

University of Nevada, Reno

Explicit Instruction in United States History Textbooks Exercises: The Role of
Exercises in Navigating and Critically Evaluating Textbooks

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Science in
Educational Specialties

By

Paul Thaddeus Boone

May, 2010

© Copyright by
Paul Thaddeus Boone
2010



University of Nevada, Reno
Statewide • Worldwide

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

We recommend that the thesis
prepared under our supervision by

PAUL THADDEUS BOONE

entitled

Explicit Instruction In United States Textbooks Exercises: The Role Of Exercises
In Navigating And Critically Evaluating Textbooks

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Rod Case And Kathryn Obenchain, Advisor

, Committee Member

Barbara Walker, Graduate School Representative

Marsha H. Read, Ph. D., Associate Dean, Graduate School

May, 2010

Abstract

Textbooks dominate history classrooms. Research finds that textbooks contain debatable interpretations and omit significant historical accounts. Researchers recommend the explicit instruction in learning strategies to help students to navigate and critically evaluate textbooks. The limited amount of research into exercises suggests textbooks encourage a passive learning approach asking students to be recorders of textbook knowledge. This thesis investigated exercises for the inclusion of research-based explicit instruction practices using Bloom's Revised Taxonomy and Explicit Instruction Practice categories as analytical tools. Explicit instruction practices were found in 22.5% of the exercises. While the majority of these exercises were lower-order thinking items, higher-order thinking exercises were more prominent than they were in the results for all exercises. The inclusion of explicit instruction practices in exercises seems to point to a means to increase the availability of higher-order thinking tasks in textbooks.

Dedication

Dedicado a Cecilia Medal, su energía positiva y alegría por la vida ayudó a vigorizar mi cuerpo, mente y alma.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the extra mile after extra mile both my advisors, Dr. Obenchain and Dr. Case, went to help me challenge myself to complete this thesis. I would like to acknowledge the infusive support of Dr. Walker. I would also like to thank my fellow graduate students, Luca Steiner, Christin Glover, and Mia Ellis for their editing help, moral support, and friendship.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	1
Chapter 1: Introduction	2
<u>Terminology</u>	4
<u>Theoretical Framework</u>	7
<u>Textbook Readability</u>	10
<u>Exercises in United States History Textbooks</u>	11
Chapter 2: Literature Review	13
<u>Content Analysis of United States History Textbooks</u>	14
Debatable Interpretations in United States History Textbooks	15
Omissions in United States History Textbooks	19
Conclusion	24
<u>Research-Based Practices for Explicit Instruction in History Textbooks</u>	25
Before Reading	25
During Reading	28
After Reading	29
Conclusion	30
<u>Exercises in United States History Textbooks</u>	31
Conclusion	34
<u>Research Questions</u>	34
Chapter 3: Methods	35
<u>Selection</u>	35
High School United States History Textbook	36
Middle School United States History Textbook	36
Teacher Editions and Sections	37
<u>Bloom's Revised Taxonomy</u>	38
Bloom's Revised Taxonomy Organizational Scheme	39
<u>Data Collection for All Exercises</u>	40
<u>Data Collection Procedures for All Exercises</u>	40
Conclusion	43
<u>Data Collection for Explicit Instruction Exercises</u>	43
<u>Data Collection Procedures for Explicit Instruction Exercises</u>	44
Conclusion	48
<u>Data Analysis</u>	48
<u>Procedures for Data Analysis</u>	49
Chapter 4: Results	52
<u>Overall Results</u>	52
Bloom's Revised Taxonomy	52
Explicit Instruction Practices Categories	54

<u>Comparisons with Previous Research Studies</u>	55
Comparisons with LaVere’s Research on Exercises in United States History Textbooks.....	56
Comparisons with Hess’ and Stoddard’s Research on Textbook Exercises.....	58
Comparisons with Harmon’s et al Research on Vocabulary Instruction in Social Studies Textbooks.....	61
Conclusion	63
<u>Comparison between the Overall Results and Explicit Instruction Exercises Results</u>	64
Distribution of Exercises.....	66
Distribution of EIE.....	68
Chapter 5: Discussion	73
<u>Recommendations</u>	75
Appendices.....	77
<u>Appendix A: Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy Dimensions and Definitions</u>	77
The Knowledge Dimension	77
Cognitive Process Dimensions	78
<u>Appendix B: Explicit Instruction Practice Categories and Definitions</u>	82
<u>Appendix C: Explicit Instruction Exercises</u>	84
<u>Appendix D: Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy for All Exercises</u>	85
<u>Appendix E: Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy for Explicit Instruction Exercises</u>	86
<u>Appendix F: Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy: Total Availability for All Exercises</u> ... 87	
<u>Appendix G: Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy: Relative Availability for All Exercises</u>	88
<u>Appendix H: Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy: Total Availability for Explicit Instruction Exercises</u>	89
<u>Appendix I: Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy: Relative Availability for Explicit Instruction Exercises</u>	90
<u>Appendix J: Explicit Instruction Exercises: Total and Relative Availability</u>	91
<u>Appendix K: Explicit Instruction Exercises for Navigating, Investigating, and Critically Evaluating</u>	92
Bibliography	93

List of Tables

- Table 1: Majority of Exercises Identified by this Study in the Knowledge Dimension
- Table 2: Majority of Exercises Identified by this Study in the Cognitive Process Dimension
- Table 3: Lower-Order Thinking Exercises Identified by this Study in the Intersections
of the Knowledge and Cognitive Process Dimensions
- Table 4: Higher-Order Thinking Exercises in Teacher Sections for Knowledge Dimension
- Table 5: Higher-Order Thinking Exercises in Teacher Sections for Cognitive Process
dimension
- Table 6: Higher-Order Thinking Exercises in Teacher Sections for the intersection between
the Knowledge and Cognitive Process dimensions
- Table 7: Lower-Order Thinking EIE that Match the Definition for Navigating
- Table 8: Higher-Order Thinking EIE that Match the Definition for Investigating
- Table 9: Lower-Order Thinking EIE that Match the Definition for Critically Evaluating
- Table 10: Distribution of Exercises in the Student Sections for Both Textbooks
- Table 11: Distribution of Exercises in the Student Sections for the High School
Textbook
- Table 12: Distribution of Exercises in the Student Sections for the Middle School
Textbook
- Table 14: Distribution of EIE in the Teacher Sections for the Both Textbooks
- Table 15: Distribution of EIE in the Teacher Sections for the High School Textbook
- Table 16: Distribution of EIE in the Teacher Sections for Middle School Textbook

Chapter 1: Introduction

Textbooks are central to the education system in the United States. They provide students with a portable reference text that is filled with basic content area information. They provide schools with a durable instructional tool that can be passed down from student to student. They provide teachers with an organized overview of a variety of academic fields. While most content area instruction relies on textbooks, the centrality of textbooks is especially apparent in United States History classrooms where they dominate the curriculum and instruction (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2007). Textbook usage in history classrooms has changed little over the past few decades. Studies of social studies textbook usage in the 1980s and early 1990s were relatively consistent. Depending on the grade level and subject of the class, it was estimated that 70% to 95% of activities in United States classrooms relied on textbooks (Chambliss & Calfee, 1998; Woodward & Elliott, 1990). The latest statistics are remarkably similar to past decades. Depending on the grade level, 32-42% of students report reading from a textbook about every day, while 3-7% of students report never reading from the textbook. In contrast, 7-8% of students report reading extra material not in the textbook while 12-31% of students report never reading extra material not in the textbook (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1999, 2002, 2007). Given the dominance of textbooks in the history classrooms it becomes important to understand what kind of instruction textbooks offer students and teachers.

Textbooks are powerful instructional tools. They are the students' primary source of information about United States History and help develop students' understanding of history (Crawford, 2003; Ogawa, 2006; Romanoski, 2003; Waters, 2005; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). Textbook instruction can be helpful in acquiring basic knowledge, such as identifying key historical events, dates, and people. They seem less helpful in developing deeper understanding of what these key events, dates, and people mean to history and the present.

Researchers have delved into textbooks and their findings highlight why textbook dominance in classrooms is problematic.

Textbooks contain debatable interpretations that is often presented in an authoritative manner that leaves little room for critical evaluation of the evidence it presents (Bain, 2006; Bryant, 2008; Case, Ndura, & Righettoni, 2006; Crawford, 2003; Delaney, 2007; DeRose, 2007; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; Manning, 2006; Ogawa, 2006; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Romanoski, 2003; Schleppegrell et al 2004). Textbooks are often organized in an incoherent manner, overflowing with eye-catching visuals and make assumptions about students' background knowledge. This organizational scheme can make it difficult for students to read textbooks and to make critical connections between events, people, issues, and ideas (Bain, 2006; Caron, 2005; Daniels & Zemelman, 2004; Harmon et al, 2000; Harniss, Caros, & Gersten, 2007; Hendrik, 2004; Manzo, 2000; Myers & Savage, 2005). When textbooks are organized in such a manner, history can become simply a list of facts and dates that obscures historical patterns and hampers critical thinking (Manning, 2006).

Given the problematic nature of textbooks, teachers need to address these issues and provide students with opportunities to navigate and critically evaluate textbooks. Students may require explicit instruction in reading and learning strategies to help them comprehend the text and develop a more balanced understanding of history (Harison, 2002; Kalman, Aulls, Rohar, & Godley, 2008; Myers & Savage, 2005). Since textbooks dominate history curriculum and teachers often rely on their teachers' editions for instructional purposes (Harmon et al, 2000), an important question remains: Do history textbook exercises provide teachers and students opportunities to use reading and learning strategies to help them understand how to navigate and critically evaluate the text?

While there is considerable research on the content of history textbooks (Alridge, 2006; Berkwitz, 2004; Bryant, 2008; Case et al, 2006; Clark, 2004; Clark et al, 2005; Crawford, 2003; Daniels & Zemelman, 2004; DeRose, 2007; Dorn, 2008; Harison, 2002;

Harniss et al, 2007; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; Hughes, 2007; Kaiomea, 2007; Ogawa, 2006; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Romanoski, 2003; Schleppegrell et al 2004; Sanchez, 2007; Vidal-Abarca, Martinez, & Gilabert, 2000; Zhao & Hoge, 2006), there is little research on exercises in textbooks (LaVere, 2008). The continuing dominance of textbooks in history classrooms and the issues regarding content and coherence emphasize the need for exercises that instruct students on how to navigate the textbook's structure and features and how to use learning and reading strategies to help them critically evaluate the information within the text. Thus the purpose of the study is to investigate the availability of exercises that offer explicit instruction in how to navigate the features of the history textbook and critically evaluate the content of the text as well as the intended intellectual work required by those exercises. Two analytical tools, Bloom's Revised Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) and Explicit Instruction Practice categories devised by the researcher from Meeks' (2003) guided reading guidelines and from the recommendations in the research literature, are used by the researcher to code each exercise.

The remainder of this introduction consists of four parts. First, the terminology used for the study is defined. Second, constructivism as the theoretical framework of the thesis is explained. Third, the readability of textbooks is assessed. And finally, the need to research textbook exercises is appraised.

Terminology

There are several terms that are referred to throughout the thesis that need to be clarified. The definitions and terms are derived from the various research literature cited below and the guided reading chapter in *Literacy in the Secondary English Classroom: Strategies for Teaching the Way Kids Learn* by Lynn Meeks (2003). The terms and their definitions are derived from similarities and overlaps found in the literature's recommendations, findings, and theoretical frameworks. These similarities and overlaps

address the paradigm of constructivism (Bain, 2007; César & Santos, 2006; Crawford, 2003; Hawkey, 2007; Kalman et al et al, 2008; Wiersma, 2008; Vidal-Abarca et al, 2000), critical literacy and critical language awareness (Case et al, 2006; Delaney, 2007; Myers & Savage, 2005; Ogawa, 2006; Schleppgrell et al 2004; Trinkle, 2009), guided reading (Meeks, 2003), and direct instruction of learning and reading strategies (Bain, 2007; Berkwitz, 2004; Delaney, 2007; Fordham et al, 2002; Forsten, Grant, & Hollas, 2003; Hedrick et al, 2004; McCabe, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Romanoski, 2003; Schleppgrell et al, 2004; Trinkle, 2009).

Exercises refer to activities available to students and teachers found in unit previews and review sections and in the corresponding supplemental sections of the teacher editions. Textbook exercises “provide one means for determining the manner in which students are held accountable for the material contained in the text and/or the material they are required to learn” (LaVere, 2008, p. 3). Exercises can include but are not limited to questions, activities, projects, essays, and vocabulary.

Explicit instruction refers to the direct teaching of reading and learning strategies. Every teacher is a literacy teacher for their content area and needs to reinforce reading and learning strategies to help students read to learn within the academic discipline (Forsten et al, 2003; Trinkle, 2009). Explicit instruction can include using organizers, making inferences, thinking about thinking, summarizing the content, connecting reading to previous experiences and knowledge, and visualizing concepts as they read (Trinkle, 2009). It includes asking and answering probing questions of the text before, during, and after reading in order to build comprehension (McCabe, 2003). These probing questions include predicting, connecting, problem-solving, text-related, presentation and layout, leading, and self-assessment (Appendix B; Meeks, 2003).

Navigating refers to using the vocabulary, structure, design, and features of the textbook to construct meaning (Kalman et al et al, 2008). Students may be asked to scan

through the features of the textbook to gain familiarity with its organization (Kalman et al et al, 2008; McCabe, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Schleppgrell et al, 2004), make predictions about the purpose and value of the textbook's features and confirm their purpose as they read (Harmon et al, 2000; Meeks, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Trinkle, 2009), make connections between the text and their own backgrounds (Forsten et al et al, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Trinkle, 2009; Vidal-Abarca et al, 2000), create advance organizers or memory markers to collect data (Fordham et al, 2002; Forsten et al, 2003; Kalman et al et al, 2008; McCabe, 2003; Trinkle, 2009), and look up definitions for vocabulary terms or create their own definitions from the context in which the words are used (Berkwitz, 2004; Forsten et al, 2003; Harmon et al, 2000; Hedrick et al, 2004; Myers & Savage, 2005).

Investigation refers to the implementation of reading and learning strategies. Students can ask and answer probing questions regarding what is included and excluded from the textbook accounts (Caron, 2005; Haenan & Tuithuf, 2008; Kalman et al, 2008; McCoy, 2005; Meeks, 2003; Romanonski, 2003; Trinkle, 2009), what kind of evidence is employed by the authors to support their historical depictions (Berkwitz, 2004; Kaiomea, 2006; Ogawa, 2006), what arguments are presented by the authors to explain historical interactions and their connections as well as in what context the historical accounts occurred (Manning, 2006). Students can be asked to think about their own beliefs and how they may impact their understanding of history (Berkwitz, 2004; Trinkle, 2009), discuss the points of view of the textbook authors and alternative interpretations of historical accounts with other students (Caron, 2005; Case et al, 2006; Delaney, 2007; Schleppgrell et al, 2004), or retell the historical account in the textbook in their own words (Bain, 2007; Case et al, 2006; Delaney 2007; Forsten et al, 2003; Fordham et al, 2002; Kalman et al, 2008; Manning 2006; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Trinkle, 2009).

Critical Evaluation refers to the close reading of textbooks as a questionable source. Students engage in open-ended investigations of historical accounts by conducting a

systematic search based on probing questions to evaluate the textbook as a historical source (Case et al, 2006; Caron, 2005; Haenan & Tuithuf, 2008; Kalman et al, 2008; McCoy, 2005; Meeks, 2003; Romanonski, 2003; Trinkle, 2009), reflect on the construction of historical knowledge through the textbook's structure (Kalman et al, 2008; McCabe, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Schleppegrell et al, 2004), examine the word choice and language used by the authors (Bryant, 2006; Case et al, 2006; Delaney, 2007; Harmon et al, 2000; Hedrick et al, 2004; Myers & Savage, 2005; Schleppegrell et al, 2004), check on the validity of textbook depictions by comparing and contrasting them with outside sources or their own previous knowledge and experiences (Alridge, 2008; Hawkey, 2007; Kalman et al, 2008; Trinkle, 2009; Vidal-Abarca et al, 2000), deconstruct textbook explanations (Delaney, 2007; Manning 2006; Romanonski, 2003; Schleppegrell et al, 2004), create new definitions for vocabulary and key terms (Berkwitz, 2004), make a list of omissions and debatable interpretations (Berkwitz, 2004), or justify their findings with historical evidence from a variety of sources and exercises (Delaney, 2007; Forsten et al, 2003; Haenan & Tuituf, 2008; Hawkey, 2007; Trinkle, 2009).

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of constructivism offers a means to understand why it is important for students to have opportunities to learn how to navigate and critically evaluate textbooks. "Research posits that constructivism is the most effective approach to educating history students. However, most history teachers still use traditional, objective methods in their classrooms" (Wiersma, 2008, p. 111). All too often textbook instruction dominates the classroom as the unquestioned authority dispensing knowledge to be absorbed by students and recalled when asked (Bain, 2007; Berkwitz, 2004; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Romanonski, 2003; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). The alignment of state-mandated content standards with textbook content is a major reason for the increased use in history

classroom. As standards get tougher, requiring more content to be covered in the classrooms, teachers feel pressured to cover everything and put their trust in textbooks written by experts to reach this goal. They often rely on their teacher editions to help them consolidate and transmit a wealth of information mandated by content standards (Bain, 2006; Bryant, 2008; Daniels & Zemelman, 2004; Harmon et al, 2000; Ogawa, 2006; McCoy, 2005; Mustafa & Cullingford, 2008; Schleppegrell et al, 2004). The results are difficult-to-understand texts and a fragmented pedagogical approach where the teacher teaches to cover the required content standards and the students learn to acquire the facts to pass the test or complete an assignment.

