



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Promoting written historical reasoning among undergraduate L2 students

Sendur, K.A.

Publication date
2021

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Sendur, K. A. (2021). *Promoting written historical reasoning among undergraduate L2 students*.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

This dissertation had two primary aims. The first aim was to study the historical reasoning of a population of L2 undergraduate students in the context of a CLIL historical reasoning course. The second aim was to foster the written historical reasoning of these students by investigating the use of a cognitive apprenticeship approach in the context of a CLIL classroom. In this chapter, the main findings of this dissertation are first reported. Next, we draw conclusions based on the findings about students' written and oral historical reasoning and important factors that may influence these findings. Finally, we explore the methodological considerations and implications for practice resulting from this dissertation.

MAIN FINDINGS

RQ1: To what extent do undergraduate L2 students make claims supported by arguments when reasoning about the reliability of a historical source orally and in writing? What difficulties can be attributed to language proficiency?

In chapter two, we investigated the oral and written historical reasoning of undergraduate L2 students when evaluating primary sources in order to use arguments to make evidence-based claims about the source's reliability. We also investigated their subsequent writing with the same primary sources. Eleven undergraduate students studying in the intensive English program took part in this study by participating in three think aloud source evaluation tasks of primary sources modelled on the Historical Assessment of Thinking (Wineburg et al., 2012) and used in the historical reasoning course. We also collected their written

answers to the same task and three Document-based Questions (DBQ), each of which had one of the primary sources as a source text.

Based on an analysis of the think aloud protocols and written answers to the source evaluation tasks, we concluded that students were able to use historical reasoning (as opposed to ahistorical reasoning) to make claims about the reliability of primary sources supported by arguments at an emerging level of proficiency. This is in line with our expectations for RQ1. Students who demonstrated the most proficient sourcing included an answer with three stages: 1) an *orientation* from the author or source's background that could be used as evidence in the other stages, 2) an *evaluation* that explains or justifies how the source or author's background may affect the reliability of the source, and 3) a *deduction* stage during which the student makes the claim of reliability.

The students in this study appeared to have two sources of difficulty that may have influenced the quality of their oral sourcing. These difficulties may stem in part from reading comprehension-related language difficulties, particularly as instructor support was withdrawn. All of the students who had major comprehension errors in the third source evaluation task also demonstrated at least one of the following two difficulties. First, students had difficulty in forming a complete answer when they omitted the *evaluation* stage of their answer. These answers demonstrated an emerging level of reasoning because while they correctly noted important aspects of the author's background and a claim of reliability, their answer lacked reasoning that would explain the connection between the two. The second difficulty was that some students did not take the historical context into account, resulting in interpretation errors. These two issues point to difficulty in interpretation that may result from errors in reading comprehension, a finding similar to Monte-Sano (2010).

A comparison of students' written and oral answers to the source evaluation tasks demonstrated that while most students scored similarly in both modes, written answers were generally less rich in detail. Notably, four of the ten

students with a highly proficient oral answer, as described above, had a lower score in their written answer. Separately, while students consistently used historical sources as evidence in their DBQ writing, they rarely considered reliability.

In response to RQ1, we concluded that these L2 students were able to make evidence-based claims about the reliability of primary sources at an emerging level of proficiency when prompted by the source evaluation task. These findings are in line with studies involving students proficient in English (Britt & Aglinskias, 2002; Wineburg, 1991). Students' interpretation is not well-elaborated, however, and prone to misunderstanding. Similar to Monte-Sano (2010)'s finding, we conclude that difficulties associated with reading comprehension may play a role in the depth and accuracy of students' interpretation. L2 students may benefit from both instructor support and the modification of the primary sources (Wineburg & Martin, 2009) to ensure stronger reading comprehension. We also found that while students used primary sources as evidence when writing source-based essays, they rarely included an evaluation of reliability, which is in line with what others have found (Monte-Sano, 2010; Nokes, 2017). Those evaluations that were included sometimes undermined the argument of the student. Explicit instruction in the stages of a complete source evaluation may assist students in formulating better answers.

RQ2: Does historical reasoning in L2 students' writing improve over the duration of a CLIL historical reasoning course and is the level and improvement in historical reasoning influenced by reading and writing proficiency?

In chapter three, we studied a cohort of students in the cognitive apprenticeship-based CLIL historical reasoning course. The purpose of this study was to conduct a broader exploration into students' written historical reasoning as a whole and the role of students' English proficiency in their progression in the course. Fifty-five undergraduate L2 students at the B2 level (CEFR)

participated in this descriptive study of students' source-based writing. Prior to instruction, we measured students' English proficiency through a short integrated reading and writing assessment based closely on one by Weigle and colleagues (Weigle, 2004; Weigle et al., 2013).

