and then refer back to the document.” She believed such learning could be achieved if she could “find interesting documents, stuff that will get [students] hooked so that they will want to read it and will want to refer back to it.” Rachel believed that students needed to be explicitly taught how to tackle such documents:

Do the KWL, ‘What do we know about this? What do we want to know?’ and after, ‘What did we learn?’ Then... teach them how to circle words they don’t know, underline things that you kind of understand. Have a format for dissecting the document. Then, have guided questions, or some kind of guide or aide to go along with the document.

Rachel believed that this type of instruction would develop critical thinking skills that could be applied to the “real world.” She wanted students to think critically about what they read and hear, and to “know that if they are going to have an opinion, back it up. You’ve got to have something to back it up.”

**Rachel’s Changing Beliefs about Teaching as a Profession**

Introductory Methods “confirmed” Rachel’s beliefs about teaching and learning. Rachel appreciated how the Methods professor shared his experiences as a classroom teacher: “It
helps a lot because... you’re like, ‘Ok, maybe what would I do in that situation?’ She added, “I think that helps a lot... just having someone who’s been where you’ve been... who can tell you, ‘I messed up... this is how I handled it... and this is how I should have [handled it].’”

Over time, Rachel changed her belief regarding a teacher’s responsibility for student learning. On a survey given at the beginning of the first semester, Rachel disagreed with the statement *every student can learn in social studies*. On a survey given at the end of the semester, she agreed with the same statement. Rachel explained this change:

In the beginning [of the semester] I was like, ‘[Social studies is] not going to be everyone’s subject of choice. If they don’t like it, they’re not going to learn.’ At the same time, from a teacher perspective, I’m thinking, ‘I need to fix that. It’s on me to make sure that every student learns.

Rachel also learned that good teaching doesn’t equate to knowing all of the answers. Although she considered herself knowledgeable in her subject area, a part of her felt that teachers had to know the answer to all content questions: “My biggest fear is messing up or not knowing any answer.” She learned the fallacy of this belief in Introductory Methods. If she didn’t have an answer to a student question, Rachel learned to say, “That’s a good question. I don’t know.” Rachel learned that, “you just have to be honest with [students].”

**Rachel’s Changing Beliefs about Teaching All Learners**

Rachel’s field placements were at urban schools with large populations of African American students: settings quite different than her own high school experience. However, she
never commented on the difference or on stereotypical challenges of urban schools. The topic was not mentioned until the end of the third semester when Rachel spoke about the advice she would give future students in the teacher preparation program:

There was a diversity class where we had to get outside of our comfort zone, read different documents [about diversity]. I thought that was great because I don’t want to group people together but the majority of people in my class came from small towns where it was no diverse at all... and then you’re thrown in [field placements] where there are students who are homeless. You have students who are on Section 8, who are on food stamps. It’s a lot. I think that diversity class helps.

Rachel credited a few other college professors, including her Method’s professor with teaching her about diversity and helping her apply that learning to her teaching.

**Rachel’s Belief in Student-Teacher Relationships**

For Rachel, the student teacher relationship was at the heart of good education. Rachel firmly believed that in order for learning to occur, teachers needed to create classroom environments where students felt safe and wanted:

I want to be there for them and have them be able to walk inside my classroom and be like, ‘Oh, I can take a little break [from the stresses of adolescence] but I’ll still learn. Like, be comfortable.’ Some people don’t have good experiences in middle or high school. I just want them to have a place and at least a connection or something with someone.
Rachel valued the rapport she developed with students at her field placement and took notice when students demonstrated kindness towards one another. The first time Rachel had to intervene with a student who was off task, the student responded positively: “So that just kind of reaffirmed like, you need good relationships with students.”

**Summary of Rachel**

Overall, Rachel was a student who entered the program with a perception of teaching that included student centered, literacy based instruction. Despite not having labels for certain strategies, or even realizing they were literacy based, her notion of good teaching had always closely mirrored the strategies and methods presented by instructors in the teacher preparation program. Therefore, her beliefs and attitudes about teaching were never challenged, only affirmed.

**Cross Case Analysis**

Each case presented rich details regarding individual participants’ changing understandings and beliefs regarding social studies literacy. The comparison of cases through cross case analysis however, revealed common themes regarding changes in participants’ understandings and beliefs. In the following section, I present the cross case analysis, following the same structure utilized in each case, with the addition of new subcategories used highlight common themes. I end this chapter with a discussion the overall findings of the cross case analysis and concluding remarks.
Prior Experiences

All four of the participants entered the teaching preparation program with prior experiences that influenced their beliefs and attitudes about teaching. Upon review of the cases, the data suggests that the participants’ prior experiences as students was particularly influential. In particular, the teaching methods employed by their former teachers shaped their perceptions of what it meant to teach.

Mary, Travis, and Rachel realized they wanted to enter the teaching profession while in high school. At that time, their perceptions of the profession would have been influenced by their teachers. In fact, Rachel spoke about the “huge influence” her high school teachers had on her desire to teach. Given the fact they all enjoyed their high school experiences, and spoke fondly about favorite teachers, it is possible that they sought to emulate the very teachers they admired.

Mary’s teachers assigned a lot of worksheets and gave a lot of notes. There was little classroom discussion and students did not engage in texts other than the textbook. Thus, before college, Mary’s vision of teaching was based upon traditional, content-based approaches. Travis’s perceptions of teaching were impacted by teachers who did “different activities” and “made it fun.” His notions of teaching were knowledge-based and activity-oriented, emphasizing students’ enjoyment of the tasks over their acquisition of understandings and skills. Travis did speak of his favorite high school courses where “we did a lot of critical thinking things”; and while his social studies classes relied mainly on a textbook,
he did remember having to analyze some primary sources and view situations from multiple sources during a debate. However, Travis spoke vaguely about these outlier experiences.

In contrast, most of Rachel’s teachers utilized student centered methods where the teacher served as facilitator and “[students] would be in control of the learning” through “hands on” activities. Rachel remembered her teachers focusing on skills and stressing the importance of learning to “think for yourselves.” She recognized that these methods were superior to traditional, content focused approaches to teaching.

Adam’s experiences as a student differed from the experiences of Mary, Travis and Rachel. First of all, Adam did not decide to become a teacher while in high school. Second, Adam did not excel in high school. In fact, Adam was a self-described “lousy student”. According to Adam, he enjoyed the social aspect of being a student, but never felt connected to the content taught in classes because it didn’t, “affect me in the real world.” He described his teachers’ practices as “lousy” because of their reliance on lecture and other content-based, traditional methods. This data suggests that Adam’s experiences as a student left him disillusioned with content based, traditional teaching methods.

Before he decided to enter the teacher preparation program, Adam accepted opportunities to teach others: most notably as an English as a second language teacher for adults. Adam did not emulate his former teacher’s methods. Instead, Adam reflected on his experiences as a student and approached lesson planning from the perspective of the disengaged student. Conceivably, Adam’s experiences as a student resulted in his belief that there was better way to teach, were learning equated doing, and every student felt engaged.
and connected to the material. He also recognized that good teaching had to account for the individual needs of the students, stating: “Even in adults, I’ve seen completely different ways that they learn.”

**Initial Beliefs about Teaching Social Studies Literacy**

Mary did not experience literacy instruction as a student. Even after realizing that the methods employed by her former teachers were “not exactly the best way to reach everybody,” Mary’s descriptions of instruction continued to be teacher-focused, with emphasis on the teacher creating and transmitting the understandings, rather than student-centered skills instruction. She strongly believed reading instruction should occur in English language arts and that social studies teachers “should be just more focused on social studies content versus the reading and writing content.” Moreover, Mary was dismayed by the low reading abilities of the students at her placement, and was skeptical of their ability to ever read at grade level. Instead of improving students’ reading abilities, Mary believed it was her job to offer workarounds stating: “Just because a person can’t read doesn’t mean they’re not going to be good at history. You just need to find a way around [their reading struggles].” Overall, not only did Mary lack a clear understanding of what social studies literacy was, she was adamant that it was not part of her job description.

The data suggests that Travis experienced both content based and skills based instruction a student. To some extent, this exposure provided Travis with the frame of reference to recognize how the differences in instruction resulted in different levels of learning: notably, skills-based instruction lead to more critical thinking and meaningful learning.
However, Travis never experienced explicit instruction focused on literacy skills. In fact, he equated literacy instruction to after-school pull out support and reading aloud in class. As a result, despite a desire to influence kids and get them excited about learning through critical thinking activities, Travis lacked a frame of reference for such instruction and was only able to speak in vague references.

Adam did not recall being taught to read and did not experience literacy based instruction as a student. However, the data indicated that he had some notion of social studies literacy at the onset of the study. During the initial interview, when asked if he was taught to read in his Historical Thought and Methods course in college, Adam made a distinction between being taught to read as “literal technical retaining what I’m reading and that kind of thing” and “learning to read meaning from a historical viewpoint.” Perhaps this was a result of the Historical Thought and Methods course, or perhaps it resulted from his engagement in social studies literacy through his extensive personal reading about history and his experiences writing a book as a historian. Nonetheless, Adam began the study with some understanding of social studies literacy and, as indicated on the initial survey, he intended to incorporate it in his instruction.

Rachel referenced pre-selecting web sources, explicitly teaching how to conduct online searches, and providing guided questions for primary documents as reading supports provided by her high school teachers. This data suggests that Rachel was thinking not in terms of basic reading, but in terms of social studies literacy. In addition, despite not recognizing it in high school, by the beginning of the study Rachel realized that through guided questioning her high
school teachers were trying to teach students to read historically. Overall, Rachel’s vision of teaching always incorporated literacy instruction because she experienced it as a student. Her perception of good teaching, based upon her influential high school teachers, had always incorporated literacy instruction. Hence, she began the study with a sense of how to utilize a variety of strategies and to teach students to read, and a desire to teach students to write, listen and speak in social studies.

Changing Beliefs about Social Studies Literacy Instruction

Upon review of the data, several elements of the teacher preparation program emerged as significant in impacting the participants’ beliefs and attitudes about social studies literacy. In the following section, I will address each significant element, providing analysis of important aspects. Elements will be addressed in chronological order, beginning with elements occurring during the first semester, and ending with elements occurring during the third semester.

First semester: Historical thinking activities.

Throughout the first semester, teacher candidates in the Introductory Methods course engaged in five historical thinking activities. Each activity utilized primary sources revolving around a person or event. Students analyzed the documents, which were often written texts, assisted by written guided questions. Each activity required students to utilize social studies literacy skills. After each activity was completed in class, the teacher candidates engaged in a class discussion focused on how to incorporate the activity into classroom instruction.
During cross case analysis, engagement in historical thinking activities emerged as an influential element across all four cases. Each participant indicated that the historical thinking activities presented in Introductory Methods impacted their beliefs and attitudes about social studies instruction. In addition, the data suggests that the activities also impacted their understanding of social studies literacy instruction.

As indicated earlier in the cross case analysis, all four participants began the study believing to some extent that quality teaching extended beyond content transmission. On surveys given at the beginning and end of the first semester, all four participants maintained their intent to require students to read news articles, read historical documents, write, and listen and speak to their classmates. However, having never engaged in explicit historical thinking activities as a high school student, Mary, Travis and Adam lacked a framework for implementing such instruction. Even Rachel, who experienced skills-based instruction in high school, never received explicit instruction where students were aware they were reading like historians. Upon review of the cases, it is apparent that the historical thinking activities provided the participants with concrete examples of how to engage students in explicit, skills based instruction. As Mary pointed out, because the instructor modeled how to teach the activities, she felt she could successfully teach the activity herself. Modeling and discussion about how to teach the activity gave the participants confidence to incorporate it in their own classroom instruction. In fact, Adam taught a historical thinking activity at his filed placement during the first semester.
On the survey given at the end of the semester, all four participants responded that Introductory Methods improved their ability to read in the social studies and accurately assess their own abilities to read in the social studies. Mary and Rachel elaborated on this idea during interviews. Mary recognized that prior to taking Introductory Methods, “I would read a historical document like a story and it’s not like that.” Rachel noted how the provided guided questions allowed her to improve her own reading skills. This data suggests that, prior to taking Introductory Methods, the participants had not honed their abilities to read historically to the point where basic historical thinking activities did not offer further instruction. Perhaps this could mean that, since the participants acknowledged personal growth as readers of history, they came to identify the particular skills and strategies utilized by discipline experts. Hence, they increased their understanding of social studies literacy instruction.

On the survey given at the end of the semester, all four participants responded that Introductory Methods improved their understanding of what it means to be literate in the discipline of history. During interviews throughout the first semester, participants elaborated on how the course improved their understanding of social studies literacy. Travis stated that the course provided him with his definition of social studies literacy: “That you should be able to read and write critically.” The course also influenced his belief that, in addition to being taught to read historically, students should be taught to write, listen and speak through a social studies lens. Adam shared how the activities increased his desire to have students read primary sources and made him realize that a social studies teacher is responsible for teaching students to read critically and not just look for a “quick, fast answer.” Rachel took such concepts one step further by recognizing that the guided questions embedded in the historical thinking
activities provided supports needed to scaffold literacy instruction. She also acknowledged the need to alter the length and readability level of primary sources for some students, and the significance of the discussion portion of the activities for improving comprehension, acknowledging multiple perspectives, and building listening skills.

Compared to the other participants, Mary’s began the study with the most limited understanding of social studies literacy. However, the historical thinking activities allowed her to converse about skills-based, primary document analysis. Citing the historical thinking activities as inspiration, Mary stated that she wanted her future students to learn “how to analyze” a historical document by teaching them to “dig into the material.” In addition, by the end of the first semester, Mary was speaking about skills instruction more frequently. However, she did not acknowledge reading or writing as social studies skills; nor did she make the connection between skills and literacy, admitting, “I can’t explain what literacy is really.”