This emphasis on an authoritative source of knowledge runs counter to the constructivist approach to education. In the constructivist paradigm, there is no objective reality or single truth, but multiple interpretations of reality and multiple truths. “Human beings have no access to an objective reality since we are constructing our version of it, while at the same time transforming it and ourselves” (Fosnot, 1996, p.23). Since there is no canon of truth or knowledge to copy and paste into reality, knowledge takes on an adaptive function (von Glaserfeld, 1996). An individual’s prior experience and background knowledge play an important role as the individual incorporates new knowledge into their worldview. Knowledge is constructed through interactions that create mutual compatibility. Individuals fit their own constructs with other constructs that function in the same way or seem compatible (Fosnot, 1996; Pierce, 1994; von Glaserfeld, 1996; Vygotsky, 1962, 1978). Context is central to the adaptation of new knowledge, and it is especially important in developing a deeper understanding of history (Bryant, 2008; Kaiomea, 2006; Ogawa, 2006; Romanonski, 2003; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). How interactions take place within the context of classroom instruction can play a decisive role in the promotion of more inclusive settings or in the establishment of exclusionary practices (Bain, 2006; César & Santos, 2006). Thus the dominant use of textbooks can discourage student investigation of the text by emphasizing

detail recall over skill development which can result in an oversimplified, dehumanized, and de-contextualized view of history (Hawkey, 2007; Manning, 2006). The constructivist model emphasizes the need for students to critically evaluate a text by asking questions about it, making inferences, ordering the text's casual structure, reflecting on what they have read, and establishing connections with their previous experience and background knowledge (Harniss et al, 2007; Schleppegrell et al, 2004; Vidal-Abarca et al, 2000). To better understand this emphasis we need to look at how constructivism is related to education.

Fosnot (1996) applies constructivist theory about learning to education with some general principles. Knowledge construction is not a static process where authority delivers the truth to the learner but an active process of interaction where teachers and students are allies or partners in constructing knowledge. "The task of the educator is not to dispense knowledge but to provide students with opportunities and incentives to build it up" (von Glaserfield, 1996, p. 7). This process of knowledge construction conceptualizes learning as development. Learning proceeds toward the development of structures, or big ideas, that create learner-constructed, central organizing principles. It requires invention and self-organization that allows learners to raise questions, generate themes, and test them for validity. Interaction does not stop at person-to-person contact. Learning involves interaction with curricular materials. How students interact with texts and what type of texts they encounter impacts how and what they learn.

The primary educational setting for learning is the classroom. In the constructivist paradigm, the classroom "is seen as a minisociety, a community of learners engaged in activity, discourse and reflection" (von Glaserfield, 1996, p. ix). Reflection is the driving force of learning, it allows learners to organize and generalize across experiences. Discourse within a community engenders further thinking. It allows learners to take ownership of ideas by defending, justifying, and communicating them. The individual learner considers "what various perspectives might have to offer relative to the problems or issues at hand" (Cobb,

1996, p. 46). These classroom interactions can shed light on new and different knowledge constructs that can come into conflict with previous knowledge constructs. Constructivism asserts that this conflict between new and old constructs creates disequilibrium that facilitates learning as we try to reach a resolution that incorporates the new knowledge into our previous experience and modifies or eliminates older knowledge constructs. The classroom is a place where learners can explore their disequilibrium by engaging in challenging, open-ended investigations within a realistic, meaningful context that allow them to explore and generate possibilities. These open-ended investigations into the construction of knowledge can be curtailed when classrooms are dominated by an authoritative source. This can be especially troubling in history classrooms dominated by textbooks because the history can be diminished from an investigation of evidence with debatable interpretations, to an incoherent list of facts to be memorized and recalled on demand.

Textbook Readability

How textbooks are designed and structured is critical to how students develop an understanding of history. The main job of textbooks is to store as much information as densely as possible (Bain, 2007; Daniels & Zemelman, 2004; McCoy, 2005). The structure of textbooks can negatively impact student performance and motivation if the teacher does not explicitly address the manner in which the information is presented (Daniels & Zemelman, 2004; McCabe, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005). In contrast, if the teacher focuses on the textbook's format it can help improve student comprehension and motivation (Case et al, 2006; Forsten et al, 2003; Gurung, 2003; Harniss et al, 2007; McCabe, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Trinkle, 2009). To make textbooks more attractive to school districts and to engage today's media-savvy students, publishers have increased the number of glossy graphics, sidebars, charts, lists, and photographs filled with details. These additions can be a distraction and decrease the coherence of the text by overshadowing

connections among events, ideas, and people, in turn decreasing the understanding of historical motives and significance (Bain, 2006; Berkwitz, 2004; Harniss et al, 2007; Manzo, 2000; Vidal-Abarca et al, 2000). Instead, students develop an understanding of history as an incoherent series of isolated facts and events. The reasons for their occurrence and their historical significance are obscured (Daniels & Zemelman, 2004; Harniss et al, 2007; Manning, 2006; Manzo, 2000). Given the dominance of history textbooks and issues regarding their readability, it is important that students be explicitly taught the reading and learning strategies that help them understand how to navigate and critically evaluate texts. Exercises constructed by the authors can provide students with opportunities to investigate the textbook.

Exercises in United States History Textbooks

Textbook exercises are designed to assess student comprehension by eliciting investigations of the text. The question is: what types of investigations do textbooks ask of students and teachers? This is especially important for history classroom where instruction is dominated by the use of textbooks that tell teachers what and how to teach and students what and how to learn (Alridge, 2006; LaVere, 2008; Nokes et al, 2007; Schleppegrell et al, 2004). Research into the nature of textbook exercises has been limited (LaVere, 2008). Researchers have primarily explored how exercises promote vocabulary instruction (Harmon et al, 2000; Hedrick et al, 2004) and the types of exercises regarding content-specific topics (LaVere, 2008; Hess & Stoddard, 2007). Their findings are troubling for textbook instruction. Textbook exercises seem to encourage a more passive learning style where the textbook becomes objective arbiter of the truth from which the student receives the official history (Case et al, 2005; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; LaVere, 2008).

Researchers emphasize the necessity for students to investigate and critically evaluate history textbooks in order to develop a deeper understanding of historical accounts as well as

their connections to the present (Bain, 2006; Delaney 2007; Fordham et al, 2002; Haenan & Tuithuf, 2008; Hawkey, 2006; Hedrick et al, 2004; Kalman et al, 2008; Manning, 2006; McCabe, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Ogawa, 2006; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Romanoski, 2003; Schleppegrell et al 2004; Trinkle, 2009; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). One method calls for explicit instruction in how textbooks are constructed, how to navigate the features of the textbook, and how to critically evaluate the textbook. This study investigates the availability of exercises that offer explicit instruction in how to navigate the structure of the textbook and critically evaluate the content of the text as well as the intended intellectual work required by those exercises.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The research literature on history textbooks can be unsettling considering their dominance of textbook instruction in history classrooms across the United States. There are significant issues regarding debatable interpretations and coverage (Alridge, 2006; Bain, 2006; Bryant, 2008; Berkwitz, 2004; Clark, 2005; Clark et al, 2004; Clark et al, 2005; DeRose, 2007; Dorn, 2008; Harison, 2002; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; Hughes, 2007; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Romanoski, 2003; Zhao & Hoge, 2006), how individuals and certain groups of people are represented in the language and visuals of the textbooks (Alridge, 2006; Bryant, 2008; Berkwitz, 2004; Clark, 2005; Clark et al, 2004; Clark et al, 2005; Hughes, 2007; Kaiomea, 2007; Ogawa, 2006), what is included as history and excluded from history (Bryant, 2008; Harison, 2002; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; Kaiomea, 2007; Ogawa, 2006; Romanoski, 2003; Zhao & Hoge, 2006), and how exercises are constructed (Case et al, 2006; Harmon et al, 2000; Hedrick et al, 2004; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; LaVere, 2008). These issues highlight the importance of students receiving explicit instruction in reading and learning strategies regarding how to navigate and critically evaluate history textbooks as a means to overcome their limitations and barriers. Research-based explicit instruction practices can help students and teachers move beyond the flaws in textbook accounts and develop a deeper understanding of the significance of historical accounts and what history means to the present day (Bain, 2006; Delaney 2007; Fordham et al, 2002; Haenan & Tuithuf, 2008; Hawkey, 2006; Hedrick et al, 2004; Kalman et al, 2008; Manning, 2006; McCabe, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Ogawa, 2006; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Romanoski, 2003; Schleppegrell et al 2004; Trinkle, 2009; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). Being that textbook instruction dominates history classrooms and that exercises are included in textbooks for the purpose of having students investigate the text to generate responses, how they are constructed can impact how and what students learn about history.

A review of the research literature will help to illustrate why explicit instruction in navigating, investigating, and critically evaluating history textbook belongs in the classroom and why more research is needed into the construction of exercises. First, the content analysis of United States history textbooks is explored. Issues concerning the similarity of, debatable interpretations in, and omissions from textbook coverage and depictions are addressed. Second, research-based practices for explicit instruction in navigating and critically evaluating textbooks are examined. A variety of reading and learning strategies are discussed. Third, the research on textbook exercises is scrutinized. Finally, research questions are offered.

Content Analysis of United States History Textbooks

The content of textbooks and exercises are interrelated. Exercises are designed to elicit responses from students based on their reading of the content. The content analysis of United States History textbooks demonstrates how problematic this relationship can be. Textbooks often tell a familiar narrative with little variation when changing grade levels or going from textbook to textbook. Gosse's (1995) research states that United States History textbooks are "remarkably similar in what is and what is not included; how an incident, person, or occasion is described; and in the sequence used to establish relationships among events" (p. 653). Despite recent attempts by publishers to improve depictions and coverage of previously neglected subjects, Gosse's assertion regarding the similarity of textbook accounts is supported by more recent research (Clark, 2005; Clark et al, 2004; Clark et al, 2005; Crawford, 2003; Gordy, Hogan, & Pritchard, 2004; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; Hughes, 2007; Foster & Nicholls, 2004; LaVere, 2008). For instance, textbooks now include more examples of women's contributions to history, but women remain underrepresented in comparison to the coverage of men. Also, their representations often fall into the traditional textbook narrative of heroic individuals (Clark, 2005; Clark et al, 2004; Clark et al, 2005). This

narrative construction can hamper students' understanding of the complexity and diversity that make up historical accounts.

One reason for this similarity is that history textbooks are rarely written by historians but by writing teams with inadequate historical credentials which make the imitation of content and exercises more likely to occur (LaVere, 2008). Another reason concerns how history is used by nations, cultures, and societies to create a common identity (Hughes, 2007; Kulczynski, 2005; Waters, 2005). Textbooks play a crucial role in this process. Textbooks remain the principal source of political, social, and cultural information for students and they can help to shape what and how students learn and understand history (Crawford, 2003; Dorn, 2008; Ogawa, 2006; Waters, 2005; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). Textbooks are not neutral resources. They are social, economic, political, and cultural constructs that are the result of negotiation and compromise between real people with real interest (Bain, 2006; Crawford, 2003; Loewen, 1995; Schramm-Pate 2006; Tanner, 1999). These texts are produced by the dominant groups in a society and reflect the values they wish to extol (Crawford, 2003; Delaney, 2007; Dorn, 2008; Ogawa 2006; Schramm-Pate 2006). These values are historically constructed, ideologically loaded notions that can be deeply problematic for teachers and students when they are presented as objective facts (Berkwitz, 2004). The similarity of history textbooks is further complicated by the inclusion of debatable interpretations.

Debatable Interpretations in United States History Textbooks

The primary concern for content analysts is how history is depicted and covered. Textbooks often include sanitized, oversimplified, and non-controversial accounts that lack the complexity found in other historical accounts (Alridge, 2006; Bryant, 2008; Clark, 2005; Clark et al, 2004; Clark et al, 2005; Crawford, 2003; DeRose, 2007; Gosse, 1995; Hughes, 2007; LaVere, 2008; Loewen, 1995; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Romanoski, 2003). They also can present heroic, one-dimensional, and packaged Great Men or Great Women narratives that

ignore a more complex, relevant, and rich understanding of people, events, ideas, and issues in history and the present day (Alridge, 2006; Clark, 2004; Clark et al, 2004; Clark et al, 2005; Woyschner, 2006). For example, representations of Martin Luther King tend to follow the traditional Great Man narrative of historical progress which devalues the contributions and silences the voices of countless other people involved in the struggle for civil rights. King is depicted as the Messianic embodiment of the Civil Rights Movement and political moderate gradually leading the United States to a more colorblind and just society. The textbooks downplay or complete ignore the significant roles of local community leader and the many ordinary citizens played in the Civil Rights movement. “This overwhelming focus on King has had a lasting effect on the present-day tendency to view King as the sole impetus for and sustainer of the movement” (Alridge, 2006, p.670). King’s depiction as a moderate denies students the totality of his vision for a more just and fair democratic society. Speeches included in textbooks skim over or omit King’s critiques of American capitalism and the Vietnam War as well as any reference to class and poverty issues (Alridge, 2006). This narrative continues in the coverage and depictions of women.

While women are receiving more coverage than they have had in the past from textbook authors, they still remain underrepresented and invisible in many ways. Women receive considerable less attention and visibility than men. For every 100 men mentioned by name there are 11 women mentioned and for every 100 pictures of men there are 18 women pictured (Clark, 2005). And when women are present they are often incorporated into a Great Women narrative where one woman stands in as the heroic example. The hero receives the lion’s share of attention in the text while the contributions by numerous other women are omitted from the narrative (Clark, 2005; Clark et al, 2004; Clark et al, 2005; Woyschner, 2006). What seems to be missing from these textbook accounts are discussions of gender issues that existed in the past or continue into today (Clark, 2005; Clark et al, 2004; Clark et al, 2005; Kaiomea, 2007). These overly simplistic depictions offer student debatable and

uncomplicated portrayals which can limit student understanding of the important issues of race, class, and gender the United States faces today.

Race, gender, and class remain controversial topics. Class is rarely if ever mentioned while issues involving race and gender are either ignored or incorporated into the heroic narrative found in textbooks (Hughes, 2007; Loewen, 1995; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Tanner, 1999). The exclusion of these controversial issues from the history textbook narrative is not surprising. Publishers and authors often consciously avoid controversial issues and questions in the construction of textbooks (Crawford, 2003; Delaney, 2007; DeRose, 2007; Dorn, 2008; Hughes, 2007; Loewen, 1995; Romanoski, 2003; Tanner, 1999; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). Publishers and authors are aware of the pressure to include or exclude certain items, what is expected of them in regards to content, and what issues they need to sidestep (Bain, 2006; Tanner, 1999). Issues that are contested at the local, state and national level are often left out of the content standards and thus out of the textbooks and classrooms (Crawford, 2003). The self-censorship by the publisher can result in remarkably similar textbooks both in their content and tone that can whitewash historical accounts, propagate a white, Eurocentric worldview, and reinforce stereotypes (Bryant, 2008; Berkwitz, 2004; Case et al, 2006; Harison, 2002; Hughes, 2007; Kaiomea, 2007; Ogawa, 2006; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). Examples are found in the depiction and coverage of native people.

The diverse and complex Native American nations are often presented as monolithic and simple societies in textbooks. Depictions tend to focus on the role of the horse in transforming their culture, their close relationship with nature, wars with Euro-Americans, and their removal to reservations (Bryant, 2008; Case et al, 2006; LaVere, 2008; Sanchez, 2007). The role of the United States government and its citizens in the destruction of Native American nations and their cultures is often downplayed in the language employed by textbook authors that is often too innocuous to convey the tragedy (Bryant, 2008). An example of a debatable interpretation can be found in the depiction of Cherokee nation

removal to the Indian Territory along the Trail of Tears. In the textbook account of the removal of the Cherokees, the hardships and deaths along the trail are not connected to government policies and at the end of the trail they receive land from the United States in present day Oklahoma (Bryant, 2008). “The idea that land – any land – was given to the American Indian, Cherokee or otherwise, sets historical truth on its very head and tells young students something that is false” and it “delivers a powerful lie at the expense of all American Indians” (Bryant, 2008, p. 12). Even when textbooks step outside traditional coverage, they continue to depict Native Americans in a stereotypical manner. When describing the contributions of Navajo code talkers during World War II the textbook depicts their heroism as following orders despite hardships and excludes any reference to inequalities between white officers and the Navajo soldiers (Case et al, 2006). Once these images and accounts are incorporated into the knowledge constructs of individual students they can be difficult to correct (Bryant, 2008). Debatable interpretations can also be reinforced in the depiction of government actions and the choice of source material by authors.

Government action towards native people is often tacitly justified as a civilizing mission or as morally beneficial to less advantaged people (Bryant, 2008; Kaiomea, 2007). This assertion can be backed by the textbooks’ uncritical reliance on post-contact European and American sources that are saturated with Euro-American constructions of appropriate beliefs and values about how society should be organized. Meanwhile, native people’s counter-narratives found in poems, songs, stories, and myths that offer more complex versions of their nations and cultures are often undervalued or misinterpreted (Kaiomea, 2007). For example, the depiction of pre-contact Hawaii conveys an oppressive world for native women who are liberated by Euro-American missionaries and settlers. These accounts downplay the active and diverse roles women played within native culture and politics. They also ignore the Euro-Americans’ gender construction that expected women to fulfill the roles of domestic servants, obedient daughters, faithful wives, and dedicated mothers (Kaiomea,

2007). Euro-Americans who sought to liberate Hawaiian women “came from a highly gender-unequal, gender-segregated society, with a Christian religion that was stubbornly patriarchal” (Kaiomea, 2007, p 345). The result can be a history that ignores power inequalities and denies students a critical understanding about the rich heritage of native nations and cultures while perpetuating colonial myths that continue to justify interventions in indigenous societies today (Bryant, 2008; Case et al, 2005; Kaiomea, 2007; Sanchez, 2007).

