

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Education Faculty Publications and
Presentations

Education

Winter 2015

Preparing Secondary Social Studies Teacher Candidates To Address Common Core State Standards and the C3 Framework With Diverse Learners

Gayle Y. Thieman

Portland State University, thiemag@pdx.edu

Susan J. Lenski

Portland State University, sjlenski@pdx.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/edu_fac



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Citation Details

Thieman, G. & Lenski, S. (2015). Preparing secondary social studies teacher candidates to address Common Core State Standards and the C3 Framework with diverse learners. *Oregon Journal of the Social Studies*, 3 (1), 13-32.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Preparing Secondary Social Studies Teacher Candidates To Address Common Core State Standards and the C3 Framework With Diverse Learners

Gayle Y. Thieman & Susan J. Lenski

This study investigates the relationship between the literacy strategies used by social studies teacher candidates, the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies (CCSS), and the College, Career and Civic Life (C3) Framework. In an initial study the authors discovered that teacher candidates (TCs) in high-poverty schools tended to teach lower-level literacy strategies. We also explored the differences between TCs who were identified as using more high-level literacy strategies and those who used lower-level strategies. This follow-up study examines the work samples of six secondary social studies TCs in high poverty schools to understand the degree to which the literacy strategies they used address the CCSS and the C3 Framework. Using a cross case analysis, findings suggested that TCs who used CCSS literacy strategies and addressed the C3 Framework demonstrated skill in using increasingly complex literacy strategies, organized their instruction around compelling questions, and taught social studies through an inquiry perspective.

Introduction

Once relegated to language arts classes, literacy instruction is now a major component of core academic classes in many secondary schools. In the last decade the consensus has been that if students are to be prepared for college, career and civic life, they need to develop advanced literacy skills to master the cognitive demands of math, science, language arts, and social studies (Heller & Greenleaf, 2007). According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), however, reading scores remain low with only modest increases in the last decade for eighth grade students (NCES, 2013a). The most recent NAEP reading scores indicate that while the achievement gap across racial and socio-economic groups continues, Black, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students have made higher gains overall than white students since 1992, and the achievement gap is narrowing somewhat (NCES, 2013a).

Compared to national results, the average eighth-grade reading scores remained stagnant in the state where this study is being conducted; only 37% scored at or above proficient which is slightly higher than 2011 but not significantly different than 1998 scores. Moreover, the performance gap across racial and socio-economic groups has not significantly improved since 1998 (NCES, 2013b).

Nationally, improvement in middle school reading scores is not seen at the high school level. NAEP reading results for twelfth-graders nationally declined over the last ten years; only 38% of students performed *at or above Proficient* in reading in 2013, while the percentage of

students scoring *below Basic* increased from 20% in 1992 to 25% in 2013. The score gap between black and white students increased, and no racial/ethnic gaps narrowed (National Assessment Governing Board, 2013). Similarly, white students and students not eligible for free or reduced lunch were among those who scored better than their counterparts on the NAEP 2010 civics test (NCES, 2011).

Literacy in Social Studies

Reports such as these spurred a renewed national focus on adolescent literacy, and many teacher preparation programs now require secondary teacher candidates (TCs) to take a content area literacy course that typically consists of teaching generic literacy strategies, assumed to be applicable across disciplines. However, experts suggest literacy strategies should be used with authentic texts and lessons within specific disciplines (Alvermann, 2002), and secondary educators are calling for disciplinary literacy instruction (Draper, Broomhead, Jensen, & Sibert, 2010; Moje, 2008; NCSS, 2010). Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) assert learning to read disciplinary texts requires high-level skills that must be explicitly taught. Furthermore, teachers need to incorporate multiple literacy tools including digital texts to build bridges from students' lives to academic content (Sheridan-Thomas, 2007; Walker & Bean, 2005); this is especially important for struggling readers and writers. However, according to the International Reading Association (2012) "many content area teachers continue to feel ill prepared to support the literacy demands within their discipline" (p. 4).

Specialists in social studies suggest that students need to have a grasp of discipline-based literacy strategies to become proficient readers and consumers of social studies (Thieman & Altoff, 2008; Nokes, 2010). In a report on academic literacy, Lee and Spratley (2010) list the kinds of discipline-specific literacy strategies that students use in social studies. They include:

- building prior knowledge,
- building vocabulary,
- using knowledge of text structures and genres to predict main ideas,
- posing relevant questions,
- comparing claims across texts, and
- evaluating evidence.