Comparing responses on surveys given at the beginning and end of the semester, data shows how the participants’ beliefs regarding a social studies teacher role in students’ overall literacy development differed. Adam and Rachel maintained their disagreement with the idea that most reading and writing instruction should occur in English language arts classes. Mary maintained her agreement to the idea that most reading and writing should occur in English language arts. Travis remained neutral regarding reading and changed his stance from agree to neutral regarding writing. Travis explained this change in beliefs by stating: “Most writing shouldn’t exactly be done through English because there’s so much benefit for history classes as well.” Travis referenced “The Artifact Bag and Museum of Me” (Hicks & Lisanti, 2010) activity
as an example of how “you can actually teach writing through history.” This data suggests that while Travis and Mary believed social studies teachers should develop students’ literacy skills, their responsibility for improving a students’ overall ability to read and write remained secondary to that of the English teacher. In contrast, this data suggests that Rachel and Adam believed social studies teachers played a significant role in students’ overall literacy development.

**Second semester: Disciplinary Literacy.**

Disciplinary Literacy emerged as an influential element to varying degrees. Compared to the unanimous praise for Introductory Methods across all cases, Disciplinary Literacy received mixed reviews. At one point, all of the participants found Disciplinary Literacy to be confusing. Travis exclaimed that it was confusing to the point where it “hurt his head.” At the same time, all participants indicated that a lot of the course content was, as Mary put it, “common sense.” Adam and Rachel felt that they didn’t gain much understanding beyond terminology, referencing the fact that they already did a lot of the things addressed in the course. Rachel attributed this prior knowledge to experiencing most strategies covered in the course as a high school student. However, she acknowledged that Disciplinary Literacy provided insight regarding why the strategies were beneficial.

Overall, the data suggest that throughout the second semester, each participant improved their understanding of social studies literacy in some aspect. However, the participants did not always attribute this learning directly to Disciplinary Literacy. Yet, Intermediate Methods did not address literacy instruction, and none of the participants
reported witnessing literacy instruction at their field placements. Thus, Disciplinary Literacy was the participants’ only source of explicit instruction regarding the teaching of literacy during the second semester. This suggests that the participants’ improved understandings of social studies literacy should be attributed to Disciplinary Literacy. In this section, I show how the data illustrated the various ways Disciplinary Literacy improved participants’ understandings of social studies literacy.

Travis and Mary began the second semester with a more limited understanding of literacy. However, they each demonstrated a growing understanding throughout the second semester. Travis broadened his definition of literacy to include, “how you think,” adding: “It’s not just reading because you have to be able to speak... write... think about something...listen to other various sources.” Mary realized literacy encompassed more than reading. She stated: “You can be literate in a field without reading a ton or knowing how to read a lot of different texts.” She also attributed teaching communication skills to social studies. Mary recognized that social studies should address controversial topics. However, she felt her students lacked the communication skills to discuss things they felt passionately about. She believed social studies should address communication by, “teaching [students] it’s okay to talk about real issues if you stay calm and don’t explode on someone.”

During the second semester, Adam, Mary, and Rachel described the connection between literacy and social studies skills. They each realized that social studies skills were literacy skills. According to Adam, Disciplinary Literacy illustrated how a person could correctly answer questions about a text they did not understand by merely copying from the text. This
impacted his understanding of social studies literacy to include the importance of explanation over regurgitation. Adam believed in “having kids do something” and “use what they learned” to be truly be literate. To ensure this focus when lesson planning, Adam wrote separate objectives for content and skills. Mary realized: “Literacy helps assure that students actually learn the material”; and that Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom, 1956), which provided the verbs for objectives, “actually had a lot to do with literacy.” When speaking about teaching literacy skills, Rachel stated: “Helping students exceed in literacy... will help them understand and learn within each content.” Rachel also emphasized the importance of scaffolding skill instruction until students could use strategies and skills independently.

The participants focused on skills that were essential to historical thinking. For example, Adam identified making inferences, summarizing, drawing conclusions, having opinions, and recognizing perspectives as skills essential to social studies literacy. Mary articulated how skills differed by content, identified social studies skills to include: analysis, making connections between events, judging bias, and recognizing different viewpoints. Rachel spoke about recognizing bias and building opinions.

Despite referencing the importance of teaching students how to analyze, Travis did not make the connection between literacy and social studies skills on his own. Only after being directly asked if he saw the connection did he state that comprehension and analyzing might be literacy skills.

Each participant claimed Disciplinary Literacy improved their understanding of literacy terminology. Data supports these claims. Throughout the second and third semesters of the
study, the participant’s demonstrated an improved ability to correctly use terminology associated with disciplinary literacy. For example, during the first half of the study, the participants sometimes used *literacy* and *reading* interchangeably on surveys and during interview. During the second half of the study, these terms were used correctly more frequently. The participants also learned the difference between *teaching methods* and *strategies* as well as the names of specific literacy strategies. Sometimes, this new knowledge caused confusion and frustration, as Adam articulated when he stated, “I don’t know all the terms and I don’t know what exactly is happening, but I know that I can do that in the classroom.” However, overall acquisition of terminology improved the participants’ abilities to communicate their understandings of, and engage in pedagogical discussions about, literacy instruction.

Data also showed that learning about literacy strategies allowed participants to better articulate their thoughts about literacy instruction. For example, acknowledging the complexities of social studies texts, Adam spoke about the importance to provide purposes for reading and to “model what historians do” with authentic texts. Travis explained the basic usage of KWLs, Possible Sentences (Buehl, 2011), think-pair-shares, and graphic organizers. He also credited Disciplinary Literacy for showing him how these strategies could be used as assessments. Rachel described a hypothetical lesson that incorporated a KWL, a graphic organizer, note-taking, and a vocab-tracker. In addition, Rachel described how each of these strategies would support literacy learning. Mary spoke about incorporating Possible Sentences (Buehl, 2011) to pre-teach vocabulary, using timelines to make connections between events, and using questioning to promote higher level thinking.
Case analysis showed that participants were making connections between Disciplinary Literacy and their Methods courses. Such connections provided a broader understanding of social studies literacy instruction. However, the participants did not always explicitly articulate the connection. The connections were sometimes inferred. For example, Mary explicitly stated that she saw connections between literacy and the lesson planning taught in Intermediate Methods. To illustrate, she explained how to improve the historical thinking activities taught in Methods to work by including the Possible Sentences strategy (Buehl, 2011) taught in Disciplinary Literacy to address vocabulary. In contrast, the other participants explained how literacy strategies could be used to improve historical thinking activities, but did not explicitly articulate that they realized this by connecting the two courses.

All four participants recognized a lack of literacy instruction at their field placements, and each expressed a desire to improve instruction by bringing in methods and strategies from Methods and Disciplinary Literacy. Overall, their mentor teachers at their field placements relied heavily on lecture or assigned large research projects with little to no supports. Travis expressed his desire to replace his mentor’s practice of assigning students to copy vocabulary definitions from the back of the book with the Possible Sentence strategy (Buehl, 2011). He also reported straying from his mentor’s reliance on textbooks by assigning primary sources with guided questions about bias. Adam wanted to engage his students in more discussion. He ended the semester still searching for strategies that focused on speaking rather than reading and writing. Mary wanted to use timelines and guided questions to help her students to make connections between the past and modern day. Rachel wanted her students to apply literacy skills by recognizing bias when watching the news.
Third Semester: Student teaching.

During the third semester, participants took on the role of student teachers and assumed almost all teaching responsibilities at their field placements. Each participant shared instances where they chose to incorporate social studies literacy in their instruction, and data analysis indicated that these experiences further impacted their understanding of social studies literacy instruction. Overall, the participants ended the study believing that social studies literacy instruction was important. However, upon review of the data, each participant ended the study with varying ability levels to incorporate literacy into their instruction. In this section I will illustrate how participants’ accounts of teaching in the field demonstrated their abilities to teach social studies literacy.

It is important to note that the participants felt they did not have enough time to implement all of the literacy instruction they desired. During student teaching, field placement mentors had to approve all of the participant’s lessons. As a result, participants could not always implement the methods, texts, and strategies they wanted. In addition, participants expressed that they did not have the time to implement all of the skills instruction they intended. Student teaching was limited to four months of instruction, and inclement winter weather resulted in school cancellations. In addition, state-wide standardized testing occurred during the participants’ time as student teachers. Therefore, aside from losing instructional time to test taking, participants were sometimes required to allot a portion of their instruction time pre-determined test preparation lessons.
Cross case analysis revealed the importance of knowing how to use strategies to improve students’ social studies literacy. For example, Mary believed students should be taught to structure papers, identify and use factual information properly use citations when writing in social studies. Travis wanted to teach students to write research paper, noting that students at his placement did not know how to structure a research paper. When asked how he would teach writing, Travis spoke about providing a guided outline that included questions such as “What is your main topic.”. Mary was unable to provide strategies to support writing instruction. She knew what she wanted student to do, but was unsure how to teach students to do it. In fact, Mary did not recognize literacy demands beyond scenarios addressed in coursework. When she taught skills-based lessons at her placement, they always closely resembled the modeled historical thinking activities from Introductory Methods.

Travis, Adam, and Rachel recognized that literacy instruction involved scaffolding, modeling, and repeated practice. For example, Travis taught several historical thinking lessons where students used the same strategies to analyze primary sources, because to acquire a skill students had to practice “time and time again.” Adam believed that meaningful literacy instruction included “lots of reading, lots of writing” and “much time spent on how to write. How to take notes, etcetera.” Rachel believed that teachers were responsible for supplying the methods and tools to guide students’ understandings and skills. Adam saw the importance of giving clear purposes and directions. He emphasized the importance of modeling “how to wrap your head around” reading primary sources, and how to take notes or use context clues to infer word meaning. Rachel echoed these ideas, and added emphasis on independent learning as the
goal of teaching: “Have [students] practice until they feel comfortable to use [the tool or resource] on their own.”

Changing Beliefs about Teaching as a Profession

In addition to their understanding of social studies literacy instruction, the teacher preparation program impacted other aspects of the participant’s understanding of teaching as a profession. Mary, Travis, and Adam changed their belief about difficulty of teaching. Mary came to realize that the profession was “a lot more research and science based than I thought.” She admitted entering the program believing that she could just emulate her former teachers, but the teacher preparation program made her realize “there’s a lot more that goes into it than just standing up and talking.” Travis also recognized his former, narrow perspective of teaching, which was challenged by the Methods professor who gave him “a whole new way to actually look at how I teach. Like ways that I’ve never even bothered to consider.” Adam also credited the Methods professor for “giving names to the different ideas that I’ve [had], being able to give me material to open a dialogue.” Adam also realized that when it comes to teaching, “the more you learn, the more you realize you don’t know.”

Changing Beliefs about Teaching All Learners

Over the course of the study, Travis and Mary expressed concerns about their abilities to teach students at different reading levels and English as a Second Language (ESL) students. Their expressed frustrations indicated an overall attitude of helplessness: that it was nearly impossible to teach struggling readers and ESL students to read in social studies classes.
For example, Travis and Mary relied on workarounds, such as reading texts aloud, for students they perceived to be struggling or students labeled as ESL. While student teaching, Mary observed that students “just don’t like to sit down and read.” As a result, Mary and her mentor used videos or read written texts aloud. Mary did recall altering primary sources by “removing all the unnecessary stuff” for a primary source analysis assignment. Students analyzed the documents, completed a graphic organizer and then used the organizer to write a speech they used in a mock debate. According to Mary, “[students] didn’t find it as challenging as I thought they would.... They said they really liked it.” However, this experience did not alter her belief that in general, her students just didn’t like to read. This data suggests that Mary didn’t recognize that her students proved they could read written texts when given proper supports, nor that it was possible that she and her mentor were assigning texts that were too difficult for students to read without supports.

In contrast, Adam and Rachel indicated a different belief. They acknowledged the varying reading needs of students, but did not express helplessness. Instead, they spoke about how they would use literacy instruction to address students’ individualized needs. Adam focused on teaching vocabulary and making connections between difficult material and students’ lives. Rachel recognized that when it comes to individual reading abilities, “each student is at a different level of understanding.” She believed it was the teacher’s responsibility to “use these strategies to see where they’re at and to help them get to where you want them to be.” She believed that students should be given interesting sources to “get them hooked,” and that students didn’t always welcome new strategies, but if you “just stick with it” by using the strategy over and over, and adjust for students’ needs, students will benefit.
All four participants were white and middle class, and each of their field placements were in schools where the majority of students were African-American and a large number were labeled as low economic status. Mary and Adam upheld several stereotypes of urban classrooms when describing students at their field placements. Comparing her students to herself as a high school student, Mary stated, “They seem to be not as interested...not to be as driven.” She also stated, “[My mentor and I are] in a situation where you have to teach kids how to politely talk to one another.” Adam recognized the stereotypes when he said, “Kids don’t do very well... What I’m seeing is what I expected.” In addition, Mary, Travis, and Adam expressed various levels of sympathy for mentors who they believed were doing their best in tough situations.

Over the course of the study, the participants shared how coursework changed their beliefs about teaching students of a different race and socio-economic status. As a result of coursework, Mary recognized the fallacy in her prior beliefs that all poor people were lazy, and that everyone had a “fair shot” to go to college. As a white person, Travis felt uncomfortable discussing current events involving race at his placement. Coursework improved his comfort level. Adam learned that a teacher should not lower their expectations for any student, and he applied this concept to his teaching. Even Rachel, who never spoke ill of her students or placement, felt that coursework regarding diversity was necessary for students like her, who “came from small towns where it was not diverse at all” who were placed in schools where “there are students who are homeless. You have students who are on Section 8, who are on food stamps.”
Yet, coursework did not address every concern. Adam was left questioning the fairness of having the same expectations for all students, knowing that some are homeless or experience turmoil at home. Mary provided workarounds, reflecting a belief that her students were lazy or incapable.

**Belief in Student-Teacher Relationships**

Each participant acknowledged the importance of student-teacher relationships. For Mary, Travis, and Rachel, positive relationships with their teachers as high school students had a lasting impact on their perception of good teaching. All four participants spoke about the influence of positive student-teacher relationships with college professors. Upon review of the cases, the participant’s relationship with their Methods instructor was particularly influential. They appreciated the comfortable classroom atmosphere he created along with his willingness to share his personal experiences as a secondary teacher, even if they were unflattering.

