



Writing to learn history: intertextuality in secondary school and university students in Chile

Rodrigo Henríquez
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile

Daniela Luque
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile

Mabelin Garrido
Universidad Alberto Hurtado

ABSTRACT

The objective of this article is to identify and compare some features of intertextuality in texts written by secondary school and university students in Chile. Employing the perspective afforded by historical literacy, academic discourse analysis, and expert-novice studies, we analyzed 17 written texts based on questions and historical evidence. The two groups were found to differ in terms of evidence usage and writing quality. Intertextual resources are much more commonly used in university-level expert writing than in secondary education. However, surprisingly, they also appeared in a significant part of the texts produced by secondary school students through elements such as paraphrasing, direct and indirect discourse, and integral and non-integral citations. These findings provide a comparative and situated perspective of historical writing across two educational levels, posing some challenges to literate practices in Historical Education and their modeling for learning.

KEYWORDS

History Writing; Intertextuality; Secondary Education; Higher Education

CITATION

Henríquez, R., Luque, D., & Garrido, M. (2023). Writing to learn history: intertextuality in secondary school and university students in Chile, *Historical Encounters*, 10(1), 144-158. <https://doi.org/10.52289/hej10.110>

COPYRIGHT

© Copyright retained by Authors
Published 7 August 2023
Distributed under a [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License

Introduction: Writing to learn history

From the perspective of disciplinary literacy (DL) studies, learning is a process whereby people acquire, produce, and transform knowledge (Moje, 2008). Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) define three levels of literacy: i) basic: skills for decoding academic texts; ii) intermediate: skills for understanding more complex concepts; and iii) disciplinary literacy: reading and writing skills that characterize scientific disciplines. In our discipline, the development of historical literacy skills has been defined in a variety of ways, with authors considering elements such as temporal comprehension or historical consciousness (Rüsen, 2004; Lee, 2005), the heuristic processes involved in reading historical sources (Wineburg, 1991: 2001), and the processes of historical writing (Martin, 2002; Monte-Sano, 2010; Martin & Rose, 2008). However, as Virta (2007) and Maposa and Wassermann (2009) warn, the concept of historical literacy can be ambiguous due to the wide range of processes that it examines (e.g. cognitive, written, visual, cultural, and epistemological). Among these processes, our study focuses on the development of historical writing. Particularly, we seek to determine how students incorporate the information contained in historical sources into their writing.

Studies conducted over the last two decades have identified the positive effects of disciplinary writing on learning. Authors have highlighted the importance of encouraging disciplinary writing in educational practice because it allows complex thought skills to develop. Such skills include epistemic thought and reflectivity, both of which are key to people's personal and social development (Figueroa et al., 2019; Miras, 2000; Atorresi et al., 2010). In this context, academic writing with an educational purpose—as opposed to professional academic writing—comprises the set of performances that students must exhibit in a course or program to demonstrate their learning. Therefore, this type of writing has a triple function: epistemic, rhetorical, and qualifying (Navarro, 2018). The educational development of disciplinary reading and writing is the most commonly recommended method for incorporating academic language into educational practice (Figueroa et al., 2019).

Snow and Ucelli (2009) define *academic language* as a “lexical, grammatical, discursive, and disciplinary domain that makes it possible to ‘pack’ complex and abstract ideas in writing while also enabling subjects to understand school texts and those produced by academic communities” (in Concha et al., 2010, p. 91). Academic language is learned by means of “academic literacy learning”, whose field comprises the set of reading and writing practices acquired in order to access and participate in the cultures of each discipline (Calle & Ávila, 2020; Carlino, 2003). The visibilization of these literate practices in school and university education has revealed that their learning and teaching are highly specialized and sophisticated rather than evident, instrumental, or basic (Ávila et al., 2013). The explanation of historical causes constitutes an example of the development of a literate practice, since it requires the learner to actively select, manipulate, assess, and transform disciplinary content (Miras & Solé, 2007). However, as noted by Calle and Ávila (2020), literate practices cannot be acquired merely by writing. They must be purposively targeted by the teaching model implemented, by means of strategies that integrate writing into the learning process. Furthermore, these strategies should prioritize feedback over punitive measures (Atorresi et al., 2010).

Studies on the learning of historical writing support the above. Several teaching practices have been identified, including the comprehension-oriented reading of historical evidence (Monte-Sano et al., 2014), the development of writing tasks based on historical evidence and questions (Monte-Sano et al., 2012; De la Paz & Felton, 2010), the use of information and communication technologies (Hernández-Ramos & De la Paz, 2009), and the organization of debates related to writing tasks (Van Drie et al., 2017). All these authors report improvements in areas such as the length and complexity of students' historical descriptions and explanations, as well as in their historical thinking. Authors tend to ascribe these improvements to teaching practices that a) emphasize historical thinking while reading evidence (Monte-Sano, 2010; Grant et al., 2004; Young et al., 1998) and b) focus on the development of literate practices that explicitly address concepts such as evidence, historical context, authorial point of view, accuracy, comparison of

sources, and causality (Coffin, 2004; De la Paz et al., 2010; Monte-Sano, 2010; Young et al., 1998; Vansledright et al., 1998; De la Paz, 2005).