Much of what students learn about history is shaped by the textbook depictions and coverage of individuals, groups of people, events, ideas, and issues. “History is important for students to know as an end in itself, but also as a means to providing a context for their own lives and current social issues” (Gordy et al, 2004, p. 89). Given the dominance of textbook instruction in history classrooms, the inclusion of debatable interpretations can leave students with a distorted view of history (Zhao & Hoge, 2006). Exercises that include explicit instruction in reading and learning strategies that teach students how to critically evaluate the information presented in the textbook can help students detect debatable interpretations by having them asking and answering probing questions of the text’s use of evidence and how the text constructs knowledge. These issues of debatable interpretations are further complicated by what textbooks select as history and what they omit from history.

Omissions in United States History Textbooks

Textbooks can offer a narrow perspective of what is history and what is not history. This limiting construction of historical knowledge seems to rely on omissions to maintain a narrative of linear progress (Harison, 2002; Hughes, 2007; Ogawa, 2006; Schramm-Pate, 2006). These omissions can obscure the complexity and diversity of human history. Some major omissions in United States History textbooks include the lack of discussions and coverage regarding White privilege, White racism, the multicultural history of the United

States, and American Exceptionalism (Berkwitz, 2004; Bryant, 2008; DeRose, 2007; Harison, 2002; Hughes, 2007; Romanoski, 2003). “Textbooks were full of the contributions and experiences of people of color and yet almost devoid of discussion of white privilege and its relation to the experiences of Americans” (Hughes, 2007, p. 205). These topics are often considered too controversial to be included in textbooks by publishers and authors despite their relevance to historical accounts and the world today (Crawford, 2003; Delaney, 2007; DeRose, 2007; Dorn, 2008; Hughes, 2007; Loewen, 1995; Romanoski, 2003; Tanner, 1999; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). If they are included in textbooks they are often presented apart from the text’s narrative in added-on sidebars with the language that often waters down any controversy (Case et al, 2006; Delaney, 2007; DeRose, 2007; Schleppgrell et al, 2004). The result can be that students perceive “racism as a tragedy of the past divorced from other historical issues such as labor, politics, and gender and the contemporary realities of power in American society” (Hughes, 2007, p. 203). How textbooks cover issues of race and gender illustrate this point.

While school boards often require the use of gender and racially fair textbooks, textbook depictions do not always match the expectation (Case et al, 2006; Clark, 2004; Clark et al, 2004; Clark et al, 2005; Gordy et al, 2004; Hughes, 2007). African-American contributions to United States History are now afforded more attention and coverage yet they remain largely absent in accounts outside of slavery, Reconstruction, and the Civil Rights Movement (Hughes, 2007). Textbooks often seem to reinforce “conclusions based on cultural traditions and social positioning” without critical examination of the language in the text (Case et al, 2006, p. 387). When describing York and his encounter with Native Americans as part of the Lewis and Clark expedition there is no mention of York’s social status as a slave or his contributions to the expedition, instead the text focuses on his blackness and physicality (Case et al, 2006). Gordy et al (2004) analyzed the depiction of women during World War II in thirteen nationally published textbooks. Their findings suggest that while

contributions by some women were included in the coverage of World War II much of the coverage downplays their contributions, especially the experiences of African American women. While women are slightly more visible in United States History textbooks today than in past decades, their visibility seems to correlate to the female authorship of certain textbooks and their position as an author relative to other authors (Clark et al, 2005). What is still missing from textbooks is coverage of issues that challenge traditional gender constructions (Clark et al, 2004).

Omissions can also be found in historical accounts where the actions of the United States government and its citizens are debatable. These accounts are complicated by nationalistic tendencies of textbook authors and publishers (DeRose, 2007; Dorn, 2008; Crawford, 2003; Harison, 2002; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Waters, 2005; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). All too often textbooks seem to embrace patriotic and optimistic image of American society (DeRose, 2007; Dorn, 2008; Crawford, 2003; Harison, 2002; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Waters, 2005; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). They tend to downplay or ignore uncomfortable truths and promote the virtues of American society (Bryant, 2008; DeRose, 2007; Waters, 2005). The result can create a sanitized version of history that insulates students from the complexity of historical and present life (Bryant, 2008; Clark, 2004; Crawford, 2003; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). In doing so textbooks help to reaffirm why society is the way it is today by depicting heroic narratives and past glories to justify the present thus legitimatizing those in the dominant cultural and political groups (Crawford, 2003; Kaiomea, 2007; Harison 2002; Waters, 2005). Thus textbooks seem to tacitly promote the concept of American Exceptionalism.

The American Revolution can be portrayed as the inspiration for the progression of liberty and democracy in the rest of the world. It is often presented as a sober and rational revolution especially in contrast to the depiction of French Revolution as chaotic and radical. United States History textbook tend to view other revolutions as flawed by excessive

ideological fervor (Harison, 2002). This narrative is also applied to internal incidents of revolt. Textbooks often present monolithic depictions of the North and the South during the Civil War and Reconstruction eras (Schramm-Pate, 2006). Slavery and racism are often presented as a problem for the South and the North is presented as a moral, social, political, and economy center of progress. The North frees the slaves as a result of the war but the efforts to bring equality to the South were undermined by corrupt individuals or doomed by a repressive military occupation (Schramm-Pate, 2006). Attacks on the United States and American involvement in wars seem to elicit similar responses.

In the wake of the 9/11, international terrorism has received more attention. Its depictions are similar across textbooks in how they define terrorism, the strong language they use to describe terrorist acts, and what countries terrorism affects most. Terrorism is limited to violent actions taken by nongovernmental group and excludes any discussion of state-sponsored terrorism (Hess & Stoddard, 2007). Images of 9/11 are remarkably similar across textbooks. They show rubble, firefighters, and the American flag. The language that accompanies the image utilizes powerful words “such as ‘horrendous plot’ and ‘unprecedented’ to describe the attacks” (Hess & Stoddard, 2007, p. 232). The visuals and written text seem to “emphasize patriotism, nationalism, and heroism” (Hess & Stoddard, 2007, p. 233). The responsibility for confronting terrorism is placed on the United States. Most of the acts covered by textbooks depict the United States and its allies as its victims. Textbook accounts give “the clear impression that terrorism is more of a problem for the United States and its allies than for other people and nations” (Hess & Stoddard, 2007, p. 237).

American Exceptionalism can also be seen in the content analysis done on textbook accounts of the United States at war. United States history textbooks present the Vietnam War as a war to stop communism in as opposed to its presentation as a war against imperialism in Vietnam textbooks (De Rose, 2007). Foster and Nicholls (2004) conducted a

comparative analysis of how America's role in World War II is depicted in eight upper secondary level textbooks in England, Japan, Sweden, and the United States. The focus of the United States History textbooks is covering the decisive role the United States military leaders played in battles and the ideals for which the soldiers fought. "The United States History textbooks emphasize the significant and pre-eminent role that the United States played in crushing the Axis forces in Europe and the Pacific" (p. 231). Textbooks from the other countries in the study vary in their inclusion of historical information and their interpretations of historical events. The study illustrates how "textbook representations appear to be influenced by particular nationalistic bias, differing cultural and geopolitical perspectives, and the sociopolitical agendas of the nation in which the books are used in schools" (p. 232).

The use of the atomic bombs on Japan is one of the most critical decisions faced by the United States in its history. Textbook depictions however seem to lack the appropriate critical treatment. Crawford (2003) found a gap between what the evidence presents, what historians now know, and the patriotic narrative found in textbook which excludes material that may reflect poorly on the United States. The decision to drop the atomic bomb is presented as a necessary step to end the war and heroic decision to save millions of American lives. Discussions regarding alternatives to and different explanations for dropping the atomic bombs are largely absent from textbook accounts.

The internment of Japanese-Americans is another event that lacks critical evaluation in textbooks. Most textbooks fail to raise the issues of racism, discrimination, civil rights, and ethnocentrism. Internment is presented as a reaction to widespread public fear and as a military necessity. Yet there is a failure to address why Americans with German and Italian ancestries were not interned. Little attention is paid to the conditions in and locations of the internment camps, questions of loyalty, and to the violence experienced by Japanese-Americans at the end of the war (Ogawa, 2006). These omissions may distort a student's

sense of history and the role of the United States and its citizens played (Zhao & Hoge, 2006). The result of these omissions can be an unrealistic perception of United States history and the significant role the United States government plays in world affairs today.

Students all too often treat the textbook as being above suspicion. Textbooks can be seen as the final word in any discussion or debate (Bain, 2007). This assertion is troubling when considering the debatable interpretations and omissions are made with regularity by textbooks. The inclusion of Explicit Instruction Exercises (EIE) can offer students a variety of opportunities to practice and incorporate strategies that can help them to overcome the debatable interpretations and omissions included in textbooks. These strategies ask students to take an active role in investigating history as it is presented in textbooks and elsewhere. Students may ask and answer questions about who or what is included, who or what is excluded, and why the authors made these selections. These exercises can offer students opportunities to critically evaluate history rather than passively accept the textbooks' word for it.

Conclusion

The content analysis of United States textbooks has delved into how history is depicted and covered raising serious issues about similarity, debatable interpretations, and omission. Students need to develop an appreciation for the complexity and diversity of history if it is going to be relevant and meaningful to their lives. Researchers agree that students need explicit instruction in how to navigate and critically evaluate textbooks. They need opportunities to scrutinize the content of textbooks to address inequalities in the historical narrative and develop an understanding of how omissions and debatable interpretations can reinforce misleading concepts and marginalize individuals (Bain, 2006; Case et al, 2006; Delaney 2007; Hawkey, 2006; Myers & Savage, 2005; Schleppegrell et al 2004). So, what explicit instruction practices are recommended by the research literature?

Research-Based Practices for Explicit Instruction in History Textbooks

The inclusion of debatable interpretations and the omission of certain historical information are exacerbated by the authoritative tone found in history textbooks (Bain, 2006). This situation is further complicated by the hidden nature of textbook authority (Bain, 2006; Case et al, 2006). Textbooks consolidate and transmit large amounts of historical information. There is often little to no room left to debate what is considered history and what is excluded from history. History education can become a fixed series of facts and students can become more concerned about memorizing who, what, where, and when rather than examining why and how (Berkwitz, 2004; Daniels & Zemelman, 2004; Haenan & Tuithuf, 2008; Manning, 2006). This approach to instruction runs counter to the process of historical inquiry. The study of history involves a critical investigation and evaluation of sources and interpretations. Students need help in becoming strategic learners and readers who are able to recognize “where history ends and a simple acceptance of authority begins” (Bain, 2006, p. 2083). Explicit instructional practices supported by research can be effective in addressing and overcoming the authority, debatable interpretations, and limitations found in history textbooks by empowering students with reading and learning strategies to take ownership for their knowledge construction (Fordham et al, 2002; Harison, 2002; Kalman et al, 2008; Myers & Savage, 2005; Schramm-Pate, 2006). The emphasis is on teaching students how to read textbooks so they can read to learn. These practices for analytical purposes can be divided into before, during, and after reading.

Before Reading

Before students start reading a textbook or one of its section, it can enhance confidence, motivation, and comprehension to become familiar with the textbook’s structure and building connections to students’ background knowledge and experience (Gurung, 2003; Kalman et al, 2008; McCabe, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Schleppegrell et al, 2004). It is

important to assess what knowledge and experience students bring to the content area and to reading textbooks in order to figure out what they need to know, to check on the appropriateness of the material, the challenges it presents for the reader, and the amount of material that students are expected to cover (Caron, 2005; Myers & Savage, 2005). By building students' understanding of how to navigate the textbook and connecting it to their background knowledge and previous experience, students can develop more confidence in their reading ability, increase their motivation to complete the task, avoid distractions in the text, and augment their mastery of the text (McCabe, 2003). Teachers and students can plan an investigation of the textbook through examining its structure and organization by posing questions and making predictions about the meaning, purpose, and value of each of the features (Delaney, 2007; Haenan & Tuituf, 2008; McCabe, 2003). The basis for these questions and predictions may reflect the students' previous experience and background knowledge.

A good jumping off point is having students scan through the features of the textbooks including bold or italic print, illustrations, vocabulary, key terms, titles, subheadings, and exercises (Harmon et al, 2000; Hedrick et al, 2004; Kalman et al, 2008; McCabe, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Trinkle, 2009). This approach can be used with the textbook as a whole to introduce its overall structure and with individual sections or passages students are asked to read. By scanning the textbook students can gain familiarity with its features, see how the features relate to the construction of knowledge, and learn how to utilize the text and its features to construct meaning. Students can also read from section to section or from idea to idea. By analyzing the framework of the textbook students can begin to see how historical accounts are constructed by the authors and what historical patterns might be represented in the text (Case et al, 2006; Myers & Savage, 2005).

Visual features such as graphs, pictures, illustrations, maps, lists, and charts play an important role in constructing the knowledge in textbooks. At times visuals can powerfully

reinforce the debatable interpretations in the written text (Hess & Stoddard, 2007). At other times they can tell a different story than the written text (Bryant, 2008). Students may also have to break from the written text and flip from page to page to find the accompanying visuals (McCabe, 2003). Students can compare the proximity of images to where they are mentioned in the text or compare what the image contains to how the text explains the account (Bryant, 2008; McCabe, 2003). They can be asked to implement strategies to counter distracting, debatable, or confusing images, such as, making copies of the visuals to have with them while they read, juxtaposing images to the written description or to other images regarding the topic, and trading out the race, gender, or class depicted in the visuals for another race, gender, or class (McCabe, 2003; Woyshner, 2006).

Vocabulary terms are especially important to the study of history as they often form the foundation for historical conceptions. Without a proper understanding of vocabulary terms students can lose sight of the big ideas and history can become an incoherent series of facts (Forsten et al, 2003; Harmon et al, 2005; Hedrick et al, 2004; Myers & Savage, 2005). What is needed is consistent and knowledgeable pre-instruction of vocabulary terms including multiple exposures to the terms in a variety of different contexts and asking students to create their own definitions. This can be helpful to students in gaining comprehension of how the terms connect to big ideas and developing reading and learning strategies that can be used beyond the textbook (Berkwitz, 2004; Fordham et al, 2002; Myers & Savage, 2005). This approach can help students unpack the sometimes dense language of the textbook and possibly uncover authority and debatable interpretations in the text (Case et al, 2006; Schleppgrell et al, 2004).

Next, students might also be asked to make predictions or create hypotheses based on their background knowledge and previous experience, as well as, their scan of the textbook features about how and what the text will present as history and why they think the text will make these choices (Case et al, 2006; Myers & Savage, 2005; Schleppgrell et al, 2004).

Students can be asked what, where, or who might be missing from the accounts or what debatable interpretations might appear in the text. These predictions can be recorded, used during the reading of the text to check on their validity, and reflected upon them after reading the text to give the students an opportunity to incorporate new knowledge and allow them an avenue to safely test their own interpretations (Berkwitz, 2004; Kalman et al, 2008; Trinkle, 2009).

Lastly, introducing students on how to use advance organizers or memory markers to consolidate data can help them build confidence in approaching the text, gain comprehension of the text, and plan their investigation for the text (Berkwitz, 2004; Delaney, 2007; Fordham et al, 2002; Haenan & Tuituf, 2008; Kalman et al, 2008; McCabe, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Trinkle, 2009). Organizers help students read with a purpose in mind that helps to make the text and reading more relevant and meaningful to them (Myers & Savage, 2005).

During Reading

During the reading of the textbooks it is important for students and teachers to reinforce the before reading and learning strategies, continue to generate questions and answers about the text, work cooperatively to co-construct new knowledge, and find a means to organize the data from the text in a clear and concise manner. Advance organizers or memory markers may include visual outlines, timelines, maps, webs, lists, graphics, diagrams, and note-taking systems that help students to scaffold their learning by highlighting important data, linking background knowledge and previous experience to new information, and making connections between events, people, issues, and ideas (Fordham et al, 2002; Trinkle, 2009). These organizers can revolve around student-generated questions or topics that challenge and explore the text itself and students' predictions or hypotheses about the text (Delaney, 2007; Myers & Savage, 2005).

Good questions or topics address important issues of the past and present, can be debated, generate alternative viewpoints, explore the reasoning behind explanations, encourage elaboration, require inferences, provoke imaginations, and elicit student interest (Caron, 2005; Myers & Savage, 2005; Trinkle, 2009). In this sense students are being asked to involve themselves in open-ended investigations of historically significant issues and debates which can help engage students in problem solving and critical thinking activities which in turn can help increase their motivation to accomplish their tasks (Wiersma, 2008). Students may be asked to slow down and re-read textbook selection paying close attention to how language and visuals are used to construct meaning in the selection, how word and image choices impact one's perception of the accounts, who is acting and being acted upon in the selection, what is the intent of the selection, if there are debatable interpretations apparent or hidden in the selection, and why the selection has historical significance (Bryant, 2006; Case et al, 2006; Delaney, 2007; Fordham et al, 2002; Schleppegrell et al, 2004; Trinkle, 2009; Woysner, 2006). They may also be asked to read other historical sources, compare them to the depictions in the textbooks, work cooperatively in groups to develop conclusions, and discuss their findings with their peers (Alridge, 2006; Berkwitz, 2004; Haenan & Tuituf, 2008). Here is where students move from reading and investigating the textbook to transforming their knowledge into a new product of their own creation.