Each participant also spoke of the importance of establishing relationships with their own students. Mary and Travis considered establishing positive relationships with students at their field placements as significant events. Adam used his relationships with students to make information more accessible to them. Adam and Rachel noted that strong student-teacher relationships were sometimes incentives for students to do their best. Rachel, who spoke of the importance of relationships from the first day of the study onward, recognized the importance of relationships in regard to classroom management.

Mary, recognized the student-teacher relationship with her mentors as influential. Sometimes these relationships had positive influences, such as when Mary praised her
mentor’s use of questioning and closing activities. However, the relationships also had negative influences, a noted by Mary’s praise of workarounds.

**Discussion**

There is an overall reluctance amongst middle and high school teachers to integrate literacy into their content instruction (Alger, 2009; O’Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995). Traditionally, middle and high school teachers place importance on content transmission (Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001). Viewing literacy as an optional set of strategies existing outside of the context of the content (Alger, 2007; Cadiero-Kaplan & Smith, 2002), such traditional approaches to content instruction do not support literacy instruction (Alger, 2007; O’Brien et al., 1995). Disciplinary literacy challenges traditional approaches to content instruction by viewing reading and writing as “contextually dependent practices” (Buehl, 2011, p. 13); thus, literacy cannot be viewed as optional.

This multiple case study demonstrated how a teacher preparation program could impact teacher candidate’s beliefs and attitudes towards teaching social studies literacy. Over the course of the three-semester study, all four teacher candidates who were participants in this study improved their understanding of social studies literacy; demonstrating that the teacher preparation program was successful in this endeavor. Furthermore, cross-case analysis revealed common factors that impacted participants’ understanding. Using Lewin’s (1947a) three-step change model, I identified how these factors improved or hindered each participants path to understanding.
Prior Knowledge Matters

Upon reviewing the data, it became apparent that the participants’ prior experiences as students impacted their initial beliefs about teaching social studies literacy. In particular, the teaching methods employed by their former teachers shaped their perceptions of what it meant to teach. Overall, prior experience as a student proved to be a driving force for Rachel and a restraining force for Mary, Travis, and Adam. Prior experience as a student served as a driving force for Rachel because it resulted in literacy being part of her original perception of teaching, providing her with the prior knowledge to understand social studies literacy. However, Mary, Travis, and Adam experienced little or no literacy instruction as a student. Therefore, prior experience as a student was a restraining force, providing limited or no frame of reference for assimilating literacy instruction into their perceptions of teaching.

Modeled Historical Thinking Activities Matter

Overall, the historical thinking activities presented in Introductory Methods served as driving forces for all four participants. The historical thinking activities improved the participants’ frameworks for understanding social studies literacy. The modeling of the instruction was key, as it provided participants with a better understanding of what social studies literacy instruction involved and looked like in the classroom. Modeled instruction also gave them the confidence to incorporate the activities in their own teaching. Participation in the historical thinking activities also improved the participant’s abilities as readers of history and introduced the concept of social studies literacy.
Explicit Disciplinary Literacy Instruction Matters

Throughout the second semester, each participant improved their individual understandings of social studies literacy. As a result, they were able to communicate their understandings of literacy, and engage in pedagogical discussions about literacy, with greater clarity. Therefore, Disciplinary Literacy was a driving force for all four participants. Disciplinary Literacy broadened the participants’ concepts of literacy to include skills that promoted reading writing, listening, speaking, and thinking. Mary and Travis, who began the semester with more limited concepts of literacy instruction, expanded their understandings of literacy to include more than reading and writing. Adam, Mary, Rachel, and to some extent Travis, saw that social studies skills were literacy skills. Each participant learned new terminology and strategies, or at least the names for strategies they were already familiar with. Finally, each participant saw the connections between Disciplinary Literacy, Methods courses, and their field placements, making for a richer understanding of social studies literacy instruction.

Practice in the Field Matters

Student teaching proved to be both a driving and restraining force for the participants. Implementation of literacy instruction, which demonstrated an understanding of how to teach literacy, proved to be significant. For Travis, Adam and Rachel, the opportunity to implement literacy instruction in a classroom served as a driving force. These three participants were able to illustrate their understanding of how to teach literacy by actually designing and teaching original, literacy-focused lessons in a secondary classroom. However, student teaching was a restraining force for Mary. Mary struggled to identify literacy demands in social studies lessons.
As a result, she did not have the ability to design and teach an original, skill-based lesson plan on her own. Since her mentor did not teach with a literacy focus, he offered no support. As a result, Mary experienced little literacy-based instruction in the field.

When it came to addressing a wide range of literacy needs, experience in the field was a driving force for Adam and Rachel. They realized how literacy instruction could help them meet the existing range of literacy needs at their field placements. However, Travis and Mary did not have this realization, and were instead left feeling helpless. Thus regarding addressing a wide range of literacy needs, experience in the field was a restraining force for Travis and Mary.

Analysis of participants’ reflections regarding their student teaching experiences presents an interesting dichotomy between Adam and Rachel, and Mary. Adam and Rachel knew what they wanted to teach and knew how to teach it; which included students being actively involved in the learning process. Additionally, Adam and Rachel believed individualized literacy instruction could improve the learning of all students. In contrast, Mary demonstrated limited abilities regarding how to teach literacy and expressed helplessness regarding teaching all learners. Perhaps this means that knowing how to teach literacy translates to a belief that literacy instruction benefits all learners.

**Student-Teacher Relationships Matter**

For each of the participants, student-teacher relationships with former teachers, their professors, and mentors were influential. The participants believed that when a student felt as if they had a good relationship with a teacher, they would learn more from that teacher. This concept applied to the relationships they hoped to establish with their own students, as well as
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to their relationships with professors and mentors. As aspiring teachers, when the participants
assumed to role of student in the class of an admired teacher they noted not only what was
taught, but how it was taught. As a result, if the professors were exhibiting quality instructional
practices, the relationship was a driving force. As was the case with their Method’s professor.
However, if the teacher was utilizing poor practices, such as some former teachers and
mentors, the relationship was a restraining force.

Concluding Remarks

This multiple case study added to the field by demonstrating how a teacher preparation
program could impact teacher candidate’s beliefs and attitudes towards teaching social studies
literacy. The four participants in this study were encouraged to describe their experiences over
the entire three semester cohort, which ultimately led to a broader understanding of how and
why their beliefs and attitudes regarding social studies literacy changed over time.

This study demonstrated the value in recognizing education as a process and school as a
lived experience (Merriam, 1998). By following the participants throughout the entire three
semester cohort, the study recognized education as a process. Each participant came to this
study with varying experiences and perceptions, and throughout cohort they each had different
experiences in the field; therefore, each participant experienced the cohort in unique ways. The
qualitative practices utilized in this study recognized school as a lived experience by giving the
participants voice to express the unique ways in which they experienced cohort. Ultimately,
their voices provided the field with valuable insights regarding teacher preparation.
While this study focused on one teacher preparation program, its findings could have implications for any teacher preparation program, or professional development for middle or high school teachers, with the intent to improve teachers’ understandings, beliefs, and attitudes regarding disciplinary literacy. By identifying common factors that impacted change, and classifying those factors as driving or restraining forces, the findings of this study provide a framework for programs seeking positive changes in teacher beliefs and attitudes regarding disciplinary literacy instruction.
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Implications

This study addressed the role of teacher education in re-envisioning the purposes and practices of social studies education. I examined changes in teacher candidates’ beliefs and attitudes about teaching social studies through a disciplinary literacy approach over the course of their three semester cohort as a way to address the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) declaration that, “disciplinary literacy is necessary for success in social studies subjects.” (Lee & Swan, 2013, p. xxvi) as well as the research that noted while middle and high school teachers have traditionally placed importance on content transmission (Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001), to teach complex, discipline specific literacy skills in classrooms, teacher education programs must prepare them to do so (Johnson & Watson, 2010; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008).

To accomplish this, teacher preparation programs must overcome challenges. As Draper (2002) observed, “content-area teachers believe that (a) it is someone else’s responsibility to teach reading and writing, (b) they lack the ability and/or training to teach reading and writing, and/or (c) they do not have the time to provide literacy instruction along with their full content curriculum” (p. 357-358). Moreover, teacher candidates’ experiences as students in traditionally taught content classes can hinder their willingness to view literacy as essential to teaching in the content areas (Holt-Reynolds, 1992). Hence, in order to prepare teacher candidates to teach discipline specific literacy skills, teacher education programs are faced with the challenge of addressing teacher candidates’ preconceived beliefs and attitudes regarding literacy instruction.
This study examined changes in teacher candidates’ beliefs and attitudes about teaching social studies through a disciplinary literacy approach over the course of their three semester secondary social studies cohort experience. In this chapter, I explain the changes in teacher candidate’s beliefs and attitudes by answering the research questions of the study. Next, I examine the study’s implications for practice for teacher preparation programs, middle and high school professional development, and democratic engagement. I then offer recommendations for future research and end by presenting the significance of the study.

Answering the Research Questions

Question One: How do teacher candidates describe their understandings of social studies literacy over the course of their cohort experience?

Through the participants’ reflections and descriptions regarding coursework and field experiences, each described how their overall understandings of social studies literacy improved as a result of their cohort experience. Cross-case analysis illuminated the differences in their understandings from the beginning of the study to the end of the third semester. But, when reflecting upon all of their experiences, I discovered a general movement towards improved understanding. First, participants realized that social studies education involved skills instruction, not just content transmission. Second, participants broadened their concept of literacy in social studies to include reading, writing, listening, speaking and thinking. Third, a clear connection was made between literacy and social studies skills. Fourth, participants came to recognize the literacy demands of social studies lessons. Some of the participants reached
the final steps, which required them to describe, create, and implement literacy-focused lessons in a classroom.

**Question Two:** How do teacher candidates describe their beliefs and attitudes towards teaching social studies literacy over the course of their cohort experience?

At the end of the first semester, the participants were asked about the role of a social studies teacher in a students’ overall literacy development. Half of the participants believed that social studies teachers should develop students’ literacy skills, but the responsibility for improving a students’ overall ability to read and write fell to the English teacher. The other half believed that social studies teachers played a significant role in students’ overall literacy development.

By the end of the study, three participants demonstrated the belief that social studies teachers were significant to students’ overall literacy development. This belief was demonstrated by a growing understanding of social studies literacy instruction and maintained enthusiasm for utilizing it in instruction. At the end of the study, these participants regretting not being able to incorporate more skills, such as writing and speaking, into their instruction. They articulated how the discipline of social studies, compared to other disciplines, was uniquely qualified to address valuable literacy skills needed for adult life.

In contrast, one participant retained a limited view of a social studies teacher’s role in students’ overall literacy development. This view was demonstrated by a positive view of workarounds and limited understandings of social studies literacy.
Question Three: How do teacher candidates describe attributing factors to changes in their understandings of, and beliefs and attitudes towards, social studies literacy?

Cross case analysis revealed that a number of factors impacted participants’ understanding of, and subsequent beliefs and attitudes towards, social studies literacy. However, the participants did not always explicitly recognize these factors as influential. The results of cross case analysis are consistent with several aspects of Loritie’s (1975) seminal work, *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*, therefore I reference Loritie’s work to further illustrate my findings.

**Prior Experiences Matter**

Each of the candidates brought their understandings from their own learning to their ideas of teaching. While prior experience as a student proved to be a common factor for all four participants, three of the candidates explicitly revealed the significance of their prior experience as students regarding their understandings of, and beliefs and attitudes towards, social studies literacy.

Lortie (1975) noted the unlikelihood that those entering the teaching profession would embrace the “new and untried” given their decision to remain in the familiar realm of school (p. 30). Lortie (1975) also noted the likelihood that those who chose to remain in the realm of school would “approve of the existing arrangements” of school and be “less motivated to press for change” (p.300). Two candidates echoed Loritie’s ideas. One candidate noted how her prior experiences as a student were often teacher-focused, with emphasis on the teacher creating
and transmitting the understandings, rather than student-centered skills instruction. As a result, this candidate relied on similar teacher centered methods with an emphasis on content transmission. Another candidate noted how “influential” teachers often incorporated literacy instruction. Hence, this candidate entered the study with a sense of how to utilize a variety of strategies and to teach students to read, and a desire to teach students to write, listen and speak in social studies. The third candidate also experienced teacher-centered, traditional, content-based instruction. However, in contrast to Lortie’s (1975) notions, this candidate described his high school courses as “lousy” and used his experiences as a student as an example of what not to do in a classroom.

Modeled Historical Thinking Activities Matter

Each participant explicitly recognized the historical thinking activities presented in Introductory Methods as influential in their understandings of, and beliefs and attitudes towards, social studies literacy. Survey data showed that all participants believed that participation in the historical thinking activities improved their abilities as readers of history and improved their understanding of what it means to be literate in the discipline of history. The historical thinking activities improved the participants’ frameworks for understanding social studies literacy and modeled instruction provided participants with a better understanding of what social studies literacy instruction involved and looked like in the classroom. It also gave them the confidence to incorporate it in their own teaching. As one participant pointed out, because the instructor modeled how to teach the activities, they felt they could successfully teach the activity on their own.
Explicit Disciplinary Literacy Instruction Matters

Throughout the second semester, each participant improved their individual understandings of social studies literacy. Data suggests that Disciplinary Literacy was influential in this regard. Two of the participants who began the semester with more limited concepts of literacy instruction expanded their understandings of literacy to include more than reading and writing. Each participant learned new terminology and strategies, or at least the names for strategies they were already familiar with. As a result, they were able to communicate their understandings of literacy in pedagogical discussions about literacy with improved clarity. Finally, each participant saw the connections between Disciplinary Literacy, Methods courses, and their field placements. However, the participants did not recognize Disciplinary Literacy as a significant attributing factor to their overall understandings of, and beliefs and attitudes towards, social studies literacy.