Complementing the above, recent studies have emphasized the relevance of teaching practices aimed at making historical writing strategies explicit (Van Drie et al., 2021; De la Paz, 2022; Miller, 2022). Likewise, researchers have found significant correlations between historical writing knowledge and historical reasoning in students who have taken part in specific learning interventions versus others who have not done so (Van Drie et al., 2021, De la Paz et al., 2022). In line with this, Miller (2022) has stressed the importance of implementing designs such as writing tasks as a way of reducing the socioeconomic gap (in the United States) in standardized History tests with open-ended questions versus tests with multiple-choice items.

The present study is aimed at complementing research on historical learning from the perspective of historical literacy. To date, studies on the use of evidence (Rouet et al., 1997; Monte-Sano & De la Paz, 2012; Nokes, 2017) have focused on interpretative criteria for analyzing historical writing, paying less attention to the specific features of the texts employed. In this context, our study focuses on the written resources used to cite a text.

The relevance of the present study lies in the fact that the identification of historical intertextuality in texts produced in response to an evidence-based writing task makes it possible to characterize challenges specific to academic writing. Pedagogical practices such as modeling and feedback can be used in both professionalizing history writing and secondary school students' writing acquisition in order to improve the abstraction and argumentation skills of the History undergraduates and school students completing such tasks.

Theoretical framework. Intertextuality and academic writing in university- and school-level History education

Many of the educational purposes of secondary school and university are fulfilled by means of writing tasks that rely on historical evidence. To complete such tasks, learners must utilize a repertoire of cognitive and linguistic skills that reflect the voices of the texts consulted, while at the same time acknowledging the consensus views of historiography. Thus, resources such as footnotes or paraphrasing enable students to incorporate authoritative academic voices as they construct an authorial voice of their own (Navarro, 2018). This phenomenon, known as intertextuality, has been defined by Bazerman (2004) as the explicit inclusion of other texts, which can be presented in multiple ways. Intertextuality can vary depending on its level of visibility. For instance, it can be explicit (e.g. quoting or referencing a text) or semi-explicit (e.g. paraphrasing, summarizing, or mentioning an idea) (Bazerman, 2004). In this regard, research shows that, in the Humanities, people attach great value to the explicit syntactic inclusion of voices (e.g. "as Habermas points out") and paraphrasing (e.g. "Habermas' theory of language can be summarized as..."). Thus, many educational goals not only require students to have a good command of these resources to show that they understand the contents and perspectives found in the sources: they are also expected to employ these sources critically and originally.

Citation is one of the prototypical examples of intertextuality in historiography and school-level historical literacy. Swales (1990) distinguishes "integral" from "non-integral" citations. In the former, the cited author is incorporated into the syntax of the sentence. In the latter, the cited author appears in parentheses or in a footnote, without a role in the syntax (Fahler et al., 2019). In non-integral citations, the voice of the citing author plays a more relevant role than that of the cited author.

The epistemic role of the citation will vary depending on its purpose, its discursive genre, and the writing task being completed, among other factors. According to Hyland (2004), selecting one type of citation over another depends on the writer's competence in generating intertextual frameworks that reflect the literature of a field and identify the accumulated knowledge of the discipline (Fahler et al., 2019). Competent writers decide to employ integral or non-integral

citations based on their knowledge of the epistemological and rhetorical objective that they wish to fulfill.

For the semi-explicit level, Fahler et al. (2019) suggest differentiating between “direct discourse” and “indirect discourse”. The former employs quotation marks and reproduces the words of the cited text literally, while the latter is expressed by paraphrasing, summarizing, or interpreting the words of the cited author. Direct discourse is used to support the position of the citing author or to analyze, discuss, or contradict it. In contrast, indirect discourse establishes a connection with the cited author.

Our literature review for the present study revealed that the results of research on academic writing are uneven. Although research has assessed the quality of school-level writing based on its suitability for the communicative situation, coherence, cohesion, structure, and punctuation (Sotomayor et al., 2016), to the best of our knowledge, no discipline-specific studies have been conducted, let alone studies on historical writing at the school and university level. What is currently known is that students have a better command of the narrative genres than of the explanatory and argumentative ones (Figueroa, Meneses, et al., 2018). This also occurs in school History lessons: the narrative genre predominates in teaching practices, among other reasons because it makes it possible to summarize historical events in a linear temporal sequence, with events being arranged one after another (Martin et al., 2008; Coffin, 2006). In contrast, the explanatory and argumentative genres require more rhetorical and disciplinary resources and further development of historical abstraction.

However, historical literacy research has yielded consistent evidence on the positive effects of purposive reading and writing tasks. Reading modeling and source interpretation tasks, together with guided writing practices, have been shown to be the most effective ways of developing written historical thinking. Research indicates that these practices foster the extension and complexity of students' historical explanations and arguments (De la Paz et al., 2010; Monte-Sano et al., 2012; Monte-Sano et al., 2014; Freedman, 2015; De La Paz et al., 2017; Van Drie et al., 2017).