We also collected three DBQs written by students at different points in the course, which were analyzed using an analytical rubric designed for this study. This rubric, which was most influenced by the work of Monte-Sano and De La Paz (2012), measures the features of historical reasoning taught in the course: claim, evidence, source evaluation, historical contextualization and corroboration.

Students initially demonstrated weak historical reasoning, as shown in their first DBQ scores. Source evaluation and historical contextualization in particular were either absent or flawed in the initial DBQ and continued as the lowest scoring features in the final DBQ. Students' scores, however, increased significantly between the first and third DBQs in all areas that were studied. The features claim, evidence and corroboration most closely approximated appropriate historical reasoning in the final DBQ. From these results we conclude that the L2 students in this course were able to incorporate features of historical reasoning in their source-based writing and that their written historical reasoning improved during the course, which is in line with our expectations for RQ2.

In terms of English language proficiency, we found that students had relatively low scores in both reading and writing, indicative of their B2 level of English proficiency. Students were able to partially or minimally fulfill the criteria for the assigned tasks, but there were errors. We used a latent growth curve analysis to investigate the effect of students' English language proficiency on their source-based writing and the changes in their reasoning over the duration of the course. An important finding related to RQ2 is that students' reading and writing proficiency in English did not predict either their reasoning or changes in their

performance during the course. These findings are similar to those who have not found a difference based on reading (De La Paz et al., 2014) or writing proficiency (Van Drie et al., 2015). This is, however, in contrast to Reisman (2012a) who found that struggling readers benefitted more. The result was that students at differing levels of English proficiency improved similarly, which supports the notion that a cognitive apprenticeship approach is also effective in the L2 CLIL context.

RQ3: How do students with different epistemic beliefs reason historically when writing a historical argument?

The descriptive study in chapter four explored an aspect that may affect students' written historical reasoning; their epistemic beliefs about history. This study addressed RQ3 by investigating undergraduate students' epistemic beliefs in history and exploring the relationship between students' beliefs and their performance in written historical reasoning after completing a historical reasoning course. Sixty-two students at the B2 CEFR level who were enrolled in the cognitive apprenticeship-based CLIL historical reasoning course participated in this study.

Since epistemic beliefs may be highly contextual and difficult to measure (Chin et al., 2011), this study employed a mixed-methods approach (Mason, 2016). Students' expressed epistemic beliefs in history were measured through a discipline-specific survey (Stoel et al., 2017). These beliefs in history were then compared to students' performance when writing a source-based historical argument. Students' written historical reasoning was assessed using the same five-part rubric developed to address RQ2. A subset of ten students participated in a task-based interview to investigate more tacit epistemic beliefs related to the second-order concept, account.

The main findings of this study indicate that there was a significant positive correlation between students' performance in source-based

argumentative writing and their epistemic beliefs regarding historical methodology, but not for the nature of knowing or nature of knowledge survey scales. Students who believed that criteria and procedures can be used to produce knowledge in the discipline of history scored higher in their source-based writing. This finding partially confirms the hypothesis for RQ3 that students with more nuanced epistemic beliefs in history would perform better in source-based writing. From this we can conclude, in response to RQ3, that students' epistemic beliefs regarding historical methodology correlated positively with their written historical reasoning.

Most students' task-based interview answers corresponded to their epistemic beliefs as indicated in the survey, but there was less correspondence between students' interviews and writing. These findings point to the conclusions that this discipline-specific survey may be an appropriate measure of epistemic beliefs about methodology in history and that the students' understanding of the second-order concept accounts may be related to students' epistemic beliefs in history.

RQ4: How do undergraduate students perform on aspects of historical reasoning (claim, evidence, sourcing, corroboration and historical contextualization) in their document-based writing before and after participating in a course with explicit instruction in historical reasoning?

RQ5: What is the effect of explicit instruction in historical contextualization during a historical reasoning course on undergraduate students' document-based writing?

In the first two studies, we found that historical contextualization appeared to be an area of difficulty for students in this historical reasoning course. This difficulty is in line with other studies in which historical contextualization has been both challenging for students and less likely to improve after instruction (Nokes et al., 2007; Reisman, 2012a). Therefore, in this final study we designed

and tested an intervention intended to promote students' written historical contextualization in their DBQ writing. This intervention took place in the context of the type of historical reasoning course described in chapter two, three and four. The study was conducted as a quasi-experimental study with 140 students ($N_{\text{exp}}=60$, $N_{\text{cont}}=80$).

