2019

Disciplinary Literacy Instruction in High School Social Studies

Kerrie Lynn Hass
Walden University

Walden University

College of Education

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Kerrie Hass

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Sunddip Aguilar, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Dianne Richardson, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Joel Goodin, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2019

Abstract

Disciplinary Literacy Instruction in High School Social Studies

by

Kerrie Lynn Hass

MS, Nova Southeastern University, 2006

BA, Marietta College, 1997

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

February 2019

Abstract

Low achievement in reading is a concern in a suburban school in the southeastern part of Florida. In an attempt to combat this issue, the school's administration has focused on teaching disciplinary literacy in content area classes, specifically social studies. In addition, the state standards also require that social studies teachers meet the Reading for History/Social Studies standards. Despite the effort put forth by the administration, there has yet to be an assessment of the social studies teachers' knowledge of the Reading for History/Social Studies standards or the instructional practices used to meet these standards. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore social studies teachers' knowledge of the Reading for History/Social Studies standards and the instructional practices utilized to meet the demands of these standards. Shulman's theory of pedagogical content knowledge framed this study, as it explores the need for teachers to be knowledgeable in both content and pedagogy. A purposeful sample of 10 social studies teachers participated in an interview and an instructional observation and submitted documents for review. Data were analyzed using hand coding for themes. The study results showed that teachers had concerns for the pacing of their course, their knowledge/preparation, and professional development opportunities. Based on the data, a 3 half-day professional development program was created to target social studies teachers' understanding of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and their knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction. This program may contribute to positive social change in helping social studies teachers effectively implement disciplinary literacy instruction, thus increasing student achievement in reading.

Disciplinary Literacy Instruction in High School Social Studies

by

Kerrie Lynn Hass

MS, Nova Southeastern University, 2006

BA, Marietta College, 1997

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

February 2019

Dedication

This study is lovingly dedicated to my husband, DuWayne; my children, Sydney and Andrew; and to the memory of my mother, who was always my biggest fan and best cheerleader. The support and unconditional love of my family and friends allowed me to complete this lifelong goal. I could not have achieved this without all of you, and I am so grateful.

Acknowledgments

I am so grateful to everyone who supported me through this process. A heartfelt thank you to my committee chair, Dr. Sunddip Aguilar; my second committee member, Dr. Gloria D. Richardson; my University Research Reviewer, Dr. Joel B. Goodin; and my program director, Dr. Amy White. Thank you for your support and guidance. I could not have completed this without such a terrific team. A special thank you to the participants of the study, who took the time to help further my research. I am so grateful for all of you.

Table of Contents

iii

iv

List of Tables

Section 1: The Problem

Introduction

Recent studies have shown that students in the United States have remained below the threshold of proficiency in basic literacy skills (Carlson, 2015; Nation's Report Card, 2015; Wendt, 2013). These deficiencies may provide dire consequences for students at the secondary and postsecondary level (Freebody, Barton, & Chen, 2013; Wendt, 2013). According to Wendt (2013), the term literacy no longer refers solely to a student's ability to read text. It now includes students' ability to read fluently, comprehend and analyze complex text, and effectively communicate socially and electronically, skills that are critical in secondary and postsecondary education, as well as in the professional world (Carlson, 2015; Vaughan, Smith, & Cranston, 2016; Wendt, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013).

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data show a steady decline in reading proficiency scores from 1992 to 2015, with only 37% of high school seniors scoring at or above grade-level proficiency in 2015 (Nation's Report Card, 2015). Of these 12th-grade students, approximately 46% of White and 49% of Asian American students scored at or above grade level proficiency. For Latinos/Hispanics, 25% scored at or above grade-level proficiency, while 17% of Black students scored at or above grade-level proficiency (Nation's Report Card, 2015). Regardless of the implementation of new programs and changes in state and federal mandates, trends in reading proficiency have remained relatively similar over the past several decades, with the average score for 12th-grade students fluctuating from 292 in 1992, the first year of implementation for the

NAEP assessment in reading, to 287 in 2015 (Carlson, 2015; Nation's Report Card, 2015).

In response to this nation-wide literacy issue, the Common Core Standards call for cross-disciplinary literacy instruction for all students, making the effort to improve students' literacy skills a shared responsibility (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Wendt, 2013). However, social studies teachers may not be providing their students with disciplinary literacy instruction due to a lack of understanding of the reading process (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Wendt, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). According to Wolsey and Faust (2013), teachers sometimes resist incorporating reading strategies into their instructional time because content area teachers may not feel equipped to teach reading. They may not be sure what content area literacy is and how the instructional practices would look during a lesson (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015; Wendt, 2013), as teacher preparation programs may not adequately prepare aspiring teachers to be experts in both content and pedagogy (Fang, 2014; Ingram, Bumstead, & Wilson, 2016). In addition, content area teachers may also resist incorporating reading instruction because they feel their focus should be on teaching content and do not feel responsible for reading instruction (Wolsey & Faust, 2013).

Disciplinary literacy allows content area teachers who may feel unprepared to take on the responsibility of teaching literacy skills and who may be concerned that teaching literacy will detract from their ability to cover content material to create literacy instruction during content acquisition (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; De La Paz et al., 2014). Implementing disciplinary literacy involves a shift in a teacher's beliefs about literacy

(Fang, 2014; Hannant & Jetnikoff, 2015; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). They must focus on a more in-depth examination into the function of literacy in the discipline and how that can be incorporated into their review of the content material (Hannant & Jetnikoff, 2015; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015). It does not necessarily make them reading teachers; however, incorporating disciplinary literacy teaching strategies may make them better teachers of their content (Dew & Teague, 2015). Unless the resistance to teaching disciplinary literacy is addressed, there will be a gap in teachers' instructional practices that may negatively affect student achievement.

The Local Problem

The Florida Standards, created by the Florida Department of Education to align with the Common Core Standards, require high school social studies teachers to provide disciplinary literacy instruction to meet the expectations of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards (Florida Department of Education, 2014; Florida Department of Education, 2017a). Content area teachers at a suburban school in Southeastern Florida report being directed by administrators to implement literacy instruction along with their course content to assist with closing the achievement gaps in reading (personal communication, August 18, 2017). The implementation of the Florida Standards makes disciplinary literacy instruction not only an educational priority, but a requirement for high school social studies teachers.

Although content area teachers are aware of this directive, levels of background and experience may lead some to implement literacy instruction more effectively than others. Teachers in the social studies department expressed concerns about the

implementation of literacy instruction in their classrooms (personal communication, April 5, 2016). Their concerns involved an admitted lack of pedagogical understanding and a concern for the amount of time necessary for the implementation of literacy instruction during their class period (personal communication, April 5, 2016). However, the need for an increase in literacy instruction was noted by members of the social studies department when data from the state assessments in reading were reviewed (personal communication, April 5, 2016).

Recent research has found that although teachers may resist the initial implementation, disciplinary literacy instruction is an effective way to create college-ready students (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). Sophisticated, college-ready readers have skills that extend beyond generalized reading and writing (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015; Wendt, 2013). Disciplinary literacy instruction engages students with content in a similar way to professionals in that particular discipline (De La Paz et al., 2014; Dew & Teague, 2015).

It is uncertain if the social studies teachers at the school of study are implementing disciplinary literacy instruction. According to the administrator, an evaluation of the implementation of disciplinary literacy skills in social studies has not been conducted as the focus has always been on the instruction of content material (personal communication, August 18, 2016). However, the tool utilized when administrators conduct teacher observations calls for the observation of a teacher's use of appropriate curricula, including the state requirements for reading, where applicable. School administrators in this study desired a focus on closing the achievement gap in

reading through disciplinary literacy instruction; however, they have not examined social studies teachers' understanding of disciplinary literacy instruction or their ability to implement disciplinary literacy in their instructional practices.

Rationale

Local Evidence

The Florida Standards, created by the Florida Department of Education to align with the Common Core Standards, require social studies teachers to provide disciplinary literacy instruction, or "the integration of reading and writing, along with speaking, listening, viewing and critical thinking" (Florida Department of Education, 2017a, para. 1) to meet the expectations of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards (Florida Department of Education, 2014). The district pacing guide that social studies teachers at the school of study are suggested to follow states that when teachers plan their lessons for instruction, they should address the state standards for literacy, specifically the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards, during their teaching of social studies content to ensure literacy and writing development. In addition, a checklist for social studies teachers provided by the district Division of Social Sciences suggests that social studies teachers support English language arts instruction by addressing the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards; however, according to the school administrator, there is no evidence that teachers are utilizing this checklist when planning for instruction (personal communication, August 18, 2016).

The 2015–2016 data for the school of study shows that 51% of students tested scored at or above grade level proficiency in reading on the Florida Standards

Assessment. The district reported 55% of all students tested scored at or above grade level proficiency in reading. In 2015–2016, 39% of the students at the school of study in the lowest 25% achievement level in reading made learning gains equivalent to one instructional year, as determined by the state. At the district level, 45% of the students in the district in the lowest 25% achievement level made learning gains. The school of study had 46% of all students tested make learning gains in reading equivalent to one instructional year, while the district had 54% of all students tested make learning gains in reading (Florida Department of Education, 2016).

The data for the 2016–2017 school year shows similar results. The school of study had 49% of all students tested score at or above grade level achievement, and 45% made learning gains. At the district level, 57% of all students tested scored at or above grade level achievement, and 56% made learning gains. Forty-two percent of the lowest 25% population at the school of study showed an increase in gains from the previous year; however, at the district level, 46% of the same population made gains (Florida Department of Education, 2017b).

In the past, the school of study has employed a fully released literacy coach to assist with reading intervention and the school-wide focus on literacy. However, the role of the literacy coach has historically involved assisting the teachers of Intensive Reading, a state-mandated course for students who do not meet grade-level proficiency on the state reading assessment (personal communication, August 18, 2017). During the 2017–2018 school year, the administrators of the school of study determined that the role of the newly hired half-time released literacy coach should be to provide support to content area

teachers in an effort to implement disciplinary literacy instruction (personal communication, August 18, 2017). In a school where student achievement in reading is a concern, it is important to assess social studies teachers' understanding of disciplinary literacy instruction and how it is being implemented in their classes.

Evidence from Literature

In the United States, average scores in reading achievement as measured by the Program for International Student Assessment were lower than fourteen other nations who participated in the assessment (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2017); therefore, it is critical to improve literacy instruction and achievement. A student's ability to learn any of the lessons taught in school is dependent on the development of the student's literacy skills (Freebody et al., 2013). According to Wendt (2013), to be successful during high school, students need to develop the ability to read and comprehend complex texts and communicate effectively and in meaningful ways. These skills are critical in the professional world and are needed to become productive and successful adults in today's society (Carlson, 2015; Vaughan et al., 2016; Wendt, 2013). Based on data published by organizations such as NAEP and NCES, the need for literacy intervention in secondary education is critical. Literacy instruction can no longer be the sole responsibility of elementary school teachers (Fang, 2016; Wendt, 2013).

Research suggests that the implementation of disciplinary literacy, or the reading, analyzing, and writing required to learn and form content knowledge in a way that is specific to a particular discipline, in content area classes can prepare students to be college-ready readers and supports literacy skills beyond general reading strategies

(Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Lapp, Fisher & Frey, 2015; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015; Stewart-Dore, 2013; Wendt, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). To create a classroom environment that is conducive to disciplinary literacy instruction, teachers must intentionally select disciplinary strategies to use and plan the purposeful placement of these strategies within their lesson (De La Paz et al., 2014; Dew & Teague, 2015). Students should be taught to examine why investigative practices that are specific to a particular discipline are valued by members of that discipline (De La Paz et al., 2014; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015). They should also be given the opportunity to explore language that is used by the experts of a particular discipline through the exposure of meaningful text (De La Paz et al., 2014; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015). Providing students with meaningful text will not only help expand their knowledge of content-specific vocabulary, but it will also contribute to their overall knowledge of the content area (Carlson, 2015; Fang, 2014; Fang, 2016; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). It will also allow students to develop cognitive strategies to assist them when independently reading challenging content-specific text (Carlson, 2015; Fang, 2014; Fang, 2016; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). Although the implementation of disciplinary literacy instruction presents new challenges for teachers, disciplinary literacy may assist teachers in meeting the demands of the standards set forth by the Common Core (Carlson, 2015; Fang, 2014). If teachers are resistant to the implementation of such instructional practices, then students are not receiving the skills necessary to be successful post-secondary and adult readers.

Purpose

The school for this study focused on improving reading achievement through the implementation of disciplinary literacy instruction, but it has not addressed the issue of teachers' knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction or their ability to implement it effectively (personal communication, August 18, 2017). While researchers have stated that the implementation of disciplinary literacy instruction could affect a student's ability to be a successful and productive adult in the professional world (Freebody et al., 2013; Wendt, 2013), the school of study has not examined the ability of the teachers in the social studies department to incorporate such practices (personal communication, August 18, 2017). The purpose of this intrinsic qualitative case study was to determine social studies teachers' knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction and how it is being implemented in their classrooms. I intended this study to bridge the gap in the teachers' instructional practices by aiding the school in improving or implementing professional development opportunities for teachers that enhance and develop their knowledge of disciplinary literacy and its implementation.

Definition of Terms

Common Core Standards: The Common Core is a set of high-quality academic standards in mathematics and English language arts/literacy (ELA) that outline what a student should know and be able to do at the end of each grade level (Common Core State Standards, 2018).

Contextualization: Contextualization is a practice in which a reader investigates the social and political circumstances while reading text to assist with determining historical context (Wineburg & Reisman, 2015).

Disciplinary Literacy: Disciplinary literacy refers to the literacy skills used to read and comprehend complex content (Wolsey & Faust, 2013). This differs from general reading strategies in that it is focused on the unique literacy skills used within a particular discipline (Ingram et al., 2016).

Domain-specific literacy: Domain-specific literacy refers to skilled reading and writing practices that conform to the norms and conventions of each discipline (Wineburg, Martin, & Monte-Sano, 2013).

Florida Standards: The Florida Standards are the expectations set forth by the educational leaders in Florida for what students should know and be able to do (Florida Department of Education, 2014).

Instructional Practices: Instructional practices are the teaching behaviors and attitudes specific to the instructional material (von der Embse, Schoemann, Kilgus, Wicoff, & Bowler, 2017).

Literacy: Literacy is the process by which people use language to communicate. It includes the practices of reading, writing, speaking, and listening (Carney & Indrisano, 2013).

Literacy coach: A literacy coach is a school site employee whose main responsibilities include directing instructional services related to literacy and providing technical assistance to teachers at their school site.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): NAEP is a nationwide assessment of what American students know and can do in various subject areas (NCES, 2018).

Pedagogical content knowledge (PCK): Shulman's (1987) theory involves the belief that teachers must be knowledgeable in their subject matter as well as in the ways to present it.

Significance of the Study

Locally and throughout the United States, teachers have had limited success in addressing the literacy needs of their students, as reading proficiency scores are below grade level for many high school students (Nation's Report Card, 2015). This study addressed a local problem by focusing on social studies teachers' knowledge of and implementation of disciplinary literacy instruction at the school of study. The results of this study could be used to identify the resources social studies teachers need to effectively implement disciplinary literacy instruction, thus possibly improving achievement in reading. Insight from this study could aid administrators in creating professional development opportunities or mentor programs for teachers to assure effective implementation of disciplinary literacy instruction.

Providing students with the skills necessary to critically read and comprehend the complex text of a specific discipline can prepare students for success beyond the secondary classroom (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Lapp et al., 2015; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015; Stewart-Dore, 2013; Wendt, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). The findings of this study may lead to positive social change by establishing training for

social studies teachers to assist them with teaching disciplinary literacy in an effort to create college-ready readers who employ literacy skills beyond general reading strategies. This study is an attempt to discover secondary social studies teachers' knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction and its implementation and to provide a way to potentially increase their ability to implement disciplinary literacy instructional practices, and, indirectly, student reading achievement.

Research Questions

This qualitative case study explored secondary social studies teachers' knowledge of disciplinary literacy and how it is implemented in their classrooms. The research questions for the study were:

RQ1: What types of training in disciplinary literacy instruction, if any, have the social studies teachers at the school of study attended?

SQ: If training was attended, what was the perceived effectiveness by the social studies teachers at the school of study?