Practice in the Field Matters

Lortie (1975) recognized teacher candidates’ preference for “practice teaching,” or student teaching, over coursework in teacher preparation programs. According to Lortie (1975), this preference illustrated teacher candidates’ desire to move towards the goal of actually teaching, along with the influence of real world experiences involving the “how of teaching” (p. 71). In alignment with these ideas, each of the participants recognized their experiences teaching in the field as having a significant impact on their overall understandings of, and beliefs and attitudes towards, social studies literacy. When describing these experiences, three participants were able to illustrate their understanding of how to teach literacy by actually...
teaching literacy-focused lessons in a secondary classroom. However, one participant did not demonstrate the same understanding, and did not design and teach an original, skill-based lesson plan. Since this participant’s mentor did not teach with a literacy focus, he offered no support. As a result, the participant experienced little literacy-based instruction in the field.

Lortie (1975) recognized such as possibility, noting that practice teaching came with the risk of exposing future teachers to “one more teacher’s style of work,” (p. 71) which could have similar influences as their prior experience as students.

Student-Teacher Relationships Matter

For each of the participants, student-teacher relationships with former teachers, their professors, and mentors were influential. The participants believed that when a student felt as if they had a good relationship with a teacher, they would learn more from that teacher. This concept applied to the relationships they hoped to establish with their own students, as well as to their relationships with professors and mentors. As aspirng teachers, when the participants assumed the role of student in the class of an admired teacher, they noted not only what was taught, but how it was taught. All of the participants explicitly recognized their Method’s professor as influential in this regard.

Upon review of what these candidates shared, I came to realize the significance of the adage seeing is believing. When describing factors that they witnessed, the candidates spoke with confidence and specificity. Such factors included their prior experiences, modeled historical thinking activities, and student-teacher relationships. These factors happened to the candidates, and the clarity provided by first-hand experience increased their influence on the
candidates. On the other hand, candidates did not recognize explicit disciplinary literacy instruction as a significant factor impacting their understandings of, and beliefs and attitudes towards, social studies literacy. Disciplinary Literacy provided instruction about specific strategies and terminology. However, while this instruction was occurring, the candidates were not seeing it in practice. Lorite (1975) described such experiences as “too theoretical” (p. 69). Such course teachings “proffer impractical expectations” without offering real world application (Lortie, 1975, p. 69). Literacy instruction was not modeled in the college classroom, nor was it utilized by mentors in the field. Thus, the candidates described explicit literacy instruction as “confusing.” Candidates did not witness strategy-based literacy instruction unless they implemented it in the field during student teaching. For the three candidates who incorporated strategies learned through explicit literacy instruction into their teaching, the implementation in the field provided the first-hand experience needed to fully understand the concept of disciplinary literacy instruction. As Lortie (1975) stated, “actual teaching gives the student teacher valuable reassurance” (p. 71).

While cross case analysis revealed a number of factors impacted participants’ understanding of, and subsequent beliefs and attitudes towards, social studies literacy, it did not provide clear indications of volition. The fact that change occurred implied that volition was present; new concepts were assimilated into existing schema, or schemas were altered to accommodate new concepts (Piaget, 1952). However, analysis did not clearly reveal teacher candidates’ personal motivation for change.
Implications for Practice

While this multiple case study focused on four teacher candidates enrolled in a teacher preparation program at one university, the findings have the potential to be applied across disciplinary contexts. The information garnered from this study would benefit any teacher preparation program with a desire to impact teacher candidates’ understandings, beliefs and attitudes about social studies literacy. Additionally, despite this study’s focus on social studies, its findings have application for teacher preparation in any discipline. Similarly, middle and high schools could use the findings of this study to develop professional development opportunities to improve their teachers’ understandings, attitudes, and beliefs regarding disciplinary literacy instruction.

In each of these contexts, the findings of this study provide a framework for promoting positive changes in teacher beliefs and attitudes regarding disciplinary literacy instruction. By answering the research questions of this study, I have come to understand how candidates progressed towards improved understandings of disciplinary literacy and how they came to view social studies teachers as significant in students’ overall literacy development. I also identified factors impacting participants’ understandings of, and subsequent beliefs and attitudes towards, social studies literacy. With these understandings, I am able to recommend ways in which teacher preparation and teacher professional development programs can improve teachers’ understandings, attitudes, and beliefs regarding disciplinary literacy instruction.
In this section, I also address the implications of disciplinary literacy regarding democratic engagement. I discuss how the adoption of a disciplinary approach to instruction would not only improve teachers’ ability to become involved in policy decisions, it would also promote equal access to education for diverse student learners.

**Implications for Teacher Preparation Programs**

Utilizing the findings from this study, Lortie’s (1975) assertions regarding socialization and teaching, and Lewin’s (1947a) three-step change model, I propose that the following elements would improve a teacher preparation program’s ability to positively impact teacher candidates’ beliefs and attitudes about disciplinary literacy instruction.

**“Unfreezing” preconceived notions of teaching: Prior knowledge.**

The first phase of Lewin’s (1947a) model required an “unfreezing” of the existing habit or social custom. In this scenario, this equates to “unfreezing” teacher candidates’ preconceived notions of what it means to teach based upon their prior experiences as students. Candidates enter teacher preparation programs with varying perceptions of what it means to teach. Lortie (1975) labeled this phenomenon the “apprenticeship of observation”: the influence of many years of being a student on individual’s perception of effective teaching. Teachers imitate their favorite teachers; thus, this “imitation, which, being generalized across individuals, becomes tradition” (Lortie, 1975, p. 63). This cycle leads to generations of repetitive practice that does not “favor informed criticism, attention to specifics, or explicit rules of assessment” (Lortie, 1975, p. 63). In this respect, until disciplinary literacy is common instructional practice in middle and high schools, it will not be a part of many teacher
candidates’ notions of teaching. Teacher preparation programs must recognize this lack of disciplinary literacy prior knowledge amongst their students and plan accordingly.

Lewin (1947a) explained that “unfreezing” could occur by increasing driving forces, decreasing restraining forces, or a combination of both. I propose a combination of both. As a driving force, teacher candidates should explore their philosophies regarding what it means to teach and recognize who impacted their perceptions of teaching. Implicit dispositions must be made explicit so that teacher candidates can “consider practices to which they have not been previously exposed” (Lortie, 1975, p. x). Teacher preparation needs to emphasize the transition from viewing education through a student lens to viewing education through a teacher lens by requiring students to examine the methods utilized by former teachers, college professors, mentors in the field. Through this process, teacher preparation programs would invite candidates to examine their existing schema (Piaget, 1952) regarding what it means to teach. Lortie (1975) suggested the following to achieve this goal: First, teacher candidates could write about former teachers and share those observations through discussion to increase opportunities for theme recognition and meaning making. Second, candidates could recall and review particular classroom incidents while applying newly acquired concepts from teacher preparation coursework. No matter the format of the assignment, the purpose should be to increase self-awareness and openness to new teaching approaches (Lortie, 1975). Throughout this process, teacher educators need to be explicit in their intent to challenge all preconceived notions of teachings in order prepare candidates to examine what it means to think and learn within the disciplines.
Movement: Key realizations.

Once an individual has become unfrozen, or motivated to change, they may be able to entertain new perspectives. A key consideration is the role of volition. For change to be meaningful, candidates must have intrinsic motivation beyond fulfilling coursework requirements. At this point, the teacher preparation program should provide driving forces and supports that promote the desired changes in beliefs and attitudes. Candidates need opportunities to either assimilate or accommodate new ideas (Piaget, 1952). Based upon the findings of this study, to achieve “movement” (Lewin 1954a) towards improved understandings of disciplinary literacy, the candidates need to make the following realizations: (a) teaching in the disciplines involves skills instruction, not just content transmission; (b) literacy in the disciplines includes reading, writing, listening, speaking and thinking; (c) there is a clear connection between literacy and discipline specific skills; (d) they can recognize the literacy demands of discipline lesson; and (e) they can describe, create, and implement literacy-focused lessons in a classroom.

Movement: Modeled literacy-focused activities.

Candidates need to recognize the importance of all discipline teachers in the overall literacy development of students. To achieve this, teacher preparation programs should engage their candidates in each discipline in modeled, literacy-focused instructional activities. Engagement in these activities will improve the candidates’ disciplinary literacy, provide a literacy learning experience on which to build a framework for literacy instruction, and provide candidates with the confidence to utilize the activity in their own classroom instruction.
Engagement in modeled literacy-focused activities would also bridge the void between coursework lacking real-world application and being “too theoretical” (Lortie, 1975). In this study, the literacy addressed was historical thinking. However, I believe that engagement in modeled, literacy focused instruction would be a driving force for change for teacher candidates in every discipline.

**Movement: Explicit disciplinary literacy instruction.**

Candidates need explicit instruction regarding disciplinary literacy. This instruction should focus on what disciplinary literacy is, why it is important, and how it impacts instruction. This instruction should be discipline specific and clearly connected to the modeled literacy-focused instructional activities. As a result of this instruction, candidates should be able to engage in pedagogical conversations using the correct terminology for literacy instruction. This includes understanding terms such as *reading, literacy, teaching methods,* and *literacy strategies.* Candidates should also learn about a variety of literacy strategies and be able to explain why they are beneficial and how to utilize them effectively during classroom instruction. Once again, coursework needs to bridge the void between lacking real-world application and being “too theoretical” (Lortie, 1975). Therefore, candidates should witness strategies being used in classroom instruction. Video could also be utilized for this purpose. As Lortie (1975) suggested, video of effective teachers accompanied by running commentary regarding what influenced their instructional decisions could be powerful tool.
Movement: Student-teacher relationships.

It is important to recognize that the process of change begins with a feeling of dissatisfaction or frustration as a result of our prior understandings being challenged or disconfirmed (Lewin, 1947a; Schein, 1996). Teacher preparation programs need to account for this by providing supports for candidates, such as positive student-teacher relationships between candidates and professors. I use the term positive to describe student-teacher relationships in which students feel comfortable and supported, they value the teacher’s expertise, and trust them to provide important and credible information. These relationships must make candidates feel safe and supported so they can accept data that disconfirms prior beliefs and embrace new ideas. Without such supports, candidates may succumb to “learning anxiety” (Schein, 1996) and reject change.

Student-teacher relationships with mentors at field placements are also important. Positive relationships between candidates and mentors who utilize traditional, content-focused teaching methods can be restraining forces for efforts to positively impact teacher candidate’s beliefs and attitudes about disciplinary literacy instruction. Hence, it would be beneficial to decrease these restraining forces, and instead increase candidate’s exposure to teachers and mentors who utilize methods that promote disciplinary literacy instruction.

Teacher preparation programs must also recognize the possibility that mentors will serve as yet another teacher to be imitated (Lortie, 1975), in line with the former teachers with whom candidates had prior experiences as students. Lortie (1975) noted that student teachers often work with only one, or very few, mentors, and that those mentors are often not chosen
based upon their ability to “explain underlying rationales for decision-making” nor are they given extra planning time to devote extra attention to a student teacher (p. 71). Ideally, teacher candidates would have the opportunity to observe a number of teachers and would be equipped with the reflective practices needed to analyze those teachers through a teacher’s lens.

**Movement and “freezing”: Practice in the field.**

As noted earlier, candidates must ultimately realize that they can describe, create, and implement literacy-focused lessons in a classroom. Therefore, opportunities for teacher candidates to apply their knowledge and understandings of disciplinary literacy instruction is essential. These opportunities need to occur in secondary classrooms where candidates have established a presence and relationships with students. This means that field placement assignments need to account for the time it takes to establish presence and relationships, as well as the time it takes to achieve student growth through ongoing literacy instruction. This element would help “freeze” new beliefs and attitudes that formed over the course of the teacher preparation program.

**“Freezing”: Ongoing support.**

The final step of Lewin’s (1947a) change model is “freezing”. This is an essential step that needs to occur to ensure that new behaviors are integrated as habit and social norm. I purpose the “freezing” needs to occur through ongoing support of candidates after graduating from the teacher preparation program. Lortie (1975) recognized the “abruptness with which full responsibility is assumed” for beginning teachers, compared to the mediated entry form of
work induction utilized in other professions that favors apprenticeships, internships, or training programs (p. 59). Lortie (1975) also noted that teaching also relies heavily on the learning-while-doing-approach. Overall, Lortie (1975) found that “the total induction system [for teaching] is not highly developed,” and that “teaching does not require as much preparation as some professions, crafts, or other skilled fields” (p. 60). In this way, teacher preparation, and the teaching professional in general, is not currently equipped to offer graduating teacher candidates with the ongoing support required to “freeze” new behaviors. As a result, new teachers are likely to revert to the notions of teaching they held when entering teacher preparation (Lewin, 1947a; Lortie, 1975).

Although this study did not directly address the idea of ongoing support, it revealed data that demonstrates its importance. The participants left the program with varying levels of understanding regarding social studies literacy, and each participant expressed a desire for more information and instruction regarding disciplinary literacy. They were searching for more information, suggesting that they had not yet fully adapted new concepts into their schema regarding teaching (Piaget, 1952). Ideally teacher preparation programs would provide ongoing support for graduates practicing in the field. Following a mediated-entry approach (Lortie, 1975) to the profession, new teachers should have lessened course loads to allow for reflection and support. Such support should include opportunities for graduates to witness quality disciplinary literacy instruction either in person or through video (as mentioned in previous sections). Support should also include opportunities for feedback and reflective discussion with mentor teachers who utilize literacy-focused teaching methods. Ideally, the graduates could
establish relationships with these mentors, which would serve as an additional driving force to support a graduate’s positive beliefs and attitudes regarding disciplinary literacy instruction.

**Professional Development for Middle and High School Teachers**

Middle and high schools face similar challenges as teacher preparation programs concerning disciplinary literacy. Traditionally, middle and high school teachers have been educated to conduct literacy instruction from a content literacy, or content reading approach. Transitioning from a content literacy to a disciplinary literacy approach in middle and high school education would require changes in how educators teach (Johnson & Watson, 2010; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). Teachers must be supported if they are to make this transition. Professional development could offer such support. In 2002, Lortie wrote a new forward to his original 1975 publication of *Schoolteacher*. In this forward, Lortie acknowledged the emergence of professional development and reflective practice as important practices for teachers, especially when reflection was associated with interaction amongst peers who could add to the discourse by sharing their own reflections and offer suggestions for practice.