Students in both conditions participated in the CLIL cognitive apprenticeship-based historical reasoning course. Students in the control condition participated in a version without a focus on historical contextualization, whereas students in the experimental condition received explicit instruction in historical contextualization. In the experimental condition, instructors provided explicit instruction in the background knowledge needed to contextualize through the use of discussion-based case studies and a quote sorting activity. Students learned about the procedural knowledge necessary to incorporate the contextualization into source-based writing by analyzing text models and practicing with language models.

The main findings of this study indicate that students in both the control and experimental conditions significantly improved their written historical reasoning in all of the areas that were studied. This is in line with our expectations for RQ4 and the results of chapter three. In contrast to our expectations for RQ5, however, students in the experimental condition scored significantly higher than those in the control condition in the category of claim, but not historical contextualization. This was particularly unexpected since students in both conditions received the same explicit instruction for the category claim, but only students in the experimental condition received explicit instruction in historical contextualization. The finding that students in the experimental condition wrote better claims may point to the effectiveness of student-led dialogue during the case studies as a component of independent practice in this model. This possibility, however, requires further study and should be tested against other alternatives.

A subsequent analysis of students' historical contextualization showed that students in both conditions had similar levels of relevant background knowledge and included similar amounts of historical contextualization in the writing. However, students in the experimental condition were less likely to include historical contextualization in a location offset from the related argument, a use contrary to the instruction students in the experimental condition received. In line with instruction, they were more likely to include an explicit connection to the argument or draw a conclusion based on the contextualization. These differences suggest the possibility that the rubric used to analyze students' writing was not sufficiently sensitive to detect historical contextualization in terms of historical background information explicitly used to support an argument, and a revised rubric has been proposed.

This study provides further evidence that a cognitive apprenticeship model is effective in teaching written historical reasoning to undergraduate L2 students. This study also demonstrates the importance and difficulty of promoting written historical contextualization. By analyzing the nature of students' written historical contextualization, this dissertation takes a step forward in identifying specific procedural knowledge that can be a part of future interventions.

A BIRDS EYE VIEW OF WRITTEN HISTORICAL REASONING

This dissertation provides a comprehensive picture of the historical reasoning of a population of undergraduate L2 students. The context of this dissertation, namely studying written historical reasoning among a population of L2 students in a CLIL course using a cognitive apprenticeship model, presents a highly complex challenge. By combining several studies that focus on different aspects of students' reasoning and the potential influence of other factors, we are able to partially overcome this limitation in order to tease out the different contributing

factors and gain a clearer understanding of students' overall historical reasoning. As a result of this approach, this dissertation is able to draw conclusions about students' written historical reasoning and factors that may affect it, including students' epistemic beliefs in history and the effect of their proficiency in reading and writing.

Since historical reasoning is not well-studied among L2 students in general or in a CLIL setting specifically, this dissertation provides important insight into students' performance. The focus on language afforded by the CLIL context also adds a useful perspective to the study of written historical reasoning. Literacy and the skillful use of language are important considerations when writing in history. The focus on the language used when writing in a CLIL context and the explicit teaching of that language allows for the detailed exploration of this aspect of historical reasoning.

STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IN HISTORICAL REASONING AND WRITING

One major contribution of this dissertation is a clearer picture of L2 students' performance in written historical reasoning in the context of a historical reasoning course. Studies of middle school and high school students' written historical reasoning, particularly among a largely L1 population, have found that students are able to produce writing with features of historical reasoning (McCarthy Young & Leinhardt, 1998; Monte-Sano, 2010; Nokes, 2017; van Drie et al., 2015). This dissertation adds the findings of an undergraduate L2 population to these studies. In response to the main research question, as well as RQ1, RQ2 and RQ4, we can conclude that students in this particular context are able to demonstrate historical reasoning in their source-based writing at an emerging level of proficiency after completing the historical reasoning course. This level of proficiency denotes that students were neither highly proficient nor did they make serious errors in their reasoning. Students' performance was

consistent across the studies, which increases our confidence in such a finding. Since much of the existing research in history education has been conducted in a students' L1, this is an important contribution to the literature.

Across the studies in this dissertation, students' performance in different features of historical reasoning was uneven. Students' initial proficiency was higher in two aspects of source-based argumentative writing: claim and the use of evidence. Specifically, students began with higher claim and evidence scores than for the scores in other aspects of written historical reasoning. While the concepts of claim and evidence have disciplinary characteristics in history, they are also featured in more domain-general writing. The higher initial scores in claim and evidence may perhaps be partly explained by aspects of their domain-general nature, whereas students may have been challenged by the more domain-specific aspects of sourcing, corroboration, and historical contextualization. In contrast, students began with lower scores in the heuristics corroboration and sourcing, as well as in historical contextualization. The lower initial scores in sourcing are consistent with the findings of others (Monte-Sano, 2010; Nokes, 2017) in which students rarely included information about the source into their writing, and even more rarely considered the reliability of the source before instruction. Students' performance in sourcing improved over the duration of the historical reasoning course. This finding is also consistent with those who have noted instruction-based improvements in sourcing (Britt & Aglinskas, 2002; Nokes et al., 2007; Reisman, 2012a).