RQ2: How are the social studies teachers at the school of study providing disciplinary literacy instruction to address the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards?

RQ3: How do the social studies teachers at the school of study blend disciplinary literacy instruction with content instruction to address the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards?

Review of the Literature

In the United States, average scores in reading achievement as measured by the Program for International Student Assessment were lower than 14 other nations who participated in the assessment (NCES, 2017). Research suggests that the implementation of disciplinary literacy in content area classes can prepare students to be college-ready readers and supports literacy skills beyond general reading strategies (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Lapp et al., 2015; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015; Stewart-Dore, 2013; Wendt, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). Improving reading achievement through the implementation of disciplinary literacy in content area classes requires teachers to not only be knowledgeable in their content, but to also be knowledgeable in the pedagogical practices involved in teaching literacy (Bennett & Hart, 2015; Fang, 2014; Ingram et al., 2016). However, content area teachers may struggle with feeling unprepared to share the responsibility of teaching literacy skills (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). They may also feel that teaching literacy skills will detract from the amount of time they have to cover academic content (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). Therefore, when reading achievement is low, teachers' knowledge of disciplinary literacy, as well as their methods for implementing disciplinary literacy instruction, must be studied with the hope of improving literacy instruction.

The purpose of this intrinsic qualitative case study was to determine social studies teachers' knowledge of disciplinary literacy and how they implement disciplinary literacy instruction in their classes. The first part of this section presents Shulman's (1987)

theory of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) as the conceptual framework. Next, I discuss effective instructional practices in disciplinary literacy. Finally, I present literature that focuses on disciplinary literacy as it relates to secondary social studies teachers.

I compiled and analyzed research from peer-reviewed journals, books, and school and district data to conduct the literature review. I conducted a search using Walden University's resources including Education Research Complete and ERIC databases. I also conducted Internet searches using Google Scholar. Keywords in my searches included *disciplinary literacy instruction*, *literacy in the content area*, *literacy instruction in secondary social studies*, *pedagogical content knowledge*, and *common core standards and disciplinary literacy.* In addition, I utilized the reference section of current articles that I found to locate additional research on this topic.

Conceptual Framework

The framework for this study is Shulman's (1987) theory of PCK. Shulman's (1987) theory involves the belief that teachers must be knowledgeable in their subject matter as well as in ways to present it. Shulman (1987) described a teacher's ultimate responsibility as "the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners and presented for instruction" (p. 8).

In his theory, Shulman (1987) outlined seven categories for teacher knowledge: general pedagogical knowledge, including classroom management and organization; knowledge of learners and their characteristics; knowledge of educational contexts,

ranging from the classroom to the community; knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values; content knowledge; curriculum knowledge; and pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987). The last of the seven categories for teacher knowledge addresses the need for teachers to have PCK, the knowledge of how to blend content information with pedagogy for effective instruction. If teachers possess a knowledge of pedagogy to effectively teach students how to read the text of a particular discipline such as social studies, where reading is fundamental to the acquisition of knowledge, students will learn how to read and think critically about content text, including primary and secondary sources, like the experts of that discipline (Allender & Freebody, 2016; Carlson, 2015; Carney & Indrisano, 2013). On the other hand, if a teacher does not possess PCK, the teacher may not be able to meet the needs of the students for critically reading content-specific text (Carlson, 2015; Fang, 2014; Ingram et al., 2016).

Shulman (1987) suggested that there are at least four major sources for the basis of teaching knowledge. They include "scholarship in content disciplines; the materials and settings of the institutionalized educational process; research on schooling, social organizations, human learning, teaching and development, etc.; and the wisdom of practice" (p. 8). Shulman (1987) argued that scholarship in content disciplines includes knowing what is important for the students to learn in a specific subject. Shulman presented the materials and settings of the institutionalized educational process as knowledge of curriculum, textbooks, budget, testing materials, and rules and roles within the educational institution. Research on schooling, social organizations, human learning, teaching and development, etc., or "formal educational scholarship" includes knowledge

of the research on "teaching, learning, and human development" (Shulman, 1987, p.10).

Shulman argued that although all three of the categories are critical for teachers to

possess, the one that is the most critical and the most difficult to develop in teachers is

that of the wisdom of practice. The wisdom of practice is the wisdom that guides "the

practices of able teachers" (Shulman, 1987, p. 11). It is the knowledge of how to be

flexible and adapt to the needs of the learners in the class while considering the complex

nature of the subject matter being taught (Shulman, 1987). Therefore, the strength of a

teacher's knowledge in these categories outlined by Shulman can affect a teacher's

degree of effectiveness and, consequently, student achievement.

Shulman's (1987) theory of PCK was appropriate to define the variables in this

study. Readers adopt different strategies based on the content of the text and purpose for

reading; therefore, teachers must use their PCK to teach literacy skills specific to the

content of the text and purpose for reading (Fang, 2014; Ingram et al., 2016; Stewart-

Dore, 2013). As per the Florida Standards, social studies teachers are responsible for

instructing students in identifying and utilizing the literacy practices that are specific to

their discipline (Florida Department of Education, 2014). They must blend the teaching

of disciplinary literacy with that of their content. This study explored social studies

teachers' knowledge of disciplinary literacy and implementation of disciplinary literacy

instruction based on Shulman's theory of PCK.

Current Literature

Literacy in the Content Area

Although the idea of content area reading has been around since the late 1880s, in the 1980s and 1990s, there was a movement in education to require content area teachers to incorporate reading and writing strategies in their instruction (Stewart-Dore, 2013). It began with the need to assist high school students with the challenging text presented in subject-area textbooks, and later became even more necessary with the incorporation of a greater amount of nonfiction text reading in elementary and middle schools (Stewart-Dore, 2013). This movement called for Content Area Reading (CAR) strategies to be taught by all content area teachers, regardless of the subject area. Over the decades, content area literacy instruction has been explored to determine what skills students need to be successful in reading and writing in the content areas.

According to Shanahan and Shanahan (2015), the purpose of most content area reading instruction is to provide students with a general set of skills that can be transferred when reading text in any subject area. The notion that reading skills are generalizable and can be applied to assist a student with reading any genre of text written about any subject is central to the idea of content area reading (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015). It is also believed that content area reading instruction will also assist students in the study of literature, as the skills should be directly transferrable (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015).

To implement effective content area reading programs, many school districts required teachers to train and retrain in generalized reading strategy instruction

(Bernstorf, 2014). During the trainings, teachers were made aware of the struggles their students faced when reading the content area text (Stewart-Dore, 2013). A focus on what teachers should instruct readers to do before, during, and after reading to better comprehend informational text was evident in many of the trainings (LaDuke, Lindner, & Yanoff, 2016). As a result of the training and efforts of teachers and school administrators, reading has been incorporated into every aspect of the school day through programs like Drop Everything and Read (DEAR), where teachers pause content area instruction to allow students time for sustained silent reading and the use of graphic organizers (Bernstorf, 2014).

Although teachers have been central to the effort to incorporate reading and writing skills in the content areas (Bernstorf, 2014), there may be issues, tensions, and conflicts that arise when content area teachers are asked to provide reading instruction during their classes (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015; Wendt, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). Content area teachers may be unsure about the role of reading and writing in their classrooms and how to implement reading and writing instruction (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015; Wendt, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). They may experience a lack of confidence, or self-efficacy, and resist incorporating reading and writing instruction, although it is being required by school administrators or district personnel (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Ingram et al., 2016; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015; Wendt, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). Although they feel confident teaching the content of their discipline, they may struggle with the pedagogy

needed to infuse reading and writing instruction (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Ingram et al., 2016; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015; Wendt, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013).

The Common Core Standards

The Common Core State Standards (2018), widely adopted across the nation, require teachers at the high school and middle school levels to incorporate the instruction of literacy practices specific to their discipline, or disciplinary literacy instruction, to their curriculum (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Wendt, 2013). According to Shanahan and Shanahan (2015), the standards that require English, social studies, and science teachers to teach literacy are not an attempt to make every teacher a reading teacher, as was the push with CAR. Instead, the Common Core State Standards (2018) in disciplinary literacy are an attempt to assure that students learn to engage in the specialized reading and writing practices of each discipline (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015). The standards for literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects focus on a student's ability to independently increase his/her knowledge of the content area through disciplinary literacy (LaDuke et al., 2016). There is also a call for students to be exposed to more complex informational text (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Wendt, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). The shift from CAR to the Common Core State Standards (2018) in disciplinary literacy broadens the generalized skills of CAR instruction and includes a disciplinary perspective that is specific to each subject area (Bennett & Hart, 2015; Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Wendt, 2013).

Disciplinary Literacy

        Disciplinary literacy is the use of literacy skills used to read and comprehend complex content (Ingram et al., 2016; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). This differs from general reading strategies in that it is focused on the unique literacy skills used within a discipline (Ingram et al., 2016; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). The concept that readers utilize different skills and strategies according to the context of the text and their purpose for reading supported the need for a change from CAR to disciplinary literacy instruction (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015; Stewart-Dore, 2013). Each discipline of study follows particular norms to create and communicate knowledge (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). Disciplinary literacy instruction will allow students to develop practices to assist them in becoming engaged, critical thinkers, readers, and writers in the content areas (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). Exposure to meaningful, complex, informational text will not only expand students' content-specific vocabularies, but it will also assist them with the acquisition of content knowledge as well as the cognitive strategies necessary to grapple with complex text and prove themselves college and career ready (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013).

        The shift in instructional practices for teachers to incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction could be intimidating and may require time and professional development to learn how to make the necessary adjustments, as they might not align with current instructional practices (LaDuke et al., 2016). Teachers must restructure their thoughts about literacy instruction from simply providing reading and writing strategies to a more

in-depth look into the specific function of reading and writing within a discipline (Ingram et al., 2016; Pytash and Ciecierski, 2015; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015). To do this, teachers of disciplinary literacy instruction move past the textbook and incorporate more authentic texts, such as primary documents, and allow students to engage in analysis similar to the practices of experts in the discipline (Pytash and Ciecierski, 2015; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015). Overall, the goal of disciplinary literacy is to guide students to utilize the processes for reading, writing, and analyzing complex, informational text similar to those utilized by the experts in a particular field of study (Ingram et al., 2016; Pytash and Ciecierski, 2015; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015).

Limitations to disciplinary literacy instruction do exist and should not be overlooked (Ingram et al., 2016). Teachers may encounter difficulties with struggling readers when presenting disciplinary literacy instruction. Students who struggle with reading may not have the foundational skills or reading strategies that are necessary to learn content to the extent of an in-field expert (Ingram et al., 2016). In addition, not every student will possess the desire or maturity to think like a disciplinary expert (Ingram et al., 2016). Teachers may also lack an understanding of the pedagogy necessary to provide disciplinary literacy instruction due to ineffective teacher preparation programs or being second career teachers (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Ingram et al., 2016; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015; Wendt, 2013). Therefore, teacher preparation programs must be equipped to provide aspiring teachers with an understanding of the literacies of their own practices and allow time for veteran teachers or second career teachers to attend professional development to better understand how to instruct students

in the literacies of their disciplines (Fang, 2014; Ingram et al., 2016; LaDuke et al.,

2016).

Disciplinary Literacy in Social Studies

In 2010, the Common Core State Standards were officially released in America

and adopted by 45 of the 50 states (Kenna & Russel, 2015). Within the area of English

language arts, standards intended for secondary social studies teachers were developed

under the title, Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in

History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects (Kenna & Russell, 2015). The

Florida Standards, created by the Florida Department of Education to align with the

Common Core Standards, require high school social studies teachers to provide

disciplinary literacy instruction to meet the expectations of the Reading for

History/Social Studies Florida Standards (Florida Department of Education, 2014;

Florida Department of Education, 2017a). The struggle for high school social studies

teachers to provide content instruction while infusing literacy instruction is at the

forefront of the debate on disciplinary literacy. High school social studies teachers may

feel as though they are discipline specialists; however, they may lack self-efficacy when

it comes to literacy instruction (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Lapp et al., 2015; Wendt,

2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). They may also feel that time constraints will cause them

to sacrifice content instruction to teach literacy skills (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; De La

Paz et al., 2014; Lapp et al., 2015). While these concerns are noted, research shows

disciplinary literacy instruction in high school social studies classes is crucial for students

to make sense of historical texts (Carlson, 2015; Vaughan Set al., 2016; Wendt, 2013; Wineburg & Reisman, 2015; Wolsey & Faust, 2013).

According to Wineburg et al. (2013), it is critical that students in both middle school and high school are provided with disciplinary literacy instruction in social studies classes in an effort to read like a historian. There are three practices involved in reading like a historian: sourcing, contextualization, and corroboration (Wineburg et al., 2013). Instruction in these practices will allow students to see patterns, understand contradictions, and make interpretations about events in history, much like a historian would while reading (Wineburg et al., 2013). Students who are taught to read with the skills of a historian will engage in historical questions while reading primary sources and will have the ability to make sense of all of the facts and information associated with the study of history (Wineburg et al., 2013).

Sourcing involves focusing on a document's attribution. According to Wineburg et al. (2013), historians begin reading a document at the end, with a focus on who the author is, his/her credibility, and when the document was written (Wineburg et al., 2013). Sourcing turns the acts of reading into an interrogation through research (Wineburg et al., 2013) and a dialogue between an active reader and the author (Wineburg & Reisman, 2015).

The consequences of failing to source while reading a historical document can be detrimental to students' education (Wineburg & Reisman, 2015). One example of the importance of sourcing took place in Rialto, California in 2014, where eighth-grade students were given a written exam inspired by the Common Core State Standards. The

teachers who created the exam did so by compiling credible sources for their students to read regarding the Holocaust. In an effort to provide multiple perspectives, they gathered a variety of sources on the topic. Some of the sources they distributed to their students argued that the Holocaust did not really happen and that the event was grossly exaggerated. What these teachers failed to realize was that one of their chosen sources came from a website created by a Holocaust denial group. Had the teachers sourced the document, they would have realized that the source is not, in fact, credible (Wineburg & Reisman, 2015).

Contextualization is the notion that a reader must be able to determine the time and place in which a document was written to properly understand the text itself (Wineburg et al., 2013; Wineburg & Reisman, 2015). Historians question the context in which a piece of text was written. They may ask such questions as: How was this text delivered? Who was the intended audience? Where and when were these words spoken/written? (Wineburg, et al., 2013)

At times, the exemplar lessons inspired by the Common Core State Standards focus more on the rhetoric of a historical document, as opposed to context. One example of this is an exemplar lesson on the Gettysburg Address that was featured on New York State's Common Core website. The lesson's focus was rhetorical in that it called for students to make a literal interpretation of Lincoln's words and complete an analysis of his word choice; however, it did not provide historical context information (Thurtell, 2013; Wineburg & Reisman, 2015). Removing a speech from its historical context to analyze the words that were spoken without understanding the motivation behind those

words would lessen the overall power and purpose of the speech (Wineburg & Reisman, 2015).

Corroboration, or inquiry, involves piecing together historical information in an effort to answer a broad question (Allender & Freebody, 2016; Wineburg et al., 2013). To do this, a historian might gather multiple sources on the same subject, such as stories, diaries, paintings, and photographs (Lapp et al., 2015; Wineburg et al., 2013). The synthesis of this information would allow a historian to explore multiple perspectives and draw facts from varied sources located in different places or in different times (Allender & Freebody, 2016; Wineburg et al., 2013). Comparing the information within those sources through close reading and asking questions of the sources themselves will allow students to determine what happened and what it meant to the course of history (Wineburg et al., 2013; Wineburg & Reisman, 2015). A study of students in Australia was conducted on the use of multiple text perspectives for critical reading. Students were given a pre-test on historical content knowledge and were post-tested three weeks later. The findings were that students who read multiple text perspectives with a common focus scored higher on the post-test of historical content. These students were also found to use sourcing and corroboration more effectively than students who were not given multiple text perspectives to read and analyze (Allender & Freebody, 2016). Overall, the close reading of multiple texts written from various perspectives can deepen content knowledge and foster more effective sourcing, contextualization, and corroboration, or history-related disciplinary literacy skills (Allender & Freebody, 2016; Wineburg et al., 2013). For this reason, disciplinary literacy should be taught in social studies classes, and

disciplinary literacy instructional practices should be regularly examined (Ingram et al., 2016; Pytash and Ciecierski, 2015; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015). This study attempts to explore how social studies teachers incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction in their classes.