In this context, the present article draws on the contributions of these historical literacy studies, focusing on the historical intertextuality strategies employed by secondary school and university students. The question that guided our study was: how do high school and university students incorporate intertextuality –considering the visibilization of evidence, the type of inclusion, and the quality of inclusion– into writing tasks focused on source examination?

Methodology and corpus

The methodology used is qualitative and descriptive; furthermore, the study benefits from the use of academic writing analysis tools (Hyland, 2011; Swales, 1990). Specifically, we took into account the criteria that authors in this field use to identify the intertextual resources employed by students. We adopted the perspective of expert-novice studies, focusing on those that have examined the development of historical thinking (Wineburg, 1991; Carreteto & Limón, 1996; Domínguez, 2015). We employed a coding scheme for the analysis of texts produced in Humanities (Fahler et al., 2019) and History programs (Navarro, Henríquez, & Álvarez, 2019).

Three methodological limitations can be identified. First, the corpus used was taken from two different studies. However, these studies belong to our line of research on historical literacy, were temporally consecutive, and involved similar purposes and methods. For instance, both studies dealt with historical writing tasks based on problems and evidence (See Appendix 1).

The second limitation is methodological in nature and concerns the use of discourse analysis methods to examine the corpus. Even though these categories belong to educational linguistics, they were adapted to historical discourse thanks to the interdisciplinary expertise of the research team, which features linguists and historians.

The third limitation concerns the number of texts used (17 in total), representing only a small selection of the total number of university and school students in Chile. Nevertheless, the study focuses on detecting phenomena within texts that are composed of 14,227 words in total. This

makes it possible to conduct a more specific analysis of writing. We trust that these limitations have been adequately solved, thus enabling the present study to offer an interdisciplinary contribution to the analysis of historical writing.

Corpus

The corpus comprises 17 texts (14,227 words) produced by students. Eight texts were written by History undergraduates, while nine were written by secondary school students (see table 1). We selected texts whose features would ensure a larger presence of intertextual resources, a strategy found to be effective in prior research (Thaiss & Zawacki, 2006; Fahler et al., 2019).

Table 1

Corpus Composition

Participants	No. of texts	No. of words
9th, 10th, and 11th grade students (Secondary Education)	9	5505
History Undergraduates (Research Seminar, 5th to 8th semester)	8	8722
Total	17	14,227

Participants

The authors of the texts are students belonging to two educational levels. One subgroup is composed of secondary school students from a State-subsidized private school located in a municipality of southern Santiago de Chile. The students, between 14 and 17 years old, are in 9th, 10th, and 11th grade. All 9 students have taken part in purposive reading and writing practices reported in Henríquez, Carmona, Quinteros, and Garrido (2018). The other subgroup is composed of 8 senior students enrolled in a Bachelor's Degree Program in History at a university of Santiago de Chile. By means of informed assent and consent forms approved by an Institutional Review Board, the participants granted their permission for their texts to be used for research purposes and subsequently disseminated. The research team strove to safeguard the participants' anonymity while processing their answers. The corpus was analyzed using Nvivo12, which made it possible to iterate and calibrate the analysis criteria over several stages.

Instruments

The instrument administered was a writing task based on historical sources which used a historical question or an instruction as a prompt (See Appendix 1).

The sources were read by the participants (secondary school students and university undergraduates) in prior sessions and discussed with their teachers in class settings. The texts were produced in similar conditions: individually, over a 90-minute period, and with the specific instruction to use the evidence provided, which the participants were allowed to use freely during the completion of the task.

The writing tasks involved the use of authentic material (Mierwald, 2022). The documents provided were primary historical sources and a selection of historiographic texts. As pointed out by Mierwald, these sources have yielded better results in tasks aimed at producing historical arguments compared to less authentic materials such as school textbooks or media-produced historical narrations (Mierwald, 2022). Furthermore, we incorporated the criterion proposed by Van Drie (2021), which consists in presenting historical problems with multiple possible interpretations. The contents (Contemporary World History and History of the 19th and 20th

Centuries in Chile) were selected in accordance with Chile’s national school curriculum. For the university group, the students worked with secondary sources chosen by their professors.

Analysis criteria

Intertextuality was identified using the following categories: visibility of the citation, type of inclusion, and quality of inclusion (Swales, 1990; Fahkler et al., 2019; Oteíza et al., 2014). Table 2 summarizes the main characteristics of the indicators associated with each criterion. Using the codes selected to explore the corpus, the researchers coded it collectively. This iterative process, with auditing stages, made it possible to refine, reclassify, and organize the occurrences observed.