The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS, 2010) also suggests literacy strategies that are most helpful before reading (making predictions, identifying text features), during reading (drawing non-linguistic representations, developing questions, identifying unfamiliar concepts, using graphic organizers), and after reading (summarizing and note taking, comparing information with other students).

Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies

The thinking about disciplinary literacy influenced the work of the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers as they developed the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) (Shanahan, personal communication). The CCSS include specific standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies for grades 6-12 and are predicated on content area teachers "using their expertise to help students meet reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language" expectations in social studies. (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010, p.

3). The History/Social Studies standards are organized around anchor standards for reading and writing, but their content is similar to the recommendations from the NCSS which focuses on understanding text structure in order to identify central ideas and evidence to support a position (NGA & CCSSO, 2010).

The CCSS for Literacy in History/Social Studies were adopted in 2010 by the state in which this research was conducted. Expectations for reading are organized into four anchor standards: key ideas and details, craft and structure, integration of knowledge and ideas, and range of reading and level of complexity (see Appendix A for the detailed standards). Similarly writing expectations are organized into four anchor standards: text types and purposes, production and distribution of writing, research to build and present knowledge, and range of writing (see Appendix B for the detailed standards).

College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards

The social studies community initially viewed the development of the CCSS for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies (CCSS) with some apprehension. Fearing that CCSS might “make the English Language Arts Standards the de facto standards for social studies,” (NCSS, 2013, p. xi) the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) joined with the Civic Mission of Schools (CMS) and fifteen other professional social studies organizations to draft the College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards. They developed a working definition of social studies that acknowledged the role of literacy education:

The social studies is an interdisciplinary exploration of the social sciences and humanities, including civics, economics, geography, and history, in order to develop responsible, informed and engaged citizens and to foster civic, economic, global, and historical literacy. (NCSS, 2013, p. xii)

The C3 Framework focuses on instructional planning via an “Inquiry Arc” that features four dimensions of instructional strategies (NCSS, 2013, p. xvii):

1. developing compelling questions and planning inquiries
2. applying disciplinary content and tools
3. evaluating multiple sources and using evidence
4. communicating conclusions and taking informed action

The C3 Framework also builds on the CCSS by emphasizing literacy to support inquiry and disciplinary understanding. Inquiry literacy includes questioning, evaluating sources, using evidence to construct and present arguments and explanations, analyzing problems, and taking informed action. Disciplinary literacy focuses on specific skills of citizenship, economics, geography, and history.

Depth of Knowledge

The CCSS standards and C3Framework instructional strategies can be identified as applying to different levels of literacy thinking. In a previous study (Lenski & Thieman, 2013), we decided to characterize the literacy strategies, used by the TCs in our research, by identifying the Depth of Knowledge (DOK) level for each literacy activity (Webb, 2002; 2007). DOK has been used as an alternative to Bloom’s taxonomy and as a way to connect standards and assessments (Herman, Webb, & Zunia, 2007).

DOK describes the cognitive complexity of intellectual tasks, considering both the depth of content understanding, and the scope of the learning activity. Level 1 (Recall/Reproduction)

asks students to identify, list, define or recall information such as who, what, when, and where. Level 2 (Skills and Concepts/Basic Reasoning) requires students to compare or contrast, classify, describe, interpret or explain issues or consider cause and effect. Level 3 (Strategic Thinking/Complex Reasoning) requires the use of evidence in drawing conclusions, applying concepts to new situations, solving problems, analyzing similarities and differences, or making connections across time and place. Level 4 (Extending Thinking/Reasoning) requires students to analyze, synthesize information from multiple sources, consider alternative perspectives across time and place, make decisions, plan and develop solutions.

Work Samples (WS) in Teacher Education

The WS is a tool for learning and understanding what teacher candidates know and can do. It was developed as a way for teacher candidates to develop units of study that focus on student learning. WS methodology enables TCs to examine ways in which they can connect teaching and learning and is currently being implemented in many teacher preparation programs (Henning, Kohler, Wilson, & Robinson, 2009). Research indicates that WSs are both a mirror and a window into teacher candidate's thinking (Devlin-Scherer, Burroughs, Daly, & McCartan, 2007). Although WS research has focused mostly on its effects on student learning, the state in which this study was conducted requires all teacher candidates to document "purposeful attention to literacy in instruction" in each work sample (Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, 2013)

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the content literacy strategies our TCs provide their students and the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies (CCSS), and the College, Career and Civic Life (C3) Framework.