Implications

Researchers studied the effects of disciplinary literacy instruction and found it to be effective in creating college-ready readers and writers (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). However, even though it is required by the Florida State Standards, some teachers may resist incorporating disciplinary literacy instruction into their classes as they may feel that it takes away from class time allotted to cover content (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; personal communication, April 5, 2016; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015; Wendt, 2013). Some content area teachers may also feel that they do not possess the skills necessary to teach disciplinary literacy, as they consider themselves content experts, but not literacy teachers (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; personal communication, April 5, 2016; Pytash & Ciecierski, 2015; Wendt, 2013). The target school has not examined social studies teachers' instructional practices in disciplinary literacy (personal communication, August 18, 2017). This intrinsic qualitative case study may provide more information about how social studies teachers incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction to meet the demands of the Florida State Standards (Florida Department of Education, 2014; Florida Department of Education, 2017a). Results of this study may be used by the school district's administration to create professional development programs to assist teachers with pedagogy for incorporating disciplinary literacy in social studies

classes. This professional development program may lead to the implementation of more effective disciplinary literacy instruction in social studies. This professional development program may influence instructional practices in social studies that could result in increased student achievement in reading.

Summary

By examining instructional practices, this intrinsic qualitative case study explores the methods in which social studies teachers incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction in their classes. Although effective instructional practices in disciplinary literacy for social studies have been studied, there is insufficient literature that addresses this relationship with regard to the teachers in the target school. The target school's administrators have not addressed social studies teachers' disciplinary literacy instructional practices for meeting the demands of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards (Florida Department of Education, 2014; Florida Department of Education, 2017a).

The following section focuses on the methodology used for this project study. It provides information regarding the study's qualitative case study design, the participants, the data collection and analysis, and the limitations of this study. Section 2 also presents a rationale for the chosen research design and data collection and analysis methods. Findings from the data are also discussed in Section 2.

Section 2: The Methodology

The purpose of this intrinsic qualitative case study was to explore the methods in which social studies teachers incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction in their classes. The target school's School Improvement Plan indicated that reading achievement has declined at a steady rate for the past 3 years. Based on past reading performance on state and district assessments, school administrators have determined that there is a need to close the achievement gap in reading through disciplinary literacy instruction. Although the Florida State Standards require social studies teachers to address the state standards for literacy, specifically the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards, during their teaching of social studies content to ensure literacy and writing development, according to the school administrator, there is no evidence that disciplinary literacy instruction is being implemented or how it is being implemented. Most researchers have focused on observations and interviews to explore disciplinary literacy instructional practices, but research on disciplinary literacy instructional practices in social studies has never been done at the school of study, and that is why an intrinsic qualitative case study was the best design for this study. The following research questions were the basis for developing interview questions for this study:

RQ1: What types of training in disciplinary literacy instruction, if any, have the social studies teachers at the school of study attended?

SQ: If training was attended, how effective was the training in disciplinary literacy instruction attended by the social studies teachers at the school of study?

RQ2: How are the social studies teachers at the school of study providing

disciplinary literacy instruction to address the Reading for History/Social Studies

Florida Standards?

RQ3: How do the social studies teachers at the school of study blend disciplinary

literacy instruction with content instruction to address the Reading for

History/Social Studies Florida Standards?

In this section I describe the research methodology approach used for this study.

Next, I explain the setting for the study with the sampling procedures used to choose the

participants for the study. Finally, I discuss the qualitative portion of the study,

explaining the instruments used to collect data and the data analysis procedures.

Case Study Design and Approach

The case study has been a common research method used in the field of

education, as it is used to contribute in some way to knowledge of "individual, group,

organizational, social, political, and related phenomena" (Yin, 2014, p. 4). A case study

allows researchers to focus on a particular case in an effort to answer *how* or *why*

questions (Yin, 2014, p. 10). A case study is commonly used to explore contemporary

events when behaviors cannot be manipulated, as is often the case in a classroom setting

(Yin, 2014). Case studies rely on data collection such as direct observations of the events

being studied and interviews with the people involved (Yin, 2014). The nature of this

study was a case study involving a collection of qualitative data through interviews,

observations, and a review of related documents. I conducted interviews with 10 social

studies teachers out of the 14 teachers in the department who agreed to participate.

Through the interview process, I gained information about the social studies teachers'

knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction and the demands of the Reading for

History/Social Studies Florida Standards. I analyzed the data by coding reoccurring

themes presented in the interviews and presented the data using thick, rich descriptions of

the emerging themes. In addition to the interviews, I conducted classroom observations

to gain information about how the social studies teachers incorporate disciplinary literacy

instruction in their classes to meet the demands of the Reading for History/Social Studies

Florida Standards. During the observations, I took field notes. I also reviewed

documents that are relevant to the study to determine how the social studies teachers

incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction in their classes to meet the demands of the

Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards. I requested such documents as

lesson plans, sample assessments, and student work that shows evidence of disciplinary

literacy instruction. Through the collection of data from interviews, observations, and a

review of documents, I developed a deeper understanding of how the social studies

teachers incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction to meet the demands of the Reading

for History/Social Studies Florida Standards.

An intrinsic case study approach was appropriate to explore the disciplinary

literacy instruction in high school social studies classes. After examining four other

qualitative strategies, I rejected them in favor of the case study, as it allowed me to

develop an in-depth study of the case at one particular high school of study.

A grounded theory research design would not have been appropriate for this study

as it would have required me to develop an abstract theory based on a particular incident

or interaction (Creswell, 2012). For this study, a theory would have to be developed involving the process by which teachers incorporate disciplinary literacy. This design was rejected because the creation of a theory about the participants and a particular incident would have limited the research.

Ethnography would not have been appropriate for this study as it involves studying a cultural group to observe patterns in their behavior, beliefs, and language over time (Creswell, 2012). Studying a specific cultural group was not necessary for this study.

Phenomenological research design was rejected for this study as it would have involved studying the lived experiences about a certain phenomenon as detailed by the individual participants (Creswell, 2014). A phenomenological study is used to determine what individuals who experience the same phenomenon have in common (Creswell, 2014). The reason I rejected this research design was that there is no need to explore the commonality between the participants.

Narrative research involves the study of the lives of individuals (Creswell, 2014). In a narrative research study, participants provide stories about their lives and the researcher retells these stories, often combining those with the researcher's own viewpoint (Creswell, 2014). This design was rejected as there was no need to explore the participants' lives outside of the school environment.

Setting and Sample

The school of study is located in the southeastern area of Florida. Enrollment at the school of study stood at approximately 2,600 students; however, in the past,

enrollment has been as high as 3,500. The school's annual School Improvement Plan stated in 2018 that the student population was diverse, with a 95% minority population, an 81% economically disadvantaged (ED) rate, as determined by free and reduced lunch qualification, and 26% English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) population. For this study, I used a representative sample of participants from the school of study, which will include teachers of minority, ED, ESOL, special education, and advanced academic students. A representative sample comprises participants who are characteristic of the entire population being studied (Creswell, 2012). There were 14 social studies teachers in the school of study. All 14 of the social studies teachers were invited to participate. Inviting all of the 14 teachers increased the possible number of participants and allowed for a generalization of the data collected (Leedy & Ormond, 2015). There were 10 participants for this study. The criteria used to select participants for this study included: two participants who teach classes that include minority students, two participants who teach ED students, two teachers who teach ESOL students, two teachers who teach special education students, and two teachers who teach advanced academic students. This sample of teachers allowed me to deeply explore the disciplinary literacy instructional practices being used by teachers who teach a representative sample of the whole school population.

To conduct my research, I obtained permission from Walden University's Institutional Review Board (approval #04-23-18-0536458). To gain access to teacher participants, I completed the formal request required by the school district to conduct a research study and obtained a letter of cooperation from the district Research Review

Committee (approval #2279). Next, I contacted the school administrator to notify him of

the study, and I contacted potential participants to request volunteers for the study. I only

used school district e-mail accounts to notify participants of the study. Once participants

agreed to participate in the study, all communication with the participants took place

using their personal e-mail account and my Walden University e-mail account. Within

one week after the initial e-mail was sent to notify potential participants of the study, I

sent a second e-mail that provided a consent form with detailed information about the

study, including what was required of the participants and the participants' rights.

Potential participants were asked to respond within 1 week if they were willing to

participate. I collected the willing participants' personal e-mail information and sent an e-

mail to schedule a time to interview and observe each participant. From the willing

participant pool, I selected a purposeful sample to interview. According to Creswell

(2012), purposeful sampling is a procedure used in qualitative research in which the

researcher intentionally selects participants and sites to study to learn about a

phenomenon. A purposeful sample will assure representation of the overall population of

the site of study (Leedy & Ormond, 2015). As previously noted, I selected two

participants who teach classes that include minority students, two participants who teach

ED students, two teachers who teach ESOL students, two teachers who teach special

education students, and two teachers who teach advanced academic students. This

sample of teachers allowed me to deeply explore the disciplinary literacy instructional

practices being used by teachers who teach a representative sample of the whole school

population. Interviews took place in a private location, and one hour was allotted for

each interview. To maintain confidentiality, I assigned a number to each participant and used that number to identify each participant's interview data.

Data Collection Strategies

I gathered data through face-to-face, semistructured interviews, instructional observations, and reviews of documents that explored social studies teachers' knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction and the instructional practices used to address the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards. Participants were asked to volunteer for this study. Ten teachers were willing to be interviewed, observed, and submit documents for review. Using three different methods of data collection allowed for triangulation. Triangulation permits a researcher to find consistencies and inconsistencies within the data collected by utilizing multiple data collection sources (Leedy & Ormond, 2015).

Data Collection Instrument

I used face-to-face, semistructured interviews to collect data. Face-to-face interviews may yield a high response rate if the researcher can establish a friendly, nonthreatening rapport with the participant, which will encourage cooperation (Leedy & Ormond, 2015; Yin, 2014). During a semistructured interview, the researcher poses guiding questions; however, the researcher has the flexibility to adjust the wording, omit questions that may become unnecessary, or alter the order of the questions (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, 2010). Semistructured interviews allow a researcher to begin questioning the participant by using planned interview questions; however, they also give the researcher the flexibility to explore themes that may arise during the interview

(Lodico et al., 2010). This format provided me with an opportunity to begin the

interview with questions that elicited data to address my research questions, but it also

allowed me to probe for deeper exploration of a theme or to explore a new theme that

may have emerged. I created the interview protocol that I used (Appendix B). This

protocol is supported by case study design and by methods detailed by Yin (2014) and

aligns to Shulman's (1987) theory of PCK by focusing on the blending of pedagogy and

content knowledge to create effective instruction.

In addition to face-to-face, semistructured interviews, I conducted instructional

observations of all participants. Observations can add "new dimensions for

understanding" a phenomenon that is being studied (Yin, 2014, p. 114). Instructional

observations allowed me a first-hand view of the disciplinary literacy instruction taking

place, as well as any success or problems encountered during the instruction. During a

direct instructional observation, the researcher should take hand-written field notes based

on their observations and later organize the notes by major topics (Yin, 2014). I created a

protocol for conducting an instructional observation (Appendix C) and adhered to the

protocol during the observations. This protocol is supported by case study design and

methods detailed by Yin (2014) and aligns to Shulman's (1987) theory of PCK.

Another data collection tool that I used during this study was a review of

documents. I requested that each participant provide me with sample documents that

showed evidence of disciplinary literacy instruction, such as lesson plans, formative

assessments, and/or summative assessments. A review of documents or artifacts can be

an important component in the overall case study (Yin, 2014). I created a protocol for completing the review of documents (Appendix D).

Interview Protocol

The interview protocol that I created is aligned with the conceptual framework and addresses the research questions and sub-questions. At the start of the interview, I reminded each participant of the purpose of the study and his/her rights as a participant. At that time, the participant signed the consent form. The consent form included an agreement to be audio recorded during the interview.

The interviews were completed in three sections. The first section addressed background information about the participant, such as how long he/she has taught, at what schools he/she has taught, why he/she decided to pursue teaching as a career. This section of the interview aimed to gather basic information that provided interesting background information about each participant and allowed the interview to begin with non-threatening questions to put the participant at ease.

The second section sought to determine each participant's knowledge of the state standards for Reading for History/Social Studies and any training in disciplinary literacy instruction attended by the participant. I began this section of the interview by asking the participant if he/she was aware of the Reading for History/Social Studies standards and what that standard requires. Next, I asked the participant to share any professional development opportunities on disciplinary literacy instruction in which they have participated. I inquired about how effective the professional development opportunities were in providing useful tools in disciplinary literacy instruction.

The third section addressed the participant's instructional practices. I asked each participant how he/she addresses the standards for Reading for History/Social Studies in his/her classroom. I asked how each participant incorporates disciplinary literacy in his/her classroom and how he/she balances content instruction with disciplinary literacy instruction. The idea of blending content knowledge with pedagogical knowledge is at the forefront of Shulman's (1987) theory of PCK.

At the conclusion of each interview, I thanked the participant for allowing me to interview him/her. I also reminded the participant that I would transcribe the interview while listening to the audio recording. A summary was sent to each participant to review and verify for accuracy.

Conducting the Interviews

The number of participants for this study was 10. From the willing participants, I selected two participants who teach classes that include minority students, two participants who teach ED students, two teachers who teach ESOL students, two teachers who teach special education students, and two teachers who teach advanced academic students. This allowed me to collect data from a representative sample of the whole school population.

I allotted one hour of time for each interview. Although I audio recorded the interview, I also took brief notes during the interview. At the conclusion of each interview, I wrote a self-reflection detailing my thoughts on the interview. While listening to the audio recorded interview, I transcribed the interview using my password-protected personal computer. I wrote a summary of the transcription and emailed it to the

participant for verification of accuracy. This process is known as member checking and ensures that the researcher has accurately recorded the participant's thoughts (Merriam, 2009). Once I sent the email, I reviewed any feedback that was given by the participant concerning accuracy and made necessary adjustments to each transcription.

Observation Protocol

The observation protocol that I created is aligned with the conceptual framework and addresses the research questions and sub-questions. Once I interviewed each of the participants, I allotted one hour of time to observe each participant while he/she was teaching class. The goal of the observation was to determine how the participant incorporates disciplinary literacy instruction in class and how it is blended with content instruction. Because observations can be disruptive, I attempted to complete my observations with minimal disruption to the instructional process, only seeking to assess the occurrence of disciplinary literacy instructional practices (Yin, 2014). Data were recorded in the form of field notes (Yin, 2014). The instrument used during the observations entailed specifics such as the participant's assigned number, the date and time of the observation, the topics being covered in the class, the standards being taught, the objective of the lesson, the intended outcome of the lesson, the materials used, the activities, how students were assessed, and the number of students present in the class. I took notes specific to any activity or discussion that showed evidence of disciplinary literacy instruction. In addition to observing teaching and learning, I also took note of any evidence of disciplinary literacy instruction in the daily agenda, on posters and other classroom décor, and on student work that was posted on the walls of each classroom.

This allowed me to note any evidence of disciplinary literacy instruction that may take place in each class but not during the observation time.

At the conclusion of each observation, I thanked the participant for allowing me to observe him/her. I also reminded the participant that I took field notes during the observation. I sent each participant a summary to review and verify for accuracy, as a form of member checking (Merriam, 2009).

Conducting the Observation

There were 10 participants for this study. From the willing participants, I selected two participants who teach classes that include minority students, two participants who teach ED students, two teachers who teach ESOL students, two teachers who teach special education students, and two teachers who teach advanced academic students. This allowed me to collect data from a representative sample of the whole school population.

I allotted one hour of time for each observation. I took field notes during each observation. At the conclusion of the observation, I wrote a reflection detailing my thoughts on the observation. I wrote a summary of the field notes and emailed it to the participant as a form of member checking, for verification of accuracy (Merriam, 2009). Once I sent the email, I reviewed any feedback that was given by the participant concerning accuracy and made any necessary adjustments to the field notes.

Review of Documents Protocol

The review of documents protocol that I created is aligned with the conceptual framework and addresses the research questions and sub-questions. Once I had

interviewed and observed each of the participants, I allotted one hour of time to review

documents shared with me by the participants. The goal of the review of documents was

to determine how the participant incorporates disciplinary literacy instruction in class and

how it is blended with content instruction. Data were recorded in the form of field notes

based on the documents reviewed (Yin, 2014).