Research has been conducted regarding effective professional development practices. Through an extensive review of research on professional development and teacher learning, Desimone (2009) identified five critical features of effective professional development and teacher learning experiences. The identified features include: content focus, collective participation, active learning, duration, and coherence (Desimone, 2009). Desimone (2009) argued that professional development programs consisting of these characteristics lead to teacher change, including increased knowledge and changes in beliefs and attitudes. Teacher
change would then result in changes in instruction and will ultimately improve student learning (Desimone, 2009). I utilize Desimone’s (2009) characteristics of professional development when outlining my suggestions for middle and high school level professional development regarding disciplinary literacy. I also reference Lewin (1947a) and Lortie (1975) to further explain my suggestions.

**Content focus and collective participation.**

Content focus refers to “activities that focus on subject matter content and how students learn that content” (Desimone, 2009). Desimone (2009) stated that content focus might be the most influence feature of teacher learning, referencing research that links content focused professional development to increases in teacher knowledge and skills, and improved practice. Collective participation refers to participation of teachers with a shared school, grade, or department. Considering both features, professional development promoting disciplinary literacy should occur within the content areas and within small grade level spans. For example, all teachers in the high school social studies department, or fifth grade English language arts teachers. Content focus and collective participation promotes discipline specific interaction and discourse, which can result in meaning learning experiences (Desimone, 2009). This study found that the following realizations occurred in the general movement towards improved understanding regarding disciplinary literacy in social studies (a) teaching in the disciplines involves skills instruction, not just content transmission; (b) literacy in the disciplines includes reading, writing, listening, speaking and thinking; (c) there is a clear connection between literacy and discipline specific skills; (d) candidates can recognize the literacy demands of
discipline lesson; and (e) candidates can describe, create, and implement literacy-focused lessons in a classroom. Each of these realizations involve discipline specific understandings. As Johnson and Watson (2010), and Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) noted, disciplinary literacy requires specific knowledge of the disciplines. Therefore, it makes sense that professional development promoting disciplinary literacy should occur within groups of teachers with the same content focus.

**Active learning.**

Desimone (2009) provided the following examples of active learning in professional development: “observing expert teachers or being observed, followed by interactive feedback and discussion; reviewing student work in the topic areas being covered; and leading discussions” (p. 184). I suggest these practices be utilized within the framework of Lewin’s (1947a) change model.

As Lortie (1975) noted, practicing teachers have varying perceptions of what it means to teach based upon their teacher preparation and experiences in the classroom. For many, adopting a disciplinary literacy approach would require them to acquire new beliefs and attitudes regarding what it means to teach in their disciplines. Like teacher candidates, practicing teachers must “unfreeze” (Lewin, 1947a) their notions of teaching before they can move towards the desired beliefs and attitudes needed for disciplinary literacy instruction to occur. Therefore, professional development programs need to create opportunities for such reflective practices in safe and supported environments. Discussions should occur within groups of teachers who share a content areas regarding what it means to learn within a discipline.
Teachers should be encouraged to share what they already know about literacy in their disciplines and then build upon this knowledge. At the same time, these discussions need to be facilitated by a disciplinary literacy expert to address misconceptions and provide insight. Such professional development opportunities would also be ideally situated for examining student work (Desimone, 2009). Discussion could address topics such as the purpose of assignments, identification of literacy skills within the assignment, and students’ acquisition of learning objectives.

Once pre-existing beliefs of teaching have been “unfrozen,” professional development programs need to increase driving forces and decrease restraining forces to promote “movement” towards the desires beliefs and attitudes (Lewin, 1947a). Driving forces should include modeled literacy focused activities and explicit disciplinary instruction to improve teacher’s overall understanding of literacy in their disciplines. While Desimone (2009) did not include such activities as “active learning,” I believe they fit the description. This study found that engagement in these activities improved the candidates’ disciplinary literacy, provided a literacy learning experience on which to build a framework for literacy instruction, and provided candidates with the confidence to utilize the activity in their own classroom instruction. I believe practicing teachers would benefit in the same ways.

Desimone (2009) identified observations, followed by interactive feedback and discussion, as an example of active learning. Just like teacher candidates, practicing teachers must have opportunities to implement literacy instruction in the classroom. Mentors and administrators need to understand that because teachers are learning, they will need time to
perfect their new practices. Teachers need to feel safe and supported to try new things and make mistakes. Therefore, the feedback and discussion following the observation should foster such an environment while providing useful suggestions to improve instruction.

Opportunities for teachers to witness quality disciplinary literacy instruction either in person or through videos (as mentioned in previous sections) aligns with Desimone’s (2009) suggested use of observation as active learning. Support should also include opportunities for feedback and reflective discussion with expert teachers who utilize literacy-focused teaching methods.

**Duration.**

To “freeze” acquired beliefs and attitudes teachers need ongoing support. Professional development for disciplinary literacy cannot be accomplished over one summer or with a few after school sessions. In fact, Desimone (2009) found that professional development that spanned over a semester, or intensive summer sessions with follow up session during the semester, and included 20 hours or more of contact time were most beneficial. Given that this study involved three semesters of coursework and field experiences and did not achieve “freezing” of new ideas, I believe professional development targeting disciplinary literacy would require more than 20 hours to achieve permanency of newly aquired behaviors. Administration and teachers need to understand that meaningful change takes times, thus adopting a disciplinary literacy approach is meaningful change that requires extended time to attend to prior knowledge, generate new understandings, and provide ongoing support.
Teacher volition also needs to be considered when determining how to “freeze” acquired beliefs. Lortie (1975) looked at how teachers found purpose in their profession. One such purpose was the “hope their teaching would produce affective changes” in students; in other words, instill a love of learning, instill an interest in subject matter, or foster independent thinking (p. 114). In this respect, in order for teachers to adopt new beliefs and practices, they need evidence that the beliefs and practices produce affective changes in students. Thus, “freezing” will not occur until teachers have had time to acquire new disciplinary literacy knowledge, apply it to their teaching, and evaluate the results. Such considerations must be addressed when designing professional development programs targeting disciplinary literacy.

**Coherence.**

Coherence refers to two aspects. First is the “extent to which teacher learning is consistent with teachers’ knowledge and beliefs” (Desimone, 2009). Second is the “consistency of school, district, and state reforms and policies with what is taught in professional development” (Desimone, 2009). When addressing professional development focused on disciplinary literacy, the first aspect only applies if teachers believe in literacy-based, or skills-based instruction. Teachers who believe in content-based, traditional methods would find themselves without coherence to the concepts of disciplinary literacy. Hence, activities that promote reflection about prior beliefs (addressed in the previous section regarding active learning) are essential. The second aspect of coherence could be achieved by the adoption of Common Core State Standards (2010), which promotes disciplinary literacy practices. However, adoption of Common Core must be accompanied by long term administrative support that
fosters the implementation of research based instructional practices and recognizes that such change requires a learning curb, a topic I previously addressed in the section regarding active learning.

Democratic Engagement

The finding of this study have two implications regarding democratic engagement. The first involves teacher involvement in policy decision. In the United States, decisions regarding curriculum are made by government officials at the federal, state, and local levels, and these policy decisions impact education in a variety of ways, including curriculum and assessments (Darling-Hammond, Banks, Zumwalt, Gomez, Sherin, Griesdorn, & Finn, 2005).

Teachers should understand that curriculum is not static, but is continuously negotiated, and they should understand that their role as professionals is to bring and understanding of how different decisions are likely to affect student learning, identity, and future educational opportunities (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005, p. 172).

To engage in such endeavors, teachers require not only knowledge regarding instructional practices, but fundamental beliefs and attitudes that impact how and why they teach.

A disciplinary literacy approach to instruction addresses how and why teachers teach through instructional practices introducing students to the ways in which experts in the core academic disciplines look at the world, investigate it, and communicate to one another about what they see and learn” (Heller & Greenleaf, 2007, p. 11). Adoption of a disciplinary literacy approach to instruction requires teachers to reflect on what it means to learn in a discipline.
Disciplinary literacy targets the complex and specific literacy skills of each discipline by emphasizing the knowledge and abilities possessed by those who create, communicate, and use knowledge within the disciplines (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012). Teachers work within a limited timeframe with set amount of instructional time in a school year. An understanding of disciplinary literacy allows teachers to make meaningful decisions regarding what gets taught during precious instructional time.

Understanding disciplinary literacy also allows a teacher to decide how concepts are taught and justify why their decisions were pedagogically sound. Teachers should share such pedagogical understandings with the policy makers who, while often are not trained educators, make critical decisions regarding education.

The second implication regarding democratic engagement applies to equal access to education. “To support democracy, educators must seek to eliminate disparities in educational opportunities among all students” (Banks, Cochran-Smith, Moll, Richert, Zeichner, LePage, Darling-Hammond, Duffy, and McDonald, 2005, p. 233). A disciplinary literacy focus to instruction does not permit content transmission and reliance on low level cognitive skills. With disciplinary literacy, the focus on skills acquisition allows students to engage in high level thinking activities. A literacy focus also apprentices students, through modeling and guided practice, into disciplines through reading, writing, and communication based activities. Such instruction exposes students to funds of knowledge (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) possessed by experts in the disciplines; funds of knowledge that, depending on a student’s background and circumstances, may not have been available to them outside of the classroom.
Recommendations for Further Research

This study contributed to the field by providing research regarding how a teacher education course specifically addressing disciplinary literacy impacted teacher candidates’ attitudes and beliefs about teaching literacy. This multiple case study to exemplified the experiences that impacted four participants’ beliefs and attitudes about learning and teaching social studies literacy. Yet, given the momentous task put forth by Common Core and NCSS of all schools adopting a disciplinary literacy approach to teaching, much more research needs to occur. I offer the following recommendation for research to aid in this task.

A limitation of this study was its inability to examine the participants’ “freezing” of newly acquired beliefs and attitudes during their first teaching positions. While the teacher preparation program influenced the participants’ adoption of positive beliefs and attitudes regarding disciplinary literacy instruction, the impact on their actual practice is unknown. Hence, the following questions need to be researched: Will a positive attitude towards disciplinary literacy instruction as a teacher candidate transfer into disciplinary literacy instruction as a practicing teacher? What factors at the school support or hinder such instruction?

This study was also unable to clearly identify teacher candidates’ intrinsic motivations for change. While cross case analysis revealed a number of factors impacted participants’ understanding of, and subsequent beliefs and attitudes towards, social studies literacy, it did not provide clear indications of volition. I believe that further research targeting teacher candidate volition regarding the adaption of disciplinary literacy into existing belief structures
would further efforts of teacher preparation programs to provide meaningful and persuasive experiences that foster change.

Language played an important role in this study; particularly the terminology used to discuss and explain disciplinary literacy. Correct usage of the terms defined in chapter one, such as literacy, social studies literacy, historical thinking, and literacy skill, proved to be indicators in participants’ overall understanding of disciplinary literacy. However, this study presented a challenge by requiring assessment of understanding without providing definitions of the terms necessary to demonstrate understanding. Participants improved their knowledge of literacy terminology during the second semester when they took Disciplinary Literacy. When examining participants’ understandings prior to their enrollment in Disciplinary Literacy, understanding had to be inferred by a researcher knowledgeable in the field. Given the importance of language in the study, and the challenges it presented, I believe the role of language in teacher preparation programs promoting disciplinary literacy warrants further research. I suggest the following research questions for further study: What is the role of language when acquiring disciplinary literacy knowledge? What is the impact of language acquisition in understanding disciplinary literacy? What are essential terms for understanding disciplinary literacy?

Finally, this study revealed common factors of the teacher preparation program that impacted participants’ beliefs and attitudes. Other teacher preparation programs may structure their courses differently and offer different instructional opportunities for candidates. I encourage other teacher preparation programs to conduct similar studies to determine the common factors in their programs that positively impact candidates’ beliefs and attitudes.
regarding disciplinary literacy instruction. By sharing such findings, teacher preparation programs across the country could use this knowledge to improve instruction.

**Significance of the Study**

As the review of literature revealed, there is a void in research concerning whether or not disciplinary approaches to literacy instruction in teacher preparation classes lead to increased teacher implementation. Given that beliefs and attitudes are important variables impacting human behavior (Lewin, 1947a; Schein, 1996), it was necessary to examine the beliefs and attitudes of teacher candidates to understand their instructional choices. Thus, this study added to the field by presenting how disciplinary literacy approaches in a teacher preparation program positively impacted teacher candidates’ attitudes and beliefs regarding social studies literacy instruction. Furthermore, by identifying common factors of the program attributing to changes in participants’ beliefs and attitudes, the study provides guidance for teacher preparation programs looking to promote similar beliefs.

In essence, this study not only makes a case for the inclusion of disciplinary literacy instruction in teacher preparation programs, but for the examination of the disciplinary instruction to ensure attention to prior knowledge, modeled-literacy focused activities, explicit disciplinary literacy instruction, practice in the field, and the role of student-teacher relationships. Disciplinary literacy should not be limited to a singular course. For candidates to truly understand how a disciplinary approach impacts philosophy and instruction, it needs to be explicitly addressed throughout the program.
Teacher candidates are entering a profession going through exciting changes and expectations for teachers are high. Teacher preparation programs have a responsibility to prepare candidates to face these challenges and embrace changes in the profession. To do this, candidates must leave programs with not only knowledge regarding instructional practices, but fundamental beliefs and attitudes that impact how and why they teach. A disciplinary literacy approach addresses how and why through instructional practices introducing “students to the ways in which experts in the core academic disciplines look at the world, investigate it, and communicate to one another about what they see and learn” (Heller & Greenleaf, 2007). I believe that candidates who share this fundamental belief possess attitudes that will allow them to face the challenges and expectations of teaching and ultimately positively impact every student who passes through their classrooms.
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TITLE: Using Disciplinary Literacy: Teacher Candidates’ Changes in Attitudes and Beliefs over Time

1. PURPOSE of the research project AND GENERAL INFORMATION:

a. PURPOSE

The purpose of this research study is to analyze changes in students’ attitudes and beliefs about teaching and learning social studies over the span of their secondary social studies methods and disciplinary literacy courses at the University of Cincinnati.

b. BACKGROUND

1) Prior research

Literacy instruction for students at the middle and high school levels needs to improve (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010; Fisher & Ivey, 2005; Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012). In 2009, Wise observed an increase in the literacy rates of elementary students over the previous 30 years. However, during the same period literacy rates amongst adolescents (middle and high school students) had remained stagnant (Wise, 2009).