Specifically this study investigates:

1. What levels of literacy activities do six social studies TCs use with linguistically and culturally diverse students in high-poverty schools?
2. What is the relationship between these literacy strategies and the CCSS standards and C3 Framework?
3. What characterizes the TCs whose literacy strategies address the CCSS standards and C3 Framework?

Methodology

The study design is a qualitative document analysis (Altheide, Coyle, DeVriese, & Schneider, 2010). Two researchers in a large urban university in the Pacific Northwest conducted this study.

Context

All of the data are from a graduate teacher education program that emphasizes a critical constructivist and social justice orientation to curriculum and instruction. The program's vision statement emphasizes diversity, inclusiveness, equity, and social justice. Teacher candidates take required coursework that emphasizes principles and practices of multicultural education, investigates developmental needs of secondary students and effective instructional practices, and teaches instructional planning and content area reading strategies. Social studies TCs take social studies methods coursework that emphasizes differentiation and literacy strategies to

meet secondary students' needs, specific discipline-based reading strategies and technologies to support multiple literacies, and investigation in social studies disciplines.

As part of the documentation of teaching competency all teacher candidates complete two WSs during Student Teaching. In this follow-up study, we examined six full-time Student Teaching II social studies WSs representing high poverty, ethnically diverse classrooms.

Participants

The six participants for this study were drawn from a larger data set of 27 work samples from 21 teacher candidates who gave us permission to use their WSs as data. For this follow-up study, we selected TCs who were teaching ethnically and linguistically diverse students in high-poverty schools and decided to use a contrastive sample (Maxwell, 2013, p. 98) of six sets of data that indicated higher and lower levels of literacy strategies.

Data Sources

We used five sections from the WSs as primary data sources: a) the school and classroom context such as class size; students' gender, racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity; poverty level; and student exceptionalities, b) the lesson plans, c) TC-created instructional materials, d) TC reflections on lessons, and e) a section titled, "Attention to Literacy" which summarized the way the teacher candidates used literacy in their WS. These sections were not written at the same time, and we considered them documents in action (Prior, 2010). The lesson plans and instructional materials were developed first; the reflections were written after each lesson; and the section summarizing literacy was written after the WS was taught. We used school and classroom context as background to contextualize the lessons during data analysis.

Data Analysis

Consistent with emergent qualitative document analysis (Altheide et al., 2010), we kept our analysis flexible as we read the data. To answer the first research question about the level of literacy activities used by the six TCs, we first identified the DOK level (Webb, 2007) of each strategy that we encountered. We developed a chart to guide us in this initial coding (see Table 1) listing the literacy activity and identifying whether the activity could be characterized as DOK level 1 (recall), 2 (skill/concepts), 3 (strategic thinking), or 4 (extended thinking). We then developed a "literacy strategy profile" for each WS, using the analysis of DOK levels to examine literacy strategies in context and to see how TCs scaffolded literacy instruction.

Next, we developed a matrix (see Table 2) that showed the classroom contexts and the levels of literacy strategies for each of the WSs and decided to focus on the six WSs that showed the greatest contrast between higher and lower level literacy strategies. We used the literacy profiles, the matrix, and the raw data to write a case for each of the data sets. Each case was a rich description of ways each TC used literacy in the WS (Hancock & Algozzine, 2011).

To answer the second question about the relationship between the TC's strategies and the CCSS standards and C3 Framework, we created a crosswalk between the CCSS Standards and C3 Framework and the literacy strategies we noted in each of the six work samples (see Table 3). Finally, to answer the third research question we used a collective case study approach (Creswell, 2013) to compare across the six cases to find similarities and differences among the data sets.

Contexts of Six Cases

The contexts of the TCs varied tremendously but all six were in high-poverty schools (free/reduced lunch ranging from 41% to 53%) with high levels of ethnic and linguistic diversity ranging from 21% to 62% of the students in the class. The following are descriptions of the school contexts.

Ted (all names are pseudonyms) taught in a diverse, low-income urban middle school. In the past decade Handson Middle School overcame its longstanding reputation of low academic achievement and high rates of student delinquency. Ted's work sample class of 33 eighth graders included equal numbers of students receiving Talented and Gifted and special education services (six) but only one student identified as ESL.