Table 2
Dimensions of Intertextuality Criteria

1. Visibility of the citation	
Integral	The cited author is present in the sentence.
Non-integral	The cited author is absent from the sentence, appearing in brackets on in a footnote.
Reference with no citation	One or more authors are explicitly mentioned without a reference.
No inclusion	No citations are included.
2. Type of evidence inclusion	
Direct	Verbatim citation with quotation marks.
Indirect	Paraphrasis, summary, or interpretation of the source.
Mixed	Combination of direct and indirect inclusion.
3. Quality	
Incorrect strategic	Incorrect, pointless, or “cut-and-paste” inclusion of source material in the text.
Reformulation -	The core ideas of the source are preserved without incorporating the student's point of view.
Reformulation with a historical meaning	Aspects of the source are incorporated into the text through a deductive process that enables the student to construct a historical meaning.

Source: Own work based on Fahler et al. (2019), and Oteíza et al. (2014).

Results

This section describes how intertextuality manifested itself in the participants' texts. Given that the texts examined differed in length, we first note the number of citations and their rate of appearance every 1000 words to homogenize the intertextual analysis conducted. To increase clarity, *secondary school* will be shortened to *SS* and *university* to *U*.

a) Intertextuality

Instances of intertextuality (table 3) in the form of citations are more frequent in texts produced by university students than in those written by school students. U texts feature 9.1 instances per 1000 words, while SS texts exhibit 8.2 instances per 1000 words (see table 6). The explicit appearance of intertextuality in writing is a feature of the quality of academic writing (Fahler et al., 2019); therefore, its presence in U texts is consistent with the disciplinary education of undergraduates. Its presence in the SS corpus is relevant, since it indicates that it has been purposely developed and exercised as part of regular teaching.

Table 3
Total No. of Instances of Intertextuality

	Total no. of citations	Instances per 1000 words
Secondary School	45	8.2
University	79	9.1

b) Visibility of the citation

Major differences can be observed between school and university writing. Integral citations predominate in the latter (8.7 instances per 1000 words), while non-integral citations are much scarcer (0.3 instances per 1000 words). We found no references with no citation. In SS texts, even though integral citations predominate (5.3 instances per 1000 words), they are comparatively less prevalent than in U texts. Still, it is worth noting the presence of non-integral citations (2.9 instances per 1000 words) and the large number of references with no citation (2.5 instances per 1000 words), as shown in table 7.

Table 4
Visibility of the Citation

	Secondary School		University	
	N	Instances per 1000 words	N	Instances per 1000 words
Integral	29	5.3	76	8.7
Non-integral	16	2.9	3	0.3
Reference with no citation	14	2.5	0	0

Table 4 shows that both groups use integral citations more frequently than non-integral ones. The limited presence of the latter in U texts is noteworthy. Possibly, the large number of texts that the participants were required to use forced them to include their sources explicitly in the syntax. Non-integral footnotes had little visibility in this type of task.

Recurrent citations, the most common ones, have two recurrent forms: a) more literally attached to the perspective presented in the text, with a weaker historical perspective, and b) exhibiting a richer interpretation of the cited author (more common in U texts). Two examples taken from SS texts will be presented. In the first one, it is worth noting the repetition used by the author: “... as can be observed in source no. 2”: “Another consequence in the social domain is the patriotism generated during and after the war, which produced patriots who were loyal and committed to their nation, as source no. 2 indicates” (ID8). Although the source plays a syntactic role, the text does not deviate from the point of view that it introduces. The second example is

similar: the text cites the source, but it is not possible to identify an author who adopts a position with respect to the perspective advanced by the source. *“All this, added to the secret involvement of the United States, resulted in a coup launched on Tuesday, September 11th, 1973, led by Commander in Chief Augusto Pinochet who, together with the military junta, sought to “extirpate the Marxist cancer from Chile” (1st Statement of the Military Junta)”* (ID 15).

In contrast, in U writing, the inclusion of an author is based on the identification of its perspective. This recurrent feature can be illustrated by two excerpts: *“Enzo Traverso has discussed the usage of memory, where certain discourses vie for the hegemony of the predominant memory, given that weak and strong memories can coexist”* (ID 21) and *“The existence of different memories –although only three have been mentioned, Stern insists that many memories are possible– leads to a so-called ‘clash of memories’, since memory is regarded as a disputed field by many authors”* (ID 17).

Another significant difference is that References with no Citation appear in SS texts but not in their U counterparts.

c) Type of evidence inclusion

Evidence is inserted in significantly different ways (see table 5). While SS texts have relatively similar rates of mixed, direct, and indirect discourse, indirect discourse is strongly predominant in U texts (6.9 instances per 1000 words). This phenomenon, reported in the literature on university-level historical writing (Fahler et al., 2019), is indicative of students' larger set of rhetorical and historical resources and their stronger comprehension skills, which enable them to reformulate the discourse of the cited authors. Indirect discourse, whose most recurrent manifestation is paraphrasing, has been highlighted as a strategy aimed at generating “intimacy” between the author of the text and that of the source. In addition, it is a resource employed by students to demonstrate their acquisition of the material to a teacher or examiner (Oteíza et al., 2014). This perspective adoption strategy is present in both U and SS texts. In the former, the following excerpt is illustrative: *“Alejandro Portelli, in his book on the ‘Ardeatine massacre’, referred to the manipulated discourse of the Italian right wing”* (ID 21). In SS texts, the inclusion of indirect discourse is strongly associated with integral citations, as the following example shows: *“In the economic domain, one consequence is that thanks to the capture of the saltpeter companies, Chile managed to leave behind an economic crisis, increasing its income, as can be observed in source no. 1”* (ID 8).