Conducting the Review of Documents

There were 10 participants for this study. From the willing participants, I selected

two participants who teach classes that include minority students, two participants who

teach ED students, two teachers who teach ESOL students, two teachers who teach

special education students, and two teachers who teach advanced academic students.

This allowed me to collect data from a representative sample of the whole school

population.

I allotted one hour of time for the review of documents for each participant. I

took field notes during the review of documents. At the conclusion of the review of

documents, I wrote a self-reflection detailing my thoughts. I made copies of any original

documents and returned original documents submitted to me to the participants after the

review has been completed.

Researcher's Role and Bias

I am currently a tenth-grade English language arts teacher for the school of study.

I have taught at the school of study for a total of 14 of my 22 years in education. I have

taught all grade levels of English language arts at this school site, and I have also taught

several elective classes as well. Because of the number of years that I have been at the

school of study, I have developed friendships with other faculty members; however, I do

not serve in a supervisory role over any of the teachers who participated in the study.

The only bias I brought to this study is that I have a strong passion for literacy. I

chose this topic for my study because I would like to see student achievement increase in

reading and an increase in literacy skills for the students at the school of study. I was

aware that, as the researcher, I must set aside my bias during this study. I did this by

acknowledging my bias and using member checking to assure that my interpretation of

the data from the interviews was accurate. I also followed the protocols that I

established, as this ensured validity during my data collection and analysis.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this intrinsic qualitative case study was to explore the methods in

which social studies teachers incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction in their classes

to meet the demands of the Reading for History/Social Studies standards. Qualitative

data was collected through interviews, observations, and a review of documents.

Qualitative data analysis is a process that allows the data that is collected to be organized

in a manner that brings meaning to the data (Creswell, 2012). This inductive reasoning

process involved organizing, transcribing, analyzing, and interpreting the data to discover

meanings in the form of reoccurring themes (Yin, 2014).

I gathered data from face-to-face, semi-structured interviews that aimed to

explore the methods in which social studies teachers incorporate disciplinary literacy

instruction in their classes to meet the demands of the Reading for History/Social Studies

standards. All 14 members of the social studies department were invited to participate;

however, only 10 agreed to participate. Those participants who were willing to

participate were interviewed, observed, and submitted documents for review. From the

10 participants, I selected two participants who teach classes that include minority

students, two participants who teach ED students, two teachers who teach ESOL

students, two teachers who teach special education students, and two teachers who teach

advanced academic students. This allowed me to collect data from a representative

sample of the whole school population.

The interview protocol I designed was divided into three sections: Background

Information, Knowledge of Disciplinary Literacy Instruction, and Instructional Practices.

The first section collected background information regarding teaching experience. The

second section explored the participants' knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction

and the Reading for History/Social Studies standards included in the Florida State

Standards. This section connects to my first research question because the question

addresses teachers' knowledge of the literacy standards and any training they may have

in teaching disciplinary literacy. The third section explored the instructional practices in

disciplinary literacy. This section connects to my second and third research questions

because it explores how teachers incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction in their

classes to meet the demands of the Reading for History/Social Studies standards. After

conducting the interviews, I transcribed the information from the audio recorded

interviews using Microsoft Word, printed a copy of each transcription, and looked for

themes and recurring patterns. I used different colored highlighters to note similarities in

phrases and words used by various participants. Having the text in different colors

allowed me to note dominant themes that were emerging. I categorized the initial 22 highlighted statements from the interviews into three themes.

The observation protocol I designed addressed my second and third research questions. It sought to answer how the participants incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction in their classes and how that instruction is blended with content instruction. After conducting the observations, I reviewed my field notes and looked for recurring patterns. I highlighted reoccurring words and phrases in different colors. Once all of the observation notes were highlighted, I organized the highlighted words and phrases under each of the three themes that emerged from the interview data. I looked for evidence of new themes, but no new themes were discovered.

The review of documents protocol I designed addressed my second and third research questions. It sought to answer how the participants incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction in their classes and how that instruction is blended with content instruction. After conducting the review of documents, I reviewed my notes and looked for recurring patterns in the words and phrases. I highlighted reoccurring words and phrases in different colors. Once all of the reviews of document protocol notes were highlighted, I organized the highlighted words and phrases under each of the three themes that emerged from the interview data. I looked for evidence of new themes, but no new themes were discovered during the review of documents. All of the reoccurring words and phrases were able to fit under the three themes that emerged during the analysis of the interview notes.

Data triangulation helped to corroborate the findings and assure validity. The three methods used when applying triangulation were: a) interviews; b) instructional observations; and c) a review of documents. Although the majority of the data collection derived from the interviews, the instructional observations and review of documents helped to validate the themes identified from the interviews (Creswell, 2012). The instructional observations and review of documents added validity to the findings from the interviews and added rigor to the study (Lodico et al., 2010).

Validity of Data

To ensure the validity of the data, several steps were taken. Before beginning the study, I conducted an extensive search of existing research on disciplinary literacy instruction and used the information gathered to formulate my research questions. In addition, triangulation was achieved by utilizing multiple data collection methods and sources. I also used member checking to ensure accuracy of the data collected. I did this by providing each participant with a summary of his/her transcribed interview and field notes from both the observation and review of documents. I allowed the participants to notify me if any changes to transcriptions or notes were necessary. Finally, I identified and maintained awareness of my personal bias throughout the study. I utilized the interview, observation, and review of documents protocols and data collection procedures I established to guard against my bias. All of these steps ensured the validity of the data.

Coding the Data

The purpose of coding is to organize the data utilizing various strategies to extract meaning from participant responses (Creswell, 2014). Yin (2014) recommends an

inductive process to organize data into specific themes. The data analysis process for each data collection tool utilized in this study involved hand-coding for themes.

Accuracy and Credibility

To improve credibility and triangulate data, more than one type of data was collected (Creswell, 2014; Yin, 2014). According to Creswell (2014), credibility refers to the trustworthiness of the data collected and the analysis conducted. Trustworthiness refers to methods used to collect data and establishes believability for the results of the study (Creswell, 2014; Yin, 2014). The measures taken in this study to achieve credibility included member checks and the use of more than one data collection tool for triangulation. Member checks proved to be quite important as participants were given the opportunity to review the data collected and legitimize the responses that were recorded. The use of member checks allowed participants to check their responses for accuracy (Creswell, 2014). The data collection tools used in this study included one 60-minute interview, one 60-minute instructional observation, and one 60-minute review of documents. Each tool addressed the understanding and implementation of disciplinary literacy instruction and aligned with the research questions.

Discrepant Cases

Accurate reporting for any discrepancies in the data reduces the bias and supports credibility (Creswell, 2014; Yin, 2014). The accurate reporting of any discrepancies in the data was verified through participant member checks for the interviews, observations, and review of documents in this study. Discrepancies were noted by each participant after a review of the summaries provided by the researcher. The researcher then followed

up with the participant for clarification, if necessary, and made necessary changes to the data. The purpose of reporting discrepant cases is to assure accuracy of data to establish credibility (Creswell, 2014).

Limitations

The limitations identified for this study include the utilization of a small sample size, which reduces generalizability, and the geographic location of the study because only one location was utilized (Creswell, 2014). Possible limitations within this study's data collection methods include potentially inaccurate responses provided by the participants during interviews (Yin, 2014). According to Yin (2014) participants may provide inaccurate responses in an attempt to provide the researcher with a response that may be more acceptable to the researcher. In addition, since observations were scheduled in advance, the lessons during the observations may not be authentic, as the participants may have staged a lesson that they thought would be more acceptable to the researcher.

Researcher experience is also a possible limitation identified for this study. According to Creswell (2014), qualitative research relies on researcher experience and can be time-consuming. It can be more easily influenced by personal bias than quantitative research (Creswell, 2014).

Data Analysis Results

Data analysis occurred after the data collection process was completed, which took three weeks. The process utilized with each data collection tool is explained below. An analysis of each data collection tool occurred separately after the collection of data, then together for identification of any patterns of responses or observations for each tool.

A similar analysis was conducted for each data collection tool to identify any trends or patterns in the data. The process by which data was generated, gathered, and recorded is described below.

<center>**Interview Data**</center>

Data Collection Process

After sending the initial email outlining the problem and the need for this study to potential participants, responses from willing participants were received. Distribution and signing of the consent form occurred once the initial email was received from each willing participant. A follow-up email was sent to schedule dates and times for interviews and instructional observations.

The recording of data began with the scheduled interviews. The protocol established by the researcher for the interviews was utilized. All interviews were recorded using the researcher's personal recording device. Participants answered seven background questions, four questions on their knowledge and training, and five questions based on their instructional practices (Appendix B). In addition, participants also answered clarifying questions asked by the researcher. Recordings were downloaded and saved onto the researcher's password-protected personal computer. The researcher transcribed each participant's interview on the password-protected personal computer using Microsoft Word, and a summary of the transcription was sent via email to each participant for member check. Participants were given one week to review the transcription summary and notify the researcher of any necessary changes. Notes were

also taken during each interview. All notes were transported to the researcher's home and locked in a filing cabinet until analysis could be conducted.

Interviews

Interviews were held in a public location that had an option for privacy. The location for each interview was chosen by each participant. The locations consisted of teacher's classrooms and conference rooms in the main office of the school of study. Before the interviews took place, a consent form was signed by each participant. The interviews lasted approximately between 35 and 45 minutes. Each participant answered the original 16 questions included in the protocol, as well as follow-up questions that the researcher asked for clarification. Participants received the opportunity to review a summary of the transcripts once the interview was completed to assure accuracy of information.

The interview process provided insight about the participants' knowledge and use of disciplinary literacy instruction, as well as any training they may have received in disciplinary literacy instruction, that may not have been noted during the instructional observation or review of documents. The role of the researcher during the interview included taking notes to support coding and analysis. Critical listening was also part of the researcher's role and was utilized as the primary data collection instrument during the interview process (Creswell, 2014).

How and When Data Was Analyzed

The interviews were audio-recorded using an app on the researcher's phone. At the conclusion of each interview, the researcher used the recordings to transcribe each

interview using Microsoft Word. The researcher wrote a summary of each transcription

and emailed each participant the summary of his/her interview to check for accuracy.

The participants were given one week to respond to the researcher with any necessary

changes. Once all of the summaries were checked for accuracy, analysis was done

through careful reading of each transcription and highlighting any findings that were

applicable to the research questions being asked.

The next step of the data analysis process required two readings of each

transcription and hand-coding for patterns and themes. Hand-coding of interview data

involved reading the data, marking it by hand, and color coding the data based on themes

(Creswell, 2014; Yin, 2014). During the first reading, the researcher focused on initial

themes that were connected to the research questions. Data were coded using a different

color to identify a connection to each research question. During the second reading, the

researcher sought to find similarities and differences between the participants' responses

(Creswell, 2014; Yin, 2014). A table was created to organize common themes among the

data collected from all participants. The coding phase took approximately three weeks to

complete. The same process took place for each of the data collection tools and each

participant.

Patterns and Themes

The interview data addressed RQ1: What types of training in disciplinary literacy

instruction, if any, have the social studies teachers at the school of study attended? The

data from the interviews also addressed the sub-question to RQ1: If training was

attended, what was the perceived effectiveness by the social studies teachers at the school

of study? Three themes emerged from the data: (a) Pacing; (b) Knowledge/Preparation; and (c) Professional Development Opportunities. Participants expressed concern about the pacing of the courses they teach. They were concerned that implementation of disciplinary literacy instruction would impede on the amount of time they have to teach course content and keep them from maintaining the pace required by the district; however, the review of documents and observations showed that many of the teachers were already implementing disciplinary literacy instruction. In addition, participants also felt uninformed about the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and unprepared to teach disciplinary literacy due to a lack of training; however, the review of documents and observations showed that many of the participants were implementing disciplinary literacy instruction. Finally, although the participants did not actively seek professional development opportunities, many expressed the need for professional development in disciplinary literacy instruction specific to social studies.

Each of the 10 participants took part in an interview. The interviews ranged from 35 to 45 minutes. The study sample included 10 high school social studies teachers: two honors/advanced placement teachers, two special education teachers, two ESOL teachers, two ED teachers (Table 1).

Table 1

Teacher Demographic Information, Experience, Certifications, and Courses Taught

Participant	Gender	Age	Experience	Certifications	Courses Taught
1	M	55	31	Social Studies (6-12)	Government, Economic, U.S. History, World History, Legal Studies, European History, Latin American History
2	M	54	21	Social Studies (6-12)	World History, U.S. History, Government, Economics, Debate
3	F	47	11	Social Studies (6-12); Gifted	World History, U.S. History, Government, Economics, Advanced Placement Government, Advanced Placement Economics
4	M	71	14	Social Studies (6-12); Physical Science; Earth and Space Science	World History, U.S. History
5	F	48	16	Social Studies (5-9; 6-12); ESOL (K-12)	World Geography, World History, U.S. History, Economics
6	F	43	21	Social Studies (6-12)	World History, Government, Economics
7	F	44	12	Social Studies (6-12)	Language Arts (9-12); World History, U.S. History, Government, Economics
8	F	44	16	Social Studies (6-12); Gifted	Journalism, Geography, Civics, World History, Advanced Placement World History, Advanced Placement European History, U.S. History, Government, Economics
9	M	60	37	Social Studies (6-12); Special Education (K-12); English Language Arts (6-12)	English Language Arts (9-12), Intensive Reading, World History, U.S. History, Government, Economics
10	M	48	14	Social Studies (6-12)	World History, U.S. History, Advanced Placement U.S. History, Government. Economics

The first seven questions, background questions, were answered by all participants (Appendix B). The participants included five male and five female teachers between the ages of 43 and 71. The participants reported having between 11 and 37 years of teaching experience. When asked if they have ever taught a subject other than social studies, four of the participants reported that they had not, while four reported having taught English and one reported having taught science. All 10 participants reported having taught social studies classes to all grade levels from 9-12, including World History, American History, Government, and Economics. Four of the participants have taught Advanced Placement (AP) level courses in the past. When asked if they have taught in another district or state, all of the participants reported that they had not; however, four of the participants had taught in another school within the district.

Questions 8 to 11, knowledge and training questions, sought to answer RQ1: What types of training in disciplinary literacy instruction, if any, have the social studies teachers at the school of study attended? They also spoke to its SQ: If training was attended, what was the perceived effectiveness by the social studies teachers at the school of study? The questions addressed the participants' knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction and training they have received in disciplinary literacy instruction (Appendix B). The following questions and responses addressed participant interviews.

Question 8 asked: "Are you aware of the Reading for History/Social Studies state standards?" Six of the 10 participants responded positively to this question without further explanation or clarification from the researcher. After clarification from the researcher, two of the other four participants stated that they were aware of the standards

and two stated that they were not. One participant stated that he/she was "aware of the standards but could not recall them in detail."

Question 9 asked, "What do you feel is the role of the social studies teacher in providing literacy instruction to students?" Nine of the 10 participants stated that the role of the social studies teacher in providing literacy instruction to students is critical and should be implemented in conjunction with the instruction given by ELA teachers. One reason for that was that "the content on the ELA state exam [Florida Standards Assessment] is mostly nonfiction, and a lot of the material that the students read on the exam contains historical documents, so it is important for social studies teachers to teach them to read these historical documents for understanding." Although nine participants agreed that it was critical for social studies teachers to implement literacy instruction, four of them felt that they were not adequately trained or knowledgeable enough to do so effectively. One participant stated that "the responsibility needs to be carried mainly by the ELA teachers because we have to worry about covering a massive amount of content. There is not much time to teach reading skills. And, I do not feel that I am the best person to do that. The ELA teachers should lead that charge. We can encourage the students to read though."

Question 10 asked: "What professional development sessions have you attended, if any, that were geared to teaching literacy in social studies?" Nine of the participants have attended Creating Independence through Student-Owned Strategies (CRISS) training, which focuses on literacy skills. One participant stated, "I use CRISS strategies often in my class. I wish they would offer an updated version of that training." Eight of

the participants stated that they attend the annual social studies conference offered by the school district each year. All eight of those participants stated that there were break-out sessions, taught by district ELA teachers, geared toward literacy instruction specific to social studies classes during that annual conference. One participant shared that attending those break-out sessions, "Makes you feel that everyone senses the need to help students with reading."