James taught at Charter High School located in a low-income suburb. James described the community: "There is a significant immigrant population [who work as migrant labor]. The area is largely middle class, religious, and blue collar." The school had not met benchmarks in reading and writing in the past several years. James taught his work sample to 30 students; twelve represented ethnically diverse students and four received academic support services.

Chuck taught at Mason Alternative High School, located in a large suburb. Mason is a part of the Coalition of Essential Schools, a national network working on restructuring and redesigning schools to foster student achievement. Chuck taught in a full-day program for thirteen students in grades 11 and 12 who were finding little success in school. Over half the students qualified for free and reduced lunch, and the same proportion received special education services.

Sheila taught her WS at Plainfield High School, a majority minority, high poverty high school located in a suburb of the metropolitan area. Historically the area was a relatively homogeneous blue-collar white community. However, as inner-city neighborhoods experienced gentrification, minority populations moved further out, contributing to the neighborhood's current demographic diversity. Sheila taught an honors global studies course to 29 sophomores, including students who were once identified as ELL students but had exited the program, and Sheila expected they "read and wrote at a high level." [WS Context]

Lily taught in the same high poverty and diverse suburban school where Sheila student taught. Lily commented, "The relatively transient nature of the community, resulting primarily from the low socio-economic status of the residents, created challenges in the classroom." [WS Context] She taught her work sample to 35 eleventh and twelfth grade students. According to Lily many students were recent immigrants; six students were designated as ELL; three of the four students who received special education services read at the third grade level.

Ashley student taught at Bethel High School, a public magnet school in an urban school district. Bethel is a career/technical school and at the time of this study, served a majority minority population. Almost half the students received free or reduced lunch, and the graduation rate was 63%. Ashley did not provide any information about her classroom context but we believe it reflected the school as a whole.

Findings

Levels of Literacy Strategies

Our first research question asked: What levels of literacy activities do six social studies TCs use with students in high-poverty schools? We found a great variety of lower and higher-

level literacy strategies summarized in Table 2. Ted, James, and Chuck evidenced a higher than average combined percentage of Level 3 and 4 literacy strategies (ranging from 40%-46%) than those of Sheila, Lily, and Ashley (ranging from 10%-22%). DOK Level 3 involves strategic thinking/complex reasoning. The secondary students used a variety of graphic organizers, compared and evaluated evidence across a variety of primary sources as they developed historical arguments and drew conclusions. DOK Level 4 involves extended thinking/reasoning; the secondary students made connections between current events, social issues, and personal experiences in their analyses and critiques.

Relationship between literacy strategies and CCSS standards and C3 Framework

Table 3 helped us visualize the second research question about the relationship between the literacy strategies used by the TCs and the CCSS standards and C3 Framework. Virtually all of the CCSS reading (Appendix A) and writing standards (Appendix B) were addressed by at least three of the TCs in their work samples. For example reading CCSS 1 and 2 (close reading, determining central ideas of a text, and citing textual evidence) were evident as TC's taught their students to identify patterns and themes, develop hypotheses, and make predictions. Reading standard seven (integrating and evaluating text in diverse formats and media) was frequently apparent as students analyzed political cartoons, paintings, photos, maps, charts, graphs, timelines, historical quotes, and news headlines. TCs taught their students to write argumentative, informative, and narrative text (CCSS 1, 2, 3) via position statements, expository letters, research reports, and fictional diaries. Writing standard 10 was evident in all the work samples as TCs taught students to write extended essays as well as graphic organizers, journal prompts, and Cornell notes.

TCs also addressed the CCSS speaking standards (Appendix C) through partner, small group, and whole class discussion and teaching students to present information orally and visually. All of the TCs addressed CCSS vocabulary standard 6 (Appendix D) and taught the academic language embedded in the unit.

Finally the C3 Framework was evident in three areas: developing and asking compelling questions, building students' prior knowledge, and developing real world connections between the subject matter and students' lives.

Characteristics of TCs whose literacy strategies addressed CCSS and C3 Framework

We used the findings from the first research question to organize our findings for the third research question: What characterizes the TCs whose literacy strategies address the CCSS standards and C3 Framework? We relied on cross-case analysis to answer this question. TCs who most often used CCSS literacy strategies and addressed the C3 Framework demonstrated skill in using increasingly complex literacy strategies, organized their instruction around compelling questions, and taught social studies through an inquiry perspective.