After Reading

After students have completed their readings, collected data from the texts, collaborated in groups, shared their ideas in discussions, and debated the issues that arose from their investigations, students can then add their own informed interpretations of historical accounts (Ogawa, 2006). Interpretations can begin with the act of students re-telling the narrative of the text and re-defining vocabulary terms in their own words (Berkwitz, 2004; Delaney, 2007; Fordham et al, 2002; Kalman et al, 2008). Next, students can reflect on

their re-telling of the text and re-defining of its terms through writing exercises, discussion, group work, collaboration, and debate. Students can be asked to describe historical interactions between people, events, ideas, and issues, then analyze the connections between these interactions to understand the how and why they took place, and, lastly, fit these interactions and connections within the appropriate context to comprehend their complexity and explain their relevance to the present day (Manning, 2006). Students can then critically evaluate and synthesize the data pulled from a variety of exercises to develop, explain, share, and justify their findings and inferences (Case et al, 2006; Delaney, 2007; Kalman et al, 2008). This process of deconstructing textbook explanations can assist students in reading comprehension, content retention, the development of self-awareness, and the acquisition of new knowledge and concepts (Berkwitz, 2004; Fordham et al, 2002; Kalman et al, 2008; Schleppegrell et al, 2004). By incorporating student-generated interpretations and investigations, students have an opportunity to take active role in their education, learn about the process of historical inquiry by doing historical research, and establish ownership of their learning (Delaney, 2007; Myers & Savage, 2005; Wiersma, 2008). These strategies become important tools for building understanding that students to carry with them beyond the textbook and into their everyday lives (Delaney, 2007).

Conclusion

Often these student-centered learning and reading strategies are recommended to teachers to supplement the textbooks. This can be problematic since a “majority of history teachers have taught (and continue to teach) their classes using traditional methods” (Wiersma, 2008, p. 116). This is further complicated by the discrepancy between teacher’s reported positive beliefs about student-centered, implicit instruction practices and their actual, more traditional instructional practices that tended to rely on textbooks and lectures (Hedrick et al, 2004). Given the dominance of textbook instruction in history classrooms, it seems the

inclusion of research-based explicit instructional practices in textbook exercises can help teachers serve the needs of their students more effectively. The question is: do textbook exercises assist students and teachers in developing a more complex understanding of history?

Exercises in United States History Textbooks

The research literature agrees that students need opportunities to critically evaluate textbooks' interpretations, questioning why certain accounts are written about, what viewpoints are included and excluded, are the accounts debatable, are they backed up by reliable evidence, and how the American government and citizens are present (Bain, 2006; Case et al, 2006; Delaney 2007; Fordham et al, 2002; Hawkey, 2006; Hedrick et al, 2004; Kalman et al, 2008; Manning, 2006; McCabe, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Ogawa, 2006; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Romanoski, 2003; Schleppegrell et al 2004; Trinkle, 2009; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). The limited amount of research literature on exercises tells a different story. Exercises seemed compromised by the design of textbooks. Textbooks seem to reinforce their own authority by "reversing the historian's logic of questions and answers, texts and teachers first definitively and confidently provide answers and then pose the questions. Suspicions are rarely raised, except the suspicion that the students have not yet mastered the facts found in the texts and classroom's materials" (Bain, 2006, p. 2081). In this context textbooks tell rather than explore. Researchers have found few opportunities to answer open-ended questions or engage in debates about historical issues (Case et al, 2006; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; LaVere, 2008). Instead students often occupy the role of recorders with the textbooks telling them what to think, what information is important, what information is not important, and how to construct answers (Alridge, 2006; Bain, 2006; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; LaVere, 2008; Schleppegrell et al, 2004). Often stereotypical depictions and debatable interpretations

are reinforced in exercises (LaVere, 2008). The intended intellectual work found in exercises can be problematic for students and teachers.

Exercises are often dominated by lower order thinking items and ignored evidence-based historical inquiry across textbooks and grade levels (Hess & Stoddard, 2007; LaVere, 2008). *Lower-order thinking items* refer exercises that require students to recite or recall facts (Newman & Wehlage, 1993). Lower-order thinking exercises can include multiple choice, true/false, matching, and duplicating text passages (Hogan & Murphy, 2007). These are the what, where, who, and when questions which asks students to retrieve and repeat basic information about historical accounts. *Higher-order thinking items* refers to exercises that require students to manipulate information and ideas transforming them by synthesizing data, generalizing their findings, or crafting their own interpretations (Newman & Wehlage, 1993). Higher-order thinking exercises can include essays, projects, presentations, debates, panel discussions, and portfolios (Hogan & Murphy, 2007). These are the how and why questions that ask students to delve into complex historical issues, develop their own conclusions, and justify their interpretations. The role low-order and higher-order thinking exercises play in textbooks can be seen in how exercises addressing vocabulary and content-specific items are constructed.

Hess and Stoddard (2007) found that “textbooks generally utilize lower order thinking items to check comprehension of the text and focus attention on particular content. The goal was almost always for students to know what happened in an objective way” (p. 236). Even when high-order thinking exercises were included, it was rare that students were asked to investigate accounts, critically evaluate issues, or develop a possible interpretation. The exercises “generally engaged students in comparing, contrasting, or synthesizing from the text” (p. 236). LaVere’s (2008) research results support these findings. He found recall questions represent 91% of the seven hundred questions examined in the study, ranging from 98% in the elementary textbooks to 90% or more in the high school textbooks. It was not

unusual to find recall questions in designated critical or higher-order thinking sections. Many content-specific exercises “did little more than perpetuate the belief by many that history is nothing more than a series of facts to be memorized” or contained preconceived assumptions denying students the opportunities to explore alternatives and develop their own interpretations (LaVere, 2008, p. 5). Exercises seem to leave students with little to no space to explore history or develop higher-order thinking skills.

Vocabulary exercises seem to replicate these issues. Vocabulary exercises are a logical place to instruct students in reading and learning strategies for the content area since vocabulary plays a significant role in developing a clear understanding of historical concepts (Hedrick et al, 2004). Textbooks are attentive to vocabulary. However, their approach to vocabulary acquisition tends to represent traditional ideas that are not supported by research (Harmon et al, 2000; Hedrick et al, 2004; Hess & Stoddard, 2007). They seem rely on lower-order thinking items such as matching and fill in the blanks activities that do not assist students in developing a deeper understanding of the term (Harmon et al, 2000). Textbooks also tend to set authoritative definition of vocabulary terms that can lessen the broader application of the words to historical concepts and contexts (Harmon et al, 2000; Hedrick et al, 2004; Hess & Stoddard, 2007). These definitions are often contradicted by written and visual examples found in the text (Bryant, 2006; Hess & Stoddard, 2007). In the textbook account of the removal of the Cherokees the visual accompanying the text Cherokees are pictured as nomadic people rather than as a well-established agricultural-based society that they were described as earlier in the written text. Another example can be found in how terrorism is depicted. It is often defined as violence conducted against civilians while excluding any mention of domestic acts, state-sponsored terrorism, or military targets. Yet there are examples in the textbooks’ depiction and coverage of the topic that include military targets such as the attack on the U.S.S. Cole, acts of state-sponsored terrorism such as the bombing Pam Am flight 103 over Scotland, and acts of domestic terrorism such as the

Oklahoma City Federal Building bombing (Hess & Stoddard, 2007). The result when definitions and examples do not match can be confusion and lack of critical understanding of concepts (Hess & Stoddard, 2007).

Conclusion

In a majority of content-specific and vocabulary exercises students are not being asked to investigate historical events, people, ideas, and issues by gathering evidence to support their interpretations about why and how history unfolded. Rather students seem to be asked to confirm the conclusions of textbook authors (Hess & Stoddard, 2007; LaVere, 2008). Exercises in these areas seem to restrict opportunities for students to investigate and critically evaluate historical events, people, ideas, and issues. More research into the nature of textbook exercises is needed (LaVere, 2008). This is of particular importance to United States History classrooms where textbooks dominate its curriculum and instruction. While the limited amount of research literature has covered how vocabulary is introduced to students and how exercises are related to knowledge construction in content-specific topics, there seems to be a gap in addressing exercises that include research-based instructional practices.

Research Questions

This gap in the research literature regarding textbook exercises led to the questions that drive this study. What is the total and relative availability of exercises in United States History textbooks that include explicit instruction practices that allow students and teachers to navigate and/or critically evaluate the textbook? What patterns emerge from the construction of exercises regarding the intended intellectual work required to complete each explicit instruction exercises?

Chapter 3: Methods

The methods chapter discusses the selection of textbooks and the sections in the textbooks studied, the organizational schemes for Bloom's Revised Taxonomy and explicit instruction practices implemented to categorize exercises, and the procedures for data collection and data analysis devised to investigate the textbook exercises. The procedures were constructed from several sources: the comprehensive review of the content analysis methodology by Krippendorff (2004), content analysis research methodology developed by Alridge (2006), the revision of Bloom's Taxonomy by Anderson & Krathwohl (2001), the analytical review of Bloom's Revised Taxonomy by Amer (2006), the research methodology using Bloom's Revised Taxonomy developed by Näsström (2009), and the research methodology developed by LaVere (2008) to analyze pedagogical exercises in United States History textbooks.

Selection

Two teacher editions of nationally published and distributed United States History textbooks were selected. Both textbooks are California editions. These editions were selected because California is a major market for textbooks and as a large market has a considerable influence on how textbooks are constructed (LaVere, 2008). The wide availability of California edition textbooks also made them more accessible to the researcher. Two textbooks were selected so the researcher could complete a thorough analysis of the intended intellectual work required by the textbook exercises in the limited time frame the researcher had to complete the data collection and analysis. One high school textbook and one middle school textbook were selected so the researcher could compare the intended intellectual work required by the textbook exercises across grade levels.

High School United States History Textbook

The first textbook, *The Americans* published by McDougal and Littell in 2007, is designed for high school students. According the publisher,

“*The Americans* explores the story of United States history, weaving the reflections of people who experienced history firsthand throughout the narrative. Thought-provoking lessons make history human and relevant to students' everyday lives, helping them realize the richness of our nation's history. *The Americans* makes history human through the personal voices of ordinary and extraordinary Americans who played a key role in, or were affected by, past events. Inspiring accounts make history come alive as students examine daily life in different eras and discover how the past has influenced the present. The *Teacher's Edition* helps you put it all together. As you write your lessons to meet the special needs of today's classroom, you can depend on unparalleled support in the teacher's edition of *The Americans*. Support begins with the convenient two-page planning guide found at the beginning of every chapter. From key ideas to technology connections, the guide features invaluable information and options to help you devise an effective course of instruction. *The Americans Teacher's Edition* supports instruction with everything from fascinating tidbits to practical graphic organizers. Side columns focus on core instruction, with optional ideas and teaching strategies being featured at the bottom of the pages” (McDougal Littell, 2007).

Middle School United States History Textbook

The second textbook, *United States History: Beginnings to 1877* published by Holt, Rinehart & Winston in 2007, is designed for middle school students. According the publisher,

“*United States History* is a new standards-based program providing rich content that is accessible to all learners through integrated research-based reading instruction.

Multiple audio, visual, and technology resources appeal to today's students by encouraging them to investigate history, the people, locations, and primary sources and to read like historians" (Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 2007).

Teacher Editions and Sections

The teacher editions were chosen to provide the researcher with all possible exercises available to teachers and students. The thesis investigated exercises included in the textbooks' preview and review sections. The preview sections were located in the introduction of the introductions to units and chapters. The preview sections were chosen for their designated role of introducing the textbook and its units to teachers and students. Thus the researcher inferred that explicit instruction practices for navigating the textbook's structures and features would be located here. The review sections are located at the end of each unit and chapter. The review sections were chosen for their designated role of assessing students' comprehension of the information covered and depicted in the units. Thus the researcher inferred that explicit instruction practices for critically evaluating the textbook's coverage and depictions would be located here. The exercises found in the textbooks' preview and review sections in both the teacher's and student's sections served as the source material. Exercises in the teacher sections were limited to suggested activities for students.

The middle school textbook's (*United States History*) chapter/unit preview sections included an additional section titled Reading Social Studies. The high school textbook's (*The Americans*) chapter/unit preview sections were titled as preview. In this study, these sections were referred to as preview sections. The high school textbook's (*The Americans*) end of chapter section was titled Assessment while the Middle School textbook titled it Standards Review with an additional section titled Social Studies Skills. Also, the unit review sections in the middle school textbook were titled Unit Workshop. In this study, these sections were referred to as review sections.

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy

Bloom's learning taxonomy was created in 1956 and provided the educational community a common language to craft and analyze curriculum as well as determine congruence between curricular objectives and assessments. In recent years there has been a great number of research studies and theoretical development about the way children learn. Educators have also revised the way in which they plan and implement instruction in the classroom. These changes highlight the primary weakness in Bloom's learning taxonomy which assumed cognitive processes have a hierarchal order from simple to complex and that one must master one cognitive process before moving on to the next process. According to the original taxonomy there is no overlap between the processes (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Näsström, 2009). To keep the importance of Bloom's work relative to present theories, research, and practices, Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) combined the well-known and widely applied taxonomy with what we have learned about the cognitive process and from research about the knowledge acquisition in recent years. The revised taxonomy is based on research studies and theoretical developments by cognitive and educational psychologists, curricular and instructional experts, and test and assessment experts (Amer, 2006). The revisions address the weaknesses of the original taxonomy and the developments found in research and theories. The notable changes are the inclusion of the cognitive process dimension moving the taxonomy's organizational scheme from one dimension to two dimensions, the renaming of categories to reflect a noun-verb relationship, and the additional of more substantial subcategories.

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy also aligned with the thesis' theoretical framework of constructivism. The revisions incorporate student-centered learning paradigm of constructivism that emphasizes self-regulation and assumes "students must discover, construct, and transform knowledge if they are to make it their own" (Amer, 2006 p. 216).

Self-regulation, or metacognition, refers to the ability to take knowledge or strategies developed in one context and apply it to another. It involves identifying what strategies the task requires and determining what personal resources one has or needs to acquire to complete the task (Amer, 2006). Definitions for the Knowledge and Cognitive Process dimensions are included in Appendix A.

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy Organizational Scheme

All exercises that included explicit instructional practices were recorded on a Bloom's Revised Taxonomy tables and Explicit Instruction Practice category tables. There were several explicit instructional practices tables: (a) one for all exercises, (b) one for all exercises in each textbook, (c) one for all exercises in each section, and (d) each textbook will have one for each of its sections.

The location tables included four columns (Appendix C): (a) one for verbatim copy of each exercise, (b) one for their location in the textbook, (c) one for the Explicit Instruction Practice category, and (d) one for the Bloom's Revised Taxonomy intersection. Each row included a verbatim copy of the explicit instruction exercise, two category slots, and the location of the exercise which will include the page number, teacher or student section, preview or review section, and a verbatim copy of the heading under which the exercise is placed. The Explicit Instruction Practice column entries were color-coded. Predicting questions were recorded in purple. Connecting questions were recorded in orange. Problem Solving questions were recorded in pink. Text-related questions were recorded in red. Presentation and Layout questions were recorded in yellow. Leading questions were recorded in green. Self-Assessment questions were recorded in dark blue.

This allowed the researcher visual references that helped to clarify the intended intellectual work of all textbook exercises that included explicit instruction practices and where they were located in the textbook. This allowed the researcher to compare the intended

intellectual work for all textbook exercises that included explicit instruction practices in various sections: exercises in teacher's sections to those in student sections, exercises in the preview sections to those in the review sections, exercises in the teacher's preview sections to those in the student's preview sections exercises in the teacher's review sections to those in the student's review sections, and textbook to textbook.

Data Collection for All Exercises

The researcher started by closely reading each exercise. Close reading refers to paying attention to the categorical definitions as the researcher reads each exercise. Next, the researcher classified each exercise based on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy. Then, the researcher determined the total availability of exercises as well as the total availability of exercises for each textbook, for each section, for each Knowledge and Cognitive Process dimension, and for the intersections of each Knowledge and Cognitive Process dimension. Finally, the researcher determined the relative availability of exercises for each textbook, for each section, for each Knowledge and Cognitive Process dimension, and for the intersections of each Knowledge and Cognitive Process dimension. This allowed the researcher to compare the intellectual work required to complete exercises within and between textbooks and different sections. It also provided an overview of the intended intellectual work required to complete exercises.

Data Collection Procedures for All Exercises

1. The researcher closely read each exercise in the preview and review sections in the student's sections and teacher's sections of each textbook for the purpose of categorizing exercises on the Bloom's Revised Taxonomy. The researcher paid close attention to the noun-verb relationship in each exercise.

2. After reading each exercise, the researcher classified the exercise based on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy.

The researcher paid close attention to the noun or noun phrase to identify the Knowledge dimension and the verb or verb phrase to identify the Cognitive dimension. Then, the researcher compared the exercise's content to the taxonomy's definitions for the Knowledge dimensions and the Cognitive Process dimensions. Next, the researcher determined which Knowledge dimension and which Cognitive Process dimension are most appropriate for the exercise. Then, the researcher determined where the dimensions intersect. Lastly, the exercise was recorded as a slash mark in the cell that represented the intersection on all tables with the exception of Explicit Instruction Practices table (Appendix J).

3. After all the exercises were read, classified, and recorded on the taxonomy's table (Appendix D), the researcher recorded the total availability of exercises overall, for each textbook, for each section covered by this study, as well as, for exercises related to each Knowledge dimension, each Cognitive Process dimension, and each intersection.

The totals were recorded on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy tables (Appendix F). There were several tables: one for all exercises, one for all exercises in each textbook, one for each section, and each textbook will have one for each of its sections.

5. To obtain the total availability of exercises covered by this study, the researcher added up all exercises and recorded the sum.

The researcher added up exercises in each section and recorded the sum. Then, the researcher added up exercises related to each Knowledge dimension in each section and recorded the sum. Next, the researcher added up exercises related to each Cognitive Process dimension in each section and recorded the sum. Then, the researcher added up exercises related to each intersection of Knowledge dimension and Cognitive Process dimension in each section and recorded the sum. Next, the researcher added up exercises for each textbook and recorded the sum. Then, the researcher added up exercises related to each Knowledge

dimension for each textbook and recorded the sum. Next, the researcher added up exercises related to each Cognitive Process dimension for each textbook and recorded the sum. Then, researcher added up exercises related to each intersection of Knowledge dimension and Cognitive Process dimension for each textbook and recorded the sum. Lastly, the researcher added up and recorded the overall totals including the overall number of exercises for all textbooks, the totals for each section, each textbook, each dimension, and each intersection.

6. After the total availability of exercises has been recorded, the researcher recorded the relative availability of exercises overall, for each textbook, and for each section as well as for exercises related to each Knowledge dimension, each Cognitive Process dimension, and each intersection.

The percentages were recorded on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy tables (Appendix G). There were several tables: one for all exercises, one for all exercises in each textbook, one for each section, and each textbook will have one for each of its sections.

7. To obtain the relative availability of exercises covered by this study, the researcher determined the percentages of exercises and recorded the results.

The researcher determined the percentages of exercises in each section and recorded the result. Then, the researcher determined the percentages of exercises related to each Knowledge dimension in each section and recorded the result. Next, the researcher determined the percentages of exercises related to each Cognitive Process dimension in each section and recorded the result. Then, researcher determined the percentages of exercises related to each intersection of Knowledge dimension and Cognitive Process dimension in each section and recorded the result. Next, the researcher determined the percentages of exercises for each textbook and recorded the result. Then, the researcher determined the percentages of exercises related to each Knowledge dimension for each textbook and recorded the result. Next, the researcher determined the percentages of exercises related to each Cognitive Process dimension for each textbook and recorded the result. Then, researcher

determined the percentages of exercises related to each intersection of Knowledge dimension and Cognitive Process dimension for each textbook and recorded the result. Lastly, the researcher determined the percentages and recorded the overall relative availability including the percentages of exercises for each section, for each textbook, for each dimension, and for each intersection.

Conclusion

At the end of these procedures the researcher classified all the exercises on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy tables based on their intended intellectual work and determined the total and relative availability of exercises. This data allowed the researcher to compare all exercises' intended intellectual work and the availability of exercises that include explicit instruction practices.

Data Collection for Explicit Instruction Exercises

The researcher followed similar procedures to collect data on exercises that included explicit instruction practices. The researcher re-read each exercise paying close attention to the inclusion of reading or learning strategies. Then, the researcher classified the exercises that include explicit instruction practice twice. First, the researcher classified the exercise into one of the Explicit Instruction Practice categories and listed exercises on the appropriate table (Appendix C). Second, the researcher classified the exercise using Bloom's Revised Taxonomy and recorded it on the taxonomy table for Explicit Instruction Practice categories (Appendix E).

After the researcher re-read each exercise, classified each exercise twice, and recorded on the appropriate table, the researcher determined total availability of EIE well as the total availability of EIE for each textbook, for each section, and each textbook will have one for each of its sections. Next, the researcher determined the relative availability of all EIE

included in the thesis as well as the relative availability of exercises in each Explicit Instruction Practice category, in each textbook, in each section, and each textbook will have one for each of its sections. The researcher also determined the total and relative availability of exercises for each Knowledge and Cognitive Process dimension, and for the intersections of each Knowledge and Cognitive Process dimension. This allowed the researcher to compare the availability of EIE to the total number of exercises available, as well as, within and between sections, dimensions, and intersections. It also provided an overview of the intellectual work required to complete EIE.

Data Collection Procedures for Explicit Instruction Exercises

1. The researcher closely re-read each exercise in the preview and review sections of the student's sections and the teacher's sections. The researcher paid close attention to the inclusion of reading or learning strategies in each exercise.

2. The researcher classified each exercise based on Explicit Instruction Practice categories.

The researcher determined if a strategy was included in the exercise. If there was no strategy included in the exercise, the researcher proceeded to the exercise. If a strategy was included in the exercise, the researcher paid close attention to the construction of the exercise. Next, the researcher compared the exercise's content to the definitions for Explicit Instruction Practice categories. Then, the researcher determined and recorded which practice was most appropriate for the exercise. Lastly, the exercise was listed on the Appendix C for all explicit instruction exercises, then on the tables for each textbook and for each section.

3. Next the researcher classified each exercise on the Bloom's Revised Taxonomy table (Appendix E).

The researcher paid close attention to the noun or noun phrase to identify the Knowledge dimension and the verb or verb phrase to identify the Cognitive dimension. Then,

the researcher compared the exercise's content to the taxonomy's definitions for the Knowledge dimensions and the Cognitive Process dimensions. Next, the researcher determined which Knowledge dimension and which Cognitive Process dimension were most appropriate for the exercise. Then, the researcher determined where the dimensions intersect. Lastly, the exercise was recorded as a slash mark in the appropriate cell on all tables.

4. After re-reading each exercise in a preview or review section and classifying them based on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy and on the Explicit Instruction Practice categories, the researcher determined the total availability of EIE and recorded the sums.

The researcher recorded the total availability for EIE related to each Knowledge dimension, each Cognitive Process dimension, and each intersection on the Bloom's Revised Taxonomy table (Appendix H). There were several tables: one for all explicit instruction exercises, one for all exercises in each textbook, one for each section, and each textbook has one for each of its sections.

The researcher recorded the total availability for EIE related to the Explicit Instruction Practice categories on several tables: one for all explicit instruction exercises, one for all exercises in each textbook, one for each section, and each textbook has one for each of its sections. The tables consisted of rows for each of the Explicit Instruction Practice categories and three columns: one for totals, one for percentages of all EIE, and one for the percentage of all exercises (Appendix J).

5. To obtain the total availability for explicit instruction exercises, the researcher added up all EIE and recorded the sums.

The researcher added up all EIE in each section and recorded the sum. Then, the researcher added up all EIE in each category for each section and recorded the sum. Next, the researcher added up all EIE for each textbook and recorded the sum. Then, the researcher added up all EIE in each category for each textbook and recorded the sum. Next, the

researcher added up all EIE and recorded the sum. Lastly, the researcher added up and recorded the sum all EIE for each category, for each section, and for each textbook.

6. To obtain the total availability for all EIE related to Bloom's Revised Taxonomy, the researcher added up all EIE related to each dimension and each intersection then recorded the sums.

The researcher added up all EIE related to each Knowledge dimension in each section and recorded the sum. Then, the researcher added up all EIE related to each Cognitive Process dimension in each section and recorded the sum. Next, the researcher added up all EIE related to each intersection of Knowledge dimension and Cognitive Process dimension in each section and recorded the sum. Then, the researcher added up EIE related to each Knowledge dimension for each textbook and recorded the sum. Next, the researcher added up EIE related to each Cognitive Process dimension for each textbook and recorded the sum. Then, researcher added up EIE related to each intersection of Knowledge dimension and Cognitive Process dimension for each textbook and recorded the sum. Lastly, the researcher added up and recorded the overall totals for each section, for each textbook, each dimension and each intersection.

7. To obtain the relative availability of all explicit instruction exercises, the researcher determined the percentage of all EIE included in the thesis and record the results.

The researcher determined the percentage of all EIE in each section and recorded the result. Then, the researcher determined the percentage of EIE related to each Explicit Instruction Practice category in each section and recorded the result. Next, the researcher determined the percentage of all EIE in each textbook and recorded the result. Then, the researcher determined the percentage of exercises related to each Explicit Instruction Practice category in each textbook and recorded the result. Lastly, the researcher determined the percentages and recorded the result for all EIE for each category.

8. To obtain the relative availability for all EIE related to Bloom's Revised Taxonomy, the researcher determined the percentages for all EIE related to each dimension and each intersection and recorded the results (Appendix G).

The researcher determined the percentage of all EIE related to each Knowledge dimension in each section and recorded the result. Then, the researcher determined the percentage of all EIE related to each Cognitive Process dimension in each section and recorded the result. Next, the researcher determined the percentage of all EIE related to each intersection of Knowledge dimension and Cognitive Process dimension in each section and recorded the result. Then, the researcher determined the percentage of EIE related to each Knowledge dimension for each textbook and recorded the result. Next, the researcher determined the percentage of EIE related to each Cognitive Process dimension for each textbook and recorded the result. Then, researcher determined the percentage of EIE related to each intersection of Knowledge dimension and Cognitive Process dimension for each textbook and recorded the result. Lastly, the researcher determined the overall percentages and recorded the results for each section, for each textbook, each dimension and each intersection.

9. After determining and recording explicit instruction exercises, the researcher categorized each explicit instruction exercise as a navigating, investigating, or critically evaluating exercise.

The researcher re-read each explicit instruction exercise. The researcher paid close attention to the definition of each term. Then, the researcher determined which term best defined the exercise. Lastly, the exercise was listed on Appendix K for all EIE defined as that term, then on Appendix K for each textbook and for each section.

Conclusion

At the end of these procedures the researcher classified all EIE on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy tables and on Explicit Instruction Practice categories based on the intended intellectual work required to complete the exercises as well as determined the total and relative availability of explicit instruction exercises. This data allowed the compare all explicit instruction exercises' intended intellectual work and their availability to all other exercises.

Data Analysis

The researcher began by comparing the total availability of exercises to the total availability of explicit instruction exercises. Then researcher compared the relative availability of exercises to the relative availability of explicit instruction exercises. Comparisons were made between overall totals and percents for the textbooks, sections, dimensions, and categories. These comparisons allowed the researcher to gain an overview of the intended intellectual work required to complete exercises in various locations as well as obtain specific details about the nature of the intended intellectual work found in textbooks, sections, dimensions, and categories. The nature of the intended intellectual work was determined by the exercises' position on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy and the exercises' Explicit Instruction Practice category. Both were ordered by increasing complexity from lower-order thinking items to higher-order thinking items. However, Bloom's Revised Taxonomy was used to determine which exercises were considered to be higher-order thinking exercises and which exercises were considered to be lower-order thinking exercises. The comparisons allowed the researcher to determine whether teachers or students have more, less, or similar access to explicit instruction exercises. Then, the researcher compared and contrasted the results from this study to previous research studies conducted on exercises

in history textbooks (Hess & Stoddard, 2007; Harmon et al, 2000; LaVere, 2008).

Comparisons served as the basis for the researcher's conclusions and recommendations.

Procedures for Data Analysis

1. The researcher compared the total availability of exercises to the total availability of EIE in all textbooks. Then, the researcher compared the total availability of exercises to the total availability of EIE in each section. Next, the researcher compared the total availability of exercises to the total availability of EIE in each textbook and each of its section. Then, the researcher compared the total availability of exercises to the total availability of EIE for each dimension and each intersection on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in all textbooks. Next, the researcher compared the total availability of exercises to the total availability of EIE for each dimension and each intersection on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in each textbook and each section. Then, the researcher compared the total availability of exercises to the total availability of EIE for each Explicit Instruction Practice category. Lastly, the researcher compared the total availability of exercises to the total availability of EIE for each Explicit Instruction Practice category in each textbook and each section.

2. The researcher compared the relative availability of EIE in all textbooks. Then, the researcher compared the relative availability of exercises to the total availability of EIE in each section. Next, the researcher compared the relative availability of EIE in each textbook and each of its section. Then, the researcher compared the relative availability of EIE for each dimension and each intersection on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in all textbooks. Next, the researcher compared the relative availability of EIE for each dimension and each intersection on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy in each textbook and each of its section. Then, the researcher compared the relative availability of exercises for each Explicit Instruction Practice category in all textbooks. Lastly, the researcher compared the total availability of exercises for each Explicit Instruction Practice category in each textbook and each of its section.

3. The researcher made inferences about the intended intellectual work required to complete EIE using the comparisons, Bloom's Revised Taxonomy, the Explicit Instruction Practice categories, and the findings from the research literature to support the inferences.

The researcher assessed the intended intellectual work required to complete EIE in all of the textbooks. Then, the researcher assessed the intended intellectual work required to complete EIE in each textbook and its sections. Next, the researcher assessed the intended intellectual work required to complete EIE in each section over all three textbooks. Then, the researcher assessed the intended intellectual work required to complete EIE in each dimension in Bloom's Revised Taxonomy, overall, in each textbook, and in each section. Lastly, the researcher assessed the intended intellectual work required to complete EIE in each Explicit Instruction Practice category, overall, in each textbook, and in each section.

5. The researcher considered the possible impact or consequences the availability of and intended intellectual work required by EIE might have on instruction and learning. The researcher used the comparisons, Bloom's Revised Taxonomy, the Explicit Instruction Practice categories, and the findings from the research literature to support the judgments.

The researcher evaluated the possible impact or consequences of the intended intellectual work required to complete EIE in all of the textbooks. Then, the researcher evaluated the possible impact or consequences of the intended intellectual work required to complete EIE in each textbook and its sections. Next, the researcher evaluated the possible impact or consequences of the intended intellectual work required to complete EIE in each section over all three textbooks. Then, the researcher evaluated the possible impact or consequences of the intended intellectual work required to complete EIE for each dimension in Bloom's Revised Taxonomy, overall, in each textbook, and in each section. Next, the researcher evaluated the possible impact or consequences of the intended intellectual work required to complete EIE for each intersection in Bloom's Revised Taxonomy, overall, in each textbook, and in each section. Lastly, the researcher evaluated the possible impact or

consequences of the intended intellectual work required to complete EIE for each Explicit Instruction Practice category, overall, in each textbook, and in each section.

6. The researcher drew conclusions from the data and findings from the research literature about the student's and teacher's relationship to the textbook in regards to explicit instruction practices. The researcher addressed issues regarding availability, the intended intellectual work, possible consequences, and access for all textbooks, each textbook, and each section.

The researcher addressed issues regarding the total and relative availability of explicit instruction exercises. Then, the researcher addressed issues regarding the value of the intended intellectual work in explicit instruction exercises. Next, the researcher addressed issues regarding the possible impact or consequences of explicit instruction exercises. Then, the researcher addressed issues regarding access to explicit instruction exercises. Lastly, the researcher addressed other issues that arose from the data collection and analysis.

7. The researcher concluded the data analysis by making recommendations to publishers, researchers, and teachers regarding the availability of and the intended intellectual work required by explicit instruction practices in the United States textbooks.

Chapter 4: Results

To answer the first research question regarding the availability of EIE, the researcher reported on the overall results and whether EIE were included in the textbooks. To answer the second research question regarding patterns constructed by the researcher about intended intellectual work required to complete all textbook exercises and Explicit Instruction Exercises (EIE), the researcher examined the data in three ways. First, in the overall results section, the availability of higher-order and lower-order thinking categories was reviewed for each analytical tool. Second, all textbook exercises and EIE were compared and contrasted with previous research on the construction of textbook exercises. Third, all textbook exercises were compared and contrasted with EIE. Embedded in these sections the middle school textbook was compared and contrasted with the high school textbook.

Overall Results

The researcher examined 1744 exercises in the unit and chapter preview and review sections. The exercises had a fairly even distribution between the two textbooks, although the middle school textbook had more total exercises despite having nearly 228 less pages and 6 less chapters. This can be partially attributed to the middle school textbook's inclusion of additional skills sections in both the review and preview sections, as well as, review sections for each unit. The high school textbook included one unit review. The researcher coded 393 exercises as EIE, which accounted for 22.5% of all exercises. Again despite fewer chapters and pages, the Middle School textbook contained the majority of EIE overall (57.5%).

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) was used as the primary analytical tool. Bloom's Revised Taxonomy is divided into two dimensions: (a) Knowledge

and (b) Cognitive Process. Each dimension is ordered from lower-order thinking tasks to higher-order thinking tasks. The researcher coded each exercise in the Knowledge dimension and in the Cognitive Process dimension. In other words, the information and reasoning required to complete the task required of the exercise. When each dimension was coded, the researcher recorded the exercise in the intersection of the Knowledge and Cognitive Process dimensions on the appropriate table (Appendix D).

In the Knowledge dimension, lower-order thinking exercises were coded as the term Factual. These exercises required students to answer with basic, or foundational, information. The higher-order thinking exercises were coded as Conceptual, Procedural, or Metacognitive. The term Conceptual was used to code exercises that required students to decipher the interrelationships among events, people, and ideas within the larger context in which they function. The term Procedural was used to code exercises that required students to implement subject-specific strategies, techniques, and methods. The term Metacognitive was used to code exercises that required students to self-regulate learning by implementing learning strategies (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). No Metacognitive exercises were coded in either textbook. The majority of all exercises and EIE were coded as the term Factual (see Table 1).

Table 1:

Majority of Exercises Identified by This Study in the Knowledge Dimension

Dimension	All Exercises	All EIE
Factual	83%	66%

In the Cognitive Process dimension, lower-order thinking exercises were coded as the terms Remember or Understand. The term Remember was used to code exercises that required students to recognize, recall, or retrieve information from the textbook. The term

Understand was used to code exercises that required students to explain facts, ideas, or concepts from the textbook. The higher-order thinking exercises were coded as Apply, Analyze, Evaluate, or Create. The term Apply was used to code exercises that required students to execute a procedure or implement theory. The term Analyze was used to code exercises that required students to differentiating facts from inferences, organizing writing, and attributing relationships. The term Evaluate was used to code exercises that required students to critique texts and justify a stand or decision. The term Create was used to code exercises that required students to generating, planning, and producing a new product (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). The majority of all exercises and EIE were coded as the terms Remember and Understand (see Table 2).

Table 2:

Majority of Exercises Identified by This Study in the Cognitive Process Dimension

Dimension	All Exercises	All EIE
Remember	46%	35%
Understand	38%	41.5%
Total	84%	76.5%

Explicit Instruction Practices Categories

A second analytical tool, Explicit Instruction Practice categories, was used to identify the learning strategy included in completing each exercise. Two categories contained a majority of higher-order thinking exercises. The category Text-Related was used to code exercises that required students to explore the text's discursive elements, evaluate questions, justify opinions, and substantiate answers. The category Self Assessment was used to code exercises that required students to transform the knowledge from the textbook by creating an artistic product (Meeks, 2003). Five categories contained a majority of lower-order thinking

exercises. The category Predicting was used to code exercises that required students to use their background knowledge to help them get an idea of the content. The category Connecting was used to code exercises that required students to connect their background knowledge to the text. The category Problem-Solving was used to code exercises that required students to use learning strategies to help them comprehend the text. The category Presentation and Layout was used to code exercises that required students to explore textbook organization and features. The category Leading was used to code exercises that required students to develop a critical sense of the text by exploring the textbook constructions of historical accounts (Meeks, 2003). The clear majority of EIE were coded as Problem-Solving, accounting for 32% of all EIE. Self-Assessment was the least coded category (4.5%). The other five Explicit Instruction Practices categories were coded in a fairly even distribution ranging from 10.5% to 16% of all EIE.

Comparisons with Previous Research Studies

Three research studies offered useful findings to compare and contrast the results of this study. The primary research study to compare and contrast with this study was LaVere's (2008) research of 691 pedagogical exercises related to Native Americans in the student sections of 13 United States history textbooks used in grades three, four, eight, and eleven. LaVere's (2008) study offered a useful comparison since it used a similar analytical tool and examined exercises in United States history textbooks for both middle and high schools. Hess and Stoddard (2007) researched the depiction of 9/11 in textbooks and supplemental curricula for United States history, world history, and government courses, which included an examination in the nature of intellectual work found in their exercises. Hess' and Stoddard's (2007) study offered a useful comparison since it reported on the availability and construction of lower-order and higher-order thinking tasks in textbook exercises. Harmon's et al (2000) research examined vocabulary exercises in 19 Social Studies textbooks ranging from grade 4

to grade 8 and what type of instructional support they offered teachers and students.

Harmon's et al (2000) study offered a useful comparison since it explored how students were expected to learn vocabulary by completing textbook exercises.

Comparisons with LaVere's Research on Exercises in United States History

Textbooks

LaVere (2008) used Bloom's Original Taxonomy "as an analytical tool for determining the level of questions" with only Knowledge-level exercises (recall) considered as lower-order thinking exercises (p.4). He found Knowledge-level, or recall, exercises were dominant accounting for 91% of all exercises examined and 90% or more of exercises in the high school textbooks. For this study, Bloom's Revised Taxonomy was used and it offered a more differentiated analytical tool. As in LaVere's research, the considerable majority of exercises required lower-order thinking tasks either recalling or explaining basic information from the textbook. The EIE results were similar to the overall results. Lower order-thinking exercises were coded as the majority of EIE. Although the relative availability of lower-order thinking exercises was considerably less among EIE than the overall results (see Table 3).

Table 3:

Lower-order Thinking Exercises Identified by This Study in the Cognitive in the Intersections of the Knowledge and Cognitive Process dimensions

Dimension	All Exercises	All EIE
Remember/Factual	41%	23.5%
Understand Factual	30%	30.5%
Total	71%	53.5%

Table 4:

Higher-order Thinking Exercises in Teacher Sections for Knowledge Dimension

Dimensions	Percentage of Total Exercises	Percentage of Total EIE	Percentage of EIE Coded in Each Dimension
Procedural	20.5%	25%	69.5%

Table 5:

Higher-order Thinking Exercises in Teacher Sections for Cognitive Process Dimension

Dimensions	Percentage of Total Exercises	Percentage of Total EIE	Percentage of EIE Coded in Each Dimension
Apply	13%	18.5%	56%

Table 6:

Higher-order Thinking Exercises in Teacher Sections for the Intersection of the Knowledge and Cognitive Process Dimensions

Dimensions	Percentage of Total Exercises	Percentage of Total EIE	Percentage of EIE Coded in Each Intersection
Remember/Procedural	11.5%	12%	60%
Apply/Procedural	5%	8%	87%

While the relative availability of lower-order thinking exercises was slightly less than LaVere's results, this can be attributed to the inclusion of exercises from the teacher section. Teacher sections accounted for 27.5 % of all exercises and tended to include higher-order thinking exercises at higher relative availability than exercises found in the student sections. This reflected the higher availability of EIE coded in the teacher sections. EIE coded in the teacher sections accounted for the majority of all exercises in the sections (see Table 4). EIE accounted for the considerable majority of all exercises coded as Procedural and Apply as well as all intersections coded as Remember/Procedural and Apply/Procedural (see Tables 4,

5 and 6). Again the considerable majority of these exercises were located in the middle school textbook.

This pattern was also reflected in Explicit Instruction Practices categories with majority of higher-order thinking exercises, Text-Related and Self-Assessment. The considerable majority of EIE coded in these categories were located in the teacher section though more evenly divided among the preview and review sections. As with LaVere's (2008) study, the exercises examined in this study were primarily focused on developing an understanding of history through the perspectives found in the textbooks. These results were consistent with Hess' and Stoddard's (2007) findings.

Comparisons with Hess' and Stoddard's Research on Textbook Exercises

Hess and Stoddard (2007) found that the majority of textbook exercises requiring lower-order thinking tasks checked on student comprehension of textbook accounts and focused the attention of students and teachers on content related to state educational standards. For example, each textbook had a series of multiple-choice exercises that covered state educational standards in each chapter's review sections. Also, in each textbook, the teacher sections included expected and possible answers to provide guidance for the teacher to direct students towards the textbooks' interpretations and accounts.

Hess and Stoddard's (2007) study coded exercises as higher-order thinking or lower-order thinking as defined by Newman & Wehlage (1993). Lower-order thinking exercises required students to receive and recite factual information. Hess and Stoddard (2007) found textbook lower-order thinking exercises "tended to check comprehension of the text and focused attention on particular content" (p. 236). Higher-order thinking exercises required students to manipulate and transform information by various means to arrive at a specific conclusion or interpretation. Hess and Stoddard (2007) found most textbook higher-order

thinking exercises “generally engaged students in comparing, contrasting, or synthesizing ideas from the text” (p. 236).

As in Hess and Stoddard’s (2007) research, this study found that textbook exercises primarily asked students to retrieve or explain the information that was presented in the textbook. In regards to higher-order thinking EIE, only 12 exercises had students directly investigate textbook interpretations (6) and outside sources (6). The rest asked students to investigate history by summarizing, analyzing, or evaluating events, people, and ideas from the perspective of the textbook. These results were further illustrated in the type of Explicit Instruction Practice categories that was most often coded. The top three categories were Problem-Solving, Presentation and Layout, and Predicting, which accounted for 63.5% of all EIE. The exercises in these categories primarily required students to organize information and interpretations from the textbook, construct meaning from textbook features, and comprehend the textbook’s content.

Similar to LaVere’s (2008) and Hess’ and Stoddard’s (2007) results, this study found limited opportunities to critically evaluate historical evidence and interpretations found in textbooks. Many of the student review exercises in the critical thinking subsections contained recall (Remember) or explain (Understand) intellectual work. There were few opportunities to answer open-ended exercises or to engage in debates about historical issues. Almost all student exercises had a corresponding expected or possible answer included in the teacher sections. Even when students were asked to create their own interpretation or take an opinionated stand, they were directed to review their notes based on their reading of the textbook or to find appropriate examples in the textbook to construct their responses. Historians seek out a variety of primary and secondary sources as evidence to counter debatable interpretations and to construct well-rounded interpretations of the past. The reliance on textbook accounts as the primary source for evidence to support student conclusions can be problematic. Textbook accounts can contain debatable perspectives or

omit information that might call into question its interpretations (Alridge, 2006; Bain, 2006; Bryant, 2008; Berkwitz, 2004; Clark, 2005; Clark et al, 2004; Clark et al, 2005; Dorn, 2008; Harison, 2002; Hughes, 2007; Schramm-Pate, 2006; Romanoski, 2003; Zhao & Hoge, 2006). Their accounts are often presented in an authoritative manner that leaves little room to debate what is considered history and what is excluded from history (Bain, 2006). This pattern was reflected in the construction of learning tasks in exercises.

The considerable majority of EIE focused on helping students and teachers to navigate the textbook and its features to construct meaning (81%). Most of these EIE involved navigating visual components of the textbook including photographs, paintings, art, visual, summaries, interpreting maps/graphs/charts, and timelines. The considerable majority of these EIE were lower-order thinking tasks (see Table 7). EIE recognized as investigating or critically evaluating the textbook included higher availability of higher-order thinking tasks (see Table 8 and 9). EIE recognized as investigating the textbook refers to exercises that require students to implement reading and learning strategies. EIE recognized as critically evaluating the textbook refers to exercises that require students to read textbooks as a questionable source. The inclusion of more exercises that require students to investigate and critically evaluate would most likely increase the amount of higher-order thinking tasks. The lack of open-ended exercises was also reflected in the exercises pertaining to vocabulary.

Table 7:

Lower-order Thinking EIE that Match the Definition for Navigating

Dimensions	Total Number of Navigating EIE	Percentage of Navigating EIE
Factual Knowledge	217	68.5%
Remember Cognitive Process	124	39%
Understand Cognitive Process	140	44%

Table 8:

Higher-order Thinking EIE that Match the Definition for Investigating

Dimensions	Total Number of Investigating EIE	Percentage of Investigating EIE
Procedural Knowledge	22	47%
Apply Cognitive Process	13	27.5%

Table 9:

Higher-order Thinking EIE that Match the Definition for Critically Evaluating

Dimensions	Total Number of Critically Evaluating EIE	Percentage of Critically Evaluating EIE
Procedural Knowledge	9	31%
Conceptual Knowledge	8	27%
Evaluate Cognitive Process	5	17%
Apply Cognitive Process	4	14%
Analyze Cognitive Process	4	14%

Comparisons with Harmon's et al Research on Vocabulary Instruction in Social Studies Textbooks

Harmon et al (2000) used a comparative pattern analysis to examine textbooks. They found that textbooks' vocabulary exercises reflected traditional ideas about vocabulary learning that were not supported by current research. Exercises tended to "stress a definitional approach to learning new words" and "did not engage students beyond an associational level of word knowledge" which brought into question the effectiveness of "helping students understand the broader concepts represented by the terms"(p.266). The majority of vocabulary exercises (82%) was located in review sections and focused on domain-specific words (78%). Most of these exercises "typically directed students to apply surface-level knowledge of key terms by filling in blanks, matching the terms with their definitions, or

making crossword puzzles” (p.265). This pattern was more prevalent in middle school textbooks. Harmon et al also found that exercises with “instruction components” asked students to “use key terms in some form of writing” (p.266). However, these exercises were problematic since there was a “lack of student support prior to such activities” and “publishers omitted teacher support for helping students to manipulate information” that are essential to produce writing that reflects an understanding of key terms and their relationship to historical concepts.

As in Harmon et al (2000) research, the majority of vocabulary exercises examined for this study was located in the student review sections and relied on matching key terms and people to their definitions in the textbook. Five vocabulary exercises required students to transform the vocabulary term into a new product that demonstrated its relationship to historical themes or concepts. Two vocabulary exercises required students to define vocabulary through contextual clues. All of these exercises were located in the teacher chapter preview sections of the middle school textbook. The rest of the vocabulary exercises asked to students to match vocabulary to their definitions in the textbook. These exercises included playing vocabulary games, creating Fold Notes, completing fill in the blanks, and writing sentences that explained the contributions/importance of key terms or persons to the era of history being studied. The majority of these exercises were located in the student chapter and unit review sections.

In terms of instructional support, there were differences between the textbooks in the way vocabulary was introduced to students, the location of exercises, and the variety of exercises available to students. The high school textbook offered two vocabulary exercises that introduced vocabulary to students. Both exercises were located in the teacher chapter preview sections. The rest of the vocabulary exercises were located in the student chapter review sections, which required students to write sentences that explained the contribution or significance of ten key terms or persons covered in the corresponding chapter. These

vocabulary exercises were representative of the repetitive nature of the high school textbook and its assumptions about students' background knowledge and previous experience. Students were confronted with the same basic intellectual work in the same amount of exercises, in the exact same place, in every chapter review section. Most of the exercises included little instruction in or explanation of how the students were expected to complete the task. Typically, it was a concisely worded directive.

In the middle school textbook, there were opportunities in each of the teacher sections of chapter previews to introduce, or pre-teach, key terms and people to students. While the majority of these exercises were coded as Explicit Instruction Exercises, only 3 required students to perform higher-order thinking task. Two EIE asked students to determine the meaning of a vocabulary term by the context in which it is located. One Explicit Instruction Exercise addressed content-specific vocabulary terms. The rest involved exercises such as making flash cards, playing vocabulary games, and creating crosswords. These exercises required the students to match key terms and people to the definition located in the textbook. In the student chapter review sections, there were a variety of vocabulary exercises, such as, matching terms or people to their definition, fill in the blanks, multiple-choice, and identifying the person or key term. Again, these exercise required the students to match key terms and people to the definition located in the textbook. As with Harmon's et al (2000) results, these exercises represent lower-order thinking task that do little to connect vocabulary with a larger historical context or help students to understand the relationships between the vocabulary and important historical concepts.

Conclusion

The findings in this study were consistent with previous research studies (Hess & Stoddard, 2007; Harmon et al, 2000; LaVere, 2008). One area not explored by previous research was the inclusion of EIE. To better understand the nature of EIE, these exercises are

compared and contrasted with the overall nature of exercises in the textbooks. Also, the similarities and differences between the availability and construction of exercises in the two textbooks are furthered explored.

Comparison between the Overall Results and Explicit Instruction Exercises Results

There were two similar coded patterns between EIE and overall results. First, lower-order thinking exercises represented the majority of exercises available, although the relative availability of lower-order thinking exercises is considerably less among EIE than the overall results (see Table 1). Second, higher-order exercises coded as the term Conceptual had almost exact relative availability accounting for 10% of all exercises and 11% of all EIE. The majority of these exercises were located in the high school textbook (60%). The primary differences were the higher relative availability of higher-order exercises in EIE as compared to all exercises and the location of the majority of exercises.

EIE offered students and teachers relatively more opportunities to engage in exercises that required students to implement strategies used in the history profession to develop an understanding for the significance of historical events, theories, and people (Procedural Knowledge). EIE included investigating how to detect bias in and the reasons that bias is part of primary sources, secondary sources, written materials, and oral presentations. For example, under the heading of “Identifying Bias in Primary Sources” in the teacher chapter review section, this EIE was included:

- “1. Have students review “Primary Sources: Sarah G. Bagley and Workers’ Rights” in Section 2 of this chapter.
2. Write the following questions for students to see. Have students work in pairs or in small groups to answer the questions.
 - What beliefs and experiences in Bagley’s background and might have shaped her views?

- What opinions does she present?
- What emotional or negative language does she use?
- What biases and stereotypes does the passage reveal?

3. Discuss students' answers as a class. If time allows, have students compare and contrast the biases of Crockett to those of Bagley" (White, 2007, p. 368).

While exercises coded as Procedural had a low relative availability overall (7%), EIE coded as Procedural had a considerably higher relative availability (23%). The inclusion of more EIE would more than likely include higher-order thinking exercises that allow students to explore in more detail such important historical procedures as recognizing short- and long-term cause and effect relationships, determining historical contexts, and applying frames of references to develop an understanding of historical complexity.

For teachers, EIE included how to adapt their instruction for learners having difficulty, Advanced Learners, English Language Learners, and Special Education students. For example, under the heading of "Differentiating Instruction for Universal Access: English-Language Learners" in the teacher unit review section, this EIE was included:

- “1. Have English learners write the drafts for their papers in their primary language.
2. Students should then refer back to these drafts as they write their final papers in English.
3. Before students write in English, review the rules for forming comparative and superlative adjectives and adverbs. Provide guided practice as needed” (White, 2007, p. 464).

These EIE were an acknowledgment of the diversity in the student population that teachers across the United States address on a daily basis. The inclusion of more EIE could provide teachers with a greater variety of exercises to engage the wide spectrum of learning styles and perspectives that students bring to the classroom.

Students and teachers also had more opportunities to engage in exercises that required students to utilize these strategies in their investigations of historical facts, concepts, and theories (Apply Cognitive Process). For example, under the heading of “Teacher-Tested Activity” in the teacher chapter preview section, this EIE was included:

“**Activity** Have students analyze a primary source about the Triangle Shirtwaist Fire tragedy in 1911. Tell them to use the SOAPS strategy. SOAPS stands for subject, occasion, audience, purpose, and speaker. As they read the source material have them identify each of the items in the strategy for each primary source. Then have students share their findings in a class discussion” (McDougal Littell, 2000, p. 273c).

This EIE required students to apply a specific learning strategy to engage with the textbook and then apply this strategy to primary source materials. This approach moves students beyond the lower-order tasks of recalling or explaining textbook information. The inclusion of more EIE could offer both teachers and students with increase opportunities to engage with textbooks and outside sources as recommended by research studies (Aldridge, 2008; Hawkey, 2007; Kalman et al, 2008; Trinkle, 2009; Vidal-Abarca et al, 2000).