Advancement in grade level coincides with declining literacy support in the classroom, where rare occurrences of literacy instruction are often relegated to the general reading strategies associated with content literacy (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). Research suggests that a content literacy approach to literacy instruction fails to address the literacy demands of middle and high school content (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010) or the realities of teaching faced by content teachers (Fisher & Ivey, 2005). Additionally, research has revealed an overall reluctance amongst middles and high school teachers to integrate literacy into their content instruction (Alger, 2009; O’Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995).

Recent research suggests a movement away from a content literacy approach towards a disciplinary literacy approach, promoting the specific literacy practices privileged in given disciplines (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010; Draper, 2008; Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012). However, transitioning from a content literacy to a disciplinary literacy approach would require changes in how educators are prepared to teach. Disciplinary literacy views reading and writing as
“contextually dependent practices” (Buehl, 2011, p. 13); thus, literacy cannot be viewed as a generic set of skills or tools. In order to identify these contextually dependent practices, Moje (2008) encouraged educators to “examine and challenge what it means to learn in the...disciplines (p. 99), arguing that such a change in thinking may lead to a more compelling argument for teaching literacy in the content areas.

Research suggests that teacher education programs should bolster teacher efficacy for teaching literacy within the disciplines in several ways. First, teacher education programs should build preservice teacher’s knowledge of disciplinary literacy. As Cantrell and Callaway (2008) observed, all participants eventually incorporated literacy practices into their instruction upon participation in supportive professional development. This suggests that exposure to literacy education in the content areas can impact classroom practices. Second, teacher education programs should promote student centered learning. Sturtevant and Linek (2003) showed that the instructional practices of effective literacy teachers focused on building the critical thinking skills of individual students. Third, teacher education programs should encourage preservice teachers to adopt attitudes and beliefs promoting the following ideas: learning is an ongoing process for students and teachers, all students can learn, and that literacy is an essential aspect of learning content. Such ideas encourage teachers to have the persistence to work through barriers and meet the needs of students by growing as professionals (Cantrell & Callaway, 2008; Sturtevant & Linek, 2003).

Acknowledging that the attitudes and beliefs of teachers and preservice teachers heavily influence classroom instruction, studies have been conducted to explore methods to alter attitudes and beliefs towards disciplinary literacy. Nokes (2010) showed that discipline specific literacy instruction can have a positive impact on not only preservice teachers’ disposition towards literacy instruction, but also a positive impact on their knowledge regarding literacy in their discipline and literacy pedagogy relevant to their discipline. Additionally, Gritter (2010) identified that preservice teachers demonstrated more student centered tendencies when discussion literacy instruction as compared to content instruction. Taking into consideration Freedman and Carver’s (2007) findings, it appears that emphasis on literacy within the disciplines encourages preservice teachers to embrace student centered pedagogy. Alger (2007) offers additional support to this notion by demonstrating how a focus on literacy can promote notions of teaching for social justice.

2) Significance

This study would add to the general body of knowledge in this discipline by
providing in-depth qualitative data regarding changes in preservice teachers’ attitudes in beliefs over the course of their teacher preparation program at the University of Cincinnati. Through in-depth interviews, the researchers intend to gain information regarding students’ experiences as a K-12 and secondary education student at UC with the goal of identifying specific aspects of the students’ overall experiences that impacted their beliefs and attitudes about teaching and learning social studies. Such data could inform university instructors and program coordinators as they plan and design methods courses. Ultimately, improved teacher preparation programs would increase teacher efficacy for literacy instruction and in turn result in quality education for students.

c. **FUNDING**
   1) Sponsor’s name and type: Not applicable
   2) Sponsor’s role: Not applicable
   3) Location of funds: Not applicable
   4) Status of funding: Not applicable

d. **FACILITIES**
   Course observations will be conducted in the classrooms assigned to the course by UC. The interviews will be conducted in conference rooms in Teachers College at the University of Cincinnati. Appropriate measures will be taken to reserve rooms for interviews at the appropriate times.

e. **DURATION OF STUDY**
   This study will follow a cohort of students in the secondary social studies education program as they progress through their methods courses (introductory, intermediate and advanced) and disciplinary literacy course, which spans one and a half academic years (3 semesters). The PI will require at least an additional academic semester to finish analyzing the data and writing a research report.

   A time constraint of this study is when new cohorts begin the secondary education program at UC. New cohorts only begin in the spring and follow a three semester program. I am constrained by these time limitations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Semester</th>
<th>Course(s)</th>
<th>Research Gathering Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Introductory social studies</td>
<td>• Pre-interview: instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>methods</td>
<td>• Pre – survey: students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify and gain consent from focal participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct 3 interviews: focal participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct classroom observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Post-survey: students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Intermediate social studies methods</th>
<th>Disciplinary literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-interview: instructors</td>
<td>Pre – survey: students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre – survey: students</td>
<td>Conduct 2 interviews: focal participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct classroom observations</td>
<td>Post-survey: students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
<th>Advanced social studies methods</th>
<th>Disciplinary literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-interview: instructor</td>
<td>Pre – survey: students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre – survey: students</td>
<td>Conduct 2 interviews: focal participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct classroom observations</td>
<td>Post-survey: students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Disciplinary literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write up research report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### f. RESEARCH TEAM

1) **Research team and time commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title / Responsibility</th>
<th>Time Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>15 hours weekly/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Advisor</td>
<td>5 hours weekly/year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) **Training team members in research ethics**

The research team has completed CITI training.

The PI has earned passing grades in the following graduate level courses at UC: Introductory Research Methods (EDST 755), Qualitative Research Methods I (EDST 8051), Qualitative Research Methods II (EDST 8052) and Theory, Ethics, and Application of Research in Teaching (CI 9003).

The faculty advisor is a UC faculty member in the College of Education who holds a Ph.D and researches in the field.

3) **Training team members in research activities**

(a) **Training**

The PI and faculty advisor will be in continual contact as they plan and conduct
this research. The responsibilities of each team member will be a point of discussion. The PI will be collected the data through surveys, interviews and observations. The faculty advisor will oversee the data collection and assist with analysis.

(b) Verification

Because the research team consists of the faculty advisor, who is under obligation to follow university procedures, the PI will be sure to attend to the appropriate standards and processes.

2. PARTICIPANTS:

a. RECRUITMENT

1) Number of participants

(a) Minimum and maximum number of participants

A cohort of approximately 10-15 student participants (estimated course enrollment) will be asked to complete pre- and post- surveys and consent to classroom observations in each of the following courses: Introductory Methods, Intermediate Methods, and Advanced Methods. From the initial survey in the Introductory Methods course, the research team will determine 3-4 focal participants to invite to take part in the interview portion of the research.

Approximately two total faculty members teaching the social studies methods courses and a disciplinary literacy course will be asked to take part planning interviews and classroom observations for each course. Additional instructors may be asked to teach methods courses over the time frame of this study. This is outside of the research team’s control.

(b) Rationale

Initially, student enrollment will determine the number of participants asked to complete surveys and participate in classroom observations. The decision to interview 3-4 is due to the feasibility of the researchers to gather and analyze the in-depth data they desire for the nature of this study.

Currently, only two instructors are expected to teach the courses involved in the study. However, additional instructors may be asked to teach methods courses over the time frame of this study. This is outside of the research team’s control.

6) Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Participants must be students accepted into the secondary education social studies
cohort. The cohort course requirements include the following in a set sequence over the course of three semesters: secondary social studies methods courses (introductory, intermediate, and advanced), disciplinary literacy, practicum I, practicum II, and student teaching. These courses address the specific criteria of this study.

Focal participants will be chosen from those who self-selected to participate in the interview portion of the study. Selections will be made based upon survey information. The intent is to choose participants who indicate a variety of attitudes and beliefs towards teaching and learning in social studies. However, the research team cannot accurately predict the variation of responses from participants who choose to opt in to the interview portion of the study.

The faculty participants must be the instructors of record for the social studies methods courses (introductory, intermediate, and advanced) and the disciplinary literacy course.

3) Vulnerable participants

(a) Vulnerability

Because most of the data is collected through the coursework of the UC courses affiliated with this study, the vulnerability is within the population only. However, these student participants have agreed to participate, and thus there is limited vulnerability with the exception of the possibility of feeling as though they are not giving the “correct answer” to the PI. This will be alleviated by ensuring the study addresses beliefs and attitudes whereby there is no correct answer. In addition, participants will be informed that their honest feedback will only help improve the overall effectiveness of the social studies secondary education program at UC.

The faculty participants will have agreed to participate based upon their desire to improve the secondary education program at UC. The amount of time dedicated to the study is minimal but they stand to gain insights from the completion of the study. They have established professional relationships with the PI, but it is not expected they will feel pressured into participation due to the professional and formal nature of the consent process. Also, the PI is a graduate student and the instructors are UC faculty members, so a power balance is not at play.

(b) Rationale

This study stems from a desire to improve the quality of instruction provided to students taking social studies education courses at UC through the inclusion of disciplinary literacy. Therefore secondary social studies methods students are the target population. Recent and current, enrollment in each cohort has been
The faculty participants must be the instructors of record for the social studies methods courses (introductory, intermediate, and advanced) and the disciplinary literacy course as it is these courses that would address disciplinary literacy in social studies.

Confirmation

Participants, the secondary social studies education cohort at UC and UC faculty members, will be required to sign consent form confirming that they are over the age of 18 years old, are not cognitively impaired and that they are not educationally limited.

4) Risks and discomforts from participating

(a) Type and level of risk or discomfort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk or Discomfort</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional discomfort</td>
<td>minimal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Safety monitoring plan: Not applicable

Reporting

(1) Notification of PI

Participants will be notified each time consent is requested that they are able to opt out of participation of the study at any point in time during the process. They will be given the phone and email contacts for the PI and the faculty advisor. These notifications will be included on the consent form signed prior to survey completion and classroom observations, and the consent form signed prior to the interviews and in an email immediately following the interviews.

(2) Notification of IRB

Participants will be given the phone and email contacts for IRB. These notifications will be included on the consent form signed prior to the surveys and classroom observations and the consent form signed prior to the interviews and in an email immediately following the interviews.

(3) Other notification

Member checking of data by the participants interviewed.
(4) Available resources

The participants could discuss any discomfort with the faculty advisor.

5) Direct benefits to the participant

All student participants will be provided with opportunities to reflect on their personal beliefs and attitudes regarding teaching.

Faculty participants will be provided with the opportunity to reflect upon, discuss and possibly plan their course with the PI who has experience teaching secondary social studies methods and disciplinary literacy courses. They will also benefit from knowing the results of the study which could help inform their practice.

6) Recruitment activities

(a) Recruitment materials

List:  Survey Directions

Initial Interview Consent

Study Overview

(b) Personnel

The PI will administer and collect the surveys in all courses and conduct all classroom observations. The PI and faculty advisor will then choose focal participants based upon interview feedback. The PI will contact all interview participants via email.

Recruitment activities

The PI will contact each faculty participant personally and explain the overall nature of this study. The PI will provide copies of the study overview and answer any questions the instructors may have regarding the study and their, or their students’, participation.

The PI will introduce the study as part of the initial survey’s directions. Student participants will be informed that the survey was designed to obtain information regarding their beliefs, attitudes, and teacher preparation regarding teaching and learning in social studies. They will be asked to reflect on the questions and answer them honestly, and that the data will help their instructors to have accurate information regarding their overall thoughts towards various aspects of teaching and learning; which will in turn help the instructor to prepare and plan
for future instruction.

These students will then be asked to participate in the interview portion of the study, which gives them the opportunity to reflect upon their teacher preparation and attitudes and beliefs about teaching and learning while providing insights that could help improve the teacher education program at UC.

The PI and faculty advisor will review the surveys and determine which participants have voiced willingness to participate are qualified as focal participants for interviewing. The PI will contact focal candidates by using the email address provided by the students on their survey.

(d) Participant response

Student Surveys: Student participant response is a dual process. The first process involves the survey. If a student chooses not to participate in the study, they will be informed to simply turn in a blank survey. As all surveys will be collected by the PI, no one in the room will know who participated or not.

Student interviews: The second process involved the interviews. If a participant chooses not to participate in the interview portion of study, they will be instructed not to write their contact information on the survey. Students choosing to participate in the interview portion of the study will be asked to complete the survey and provide their name and email address on the survey itself. Students who wish to participate in the interview process will be contacted by the PI through an “invitation email”, and they will respond to the PI’s invitation email by email, phone, or in person. This second process allows for an additional opportunity to opt out of the study or to verify their willingness to participate.

Instructor Interviews: The faculty participants can inform the PI of their willingness to participate in person or via email.

Classroom Observations: The faculty participants will inform the PI of their willingness to participate during the interview process. Student participants will provide consent just prior to the observation taking place.

b. CONSENT PROCESS

1) Presenting information to potential participants

Student Surveys: The PI will read the consent information to the each methods class with each survey. Additionally, the consent information will be provided in writing with each survey. The PI will answer any posed questions regarding consent throughout the survey process.

Student consent process for surveys:
1. The PI reads survey purpose, directions, and consent information. The PI will address any questions.
2. The PI directs students to detach the consent signature page from the directions and contact info page. The PI will collect all consent signature pages (signed and unsigned) and distribute surveys to all students.
3. Students will be provided time to complete the survey. Those who did not provide consent will not complete the survey.
4. The PI will collect all surveys.

Student consent process for survey 1 and interviews:

5. The PI reads survey purpose, directions, and consent information. The PI will address any questions.
6. The PI directs students to detach the consent signature page from the directions and contact info page. The PI will collect all consent signature pages (signed and unsigned) and distribute surveys and interview information to all students.
7. The PI will explain the purpose, directions and consent process for the interview portion of the study. The PI will address any questions.
8. Students will be provided time to complete the survey. Those who did not provide consent will not complete the survey. During this time students will also indicate consent for the interviews on the survey.
9. The PI will collect all surveys.