Skill in Using Increasingly Complex Literacy Strategies

We initially used the DOK levels as an organizing structure for levels of literacy strategies because our original analysis predated the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The kinds of literacy strategies we analyzed, however, are subsumed in the Literacy Standards for History/Social Studies 6-12. To that end, we looked at ways TCs taught students how to access prior knowledge, increase vocabulary, use higher order thinking skills, develop graphic organizers, write summaries, and make connections.

Readers use prior knowledge to help them understand written text; accessing and building prior knowledge are essential strategies for learning. Ted and Sheila used journal prompts to ask students to share their prior knowledge and opinions on a topic. James specifically taught background knowledge about human rights and social justice to help his students understand these complex topics. Chuck used a film to provide background knowledge on anarchy and help his students understand the need for a social contract.

All six teacher candidates taught key vocabulary; however, three challenged their students to go beyond defining terms. James and Chuck's students used context clues to determine word meaning, and Ted's students drew pictures to represent the vocabulary. Four of the six teacher candidates provided opportunities for students to make predictions and develop hypotheses based on their reading. For example Sheila's students analyzed maps of the Middle East and predicted political issues involving Palestinian and Israeli conflict over territory.

Ted, James, Chuck, and Sheila posed relevant and compelling higher order thinking questions in their lessons that challenged students to think critically. For example, in his unit on the civil rights movement Jeff asked students to develop their own philosophy of nonviolence and decide how the use of nonviolence promotes social justice. Chuck asked students to draw conclusions on why the Bill of Rights was necessary to ensure passage of the Constitution and to hypothesize what would happen without these amendments. Similarly Ted, James, Chuck, and Sheila asked their students to evaluate, cite, and compare evidence across texts while Lily and Ashley did not include these literacy strategies.

Graphic organizers were a frequent method of supporting student note-taking while listening to a lecture, multimedia presentation, or reading. Ted incorporated word webs, Venn diagrams, T-charts, and a protocol for analyzing primary sources. James engaged students in constructing a timeline; Chuck also used a document analysis protocol; Sheila created an artifact comparison chart; and Ashley's students completed a KWL.

Each of the teacher candidates engaged their students to some degree in summarizing information through note taking and identifying patterns such as compare/contrast or cause/effect. Ted and Sheila taught students to take Cornell notes and then formulate a written opinion. For example Sheila's students developed an argument about the Palestinian/Israeli conflict. James' students read a series of articles, noting key events and how each historical figure influenced the Civil Rights movement and created a timeline.

All of the teacher candidates understood the need to build connections between the subject matter and students' interests. Tyler integrated current reform movements throughout his unit on the Antebellum period; James' students examined statistics on current local and national school segregation and attitudes regarding undocumented immigrants and LGBTQ issues. Chuck asked students to relate anarchy in the novel, *Lord of the Flies*, to their personal experiences of bullying. Lily's students wrote in their journals about the "generation gap" and compared stereotypes of women in the 1920's to stereotypes of teenagers today.

Finally, we traced the progression of DOK levels from one to four within the same lesson sequence recognizing that literacy strategies should be scaffolded from simpler to more complex through the unit. Again, TCs who addressed CCSS and C3 Framework were more skillful. Ted excelled in scaffolding his eight grade students through exploration of an issue, noting multiple solutions, creating solutions and then synthesizing and communicating their learning. Similarly James led his students to define, summarize, interpret, compare, draw

conclusions, cite evidence and synthesize their knowledge of the Civil Rights Movement. Chuck's students summarized, interpreted, compared and then developed a logical argument. Sheila also taught her students to gather information, evaluate web sources, and write a position statement.

Skill in Organizing Instruction around Compelling Questions

As part of the social studies methods courses, the TCs were taught to use principles of backwards-curriculum design (McTighe & Wiggins, 2013) with curriculum framing questions, including a unit essential question that focused instruction on the big ideas and key concepts of the unit. We found a variety of ways the TCs organized their instruction around essential questions or "compelling questions" to use the C3 Framework nomenclature.