Another major conclusion from this dissertation is that students demonstrated significant change in each area of written historical reasoning studied in chapters three and five. These findings point to the conclusion, in response to RQ2 and RQ4, that students' overall written historical reasoning improves during the historical reasoning course. These findings are consistent with the improvement seen after instruction in the written historical reasoning of

middle and high school students (De La Paz, 2005; De La Paz et al., 2017; van Drie et al., 2015).

This dissertation adds to the literature by investigating reasons for students' difficulty when making argument-based claims about the reliability of historical sources (RQ1). The findings of this dissertation point to the use of historical contextualization and the formation of a complete answer as some of the difficulties these L2 students may have experienced when making claims about the reliability of a primary source. Students' lack of a complete answer when evaluating a source's reliability may indicate that students need additional procedural knowledge in order to formulate a complete answer. As a part of the study of students' sourcing, we identified the components of a complete answer. Future research may investigate whether explicit instruction in formulating this complete answer results in higher proficiency both in a source evaluation task and in the context of source-based writing.

Historical contextualization was similarly challenging for students in the historical reasoning course, which is line with other studies (Nokes et al., 2007; Reisman, 2012a). These findings add L2 students' performance in historical contextualization to the literature and underscore the challenge in effectively teaching written historical contextualization, which appears to be more resistant to improvement than other aspects of written historical reasoning. This dissertation takes a step forward by providing a detailed analysis of the ways in which students incorporate historical contextualization into their writing. Specifically, we noted the placement of the historical contextualization with respect to the related argument and the use of language to explicitly connect the contextualization to the argument as important aspects of historical contextualization. We subsequently added these aspects to the analytical rubric developed for this dissertation. Using this analysis of students' historical contextualization, it may be possible to develop additional explicit instruction to teach students the procedural knowledge needed to effectively include historical

contextualization in their writing. Testing this possibility will be an important area of future research.

While students' written historical contextualization improved relative to their starting proficiency, explicit instruction in historical contextualization focusing on building both content and procedural knowledge did not result in more proficient historical contextualization in comparison to those who did not receive explicit instruction. These findings are similar to others who found no change after instruction (Nokes et al., 2007; Reisman, 2012a) and provide further evidence that historical contextualization is particularly difficult to improve even with instruction. These findings also demonstrate the importance of future research in this area. In Chapter 5, we found that students in both conditions ended the course with similar levels of background knowledge. Research may consider the effect of increased background knowledge on students' written historical contextualization as opposed to increased knowledge of the procedural knowledge needed to contextualize. Such research may help distinguish the relative importance of these two aspects of historical contextualization.

Similar to our findings of sourcing and historical contextualization, students began with low scores in the area of corroboration. In both chapters three and five, students demonstrated improvement in corroboration after instruction. This finding is consistent with Nokes et al. (2007), who found an effect for corroboration, but contrary to Reisman (2012a), who did not. Students studied in this dissertation improved more in corroboration than they did in either source evaluation or historical contextualization. The finding relative to source evaluation is contrary to Nokes et al. (2007) who found greater improvement in source evaluation than corroboration. These findings lead us to conclude in response to RQ2 and RQ4 that students can corroborate in written historical reasoning and that corroboration improves with instruction. Future research may investigate the reasons behind the relative difference in students' improvement. One possibility is that students were more familiar with the

concept of corroboration since it involves the skill of comparison, a concept generally included in the intensive English course. It is also possible that the corroboration language in the form of sentence stems that instructors provided were particularly useful. Further analysis of the use of the provided language in student' writing may provide insight into this aspect.

In addition to the conclusions detailed above, there may be additional factors that play a role in students' performance in the written historical reasoning. Two of these factors, epistemic beliefs in history and the role of English proficiency, featured prominently in the studies that comprise this dissertation and are discussed separately.

EPISTEMIC BELIEFS IN HISTORY

Epistemic beliefs in the discipline of history may have an effect on students' performance in written historical reasoning. Argumentative written historical reasoning often includes the use of multiple sources to make an evidence-based claim about historical phenomena (van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008). Maggioni et al. (2010) found that epistemic beliefs played a role in the comprehension of multiple sources, while epistemic beliefs seems to have had an indirect effect on the use of multiple sources in students' writing (Barzilai & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015). The lack of a direct relationship between epistemic beliefs and source use in writing shows how complex this relationship is and the uncertainty of the exact role of epistemic beliefs in source-based writing. This uncertainty is compounded by a lack of research that directly measures this relationship (see, for example Reisman, 2012a).