Question 11 asked: "Have you attempted to attend professional development sessions geared to teaching literacy in social studies?" Other than the annual social studies conference offered by the district, eight of the participants stated that they have not actively sought professional development that is specifically geared toward teaching literacy in social studies. Two participants stated that they have sought professional development training in literacy but were not able to find any to attend. One stated, "Those types of trainings are few and far between. The focus for social studies seems to always be on content."

Questions 12-16, instructional practice questions, focused on the participants' instructional practices, including instructional strategies and planning (Appendix B). The following questions and responses addressed participant interviews.

Question 12 requested: "Please describe a typical lesson in your class." Five of the 10 participants discussed beginning their class with a "bell-ringer" activity. One stated, "I post the essential question on the board as a bell-ringer. Students copy it into their notes and attempt to answer it by the end of the class period." Another participant stated, "I do various activities as bell-ringers, graphic organizers, political cartoons, or

visuals of some kind, to introduce the new topic being discussed in class that day." Two

of the participants stated that they begin class with oral reading of the text. Three of the

participants stated that they begin class reviewing what was discussed during the previous

class, either orally or by having students complete a written activity.

All of the participants stated that they use in-class oral reading and lecture during

a typical class. One participant stated, "I know it isn't looked highly upon, but I lecture.

Honestly, there is no other way to get the information to the students. They may read it,

but they don't always understand it by themselves." Three of the participants stated that

they provide students with guided reading activities during in-class reading or guided

note-taking worksheets to use for taking notes. One participant stated, "If I do not

provide students with a note-taking worksheet, they would write down every word I said.

Note-taking would take the full two-hour period, and we don't have time for that." Seven

of the participants stated that they assign independent or group work to students

following a lecture and note-taking session. Those seven participants all stated that they

rely heavily on the textbook to provide the follow-up activities to reading and note-

taking.

Question 13 asked: "How do you decide what instructional strategies to use

during each lesson to meet the requirements of the state standards?" All ten of the

participants mentioned the district created pacing guides when asked this question. Four

of the participants stated that they base their instructional strategies on the student

population in their classes. One participant stated, "Knowing your student population is

so important. I make instructional decisions based on IEPs and 504s, reading levels,

ability levels, and interest levels." Another participant stated, "I have a lot of SPED students. I have to modify a lot of what I do in my classes, but they are still meeting the standards."

Question 14 asked: "Do you incorporate disciplinary literacy strategies in your everyday lessons? If so, how? If not, why?" All of the participant responses were positive. All ten of the participants agreed that they, in some way, incorporate literacy instruction in every class period. One common thread was vocabulary. All of the participants mentioned utilizing vocabulary instruction in every class period. One participant stated, "The students have to define vocabulary and key terms every class period. If not, they have no idea what they are reading about or what I am talking about when I lecture."

Another commonality among the responses to this question was that all of the participants stressed the need to stay on pace with district expectations. They all agreed that incorporating literacy strategies is important, but that time is an issue. One participant stated, "We are up against the clock called the pacing guide. If we do not stay on pace, our students won't do well on the mini-assessments given by the district. Those scores then reflect poorly on our teaching." Another participant stated, "As much as I recognize the need to teach literacy skills, I have to stay on pace and cover the content. They have an exam to take at the end of the year. Those scores are part of what determines our school grade."

Question 15 asked: "How do you balance the instruction of disciplinary literacy and content in your class?" All of the participants stated that this is a struggle for them as

teachers. Balancing the amount of time given to cover material while assuring that students have the skills they need to understand that material appears to be a common concern among the participants. One participant stated, "This is our biggest challenge. I'm up against the district's expectations. I can't stop covering content because a student struggles with reading. What do I do?" Although they all admitted that this is a struggle, eight of the participants stated that they attempt to implement literacy instruction while they cover content. One participant stated, "I use graphic organizers to help them break down difficult text. We read primary documents, and I use a lot of CRISS strategies." Another participant stated, "It's a give and take. I incorporate reading skills and writing skills. The social studies labs are very useful for incorporating writing in our classes. We are covering content, but they are also practicing writing."

Question 16 asked:" How much time is used to teach disciplinary literacy? How much time is used to teach content?" Six of the participants stated that they believe it is a 40/60 ratio of literacy instruction to content instruction. One participant stated that approximately 15 minutes of the two-hour block is used for literacy instruction. Two participants stated that approximately 25% of class time is used for literacy instruction. One participant stated that it has to be equal. "In my class, it has to be 50/50. If I don't incorporate literacy instruction, they will never understand what they are reading. How can it possibly be less?"

In summary, the data from the interviews showed a discrepancy in the amount of time utilized to incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction in social studies classes. All of the participants admitted that time is a major factor in how they incorporate

disciplinary literacy instruction in their classes and that keeping on pace with district

expectations is a high priority. The data also showed that while all of the teachers

understand the need to incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction, some feel unprepared

to do so, citing a lack of effective training in disciplinary literacy instruction in social

studies; however, the majority have not sought training to assist them in this endeavor.

Observation Data

Data Collection Process

Once interviews were completed, instructional observations were conducted of

each participant. The participant scheduled an agreeable time and date with the

researcher to observe his/her class for one hour. The researcher followed the

instructional observation protocol (Appendix C) and took notes during each observation.

Minimal disturbance to classroom instruction was created during each observation.

Once each observation was complete, the researcher provided a summary of the

notes to each participant for a member check. Participants had one week to notify the

researcher of any changes he/she would like to make to the summary. All of the

observation notes were transported to the researcher's home and locked in a filing cabinet

until data analysis began.

Observations

Observations were conducted in each participant's classroom. The date and time

for each observation were chosen by each participant. The observations lasted

approximately 60 minutes. The researcher utilized the protocol established for the

instructional observation (Appendix C). Participants received the opportunity to review a

summary of the observation once each observation was completed to assure accuracy of information.

The observation process provided insight into the participants' use of disciplinary literacy instruction to reinforce what was noted during the interview. The role of the researcher during the observation included taking notes to support coding and analysis. Critical listening was also part of the researcher's role and was utilized as the primary data collection instrument during the observation process (Creswell, 2014).

Findings Connected to the Problem Statement and Research Questions

The observation data addressed RQ2 and RQ3: How are the social studies teachers at the school of study providing disciplinary literacy instruction to address the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards? How do the social studies teachers at the school of study blend disciplinary literacy instruction with content instruction to address the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards? Each participant agreed to a 60-minute observation. The researcher utilized the observation protocol and took notes during each observation.

Participant 1 engaged students in an analysis of American social issues. The students took notes while the participant lectured. A guided note-taking worksheet was utilized. At the conclusion of the lecture, students were asked to respond to guiding questions in their notebooks. The social studies standards being address were clearly posted for students; however, no Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards were posted.

Participant 2 began class by reminding students of the requirements for the project on which they are currently working. The project required students to affirm or negate Billy Joel's proposition that we (America) did not start the fire. Students were being asked to respond in the form of a researched-based, analytical essay and a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation. After the reminders, the students moved their desks to meet with their group members and began working on their project. Student tablets were utilized to access resources on the Internet. Students also utilized their textbook as a research resource. The social studies standards, as well as the Reading for History/Social Studies standards, were clearly posted on the board.

Participant 3 assigned a similar project to students as did Participant 2. Class began with a review of the project requirements, the grading rubric, and expectations for academic integrity. Students utilized their tablets to work in groups to research their chosen decade and its impact on American history. The participant provided students with guiding questions for their research. The social studies standards, as well as the Reading for History/Social Studies standards, were clearly posted on the board.

Participant 4 began class by introducing a new topic. Guided note-taking worksheets were distributed to each student. Students took notes utilizing the guided note-taking worksheets while the participant lectured. No standards or objectives were posted in the classroom.

Participant 5 began class with a bell-ringer activity. When students entered class, a political cartoon was posted on the electronic white board. Students took a moment to record their thoughts in their notebooks. Once the participant took attendance, a review

of the political cartoon began. Students offered their thoughts, and the participant shared

how the cartoon connects to the topics being covered in class. This activity lasted about

15 minutes. The participant then reviewed some history sources posted to a Pinterest

page. The participant then distributed a graphic organizer to each student. The purpose

of the graphic organizer was for students to take notes during the participant's lecture.

Short videos were utilized during the lecture to clarify certain points of information. The

social studies standards, as well as the Reading for History/Social Studies standards, were

clearly posted on the board.

Participant 6 began class by reviewing the topic discussed during the previous

class, what a person needs to do to be elected. Once the review ended, the participant

handed out a graphic organizer for students to complete utilizing their notes and

resources that they were directed to access on the internet. The social studies standards

were posted on the board for the students to view; however, the Reading for

History/Social Studies Florida Standards were note posted.

Participant 7's class was engaged in a project similar to the students in

Participants 2 and 3's classes. Class began with a review of the project requirements and

the grading rubric. Students utilized their tablets to work in groups to research their

chosen decade and its impact on American history. The participant provided students

with guiding questions for their research. The social studies standards, as well as the

Reading for History/Social Studies standards, were clearly posted on the board. The

students worked in their groups for the remainder of the 60-minute observation. The

participant circulated the room to assist students in need.

Participant 8 engaged the students in a discussion regarding future course choices and college entrance requirements. Standards were not posted; however, the class being observed was an Advanced Placement (AP) course which is not necessarily limited to the Florida State Standards. The participant explained to the researcher that the AP exam for that course had already taken place, so the focus for the students is on choosing other AP courses and understanding college entrance requirements.

Participant 9 addressed the Cold War and Post-War changes during the observation. Students were utilizing a note-taking guide to take notes while the participant lectured. The participant utilized a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation to provide visuals to supplement the lecture. Students asked questions as needed, and discussion took place. The social studies standards, as well as the Reading for History/Social Studies standards, were clearly posted on the board.

Participant 10 also utilized lecture as the primary method of information distribution. Students listened and took notes in their notebooks based on the lecture being given. No note-taking worksheets or guides were provided. No standards were posted for the students.

In summary, apart from Participants 8 and 10, all of the participants utilized some form of reading or note-taking/writing strategy during the class that was observed. While all but three participants posted the social studies standards, the Reading for History/Social Studies standards were only posted by five participants. In addition, all but three of the participants utilized lecture during their observed classes. In the three classes without lecture, the students were engaged in a group project.

Review of Documents Data

Data Collection Process

Each of the 10 participants submitted a minimum of three documents of their

choice for review. The documents were given to the researcher during the interview or

observation. Among the documents submitted were lesson plans, classwork/worksheets,

project descriptions, and assessments. Documents were transported to the researcher's

home and locked in a filing cabinet until the data analysis process began.

Review of Documents

The review of documents was conducted in a conference room at the school of

study. Participants submitted three documents of their choice during the interview or

observation. Each review of documents lasted approximately 60 minutes. The researcher

utilized the protocol established for the review of documents (Appendix D).

The review of documents process provided insight about the participants' use of

disciplinary literacy instruction to reinforce what was noted during the interview and

observation. The role of the researcher during the review of documents included taking

notes to support coding and analysis. During the review of documents, the researcher

noted a description of the document, the intended purpose of the document, the standards

covered by each document, and any evidence of disciplinary literacy instruction. Upon

completion of the review, a copy of each document was returned to the respective

participant.

Findings Connected to the Problem Statement and Research Questions

The review of documents addressed RQ 2 and RQ 3: How are the social studies teachers at the school of study providing disciplinary literacy instruction to address the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards? How do the social studies teachers at the school of study blend disciplinary literacy instruction with content instruction to address the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards? The participants were asked to submit any document that showed evidence of disciplinary literacy instruction. The documents submitted by the participants were categorized into four types: lesson plans, classwork/worksheets, project descriptions, and assessments.

Lesson plans. Of the 10 participants, three submitted lesson plans for the review of documents. The intended purpose of all of the lesson plans was to detail the objectives of each lesson, the activities in which students were engaged, and how students were assessed on the skills that were taught. Of the three lesson plans submitted, one did not list any of the Florida Standards, neither the standards for social studies nor the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards. One lesson plan listed only the social studies standards covered by that lesson, and one lesson plan listed both the social studies standards being covered as well as the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards.

Classwork/Worksheets. All ten of the participants submitted documents in this category. The documents included graphic organizers, reading assignments, review questions, political cartoons, and writing assignments. The intended purpose of each of the documents submitted was for students to review a topic that had been covered in class

by using a reading or writing skill. All of the documents addressed both Social Studies Florida State Standards and Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards.

Projects. Five of the ten participants submitted project descriptions. The documents included group projects and individual writing assignments. The intended purpose of each assignment was to assess students' knowledge of a particular historical topic by having students research, write an essay/report, or present their findings via PowerPoint. All of the documents addressed both Social Studies Florida Standards and Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards.

Assessments. Three of the 10 participants submitted an assessment, either a quiz or a test, for the review of documents. The intended purpose of each assessment was to determine students' knowledge of a historical topic. Of the three documents submitted, one of the documents consisted of 40 multiple choice questions.

In summary, all of the participants submitted documents that showed evidence of disciplinary literacy instruction. Examples of these include writing assignments, reading assignments using primary documents, and graphic organizers. While three participants submitted lesson plans as a document for review, only one participant listed the Reading for History/Social Studies standards on the lesson plan.

Thematic Patterns Between Data Sources

Yin (2014) recommends conducting an analysis for patterns between data sources. The data sources used for this study included responses from interviews, field notes from observations, and field notes from a review of documents. Three themes emerged from the data: a) Pacing; b) Knowledge/Preparation; and c) Professional Development

Opportunities. Participants expressed concern about the pacing of the courses they teach. They were concerned that implementation of disciplinary literacy instruction would impede on the amount of time they have to teach course content and keep them from maintaining the pace required by the district; however, the review of documents and observations showed that many of the teachers were already implementing disciplinary literacy instruction. In addition, participants also felt uninformed about the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and unprepared to teach disciplinary literacy due to a lack of effective training; however, the review of documents and observations showed that many of the participants were implementing disciplinary literacy instruction. Finally, although the participants did not actively seek professional development opportunities in teaching disciplinary literacy, many expressed the need for professional development in disciplinary literacy instruction. Participants expressed concern for a lack of professional development opportunities that address disciplinary literacy instruction in social studies.

The results of the data analysis point to the need for the administration to provide quality professional development (PD) on the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instructional strategies. Administrators will need to provide the time and resources necessary to conduct a professional development program on the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction. A professional development program may give social studies teachers the knowledge and/or training necessary to effectively implement disciplinary literacy instruction.

Conclusion

The data from the interviews, observations, and review of documents showed a pattern between participant responses that included a desire for professional development in the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction. Participants expressed the need for training in how to implement disciplinary literacy instruction without utilizing a great amount of time needed for content instruction. In Section 2, I presented the methodology for the study, in addition to the rationale for the study design and approach. I discussed the procedures used in participant selection, data collection, and data analysis. The credibility of the findings was also discussed.

With these results in mind, the project was designed to include a three-day training session on the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction. The first day focuses on unpacking the standards and identifying the requirements of each standard. The second day focuses on disciplinary literacy instructional strategies. The third day provides the participants with opportunities to collaborate to create material to assist with incorporating disciplinary literacy instruction. Section 3 of this project study provides details on the rationale, timeline, and goals of the project.

Section 3: The Project

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to determine social studies teachers' knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction and how it is being implemented in their classrooms. Based on the current literature and the findings from this study, it is evident that there is a need for professional development to address the social studies teachers' understanding of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and their knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction. The findings showed that participants felt uninformed about the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and unprepared to teach disciplinary literacy. They were also concerned that implementation of disciplinary literacy instruction would impinge on the amount of time they have to teach course content and keep them from maintaining the pace required by the district. Participants expressed the need for training in how to implement disciplinary literacy instruction without utilizing a great amount of time needed for content instruction.

I created a 3 half-day professional development program that focuses on enhancing teachers' understandings of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction. First, teachers need to become familiar with the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and what is required to meet the specifications of these standards. Next, the teachers need disciplinary literacy instructional strategies that can be incorporated in their classroom instruction in practical, timely ways. Finally, teachers need time to collaborate and develop lessons that include

disciplinary literacy instruction and create instructional material to implement those lessons. The goal of this professional development program is to increase the effectiveness of disciplinary literacy instruction in social studies by developing the social studies teachers' knowledge of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction.