The three TCs (Ted, James, and Chuck) whose literacy strategies addressed the CCSS and C3 Framework also had the most conceptual essential questions. For example, James taught a unit on the American civil rights movement; his curriculum framing questions connected students to larger ideas than simply learning historical facts, indicating a constructivist view of teaching history. James's essential question was "How can we ensure social justice for everyone?" Using this question as a guide, James wanted to help students understand "contemporary definitions of rights" and move students to understand the American civil rights movement in the context of rights and social justice and to have students apply these ideas to current social issues. James used primary documents such as the U.S. Constitution and the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights as the basis for teaching the civil rights movement. He also wanted students to understand how post-civil rights decades still have "prejudice and oppression" "based on race, sex, sexual orientation, nationality, etc." [WS: Rationale]

Developing a strong essential question did not necessarily mean that the TCs infused the question throughout the unit. However, the TCs whose literacy strategies addressed the CCSS and C3 Framework referred to their essential question throughout the unit. For example, Chuck's students examined, "How do governments balance power?" and he reflected: As students begin to understand this dynamic they begin to formulate a more nuanced understanding of their own rights and responsibilities, in turn creating more agile and responsible citizens." [Work Sample: Rationale]

Skill in Supporting Inquiry

When analyzing qualitative data, it is illuminating to understand the participants' theoretical viewpoints. According to Maxwell (2013) when a researcher tries to understand a participant's actions, "any attempt to interpret or explain the participant's actions without taking account of their actual beliefs, values and theories is probably fruitless" (p. 52). Therefore, we searched the data to get an understanding of the ways the TCs viewed inquiry.

One of the prerequisites for social studies inquiry is to read primary sources. We found that all of the teacher candidates incorporated primary source analysis into their WSs. However, how they used the documents differed. Ted, James, and Chuck explicitly taught methods of inquiry. Ted's eighth grade students interpreted political cartoons, paintings, map, charts, graphs, timelines, and analyzed quotes from former slaves. James and Chuck asked their high school students to interpret, compare and draw conclusions from their reading of excerpts from the Constitution, Supreme Court decisions, and Declaration of Independence. To prepare

for a debate on territorial conflict between Israel and Palestine Sheila's students conducted library research with a variety of primary and secondary sources.

Conclusions and Implications

We concluded from our study that TCs are incorporating literacy strategies in social studies teaching that address the CCSS and C3 Framework. That was the good news. However, there were wide differences in ways TCs taught higher-level literacy strategies, especially in high-poverty schools. We identified three skills of TCs who used a preponderance of literacy strategies: organizing instruction around compelling questions, supporting inquiry, and using increasingly complex literacy strategies. These conclusions lead us to several plans for change.

Based on our findings we realize that our instruction in social studies literacy strategies has just scratched the surface. We have been successful in helping TCs incorporate literacy strategies, but not in helping all TCs incorporate the full range of the Common Core State Standards or the College, Career and Civic Life (C3) Framework. We need to teach our TCs how to scaffold instruction from lower-levels of thinking to higher-levels within a unit of study. We also need to help TCs identify their own views of social studies inquiry and help them expend those views when necessary. We find we have been successful in helping TCs develop compelling questions, but now we need to help them infuse the questions throughout a unit of study. We also plan on continuing to work with TCs to move students to higher-levels of thinking through literacy strategies in a series of lessons.

We believe that this study has opened our eyes to the next steps we need to take to help our social studies TCs become stronger teachers in general and also to help them become more responsive to the needs of students in high-poverty schools. Since this research study was completed, the graduate teacher education program has revised the secondary program to include additional coursework in literacy for diverse students and English Learners and clarified WS requirements to include compelling questions and explicit literacy strategies in all lesson plans.

Limitations

One of the limitations of relying on participant-created documents as the only source of evidence is there is less opportunity to triangulate data. While the lesson plan may indicate the amount of time for a given literacy activity, without direct observation the researcher cannot objectively confirm whether and how the literacy strategy was implemented. We did read the lesson reflections and often teacher candidates commented on the effectiveness of implementing various literacy strategies. Also the "Attention to Literacy" section of the work sample highlighted literacy strategies that TCs used in the lesson plans. We are developing ways to provide confirmatory evidence including teacher candidates' videotapes of teaching and analysis of literacy strategies as well as observations of student teaching lessons by university supervisors.