Distribution of Exercises

Review sections, which accounted for 68% of all exercises, were dominated by exercises in the student section, which in turn accounted for 89.5% of all exercises in the review sections (see Table 10, 11, and 12). These sections were primarily focused on checking student comprehension of textbook themes, interpretations, and information. Each exercise was also tied to a state educational standard. While there were some differences in the construction of each textbook’s review sections, overall the review sections were constructed in a similar and repetitive manner. The review sections included with a vocabulary review of key terms or persons, followed by a critical thinking section that led

Table 10:

Distribution of Exercises in the Student Sections for Both Textbooks

Textbooks	All Exercises	Percentage of All Exercises in Student Sections	Percentage of All Exercises
Student Sections	1262	100%	72.5%
Student Review Sections	1058	84%	60.5%
Student Preview Sections	204	16%	11.5%

Table 11:

Distribution of Exercises in the Student Sections for the High School Textbook

Textbooks	All Exercises	Percentage of All Exercises in Student Sections	Percentage of All Exercises
Student Sections	631	100%	72.5%
Student Review Sections	512	81%	60%
Student Preview Sections	119	19%	14%

Table 12:

Distribution of Exercises in the Student Sections for the Middle School Textbook

Textbooks	All Exercises	Percentage of All Exercises in Student Sections	Percentage of All Exercises
Student Sections	631	100%	72.5%
Student Review Sections	546	86%	61%
Student Preview Sections	85	14%	9.5%

students through themes and interpretations of the textbook, and ended with a section of multiple choice exercises that covered particular state educational standards.

The high school textbook included an Alternative Assessment section, which asked students to access supplemental textbook materials or to engage in analyzing historical events or themes. The middle school textbooks had a more diverse format of exercises including subsections, such as, Using the Internet, Social Studies Skills, Focus on Writing/Reading/Speaking, and Visual Summary. It also included two additional sections. A Social Studies Skill section addressed different skills in each chapter, such as framing historical questions, analyzing costs and benefits, and determining different points of view. A workshop section at the end of each unit focused on reviewing unit themes, social studies skills, and textbook accounts. The majority of exercises were instructional suggestions included in the subsections of Differentiating Instruction for Universal Access, Preteach, Reteach, Direct Teach, and Teaching Tips. These sections were dominated by the teacher section exercises. The primary focus of teacher review sections in both textbooks was on instructional suggestions designed to check comprehension of textbook themes, interpretations, and information.

Distribution of EIE

The pattern of exercise distribution for EIE was opposite from the overall distribution of exercises. Preview sections that accounted for the majority of EIE and were primarily located in the teacher section (see Table 14, 15, and 16). These sections were primarily focused on introducing students to the themes, interpretations, and information found in each of the textbooks' chapters and units. While there were some differences in the construction of each textbook's preview sections, overall the preview sections were constructed in a similar manner and they were replicated in each chapter and unit preview.

Table 14:

Distribution of EIE in the Teacher Sections for Both Textbooks

Textbooks	Total Number of EIE	Percentage of Total Number of EIE	Percentage of All Exercises in Each Sections
Teacher Sections	308	78.5%	64%
Teacher Preview Sections	221	56%	62%
Teacher Review Sections	87	29%	68.5%

Table 15:

Distribution of EIE in the Teacher Sections for the High School Textbook

Textbooks	Total Number of EIE	Percentage of Total Number of EIE	Percentage of All Exercises in Each Sections
Teacher Sections	112	67%	51.5%
Teacher Preview Sections	108	64%	53%
Teacher Review Sections	4	2.5%	31%

Table 16:

Distribution of EIE in the Teacher Sections for the Middle School Textbook

Textbooks	Total Number of EIE	Percentage of Total Number of EIE	Percentage of All Exercises in Each Sections
Teacher Sections	196	87%	74%
Teacher Preview Sections	113	50%	75.5%
Teacher Review Sections	83	37%	73%

Preview sections primarily consisted of navigating visual elements including photos, paintings, and timelines. Most of these EIE were located in the teacher section. Only thirteen EIE were located in the student preview section and all of these were located in the middle school textbook. These exercises were primarily focused on lower-order thinking tasks. Students were asked to retrieve information from the timeline. Four questions within these exercises asked students to use the timeline to explain a theme found in the following chapter or to identify a trend in historical events. With the photographs or paintings, students were asked to do similar tasks throughout the textbook, such as, describing the scene, suggesting a title or adjectives, predicting how the individuals might be feeling or thinking, and recognizing what symbolism is used. One EIE asked students to compare and contrast the chapter preview image with another image in the textbook and included a suggested extension to compare and contrast those images with from the Internet to determine which image conveys the impact of the Dust Bowl more convincingly. The primary difference between the textbooks was in the variety of exercises available in each textbook's preview sections.

The high school textbook's student preview sections included a brief unit project section, which introduced students to the expected end product, and a series of questions regarding the timeline and the image on the chapter preview page. In the teacher sections, the EIE were more directive than descriptive. Teachers were directed to ask students certain question, remind students to do a certain task, or explain a certain concept to the students followed by a direction to ask students a certain question to confirm the topics importance. An example can be found in the introduction of a unit project, under the title of "Supporting a Point of View":

“Explain that supporting a point of view means presenting good reasons for what you believe. Discuss what makes a reason a good reason. (logically supports the main point; true and based on best, most complete facts)

One approach to supporting a point of view can be to argue against opposing views. For example, to support the view that people need liberty, one might describe how denying people liberty harms them” (McDougal Littell, 2000, p. 1).

The middle school textbook offered more variety in the type and number of exercises.

The middle school textbook included introductions to vocabulary terms and chapter/unit themes. There was also a subsection in each chapter preview on Democracy and Civic Education that covered topics such as participating in the political process, civic virtue, social responsibility, and the common good. All exercises in this subsection were presented in hypothetical situations or abstract terms that attempted to connect citizenship issues to student interests, such as banning cell phones on school campuses. This approach can be useful for engaging students in discussion about topics relevant to their lives and can be related to the purpose of social studies education to instruct students on the rights and responsibilities of democratic citizenship. However, these issues were not directly related to the chapter content or specific historical examples. Thus, students were missing out on opportunities to make direct connection between their previous experiences and similar historical experiences. The review sections also included a Reading Social Studies section that addressed different skills in each chapter, such as comparing historical texts, organizing information, and drawing conclusions about the past. This subsection addressed chapter themes, previewed key historical events, introduced vocabulary, and examined social studies’ reading skills, such as, textual signals for chronological order and determining main ideas from a text.

Overall, both textbooks were highly repetitive in the nature of the intended intellectual work of the exercises and in the organization of textbook sections. Similar

exercises in the exact location and under the exact title were located in each of the student preview and review sections. Teacher sections offered a little more variety, although the high school textbook had far less variety than the middle school. In the high school textbook, slightly different wording of exercises or the inclusion of specific events, people, or interpretations from the corresponding chapter distinguished the majority of exercises between the different preview and review sections. While the intended intellectual work of exercises were similar to the high school textbook, the middle school textbook offered students and teacher a much higher relative availability of overall exercises and EIE per chapter/unit. The middle school textbook's teacher sections had a similar structure in each chapter and unit, but included more variety in exercises. The additional chapter review sections, Reading Social Studies sections, and Social Studies Skills, allowed for teachers and students to engage in more exercises that investigated the procedures of the history profession.

Whether considering the higher relative availability of higher-order thinking tasks in EIE or the greater variety of exercises found in the middle school textbooks, lower-order thinking tasks still dominated exercise construction. Yet not all textbooks or exercises are created equal. Teachers and students do have opportunities, however limited, inside textbooks to actively engage in learning how to learn about history. The onus remains on teachers to take advantage of these opportunities and build on the knowledge constructs of textbooks to develop more complex understandings of what history is and can be for their students.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The dominance of textbooks in history classroom does not seem to waning. Their prominence means researchers need to continue to examine how textbooks are constructed. How textbooks are written and how their exercises engage students in the study of history will continue to impact how students learn and teachers teach (Alridge, 2006; Bain, 2006; LaVere, 2008; Nokes et al, 2007; Schleppegrell et al, 2004). Therefore, this study examined if textbooks exercises included explicit instruction practices that required students and teachers to navigate, investigate, and critically evaluate textbooks. The results of this study concur with many of the findings in previous research studies regarding the problematic nature of intended intellectual work regarding textbook exercises (Case et al, 2006; Hess & Stoddard, 2007; Harmon et al, 2000; LaVere, 2008). This study does offer two important contributions to the content analysis of textbook exercises: (a) its use of two analytical tools to research textbook exercises and (b) its focus on Explicit Instruction Exercises as a means to improve the intended intellectual work of textbook exercises.

The combination of Bloom's Revised Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) and Explicit Instruction Practice categories (Meeks, 2003) to analyze the data offers a wider perspective into the construction of textbook exercises than the previous studies. Bloom's Revised Taxonomy allowed the researcher to examine exercises in three ways: (a) the information required to answer the exercise, (b) the cognitive process associated with intellectual task of the exercise, and (c) the intersection between these two dimensions. The Explicit Instruction Practice categories allowed the researcher to classify the type of learning and reading strategies included in each Explicit Instruction Exercise. Together these tools allowed the researcher to identify the knowledge and cognitive process required to complete the exercise, as well as, identify the specific learning task included in the exercise.

The results of this research into Explicit Instruction Exercises seem to point to a means to increase the availability of higher-order thinking exercises in textbooks. While lower-order thinking exercises are important in developing a base of information, higher-order thinking exercises can help students develop their own interpretations and conclusions. Higher-order thinking tasks tend to engage students in developing a more complex understanding of historical events, concepts, and people, as well as, the procedures historians use to construct their interpretations of the past. In other words, higher-order exercises can help students learn how to investigate historical evidence and critically evaluate historical interpretations.

The results also seem to indicate a need to include more student exercises in the preview sections and more teacher exercises in the review sections, especially in terms of Explicit Instruction Exercises. Preview sections could offer students more opportunities to investigate the organizational elements of the units and chapters to better understand how the textbook is constructed and how they can effectively use the textbook to develop their own interpretations of the past. As the preview sections are currently constructed, exercises in the student sections focus primarily on the visual elements to provide a basic introduction to the major themes of the chapter. As for exercises that ask students to scan and skim chapters or to incorporate reading strategies, they are all located in the teacher sections.

Review sections could offer teachers more opportunities to help students critically evaluate textbook interpretations by applying procedures of the history profession to analyze the textbook's language, presentation, interpretations, and omissions. This approach might allow students more opportunities to be active producers of knowledge with explicit instructional support from the teacher rather than passive recorders of prescribed knowledge. Students would need to utilize or acquire appropriate learning strategies to transform the information from the textbook and other sources to craft their own interpretations of history. As these review sections are currently constructed, exercises in the teacher sections focus

primarily on checking student comprehension of information from the textbook and state standards.

Recommendations

In regards to further research, the relationship between higher-order thinking and lower-order thinking exercises needs to be explored. Students need a solid evidentiary foundation in the historical questions of who, what, where, and when in order to investigate and critically evaluate the why and how of history. Students also need a solid foundation in theory to help them make sense of and build interpretations from the evidentiary details. Given the considerable amount of foundational information needed to formulate a historical argument, it will take a greater number of lower-order exercises to assess students understanding and comprehension of historical events, people, and ideas than the number of exercises that build upon this information to complete a higher-order thinking exercises. In other words, Factual Knowledge and the Cognitive Processes of Remember and Understand will most likely remain the majority of textbook exercises.

Perhaps a research model that not only analyzes the intended intellectual work of exercises and the learning strategies they incorporate but what type of relationship is developed between lower- and higher-order exercises could provide a more accurately assessment of textbook exercises. Do the lower-order thinking exercises help develop a foundation of information that help students to complete the higher-order exercises or do they primarily assess student comprehension of content standards with little or no connection to higher-order exercises? This could help address the validity of the criticism that the textbook construction creates a list of facts and dates that obscures historical patterns and hampers critical thinking (Berkwitz, 2004; Daniels & Zemelman, 2004; Haenan & Tuithuf, 2008; Manning, 2006).

For publishers, the inclusion of more Explicit Instruction Exercises would likely increase the availability of higher-order thinking tasks that educational research has recommended for years. These increases could also make their textbooks more attractive to school districts looking for textbooks that engage students in higher-order thinking tasks. To improve the nature of Explicit Instruction Exercises, publishers need to include more opportunities to critically evaluate the textbook's information and interpretations. This approach will require authors to craft more exercises that ask students and teachers to compare and contrast textbook accounts with outside resources and to deconstruct textbook interpretations of historical accounts by examining alternative ideas and approaches to the same historical accounts.

For teachers, the study found the considerable majority of Explicit Instruction Exercises being located in teacher section in both textbooks. Teachers need to be aware of this possibility and that the majority of Explicit Instruction Exercises may only be available to students if they purposefully incorporate these exercises into their instruction. Teachers also need to be more active consumers of textbooks. They need to seek out textbooks that employ more Explicit Instruction Exercises throughout the textbook. If they cannot find textbooks that satisfy this prerequisite they need to become more vocal, demanding publishers include more open-ended exercises that help both teachers and students understand how to actively navigate, investigate, and critically evaluate history.

Appendices

Appendix A: Bloom's Revised Taxonomy Dimensions and Definitions

The Knowledge Dimension

The Knowledge dimension is associated with the noun or noun phrase in the item and is related to the content to be acquired. The revised Knowledge taxonomy is divided into four categories. It renames three Knowledge subcategories found in the original taxonomy: factual, conceptual, and procedural. It adds a new category metacognitive knowledge, which was not recognized by the original taxonomy. Ordering knowledge along a continuum is problematic, so the researcher may place each exercise into more than one category in the knowledge dimension, with the exception of Factual and Conceptual Knowledge, *which* will be ordered along a continuum since Factual Knowledge serves as the foundation for Conceptual Knowledge (Näsström, 2009).

Factual Knowledge refers to basic elements students must know to be acquainted with a discipline or solve problems in it. This category includes the subcategories regarding the knowledge of terminology and specific details or elements (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In history textbooks this refers to exercises that ask students to define vocabulary or key terms, as well as, answer questions about the who, what, when, and where of historical accounts.

Conceptual Knowledge refers to the interrelationships among the basic elements within a larger structure that enable them to function together. This category includes the subcategories regarding the knowledge of classifications/categories, principles/generalizations, and theories/models/structures (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In history textbooks this refers to exercises that ask students to make

connection between vocabulary or key terms and big ideas as well as the connections between people, events, ideas, and issues.

Procedural Knowledge refers to how to do something, methods of inquiry, and criteria for using strategies, techniques, and methods. This category includes the subcategories regarding the knowledge of subject-specific skills, techniques, and methods, as well as, the criteria for determining when to use appropriate procedures (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In history textbooks this refers to exercises that ask students to navigate the structure and features of the textbooks as well as how to critically evaluate the textbook's accounts.

Metacognitive Knowledge refers to awareness of and knowledge about one's own cognition and one's own ability to self-regulate learning by utilizing or acquiring appropriate strategies. This category includes the subcategories regarding the contextual and conditional knowledge of strategies and cognitive tasks as well as self-knowledge (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). "Metacognitive knowledge of learning strategies enables students to perform better and learn more. Students who know about the different kinds of strategies for learning, thinking, and problem solving will be more likely to use them" (Amer, 2006 p. 219). In history textbooks this refers to the inclusion of learning strategies in textbook exercises.

Cognitive Process Dimensions

The cognitive process dimension is associated with the verb or verb phrase in the item and is related to what intellectual work is to be done with or to the content (Amer, 2006). The cognitive process dimension renames the three original taxonomy categories using verbs. Knowledge is now Remember, Comprehension is now Understand, and Synthesis is now Create. Application, Analysis, and Evaluation are retained and placed in the verb forms of Apply, Analyze, and Evaluate. While the cognitive process order is still formed

in increasing complexity, the order is no longer a cumulative hierarchy. “This is clearly evident in the category *Understand*. Because its scope has been broadened over *Comprehend* in the [original taxonomy], some cognitive processes associated with *Understand* (e.g. *Explaining*) are more cognitively complex than at least one of the cognitive processes associated with *Apply* (e.g. *Executing*)” (Amer, 2006 p. 220-21). There is room for overlap (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). For analytical purposes the dimensions will not overlap. If there is an overlap, or the inclusion of more than one dimension in the construction of the exercise, the exercise will be assigned to the higher order cognitive process (Näsström, 2009).

Remembering refers to the student’s ability to recognize, recall, or retrieve relevant knowledge from long-term memory. This category includes the subcategories regarding recognizing and recalling (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In history textbooks this refers to exercises that ask students to pull answers directly from the text, such as, who were the generals in charge of armies at the Battle of Gettysburg. Key words for exercises include define, duplicate, list, memorize, recall, repeat, reproduce state, and recognize.

Understand refers to the student’s ability to explain facts, ideas, or concepts. Students can construct meaning from instructional messages, including oral, written, and graphic communication. This category includes the subcategories regarding interpreting, exemplifying, classifying, summarizing, inferring, comparing, and explaining (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In history textbooks this refers to exercises that ask students to decipher the text’s explanation and infer the key elements of an account, such as, summarize the major events that lead to the Union’s victory at Gettysburg in your own words. Key words for exercises include classify, describe, discuss, explain, identify, locate, report, select, translate, paraphrase, summarize, and exemplify.

Apply refers to the student’s ability to use the information from the text in a new way or carry out a procedure in a given situation. Students can employ concepts and principles to

new situations, apply laws and theories to practical situations, construct graphs and tables, and demonstrate the correct usage of a method or procedure. This category includes the subcategories regarding executing and implementing (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In history textbooks this refers to exercises that ask students to apply information from the text to a theory or procedure that explains the significance of the account, such as, choose a theory as to why the Confederacy lost at Gettysburg and explain the strengths and weaknesses of the theory's interpretations. Key words for exercises include choose, demonstrate, dramatize, employ, illustrate, interpret, operate, schedule, sketch, solve, use, write, implement, and execute.