Rationale

Three themes emerged from the data in this study: (a) pacing, (b) knowledge/preparation, and (c) professional development opportunities. Participants showed concern regarding the amount of time in which they are expected to cover a large amount of content in each social studies course. They fear that implementation of disciplinary literacy instruction will impinge on the amount of time they have to teach course content and keep them from maintaining the pace required by the district. In addition, participants also felt uninformed about the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and unprepared to teach disciplinary literacy. Finally, participants expressed the need for professional development in disciplinary literacy instruction.

The rationale for the creation of this professional development is supported by the current literature on effective professional development. Effective professional development is necessary to respond to the demands of standards-based accountability policies (Fullan et al., 2015). Effective professional development programs provide instruction in pedagogy and allow teachers to construct knowledge through collaboration and the exposure to authentic artifacts (Ching & Hursh, 2014; Fullan et al., 2014). The findings of this study showed that participants attended some professional development

opportunities in which they were exposed to disciplinary literacy instructional strategies; however, they felt that a sufficient amount of effective training in disciplinary literacy instruction had not been offered by the district.

The project was designed with the needs of adult learners in mind. According to Jordan (2016), the following factors are necessary to support adult learning: (a) the need for knowledge, (b) the control over the individual's own learning, (c) real-world context when learning, (d) preparedness to learn, (e) exposure to learning, and (f) intrinsic motivation. Each factor listed by Jordan (2016) was considered in creating the project to meet the needs of the social studies teachers.

The findings from this study provided a framework for the 3 half-day professional development program to support social studies teachers in understanding the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction. Teachers may gain an understanding of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and what is required to meet the specifications of the standards. The teachers will be exposed to disciplinary literacy instructional strategies that can be incorporated in their classroom instruction in practical, timely ways. The professional development program will also offer teachers time to collaborate and develop lessons that include disciplinary literacy instruction and create the instructional material necessary to implement the lessons. Providing social studies teachers with this professional development program may lead to an increase in effective disciplinary literacy instruction in the social studies courses at the school of study.

Review of the Literature

I conducted an analysis of research literature from peer-reviewed articles and journals. I conducted an exhaustive search of the literature using the Walden University library resources, including ERIC and Education Research Complete. I also utilized Google Scholar to locate research for the literature review. The keywords used in the search included: *professional development, effective professional development, disciplinary literacy professional development,* and *social studies professional development.* The review of literature supported a 3-day professional development program on the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction as the framework for this project.

Professional Development

Professional development programs provide teachers with a way to grow as professionals and stay abreast of the latest trends in education. According to Edinger (2017), it is an important predictor of classroom success. Millions of dollars are being invested each year in an effort to create an increased focus on teacher professional development; however, some professional development programs are ineffective because they lack clear and authentic links to classroom instructional practices (Gore et al., 2017; Gutierez & Kim, 2017) and may not take the theory of andragogy, or adult learning, into consideration (Knowles, 1973). Knowles (1973) outlined four assumptions that can be made about adult learners. The first assumption is that adults are self-directed and have a need to be treated as such (Knowles, 1973). When they are not perceived as self-directed or treated like children, it may interfere with their learning. The second assumption

involves an increase in the emphasis on experiential learning (Knowles, 1973). Because

adults come to a learning situation with experiences that define who they are, ignoring

these experiences will be perceived as though the learners themselves are being ignored.

The third assumption involves an adult's need to learn certain information or skills

because of their position in life (Knowles, 1973). For example, many adults engage in

learning experiences to assist in their careers, improve leadership skills, and so forth. The

final assumption is that adults tend to have a problem-centered motivation for learning

(Knowles, 1973). In other words, when adults face a problem at their place of

employment, they will seek knowledge in an effort to solve said problem.

Effective professional development utilizes the assumptions outlined by Knowles

(1973) while enhancing teacher knowledge of the subject matter, providing extended

learning time, actively engaging teachers in the learning process, allowing for

collaboration among teachers, and being directly linked to what teachers are being asked

to do (Monte-Sano et al., 2017, Teras & Kartoglu, 2017). Similar to Jordan's (2016) list

of factors to support adult learners and Knowles (1973) assumptions, Teras and Kartoglu

(2017) outlined nine elements for successful professional development. These include:

(a) Authentic context, (b) authentic tasks, (c) access to expert modeling, (d) promoting

multiple roles, (e) collaboration, (f) reflection, (g) articulation, (h) coaching support, and

(i) authentic assessment. Both Jordan (2016) and Teras and Kartoglu (2017) list

authentic context as a necessary element for professional development in adults.

Understanding the real-world need for the implementation of curriculum and how it is

adaptable to the teaching of their subject matter contributes to a more successful

professional development program (Beriswill, Bracey, Sherman-Morris, Huang, & Lee, 2016; de Groot-Reuvekamp, et al., 2018). Authentic tasks and expert modeling assist teachers with the implementation, or the reenactment, of the instruction in their classrooms (Kennedy, 2016; Schoenbach, Greenleaf, & Murphy, 2017). Promoting multiple roles assures that learners are exposed to a variety of sources and information (Teras & Kartoglu, 2017). Collaboration and coaching involve collegial sharing of best practices and interaction among professional development program participants (Teras & Kartoglu, 2017). McNeill, Butt, & Armstrong (2016) interviewed teachers at three schools to determine the influence of a collaborative professional development on instructional practices. The researchers determined that collaborative professional development provided an effective method for teachers to consolidate information into more effective instructional practices (McNeill et al., 2016). Reflection and articulation allow teachers to have a better understanding of themselves as professionals (Ab Rashid, 2018). Providing teachers with the time to reflect on what was learned, the implementation of the learning, and its successes and/or failures is a critical part of the professional growth process (Ab Rashid, 2018).

Content-Specific Professional Development

Content-specific professional development refers to a professional development program that focuses on the curriculum of one content, as opposed to general educational practices. Creating a content-specific professional development program allows for more authentic tasks and expert modeling, which assist teachers with the implementation, or the reenactment, of the instruction in their classrooms (Kennedy, 2016; Schoenbach et al.,

2017). Teachers experience content-specific lessons, learn the rationale behind the curriculum content, and focus on content-specific pedagogy (Bautista, Yau, & Wong, 2017; Fenton, 2017).

Although there is an increased focus on professional development programs for teachers and more funding is being allocated for this use in many districts, the programs may not be adequate to meet the content-specific needs of teachers (Bautista et al., 2017; Gore et al., 2017; Gutierez & Kim, 2017). Professional development programs should provide teachers with a deeper understanding of their subject matter and instructional strategies that are content-specific (Bautista et al., 2017; Mendoza, 2018). If the need for content-specific professional development is taken into consideration, this school of study will require professional development training in the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction in social studies. This professional development training will address the problem and purpose of this study.

Collaboration

Collaboration occurs when two or more teachers come together to practice collegial sharing or teamwork (Teras & Kartoglu, 2017). An essential component of effective professional development is the opportunity to practice collaboration. A study of physical education teachers participating in professional development communities showed that collaboration made them feel part of a community, which could foster collegiality and professional growth (Patton & Parker, 2017). Participating in a collaborative professional development program allows teachers an opportunity to share thoughts and attitudes, along with instructional practices, and be supportive of one

another. It is a critical element in professional growth. Bearing that in mind, the professional development program created for the school of study will take place in a collaborative setting where teachers will be given the opportunity to share and discuss their thoughts and ideas. The third day of the professional development program will be dedicated to collaborative work to create authentic lessons and the instructional materials necessary to execute the lessons.

Project Description

The purpose of this professional development program is to increase social studies teachers' knowledge of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction. The project consists of 3 half-day training sessions; each session is approximately 3 hours long. The first day includes an in-depth look at the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards. A review of the standards will be completed, and participants will be given an opportunity to discuss how they could incorporate the standards into their current lessons. The second day includes an in-depth look at lessons that incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction for social studies. Methodology for incorporating disciplinary literacy instruction into a daily social studies lesson will be researched, and sample lessons will be presented. The third session will allow participants to collaborate to develop lesson plans and resources to execute the plans they develop. Providing participants with an opportunity to develop plans that are authentic to the content of their courses will assure a more successful professional development program (Beriswill et al., 2016; de Groot-Reuvekamp et al., 2018).

Resources and Support

Most of the resources needed to implement this professional development program are readily available to the school of study. Teachers will need a laptop and the Internet to access the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards. They may choose to take notes using Microsoft Word or paper and pen/pencil. The presenter will also need a laptop/desktop computer, interactive whiteboard with projector, access to the internet, and copies of the handouts for the participants. The participants will be provided paper copies of the online documents organized in a binder.

Potential Barriers and Solutions

Two potential barriers to this project are: (a) substitute funding for teachers to attend the professional development program; and (b) scheduling time for the program. One possible solution would be to utilize the three district-designated optional teacher work days for this professional development program. This solution will eliminate the need for substitute teachers, as those days are already designated as non-student contact days. This solution will also eliminate the issue of scheduling time for training and, in fact, allow for a half-day of extra time after each session for participant reflection and/or collaboration.

Other potential barriers include administrative support for the implementation of this professional development program and teacher buy-in. Both teachers and administrators have expressed the need for training and support in disciplinary literacy instruction; therefore, buy-in and support should not be an issue at the school of study. Should buy-in and support present as a problem, data from the study will be presented,

providing evidence and support for this professional development program. Administrative support seems likely, as the problem of the study supports the need for training in disciplinary literacy instruction.

Proposal for Implementation and Project Timetable

The timetable for this professional development program will be August 12-14, 2019. Each session will take place from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. The first session will consist of an in-depth review of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards. The second session will include an in-depth look at disciplinary literacy instruction for social studies, with time to research sample lessons and resources. The third session will be designated for collaboration time for participants to work to develop their own lessons and resources authentic to the content in the courses they teach.

Roles and Responsibilities

There are several roles and responsibilities that must be assumed for this professional development program to be successful. First, the school administrator must approve the dates and times for the program. The administrator must provide a space for the professional development program to occur, keeping in mind the need for laptops for the participants and an interactive white board and projector for the facilitator. Second, I will assume the role of facilitator, providing the participants with the materials necessary for a successful program. Copies of any digital presentations and/or tools will be emailed to all participants, and paper copies of all digital presentations and/or tools will also be provided. The facilitator will be responsible for creating and providing the participants with the digital and paper copies. Finally, the participants have a responsibility to

approach this professional development program with a willingness to learn and implement the skills and tools provided. All roles and responsibilities must be completed for this program to be successful.

Program Evaluation Plan

At the end of each of the first two sessions, the participants will complete a formative evaluation to provide feedback on their experiences. The evaluations will provide the facilitator with feedback to make necessary changes prior to the next session. At the end of the third session, participants will complete the first of two summative evaluations to provide feedback on their overall experience. The purpose of the summative evaluations is to determine if the goals of the professional development program were met. Specifically, the evaluation will provide feedback on whether participants feel more knowledgeable about the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction. Three months after the professional development program, participants will be asked to complete another evaluation to provide feedback on the program's influence on their instructional practices.

Key Stakeholders

The key stakeholders include teachers and administrators at the school of study, as well as district personnel. Participating teachers will benefit from the professional development program because of the skills obtained that will directly affect classroom instruction and, in turn, student achievement. Administrators will monitor the program and the participants' learning. They will also monitor student learning and student

achievement. All stakeholders will be given access to the study, the data, and the

findings to better understand the purpose of the project and its goals.

Project Implications

Social Change for the Local Site

This professional development program addresses the need to improve social

studies teachers' knowledge of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards

and disciplinary literacy instruction, which may result in positive social change.

Improving teachers' instructional practices in literacy could positively impact student

achievement and student preparation for college and careers (Carney & Indrisano, 2013;

Wolsey & Faust, 2013). Effective disciplinary literacy instruction will provide students

with the opportunity to grapple with challenging and authentic text, a skill necessary in

college and for success in many career fields (Carlson, 2015; Vaughan et al., 2016;

Wendt, 2013). Participants will also be given time to collaborate to develop lesson plans

and the instructional material needed to execute the lesson plans. Participants will also

be given time to collaborate to identify any concerns they may have and work to develop

solutions to these problems. Improving social studies teachers' understanding and

knowledge of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary

literacy instruction will lead to an increase in student achievement in reading.

Larger-Scale Social Change

Larger scale social change for the professional development program will include

utilizing the program beyond the school of study. NAEP data show a steady decline in

reading proficiency scores from 1992 to 2015, with only 37% of high school seniors

scoring at or above grade-level proficiency in 2015 (Nation's Report Card, 2015). Of

these twelfth-grade students, approximately 46% of white and 49% of Asian students

scored at or above grade level proficiency. For Latinos/Hispanics, 25% scored at or

above grade-level proficiency, while 17% of African American/blacks scored at or above

grade-level proficiency (Nation's Report Card, 2015). In response to this need to

increase literacy proficiency, content area teachers are being asked to incorporate

disciplinary literacy instruction in their classes. Disciplinary literacy allows content area

teachers who may feel unprepared to take on the responsibility of teaching literacy skills

and who may be concerned that teaching literacy will detract from their ability to cover

content material to create literacy instruction during content acquisition (Carney &

Indrisano, 2013; De La Paz et al., 2014). The project will present strategies and

suggestions that are designed specifically for social studies teachers to incorporate

disciplinary literacy instruction in their classrooms. The results from this study will offer

substantiation to a larger population experiencing similar problems in reading

achievement.

Conclusion

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to determine social studies

teachers' knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction and how it is being implemented

in their classrooms. The qualitative data showed that participants felt uninformed about

the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and unprepared to teach

disciplinary literacy. They also expressed a concern for the impact that teaching

disciplinary literacy would have on the pacing of their courses. Based on these findings,

a professional development program was created in which participants would be given time to review the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and determine how best to cover the standards in their classes, learn about disciplinary literacy and how to incorporate it in their classes so as not to disturb the pace of the course, and collaborate with colleagues to create relevant lessons and instructional material.

Section 4: Reflections and Conclusions

Introduction

Section 4 of this study includes the strengths and limitations of the project and provides recommendations for improvement. This will assist in supporting other sites experiencing similar problems in reading proficiency. This section includes my reflections on scholarship, project development, and leadership. This section also includes a personal reflection, with discussions on implications, applications, and directions for future research.

Project Strengths

A strength of the project is that it addresses the problem of the study by identifying social studies teachers' knowledge of and implementation of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida standards and disciplinary literacy instruction, as determined during data analysis. The project began with a review of the literature and triangulation of various data sources. This substantiated the project format as the best fit for responding to the problem at the school of study.

Another strength of this project is that it addresses the concerns expressed by the participants. The qualitative data showed that participants felt uninformed about the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and unprepared to teach disciplinary literacy. They also expressed a concern for the impact that teaching disciplinary literacy would have on the pacing of their courses. The project will provide the participants with a review of the standards as well as disciplinary literacy

instructional materials and lessons that can be adapted to fit the needs of the student populations they teach.

The final strength of this project is that it allows for time to collaborate. Participants will have time to work together to develop relevant lessons and instructional materials that can be used in their classes. They can work to identify any concerns or possible barriers and problem-solve as a team during this collaboration time. The project and collaboration time for the development of peer-generated lessons and instructional materials will address the concerns expressed by participants regarding their lack of knowledge of the standards and disciplinary literacy instruction.

Project Limitations

One of the limitations of this project is a lack of time. Because all of the participants are teachers and would require substitutes and/or release time from class, the most cost-effective time to conduct this professional development project is during the designated teacher work days in August, before the start of the school year. However, that limits the program to three days.

A second limitation is buy-in from teachers and administrators. The study participants have identified concerns regarding the need for a professional development program on the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction; however, the remainder of the social studies department members may not agree that there is a need for this program and may not be willing to participate (Jordan, 2016).

Another limitation may be the small sample size used for this study. Although 10 participants were interviewed and observed out of the 14 teachers in the social studies department at the school of study, generalizability to a greater population of social studies teachers outside the school of study may be affected by this small sample size. To increase generalizability and address this limitation, the study could be conducted at other school sites within this school district (Creswell, 2014; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

The final limitation of this study is the experience and competency of the researcher. I had no prior experience in collecting and analyzing qualitative data or developing a project of this magnitude. Strategies for addressing this limitation included member checking for accuracy and triangulation methods for the collection of data (Creswell, 2014; Yin, 2014). A program evaluation will also be used to identify the effectiveness of the project.