Table 5
Type of Evidence Inclusion

	Secondary School		History Undergraduates	
	N	Instances per 1000 words	N	Instances per 1000 words
Direct	15	2.7	14	1.6
Indirect	12	2.2	60	6.9
Mixed	17	3.1	19	2.2

Mixed discourse is more prevalent in SS texts (3.1 instances per 1000 words) than in U ones (2.2 instances per 1000 words). However, U texts exhibit more rhetorical resources for incorporating and connecting the citation into the syntax of the sentence. As shown in the following example, this function enables students to support an argument: *Their “failed” existence can be justified if it at least arouses reactions such as that of Villalobos and opens a debate on the memory of this critical period. As Jelin points out, memory is “is a construction that is always open, never closed”* (ID 18). In contrast, in SS writing, evidence is inserted by mentioning the number of the source, but not the name of the author or his/her perspective: *as can be observed in source no.*

2, "... the emergence of a State power determined to create patriots who were loyal and committed to their nation, as can be observed in source no. 2" (ID 5).

d) Inclusion quality

Two tendencies can be observed in table 6. First, both groups (especially History undergraduates) reformulate the evidence found in the sources preserving their core meaning. SS texts feature 4 instances per 1000 words, while their U counterparts exhibit 4.9 instances per 1000 words. The main difference is that U texts extend the reformulation of the source with historical judgments (4.5 instances per 1000 words compared to 1.5 instances per 1000 words in SS texts). It is reasonable to think that university students possess a larger rhetorical repertoire and have acquired more disciplinary contents, all of which enables them to establish connections between the meanings of the source and their personal views.

Table 6
Quality of the Inclusion

	Secondary School		University	
	N	Instances per 1000 words	N	Instances per 1000 words
Strategic	19	3.5	12	1.4
Reformulation	22	4	43	4.9
Reformulation with judgment	8	1.5	39	4.5

Another noteworthy aspect is that SS texts feature more examples of "strategic and/or incorrect incorporation", with 3.5 instances per 1000 words. Several factors reported in the literature can shed light on this situation, ranging from insufficient reading comprehension skills for understanding the meanings conveyed in the source to the student's expectation that the reader will correctly evaluate the mere naming of the author of the source (Calle-Arango & Ávila-Reyes, 2020).

One of the most common ways in which sources are incorporated is through the author's endorsement of their content without identifying their perspective. This is illustrated in the following example: "*First, there is the internal War in Chile between the Marxist resistance and the military government "the Marxist resistance is not over yet, there still are extremists around. I must say that Chile is currently in a state of internal war (...) neutralization or elimination of all those elements identified as enemies of the nation"* (ID 1). The student does not distinguish the perspective of the source and the content that it provides to answer the question about the reasons for the coup in Chile in 1973.

At the Reformulation level, SS and U discourses are clearly similar. However, the most significant and recurrent difference is that SS texts mention the source as an object, while U texts refer to the author and his/her perspective. This can be illustrated with a SS example: "*A consequence that influences the social and economic domain in a single concept is the evident change in the distribution of the GDP in Chile. Chart number two of source number four illustrates this change, mining increases and the percentage of agriculture decreases"* (ID 9). U students write differently: "*Enzo Traverso has referred to the usage of memory, where certain discourses vie for the hegemony of the predominant memory, given that weak and strong memories can coexist"* (ID 21).

Reformulation with a historical meaning is much more common in U texts (4.5 instances per 1000 words) than in SS texts (1.5 instances per 1000 words). This indicates that it is the most prevalent resource in expert writing. For instance, in one U text (ID17), the writer contradicts one author (Villalobos) using an argument advanced by another author (Portelli) to construct an argument to validate the existence of the Museum of Memory in Chile: "*I do not think the museum*

represents “a desire to falsify the past” as Villalobos states, because it contains no invented or fictional events, such as what happened with collective Roman memory based on the Ardeatine massacre, described by Portelli; as previously explained, it cannot be said that the museum is lying, since all memories are valid and the museum represents one hegemonic memory about that period. The State's officialization of what happened can violate one of the main features of memory, invisibilizing one memory and not another” (ID17).

Interestingly, a handful of SS texts – such as ID 14 – featured resources similar to those of their U counterparts: “On the same day of the coup, the Commander in Chief of the Air Force, General Leigh, announced that the country was in a state of war and that the enemy was “the Marxist cancer”, which he believed was not representative of the identity of the country's inhabitants. Therefore, his mission was to eliminate this political faction whose very existence was, supposedly, an attack on the republic and its democratic tradition. This “mission” was legitimized by means of constitutional reforms that violated the human rights to life, freedom, and free association (decree-laws no. 5, 77, 1629). But, what is the origin of this idea that the mere notion of this socialist thought represented an attack on freedom and democracy?” (ID 14). In both examples (ID 17 and ID 14), the writers include voices of authorship using historical evidence.