References

- Alvermann, D.E. (2002). Effective literacy instruction for adolescents. *Journal of Literacy Research, 34*, 189-208.
- Altheide, S., Coyle, M., DeVriese, K., & Schneider, C. (2010). In S. Nagy Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 127-151). New York, NY Guilford Press.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010). *Common core state standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. Retrieved from: http://http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_ELA%20Standards.pdf
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Devlin-Scherer, R., Burroughs, G., Daly, J., & McCartan, W. (2007). The value of the teacher work sample for improving instruction and program. *Action in Teacher Education, 29*(1), 51-60.
- Draper, R.J., Broomhead, P., Jensen, A.P., & Siebert, D. (2010). Aims and criteria for collaboration in content-area classrooms. In R.J. Draper, P. Broomhead, A.P. Jensen, J.D. Nokes, D. Siebert (Eds.), *(Re)Imagining content-area literacy instruction* (pp. 1-19). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hancock, D.R., & Algozzine, B. (2011). *Doing case study research* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Heller, R. & Greenleaf, C. (2007). *Literacy instruction in the content areas: Getting to the core of middle and high school improvement*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Henning, J.E., Kohler, F.W., Wilson, B., & Robinson, V.L. (2009). *Improving teacher quality: Using the teacher work sample to make evidence-based decisions*. Lanham, MD: Rowen Littlefield Publishers.
- Herman, J., Webb, N., & Zuniga, S. (2007). Measurement issues in the alignment of standards and assessments: A case study. *Applied Measurement in Education*,
- International Reading Association. (2012). *Adolescent literacy* (Position statement, Rev. 2012 ed.). Newark, DE: Author. Retrieved from www.reading.org/Resources/ResourcesbyTopic/Adolescent/Overview.aspx.
- Lee, C.D., & Spratley, A. (2010). *Reading in the disciplines: The challenges of adolescent literacy*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Lenski, S., & Thieman, G. (2013). What work samples reveal about secondary pre-service social studies teachers' use of literacy strategies. *Teacher Education Quarterly 40* (1), 63-79.
- Maxwell, J.A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- McTighe, J. & Wiggins, G. (2013). *Essential questions: Opening doors to student understanding*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Curriculum and Supervision Development.
- Moje, E. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*, 96-107.
- National Assessment Governing Board. (2013). *Nation's 12th graders' math and reading scores stagnant since 2009*. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nagb.org/newsroom/naep-releases/2013-grade-12-math-reading.html>

- National Center for Education Statistics (2013a). *Which student groups are making gains?* Washington, D.C. Author. Retrieved from: http://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2013/#/gains-by-group
- National Center for Education Statistics (2013b). *The Nation's Report Card: Reading 2013: State snapshot report.* Washington, D.C: Author. Retrieved from: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/subject/publications/stt2013/pdf/2014464OR8.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics (2011). *The Nation's Report Card: Civics 2010.* National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2011466>
- National Council for the Social Studies. (2010). *National curriculum standards for social studies: A framework for teaching, learning and assessment.* Washington, DC: Author.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (2013). *Social studies for the next generation: Purposes, practices, and implications of the college, career, and civic life (C3) framework for social studies state standards.* Washington, DC: Author.
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects.* Washington, DC: Authors. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy>
- Nokes, J.D. (2010). (Re)Imagining literacies for history classrooms. In R.J. Draper, P. Broomhead, A.P. Jensen, J.D. Nokes, D. Siebert (Eds.), *(Re)Imagining content-area literacy instruction* (pp. 54-67). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Prior, L. (2010). Researching documents: Emergent methods. In S. Nagy Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 111-126). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Shanahan T. & Shanahan, S. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(2), 40-59.
- Sheridan-Thomas, H. (2007). Making sense of multiple literacies: Exploring pre-service content area teachers' understandings and applications. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 46(2), 121-150.
- Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. (2013). *Evidence of effectiveness: 584-017-0185* (2) (g). Retrieved from http://vjhttp://tspc.oregon.gov/support/News_Item_Supplemental.asp?id=%20315&vid=%201&sid=1
- Thieman, G., & Altoff, M. (2008, May). *Social studies: Discipline-based literacy strategies.* Paper presented at the International Reading Association Annual Conference, Atlanta, GA.
- Webb, N.L. (2002). *Depth-of-knowledge levels for four content areas.* Wisconsin Center for Educational Research. Retrieved from http://facstaff.wcer.wisc.edu/normw/All_content_areas.DOK_level_32802.pdf
- Webb, N.L. (2007). Issues related to judging the alignment of curriculum standards and assessments. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 20(1), 7-25.

Author Bios

Gayle Thieman is an associate professor at Portland State University Graduate School of Education secondary teacher education program, specializing in social studies methods, instructional design and technology.

Susan Lenski is a professor at Portland State University Graduate School of Education secondary teacher education program, specializing in literacy, and she teaches in the doctoral program.