



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.

REFERENCES

- Abushihab, I. (2014). An analysis of grammatical errors in writing made by Turkish learners of English as a foreign language. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6(4), 213-223.
- Augustus. (1998). *The deeds of the divine Augustus* (T. Bushnell, Trans.).
<http://classics.mit.edu/Augustus/deeds.html>
- Avaroğulları, M., & Demir, M. A. (2015). Uncritical receivers of historical myths: A grim picture from Turkish high schoolers. *US-China Education Review*, 5(4), 270-277.
- Barron, B. (2003). When smart groups fail. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 12(3), 307-359.
- Barzilai, S., & Eshet-Alkalai, Y. (2015). The role of epistemic perspectives in comprehension of multiple author viewpoints. *Learning and Instruction*, 36, 86-103.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2014.12.003>
- Barzilai, S., & Weinstock, M. (2015). Measuring epistemic thinking within and across topics: A scenario-based approach. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 42, 141-158.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2015.06.006>
- Barzilai, S., & Zohar, A. (2012). Epistemic thinking in action: Evaluating and integrating online sources. *Cognition and Instruction*, 30(1), 39-85.
- Berkeley, S., King-Sears, M. E., Vilbas, J., & Conklin, S. (2016). Textbook characteristics that support or thwart comprehension: The current state of social studies texts. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 32(3), 247-272. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2014.970721>
- Bråten, I., Strømsø, H. I., & Britt, M. A. (2009). Trust matters: Examining the role of source evaluation in students' construction of meaning within and across multiple texts. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(1), 6-28.
- Britt, M. A., & Aglinskias, C. (2002). Improving students' ability to identify and use source information. *Cognition and Instruction*, 20(4), 485-522.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3233902>
- Carr, E. H. (1990). *What is history?* Penguin UK.
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2013). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 243-262. doi:10.1093/applin/amt011
- Chinn, C. A., Buckland, L. A., & Samarapungavan, A. (2011). Expanding the dimensions of epistemic cognition: Arguments from philosophy and psychology. *Educational Psychologist*, 46(3), 141-167.
- Chinn, C. A., Rinehart, R. W., & Buckland, L. A. (2014). Epistemic cognition and evaluating information: Applying the AIR model of epistemic cognition. In D. N. Rapp & J. L. G. Braasch (Eds.), *Processing inaccurate information: Theoretical and applied perspectives from cognitive science and the educational sciences* (pp. 425-453). MIT Press.
- Cobb, T. (n.d.). Web vocabprofile. <http://www.lexutor.ca/vp/>
- Coffin, C. (2006). *Historical discourse: The language of time, cause and evaluation*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Cohen, D. J. (2005). By the book: Assessing the place of textbooks in U.S. survey courses. *Journal of American History*, 91(4), 1405-1415. doi:10.2307/3660181

- Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Holum, A. (1991). Cognitive apprenticeship: Making thinking visible. *American Educator*, 15(3), 6-11.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and language integrated learning*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Cumming, A., Lai, C., & Cho, H. (2016). Students' writing from sources for academic purposes: A synthesis of recent research. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 23, 47-58. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.06.002>
- Cumming, A., Yang, L., Qiu, C., Zhang, L., Ji, X., Wang, J., Wang, Y., Zhan, J., Zhang, F., & Xu, C. (2018). Students' practices and abilities for writing from sources in English at universities in China. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 39, 1-15.
- Dallinger, S., Jonkmann, K., Hollm, J., & Fiege, C. (2016). The effect of content and language integrated learning on students' English and history competences—Killing two birds with one stone? *Learning and Instruction*, 41, 23-31.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182-204.
- de Graaff, R., Koopman, G. J., Anikina, Y., & Westhoff, G. (2007). An observation tool for effective L2 pedagogy in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 603-624. <https://doi.org/10.2167/beb462.0>
- De La Paz, S. (2005). Effects of historical reasoning instruction and writing strategy mastery in culturally and academically diverse middle school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 139-156.
- De La Paz, S., Felton, M., Monte-Sano, C., Croninger, R., Jackson, C., Deogracias, J. S., & Hoffman, B. P. (2014). Developing historical reading and writing with adolescent readers: Effects on student learning. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 42(2), 228-274.
- De La Paz, S., Ferretti, R., Wissinger, D., Yee, L., & MacArthur, C. (2012). Adolescents' disciplinary use of evidence, argumentative strategies, and organizational structure in writing about historical controversies. *Written Communication*, 29(4), 412-454.
- De La Paz, S., Monte-Sano, C., Felton, M., Croninger, R., Jackson, C., & Piantedosi, K. W. (2017). A historical writing apprenticeship for adolescents: Integrating disciplinary learning with cognitive strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 52(1), 31-52. doi:[doi:10.1002/rrq.147](https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.147)
- De Oliveira, L. C. (2011). *Knowing and writing school history: The language of students' expository writing and teachers' expectations*. Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Demircioglu, I. H. (2009). Analysis of Turkish secondary school history examination questions according to cognitive levels. *The New Educational Review*, 17(1), 295-304.
- Durgunoglu, A. Y. (2006). How the language's characteristics influence Turkish literacy development. In R. Malatesha Joshi & P.G. Aaron *Handbook of orthography and literacy* (pp.219-230). Routledge.
- Eurydice. (2006). *Content and language integrated learning at school in Europe*. Eurydice European Unit. <https://op.europa.eu/s/ou9U>
- Eurydice. (2017). *Key data on teaching languages at schools in Europe*. Publication Office of the European Union. <https://op.europa.eu/s/ou9T>

- Felton, M. K., & Herko, S. (2004). From dialogue to two-sided argument: scaffolding adolescents' persuasive writing. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 47(8), 672-683. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40016901>
- Futrell, A. (2006). *The Roman games: a sourcebook*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fernández-Sanjurjo, J., Fernández-Costales, A., & Arias Blanco, J. M. (2019). Analysing students' content-learning in science in CLIL vs. non-CLIL programmes: Empirical evidence from Spain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(6), 661-674. doi:10.1080/13670050.2017.1294142
- Goo, J., Granena, G., Yilmaz, Y., & Novella, M. (2015). Implicit and explicit instruction in L2 learning. In P. Rebuschat (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (Vol. 48, pp. 443-482). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3), 445-476. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.445>
- Grant, S. (2018). Teaching practices in history education. In S. A. Metzger & L. M. Harris (Eds.), *The Wiley International Handbook of History Teaching and Learning*, (pp. 419-448). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Greene, J. A., & Yu, S. B. (2014). Modeling and measuring epistemic cognition: A qualitative re-investigation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 39(1), 12-28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2013.10.002>
- Greene, S. (1994). The problems of learning to think like a historian: Writing history in the culture of the classroom. *Educational Psychologist*, 29(2), 89-96.
- Heatley, A., Nation, I. S. P., & Coxhead, A. (2002). RANGE and FREQUENCY programs. <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/staff/paul-nation.aspx>
- Hillocks Jr, G. (1986). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching*. National Conference on Research in English and ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.
- Hirvela, A. (2016). Academic reading into writing. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 127-137). Routledge.
- Hofer, B. K. (2016). Epistemic cognition as a psychological construct: Advancements and challenges. In J. A. Greene, W. A. Sandoval, & I. Bråten (Eds.), *Handbook of epistemic cognition* (pp. 31-50). Routledge.
- Hofer, B. K., & Pintrich, P. R. (1997). The development of epistemological theories: Beliefs about knowledge and knowing and their relation to learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 67(1), 88-140. doi:10.2307/1170620
- Huijgen, T., van Boxtel, C., van de Grift, W., & Holthuis, P. (2017). Toward historical perspective taking: Students' reasoning when contextualizing the actions of people in the past. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 45(1), 110-144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2016.1208597>
- Huijgen, T., van de Grift, W., van Boxtel, C., & Holthuis, P. (2017). Teaching historical contextualization: the construction of a reliable observation instrument. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 32(2), 159-181. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-016-0295-8>

- Huijgen, T., van de Grift, W., van Boxtel, C., & Holthuis, P. (2018). Promoting historical contextualization: the development and testing of a pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 50(3), 410-434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2018.1435724>
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148-164.
- Keck, C. (2014). Copying, paraphrasing, and academic writing development: A re-examination of L1 and L2 summarization practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 25, 4-22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.05.005>
- King, P., & Kitchener, K. (2002). The reflective judgement model: Twenty years of research on epistemic cognition. In B. Hofer & P. Pintrich (Eds.), *Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing* (pp. 37-61). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kirkgöz, Y. (2009). Globalization and English language policy in Turkey. *Educational Policy*, 23(5), 663-684. doi:10.1177/0895904808316319
- Kolikant, Y. B.-D., Gatchell, D. W., Hirsch, P. L., & Linsenmeier, R. A. (2006). A Cognitive-Apprenticeship-inspired instructional approach for teaching scientific writing and reading. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 36(3), 20-25.
- Köroğlu, Z. Ç. (2014). An Analysis on Grammatical Errors of Turkish EFL Students' Written Texts. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 9(12).
- Kuhn, D. (2001). How do people know? *Psychological Science*, 12(1), 1-8. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00302
- Kuhn, D., Cheney, R., & Weinstock, M. (2000). The development of epistemological understanding. *Cognitive Development*, 15(3), 309-328. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2014\(00\)00030-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2014(00)00030-7)
- Kuhn, D., Shaw, V., & Felton, M. (1997). Effects of Dyadic Interaction on Argumentive Reasoning. *Cognition and Instruction*, 15(3), 287-315. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci1503_1
- Kuhn, D., & Weinstock, M. (2002). *What is epistemological thinking and why does it matter?* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Lee, P. (2001). History in an information culture. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*, 1(2), 75-98.
- Lee, P. (2005). Putting Principles into Practice: Understanding History. In S. Donovan & J. Bransford (Eds.), *How students learn*. National Academies Press.
- Lee, P. (2011). Historical literacy and transformative history. In L. Perikleous & D. Shemilt (Eds.), *The future of the past: Why history education matters* (pp. 129-167). Association for Historical Dialogue and Research.
- Lee, P., & Ashby, R. (2000). Progression in historical understanding among students ages 7-14. In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history* (pp. 199-222). New York University Press
- Lee, P., Dickinson, A., & Ashby, R. (2001). Children's ideas about historical explanation. In A. Dickinson, P. Gordon & P. Lee (Eds.), *Raising standards in history education* (pp. 97-115). Woburn Press.
- Lee, P., & Shemilt, D. (2003). A scaffold, not a cage: Progression and progression models in history. *Teaching History*(113), 13-19.

- Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). "Completely different worlds": EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 39-69.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3587974>
- Li, Y., & Casanave, C. P. (2012). Two first-year students' strategies for writing from sources: Patchwriting or plagiarism? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 165-180.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.002>
- Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., Durik, A. M., Conley, A. M., Barron, K. E., Tauer, J. M., Karabenick, S. A., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2010). Measuring situational interest in academic domains. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70(4), 647-671.
- Llinares, A., & Whittaker, R. (2007). Talking and writing in a foreign language in CLIL contexts: a linguistic analysis of secondary school learners of Geography and History. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada*, 20, 83-91.
- Llinares, A., & Whittaker, R. (2010). Writing and speaking in the history class. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 125-144). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lo, Y. Y. (2014). L2 learning opportunities in different academic subjects in content-based instruction – evidence in favour of 'conventional wisdom'. *Language and Education*, 28(2), 141-160. doi:10.1080/09500782.2013.786086
- Loban, W. (1976). *Language development: Kindergarten through grade twelve* (Vol. 18). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers.
- Lorenzo, F. (2017). Historical literacy in bilingual settings: Cognitive academic language in CLIL history narratives. *Linguistics and Education*, 37, 32-41.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2016.11.002>
- Maggioni, L. (2010). *Studying epistemic cognition in the history classroom: Cases of teaching and learning to think historically* [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Maryland].
<http://hdl.handle.net/1903/10797>
- Maggioni, L., Fox, E., & Alexander, P. A. (2010). The epistemic dimension of competence in the social sciences. *JSSSE-Journal of Social Science Education*, 9(4), 15-23.
- Maggioni, L., VanSledright, B., & Alexander, P. A. (2009). Walking on the borders: A measure of epistemic cognition in history. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 77(3), 187-214.
- Martin, J. (1991). Distilling knowledge and scaffolding text. In E. Ventola (Ed.), *Functional and systemic linguistics: Approaches and uses* (Vol. 55, pp. 307-337). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mason, L. (2016). Psychological perspectives on measuring epistemic cognition. In N. Valanides (Ed.), *Handbook of epistemic cognition* (pp. 375-392). Routledge.
- McCarthy Young, K., & Leinhardt, G. (1998). Writing from primary documents. *Written Communication*, 15(1), 25-68. doi:10.1177/0741088398015001002
- McDonough, K., Crawford, W. J., & De Vleeschauwer, J. (2014). Summary writing in a Thai EFL university context. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 24, 20-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.03.001>
- McGrew, S., Ortega, T., Breakstone, J., & Wineburg, S. (2017). The challenge that's bigger than fake news: Teaching students to engage in civic online reasoning. *American Educator*, 41(3), 4-10.
- Meyer, O., Coyle, D., Halbach, A., Schuck, K., & Ting, T. (2015). A pluriliteracies approach to content and language integrated learning – mapping learner progressions in knowledge

- construction and meaning-making. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(1), 41-57.
doi:10.1080/07908318.2014.1000924
- Miller, R. T., Mitchell, T. D., & Pessoa, S. (2014). Valued voices: Students' use of engagement in argumentative history writing. *Linguistics and Education*, 28, 107-120.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.10.002>
- Miller, R. T., Mitchell, T. D., & Pessoa, S. (2016). Impact of source texts and prompts on students' genre uptake. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 31, 11-24.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.01.001>
- Mitchell, T. D., & Pessoa, S. (2017). Scaffolding the writing development of the argument genre in history: The case of two novice writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 30, 26-37. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2017.10.002>
- Monte-Sano, C. (2008). Qualities of historical writing instruction: A comparative case study of two teachers' practices. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(4), 1045-1079. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27667162>.
- Monte-Sano, C. (2010). Disciplinary literacy in history: An exploration of the historical nature of adolescents' writing. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19(4), 539-568.
- Monte-Sano, C. (2011). Beyond reading comprehension and summary: Learning to read and write in history by focusing on evidence, perspective, and interpretation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 41(2), 212-249. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2011.00547.x>
- Monte-Sano, C., & De La Paz, S. (2012). Using writing tasks to elicit adolescents' historical reasoning. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 44(3), 273-299.
<https://doi.org/doi:10.1177/1086296X12450445>
- Morton, T. (2010). Using a genre-based approach to integrating content and language in CLIL. In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula, & U. Smit (Eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (pp. 81-104). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Muis, K. R., Bendixen, L. D., & Haerle, F. C. (2006). Domain-generality and domain-specificity in personal epistemology research: Philosophical and empirical reflections in the development of a theoretical framework. *Educational Psychology Review*, 18(1), 3-54.
www.jstor.org/stable/23363851
- Myskow, G. (2018). Changes in attitude: Evaluative language in secondary school and university history textbooks. *Linguistics and Education*, 43, 53-63.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.12.001>
- Myskow, G., & Ono, M. (2018). A matter of facts: L2 writers' use of evidence and evaluation in biographical essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 41, 55-70.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.08.002>
- Nokes, J. D. (2011). Recognizing and addressing the barriers to adolescents' "reading like historians". *The History Teacher*, 44(3), 379-404. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41303991>
- Nokes, J. D. (2017). Exploring patterns of historical thinking through eighth-grade students' argumentative writing. *Journal of Writing Research*, 8(3), 437-467. doi:10.17239/jowr-2017.08.03.02
- Nokes, J. D., & De La Paz, S. (2018). Writing and argumentation in history education. In S.A. Metzger & L. McArthur Harris (Eds.), *The Wiley International Handbook of History Teaching and Learning*, (pp. 551-578). Wiley Blackwell.

- Nokes, J. D., Dole, J. A., & Hacker, D. J. (2007). Teaching high school students to use heuristics while reading historical texts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(3), 492-504. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.492
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 50*(3), 417-528.
- O'Neill, D. K. (2012). Designs that fly: what the history of aeronautics tells us about the future of design-based research in education. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 35*(2), 119-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2012.683573>
- Oattes, H., Fukkink, R., Oostdam, R., de Graaff, R., & Wilschut, A. (2020). A showdown between bilingual and mainstream education: the impact of language of instruction on learning subject content knowledge. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 1*-14. doi:10.1080/13670050.2020.1718592
- Oattes, H., Oostdam, R., De Graaff, R., & Wilschut, A. (2018). The challenge of balancing content and language: Perceptions of Dutch bilingual education history teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 70*, 165-174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.11.022>
- Pérez-Cañado, M. L. (2012). CLIL research in Europe: past, present, and future. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*(3), 315-341. doi:10.1080/13670050.2011.630064
- Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. J. (1993). Reliability and predictive validity of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*(3), 801-813.
- Raykov, T., & Marcoulides, G. A. (2012). *A first course in structural equation modeling*. Routledge.
- Reisman, A. (2012a). Reading like a historian: A document-based history curriculum intervention in urban high schools. *Cognition and Instruction, 30*(1), 86-112. doi:10.1080/07370008.2011.634081
- Reisman, A. (2012b). The 'Document-Based Lesson': Bringing disciplinary inquiry into high school history classrooms with adolescent struggling readers. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 44*(2), 233-264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2011.591436>
- Reisman, A., & McGrew, S. (2018). Reading in history education: Text, sources, and evidence. In S. A. Metzger & L. M. Harris (Eds.), *The Wiley International Handbook of History Teaching and Learning*, (pp. 529-550). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Reisman, A., & Wineburg, S. (2008). Teaching the skill of contextualizing in history. *The Social Studies, 99*(5), 202-207. <https://doi.org/10.3200/TSSS.99.5.202-207>
- Reznitskaya, A., Anderson, R. C., McNurlen, B., Nguyen-Jahiel, K., Archodidou, A., & Kim, S.-y. (2001). Influence of oral discussion on written argument. *Discourse Processes, 32*(2-3), 155-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2001.9651596>
- Reznitskaya, A., & Gregory, M. (2013). Student thought and classroom language: Examining the mechanisms of change in dialogic teaching. *Educational Psychologist, 48*(2), 114-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2013.775898>
- Reznitskaya, A., Kuo, L. J., Clark, A. M., Miller, B., Jadallah, M., Anderson, R. C., & Nguyen-Jahiel, K. (2009). Collaborative reasoning: a dialogic approach to group discussions. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 39*(1), 29-48. doi:10.1080/03057640802701952
- Rouet, J.-F., Britt, M. A., Mason, R. A., & Perfetti, C. A. (1996). Using multiple sources of evidence to reason about history. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*(3), 478-493.

- Sandoval, W. A. (2005). Understanding students' practical epistemologies and their influence on learning through inquiry. *Science Education*, 89(4), 634-656. doi:10.1002/sce.20065
- Sandoval, W. A. (2014). Science education's need for a theory of epistemological development. *Science Education*, 98(3), 383-387. doi:10.1002/sce.21107
- Schleppegrell, M. J., Achugar, M., & Oteiza, T. (2004). The grammar of history: Enhancing content-based instruction through a functional focus on language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(1), 67-93.
- Schleppegrell, M., & de Oliveira, L. C. (2006). An integrated language and content approach for history teachers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5(4), 254-268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2006.08.003>
- Schommer, M. (1990). Effects of beliefs about the nature of knowledge on comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(3), 498-504.
- Schoonen, R., Snellings, P., Stevenson, M., & Van Gelderen, A. (2009). Towards a blueprint of the foreign language writer: The linguistic and cognitive demands of foreign language writing. In R. M. Manchon (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 77-101). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691859>
- Sendur, K.A., van Boxtel, C. & van Drie, J.P. (2021). Undergraduate L2 students' performance when evaluating historical sources for reliability. *English for Specific Purposes*, 61, 17-31. <http://10.1016/j.esp.2020.08.004>
- Sendur, K.A., van Drie, J.P., van Boxtel, C. & Kan, K.J. (2020). Historical reasoning in an Undergraduate CLIL course: Students' progression and the role of English proficiency. *International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*, 1-17, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1844136>
- Shemilt, D. (1984). Beauty and the philosopher: Empathy in history and classroom. *Learning history*, 39-84.
- Shi, L. (2012). Rewriting and paraphrasing source texts in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 134-148. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.003>
- Shin, S.-Y., & Ewert, D. (2015). What accounts for integrated reading-to-write task scores? *Language Testing*, 32(2), 259-281. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1177/0265532214560257>
- Smith, M., Breakstone, J., & Wineburg, S. (2019). History Assessments of Thinking: A Validity Study. *Cognition and Instruction*, 37(1), 118-144. doi:10.1080/07370008.2018.1499646
- Stanford, M. (1986/1995). *The nature of historical knowledge*. B. Blackwell.
- Stoel, G., Logtenberg, A., Wansink, B., Huijgen, T., van Boxtel, C., & van Drie, J. (2017). Measuring epistemological beliefs in history education: An exploration of naïve and nuanced beliefs. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 83, 120-134. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.03.003>
- Stoel, G., van Drie, J., & van Boxtel, C. (2017). The effects of explicit teaching of strategies, second-order concepts, and epistemological underpinnings on students' ability to reason causally in history. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 109(3), 321-337. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000143>
- Suetonius. (1998). *The lives of the Caesars* (J. Rolfe, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- T. C. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (2018a). *Ortaöğretim İngilizce dersi (9, 10, 11 ve 12 sınıflar) öğretim programı* [Secondary English course (grades 9, 10, 11, and 12) teaching program]. <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/>

- T. C. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (2018b). *Ortaöğretim tarih dersi (9, 10 ve 11 sınıflar) öğretim programı* [Secondary history Course (grades 9, 10, 11, and 12) teaching program]. <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/>
- Thompson, C., Morton, J., & Storch, N. (2013). Where from, who, why and how? A study of the use of sources by first year L2 university students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12*(2), 99-109. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.004>
- Unsworth, L. (1999). Developing critical understanding of the specialised language of school science and history texts: A functional grammatical perspective. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 42*(7), 508-521. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40015633>
- van Boxtel, C., & van Drie, J. (2012). "That's in the time of the Romans!" Knowledge and strategies students use to contextualize historical images and documents. *Cognition and Instruction, 30*(2), 113-145. doi:10.1080/07370008.2012.661813
- van Boxtel, C., & van Drie, J. (2013). Historical reasoning in the classroom: What does it look like and how can we enhance it? *Teaching History*(150), 44-52. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43260513>
- van Boxtel, C., & van Drie, J. (2018). Historical reasoning: conceptualizations and educational applications. In S.A. Metzger & L. McArthur Harris (Eds.), *The Wiley International Handbook of History Teaching and Learning*, (pp. 149-176). Wiley Blackwell.
- van Drie, J., Braaksma, M., & van Boxtel, C. (2015). Writing in history: Effects of writing instruction on historical reasoning and text quality. *Journal of Writing Research, 7*(1), 123-156. doi:10.17239/jowr-2015.07.01.06
- van Drie, J., & van Boxtel, C. (2008). Historical reasoning: Towards a framework for analyzing students' reasoning about the past. *Educational Psychology Review, 20*(2), 87-110. doi:10.1007/s10648-007-9056-1
- van Drie, J., & Van de Ven, P.H. (2017). Moving ideas: an exploration of students' use of dialogue for writing in history. *Language and Education, 31*(6), 526-542.
- Van Someren, M., Barnard, Y., & Sandberg, J. (1994). *The think aloud method: a practical approach to modelling cognitive*. Academic Press.
- van Weijen, D., Rijlaarsdam, G., & van den Bergh, H. (2019). Source use and argumentation behavior in L1 and L2 writing: a within-writer comparison. *Reading and Writing, 32*(6), 1635-1655. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-018-9842-9>
- Walraven, A., Brand-Gruwel, S., & Boshuizen, H. P. (2009). How students evaluate information and sources when searching the World Wide Web for information. *Computers & Education, 52*(1), 234-246.
- Wegerif, R., Mercer, N., & Dawes, L. (1999). From social interaction to individual reasoning: an empirical investigation of a possible socio-cultural model of cognitive development. *Learning and Instruction, 9*(6), 493-516. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752\(99\)00013-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(99)00013-4)
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Weigle, S. C. (2004). Integrating reading and writing in a competency test for non-native speakers of English. *Assessing Writing, 9*(1), 27-55. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2004.01.002>
- Weigle, S. C., Yang, W., & Montee, M. (2013). Exploring reading processes in an academic reading test using short-answer questions. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 10*(1), 28-48.
- Westhoff, G. (2004). The art of playing a pinball machine. Characteristics of effective SLA-tasks. *Babylonia, 12*(3), 58-62.