Analyze refers to the student's ability to distinguish between the different parts. Students can break material into constituent parts and determine how parts relate to one another, as well as, to an overall structure or purpose. Students can also recognize unstated assumptions, identify logical fallacies in reasoning, distinguish between facts and inferences, evaluate the relevancy of data, and dissect the organizational structure of writing. This category includes the subcategories regarding differentiating, organizing, and attributing (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In history textbooks this refers to exercises that ask students to investigate the text, such as, compare and contrast the key decisions made by Union and Confederate leaders that impacted the outcome of Battle of Gettysburg. Key words for exercises include appraise, attribute, compare, contrast, criticize, differentiate, discriminate, distinguish, examine experiment, question, organize, and test.

Evaluate refers to the student's ability to justify a stand or decision and make judgments based on criteria and standards. Students can judge the logical consistency of written material, the adequacy with which conclusions are supported by data, the value of a work by the use of internal criteria, and the value of a work by use of external standards of excellence. This category includes the subcategories regarding checking and critiquing (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In history textbooks this refers to exercises that

ask students to critical evaluate the text, such as, assessing whether or not the evidence provided by the text supports its depiction of and conclusions about a Battle of Gettysburg. Key words for exercises include appraise, argue, defend, judge, select, support, value, evaluate, check, and critique.

Create refers to the student's ability to generate a new product or point of view. Students can be asked to put elements together to form a coherent, functional whole or reorganize elements into a new pattern or structure. This category includes the subcategories regarding generating, planning, and producing (Amer, 2006; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In history textbooks this refers to exercises that ask students to transform the information in the text to craft a new product, such as, compose a song, skit, poem, or rap to convey the historical significance of a Battle of Gettysburg. Key words for exercises include assemble, construct, create, design, develop, formulate, write, generate, plan, and produce.

Appendix B: Explicit Instruction Practice Categories and Definitions

Predicting questions refers to building on students' background knowledge to help them get an idea of the content (Meeks, 2003). For example, students may be asked how footnotes and vocabulary help make meaning from the text or what are their personal associations with the words in the title (Forsten et al, 2003; Kalman et al, 2008; Meeks, 2003; Woyshner, 2006).

Connecting questions refers to building on students' background knowledge by connecting their previous experiences to the text (Meeks, 2003). These questions attempt to associate student discourse with the text. For example, students may be asked what the passage reminds them of or what parts of the textbook are they familiar with using (Forsten et al, 2003; Kalman et al, 2008; Meeks, 2003; Woyshner, 2006).

Problem-solving questions help students become aware of learning strategies to help them comprehend difficult text and passages (Meeks, 2003). Learning strategies can include time management, re-reading, asking and answering questions, using the index, applying trial and error, reading aloud, taking notes, skimming, making connections to previous experience, guessing, creating graphic organizers, reading from idea to idea, and combining strategies (Case et al, 2006; Fordham et al, 2002; Forsten et al, 2003; Hawkey, 2007; Kalman et al, 2008; Myers & Savage, 2005; Trinkle, 2009; Wiersma, 2008). Students may need to ask themselves if they should re-read the passage, use the index, or establishing meaning from the context. They may be asked to create a make list or map to organize the content (Meeks, 2003).

Text-related questions refer to exploring the discursive elements, evaluating questions, justifying opinions, and substantiating answers (Meeks, 2003). Students can be asked to describe of the influences and outcomes of historical accounts, analyzing connections between accounts, and placing historical accounts into context as a means of

exploring the fluidity of history (Alridge, 2008; Case et al, 2006; Kalman et al, 2008; Manning, 2006). Students may be asked what are the main arguments presented in the text or what kinds of evidence are used by the textbook to support its arguments (Meeks, 2003).

Presentation and layout questions refer to exploring how the textbook is designed and organized (Meeks, 2003). The organization of the textbooks can play a significant role in how students make meaning from the text. These questions can ask students to learn the textbook's topography, conduct systemic searches of the text, and use the textbook as an outline (Fordham et al, 2002; Heanan & Tuituf, 2008; McCabe, 2003). Students may be asked are the graphics referred to in the text passage (Meeks, 2003).

Leading questions refer to eliciting words from the text, putting them in the mouths of the student, and creating definitions from the context (Meeks, 2003). These questions can help students develop a critical sense of the text by exploring the textbook's language, word choice, vocabulary, text features, and exercises by asking students to slow down for a close examination of the text, juxtaposing historical accounts to reflect on the construction of historical knowledge, and trading the gender, race, ethnicity, and/or class of people in depiction of historical accounts (Bryant, 2008; Case et al, 2005; César & Santos, 2006; McCabe, 2003; Myers & Savage, 2005; Woysner, 2006). Students may be asked, what they think the author means by including a certain key term.

Self-Assessment questions refer to a student own evaluation of their reading ability. These questions can ask student to diagnosis issues with reading certain texts and devise reading strategies to help them build comprehension (Meeks, 2003). Students may be asked to transform the knowledge from the textbook by creating an artistic product such as a poster, skit, or song (Forsten et al, 2003; Trinkle, 2009).

Appendix D: Bloom's Revised Taxonomy for All Exercises

Table 7: Bloom's Revised Taxonomy for All Exercises						
Textbook: _____ Section: _____						
Knowledge Dimension	The Cognitive Process Dimension					
	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create
Factual						
Conceptual						
Procedural						
Metacognitive						

Appendix E: Bloom's Revised Taxonomy for Explicit Instruction Exercises

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy for Explicit Instruction Exercises						
Textbook: _____ Section: _____						
Knowledge Dimension	The Cognitive Process Dimension					
	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create
Factual						
Conceptual						
Procedural						
Metacognitive						

Appendix F: Bloom's Revised Taxonomy: Total Availability for All Exercises

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy: Total Availability for All Exercises						
Textbook: _____ Section: _____						
Knowledge Dimension	The Cognitive Process Dimension					
	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create
Factual						
Conceptual						
Procedural						
Metacognitive						

Appendix G: Bloom's Revised Taxonomy: Relative Availability for All Exercises

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy: Relative Availability for All Exercises						
Textbook: _____ Section: _____						
Knowledge Dimension	The Cognitive Process Dimension					
	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create
Factual						
Conceptual						
Procedural						
Metacognitive						

Appendix H: Bloom's Revised Taxonomy: Total Availability for Explicit Instruction

Exercises

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy: Total Availability for Explicit Instruction Exercises						
Textbook: _____ Section: _____						
Knowledge Dimension	The Cognitive Process Dimension					
	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create
Factual						
Conceptual						
Procedural						
Metacognitive						

Appendix I: Bloom's Revised Taxonomy: Relative Availability for Explicit Instruction

Exercises

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy: Relative Availability for Explicit Instruction Exercises						
Textbook: _____ Section: _____						
Knowledge Dimension	The Cognitive Process Dimension					
	Remember	Understand	Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create
Factual						
Conceptual						
Procedural						
Metacognitive						

Appendix J: Explicit Instruction Exercises: Total and Relative Availability

Explicit Instruction Exercises: Total and Relative Availability			
Textbook: _____ Section: _____			
Category	Overall Totals	Overall Percent	All Exercises Percent
Predicting			
Connecting			
Problem Solving			
Text-Related			
Presentation and Layout			
Leading			
Self-Assessment			
<i>Overall Totals and Percents</i>			

Bibliography

- Alridge, D. P. (2006). The limits of master narratives in history textbooks: An Analysis of presentations of Martin Luther King, Jr.. *Teachers College Record*, 108(4), 662-686.
- Amer, A. (2006). Reflections on Bloom's revised taxonomy. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 8(1), 213-230.
- Anderson, L.W., and Krathwohl, D.R. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Bain, R. B. (2006). Rounding up unusual suspects: Facing the authority hidden in the history classroom. *Classroom Teachers College Record*, 108(10), 2080–2114
- Berkwitz, (2004). Conceptions and misconceptions about “Western Buddhism”: Issues and approaches for the classroom. *Teaching Theology and Religion*, 7(3), 141–152
- Bryant, J (2008). State secret: North Carolina and the Cherokee Trial of Tears. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 47(2), 3-21.
- Case, R. E., Ndura, E., & Righettini, M (2006). Balancing linguistic and social needs: Evaluating texts using critical language awareness approach. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 48(5), 374-391.
- Caron, E. J. (2005). What leads to the fall of a great empire? Using central questions to design issues-based history units. *The Social Studies*, 96(2), 51-60.

- César, M. & Santos, N. (2006). From exclusion to inclusion: Collaborative work contributions to more inclusive learning settings. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 22*, 333-346.
- Chambliss, M., & Calfee, R. (1998). *Textbooks for learning: Nurturing children's minds*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Clark, R. (2005). Have there been any great women artists? An investigation of the visibility of women artists in recent art history textbooks. *Art Education, 58*(3), 6-13.
- Clark, R., Allard, J., & Mahoney, T. (2004). How much the sky? Women in American history textbooks from 1960s, 1980s, and 1990s. *Social Education, 68*(1), 57-62.
- Clark, R., Ayton, K., Frechette, N., & Keller, P. J. (2005). Women of the world re-write! Women in American History high school textbooks from 1960s, 1980s, and 1990s. *Social Education, 69*(1), 41-45.
- Cobb, P. (1996). Chapter 03: Where is the Mind? A coordination of sociocultural and cognitive constructivist perspectives. In C. Fosnot (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (pp. 35-52). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Crawford, K. (2003). Re-visiting Hiroshima: The role of US and Japanese history textbooks in the construction of national memory. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 4*(1), 108-117.
- Daniels, H. & Zemelman, S. (2004). Out with the textbook, in with learning. *Educational Leadership, 61*(4), 36-40.
- Delaney, C. J. (2007). World War II and beyond: Middle school inquiry and Critical Literacy. *The NERA Journal, 43*(2), 30-34
- DeRose, J. J. (2007). Comparing international textbooks to develop historical thinking. *Social Education, 73*(1), 36-39.

- Divine, R.A., Breen, T. H., Fredrickson, G. M., Williams, R. H., Gross, A.J., & Brands, H. W. (2005). *America: Past and present* (7th ed.). New York: Pearson Longman.
- Dorn, C. (2008). "Treason in the textbooks": Reinterpreting the Harold Rugg textbook controversy in the context of wartime schooling. *Paedagogica Historica*, 44(4), 457-479.
- Fordham, N. W., Wellman, D., & Sandman, A. (2002). Taming the text: Engaging and supporting students in social studies readings. *The Social Studies*, 93(4), 149-58.
- Forsten, C., Grant, J., & Hollas, B. (2003). Reading to learn: Are textbooks too tough? *Principal*, 83(2), 28-33.
- Fosnot, C. (1996). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Foster, S., & Nicholls, J. (2005). America in World War II: An analysis of history textbooks from England, Japan, Sweden, and the United States. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 20(3), 214-233
- Gordy, L. L., Hogan, J., & Pritchard, A. (2004). Assessing "herstory" of WWII: Content analysis of high school history textbooks. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 37(1), 80-91.
- Gosse, V. (1995). Consensus and contradiction in textbook treatments of the Sixties. *Journal of American History*, 82(2) 658-669.
- Gurung, R. (2003). Pedagogical aids and student performance. *Teaching of Psychology*, 30(2), 92-95.
- Haenen, J., & Tuithuf, H. (2008). Cooperative learning: The place of pupil involvement in a history classroom. *Teaching History*, 131, 30-34.

- Harison, C. (2002). Teaching the French Revolution: Lessons and imagery from nineteenth and twentieth century textbooks. *The History Teacher*, 35(2), 137-162.
- Harmon, J. M., Hedrick, W. B., & Fox, A. (2000). A content analysis of vocabulary instruction in social studies textbooks for grades 4-8. *The Elementary School Journal*, 100(3), 253-271.
- Harniss, M. K., Caros, J., & Gersten, R. (2007). Impact of the design of U.S. history textbooks on content acquisition and academic engagement of special education students: An experimental investigation. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 40(2), 100-110.
- Hawkey, K. (2007). Theorizing content: tools from cultural history. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 39(1), 63-76.
- Hendrik, W. B., Harmon, J. M., & Linerode, P. M. (2004). Teachers' beliefs and practices of vocabulary instruction with social studies textbooks in grades 4-8. *Reading Horizons*, 45(2), 103-25.
- Hess, D. & Stoddard, J. (2007). 9/11 and terrorism: "The ultimate teachable moment" in textbooks and supplemental curricula. *Social Education*, 71(5), 231-237.
- Hogan, T. P. & Murphy, G. (2007). Recommendations for preparing and scoring constructed-response items: What the experts say. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 20(4), 427-441.
- Holt, Rinehart, & Winston. (2007). Holt launches new United States History program for middle grades: *Standards-based content and research-based reading boosts mastery of U.S. History*. Retrieved on November 1, 2008 from http://www.harcourt.com/about/news/articles/2005/111705_holt_ushistory.pdf
- Hughes, R. L. (2007). A hint of whiteness: History textbooks and social construction of race in the wake of the Sixties. *The Social Studies*, 98(5), 201-7.

- Kaiomea, J. (2007). N Whine Mana: A postcolonial reading of classroom discourse on the imperial rescue of oppressed Hawaiian women. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 14(3), 329-348.
- Kalman, C., Aulls, M. W., Rohar, S., & Godley, J. (2008). Students' perceptions of reflective writing as a tool for exploring an introductory textbook. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 37(4), 74-81.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kulczynski, (2005). Eastern Europe in Western Civilization textbooks: The example of Poland. *The History Teacher*, (38)2, 153-177.
- LaVere, D., B. (2008). The quality of pedagogical exercises in U.S. History textbooks. *The Social Studies*, 99(1), 3-8.
- Loewen, J. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: The New York Press.
- McCabe, P. (2003). Working with the textbook: How to enhance student motivation. *Social Education*, 67(5), 274-277.
- McCoy, K. (2005). Strategies for Teaching Social Studies. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 38(5), 1-14.
- McDougal Littell. (2007a). *The Americans*. Evanston, ILL: McDougal Littell
- McDougal Littell. (2007b). Product description. Retrieved on November 1, 2008 from <http://www.mcdougallittell.com/ml/ss.htm?lvl=4&ID=1006300000019628>
- Manning, P. (2006). Interactions and connections: Locating and managing historical complexity. *The History Teacher*, (39)2, 175-195.
- Manzo, K. K. (2000). Analysis finds shallowness in the latest history textbooks. *Education Week*, 19(33), 6-7.

- Meeks, L. (2003). *Literacy in the secondary English classroom: strategies for teaching the way kids learn*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Mustafa & Cullingford, (2008). Teacher autonomy and centralised control: The case of textbook. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 28(1), 81-88.
- Myers, M. P. & Savage, T. (2005). Enhancing student comprehension of social studies material. *The Social Studies* 96(1), 18-23.
- Näsström, G. (2009). Interpretation of standards with Bloom's revised taxonomy: A comparison of teachers and assessment experts. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 32(1), 39-51.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2007). *The nation's report card U.S. History 2006*. Retrieved August 3, 2008, from <http://www.nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>
- Newman, F. W. & Wehlage, G. G. (1993). Five standards of authentic instruction. *Educational Leadership*, 50(7), 8-12.
- Nokes, J. D., Dole, J. A., & Hacker, D., J. (2007). Teaching high school students to use heuristics while reading historical texts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3), 492–504.
- Ogawa, M. (2006). Treatment of Japanese-American internment during World War II in U.S. history textbooks. *International Journal of Social Education*, 19(1), 35-47.
- Pearson Longman. (2005). Product description. Retrieved on November 1, 2008 from <http://www.pearsonschool.com/index.cfm?locator=PSZ16s&PMDbSiteId=2781&PMDbSolutionId=6724&PMDbCategoryId=815&PMDbProgramId=14641&level=4>
- Pierce, B. N. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9-31.
- Romanowski, M., J. (2003). Religion in contemporary U.S. history textbooks. *The Social Studies*, 94(1), 29-34.

- Sanchez, T. R. (2007). The depiction of Native Americans in recent (1991-2004) secondary American history textbooks: How far have we come? *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40(4), 311-320.
- Schleppegrell, M. J., Achugar, M., & Oteiza, T. (2004). The grammar of history: Enhancing content-based instruction through a functional focus on language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(1), 67-93.
- Schramm-Pate, S. L. (2006). Disrupting the North/South binary: A deconstruction of two social studies textbooks' portrayals of the Reconstruction era in America (1861-77). *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 22(2), 139-58.
- Tyree, R. (1994). Instructional materials for diverse learners: Features and considerations for textbook design. *Remedial and Special Education*. 15(6), 363-377.
- Vidal-Abarca, E., Martinez, G., & Gilabert, R. (2000). Two procedures to improve instructional text: effects on memory and learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(1), 107-16.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- von Glasersfeld, B. (1996) Preface and Chapter 01. Constructivism. In C. Fosnot (Ed.) *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (8-33). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Waters, T. (2005). Why students think there are two kinds of American History. *The History Teacher*, (39)1, 11-21.
- White, D. G. (2007). *United States History: Beginnings to 1877*. Orlando, FL: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

- Wiersma, A. (2008). A study of the teaching methods of high school history teachers. *The Social Studies*, 99(3), 111-116.
- Woodward, A. & Elliott, D. L. (1990). Textbook use and teacher professionalism. In D. L. Eliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the U.S.* (89th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1, 178-193). Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education.
- Woyshner, (2006). Picturing women: Gender, images, and representation in social studies. *Social Education*, 70(6), 358-362.
- Zhao & Hoge, Y. & Hoge, J. D. (2006). Countering textbook distortion: War atrocities in Asia, 1937-1945. *Social Education*, 70(7), 424-430.