The studies in this dissertation also demonstrate the complexity of the relationship between epistemic beliefs in history and written historical reasoning. One main conclusion of this dissertation in response to RQ3 is that there is a clear and significant positive relationship between students' epistemic beliefs in

history regarding historical methodology, as measured by Stoel et al.'s (2017) survey, and students' historical source-based writing. This finding is important because it supports the idea that epistemic beliefs affect students' performance, similar to Kuhn (2001) and indirectly found by Barzilai and Eshet-Alkalai (2015). However, the null finding of a relationship between students' beliefs regarding the nature of knowledge and the nature of knowing leave significant questions about the extent to which epistemic beliefs are key.

A discrepant accounts task was used to examine students' approach when distinguishing between historical accounts, as well as to examine whether a student's epistemic stance (based on the historical methodology and nature of knowledge survey scales) appeared to play a role in students' approach. The findings of this study provide evidence of a relationship between the epistemic stance and students' understanding of the second order concept, accounts, as students' stance largely corresponded to their approach in the task. This is an important contribution because it shows that there is a likely epistemic element when discriminating between historical accounts, a key second order concept in history. This adds to Maggioni et al.'s (2009) findings about evidence, another second order concept. It also clarifies the importance of considering how to promote epistemic beliefs when designing historical reasoning curriculum since it likely plays a role in students' approach in aspects of historical reasoning.

While students' approach when discriminating between historical accounts appears to be related to epistemic beliefs in history, that element does not manifest itself in students' writing. There is not a clear relationship between students' epistemic stance and their source-based writing. This is a surprising finding since epistemic beliefs related to historical methodology, which was half of the basis for the stance, did correlate with students' writing and students who completed the discrepant accounts task partly to strongly agreed that historical methodology can be used in history in order to produce knowledge. This surprising finding suggests that beliefs about the nature of knowledge in history

have an important but unexplained role in students' source-based writing. One possible explanation is that students may find it difficult to transfer their beliefs to their writing, resulting in a mismatch between their beliefs and writing. This can also be complicated by students' conceptions about the nature of a text and how their beliefs may be reflected in their writing. Future research should further explore this aspect of students' epistemic beliefs.

THE ROLE OF READING AND WRITING PROFICIENCY IN ENGLISH

Students' proficiency in reading and writing may also play a role in their written historical reasoning. Reading proficiency may affect students' comprehension and interpretation of primary and secondary sources. While the language of history textbooks is not overly technical, reading textbooks in history is complicated by abstract grammatical and organizational patterns (Martin, 1991). Primary sources, which are located in a different context and often make use of unfamiliar vocabulary and structures, are even more challenging (Wineburg & Martin, 2009). Based on the findings of chapter 2, we also conclude that reading, particularly primary sources, is a challenge that can affect students' comprehension and interpretation. This challenge was particularly apparent as instructor support was withdrawn over the duration of the course. Comprehension errors, such as misidentifying the intended audience in a primary source, increased as support was withdrawn. These comprehension errors typically resulted in interpretation errors or in the student being unable to make an interpretation.

Composing source-based writing in history is a complex process that makes use of skills such as correctly integrating sources and constructing an interpretation. Students' experience and proficiency in such writing may pose a challenge. Keck (2014) found that novice L1 and L2 writers paraphrased more extensively than experienced writers whereas L2 students in other studies stayed

close to the original texts (Cumming et al., 2018; van Weijen et al., 2019). These studies imply that interpretation may be negatively affected by students' proficiency in writing. In contrast, however, the findings of this dissertation indicate that students were able to progress similarly in their written historical reasoning regardless of writing proficiency. Students with different levels of writing proficiency progressed similarly in the course. Students in these studies were all at the B2 CEFR level, which limits the conclusions that can be drawn about the effect of writing proficiency. Future research should investigate whether this effect holds for students at different CEFR levels.

THE ROLE OF A COGNITIVE APPRENTICESHIP MODEL IN A CLIL CONTEXT

A major finding of this dissertation is that a cognitive apprenticeship model appears to be an effective method of instruction for the L2 students in these studies. Each of the studies that comprise this dissertation employ a cognitive apprenticeship model of instruction (Collins et al., 1991). In this model, instructors combine explicit instruction in historical reasoning with explicit instruction in the language of historical argumentative writing. Others have found that explicit instruction, and particularly the cognitive apprenticeship model, are effective in promoting historical reasoning among middle and high school students (De La Paz et al., 2014; De La Paz et al., 2017; Monte-Sano, 2011; Nokes et al., 2007; Stoel et al., 2017). The findings in this dissertation add L2 undergraduate students to the literature.

The studies in this dissertation also made use of a CLIL approach by combining teaching historical reasoning with the language needed when reading sources in history and composing source-based writing. CLIL is an approach that can be used to simultaneously teach content and language (Coyle et al., 2010). CLIL history courses can be found in secondary schools (Dallinger et al., 2016; Oattes et al., 2020) and at the university level (Myskow & Ono, 2018). Studies of

CLIL classrooms indicate that CLIL appears to be an effective instructional approach in terms of language, although the impact on content knowledge is more complicated (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Pérez-Cañado, 2012). Studies of CLIL history classes have commonly focused on the use of language or the acquisition of content knowledge (Dallinger et al., 2016; Miller et al., 2014; Myskow & Ono, 2018). This dissertation makes a contribution to the CLIL literature by focusing on the promotion of written historical reasoning. The studies in this dissertation provide evidence that a CLIL approach works well for the students in this historical reasoning course. Students demonstrated evidence of written historical reasoning that improved over the duration of the course.

Based on the results of the studies in this dissertation, we conclude that a cognitive apprenticeship model can be effectively used in a CLIL context. Cognitive apprenticeship has been successfully used in several contexts, such as science writing (Kolikant et al., 2006) and history education (De La Paz et al., 2017). Using cognitive apprenticeship in a CLIL context structures the explicit instruction of language and procedural aspects of writing that may be critical for advancing the written historical reasoning of novice L2 writers. The combination of a CLIL and cognitive apprenticeship model may be a particularly effective approach towards teaching written historical reasoning in a tertiary L2 population and should be further explored through studies that compare alternative approaches. Studies may also investigate if the combination of cognitive apprenticeship and CLIL works in other disciplines or for other learning goals.

One unexpected finding from this dissertation was that students in the experimental condition of the quasi-experimental intervention study in Chapter 5 wrote significantly better claims after the intervention than students in the control group. This finding is unexpected since claims were not the focus of the intervention. One possible reason for students' performance was the additional independent practice, an aspect of the cognitive apprenticeship approach, that the case studies afforded students. This independent practice may have been

enhanced because of the dialogic nature of the case study, a position supported by Reznitskaya et al. (2009). This unexpected finding merits further study, particularly to determine if the approach used in this activity can be modified to further enhance students' historical contextualization as well.

The final level of emerging proficiency demonstrated by students will be an important area of future research. In particular, future studies should investigate how to promote written historical reasoning in such a way that students are able to push past an emerging level to more proficient historical reasoning. The results of the intervention study in chapter five suggest that an increased focus on procedural knowledge may be a promising area to pursue while the findings of chapter two point to the importance of sufficient instructor support in overcoming difficulties in comprehension and answer formation. Both of these chapters also point towards the further study of a cognitive apprenticeship model in teaching written historical reasoning. Such studies will help overcome one limitation of this study, namely the complexity of studying several aspects of historical reasoning simultaneously.

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The studies in this dissertation raise interesting methodological questions. In these studies, we measured written historical reasoning, including claim, the use of evidence, source evaluation, historical contextualization and corroboration using a five-part analytical rubric. This rubric was strongly influenced by the existing literature of written historical reasoning (Monte-Sano & De La Paz, 2012; Nokes, 2017; van Drie et al., 2015). Despite its strong basis in the literature, the results in chapter five make it clear that the historical contextualization feature of the rubric did not completely capture students' performance. It appears that the following aspects should be added to the rubric: the location of the historical contextualization within the context of the argument and a conclusion based on

the historical contextualization. Adding these features may result in more accurately capturing students' reasoning. On the basis of these results, we have revised the rubric to include these features. See Appendix J for the final rubric. Future research should test the extent to which this newly proposed rubric captures students' historical reasoning as compared to the previous version of the rubric or other methods of measuring written historical reasoning.

In chapter four, we measured students' epistemic beliefs and written historical reasoning. Based on our results, we conclude that there is likely to be a relationship between students' epistemic beliefs in history in terms of historical methodology, as measured by the survey, and historical reasoning performance, as measured by students' performance on their source-based writing. There also appears to be a relationship between students' epistemic stance and their approach to the interview task. These findings lend some support to the idea that Stoel et al. (2017)'s survey may be a valid measure of students' epistemic beliefs about historical methodology. It also gives a useful comparison point when triangulating other data. One limitation of this study is that the Cronbach's alpha for the nature of knowledge and nature of knowing scales was lower than desired. A second limitation is that the study took place with a small number of students. Survey results from a larger group of students or with a higher Cronbach's alpha may provide further insight into the role of these aspects of students' epistemic beliefs in their written historical reasoning.

In addition to the survey, this dissertation also introduces the possibility of using the second-order concept, accounts, to measure students' epistemic beliefs in history. Most of the students in the small subset of chapter four had an approach to this accounts-based task that corresponded to their epistemic beliefs as measured by the survey. This raises the possibility that there is an epistemic component of students' approach when reading historical accounts. This possibility merits further research in how (and whether) to use second-order concepts to measure students' epistemic beliefs in history. It also raises the

question of whether other second-order concepts tap students' tacit or explicit epistemic beliefs in history.

While the context of this course allows for a detailed analysis of multiple aspects of historical reasoning, its nature also limits the conclusions that can be drawn for a broader population. This study investigates students at a single university in one historical reasoning course taken at the beginning of students' undergraduate career. Because students take the course after placement at the B2 CEFR level, students' language proficiency is similar. Studies with more diverse participants or in other settings are also needed for comparison and to investigate the broader applicability of these findings.

IMPLICATION FOR PRACTICE

The studies in this dissertation were conducted in the context of an existing historical reasoning course for undergraduate L2 students. This context enables the findings of this dissertation to have immediate and concrete implications for future practice. These implications can and have been applied to the context in which the dissertation took place. The findings of this study can also be applied in other relevant contexts, such as in CLIL history classrooms and those in which L2 students are present. Design principles for such courses based on the implications for practice are outlined in Table 1.

Table 1*Design Principles for a CLIL/Cognitive Apprenticeship Approach*

Consider the overall goals for the course when balancing the need for language versus content/reasoning instruction.

Courses emphasizing language should build in lessons that 1) build students' receptive skills in deciphering primary and secondary sources, 2) develop students' productive skills in the procedural aspects of writing about history and 3) introduce aspects of language needed for the specific features of the course

Courses that emphasize historical reasoning should 1) modify sources based on Wineburg and Martin (2009)'s principles to promote comprehension and 2) scaffold students' reasoning through graphic organizers, annotation prompts and other means.

Regardless of the course goals, explicit instruction should include text/answer models and language stems to apprentice students into the expectations of written historical reasoning.

In both types of courses, use explicit instruction when introducing new concepts and skills.

When students demonstrate proficiency, ownership of that (aspect of an) academic task should be gradually transferred to students along an adaptable continuum that reflects the complexity of the task and the proficiency of students. The role of the instructor should turn to facilitating/fact checking students' work.

Assess student work using a criterion-referenced method such as an analytical rubric. A rubric can be used to both assess students' work and provide meaningful information on the expectations of writing in history.

Consider the effect of students' epistemic beliefs in history on their reasoning and writing. Instructors may consider explicitly discussing students' epistemic beliefs about the nature of historical knowledge and methodology to challenge their assumptions.

One implication for practice is the importance of considering the goals for similar types of courses in order to enact the most appropriate instructional decisions. In the course under study, there were two overarching goals. The first goal focused on developing students' proficiency in historical reasoning. We accomplished this partially by using a cognitive apprenticeship model of instruction (Collins et al., 1991). Cognitive apprenticeship had previously been

found to be effective in promoting historical reasoning in (primarily L1) students (De La Paz et al., 2017), which gave us confidence that it had promise for L2 students as well.

Cognitive apprenticeship was a promising instructional method for these L2 students because it enabled instructors to provide the level of support needed to help students progress in their historical reasoning. Initially modeling historical reasoning before providing guided and independent practice structured the difficulty of instructors' expectations for students and allowed students to practice one aspect of historical reasoning before combining it with others. Courses that include the goal of promoting historical reasoning in L2 students should similarly consider the instructional method.

One important finding from this dissertation that may impact future practice is that a cognitive apprenticeship approach worked well in this L2 context, specifically the context of a CLIL classroom. The CLIL context allowed instructors to include a strong language focus that supported students' reading comprehension and the procedural aspects of their written historical reasoning. The combination of cognitive apprenticeship and CLIL enabled us to meet both of the two overarching goals. This instructional model should be considered for future CLIL courses that include historical reasoning as an instructional goal.

The goal of building students' historical reasoning affected the sources used in the course and the types of scaffolding provided to students to help them cope with these sources. Textual primary sources used in the course were simplified according to Wineburg and Martin's (2009) recommendations. Namely, we shortened the sources, simplified the vocabulary and structure, and included white space around the sources. Secondary sources were also simplified in order to be accessible to students at a B2 CEFR level. We chose to simplify authentic texts in order to maintain a strong focus on historical reasoning. We also scaffolded students' interpretation of sources through the regular use of graphic organizers and annotation prompts. These instructional materials

enabled students to cope with the challenge of source interpretation and was an intentional instructional decision made in order to attain the goal of teaching historical reasoning. There is, however, a necessary tradeoff. By focusing on historical reasoning, we were more limited in the extent to which we could focus on building students' English language proficiency. When designing future interventions, it will be important to consider this balance in order to align the instructional design with course goals.

The second major course goal was developing student's English reading and writing proficiency and procedural knowledge in terms of argumentative writing in the field of history. One way we approached this goal was by including form-focused instruction. The aspects of language we included were identified in the literature as important in writing about history (Coffin, 2006). For example, students learned about the purpose and mechanics of using hedging language when constructing a historical interpretation. Teaching hedging also helped explain concepts in historical reasoning. Students were instructed to use hedging when writing an interpretation because interpretations in history are tentative. Courses that promote historical reasoning will similarly need to determine the aspects of language to teach. We also used language models, both sentence stems and text models, to teach the language of written historical reasoning. Sentence stems were included for each aspect of historical reasoning, and were directly applicable in students' writing. Students' use of these sentence stems was seen extensively in their writing, which gives us confidence that they were an effective method of instruction.

As a part of the studies in this dissertation, we identified two additional aspects of language that can be immediately utilized in instruction. In chapter 2 we identified the components of a proficient source evaluation answer. Proficient answers contained an orientation of the author's background, an evaluation explaining how the background may affect reliability, and an assessment, or deduction, of reliability. These components can be used to explicitly teach

students how to write a proficient answer, which was implemented in a subsequent iteration of the historical reasoning class. After participating in a professional development seminar with the author of this dissertation, instructors used explicit instruction and language models to introduce the elements of a proficient source evaluation. Anecdotal feedback from instructors indicates that the approach was highly successful and resulted in changes to students' written sourcing. Future research may more formally investigate this approach.

Another aspect of language that can be taught is noted in chapter 5. In this chapter, we described how students included historical contextualization in their writing. Specifically, we explored the placement of the historical contextualization with respect to the argument, and which locations resulted in higher historical contextualization scores with the analytical rubric. This finding can be used to teach students where within the context of the argument to place their historical contextualization. This may be most effective in a text model activity since it allows students to compare different options. The same can also be applied to the second aspect of language identified in chapter five, the explicit notation of a connection between the historical contextualization and the argument.

In addition to its use as a research tool, the analytical rubric developed for this dissertation also has implications for teaching. A simplified version of the rubric was prepared for the historical reasoning course and is in use in the current iteration of the historical reasoning course as both an instructional tool and an assessment method. In the simplified version, the possible number of scoring bands was reduced from five to three, the language was simplified and a language/paraphrasing category was added. This simplified rubric is currently used by instructors to grade and provide feedback to students on each draft of their writing. This use of the rubric supports both instructors and students by clearly identifying and describing expectations for students' written historical reasoning.

The findings related to students' epistemic beliefs in history also have practical implications for instruction. Epistemic beliefs in history regarding historical methodology appear to play a role in students' performance. Instructors, therefore, may need to consider students' beliefs when planning instruction. Explicit discussion of epistemic beliefs may be beneficial in advancing students' beliefs (Stoel et al., 2017). One option we have explored is the use of the epistemic beliefs survey as a learning tool to raise awareness of and encourage reflection among students regarding their own beliefs. This was implemented in a recent iteration of the historical reasoning course. In this iteration students completed a shortened pre-course version of the survey. Students then discussed and reflected on their answers during the course. While this iteration was cut short due to the COVID pandemic, we anticipate exploring this option in the future and testing its effectiveness.

The inherent limits in terms of time and resources necessitate that multiple overarching goals may not be able to be dominant. Therefore, it will be incumbent upon the those designing instruction to carefully consider the goals of any course in order to determine the appropriate weight to give to each.

In conclusion, the combined studies in this dissertation contribute to the literature by providing a rich descriptive picture of the written historical reasoning of undergraduate L2 students. In addition to considering students' written historical reasoning, this dissertation also makes a contribution by examining students' epistemic beliefs in history, as well as the role of reading and writing proficiency on students' performance. By testing the use of a cognitive apprenticeship model in a CLIL setting, this dissertation demonstrates that the combined approach can be successfully used with the students in this context. While the conclusions of these studies are limited by their context, they make a step forward in better understanding how to promote written historical reasoning among undergraduate L2 students.