-
- Wette, R. (2017). Source text use by undergraduate post-novice L2 writers in disciplinary assignments: Progress and ongoing challenges. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 37*, 46-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.05.015>
- Wineburg, S. (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*(1), 73-87. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.83.1.73
- Wineburg, S. (1998). Reading Abraham Lincoln: An expert/expert study in the interpretation of historical texts. *Cognitive Science, 22*(3), 319-346. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog2203_3
- Wineburg, S., & Fournier, J. (1994). Contextualized thinking in history. In M. Carretero & J.F. Voss (Eds.). *Cognitive and instructional processes in history and the social sciences*, (pp. 285-308). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203052952>.
- Wineburg, S., & Martin, D. (2009). Tampering with history: Adapting primary sources for struggling readers. *Social Education, 73*(5), 212-216.
- Wineburg, S., Smith, M., & Breakstone, J. (2012). New directions in assessment: Using Library of Congress sources to assess historical understanding. *Social Education, 76*(6), 290-293.
- Yildirim, A. (2006). High school textbooks in Turkey from teachers' and students' perspectives: The case of history textbooks. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 7*(2), 218-228. doi:10.1007/bf03031545

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Source Evaluation Tasks

Source Evaluation 1

Directions: Use the text, source information, and your knowledge of history to answer the questions that follow.

Source: “The Divine Augustus” was written by Suetonius. It is a biography that he wrote about the first Roman emperor, Augustus. He also wrote biographies of other Roman emperors.

Augustus stopped the disorderly and disrespectful way of viewing games by passing special laws. He did this because he was angry that people insulted a senator by not offering him a seat at the games in Puteoli. As a result of this insult, the senate decreed that the first row of seats should be reserved for senators at all public shows. In Rome, Augustus would not allow the representatives of the free and allied nations (parts of the Roman Empire) to sit in the front because he was told that even former slaves could become representatives. He separated soldiers from civilians. He assigned separate seats to the married common men. He assigned a section of seats to boys and assigned the seats nearby to their tutors. And he decreed that no one wearing a dark cloak should sit in the middle (they had to sit in the upper seats). He would not allow women to view the gladiators, except from the upper seats (Suetonius, Augustus 44, trans. 1998).

Additional facts related to Suetonius:

1. Suetonius lived between approximately 71-135 CE. The emperor Augustus died in 14 CE.
2. Suetonius was in charge of Roman libraries and archives for Emperor Hadrian, and had access to letters that Emperor Augustus wrote.
3. Suetonius was from a wealthy Roman equestrian family. Equestrians were generally not involved in politics.

Question: Which 1 of the 3 facts above might cause you to question the reliability of Suetonius’ account?

Source Evaluation 2

Directions: Use the text, source information, and your knowledge of history to answer the questions that follow.

Source: “Deeds of the Divine Augustus” was written by the first Roman emperor, Augustus. In this text he lists his achievements and the money he spent on Rome and Romans.

Three times I gave shows of gladiators under my name and five times under the name of my sons and grandsons; in these shows about 10,000 men fought. Twice I furnished under my name spectacles of athletes gathered from everywhere, and three times under my grandson's name. I celebrated games under my name four times, and furthermore in the place of other magistrates twenty-three times. As master of the college I celebrated the secular games for the college of the Fifteen, with my colleague Marcus Agrippa, when Gaius Furnius and Gaius Silanus were consuls. Consul for the thirteenth time, I celebrated the first games of Mars. After that the senate made a decree and a law saying that consuls should celebrate the games of Mars (Augustus, Deeds of the Divine Augustus 22, trans. 1998).

Additional facts related to Augustus:

1. Augustus wrote new rules about where people could sit during gladiator shows.
2. Other primary sources attest (also say) that at least 7 of these 8 gladiator shows took place.
3. Augustus asked the senate to write this text on bronze pillars and put it up in Rome and around the Roman Empire.

Question: Which 1 of the 3 facts above might cause you to question the reliability of Augustus' account?

Source Evaluation 3

Directions: Use the text, source information, and your knowledge of history to answer the questions that follow.

Source: “Satire” was written by Juvenal. Juvenal used satire to criticize corruption in Roman society and the behaviors of people he didn’t agree with.

What beauty set Eppia (a senator’s wife) on fire? What youth captured her? What did she see that made her endure being called a gladiator’s woman? For her darling Sergius (the gladiator) had already begun to shave (because he was middle aged), and to hope for retirement soon because of a wounded arm. Moreover, there were many deformities on his face; for instance there was a huge wart on the middle of his nose, which was rubbed by his helmet, and a bitter liquid dripped continually from one eye. But he was a gladiator...She preferred this to her children and her country. That woman preferred this to her sister and her husband. The sword is what they love (Juvenal, Satire 6.102-112, as cited in Futrell, 2006).

Additional facts related to Juvenal:

1. Juvenal lived between approximately 60-127 CE.
2. Juvenal’s satires were probably intended for a rich male audience.
3. Juvenal wrote an entire satire criticizing women and their behavior.

Question: Which 1 of the 3 facts above might cause you to question the reliability of Juvenal’s account?

APPENDIX B

Coding Scheme

Claim	Example
Code as Uncertainty when the student declines to or cannot make a claim of reliability because of some uncertainty.	“We don’t have the time that Satire was written. So first one is...I’m not very sure.” (S2, SE3)
Code as Claim when the student makes a claim of reliability regarding the source or author, but doesn’t support the claim with any arguments. In this context, a claim is 1) any statement in which the student determines whether the given primary source is reliable or not reliable based on one or more ‘additional facts’ read in the source evaluation task or 2) any statement in which the student determines whether an ‘additional fact’ in the source evaluation task causes the student to question the reliability of the primary source. The claim must either specifically refer to reliability or can be reasonably inferred to refer to reliability.	“I think first one is not unreliable too much.” (S3, SE3)
Code as Ahistorical Claim (AC) when the student makes a claim regarding the reliability of the source or author based on ahistorical arguments.	“Other primary sources also say that at least seven these gladiator shows took place. Majority thinks that it have to most of this seven. It’s out of eight so it’s nearly 95% true.” (S2, SE2)
Code as Historical Claim Incorrect (HCI) when the student makes a claim of reliability regarding the source or author and bases the claim of reliability on historical reasoning, but at least half of the basis is incorrect or the claim is illogical. A basis is incorrect if available evidence provided to the students contradicts it.	“It’s not (fact) one. He (Augustus) wrote new...We don’t know his new rules.” (S2, SE2)
Code as Historical Claim Surface (HCS) when the student makes a claim of reliability regarding the source or author and the claim is reasonable, but is not elaborated upon, the elaboration is shallow, and/or partly incorrect.	“Augustus asked the senate to write these texts on bronze pillars and put it up in Rome and around the roman empire. I think this is unreliable because he want to show his power to the public. And he wrote his text on bronze pillars because he wanted to show everyone his text. And he also put it up Rome and around the Roman Empire be it is also

	he want to show everyone because he put it in public place.” (S10, SE2)
Code as Historical Claim Elaborate(HCE) when the student makes a claim of reliability regarding the source or author and the claim is reasonable, correct and well elaborated. A well-elaborated claim contains substantive details explaining or speculating about the claim, author or source.	“I think fact 3 eh cause me to question the reliability of the Juvenal’s account because his purpose is to criticize corruption in the Roman society. So he doesn’t think the women’s the people in the Roman society act, what they do. He doesn’t agree with what Romans doing and clearly he doesn’t agree with the idea that gladiators are desirable. So his purpose is to criticize this and that’s why he’s mentioning this like it’s a very very bad thing and he’s saying only the bad parts of it. So I think Juvenal is not reliable because of this.” (S6, SE3)

Arguments	Example
Code as Historical Argument Corroboration when the student justifies a claim based on corroborating information in multiple sources.	“I think this is reliable too because the text and other primary sources say the same thing.” (S10, SE2)
Code as Historical Argument Purpose when the student justifies a claim based on the author’s stated or implied purpose and/or the author’s stated or potential audience.	“I think this is unreliable because he want to show his power to the public.” (S10, SE2)
Code as Historical Argument Position when the student justifies a claim based on the author’s “occupation, profession or credentials” or access to information due to the author’s position.	“He was in charge of Roma libraries...This is reliable because he had access to his (Augustus’) letters.”
Code as Historical Argument Perspective when the student justifies a claim based on the author’s perspective, including the author’s socioeconomic class, gender, or view of others.	“So he doesn’t think the women’s the people in the Roman society act, what they do. He doesn’t agree with what Romans doing and clearly he doesn’t agree with the idea that gladiators are desirable.” (S6, SE3)
Code as Historical Argument Proximity when the student justifies a claim based on the author’s temporal or geographical proximity to the topic.	“According to it the writer lived in a period much later than Augustus, so these writings were written after an 80-90 year period. So if you ask me this gap in periods might have affected the reliability of the writings.” (S3, SE1)

Code as Historical Argument Historical Context when the student justifies a claim based on the period's temporal, spatial or social context.	"In that time there weren't only rich male audience, there were also normal women." (S9, SE3)
Code as Historical Argument Exaggeration when the student justifies a claim based on exaggeration in the source. The argument may be specified or speculative.	"And in the text he talk about how he is rich and powerful. He praise himself and I am guessing he probably add extra information about himself in text." (S8, SE2)
Code as Historical Argument Omitting Information when the student justifies a claim based on intentionally omitted information from the source. The argument may be specified or speculative.	"...and he's saying only the bad parts of it." (S6, SE3)
Code as Ahistorical Argument Quantify truth when the student justifies a claim based on an amount of truth.	"It's out of eight so it's nearly 95% true." (S2, SE2)
Code as Ahistorical Argument Personal Opinion when the student justifies a claim based on the student's own opinion which is not supported by the available evidence.	"All politicians are liars." (S6, SE2)
Code as Ahistorical Argument Logical Fallacy when the student justifies a claim based on a previously determined argument. The claim is not altered when faced with conflicting information.	"I'm changing because I don't want to be opposed to my previous argument." (S1, SE3)

APPENDIX C

Sample DBQ3 from S7

In the Roman society, there were various views about gladiators. The society give very attention to shows. They seem as a career of chance to get fame and wealth. However the society seem them as the lowest status. Dunkle argues that being a gladiator could seem as a attractive career. Gladiators would fight 2 or 3 times per a year and also, they would have some opportunities to getting a fame and wealth. Chances that they gain with this career ensure to buy their freedom. In addition, the volunteer gladiators could want to get military glory and achieve the adoration of public (Dunkle). Besides the public adoration, in the Satire of Juvenal describes female adoration to gladiators. Career as a gladiator seem womens in Roman society preferred them to their aristocrat or politician husbands. The reason for this statement, women being love to their swords and wounds. Juvenal's Satire is unreliable because he was not objective because of his exaggerations. He criticizes only from one perspective. In the text graffiti by anonymous gave an example Eppia who was the senator's wife to this.