Discussion and conclusions

Learning a school- or university-level discipline involves acquiring a set of literate and oral discursive practices which can be used to observe and evaluate the learner's acquisition of the discipline and his/her progression in it. The explicit teaching of academic writing through recurrent modeling practices is a powerful tool for learning the contents and skills of a discipline (Calle & Ávila, 2020). In History, intertextual skills are developed through practices that make explicit their rhetorical and epistemological functions. Results show that the rhetorical function predominates over the epistemological function in SS texts, while U texts exhibit the opposite situation. U writers have more intertextuality resources than SS students (9.1 instances per 1000 words versus 8.2). This should not come as a surprise given that the objective of university education is to prepare professional historians. What is indeed surprising, however, is the small numerical difference between the instances found in U and SS texts. This indicates that some expert practices are present in SS writing. This aspect, examined in studies on reading practices (Reisman, 2012) and historical writing (Nokes, 2017), shows that writing requires phases that include constant modeling and feedback. However, these conditions are not commonly found in secondary school and university teaching in Chile.

In line with Fahler et al. (2019), we also found that university-level historical writing has a tendency to feature indirect discourse more frequently than its direct counterpart. This tends to highlight the voice of the cited author by incorporating it syntactically in the text, which results in greater closeness or ideological solidarity with him/her (Oteíza et al., 2014). In contrast, verbatim or direct citations are the least common variety. These citations are frequently used to examine sources and offer a direct look at them. Nevertheless, given the nature of the writing task and the conditions under which the texts were produced (90 minutes), both SS and U students chose to reformulate the contents of the sources by means of indirect discourse. It is worth mentioning that the participants used inclusion through indirect discourse, which reveals the presence of rhetorical and disciplinary resources for including the author's authoritative voice. The difference between SS and U participants is that the former used citations as a voice of authority, while the latter employed them to construct arguments.

The visibilization of the author is another of the resources that, according to our findings, is indicative of the higher levels of complexity found in U texts. In contrast, SS students, despite mentioning historical evidence, often fail to include proper citations in their texts. This phenomenon, observed in Chilean students (Henríquez & Ruiz, 2014), is one of the challenges that educational practices must address. The ability to incorporate, paraphrase, and use historical evidence needs practice and feedback. Nevertheless, literate educational practices are scarce in school and university classes and, when they exist, effective feedback is not provided (Atorresi et

al., 2010). Despite these shortcomings, expert students are highly efficient at reformulating the meanings of the sources in their written texts. In addition, they are able to elaborate on this content by means of judgments, assertions, and connections with the topic that must be covered in each task. SS students are much more likely to incorporate historical evidence wrongly or partially.

Our results show that, even though U writers possess more intertextual resources for constructing historical discourse, SS writers deploy a variety of complex strategies such as indirect discourse and verbatim citations. These results are consistent with the literature on the teaching of writing, which highlights the importance of modeling this skill using specific tasks (De la Paz, 2022; Miller, 2022; Van Drie et al., 2021).

Despite the limitations of the present study, such as the number of texts analyzed and the small size of the random sample, the results obtained make it possible to determine certain quality criteria for the development of causality and intertextuality in academic historical writing. Another limitation was the closeness of the historical sources used. Even though we employed authentic materials (Mierwald, 2022) and historical tasks (Van Drie, 2021), the school students worked on historical questions and problems following the explicit guidance of their teachers, producing texts aligned with clearly identifiable historical genres, but which also reflected less engagement with the sources, whereas the university students, despite discussing the documents and analyzing them with their professors, were given a more open-ended analysis task (See Appendix 1). Furthermore, although the historical tasks presented were authentic, topics such as the Cold War (20th century) and the War of the Pacific (19th century) are less relevant to students than recent Chilean history (Coup of 1973 and Historical Memory of the Recent Past); therefore, 11th grade and university students may have been more closely connected to their topics and their associated arguments than 9th and 10th graders.

References

- Atorresi, A., Burga León, A., Bengochea, G. R., Bogoya, D., Castro Elizondo, M., García, F. A., Valencia, F. J., Martínez Gamboa, R., & Pardo Adames, C. (2010). *Escritura, un estudio de las habilidades de los estudiantes de América Latina y el Caribe*. OREALC/UNESCO.
- Ávila Reyes, N., González-Álvarez, P., & Peñaloza Castillo, C. (2013). Creación de un programa de escritura en una universidad chilena: estrategias para promover un cambio institucional. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa (RMIE)*, 18(57), 537–560.
- Bazerman, C. (2004). Speech acts, genres, and activity systems: How texts organize activity and people. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior (Eds.), *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices* (pp. 309–339). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Calle-Arango, L., & Ávila-Reyes, N. (2020). Alfabetización académica chilena: Revisión de investigaciones de una década. *Literatura y Lingüística*, 41, 455-482. <https://doi.org/10.29344/0717621X.41.2280>
- Carlino, P. (2003). Alfabetización Académica: un cambio necesario, algunas alternativas posibles. *Educere*, 6(20), 409–420.
- Coffin, C. (2004). Learning to write history. *Written Communication*, 21(3), 261-289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088304265476>
- Coffin, C. (2006). *Historical discourse: the language of time, cause and evaluation*. Continuum.
- Concha, S., & Paratore, J. R. (2011). Local coherence in persuasive writing: An exploration of Chilean students' metalinguistic knowledge, writing process, and writing products. *Written Communication*, 28(1), 34-69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088310383383>