Student Interviews: The PI will provide a written copy of the consent form for the entire interview process (7 interviews over 3 semesters) to each focal participant at the beginning of the initial interview. The PI will instruct the focal participants to read and sign the consent form, along with address any questions the participants may have regarding consent. The interviews will only be conducted once consent is provided.

Instructor Interviews: The PI will provide a written copy of the consent form to each faculty participant at the initial instructor interview. The consent form will indicate that the faculty participant is providing consent to be interviewed for each of the following courses they teach over span of the study: introductory secondary social studies methods, intermediate secondary social studies methods, advanced secondary social studies methods, and secondary disciplinary literacy). The PI will instruct the faculty participants to read and sign the consent form, along with address any questions the participants may have regarding consent. The interviews will only be conducted once consent is provided.

Classroom observations: During the faculty interview, the PI will get consent from the course instructors to conduct classroom observations on certain dates predetermined during the faculty interview. On the selected dates, the PI will
provide students with written texts describing the purpose for the observation and consent. Consent forms will be collected prior to each observation.

6) Answering questions from potential participants

Surveys: Participants taking the surveys will have the opportunity to ask the PI questions as she will be administering the survey. They will be informed that the surveys are anonymous unless they opt into the interview portion of the study. In these cases, participants will be informed that their survey and interview content and their identity will only be known by the PI and the faculty advisor. Participants will also be provided with contact information for the PI, the faculty advisor, and the IRB. Students will be informed that their instructor will be made aware of the overall results of the survey, but not who did or did not participate.

Student Interviews: Focal participants will be reminded of the voluntary nature of their study participation as well as their right to end their participation at any time during the process. They will have opportunities to ask questions throughout the process. They will be informed that their survey and interview content and their identity will only be known by the PI and the faculty advisor and will remain confidential throughout the study and in the final report. They will also be provided with contact information for the PI, the faculty advisor, and the IRB.

Instructor Interviews: Faculty participants will be reminded of the voluntary nature of their study participation as well as their right to end their participation at any time during the process. They will have opportunities to ask questions throughout the process. They will be informed that their names will not be used in the study report. They will also be provided with contact information for the PI, the faculty advisor, and the IRB.

Classroom Observations: Participants will have the opportunity to ask the PI questions when she asks for consent prior to the observations.

3) Indicating consent

Student Surveys: A written text explaining the consent process will be provided to all student participants. Students will be asked to sign the text if they consent to survey participation. The consent text will be collected prior to distributing surveys to all of the students. This way no one will know who consented to the survey.

Student Interviews: A written text explaining the consent process for the interviews will be provided to all student participants prior to survey completion. Consent will be given by providing their name and a contact email in an opt in section at the end of the survey and providing a contact email address. An additional written consent form will be given to each focal participant and signed at the time of the initial interview.
Instructor Interviews: Faculty participants will provide consent by signing a written form prior to the start of the initial interview.

Classroom Observations: faculty participants will provide consent during the instructor interview. Student participants will provide consent in writing prior to the beginning of each classroom observation.

6) Legally authorized representative (LAR) for minors or cognitively impaired participants

   Not applicable

6) Verification of LAR for cognitively impaired participants

   Not applicable

6) Avoiding coercion

   If individuals choose not to participate in either the survey or interview portion of the study, they will be instructed to not provide consent. No one in the room will know if they have chosen to participate or not as the PI will distribute and collect all materials from all students regardless of completion. Individual surveys and information regarding who did or did not provide consent, or who was or was not selected to participate as a focal participant will be not be provided to course instructors.

   The course instructors will have agreed to participate based upon their desire to improve the secondary education program at UC. The amount of time dedicated to the study is minimal but they stand to gain insights from the completion of the study. They have established professional relationships with the PI, but it is not expected they will feel pressured into participation due to the professional and formal nature of the consent process. Also, the PI is a graduate student and the instructors are UC faculty members, so a power balance is not at play.

6) Recruitment incentives

   There will be no recruitment incentives.

c. CONSENT DOCUMENTS (ICDs)

   List:
   - Survey Directions and Consent
   - Initial Student Interview Consent
   - Second Student Interview Consent
   - Instructor Interview Consent
   - Classroom Observation Consent
3. RESEARCH-RELATED ACTIVITY:

a. SECONDARY ANALYSIS of an EXISTING DATASET

1) Person or entity that holds the dataset
   Not applicable

6) General description of the data, including when and how the data were obtained
   Not applicable

6) List of the fields (or description of the kinds of information) that will be used from the dataset, with specific mention of any individually identifying data
   Not applicable

6) Explanation why individually identifying data are needed for your study, how confidentiality of individually identifiable data will be assured, and how soon identifiers will be purged from the dataset
   Not applicable

6) Explanation of how the dataset (or portion of the dataset) will be obtained from the current holder
   Not applicable

b. REVIEW OF RECORDS that were collected for NON-RESEARCH PURPOSES

1) Person or entity that holds the records
   Not applicable

6) General description of the kind of records, including when and how the records were obtained
   Not applicable

6) Specific description of the information (i.e., data fields) that will be used from the records, with specific mention of any individually identifying information
   Not applicable

6) Explanation why individually identifying information is needed for your study, and how soon identifiers will be purged from the research records
   Not applicable
6) Explanation of how the records (or excerpts from the records) will be obtained from the current holder

Not applicable

c. RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

1) Privacy of participation

Student Survey: Participation in the surveys is minimal risk. However, the PI and faculty advisor will keep and individual’s participation private.

If students choose not to participate in either the surveys or interview portion of the study, they will be instructed to not provide consent. No one in the room will know if they have chosen to participate or not as the PI will distribute and collect all materials from all students regardless of completion. Individual surveys and information regarding who did or did not provide consent, or who was or was not selected to participate as a focal participant will be not be provided to course instructors.

Student Interviews: Student focal interviews will be arranged by the PI and will be held in Teachers College. However, the participants will be asked if they prefer another location. Appointment times and room locations will be arranged to participants will not see one another coming or going. Also, the instructors will not be made aware of interview times or locations.

Instructor Interviews: Course Instructor interviews will be held in the location of their choosing. The faculty participants may opt to reveal their identity and waive confidentiality do to the fact that their initial participation in this study is vital. Without their consent, the PI will not be able to conduct the surveys which would identify participants.

Classroom Observations: All consent forms will be distributed and collected by the PI so only the PI will know who provided consent. The PI will only record the input from those who provided consent in her field notes.

6) Confidentiality of data

Student Surveys: Only the PI and faculty advisor will see the signed survey consent forms. The forms will be destroyed after completion and publication of the study.

The survey data will be scanned into a password protected electronic device kept by the PI. Interview data will be kept on the password protected personal electronic device of the PI. Instructors of the courses will only see the overall electronically tallied results of the surveys, not the actual completed survey forms. Survey data will be deleted after completion and publication of the study.

Students will only put their names on the survey if they opt in to the interview
process. This process allows the PI to use the information provided by focal participants during the interviews. Surveys will be destroyed after and completion and publication of the study.

Student Interviews: Participation in the student interview portion of the study will remain confidential, and all interview data will be masked with a pseudonym selected by the participant, and only the PI and faculty advisor will know the correlating name of the participant connected to the pseudonym. The participant can choose not to be audio recorded, in which case the PI would rely on her notes. All interview data and the surveys from focal participants will be kept in a locked cabinet in Teachers College or in the password protected electronic device of the PI. All interview data and surveys will be destroyed after completion and publication of the study.

Instructor Interviews: Participation in the faculty portion of the study will remain confidential and all interview data will be masked with a pseudonym selected by the participant, and only the PI and faculty advisor will know the correlating name of the participant connected to the pseudonym. However, the faculty participants may opt to reveal their identity and waive confidentiality. The participant can choose not to be audio recorded, in which case the PI would rely on her notes. All interview data from faculty participants will be kept in a locked cabinet in Teachers College or in the password protected electronic device of the PI. All interview data will be destroyed after completion and publication of the study.

Classroom Observations: Participation in the classroom observation of the study will remain confidential, and all field note data will be masked with a pseudonym selected by the PI. All observation data will be kept in a locked cabinet in Teachers College or in the password protected electronic device of the PI. All observation data will be destroyed after completion and publication of the study.

3) Research-related activities

(a) Participant cohorts

Not applicable

(b) Activities and duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Semester</th>
<th>Course(s)</th>
<th>Research Gathering Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Introductory social studies methods</td>
<td>• Instructor interview: Instructor and PI (90 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o How are you addressing disciplinary literacy in your course? What topics and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate social studies methods</td>
<td>Disciplinary literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre – survey:</strong> PI and students (25 minutes)</td>
<td><strong>Instructor interview:</strong> Instructors and PI (90 minutes each)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o What are your attitudes and beliefs regarding teaching and learning social studies?</td>
<td>o How are you addressing disciplinary literacy in your course? What topics and assignments meet this criteria?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Students will also indicate consent for focal interviews.</td>
<td></td>
<td>o Pre – survey: PI and students in methods course (15 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Students may choose not to complete the survey and they are free to do other silent work.</td>
<td>o What are your attitudes and beliefs regarding teaching and learning social studies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify and gain consent from focal participants:</strong> PI and faculty advisor</td>
<td><strong>2 focal interviews:</strong> PI and focal participants (90 min each)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 focal interviews:</strong> PI and focal participants (90 min each) (*see below)</td>
<td></td>
<td>o <strong>Post-survey:</strong> PI and Students (15 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Interview 1: establish context: background</td>
<td>o What are your attitudes and beliefs regarding teaching and learning social studies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Interview 2: details of the experience</td>
<td>o What has impacted these attitudes and beliefs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Interview 3: reflection and meaning making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>Advanced social studies methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Instructor interview: Instructor and PI (90 min)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o How are you addressing disciplinary literacy in your course? What topics and assignments meet this criteria?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pre – survey: PI and students (15 min)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o What are your attitudes and beliefs regarding teaching and learning social studies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2 focal interviews: PI and focal participants (90 min each)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Interview 1: details of the experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Interview 2: reflection and meaning making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Classroom observations: approximately 3: PI, students, and instructor (209pprox. 60 min each)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Observe and take field notes of class activities/ discussion regarding disciplinary literacy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**<strong>Student teaching observations: PI and focal participants (209pprox. 90 min each)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Post-survey: PI and students (15 min)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o What are your attitudes and beliefs regarding teaching and learning social studies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o What has impacted these attitudes and beliefs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This study will utilize Seidman’s (2013) in-depth, phenomenological interviewing emphasizing
the transitory nature of human experience, reflection, and subjective understanding through context. Seidman (2013) endorses a three interview series process in which the first establishes context, the second garners details of the experience from the participant’s point of view, and the third requires participants to reflect and make meaning of the experience within the context of their life.

Data will also be collected through classroom observations and student work samples provided by the focal interview participants from methods and disciplinary literacy courses. This data will enrich the interviews by providing additional context and artifacts for meaningful reflection.

To contextualize the interviews, pre and post surveys will be administered to all secondary social studies students enrolled in the series of three methods courses. The surveys will utilize a likert scale to obtain information regarding students’ beliefs, attitudes, and teacher preparation regarding disciplinary literacy.

**The PI intends to observe the focal participants in their student teaching placements during their third semester. However, the specifics of their placements are not yet known so this aspect of the research will be added and submitted to the IRB during the second semester of the study.

I. Data collection tools

List:

- Pre-survey
- Post-survey
- Student interview guide
- Instructor interview guide

(d) Payments to participants: reimbursement of expenses or payment for time and effort

Not applicable

4. DATA ANALYSIS:

A multiple-case study (Duke & Mallette, 2011; Yin, 2009) will be conducted in order to investigate the phenomenon of a teacher education program through the lived experiences of the pre-service teachers. It is (1) particularistic in that it focuses on a single teacher education program, (2) descriptive because it utilizes multiple data sources, (3) heuristic in its purpose to increase understandings of how to best educate pre-service teachers, and (4) inductive as the
data will drive the understanding that emerge from the study (Duke & Mallette, 2011).

To ensure validity, the research will include the following: multiple data sources including survey results, interview data, classroom observations and student work samples from the identified courses; the use of member checks; extended time in the field through a longitudinal study with interviews and classroom observations; and comparative data analysis by the PI and faculty advisor. Additionally, the personal biases of the researcher will be kept in check throughout the process through reflection and journaling.

6. REFERENCES:

Alger, C. L. (2007). Engaging student teachers’ hearts and minds in the struggle to address (il)literacy in content area classrooms. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 50*(8), 620-630. Doi:10.1598/JAAL.50.8.1


**6. ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION:**

none
**Appendix B**

**Pre-Survey: Attitudes and Beliefs Study**

**Spring, 2014**

Directions: Please read the following questions carefully and answer them to the best of your ability using the following scale: Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly disagree. Indicate your answer by placing an X in the corresponding box. Please choose one answer per question.

**Reflect upon your experiences in social studies classes as a middle level and high school student.**

In *middle school* (grades 4-8) **social studies** classes, I was regularly given assignments that required me to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. read from textbooks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. read news articles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. read historical documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. write.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. listen to my classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. speak to my classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In *high school* (grades 9-12) **social studies** classes, I was regularly given assignments that required me to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. read from textbooks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. read news articles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. read historical documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. write.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. listen to my classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. speak to my classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflect upon the impact each of these assignments had on your education (grades 4-12). If you were never required to perform these tasks, leave the question blank.

____________________________ had a positive impact on my learning in social studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Reading from textbooks.</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Reading news articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Reading historical documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Listening to my classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Speaking to my classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflect upon your attitudes and beliefs regarding your abilities in the areas of social studies.

I consider myself to be an able reader in...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19. social studies.</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. the discipline of history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. the discipline of political science.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. the discipline of economics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. the discipline of geography.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I consider myself knowledgeable in...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. social studies.</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. the discipline of history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. the discipline of political science.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. the discipline of economics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. the discipline of geography.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I can identify the skills required to perform as a(n)...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29. historian.</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. political scientist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. geographer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. economist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I possess the skills required to perform as a(n)...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. historian.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. political scientist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. geographer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. economist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflect upon your beliefs regarding teaching and learning.