Second view from Roman society, as a career gladiators seem as slave and prisoners of war (Dunkle). The legal status of them seem as the lowest status in Roman society both the Empire and Republic. They had no citizen rights in society differ from free man. In the text written by Galen, being a gladiator explained as an unhealthy career. Describes that gladiators seem as stupid as animal. Due to their wounds they lost their minds and their motor system. Gladiators have no condition, also they lose their feeling in their body. Because of their deformation, the limbs that they have become dislocated (Galen). In the text written by Galen seem as reliable because of he lived during the late second century CE. In addition to his reliability, he was a doctor who worked for a gladiator school. Therefore he was access to information completely. However he tried to convince people to not become a gladiator. Therefore, this source was not objective.

APPENDIX D

Overview of Historical Reasoning Course Lessons

Lesson	Content Focus	Reading/Writing Focus	Historical Reasoning Focus
1	Introduction to gladiators and Roman history	Reading: Annotation	Introduction to historical reasoning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is history • How do we know about history • Who/why writes history • Why is history important
2	Socioeconomic status	Reading: Annotation Writing: Claims and evidence Writing: In-class pre-DBQ writing	Introduction to primary source analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source evaluation • Historical contextualization • Corroboration
3	Socioeconomic status	Reading: Argument structure Writing: Claims and evidence Writing: In-class DBQ1	Guided primary source analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source evaluation • Historical contextualization
4	Politics	Reading: Argument structure Writing: Claims and evidence	Guided primary source analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source evaluation • Historical contextualization
5	Politics	Writing: Claims and evidence Writing: Argument structure Writing: In-class DBQ2	Guided primary source analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corroboration
6	Culture and values	Reading: Argument structure	Independent primary source analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source evaluation • Historical contextualization • Corroboration
7	Culture and values	Writing: Argument structure (synthesis of multiple sources)	Independent primary source analysis (continued from Lesson 6)
8	Review	Writing: Argument structure (synthesis of multiple sources) Writing: In-class DBQ3 completed post-Lesson 8	Independent primary source analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source evaluation • Historical contextualization • Corroboration

APPENDIX E

Primary Source Excerpt

Note: This primary source excerpt was available for students to use in DBQ1.

Augustus stopped the disorderly and disrespectful way of viewing games by passing special laws. He did this because he was angry that people insulted a senator by not offering him a seat at the games in Puteoli. As a result of this insult, the senate decreed that the first row of seats should be reserved for senators at all public shows. In Rome, Augustus would not allow the representatives of the free and allied nations (parts of the Roman Empire) to sit in the front because he was told that even former slaves could become representatives. He separated soldiers from civilians. He assigned separate seats to the married common men. He assigned a section of seats to boys and assigned the seats nearby to their tutors. And he decreed that no one wearing a dark cloak should sit in the middle (they had to sit in the upper seats). He would not allow women to view the gladiators, except from the upper seats (Suetonius, Augustus 44, trans. 1998).

APPENDIX F

Historical Reasoning Rubric (Original)

	Claim	Use of Evidence	Source Evaluation	Historical Contextualization	Corroboration
4	Presents a clear and accurate claim that adequately addresses the question.	The evidence is accurate, relevant and sufficient to support the claim & the evidence is accurately explained at least once & explicitly linked to the claim at least once.	Refers to at least 1 author by name or title & notes relevant feature(s) of the primary source (PS). Indicates potential effect of the feature on the information&/or explains the effect &/or uses the feature to further the argument. (at least 2/3)	Provides accurate and relevant historical context (HC) (temporal, spatial or social features) as support for the claim, evidence or source. The HC is elaborate and used to situate and/or further the claim or the HC is less elaborate & explicitly used to situate and/or further the claim.	Uses multiple sources to support the same point at least once & explicitly indicates an appropriate link between the sources & explains the link by noting how they are similar
3	Presents a clear and accurate claim that partially addresses the question.	The evidence is accurate, relevant and sufficient to support the claim. The evidence may be accurately explained at least once or explicitly linked to the claim at least once.	Refers to at least 1 author by name or title & notes relevant feature(s) of the PS. Indicates potential effect of the feature on the information or explains the effect or uses the feature to further the argument. (1/3)	Provides accurate and relevant historical context It may be used to implicitly situate &/or further the argument.	Uses multiple sources to support the same point at least once & explicitly indicates an appropriate link between the sources & notes that they are similar

2	Accurately restates the question or topic without directly stating a claim. May contain minor errors.	The evidence is insufficient and may contain irrelevant or inaccurate information. The evidence is explained &/or explicitly linked to the main idea at least once. The explanation or link may be inaccurate.	Refers to at least 1 author by name or title & notes relevant feature(s) of the PS. There may be an attempt to note the effect or use it to further the argument. If included, the interpretation undermines the argument or has errors.	Provides historical context that is of limited support for the argument &/or has minor inaccuracies. It is not used to situate &/or further the argument/argument &/or there are errors.	Uses multiple sources to support the same point at least once & explicitly indicates an inappropriate or unclear link between the sources
1	The main idea is difficult to discern, implied or marginally addresses the questions &/or is inconsistent with the evidence in the sources &/or the language makes the intended meaning somewhat unclear	The evidence is insufficient and may contain irrelevant or inaccurate information. The evidence is not explained & not explicitly linked to the claim &/or the evidence is primarily copy-pasted.	Refers to at least 1 author by name or title & notes irrelevant or inaccurate feature(s) of the PS. There may be an attempt to note the effect or use it to further the argument. The interpretation may have errors.	Provides historical context that is historically inaccurate &/or largely irrelevant.	Uses multiple sources to support the same point at least once & treats sources separately without explicit corroboration (can look list-like).
0	There is no main idea or the main idea is copy-pasted from the sources or the language makes the main idea incomprehensible.	There is no evidence &/or the evidence is primarily irrelevant	Notes the author without any attempt to assess reliability or fails to note the author or title.	Does not note historical context.	Uses one source for support when multiple are available.

APPENDIX G

Sample Student DBQ3 from Student 37

In Roman society, there are two views for gladiators. The low class people such as slaves and freedman saw gladiators attractive and strong. On the other hand, politicians saw them a tool for becoming popular in politics. According to Dunkle, in “The Gladiator” people who became a gladiator take a new meaning for their life. They lived in a military discipline like a soldier. Gladiators had better living conditions than low class people. For instance, there were house, food and medical attention for them. On the other hand, in “The Roman Arena” by Brown, in late Republic time gladiators were used by politicians to gain political power. For example, Julius Caesar had had more popularity due to giving a show which included 320 gladiator. This is supported by Augustus who was the first roman emperor. He details that he gave shows under his name and his sons and grandsons name. In these shows, about 10,000 men fought. As master of college he celebrated the secular games with his colleagues. Consul for the thirteenth time, he celebrated the first games of Mars. Augustus was the first Roman emperor and in his text he listed his achievement and his wealth. He might have bragged himself and it makes the source unreliable. However, he organized the games, lived at these times and he was the emperor, therefore he may know information about gladiators. Hence, the source can be reliable. Because of these, the source is a mixed source. During both Republic and Empire times, gladiator shows were very popular. Roman liked fightings, bloods and killing, thus they enjoyed with watching gladiatorial combats. Moreover, politicians may have thought that giving gladiator shows is an effective way to show own money and gain political power.

APPENDIX H
Additional Tables

Table H1*Student Gender and Intended Area of Study (N=62)*

Gender		Intended Area of Study		
Male	Female	Arts and Social Sciences	Science and Engineering	Management
32	30	4	52	6

Table H2*Descriptive Statistics for the DBQ Subscales (N=62)*

	Mean (SD)
Claim	2.23 (1.12)
Evidence	2.58 (.93)
Source Evaluation	2.32 (1.24)
Historical Contextualization	2.44 (1.24)
Corroboration	2.69 (1.30)
Total Score	12.26 (3.10)

Note: Subscales could range between 0-4, while the total score could range between 0-20.

APPENDIX I

Discrepant Accounts Task

The questions from the Project Chata task (Lee, 2001; Lee & Ashby, 2000) include: 1) You just read two different explanations of why the Roman Empire fell. What might this difference mean? a) No one knows when it ended, b) It's just a matter of opinion when it ended, c) There was no one single time when it ended, and d) One of the stories must be wrong about when it ended. They were also asked: 2) Is your choice what you really thought? 3) How could we decide when the Empire ended? 4) Are these two dates the only possible times for the end of the Empire? And 5) Do the differences between the stories matter?

Table C1. *Main Categories, Subcategories and Sample Student Answers for the Fall of Rome Task*

Main Category	Subcategory	Student Answers (excerpt)
Factual	1. Semantics only	No participants in this study took this approach.
	2. One story is wrong, the end is known	No participants in this study took this approach.
	3. The end is unknowable	No participants in this study took this approach.
	4. The end is knowable, but contingently unknown	I am not sure about how can we decide (which account is right) because maybe two of them are wrong. Maybe one is true but maybe from people who lived in those times could tell the real story like they could call eye witnesses maybe but I don't think we can be 100% sure about the story (S5).
Multiple Past	5. The end is multiple	No participants in this study took this approach.
Criterial	6. The end is criterial (implicit criterion)	I don't think there is another option (for an ending date). We should examine it actually...(We could find out because) historians have their own methods. It can be looked whether different historians say different things. It was exist in the establishment of Ottoman Empire. Some was saying it is 1299. One historians I don't remember the name was saying it is 1302. But,

		only he says that. According to what he says it I don't know. I don't know the topic that much, so I don't know (S9).
	7. The end is criterial (one explicit criterion)	When I think the concept of the empire, the thing that comes my mind is that people from various nations live all together. In the first story the West ended. The Roman Empire was shown as it ended but many people from different nations and different cultures remain living together in Eastern Empire. That's why I thought the idea of living together with different nations should be disappeared to talk about the collapse of an empire (S1).
	8. The end is criterial (alternative criteria)	So, in my opinion, I think when the capital was captured with when the people of the Empire...Not the Emperor, because the people of the Empire... they... when you capture the city, the nation's when it ended... not the emperor because the nation can improve the culture, and continue, and can teach the subsequent generations to live on. Because you can take the emperor, but the nation will keep going, nation will choose another emperor, it can change... but if you change the nation, it's another empire...(S7).

Note: Main category and subcategory titles are from (Lee, 2001; Lee & Ashby, 2000). Student answers are from this study's participants

APPENDIX J

Historical Reasoning Rubric (Final)

	Claim	Use of Evidence	Source Evaluation	Historical Contextualization	Corroboration
4	Presents a clear and accurate claim that adequately addresses the question.	The evidence is accurate, relevant and sufficient to support the claim & the evidence is accurately explained at least once & explicitly linked to the claim at least once.	Refers to at least 1 author by name or title & notes relevant feature(s) of the primary source (PS). Indicates potential effect of the feature on the information&/or explains the effect &/or uses the feature to further the argument. (at least 2/3)	Historical context (temporal, spatial or social features) is accurate and relevant. The HC is elaborate enough to support and/or situate the argument. HC is proximate to the related argument. A connection/conclusion between the HC and the evidence is explicitly noted.	Uses multiple sources to support the same point at least once & explicitly indicates an appropriate link between the sources & explains the link by noting how they are similar
3	Presents a clear and accurate claim that partially addresses the question.	The evidence is accurate, relevant and sufficient to support the claim. The evidence may be accurately explained at least once or explicitly linked to the claim at least once.	Refers to at least 1 author by name or title & notes relevant feature(s) of the PS. Indicates potential effect of the feature on the information or explains the effect or uses the feature to further the argument. (1/3)	HC is accurate and relevant. The HC is elaborate enough to support and/or situate the argument. HC is proximate to the related argument.	Uses multiple sources to support the same point at least once & explicitly indicates an appropriate link between the sources & notes that they are similar
2	Accurately restates the question or topic without	The evidence is insufficient and may	Refers to at least 1 author by name or title & notes relevant feature(s) of the PS.	HC may have minor inaccuracies and/or be a limited relevance and/or is	Uses multiple sources to support the same point at least once & explicitly

APPENDIXES

	directly stating a claim. May contain minor errors.	contain irrelevant or inaccurate information. The evidence is explained &/or explicitly linked to the main idea at least once. The explanation or link may be inaccurate.	There may be an attempt to note the effect or use it to further the argument. If included, the interpretation undermines the argument or has errors.	not elaborate enough to support and/or situate the argument. HC is proximate to the related argument.	indicates an inappropriate or unclear link between the sources
1	The main idea is difficult to discern, implied or marginally addresses the questions &/or is inconsistent with the evidence in the sources &/or the language makes the intended meaning somewhat unclear	The evidence is insufficient and may contain irrelevant or inaccurate information. The evidence is not explained & not explicitly linked to the claim &/or the evidence is primarily copy-pasted.	Refers to at least 1 author by name or title & notes irrelevant or inaccurate feature(s) of the PS. There may be an attempt to note the effect or use it to further the argument. The interpretation may have errors.	HC is historically inaccurate and/or largely irrelevant and/or the location of the HC is offset from the related argument	Uses multiple sources to support the same point at least once & treats sources separately without explicit corroboration (can look list-like).
0	There is no main idea or the main idea is copy-pasted from the sources or the language makes the main idea incomprehensible.	There is no evidence &/or the evidence is primarily irrelevant	Notes the author without any attempt to assess reliability or fails to note the author or title.	Does not note historical context.	Uses one source for support when multiple are available.

SUMMARY

PROMOTING WRITTEN HISTORICAL REASONING AMONG UNDERGRADUATE L2 STUDENTS

CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This dissertation set out to study the written historical reasoning of L2 undergraduate students in a historical reasoning course. The specific context of this course was a CLIL setting using a cognitive apprenticeship approach. Cognitive apprenticeship is a form of explicit teaching in which teachers first model expert behavior and provide scaffolding for students as they practice before gradually transferring responsibility to students (Collins et al., 1999). The overall purpose of this dissertation was to describe different aspects of students' historical reasoning and study how to promote their written historical reasoning. Teaching the procedural aspects of written historical reasoning was a noted focus. This dissertation addresses the following research question: How do undergraduate students in a cognitive apprenticeship-based CLIL historical reasoning course reason about history in writing and what fosters the written historical reasoning of these students?

In this dissertation, we studied students' written historical reasoning using the framework of van Drie and van Boxtel (2008, 2018) and informed by Monte-Sano (2010)'s work on written historical reasoning among high school students. Much work on written historical reasoning among middle and high school students exists, particularly in students' L1 (Nokes & De La Paz, 2018). This dissertation adds tertiary L2 students to the literature.

This dissertation takes into consideration two additional factors when describing and promoting written historical reasoning. First, this dissertation

considers the impact of students' proficiency in reading and writing in English. Reading in history can be challenging because of the structure and vocabulary inherent in textbook writing and primary sources (Martin, 1991; Wineburg & Martin, 2009). Argumentative writing in history typically requires the interpretation and integration of multiple sources. Novice writers, particularly in an L2 may be challenged by this feature of the genre (Cumming et al., 2016). This is an important factor since it may play a role in written historical reasoning (Nokes, 2011; van Boxtel & van Drie, 2018) and is considered in this dissertation.

The second additional factor is the potential role of epistemic beliefs in history on written historical reasoning, an aspect noted in van Boxtel and van Drie's (2018) model. This dissertation uses the four-part model of epistemic beliefs introduced by Kuhn and colleagues (Kuhn, 2001; Kuhn et al., 2000). Epistemic beliefs can have an impact on academic performance (Kuhn, 2001) and are therefore considered in this dissertation.

The series of studies in this dissertation were conducted with undergraduate L2 students studying in an intensive English program prior to beginning undergraduate courses. Students participated in these studies while enrolled in a historical reasoning course designed by the author of this dissertation. The course incrementally introduced students to concepts in historical reasoning while also introducing them to the procedural knowledge needed to incorporate their historical reasoning into their writing. The course served as a bridge to a series of required undergraduate history courses by apprenticing students into the reasoning and writing expected of them.

CHAPTER 2: UNDERGRADUATE L2 STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE WHEN EVALUATING HISTORICAL SOURCES FOR RELIABILITY

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?

Evaluating primary sources for reliability, an aspect of sourcing, is an important heuristic in historical reasoning (van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008; Wineburg, 1991). The act of reading and reasoning about these sources, however, is complicated by their language and the context in which they are written (Wineburg & Martin, 2009). When reasoning about and writing with primary sources, students tend not to use a sourcing heuristic (Monte-Sano, 2010; Wineburg, 1991). While sourcing is well-studied among proficient and L1 students, the performance of L2 students and the role of their English proficiency is not as well understood.

This study examines the oral and written historical reasoning of undergraduate L2 students when evaluating primary sources for reliability and later 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 DBQs, each of which had one of the primary sources as a source text.

We analyzed students' oral sourcing using a coding scheme that accounted for both the different types of arguments students used to assess the reliability and the overall quality of the students' claim about the primary source's reliability. We also compared students' oral sourcing to their written answer after

assessing the written answers at the claim level only. Finally, we traced students' use of sourcing in their DBQs.

In an analysis of the think aloud protocols and written answers to the source evaluation tasks, as expected, we found that students are able to use historical reasoning (as opposed to ahistorical reasoning) to reason about primary sources at an emerging level of proficiency. Students who demonstrated the most proficient sourcing included an answer with three stages: 1) an *orientation* of the author or source's background relevant to the other stages, 2) an *evaluation* that explains 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 assessment of reliability.

The students in our study appeared to have two sources of difficulty that may have influenced the quality of their oral sourcing. 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 an assessment 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 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 two difficulties described above.

Next, we compared students' written and oral answers to the source evaluation task, demonstrating 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. Finally, we traced students' use of the same primary

sources in their DBQ essays. We found that while students consistently used the historical sources as evidence, they rarely considered reliability.

From this study, we concluded that these L2 students are able to assess 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 & Aglinskas, 2002; Wineburg, 1991). Students' interpretation is not well-elaborated, however, and prone to misunderstanding. 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 use primary sources as evidence when writing source-based essays, they rarely include an evaluation of reliability, which is in line with what others have found (Monte-Sano, 2010; Nokes, 2017). Those evaluations that are included sometimes undermine the argument of the student. Explicit instruction in the stages of a complete source evaluation may assist students in formulating better answers.

CHAPTER 3: HISTORICAL REASONING IN AN UNDERGRADUATE CLIL COURSE:

STUDENTS' PROGRESSION AND THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

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 this chapter we studied a cohort of students in the CLIL historical reasoning course with the purpose of conducting a broader exploration into students' written historical reasoning as a whole and the role of students' English proficiency in their progression in the course. Studies (of largely L1 students) have shown that students are able to include features of historical reasoning in their source-based writing (Monte-Sano, 2010; Nokes, 2017; Nokes et al., 2007). A cognitive apprenticeship model of teaching appears to be particularly effective

in helping students advance such written historical reasoning (De La Paz et al., 2017). These same studies demonstrate, however, that students' performance is often uneven and some aspects (especially historical contextualization) present a substantial challenge. In the population of L2 students included in this study, it is possible that English proficiency may also play a role in students' written historical reasoning due to the complexity of reading and writing about history (e.g.) (Cumming et al., 2018; Martin, 1991).

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). This assessment was chosen because it adheres closely to the reading and writing expected of students in the course, and would therefore provide relevant information.

We also collected three DBQs written by students at different points in the course, which we analyzed using an analytical rubric designed for this study. This rubric, which is 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 we 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 are able to incorporate features of historical reasoning in their source-based writing and that their written historical reasoning improves during the course, which is in line with our expectations.

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 of this study is that students' English proficiency level did not predict either their reasoning or changes in their performance during the course. 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.

CHAPTER 4: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EPISTEMIC BELIEFS IN HISTORY AND WRITTEN HISTORICAL REASONING

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

This descriptive study explored an aspect that may affect students' written historical reasoning, their epistemic beliefs about history. Epistemic beliefs may play a role in students' historical reasoning by affecting how students approach multiple sources (Maggioni et al., 2010) and justify knowledge (Greene & Yu, 2014), making it an important consideration when designing instruction. A lack of research that directly measures this role (see, for example Reisman, 2012a) makes it difficult to draw conclusions.

This study investigated undergraduate students' epistemic beliefs in history and explored 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 historical reasoning course participated in this study.

Since epistemic beliefs may be highly contextual and difficult to measure (Chinn et al., 2011), this study adhered to the recommendation to employ a mixed-methods approach (Mason, 2016). Students' expressed epistemic beliefs in history were measured through a discipline-specific survey (Stoel et al., 2017). The survey measured three aspects of students' beliefs: beliefs about the nature of knowing, those regarding the nature of knowledge, and beliefs about historical methodology. Students' epistemic beliefs in history, as measured by the survey, were then compared to their performance when writing a source-based historical argument. Students' written historical reasoning was assessed using the same five-part rubric developed for the study described in chapter three. 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 results 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 knowledge and nature of knowing survey scales. This finding partially confirms the hypothesis that students with more nuanced epistemic beliefs in history would perform better in source-based writing.

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. This finding points to the conclusions that this discipline-specific survey may be an appropriate measure of epistemic beliefs and history and that the second-order concept accounts may be related to epistemic beliefs.

CHAPTER 5: HISTORICAL CONTEXTUALIZATION IN STUDENTS' WRITING

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 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 source-based writing. This intervention took place in the context of the historical reasoning course described in chapters 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 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.

Our results 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 and the results of the study in chapter 3. In contrast to our expectations, 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 is 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.

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 is not sufficiently sensitive to detect historical contextualization, and a revised rubric has been proposed.

This study provides further evidence that a cognitive apprenticeship model is effective in teaching historical reasoning to undergraduate L2 students. The finding that students in the experimental condition wrote better claims may point to the effectiveness of student-led dialogue as a component of independent practice in this model. This possibility, however, requires further study. 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.

CHAPTER 6: GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

This dissertation had two primary aims: studying the historical reasoning of a population of L2 undergraduate students in the context of a CLIL historical reasoning course and fostering the written historical reasoning of these students by investigating the use of a cognitive apprenticeship approach. In order to study this complex context, we used a series of descriptive studies to explicate students' performance in written historical reasoning and the difficulties they experienced. These studies culminated in a quasi-experimental study that tested this pedagogical approach. As a part of the dissertation, we produced an analytical rubric that can be used to measure written historical reasoning in both research and classroom contexts.

Based on these studies, this dissertation draws several conclusions about the written historical reasoning of L2 undergraduate students in a CLIL context. First, 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. The finding that students can reason historically in writing is consistent with others (McCarthy Young & Leinhardt, 1998; Monte-Sano, 2010; Nokes, 2017; van Drie et al., 2015). Students' performance in different aspects of historical reasoning was uneven. Claim and the use of evidence started with higher scores compared to the features sourcing, corroboration and contextualization. Another conclusion from this dissertation is that students demonstrated significant change in each area of written historical reasoning. These findings are consistent with others who have studied middle and high school students' historical reasoning (De La Paz, 2005; De La Paz et al., 2017; van Drie et al., 2015).

Based on the results of chapter four, we conclude that students' epistemic beliefs in history regarding the use of historical methodology is related to students' written historical reasoning. We did not, however, find a similar

relationship between students' writing and their beliefs about the nature of knowing and knowledge in history. These findings somewhat support those of Kuhn (2001) and (indirectly) Barzilai and Eshet-Alkalai (2015) but raise questions about the nature of the relationship.

This dissertation also draws conclusions about the role of students' reading and writing proficiency in English in historical reasoning. Wineburg and Martin (2009) note that primary source comprehension can be complicated by the unfamiliar vocabulary, structures and context. Similarly, in chapter two we found that comprehension errors when reading primary sources often resulted in interpretation errors. Importantly, in chapter three we concluded that students at differing levels of reading and writing proficiency (albeit all at a B2 CEFR level) were able to proceed similarly in the course.

A final major conclusion was that the cognitive apprenticeship model of instruction appears to have worked well with this group of L2 students. This conclusion furthers the research that has been conducted with explicit instruction, particularly cognitive apprenticeship, in the middle and high school contexts (De La Paz et al., 2014; De La Paz et al., 2017; Monte-Sano, 2011; Nokes et al., 2007). This is a major contribution to the literature since it successfully combines the use of a CLIL context with cognitive apprenticeship.

These findings are limited since the studies were conducted at a single university during one historical reasoning course. Research that compares the CLIL/cognitive apprenticeship combination with other approaches, along with students of more diverse language proficiencies and backgrounds is needed to create more generalizable conclusions.

This dissertation adds several implications for practice that can, and have been, adopted. Since resources are not infinite, the goals of any historical reasoning course must be at the forefront of instructional decisions. If language is a primary goal, then form-focused instruction and explicit instruction in the language of procedural aspects of writing may play a central role. In contrast, if

historical reasoning is dominant, then sources may need to be modified or appropriately scaffolded in order to ensure an appropriate interpretation.

SAMENVATTING

BEVORDEREN VAN SCHRIFTELIJK HISTORISCH REDENEREN IN DE TWEEDE TAAL BIJ BACHELOR STUDENTEN

HOOFDSTUK 1: ALGEMENE INTRODUCTIE

Dit promotieonderzoek is opgezet om het schriftelijk historisch redeneren van bachelor studenten in een tweede taal tijdens een cursus historisch redeneren te bestuderen. Deze cursus werd gegeven in een CLIL-context (Content and Language Integrated Learning, waarbij inhoud en taal geïntegreerd worden aangeboden), waarin ook een ‘cognitive apprenticeship’ aanpak gebruikt werd. ‘Cognitive apprenticeship’ is een vorm van expliciet onderwijs, waarbij docenten eerst expertgedrag modelleren, vervolgens ondersteuning bieden als studenten zelf oefenen, om zo uiteindelijk de verantwoordelijkheid geleidelijk naar de studenten over te dragen (Collins et al., 1999). Het overkoepelende doel van dit onderzoek was om verschillende aspecten van het historisch redeneren van studenten te beschrijven en om te onderzoeken hoe het historisch redeneren in geschreven tekst verbeterd kan worden. Het onderwijzen van procedurele aspecten van schriftelijk historisch redeneren was daarbij een belangrijke focus. In dit proefschrift staat de volgende onderzoeksvraag centraal: Hoe redeneren bachelor studenten binnen een cursus historisch redeneren gebaseerd op een ‘cognitive apprenticeship’- CLIL benadering over geschiedenis en wat bevordert het schriftelijk historisch redeneren van deze studenten?

In dit onderzoek hebben we het schriftelijk historisch redeneren van studenten bestudeerd. We hebben daarvoor gebruik gemaakt van het raamwerk van Van Drie en Van Boxtel (2008; 2018) en van Monte-Sano’s werk (2010) over schriftelijk historisch redeneren bij leerlingen in het voortgezet onderwijs. Er is

veel onderzoek gedaan naar schriftelijk historisch redeneren bij leerlingen in het voortgezet onderwijs, vooral in de eerste taal van de leerling (Nokes & De La Paz, 2018). Dit onderzoek voegt daaraan toe dat doordat het gaat om tweede-taalverwerwers en het gericht is op het hoger onderwijs.

Daarnaast worden in de onderzoeken in dit proefschrift twee andere elementen meegenomen in het beschrijven en het bevorderen van schriftelijk historisch redeneren. Ten eerste, de invloed van de lees- en schrijfvaardigheid in de tweede taal, in dit geval het Engels. Lezen bij geschiedenis kan uitdagend zijn vanwege de structuur en het vocabulaire dat gebruikt wordt in schoolboeken geschiedenis en in primaire bronnen (Martin, 1991; Wineburg & Martin, 2009). Het schrijven van argumentatieve teksten bij geschiedenis behelst de interpretatie en integratie van meerdere historische bronnen. Beginnende schrijvers, vooral in een tweede taal, kunnen bij dit tekstgenre moeilijkheden ondervinden (Cumming et al., 2016). Omdat deze factor een belangrijke rol kan spelen in het schriftelijk historisch redeneren (Nokes, 2011; van Boxtel & van Drie, 2018), nemen we deze factor mee.

Het tweede element dat dit proefschrift toevoegt aan de bestaande literatuur is de mogelijke rol van epistemologische opvattingen over geschiedenis bij het schriftelijk historisch redeneren. Dit aspect wordt ook genoemd in het raamwerk voor historisch redeneren van Van Boxtel en Van Drie (2018). In dit proefschrift maken we gebruik van het vierdelig model van epistemologische opvattingen, zoals geïntroduceerd door Kuhn en collega's (Kuhn, 2001; Kuhn et al. 2000). Epistemologische opvattingen kunnen van invloed zijn op de leerprestaties (Kuhn, 2001) en worden daarom in dit onderzoek meegenomen.

De verschillende studies in dit proefschrift zijn uitgevoerd met Turkse bachelor studenten met Engels als tweede taal (T2), die deelnamen aan een Engels taalprogramma voorafgaand aan de start van hun bachelor. Studenten namen binnen dit programma deel aan een cursus historisch redeneren, die ontworpen was door de auteur van dit proefschrift. In de cursus worden

belangrijke concepten van historisch redeneren stapsgewijs geïntroduceerd, terwijl er daarnaast aandacht is voor de procedurele kennis die nodig is om historisch redeneren te verwerken in teksten. De cursus functioneert als een brug naar een reeks van verplichte bachelor cursussen over geschiedenis. Studenten ontwikkelen redeneer- en schrijfvaardigheden die voor deze cursussen van belang zijn.

HOOFDSTUK 2: PRESTATIES VAN TWEDE TAAL BACHELOR STUDENTEN IN HET EVALUEREN VAN HISTORISCHE BRONNEN OP BETROUWBAARHEID

Onderzoeksvraag 1: In hoeverre onderbouwen T2-studenten hun beweringen met argumenten als ze mondeling en schriftelijk redeneren over de betrouwbaarheid van een historische bron? Welke verschillen kunnen worden toegeschreven aan taalvaardigheid?

Het evalueren van primaire bronnen op betrouwbaarheid, een aspect van bronevaluatie is een belangrijke heuristiek bij historisch redeneren (van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008; Wineburg, 1991). Het lezen en redeneren over bronnen is complex vanwege de taal en de context waarin de bron geschreven is (Wineburg & Martin, 2009). Als studenten redeneren en schrijven met primaire bronnen, hebben ze de neiging om de heuristiek bronevaluatie niet te gebruiken (Monte-Sano, 2010; Wineburg, 1991). Het beoordelen van bronnen op betrouwbaarheid is goed onderzocht bij leerlingen die dit in hun eerste taal doen. Er is nog weinig kennis over hoe tweede-taalverwervers dit doen en wat daarbij de rol is van hun taalvaardigheid in de tweede taal, het Engels.

In deze studie onderzochten we het mondeling en schriftelijk historisch redeneren van T2 bachelor studenten, als zij primaire bronnen op betrouwbaarheid evalueren en vervolgens een tekst schrijven op basis van deze bronnen. Aan deze studie namen elf bachelor studenten deel, die een intensief taalprogramma Engels volgden. Ze maakten hardop denkend drie taken gericht

op de evaluatie van primaire bronnen. Deze taken werden gebaseerd op het format ‘Historical Assessment of Thinking (Wineburg et al., 2012) en waren onderdeel van de cursus historisch redeneren. We verzamelden ook hun schriftelijk antwoorden op deze drie taken en de antwoorden op drie ‘Document-Based Questions’ (DBQ’s), waarin steeds één van de primaire bronnen gebruikt werd.

We analyseerden de mondelinge bronevaluatie van studenten met behulp van een codeerschema waarin zowel aandacht was voor verschillende typen argumenten die gebruikt konden worden om de betrouwbaarheid te bepalen, als voor de algemene kwaliteit van de argumentatie ten aanzien van de betrouwbaarheid van de primaire bron. We hebben de mondelinge bronevaluatie vergeleken met hun schriftelijke antwoorden. De schriftelijke antwoorden werden beoordeeld op de kwaliteit van de argumentatie. Tot slot hebben we gekeken hoe studenten bronevaluatie gebruikten in hun DBQ’s.

Bij een analyse van de hardopdenkprotocollen en schriftelijke antwoorden op de bronevaluatietaken vonden we, zoals verwacht, dat studenten in staat waren om historisch te redeneren (in tegenstelling tot ahistorisch redeneren) over primaire bronnen op een beginnend niveau. De antwoorden van studenten die bronevaluatie lieten zien op het hoogste niveau, omvatten drie fasen: 1) een *oriëntatie* op de achtergrond van de auteur of de bron zelf die relevant is voor de andere fasen, 2) een *evaluatie* waarin uitgelegd wordt hoe de bron of de achtergrond van de auteur de betrouwbaarheid van de bron beïnvloedt, en 3) een fase van *deductie*, waarin de student een oordeel geeft over de betrouwbaarheid.

De studenten in onze studie bleken tegen twee moeilijkheden aan te lopen die mogelijk van invloed waren op de kwaliteit van hun mondelinge bronevaluatie. Ten eerste hadden studenten moeite om een volledig antwoord te geven wanneer ze de evaluatiefase van hun antwoord hadden overgeslagen. Deze antwoorden toonden een beginnend niveau van redeneren;

de belangrijke aspecten van de achtergrond van de auteur werden correct benoemd en er werd een oordeel over de betrouwbaarheid van de bron gegeven, maar in het antwoord ontbrak een redenering waarin het verband tussen deze twee elementen werd gelegd. De tweede moeilijkheid was dat sommige studenten geen rekening hielden met de historische context, wat leidde tot interpretatiefouten. Deze problemen kunnen gedeeltelijk voortkomen uit taalproblemen die met begrijpend lezen te maken hebben, vooral omdat de taak zonder ondersteuning van een docent gemaakt werd. Alle studenten die grote fouten maakten bij het begrijpen van de tekst bij de derde bronevaluatietaak, lieten ook ten minste één van de twee hierboven beschreven moeilijkheden zien.

Vervolgens hebben we de schriftelijke en mondelinge antwoorden van de studenten op de bronevaluatietaak vergeleken. Hieruit bleek dat de meeste studenten in beide gevallen ongeveer gelijk scoorden, maar dat de schriftelijke antwoorden over het algemeen minder rijk aan details waren. Vier van de tien studenten die hoog scoorden bij hun mondelinge antwoord, zoals hierboven beschreven, hadden een lagere score in hun schriftelijke antwoord. Ten slotte hebben we getraceerd hoe studenten de primaire bronnen in hun DBQ-teksten gebruikten. We ontdekten dat hoewel studenten consequent de historische bronnen als bewijs gebruikten, ze zelden iets schreven over de betrouwbaarheid van de bron.

Uit dit onderzoek kunnen we concluderen dat deze T2-studenten als ze werken aan een bronevaluatietaak in staat zijn om de betrouwbaarheid van primaire bronnen te beoordelen op beginnend vaardigheidsniveau. Deze bevinding is in overeenstemming met onderzoeken onder studenten die bekwaam zijn in het Engels (Britt & Aglinskas, 2002; Wineburg, 1991). De interpretatie van de studenten was echter niet goed uitgewerkt en bevatte soms onjuist geïnterpreteerde onderdelen. T2-studenten zouden baat kunnen hebben bij ondersteuning door docenten en het aanpassen van de primaire bronnen (Wineburg & Martin, 2009), om ervoor te zorgen dat de tekst goed begrepen

wordt. We vonden ook dat hoewel studenten primaire bronnen als bewijs gebruikten bij het schrijven van een op bronnen gebaseerde tekst, deze zelden een evaluatie van de betrouwbaarheid bevatte. Dit is in overeenstemming met wat anderen hebben gevonden (Monte-Sano, 2010; Nokes, 2017). Soms werden wel evaluaties van bronnen gegeven, maar deze ondermijnden het argument dat de student probeerde te maken. Expliciete instructie tijdens de verschillende fasen van een complete evaluatie van bronnen, zou studenten kunnen helpen bij het formuleren van betere antwoorden.

HOOFDSTUK 3: HISTORISCH REDENEREN IN EEN BACHELOR CLIL-CURSUS:

VOORUITGANG VAN STUDENTEN EN DE ROL VAN TAALVAARDIGHEID

Onderzoeksvraag 2: Verbetert het historisch redeneren in het schrijven van T2-studenten gedurende een CLIL-cursus historisch redeneren en wordt het niveau en de verbetering in historisch redeneren beïnvloed door lees- en schrijfvaardigheid?

In dit hoofdstuk hebben we een cohort studenten bestudeerd in een CLIL cursus historisch redeneren met als doel een bredere verkenning van het schriftelijk historisch redeneren als geheel en zicht krijgen op de invloed van de Engels taalvaardigheid van de studenten op hun voortgang in de cursus. Studies (grotendeels van T1-studenten) hebben aangetoond dat studenten in staat zijn om elementen van historisch redeneren te verwerken bij het schrijven van een op bronnen gebaseerde tekst (Monte-Sano, 2010; Nokes, 2017; Nokes et al., 2007). De ‘cognitive apprenticeship’ aanpak lijkt bijzonder effectief te zijn om studenten te helpen om vooruitgang te boeken in het schriftelijk historisch redeneren (De La Paz et al., 2017). Dezelfde onderzoeken tonen echter aan dat de prestaties van studenten vaak ongelijk zijn en dat sommige aspecten (vooral historisch contextualiseren) een ware uitdaging voor studenten zijn. In de populatie van T2-studenten in deze studie is het mogelijk dat de taalvaardigheid Engels ook een rol

speelt bij het schriftelijk historisch redeneren vanwege de complexiteit van lezen en schrijven bij geschiedenis (bijv. Cumming et al., 2018; Martin, 1991).

Vijfenvijftig bachelor T2-studenten op B2-niveau (CEFR) namen aan deze beschrijvende studie naar schrijven op basis van historische bronnen deel. Voorafgaand aan de instructie, hebben we de taalvaardigheid Engels van de studenten gemeten door middel van een korte, geïntegreerde lees- en schrijftaak. Deze taak is gebaseerd op een taak van Weigle en collega's (Weigle, 2004; Weigle et al., 2013). We hebben voor deze taak gekozen omdat deze taak nauw aansluit bij het lezen en schrijven dat van studenten in de cursus verwacht wordt.

We hebben ook drie DBQ's verzameld die door studenten op verschillende momenten in de cursus gemaakt zijn. Deze hebben we geanalyseerd met behulp van een analytische rubric, die voor deze studie ontworpen is. Deze rubric, gebaseerd op het werk van Monte-Sano en De La Paz (2012), meet de aspecten van historisch redeneren die in de cursus worden onderwezen: bewering, bewijs, bronevaluatie, historisch contextualiseren en corroboratie (het vergelijken van verschillende bronnen met als doel te kijken of ze vergelijkbare informatie geven).

Studenten vertoonden aanvankelijk een lage kwaliteit historisch redeneren, zoals blijkt uit hun eerste DBQ-scores. Met name bronevaluatie en historisch contextualiseren waren ofwel afwezig of gebrekkig in de eerste DBQ en bij de laatste DBQ scoorden de studenten op deze twee elementen het laagst. Echter, de scores van de studenten werden tussen de eerste en derde DBQ significant beter, op alle elementen van de analyse. De elementen bewering, bewijs en vergelijking bronnen kwamen in de laatste DBQ het meest in de buurt van adequaat historisch redeneren. Op basis van deze resultaten concludeerden we dat de T2-studenten in deze cursus in staat zijn om aspecten van historisch redeneren te gebruiken in op bronnen gebaseerde schrijfoopdrachten en dat hun schriftelijk historisch redeneren verbetert gedurende de cursus. Deze uitkomsten zijn in lijn met onze verwachtingen vooraf.

Ten aanzien van de rol van de taalvaardigheid Engels vonden we dat de studenten relatief lage scores hadden op zowel lezen als schrijven, wat overeenkomt met hun B2-niveau van kennis van het Engels. Studenten konden gedeeltelijk aan de criteria voldoen voor de toegewezen taken, maar er werden fouten gemaakt. Een latente groeicurve-analyse is gebruikt om zicht te krijgen op het effect van de Engelse taalvaardigheid op het schrijven op basis van bronnen en op de veranderingen in redeneren gedurende de cursus. Een belangrijke bevinding is dat de beheersing van de Engelse taal van studenten geen voorspeller was voor de kwaliteit van historisch redeneren of de veranderingen in prestaties gedurende de cursus. Studenten met verschillende niveaus van Engelse taalvaardigheid verbeterden op dezelfde manier, wat het idee ondersteunt dat de ‘cognitive apprenticeship’ aanpak ook effectief is in een T2 CLIL-context.

HOOFDSTUK 4: DE RELATIE TUSSEN EPISTEMOLOGISCHE OPVATTINGEN OVER GESCHIEDENIS EN GESCHREVEN HISTORISCH REDENEREN

Onderzoeksvraag 3: Hoe ziet het historisch redeneren van studenten met verschillende epistemologische opvattingen eruit wanneer ze een argumentatieve tekst schrijven?

In dit beschrijvende onderzoek werd een factor onderzocht die van invloed kan zijn op het schriftelijk historisch redeneren van studenten, namelijk hun epistemologische opvattingen over geschiedenis. Epistemologische opvattingen kunnen een rol spelen in het historisch redeneren van studenten, omdat ze invloed kunnen hebben op de omgang met meerdere bronnen (Maggioni et al., 2010) en het rechtvaardigen van kennis (Greene & Yu, 2014). Daarom zijn deze opvattingen ook belangrijk voor het ontwerpen van onderwijs. Omdat er geen onderzoek is waarin deze rol direct wordt gemeten (zie bijvoorbeeld Reisman, 2012a) is het moeilijk om conclusies te trekken.

In deze studie onderzochten we de epistemologische opvattingen over geschiedenis van bachelor studenten en de relatie tussen die opvattingen en hun prestaties in schriftelijk historisch redeneren na het voltooien van een cursus historisch redeneren. Aan deze studie namen tweeënzestig studenten (B2 CEFR-niveau) deel, die waren ingeschreven voor de cursus historisch redeneren.

Omdat epistemologische opvattingen contextueel bepaald zijn en moeilijk te meten (Chinn et al., 2011), volgden we in deze studie de aanbeveling om een ‘mixed-method’ benadering te gebruiken (Mason, 2016). De epistemologische opvattingen over geschiedenis werden gemeten door middel van een discipline-specifieke vragenlijst (Stoel et al., 2017). In de vragenlijst werden drie aspecten gemeten: opvattingen over de aard van kennisconstructie bij geschiedenis, over de aard van historische kennis, en over de historische methode (er zijn criteria en procedures om tot historische kennis te komen). De epistemologische opvattingen over geschiedenis van studenten zoals gemeten door de vragenlijst, werden vervolgens vergeleken met hun prestaties bij een op bronnen gebaseerde argumentatieve schrijftaak. Het historisch redeneren van studenten werd beoordeeld met behulp van dezelfde vijfdelige rubric die ontwikkeld was voor de studie beschreven in hoofdstuk 3. Ten slotte nam een subset van tien studenten deel aan een taakgebaseerd interview, met als doel de meer impliciete epistemologische opvattingen te onderzoeken die gerelateerd zijn aan het tweede orde concept ‘historisch verslag’ (‘account’).

De resultaten van deze studie geven aan dat er een significant positief verband was tussen de prestaties van studenten in hun schriftelijk historisch redeneren en hun epistemologische opvattingen met betrekking tot de historische methode, maar niet voor de aard van historische kennis en de aard van kennisconstructie. Deze bevinding bevestigt gedeeltelijk de hypothese dat studenten met meer genuanceerde epistemologische opvattingen over geschiedenis beter zouden presteren bij het schrijven op basis van bronnen.

De antwoorden die studenten gaven in het taakgebaseerde interview kwamen voor de meesten van hen overeen met de epistemologische opvattingen zoals die uit de vragenlijst naar voren kwamen. Maar, er bleek minder overeenstemming tussen de interviews en het historisch redeneren in de schrijftaak te zijn. Deze bevinding brengt ons tot de conclusie dat de discipline-specifieke vragenlijst een geschikt instrument kan zijn om epistemologische opvattingen over geschiedenis te meten en dat begrip van het tweede-orde concept 'account' gerelateerd is aan epistemologische opvattingen.

HOOFDSTUK 5: HISTORISCH CONTEXTUALISEREN IN HET SCHRIJVEN VAN STUDENTEN

Onderzoeksvraag 4: Hoe presteren bachelor studenten op aspecten van historisch redeneren (bewering, bewijs, bronevaluatie, corroboratie en historisch contextualiseren) in een op bronnen gebaseerde schrijftaak voor en na deelname aan een cursus met expliciete instructie in historisch redeneren?

Onderzoeksvraag 5: Wat is het effect van expliciete instructie in historisch contextualiseren tijdens een cursus historisch redeneren op het schrijven van een op bronnen gebaseerde tekst?

In de eerste twee studies ontdekten we dat historisch contextualiseren voor studenten in deze cursus historisch redeneren lastig was. Ook andere studies laten zien dat historisch contextualiseren uitdagend is voor studenten en dat deze vaardigheid minder snel lijkt te verbeteren na instructie (Nokes et al., 2007; Reisman, 2012a). Daarom hebben we in deze laatste studie een interventie ontwikkeld en getest om historisch contextualiseren in een op bronnen gebaseerde schrijftaak te verbeteren. Deze interventie vond plaats in het kader van de cursus historisch redeneren, beschreven in de hoofdstukken 2, 3 en 4. De studie werd uitgevoerd als een quasi-experimenteel onderzoek met 140 studenten ($N_{\text{exp}} = 60$, $N_{\text{cont}} = 80$).

Studenten in beide condities namen deel aan de cursus historisch redeneren, gebaseerd op een ‘cognitive apprenticeship’ aanpak. Studenten in de controleconditie deden mee aan een versie zonder focus op historisch contextualiseren, terwijl studenten in de experimentele conditie expliciete instructie over historisch contextualiseren ontvingen. In de experimentele conditie gaven docenten expliciete instructie over de achtergrondkennis die nodig is om te contextualiseren door middel van discussie over concrete casussen en een activiteit voor het sorteren van citaten. Studenten leerden over de procedurele kennis die nodig is om historische context te verwerken in een op bronnen gebaseerde tekst, door middel van het bestuderen van tekstmodellen en het oefenen met taalmodellen.

De resultaten gaven aan dat studenten in zowel de controle als de experimentele conditie aanzienlijke verbetering vertoonden in het schriftelijk historisch redeneren, op alle onderzochte elementen. Dit kwam overeen met onze verwachtingen en ook met de resultaten van de studie in hoofdstuk 3. Echter, in tegenstelling tot onze verwachtingen, scoorden studenten in de experimentele conditie, in vergelijking met de controle conditie, significant hoger op de categorie bewering, maar niet op de categorie historisch contextualiseren. Dit was vooral onverwacht omdat studenten in beide condities dezelfde expliciete instructie ontvingen over de categorie bewering en alleen studenten in de experimentele conditie expliciete instructie ontvingen over historisch contextualiseren.

Een aanvullende analyse naar het contextualiseren van studenten liet zien dat studenten in beide condities vergelijkbare niveaus van relevante achtergrondkennis hadden. Ook vonden we vergelijkbare hoeveelheden historische context in de teksten. In de experimentele conditie bleken studenten echter minder geneigd om deze historische context los van het betreffende argument te plaatsen. De relatie met het argument was ook een aspect dat in de instructie naar voren kwam. In overeenstemming met deze instructie, maakten ze

vaker een expliciete verbinding met het argument of trokken een conclusie op basis van de contextualisatie. Deze verschillen lijken er op te wijzen dat de rubric die gebruikt werd om de teksten van de studenten te analyseren niet gevoelig genoeg was om historisch contextualiseren goed te detecteren. Daarom stellen we een aangepaste versie van de rubric voor.

Deze studie liet zien dat een ‘cognitive apprenticeship’ aanpak effectief is voor het onderwijzen van historisch redeneren aan bachelor T2-studenten. De bevinding dat studenten in de experimentele conditie betere beweringen schreven, zou kunnen wijzen op de effectiviteit van dialoog tussen studenten als onderdeel van het zelfstandig oefenen binnen deze conditie. Dit vereist echter nader onderzoek. Deze studie liet ook het belang en de moeilijkheid van het bevorderen van historisch contextualiseren in teksten zien. Door een nadere analyse van het contextualiseren in teksten van studenten, kon in deze studie specifieke procedurele kennis geïdentificeerd worden die onderdeel kan zijn van toekomstige interventies.

HOOFDSTUK 6: ALGEMENE CONCLUSIES EN DISCUSSIE

Dit proefschrift kende twee hoofddoelen: het bestuderen van het historisch redeneren van T2 bachelor studenten in de context van een CLIL-cursus historisch redeneren en het bevorderen van het schriftelijk historisch redeneren van deze studenten door het gebruik van een ‘cognitive apprenticeship’ aanpak. Om deze complexe context te bestuderen, hebben we gebruik gemaakt van een reeks beschrijvende onderzoeken om zicht te krijgen op de prestaties in geschreven historisch redeneren, als ook op de moeilijkheden die zij daarbij ondervonden. Deze onderzoeken mondden uit in een quasi-experimenteel onderzoek waarin deze didactische benadering getest werd. Als onderdeel van het onderzoek is een rubric ontwikkeld die kan worden gebruikt om geschreven historisch redeneren meten, zowel in onderzoek als in onderwijscontexten.

Op basis van de studies beschreven in dit proefschrift kunnen verschillende conclusies getrokken worden ten aanzien van het schriftelijk historisch redeneren in een CLIL-context van T2 bachelor studenten. Ten eerste kunnen we concluderen dat deze specifieke groep studenten na het voltooien van de cursus historisch redeneren op een beginnend niveau historisch redeneren in een op bronnen gebaseerde schrijftaak. Deze bevinding is consistent met wat anderen gevonden hebben (McCarthy Young & Leinhardt, 1998; Monte-Sano, 2010; Nokes, 2017; van Drie et al., 2015). De prestaties van de studenten op de verschillende aspecten van historisch redeneren waren echter verschillend. Leerlingen scoorden hoger op het formuleren van bewering het gebruik van bewijs dan op bronevaluatie, corroboratie en historisch contextualiseren. Een andere conclusie van dit proefschrift is dat studenten een significante verbetering lieten zien op elk aspect van historisch redeneren. Deze bevindingen zijn consistent met onderzoeken waarin het historisch redeneren van leerlingen in het voortgezet onderwijs is bestudeerd (De La Paz, 2005; De La Paz et al., 2017; van Drie et al., 2015).

Op basis van de resultaten van hoofdstuk 4 concluderen we dat de epistemologische opvattingen over geschiedenis van studenten, en met name opvattingen over het gebruik van de historische methode, gerelateerd zijn aan de kwaliteit van het historisch redeneren in geschreven teksten. We hebben echter geen vergelijkbare relatie gevonden tussen het historisch redeneren in teksten en opvattingen over de aard van kennisconstructie en historische kennis. Deze bevindingen ondersteunen enigszins de resultaten gevonden door Kuhn (2001) en (indirect) Barzilai en Eshet-Alkalai (2015), maar roepen ook vragen op over de aard van de relatie.

Op basis van het onderzoek kunnen we ook conclusies trekken over de rol van de lees- en schrijfvaardigheid in het Engels bij historisch redeneren. Wineburg en Martin (2009) merkten op dat het begrijpen van primaire bronnen gecompliceerd wordt door onbekende woorden, structuren en context. Zo

ontdekten we in hoofdstuk 2 dat fouten in het begrijpen van primaire bronnen vaak resulteerden in interpretatiefouten. Belangrijk is dat we in hoofdstuk 3 concludeerden dat studenten met verschillende niveaus van lees- en schrijfvaardigheid (zij het allemaal op een B2 ERK-niveau) op een zelfde wijze vooruit gingen tijdens de cursus.

Een laatste belangrijke conclusie is dat de ‘cognitive apprenticeship’ aanpak binnen de cursus goed gewerkt heeft bij deze groep T2-studenten. Deze conclusie is een waardevolle aanvulling op het onderzoek dat is uitgevoerd met expliciet instructie, met name met de ‘cognitive apprenticeship’ aanpak in het voortgezet onderwijs (De La Paz et al., 2014; De La Paz et al., 2017; Monte-Sano, 2011; Nokes et al., 2007). Onze bevindingen zijn tevens een belangrijke bijdrage aan de literatuur, omdat de combinatie van een CLIL-context met de ‘cognitive apprenticeship’ aanpak succesvol bleek.

De beperking van deze bevindingen is dat de onderzoeken bij één enkele universiteit zijn uitgevoerd en bij één cursus historisch redeneren. Om meer generaliseerbare conclusies te kunnen trekken is meer onderzoek nodig dat de combinatie CLIL en ‘cognitive apprenticeship’ vergelijkt met andere benaderingen en bij studenten met meer uiteenlopende taalvaardigheid en achtergronden.

Vanuit dit proefschrift kunnen een aantal implicaties voor de onderwijspraktijk benoemd worden, waarvan sommige al in de praktijk gebracht zijn. Omdat tijd en middelen beperkt zijn, moeten bij beslissingen over de inrichting van het onderwijs de doelen van de historisch redeneren cursus voorop staan. Als taal een primair doel is, dan kunnen instructie gericht op vorm en expliciete instructie gericht op de taal van de procedurele aspecten van het schrijven een centrale rol spelen. Als het doel van historisch redeneren het meest belangrijk is, dan dienen bronnen aangepast te worden of dient er passende ondersteuning geboden te worden om een juiste interpretatie van de bronnen te bewerkstelligen.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

CHAPTERS IN THIS DISSERTATION AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF CO-AUTHORS

Chapter 2 is based on:

Sendur, K.A., van Boxtel, C. & van Drie, J.P. (2021). Undergraduate L2 students' performance when evaluating historical sources for reliability. *English for Specific Purposes, 61, 17-31.*

Contributions:

Kristin Sendur reviewed the literature, designed the course, collected the data, designed the coding scheme, and wrote the manuscript. Kristin Sendur analyzed the data and Carla van Boxtel contributed to establishing inter-rater reliability. Carla van Boxtel and Jannet van Drie supervised Kristin Sendur, gave feedback on the design of the study, the coding scheme, and the manuscript.

Chapter 3 is based on:

Sendur, K.A., van Drie, J.P., van Boxtel, C. & Kan, K.J. (2020). Historical reasoning in an Undergraduate CLIL course: Students' progression and the role of English proficiency. *International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education, 1-17.*

Contributions:

Kristin Sendur reviewed the literature, designed the analytical rubric, designed and scored the English proficiency measure, collected the data, and wrote the manuscript. Kristin Sendur analyzed the writing data and Jannet van Drie contributed to establishing inter-rater reliability. Kees-Jan Kan conducted the latent curve analysis. Kristin Sendur, assisted by Jannet van Drie and Carla van

Boxtel, conducted the remaining statistical analysis. Carla van Boxtel and Jannet van Drie supervised Kristin Sendur, gave feedback on the design of the study, the coding scheme, and the manuscript.

Chapter 4 is based on:

Sendur, K. A., van Drie, J. P., and van Boxtel, C. (submitted). Epistemic beliefs and written historical reasoning: Exploring their relationship. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Contributions:

Kristin Sendur reviewed the literature, simplified the survey, collected the data and wrote the manuscript. Kristin Sendur analyzed the discrepant task interview data and Jannet van Drie contributed to establishing inter-rater reliability. Kristin Sendur, assisted by Jannet van Drie and Carla van Boxtel, conducted the remaining statistical analysis. Carla van Boxtel and Jannet van Drie supervised Kristin Sendur, and gave feedback on the design of the study and the manuscript.

Chapter 5 is based on:

Sendur, K. A., van Drie, J., & van Boxtel, C. (submitted). Historical contextualization in students' writing. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Contributions:

Kristin Sendur reviewed the literature, redesigned the course, collected data, and wrote the manuscript. Kristin Sendur analyzed the writing data and Jannet van Drie contributed to establishing inter-rater reliability. Kristin Sendur, assisted by Jannet van Drie and Carla van Boxtel, conducted the remaining statistical analysis. Carla van Boxtel and Jannet van Drie supervised Kristin Sendur, and gave feedback on the design of the study and the manuscript.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Kristin Sendur (1979) studied Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology at Bryn Mawr College in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. She also minored in education, focusing on museum education. She graduated with a bachelors degree in 2002. Between 2002 and 2006 she taught middle and high school history at public and private schools in Springfield, Virginia and Alexandria, Virginia. Between 2006 and 2007 she studied Secondary History Education at Boston College in Boston, Massachusetts. Her masters thesis focused on teaching multi-perspectivity in American history.

In 2007, Kristin joined the Writing Center at Sabanci University in Istanbul, Turkey. She developed new Writing Center programming for L2 students studying in the University's intensive English program. She continued in Sabanci University's Academic Communication program when it was formed in 2014. In this role, she provides pedagogical training for new graduate students who assist in teaching courses. She also designs courses that promote historical reasoning and writing, which was the starting point for this dissertation. She continues to work at Sabanci University.

Kristin began as a PhD student in 2017, working with Carla van Boxtel and Jannet van Drie at the Research Institute of Child Development and Education at the University of Amsterdam. Her research focuses on teaching written historical reasoning to L2 students at the tertiary level. Results from this research have been presented at EARLI 2019 and in 2019 at a symposium on epistemic beliefs in Amsterdam.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS

Sendur, K. A., van Drie, J., & van Boxtel, C. (submitted). Historical contextualization in students' writing. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Sendur, K. A., van Drie, J. P., and van Boxtel, C. (submitted). Epistemic beliefs and written historical reasoning: Exploring their relationship. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Sendur, K.A., van Boxtel, C. & van Drie, J.P. (2021). Undergraduate L2 students' performance when evaluating historical sources for reliability. *English for Specific Purposes*, 61, 17-31. Doi: <http://10.1016/j.esp.2020.08.004>

Sendur, K.A., van Drie, J.P., van Boxtel, C. & Kan, K.J. (2020). Historical reasoning in an Undergraduate CLIL course: Students' progression and the role of English proficiency. *International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*, 1-17, Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1844136>

PRESENTATIONS

Sendur, K.A., van Boxtel, C., & van Drie, J. (2019, September). *The intersection of epistemological beliefs and historical reasoning in students' writing*. Amsterdam, Netherlands, poster presented at the Enhancing Historical Reasoning: Measuring and Developing Students' Epistemological Understanding Research Seminar.

Sendur, K.A., van Drie, J. & van Boxtel, C. (2019, August). *Features of historical reasoning in undergraduate English language learners' writing*. Aachen, Germany poster presented at the biennial conference of the European Association for Research in Learning and Instruction (EARLI).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the many people in my life who have made this dissertation a reality. These studies would not have been possible without the encouragement and support of Jacqueline Einer, Amy Stopper, Vildan Çal, and the many instructors who welcomed me into their classrooms. I also wish to thank the students who participated in these studies.

I sincerely appreciate the help of Gerhard Stoel and Asuman Tetik, who conducted the preliminary statistical analysis for Chapter four, as well as Gerhard Stoel, Marloes Cornellisen, and the instructors who collaborated on the simplification and translation of the epistemic beliefs survey. My thanks also to Kees-Jan Kan who consulted with us on the statistical analysis and performed the latent growth curve analysis for Chapter three. I am eternally grateful to my promoter, Carla van Boxtel, and co-promotor, Jannet van Drie, for guiding and mentoring me during this journey. And finally, I wish to thank my family for their support and patience.