- De La Paz S, Wissinger D. R. Gross M. & Butler C. (2022). Strategies that promote historical reasoning and contextualization: a pilot intervention with urban high school students. *Reading and Writing*, 35, 353–376. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-021-10183-0>
- De La Paz, S. (2005). Effects of historical reasoning instruction and writing strategy mastery in culturally and academically diverse middle school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 139-156. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.139>
- De La Paz, S., & Felton, M. K. (2010). Reading and writing from multiple source documents in history: Effects of strategy instruction with low to average high school writers. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 35(3), 174-192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.03.001>
- De La Paz, S., & Wissinger, D. R. (2015). Effects of genre and content knowledge on historical thinking with academically diverse high school students. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 83(1), 110-129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2013.87622>
- Fahler, V., Colombo, V., & Navarro, F. (2019). En búsqueda de una voz disciplinar: intertextualidad en escritura académica de formación en carreras de humanidades. *Calidoscopio*, 17(3), 554-575. <https://doi.org/10.4013/cld.2019.173.08>
- Figueroa, J., Chandía, E., & Meneses, J. (2018). Calidad de la escritura en explicaciones y argumentaciones. Validación estructural de una rúbrica para medir desempeños. *Boletín de Lingüística*, 30(49–50), 43–67.
- Figueroa, J., Meneses, A., & Chandia, E. (2018). Academic language and the quality of written arguments and explanations of Chilean 8th graders. *Reading and Writing*, 31, 703-723. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-017-9806-5>
- Figueroa, J., Meneses, A., & Chandía, E. (2019). Desempeños en la calidad de explicaciones y argumentaciones en estudiantes chilenos de 8º básico. *Revista Signos*, 52(99), 31-54. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-09342019000100031>
- Freedman, E. B. (2015). "What happened needs to be told": Fostering critical historical reasoning in the classroom. *Cognition and Instruction*, 33(4), 357-398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2015.1101465>
- Grafton, A. (1998). *Los orígenes trágicos de la erudición*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Grant, S. G., Gradwell, J., & Cimbricz, S. (2004). A question of authenticity: The document-based question as an assessment of students' knowledge of history. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 19(4), 309–337.
- Henríquez, R., & Canelo, V. (2014). Géneros históricos y construcción de la significación histórica: el caso de los estudiantes de Licenciatura en Historia. *Onomázein Revista de Lingüística, Filología y Traducción, ALSFAL*. <https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.alsfal.3>
- Henríquez, R., & Ruiz, M. (2014). Chilean students learn to think historically: Construction of historical causation through the use of evidence in writing. *Linguistics and Education*, 25, 145-157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2013.10.003>
- Henríquez, R.; Carmona; A., Quniteros, A.; Garrido, M. *Leer y escribir para aprender Historia: Secuencias para la enseñanza y el aprendizaje del pensamiento histórico*. Santiago: Ediciones UC, 2018.
- Hernández-Ramos, P., & de La Paz, S. (2009). Learning history in middle school by designing multimedia in a project-based learning experience. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2009.10782545>

- Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social intreractions in academic writing (Michigan Classics Ed.)*. University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.6719>
- Lee, P. (2005). Putting principles into practice: Understanding history. In M. S. Donovan and J. D. Bransford (Eds.), *How students learn: history in the classroom* (pp. 31–74). National Academies Press.
- Maposa, M., & Wassermann, J. (2009). Conceptualising historical literacy-a review of the literature. *Yesterday and Today*, 4, 41-66.
- Martin, J. (2002). Writing history: Construing time and value in discourses of the past. In M. Schleppegrell, & C. Colombi. (Eds.), *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power* (pp. 87-118). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Martin, J. & Rose, D. (2008) *Genre relations: mapping culture*. Equinox.
- Mierwald M. Lehmann T. & Brauch N. (2022). Writing about the past: the impact of different authentic instructional material on students' argument writing in history. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 37, 163–184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-021-00541-5>
- Miller M. (2022). U.S. history state assessment items: exploring the income-achievement gap and levels of academic language historical thinking and historical literacy demand. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 50(4), 607–636. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2022.2065942>
- Miras, M. (2000). La escritura reflexiva. Aprender a escribir y aprender acerca de lo que se escribe. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 23(89), 65-80. <https://doi.org/10.1174/021037000760088099>
- Miras, M., & Solé, I. (2007). La elaboración del conocimiento científico y académico. In *Escribir y comunicarse en contextos científicos y académicos: Conocimientos y estrategias* (pp. 83-112). Graó.
- Moje, E. B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(2), 96-107. <https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.52.2.1>
- Monte-Sano, C. (2010). Disciplinary literacy in history: An exploration of the historical nature of adolescents' writing. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19(4), 539-568. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2010.481014>
- Monte-Sano, C., & de La Paz, S. (2012). Using writing tasks to elicit adolescents' historical reasoning. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 44(3), 273-299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X12450445>
- Monte-Sano, C., de La Paz, S., & Felton, M. (2014). Implementing a disciplinary-literacy curriculum for US history: Learning from expert middle school teachers in diverse classrooms. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 46(4), 540-575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2014.904444>
- Navarro, F. (2018). Más allá de la alfabetización académica: las funciones de la escritura en educación superior. In M. A. Alves & V. I. Bortoluzzi (Eds.), *Formação de Professores. Ensino, linguagens e tecnologias* (pp. 13-49). Editora Fi.
- Navarro, F.; Henríquez R.; Álvarez, (July 2019). *From narrative to science: disciplinary professionalization in the use of historical sources*. The 2019 Conference for the European

- Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing. Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- Nokes, J. D. (2017). Exploring patterns of historical thinking through eighth-grade students' argumentative writing. *Journal of Writing Research, 8*(3), 437-467.
<https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2017.08.03.02>
- Oteíza, T., Dalla Porta, C., & Garrido, M. (2014). La evidencialidad en la construcción de la significación histórica por estudiantes de Licenciatura de Historia. *Onomázein Revista de Lingüística, Filología y Traducción, (NE I)*, 57-80. <https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.alsfal.5>
- Reisman, A. (2012). Reading like a historian: A document-based history curriculum intervention in urban high schools. *Cognition and Instruction, 30*(1), 86-112.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2011.634081>
- Rüsen, J. (2004). Historical consciousness: Narrative structure, moral function, and ontogenetic development. In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing historical consciousness* (pp.63–85). University of Toronto Press.
- Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 78*(1), 40-59.
- Snow, C. E., & Uccelli, P. (2009). The challenge of academic language. In D. R. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Literacy* (pp. 112-133). Cambridge University Press.
- Sotomayor, C., Gómez, G., Ávila, N., Jéldrez, E., Bedwell, P., & Domínguez, A.-M. (2016). Evaluación analítica de la escritura de estudiantes de 4º año básico en Chile. *Onomázein, 34*, 381-425.
<https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.34.21>
- Swales, J. (1990). Research articles in English. In J. M. SWALES (Ed.), *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings* (pp. 110-176). Cambridge University Press.
- Swales J. M. (Ed.). (2007). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Thaiss, C., Haiss, C. & Zawacki, T. (2006). *Engaged writers and dynamic disciplines: research on the academic writing life*. Boynton/Cook.
- Van Drie, J., & van de Ven, P.-H. (2017). Moving ideas: an exploration of students' use of dialogue for writing in history. *Language and Education, 31*(6), 526-542.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2017.1326504>
- Van Drie, J., Van Driel, J., & Van Weijen, D. (2021). Developing students' writing in history: Effects of a teacher-designed domain-specific writing instruction. *Journal of Writing Research, 13*(2), 201-229. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2021.13.02.01>
- VanSledright, B. A., & Kelly, C. (1998). Reading American history: The influence of multiple sources on six fifth graders. *The Elementary School Journal, 98*(3), 239-265.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/461893>
- Virta, A. (2007). Historical literacy: Thinking, reading and understanding history. *Journal of Research in Teacher Education, 14*(4), 11-25.
- Wineburg, S. S. (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*(1), 73-87. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.83.1.73>

Young, K. M., & Leinhardt, G. (1998). Writing from primary documents. *Written Communication*, 15(1), 25-68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088398015001002>

Acknowledgements

Article produced with the support of FONDECYT regular No. 1190275. The professionalization of Chilean historiography: policies, concepts, and discourses in its articulation as an intellectual field (1930–1990).

About the Authors

Rodrigo Henríquez Vásquez is Associate professor (joint appointment) in the History Institute and Faculty of Education at Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. The focus of his research and teaching is the development of professional and scholarly historical thinking and writing during the 20th and 21st centuries. From the perspectives of Conceptual History, Historical Literacy and Historical Discourse Analysis, he has been able to identify dynamics of historiographical professionalization, analyzed in its methods, writing and concepts developed in Chile and Latin America.

ORCID: 0000-0002-7123-4766

Email: rodrigo.henriquez@uc.cl

Daniela Luque is a Ph.D. candidate in education and works as an adjunct professor in the Faculty of Education at Pontificia Universidad Católica, Chile. Her research has focused on K-12 civics and citizenship education, history and social studies teaching, teacher training, and human rights education.

ORCID: 0000-0002-0489-2865

Email: daniela.luque@uc.cl

Mabelin Garrido Contreras is a Ph.D student in education at Pontificia Universidad Católica, Chile, and works as an assistant academic in the Faculty of Philosophy and Humanities at Alberto Hurtado University, Chile. Her research focused on civics and citizenship education, teacher teaching and teaching and learning of history and social studies, high school students.

ORCID: 0000-0002-7270-2920

Email: mgarrido@uahurtado.cl