Recommendations for Alternative Approaches

An alternative way to address the problem at the school of study could include implementing a long-term professional development program. Continuing the program for more than 3 days will allow the participants an opportunity to share concerns regarding implementations of the lessons and instructional materials created during the first three sessions. An extended program will also allow for the sharing of best practices in disciplinary literacy instruction. In addition, an extended program could allow for the involvement of other content area departments as well, such as mathematics and science.

Another alternative could be to involve social studies teachers from several schools throughout the district that are experiencing the same problems with literacy

proficiency. Involving other schools would lead to more generalizable data and a greater collaborative effort and sharing of best practices. This strategy would support the need to increase literacy proficiency on a district-wide scale.

Scholarship, Project Development and Evaluation, and Leadership and Change

This study will provide stakeholders with information about social studies teachers' knowledge of and implementation of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction. Improving social studies teachers' knowledge of the standards and disciplinary literacy instruction could improve disciplinary literacy instructional practices in social studies, resulting in a possible overall increase in student literacy proficiency at the school of study. Addressing the need for disciplinary literacy instruction in the content areas could lead to an improvement in literacy proficiency at the school of study.

Self-Analysis of Scholarship

This study gave me the opportunity to challenge myself, as both an educator and a researcher, in ways that I never thought possible. Throughout the process, I gained valuable knowledge about teaching disciplinary literacy in social studies and how it differs from teaching literacy in ELA. As an ELA teacher, I have been able to apply this information to the ways in which I approach primary historical documents and other seminal texts in my classes. My role as an ELA teacher is more clearly defined by understanding the role that other subject area teachers play in literacy instruction.

During the process of this research study, I learned how to be a research practitioner by conducting a study and analyzing the data collected to determine findings.

I found writing up the qualitative findings to be the most difficult, although determining themes and organizing the findings by theme made it simpler. All of the information I have learned by conducting this study has helped me grow as a professional. I have a newfound respect for the work of my colleagues and a stronger desire to share my knowledge of literacy instruction with those outside of the ELA department.

Self-Analysis of Project Development

Through the information I gathered during the research process, I learned that teachers want time to collaborate and develop authentic lessons and instructional material. They also want time to share ideas with one another, identify barriers they face, and develop ways to overcome the barriers. I took the information I learned during the interviews into consideration when developing the project. I attempted to provide teachers with the time, not only to receive the information they feel they lack regarding the standards and disciplinary literacy instruction, but to collaborate to develop lessons and instructional materials. It was important for me to create a project that satisfied the teachers' needs and made efficient use of their time. Developing a project that met their needs was satisfying to me as an educator and research practitioner.

Self-Analysis of Leadership and Change

I embarked on the process of earning my doctoral degree to fulfill a life-long dream. However, I feel that something greater has emerged from the process. I have developed an awareness of the need for literacy instruction in all disciplines, and I now have the knowledge to share my understanding of that need with others. In the future, I would like to work in a leadership role providing teachers of other disciplines with

knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction and guide them in the process of implementation. This doctoral journey has led to a possible new career goal for me and a way to bring about positive change in literacy education.

Reflection on the Importance of the Work

Throughout my study, although I often felt overwhelmed, I attempted to focus on the importance of the work. My goal was to find a solution to a serious problem in education, the need to increase literacy proficiency. Through my review of the literature, I determined that disciplinary literacy instruction was one way to increase literacy proficiency in the school of study. Researchers studied the effects of disciplinary literacy instruction and found it to be effective in creating college-ready readers and writers (Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). Knowing that I could impact the school of study by developing ways for social studies teachers to become more knowledgeable about the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction drove me to complete the research and project development process. Now that I am at the end of this journey, it is exciting to know that my work could positively influence the instructional practices of teachers and the literacy proficiency of students at the school of study.

Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research

I designed the professional development program to address the concerns of the administrators at the school of study regarding low proficiency levels in reading by incorporating disciplinary literacy instruction in social studies classes. The information from this study and the professional development program that was developed can be

used by administrators to address social studies teachers' concerns about teaching

disciplinary literacy, which may lead to positive social change. Improving social studies

teachers' knowledge and implementation of the Reading for History/Social Studies

Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction could lead to more effective

instruction in social studies and an increase in students' literacy proficiency. Providing

students with the skills necessary to critically read and comprehend the complex text of a

specific discipline can prepare students for success beyond the secondary classroom

(Carney & Indrisano, 2013; Lapp et al., 2015; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2015; Stewart-

Dore, 2013; Wendt, 2013; Wolsey & Faust, 2013). These skills are critical in the

professional world and are needed to become productive and successful adults in today's

society (Carlson, 2015; Vaughan et al., 2016; Wendt, 2013).

Possible future implications and applications include additional professional

development programs that address disciplinary literacy instruction in other subject areas

or disciplines, such as science and mathematics. This study could also be implemented at

other high schools in the district to extend the collaborative effort of the professional

development program. In addition, the information gathered from this study and the

implementation and evaluation of the professional development program could be shared

with local colleges and universities in an effort to create more effective teacher

preparation programs.

For further research, I recommend extending the research to include more schools

in the district and teachers of various subject areas. Studies could be conducted in

schools throughout the district, and the professional development program could be

implemented on a district-wide basis. New professional development programs could be created based on the findings to include mathematics and science teachers, as well as teachers of the fine and vocational arts. These additional programs would provide disciplinary literacy instruction to all content area teachers, thus improving literacy instruction and overall student proficiency in literacy.

Conclusion

This study was focused on determining social studies teachers' knowledge and implementation of the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards and disciplinary literacy instruction. From the study findings, I created a professional development program to address the teachers' knowledge of the standards and disciplinary literacy instruction. The program also provides participants with the time to collaborate to develop authentic lesson plans and instructional material to teach disciplinary literacy in social studies. Developing more effective instructional practices in disciplinary literacy in social studies will lead to an increase in students' proficiency in literacy. This impact will influence social change at the school of study. If effective, this professional development program may be valuable to other schools in assisting to increase reading proficiency through disciplinary literacy instruction in social studies.

References

Ab Rashid, R. (2018). Dialogic reflection for professional development through

conversations on a social networking site. *Reflective Practice, 19*(1), 105-117.

doi:10.1080/14623943.2017.1379385

Allender, T. & Freebody, P. (2016). Disciplinary and idiomatic literacy: Re-living and re-

working the past in senior school history. *Australian Journal of Language and

Literacy 39*(1), 7-19. Retrieved from https://www.alea.edu.au/

Bautista, A., Yau, X., & Wong, J. (2017). High quality music teacher professional

development: A review of literature. *Music Education Research, 19*(4), 455-469.

doi:10.1080/14613808.2016.1249357

Bennett, S. M. & Hart, S. M. (2015). Addressing the shift: Preparing preservice

secondary teachers for the common core. *Reading Horizons, 53*(4), 1-33.

Retrieved from http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons

Beriswill, J.E., Bracey, P.S., Sherman-Morris, K., Huang, K., & Lee, S.J. (2016).

Professional development for promoting 21st century skills and common core

state standards in foreign language and social studies classrooms. *Tech Trends,

60*, 77-84. doi:10.1007/s11528-015-0004-5

Bernstorf, E. (2014). Disciplinary literacy: A new concept or old as the hills? *Kodaly

Envoy, 40*(4), 33-35. Retrieved from http://www.oake.org

Carlson, J. R. (2015). Disciplinary literacy from the perspective of one beginning social

studies teacher candidate. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 54*, 185-205.

Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ulri20

Carney, M. Indrisano, R. (2013). Disciplinary literacy and pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Education, 193*(3), 39-49. Retrieved from http://www.bu.edu/journalofeducation/

Ching. C.C., & Hursh, A.W. (2014). Peer modelling and innovation adoption among teachers in online professional development. *Computers & Education, 73*(1), 72-82. doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.12.011

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2018). About the standards. Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (Laureate custom ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

de Groot-Reuvekamp, M., Ros, A., & Van Boxtel, C. (2018). A successful professional development program in history: What matters? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 75*, 290-301. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2018.07.005

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 and Research in Social Education, 42*(2), 228-274. doi:10.1080/00933104.2014.908754

Dew, T. & Teague, S. (2015). Using disciplinary literacy strategies to enhance student learning. *Science Scope, 38*(6), 33-38. Retrieved from https://www.nsta.org/

Edinger, M.J. (2017). Online teacher professional development for gifted education: Examining the impact of a new pedagogical model. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 61*(4), 300-312. doi:10.1177/0016986217722616

Fang, Z. (2014). Preparing content area teachers for disciplinary literacy instruction. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 57*(6), 444-448. doi:10.1002/jaal.269

Fang, Z. (2016). Teaching close reading with complex texts across content areas. *Research in the Teaching of English, 51*(1), 106-116. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org

Fenton, D. (2017). Recommendations for professional development necessary for iPad integration. *Educational Media International, 54*(3), 165-184. doi:10.1080/09523987.2017

Florida Department of Education. (2014). Florida standards. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/academics/standards/florida-standards

Florida Department of Education. (2016). Florida school accountability reports. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/accountability-reporting/school-grades

Florida Department of Education. (2017a). Literacy for learning in the content areas. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/academics/standards/subject-areas/literacy

Florida Department of Education. (2017b). Florida school accountability reports. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/accountability-reporting/school-grades/

Freebody, P., Chan, E., & Barton, G. (2013). Literacy and curriculum: Language and knowledge in the classroom. In K. Hall, T. Cremin, B. Comber, & L. C. Moll

(Eds.), *International handbook of research on children's literacy, learning, and culture* (pp. 304–318). Chichester, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781118323342.ch22

Fullan, M., Rincon-Gallardo, S., & Hargreaves, A. (2015). Professional capital as accountability. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 23*(15), 1-15. doi:10.14507/epaa.v23.1998.

Gore, J., Lloyd, A., Smith, M., Bowe, J., Ellis, H., & Lubans, D. (2017). Effects of professional development on the quality of teaching: Results from a randomized controlled trial of quality teaching rounds. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 68*, 99-113. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.08.007

Gutierez, S.B., & Kim, H.B. (2017). Becoming teacher-researchers: Teachers' reflections on collaborative professional development. *Educational Research, 59*(4), 444-459. doi:10.1080/00131881.2017.1347051

Hannant, K. & Jetnikoff, A. (2015). Investigating a disciplinary approach to literacy learning in a secondary school. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years, 23*(3), 28-37. Retrieved from http://www.alea.edu.au/

Ingram, J. M., Bumstead, S., Wilson, T. (2016). Content and disciplinary literacies: A compromise to benefit pre-service teachers. *National Teacher Education Journal, 9*(2), 103-108. Retrieved from http://www.ntejournal.com/

Jordan, C. (2016). The community-engaged scholars program: Designing a professional development program to enhance individual capacity, community benefit, and institutional support. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education,*

8(3), 6-15. Retrieved from http://www.indstate.edu/jcehe/index.htm

Kenna, J. L. & Russell, W.B. (2015). Secondary social studies teachers' time

commitment when addressing the common core state standards. *Journal of Social

Studies Education Research, 6*(1), 26-48. Retrieved from http://sosyalbilgiler.org

Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review

of Educational Research, 86*(4), 945-980. doi:10.3102/0034654315626800

Knowles, M. (1973). *The adult learner: A neglected species*. Houston, TX: Gulf

Publishing Company.

LaDuke, A., Lindner, M., & Yanoff, E. (2016). Content, disciplinary, and critical

literacies in the C3 and common core. *Social Studies Research and Practice,

11*(3), 96-111. Retrieved from http://socstrp.org

Lapp, D., Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2015). Learning, creating, and sharing information

across the disciplines. *Voices from the Middle, 22*(1), 7-9. Retrieved from

http://www.ncte.org

Leedy, P., & Ormond, J. (2015). Practical research: Planning and design (11th ed.).

Boston, MA: Pearson.

Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2010). *Methods in educational

research: From theory to practice* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McNeill, J., Butt, G., & Armstrong, A. (2016). Developing collaborative approaches to

enhance the professional development of primary mathematics teachers.

Education 3-13, *44*(4), 426-441. doi:10.1080/03004279.2014.973896

Mendoza, A. (2018). Preparing preservice educators to teach critical, place-based

literacies. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 61*(4), 413-420. doi:10.1002/jaal.708

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merrian, S., & Tisdell, E. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Monte-Sano, C., De La Paz, S., Felton, M., Piantedosi, K.W., Yee, L.S., & Carey, R.L. (2017). Learning to teach disciplinary literacy across diverse eighth grade history classrooms within a district-university partnership. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 44*(4), 98-124. Retrieved from: http://www.teqjournal.org/

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). Program for International Student Assessment. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pisa/pisa2015/pisa2015highlights_4.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). What is NAEP? Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/

Nation's Report Card. (2015). 2015 Mathematics and Reading at Grade 12. Retrieved from https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_g12_2015/#reading

Patton, K., & Parker, M. (2017). Teacher education communities of practice: More than a culture of collaboration. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *67*, 351-360. doi:10.1016/j.tate.207.03.013

Pytash, K. & Ciecierski, L. (2015). Teaching from a disciplinary literacy stance. *Voices from the Middle, 22*(3), 14-18. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org

Schoenbach, R., Greenleaf, C., & Murphy, L. (2017). *Leading for literacy: A reading apprenticeship approach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 1-21. Retrieved from http://hepg.org/her-home/home

Shanahan, T. and Shanahan, C. R. (2015). Disciplinary literacy comes to middle school. *Voices from the Middle, 22*(1), 10-13. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org

Stewart-Dore, N. (2013). Coda: From content area reading to disciplinary literacy. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years, 21*(1), 48-50. Retrieved from http://www.alea.edu.au/

Teras, H., & Kartoglu, U. (2017). A grounded theory of professional learning in an authentic online professional development program. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 18*(7), 49-68. doi:10.1080/147939X.2017.1361469

Thurtell, C. (2013). Do the common core standards flunk history? *Social Science Docket, 13*(2), 8-12. Retrieved from http://www.nyscss.org/resources/publications/docket.cfm

Vaughan, L. J., Smith, S. & Cranston, M. (2016). An argument for disciplinary information literacy. *Knowledge Quest, 44*(5), 40-41. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1099505.pdf

von der Embse, N. P., Schoemann, A. M., Kilgus, S. P., Wicoff, M., & Bowler, M. (2017). The influence of test-based accountability policies on teacher stress and instructional practices: a moderated mediation model. *Educational Psychology,*

37(3), 312-331. doi:10.1080/01443410.2016.1183766

Wendt, J. L. (2013). Combating the crisis in adolescent literacy: Exploring literacy in the secondary classroom. *American Secondary Education, 41*(2), 38-48. Retrieved from http://www.ashland.edu/academics/education/ase/

Wineburg, S., Martin, D. & Monte-Sano, C. (2013). *Reading like a historian: Teaching literacy in middle and high school history classrooms.* New York, NY. Teachers College Press.

Wineburg, S. & Reisman, A. (2015). Disciplinary literacy in history: A toolkit for digital citizenship. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 58*(8), 636-639. doi:10.1002/jaal.410

Wolsey, D. & Faust, M. (2013). Getting started with disciplinary literacy. *California Reader, 46*(3), 22-29. Retrieved from http://www.californiareads.org/

Yin, R. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendix A: The Project

Day 1
8:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.: Review standards and allow participants to work in groups.
9:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.: Break
9:45 a.m. – 10:55 a.m.: Presentations
10:55 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.: Review of assignment for the next session

DAY 1: Unpacking and understanding the content standards.
Objective: Compare and contrast the reading standards skill focus in grades 9-10 and grades 11-12.
Activity: Group Jigsaw

1) Break participants down into groups and divide among them 1-2 of the 9-10 and 11-12 reading standards.

2) Using chart paper and markers group members will visually represent the common skill focus of each standard and differentiate the process of how that skill is applied.

3) Members will then discuss what they have done; or brainstorm materials or processes they have utilized or could use in their classroom to teach that standard. Using pre-established Google.doc files, each group will also complete a strategy / resource outline for their assigned standard that can be shared with the group. This will be expanded upon in the homework assignment to prepare for the next class.