I believe that...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. a teacher should be an able reader in their discipline(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. every student can learn in social studies classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. teaching in social studies should be student centered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. students should learn skills in social studies classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. most reading instruction should occur in English language arts classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. most writing instruction should occur in English language arts classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When I teach social studies, I intend to require my students to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. read from a textbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. read news articles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. read historical documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. write.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. listen to their classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. speak to their classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When I teach social studies, I intend to teach my students to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>read at least one type of text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>read a variety of texts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>write.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>listen to their classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>speak to their classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel prepared to teach...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>social studies at the secondary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>history at the secondary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>political science at the secondary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>geography at the secondary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>economics at the secondary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Post-Survey: Attitudes and Beliefs Study

Spring, 2014

Directions: Please read the following questions carefully and answer them to the best of your ability using the following scale: Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly disagree. Indicate your answer by placing an X in the corresponding box. Please choose one answer per question.

I consider myself to be an able reader in...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>social studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>the discipline of history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>the discipline of political science.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>the discipline of economics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>the discipline of geography.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. This course improved my ability to read in the social studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. This course improved my ability to accurately assess my own abilities to read in the social studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I consider myself knowledgeable in...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>social studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>the discipline of history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>the discipline of political science.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>the discipline of economics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>the discipline of geography.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. This course increased my knowledge of social studies. (*I am not asking about your knowledge of teaching social studies.*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. This course improved my ability to accurately assess my own knowledge of social studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I can identify the skills required to perform as a(n)...  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. historian.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. political scientist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. geographer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. economist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. This course improved my ability to identify social studies related skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I possess the skills required to perform as a(n)...  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. historian.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. political scientist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. geographer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. economist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. This course improved my social studies related skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. This course improved my ability to accurately assess my own social studies related skills.
Reflect upon your beliefs regarding teaching and learning.

I believe that...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>a teacher should be an able reader in their discipline(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>every student can learn in social studies classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>teaching in social studies should be student centered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>students should learn skills in social studies classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>most reading instruction should occur in English language arts classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>most writing instruction should occur in English language arts classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This course impacted my beliefs about the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>a teacher should be an able reader in their discipline(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>every student can learn in social studies classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>teaching in social studies should be student centered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>students should learn skills in social studies classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>most reading instruction should occur in English language arts classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>most writing instruction should occur in English language arts classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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When I teach social studies, I intend to require my students to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>read from a textbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>read news articles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>read historical documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>write.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>listen to their classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>speak to their classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When I teach social studies, I intend to teach my students to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>read at least one type of text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>read a variety of texts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>write.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>listen to their classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>speak to their classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel prepared to teach...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>social studies at the secondary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>history at the secondary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>political science at the secondary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>geography at the secondary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>economics at the secondary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. Please provide a definition of literacy, or a brief explanation of what it means to be literate.

55. Please provide a brief explanation of what it means to be literate in social studies.
56. This course positively influenced my ability to provide the above definitions/explanations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This course improved my understanding of what it means to be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57. literate in the discipline of history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. literate in the discipline of political science.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. literate in the discipline of economics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. literate in the discipline of geography.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This course increased my ability to incorporate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61. reading instruction into my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. writing instruction into my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. listening instruction into my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. speaking instruction into my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This course provided me with strategies to incorporate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65. reading instruction into my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. writing instruction into my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. listening instruction into my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. speaking instruction into my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you are an interview participant in this study, please print your name below.
Appendix D

Pre-Survey: Attitudes and Beliefs Study

Fall, 2014

Directions: Please read the following questions carefully and answer them to the best of your ability.

1. List the types of texts used in the social studies fields (history, political science, geography, and economics).

2. List the skills used by experts in the social studies fields (history, political science, geography, and economics).

3. Describe how you intend to incorporate literacy instruction into your teaching.

4. List the literacy strategies appropriate for social studies instruction.

5. List the literacy strategies you feel comfortable incorporating into your instruction as of today.

If you are an interview participant in this study, please provide your name:
Appendix E

Post-Survey: Attitudes and Beliefs Study

Fall, 2014

Directions: Please read the following questions carefully and answer them to the best of your ability.

1. List the types of texts used in the social studies fields (history, political science, geography, and economics).

2. List the skills used by experts in the social studies fields (history, political science, geography, and economics).

3. Describe how you intend to incorporate literacy instruction into your teaching.

4. List the literacy strategies appropriate for social studies instruction.

5. List the literacy strategies you feel comfortable incorporating into your instruction as of today.

If you are an interview participant in this study, please provide your name:
Appendix F

Pre-Survey: Attitudes and Beliefs Study

Spring, 2015

Directions: Please read the following questions carefully and answer them to the best of your ability.

1. Define disciplinary literacy.

2. Explain how disciplinary literacy can impact student learning in secondary social studies classrooms.

3. Do you intend to incorporate literacy instruction into your teaching this semester? Explain your answer.

4. Describe how you intend to incorporate literacy instruction into your teaching this semester.

5. List the literacy strategies you intend to utilize when teaching this semester.

6. Are there barriers to incorporating literacy instruction into your teaching this semester? Explain your answer.
Appendix G

Post-Survey: Attitudes and Beliefs Study

Spring, 2015

Directions: Please read the following questions carefully and answer them to the best of your ability.

1. Describe how you incorporated literacy instruction into your teaching this semester.

2. Describe how the inclusion of literacy instruction impacted your attitudes and beliefs about teaching.

3. List the literacy strategies you utilized when teaching this semester.

4. Were there barriers to incorporating literacy instruction into your teaching this semester? Explain your answer.
Appendix H

Interview Guides

Spring 2014, Interview Guide 1: Focused Life History

1. Tell me the story about how you decided to become a teacher.
2. Describe your overall experience with your middle school education.
   a. Specific attention to survey questions.
3. Describe your overall experience with your high school education.
   a. Specific attention to survey questions
4. How did you learn to read?
5. What were your experiences with texts and reading in middle school?
   a. Specific attention to survey questions
6. What were your experiences with texts and reading in high school?
   a. Specific attention to survey questions
7. Describe your teachers. What types of techniques did they use?
8. What made you choose education? How did you come to that decision?
9. What made you choose social studies? How did you come to that decision?
10. Tell me how you came to be in the social studies education program at UC?

Listen for:
- Be aware of what am I note clearly understanding.
- When they furrow (counter to what you’re saying) – push a bit
- Tell me a negative experience that led you to question your decision.
- Watch for lack of understanding on my side
- Bring paper to jot down questions
- What’s your driving philosophy to teaching and learning.
- Driving quotes
- Have you ever thought about what you are going to do...
- What’s the last book you read for pleasure about your content area?
- Tell me what you do that would convince someone that you have a passion for...

Spring 2014, Interview Guide 2: The Details of the Experience

1. What does a social studies teacher do?
2. Tell me about a typical day at your field placement. What do you do? What do the students do?
3. Tell me about a significant experience you have had in the field. What happened? What made it significant?
4. Tell me about a typical day for you as a UC student.
5. Describe what it is like for you in your courses. What are you doing? What are you learning?
6. Tell me about a significant experience you had in your methods class. What happened? What made it significant?
7. Tell me about a significant experience you had in your disciplinary literacy class. What happened? What made it significant?

Spring 2014, Interview Guide 3: Reflection on the Meaning
- Review Pre and Post survey responses – ask participants to explain changes in their answers (noteworthy discrepancies will be highlighted prior to)
  o Ask follow up questions – ask for specific causes of changes in thinking
- Ask about their definition of literacy
  o Ask for specific influences on this definition (courses)
  o Did the methods course directly address literacy – did it use the term?
- Ask participant to tell you about their lesson plan
  o Ask for further information regarding certain aspects (highlighted prior to)
  o Why did you choose these verbs for your objectives?
  o Was this a literacy lesson?
  o Where did you incorporate literacy instruction?

Spring 2014, Instructor Interview Guide
I would like to find out how disciplinary literacy is being addressed in your course.

- How do you conceptualize social studies literacy? How would you explain it? What should teachers and learners be doing when engaged in it?

The following are finding from the literature review regarding disciplinary literacy instruction:

How are each of these reflected in your course instruction and assignment?

Findings from Literature Review:

Pre-service Teacher education programs should:

1. Build preservice teacher’s knowledge of disciplinary literacy:
   a. Incorporate authentic experiences where pre-service teachers involve themselves with multiple disciplinary texts.
b. Incorporate authentic experiences where pre-service teachers think within the disciplines.

2. promote student centered learning.

3. encourage preservice teachers to adopt attitudes and beliefs promoting the following ideas: learning is an ongoing process for students and teachers, all students can learn, and that literacy is an essential aspect of learning content.

- What assignments address disciplinary literacy in your class?
- What class topics address disciplinary literacy?
- What would be beneficial days for me to observe class activities regarding disciplinary literacy?

Fall 2014, Interview Guide 1

How is it going? Tell me about your teaching experiences this semester.

Definitions – explain your thinking

- disciplinary literacy
- literacy strategies
- literacy tools
- literacy instruction
- literacy skill
- language functions

How would you delineate between reading and literacy?

What is Bloom’s taxonomy/ Bloom verbs? What is their relationship to literacy?

Review the pre-survey 2 questions.

- texts in the 4 fields
- skills used by experts in the 4 fields
- How do you intend to incorporate literacy instruction into your teaching?
- literacy strategies appropriate for social studies instruction?
- literacy strategies you feel comfortable using.

Disciplinary literacy KWL – explain your answers.

Disciplinary Literacy Course

- Tell me about your learning in the course.
DISCIPLINARY LITERACY IN SOCIAL STUDIES

- take aways?
- connections to methods courses?
- How has it impacted your thinking about teaching?
- How has it impacted your thinking about learning?

Intermediate Methods

- Tell me about your learning in the course.
- take aways?
- connections to DL course?
- How has it impacted your thinking about teaching?
- How has it impacted your thinking about learning?

Field Experience

- Tell me about your learning in the course.
- take aways?
- connections to methods courses?
- How has it impacted your thinking about teaching?
- How has it impacted your thinking about learning?

Fall 2014, Interview Guide 2

How is it going? Tell me about your teaching experiences this semester.

Definitions – explain your thinking

- disciplinary literacy
- literacy strategies
- literacy tools
- literacy instruction
- literacy skill
- language functions

What is your role in the literacy development of students?

Survey 2 questions.

- skills used by experts in the 4 fields
- How do you intend to incorporate literacy instruction into your teaching?
- literacy strategies appropriate for social studies instruction?
- literacy strategies you feel comfortable using.
Disciplinary Literacy Course

- Tell me about your learning in the course.
- take aways?
- connections to methods courses?
- How has it impacted your thinking about teaching?
- How has it impacted your thinking about learning?
- meaningful assignments? Discussions? Topics?

Intermediate Methods

- Tell me about your learning in the course.
- take aways?
- connections to DL course?
- How has it impacted your thinking about teaching?
- How has it impacted your thinking about learning?
- meaningful assignments? Discussions? Topics?

Field Experience

- Tell me about your learning in the course.
- take aways?
- connections to courses?
- How has it impacted your thinking about teaching?
- How has it impacted your thinking about learning?
- meaningful experiences?

Next semester – student teaching

- How are you feeling about it? Do you feel prepared?
- What are things that you learned in your coursework that you plan to implement?
- What do you wish you knew more about?
- How do you plan to improve students’ literacy abilities?

Fall 2014, Methods Instructor Interview Guide

1. What are your overall goals for the course? How do you want to impact how teacher candidates think about teaching social studies?
2. What changes have you noticed regarding your methods students’ attitudes and beliefs about teaching social studies?
3. What have been your biggest challenges when teaching methods courses?
4. What have been your biggest successes when teaching methods courses?
5. What have methods students struggled with the most?
6. What do you consider literacy instruction? Literacy strategies? Literacy skills?
7. Describe a secondary social studies teachers’ role in providing literacy instruction to students?
8. What changes have you noticed regarding your methods students’ attitudes and beliefs about teaching social studies?
9. In what ways have you supported teacher candidates’ abilities to provide literacy instruction in social studies? Discussions, assignments?
10. Have you explicitly discussed/talked about literacy instruction in your methods course? Used the term literacy.
11. What changes have you noticed regarding your methods students’ attitudes and beliefs about teaching literacy in social studies?
12. Describe the collaboration between you and the disciplinary literacy instructor? To your knowledge. What are students learning in the disciplinary literacy course?

Fall 2014, Disciplinary Literacy Instructor Interview Guide Fall 2014

1. What are your overall goals for the course? How do you want to impact how teacher candidates think about teaching social studies?
2. How do you define literacy, Disciplinary literacy, literacy instruction, literacy skills, literacy strategies?
3. What does it mean to be literate in social studies?
4. Describe a secondary social studies teachers’ role in providing literacy instruction to students?
5. What changes have you noticed regarding your students’ attitudes and beliefs about teaching social studies?
6. What have been your biggest challenges when teaching this course?
7. What have been your biggest successes when teaching this course?
8. What have the social studies students struggled with the most?
9. What changes have you noticed regarding your methods students’ attitudes and beliefs about teaching social studies?
10. In what ways have you supported teacher candidates’ abilities to provide literacy instruction in social studies? Discussions, assignments?
11. What changes have you noticed regarding your students’ attitudes and beliefs about teaching literacy in social studies?
12. Describe the collaboration between you and the social studies methods instructor? To your knowledge. What are students learning in their social studies methods course?
**Spring 2015 Interview Guide**

1. Describe the environment at your placement.
2. Describe the literacy environment. General attitudes towards reading. Amount of time reading? Is it an expectation?
3. What have been your biggest successes this semester teaching?
4. What have been your biggest obstacles?
5. Are you accomplishing what you set out to?
6. Do you feel UC prepared you?
7. Do you feel supported?
9. Have you been able to implement these strategies?
10. Tell me about a time when you conducted a literacy lesson. What were the objectives? Did the students meet them?
11. Describe any barriers.
12. How you worked to overcome these barriers?
13. Do you feel your students are improving their literacy skills in social studies? Explain.
14. What are your goals for the rest of the semester?