4) Groups will present and discuss each standard pairing with additional input being solicited from the class as a whole on methods and resources used to deliver each standard.

5) Homework Assignment: Using, but not limited to the online resources provided, group members will consult on dividing up and researching for lesson plans and materials which will meet the standards to which they were assigned and which would be adaptable for any subject.

6) Homework Product for Next Class: Each student should contribute and present to the group a resource / lesson sample and a brief outline of activities with suggested time spent to teach that skill / standard. These outlines might also be established online using Google.doc to provide a collaborative platform and for easy presentation the following class.

Day 2
8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.: Video clips and discussion
8:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.: Group work
9:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.: Break
9:45 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.: Presentations
DAY 2: Mapping Sample Strategies and Lessons to the Standards
Objective: Research and identify historical reading and writing strategies standards skill focus in grades 9-10 and grades 11-12.
Activity: Group Jigsaw

1) How do I fit in literacy and still deliver content to my students? Introduce the session with the Teaching.org or Stanford Education Group clips on teaching historical thinking skills. Teachers should consider these skills for discussion in the groups.

2) Groups will reconvene for individual presentation / review of the resource materials found for the assigned standard.
   a) Group discussion regarding challenges and strategies for efficiency in time and effectiveness in instructional integrity.
   b) Using the Google.doc files provided, each group will provide a list of resources / lessons with active links and a brief outline with a suggested timeline to teach each skill or strategy.
   c) Outlines are intended to be usable for teachers to insert into their working lesson plans for efficient use of time.

3) Group Standard / Skill Resource Presentations

Day 3
8:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.: Planning
9:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.: Break
9:45 a.m. – 10:50 a.m.: Planning
10:50 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.: Evaluation
DAY 3: Curriculum Mapping
Objective: Research and identify historical reading and writing strategies standards skill focus in grades 9-10 and grades 11-12.
Activity: Teacher Planning

1) Teachers within common subject areas will meet to map standards and lesson resources to their course syllabi and ensure alignment with any required pacing guides.

Historical Literacy and Writing Resources

1) The Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History: History Now. https://www.gilderlehrman.org
2) Facing History: https://www.facinghistory.org
3) American Historians Association: https://www.historians.org/
4) Teaching History: https://teachinghistory.org
5) Historical Thinking Matters: historicalthinkingmatters.org
6) Stanford History Education Group: sheg.stanford.edu
7) History Detectives: PBS. http://www.pbs.org/opb/historydetectives/educators/
8) The Critical Thinking Consortium: https://tc2.ca/
9) The Historical thinking Project: http://historicalthinking.ca/
10) Docs Teach: Library of Congress. https://www.docsteach.org/activities

Resources

STRAND: READING STANDARDS FOR LITERACY IN HISTORY/SOCIAL STUDIES 6–12		
Cluster 1: Key Ideas and Details		
STANDARD CODE	**STANDARD**	**COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY**
LAFS.910.RH.1.1	**Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, <u>attending to such features as the date and origin of the information.</u>**	Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.1112.RH.1.1	Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, <u>connecting insights gained from specific details to an understanding of the text as a whole.</u>	Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.910.RH.1.2	**Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; <u>provide an accurate summary of how key events or ideas develop over the course of the text.</u>**	Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.1112.RH.1.2	Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; <u>provide an accurate summary that makes clear the relationships among the key details and ideas.</u>	Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.910.RH.1.3	**Analyze in detail a series of events described in a text; <u>determine whether earlier events caused later ones or simply preceded them</u>.**	Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.RH.1.3	Evaluate various explanations for actions or events and <u>determine which explanation best accords with textual evidence, acknowledging where the text leaves matters uncertain.</u>	Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

Cluster 2: Craft and Structure		
STANDARD CODE	**STANDARD**	**COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY**
LAFS.910.RH.2.4	**Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including vocabulary describing political, social, or economic aspects of history/social science.**	**Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts**
LAFS.1112.RH.2.4	Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including analyzing how an author uses and refines the meaning of a key term over the course of a text (e.g., how Madison defines faction in Federalist No. 10).	Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts
LAFS.910.RH.2.5	**Analyze how a text uses structure to emphasize key points or advance an explanation or analysis.**	**Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning**
LAFS.1112.RH.2.5	Analyze in detail how a complex primary source is structured, including how key sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text contribute to the whole.	Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.RH.2.6	**Compare the point of view of two or more authors for how they treat the same or similar topics, including which details they include and emphasize in their respective accounts.**	**Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning**
LAFS.1112.RH.2.6	Evaluate authors' differing points of view on the same historical event or issue by assessing the authors' claims, reasoning, and evidence.	Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

Cluster 3: Integration of Knowledge and Ideas		
STANDARD CODE	**STANDARD**	**COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY**
LAFS.910.RH.3.7	**Integrate quantitative or technical analysis (e.g., charts, research data) with qualitative analysis in print or digital text.**	**Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning**
LAFS.1112.RH.3.7	Integrate and evaluate multiple sources of information presented in diverse formats and media (e.g., visually, quantitatively, as well as in words) in order to address a question or solve a problem.	Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.RH.3.8	**Assess the extent to which the reasoning and evidence in a text support the author's claims.**	**Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning**
LAFS.1112.RH.3.8	Evaluate an author's premises, claims, and evidence by corroborating or challenging them with other information.	Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.RH.3.9	**Compare and contrast treatments of the same topic in several primary and secondary sources.**	**Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning**
LAFS.1112.RH.3.9	Integrate information from diverse sources, both primary and secondary, into a coherent understanding of an idea or event, noting discrepancies among sources.	Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

Cluster 4: Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity		
STANDARD CODE	**STANDARD**	**COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY**
LAFS.910.RH.4.10	**By the end of grade 10, read and comprehend history/social studies texts in the grades 9–10 text complexity band independently and proficiently.**	**Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts**
LAFS.1112.RH.4.10	By the end of grade 12, read and comprehend history/social studies texts in the grades 11–CCR text complexity band independently and proficiently.	Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts

STRAND: WRITING STANDARDS FOR LITERACY IN HISTORY/SOCIAL STUDIES 6–12		
Cluster 1: Key Ideas and Details		
STANDARD CODE	**STANDARD**	**COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY**
LAFS.910.WHST.1.1	**Write arguments focused on discipline-specific content.**	**Level 4: Extended Thinking & Complex Reasoning**

a. Introduce precise claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that establishes clear relationships among the claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence.
b. Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly, supplying data and evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both claim(s) and counterclaims in a discipline-appropriate form and in a manner that anticipates the audience's knowledge level and concerns.
c. Use words, phrases, and clauses to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships between claim(s) and reasons, between reasons and evidence, and between claim(s) and counterclaims.
d. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing.
e. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from or supports the argument presented.

LAFS.1112.WHST.1.1	**Write arguments focused on discipline-specific content.**	**Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning**

a. Introduce precise, knowledgeable claim(s), establish the significance of the claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that logically sequences the claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence.
b. Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly and thoroughly, supplying the most relevant data and evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both claim(s) and counterclaims in a discipline-appropriate form that anticipates the audience's knowledge level, concerns, values, and possible biases.
c. Use words, phrases, and clauses as well as varied syntax to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships between claim(s) and reasons, between reasons and evidence, and between claim(s) and counterclaims.
d. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the

| norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing. |
| e. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from or supports the argument presented. |

LAFS.910.WHST.1.2	**Write informative/explanatory texts, including the narration of historical events, scientific procedures/ experiments, or technical processes.**	**Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning**

a. Introduce a topic and organize ideas, concepts, and information to make important connections and distinctions; include formatting (e.g., headings), graphics (e.g., figures, tables), and multimedia when useful to aiding comprehension.
b. Develop the topic with well-chosen, relevant, and sufficient facts, extended definitions, concrete details, quotations, or other information and examples appropriate to the audience's knowledge of the topic.
c. Use varied transitions and sentence structures to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships among ideas and concepts.
d. Use precise language and domain-specific vocabulary to manage the complexity of the topic and convey a style appropriate to the discipline and context as well as to the expertise of likely readers.
e. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing.
f. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the information or explanation presented (e.g., articulating implications or the significance of the topic).

LAFS.1112.WHST.1.2	**Write informative/explanatory texts, including the narration of historical events, scientific procedures/ experiments, or technical processes.**	**Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning**

a. Introduce a topic and organize complex ideas, concepts, and information so that each new element builds on that which precedes it to create a unified whole; include formatting (e.g., headings), graphics (e.g., figures, tables), and multimedia when useful to aiding comprehension.

b. Develop the topic thoroughly by selecting the most significant and relevant facts, extended definitions, concrete details, quotations, or other information and examples appropriate to the audience's knowledge of the topic.

c. Use varied transitions and sentence structures to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships among complex ideas and concepts.

d. Use precise language, domain-specific vocabulary and techniques such as metaphor, simile, and analogy to manage the complexity of the topic; convey a knowledgeable stance in a style that responds to the discipline and context as well as to the expertise of likely readers.

e. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the information or explanation provided (e.g., articulating implications or the significance of the topic).

Cluster 2: Production and Distribution of Writing		
STANDARD CODE	**STANDARD**	**COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY**
LAFS.910.WHST.2.4	**Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.**	**Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning**
LAFS.1112.WHST.2.4	Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.	Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.WHST.2.5	**Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on addressing what is most significant for a specific purpose and audience.**	**Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning**
LAFS.1112.WHST.2.5	Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on addressing what is most significant for a specific purpose and audience.	Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.WHST.2.6	**·Use technology, including the Internet, to produce, publish, and update individual or shared writing products, taking advantage of technology's capacity to link to other information and to display information flexibly and dynamically.**	**Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts**
LAFS.1112.WHST.2.6	Use technology, including the Internet, to produce, publish, and update individual or shared writing products in response to ongoing feedback, including new arguments or information.	Level 2: Basic Application of Skills & Concepts

Cluster 3: Research to Build and Present Knowledge		
STANDARD CODE	**STANDARD**	**COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY**
LAFS.910.WHST.3.7	**Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects to answer a question (including a self-generated question) or solve a problem; narrow or broaden the inquiry when appropriate; synthesize multiple sources on the subject, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.**	**Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning**
LAFS.1112.WHST.3.7	Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects to answer a question (including a self-generated question) or solve a problem; narrow or broaden the inquiry when appropriate; synthesize multiple sources on the subject, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.	Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning
LAFS.910.WHST.3.8	**Gather relevant information from multiple authoritative print and digital sources, using advanced searches effectively; assess the usefulness of each source in answering the research question; integrate information into the text selectively to maintain the flow of ideas, avoiding plagiarism and following a standard format for citation.**	**Level 4: Extended Thinking &Complex Reasoning**
LAFS.1112.WHST.3.8	Gather relevant information from multiple authoritative sources, using advanced searches effectively; assess strengths and limitations of each source in terms of the specific task, purpose, and audience; integrate information into the text to maintain the flow of ideas, avoiding plagiarism and overreliance on one source and following a standard	Level 4: Extended Thinking & Complex Reasoning

	format for citation.	

Cluster 4: Range of Writing		
STANDARD CODE	**STANDARD**	**COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY**
LAFS.910.WHST.4.10	Write routinely over extended time frames (time for reflection and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of discipline-specific tasks, purposes, and audiences.	Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning
LAFS.1112.WHST.4.10	Write routinely over extended time frames (time for reflection and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of discipline-specific tasks, purposes, and audiences.	Level 3: Strategic Thinking & Complex Reasoning

Formative Evaluation for Day 1 and 2:

Using a scale of 1-5, where 1 is Disagree and 5 is Agree, please answer the following

questions.

This professional development was relevant to my needs.

1   2   3   4   5

This professional development was of quality.

1   2   3   4   5

This professional development enhanced my understanding of the Reading for

History/Social Studies Florida Standards.

1   2   3   4   5

This professional development provided me with relevant tools to effectively implement

disciplinary literacy instruction.

1   2   3   4   5

Summative Evaluation

Using a scale of 1-5, where 1 is "disagree" and 5 is "agree", please answer the following

questions.

After attending this professional development, I feel more knowledgeable about the

Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards.

1   2   3   4   5

After attending this professional development, I feel better equipped to incorporate

disciplinary literacy instruction in my classes.

1   2   3   4   5

I feel that this professional development was a productive use of time.

1   2   3   4   5

I feel that attending this professional development will make me a more effective teacher.

1   2   3   4   5

After attending this professional development, I understand the need for disciplinary

literacy instruction in social studies.

1   2   3   4   5

Summative Evaluation (After 3 months)

Using a scale of 1-5, where 1 is Disagree and 5 is Agree, please answer the following questions.

I have been able to utilize strategies that I learned during the professional development in my classes.

1   2   3   4   5

I feel confident incorporating disciplinary literacy strategies in my classes.

1   2   3   4   5

I feel confident utilizing strategies to address the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards.

1   2   3   4   5

I feel confident locating strategies to address the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards.

1   2   3   4   5

Comments:

Appendix B: Interview Protocol

Research Questions:

1. What types of training in disciplinary literacy instruction, if any, have the social studies teachers at the school of study attended?
   Sub-question:
   If training was attended, how effective was the training in disciplinary literacy instruction attended by the social studies teachers from the school of study?
2. How are the social studies teachers at the school of study providing disciplinary literacy instruction to address the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards?
3. How do the social studies teachers at the school of study blend disciplinary literacy instruction with content instruction to address the Reading for History/Social Studies Florida Standards?

Date:

Time at Start of Interview:

Time at End of Interview:

Interviewee's Assigned Number:

Opening Script:

Thank you for taking the time to allow me to interview you today. The purpose of my study is to explore social studies teachers' knowledge of disciplinary literacy instruction and the methods in which social studies teachers incorporate disciplinary literacy instruction in their classes to meet the demands of the Reading for History/Social Studies standards. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If at any time there is a question you do not want to answer or if you would like to stop the interview entirely, please let me know. To protect your identity, I will be assigning you a participant number and will use your number instead of your name. I will be taking notes during the interview, and I will also need to audio record the interview. Once the interview is over, I will transcribe the interview from the audio recording, and I will provide you with a summary to review for accuracy. Do you have any questions before we begin? Please let me know when you are ready, and I will begin recording.

Background Questions:

1. Gender? Age?
2. How long have you been teaching?
3. How long have you been teaching social studies?
4. Have you ever taught another subject?
5. What subjects are you currently certified to teach?
6. What grade levels and courses have you taught?
7. Have you ever taught in another school, district, or state?

Knowledge and Training:

8. Are you aware of the Reading for History/Social Studies state standards?

   Directions for interviewer:

   - If no, read the Reading for History/Social Studies state standard to the participant.

9. What do you feel is the role of the social studies teacher in providing literacy instruction to students?
10. What professional development sessions have you attended, if any, that were geared to teaching literacy in social studies?
11. If not, have you attempted to attend professional development sessions geared to teaching literacy in social studies? If yes, what did you find most useful about the professional development sessions?

Instructional Practices:

12. Please describe a typical lesson in your class.
13. How do you decide what instructional strategies to use during each lesson to meet the requirements of the state standards?
14. Do you incorporate disciplinary literacy strategies in your everyday lessons? If so, how? If not, why?
15. How do you balance the instruction of disciplinary literacy and content in your class?
16. How much time is used to teach disciplinary literacy? How much is used to teach content?

Concluding Script:

Thank you for allowing me to interview you. I appreciate your time. Keep in mind that all of your responses will remain confidential. Once I have transcribed the interview, I will send you a summary to review for accuracy. If there is anything you feel that I should change, please notify me.

Appendix C: Observation Protocol

Date:

Time at Start of Observation:

Time at End of Observation:

Participant's Assigned Number:

Topic being covered:

Standards being taught:

Objectives of lesson:

Intended outcome:

Materials used:

Activities:

How students will be assessed:

Number of students in the class:

Appendix D: Review of Documents Protocol

Date:

Time at Start of Review:

Time at End of Review:

Interviewee Assigned Number:

Document 1:

Description of document:

Intended purpose:

Standards covered:

Evidence of disciplinary literacy instruction:

Document 2:

Description of document:

Intended purpose:

Standards covered:

Evidence of disciplinary literacy instruction:

Document 3:

Description of document:

Intended purpose:

Standards covered:

Evidence of disciplinary literacy instruction: