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Abstract
FROM COURSEWORK TO CLASSROOM: LEARNING TO TEACH HISTORY TO BILINGUAL STUDENTS

Laura Schall-Leckrone
Dissertation Advisor: Maria Estela Brisk

This qualitative research study examined how student teachers and novice history teachers learn to teach adolescent bilingual learners (BLs) from coursework to the classroom. The purpose of the study was to investigate to what extent five participants drew upon social justice-oriented pre-service preparation when they taught history to bilingual students in secondary schools in the Greater Boston area. More specifically, this study examined how participants scaffolded history instruction for BLs and taught the language of history to BLs. Classroom data—observation videotapes, interviews, lesson plans, and teaching materials—were analyzed using the Sheltered Immersion Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Echevarría, Vogt & Short, 2008) and Lucas and Villegas’s framework for Linguistically Responsive Teachers (LRT) (2011) to assess trends in how individual participants, student teachers, and novice teachers scaffolded instruction. An analytical framework was created based on systemic functional linguistics (SFL) description of key genres of secondary history (Coffin, 1997, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008) to understand how participants taught the language of history. Findings of this study suggest that as participants gained classroom experience, they increasingly implemented instructional scaffolds aligned with classroom activities to engage students in rigorous content instruction. Yet participants did not consistently teach language demands of history. Based on study results, I suggest outcomes for early phases of a continuum of teacher learning related to teaching history to BLs. I also propose a framework for teaching the language of history that draws from SFL-informed genre pedagogy (Coffin, 1997, 2006; Gibbons, 2009; Rose & Martin,
2012; Schleppegrell, 2005), and I propose a model for language and content teacher preparation specific to history but also applicable to other secondary content areas. A key argument that this dissertation advances is that secondary history teachers need coherent, consistent, and coordinated support from pre-service coursework to student teaching to full-time teaching to learn to teach BLs. Implications of this study can inform teachers, teacher educators, and researchers who seek to improve opportunities for adolescent BLs to receive equitable access to rigorous content instruction and to develop specific literacy skills that could serve as a foundation for individual achievement and engaged citizenship.
This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my mentor, Dr. Arlene Dannenberg, whose life, leadership in the field of bilingual education in Massachusetts, extraordinary kindness and sense of humor continue to inspire me.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I received overwhelming support, encouragement, and many kindnesses throughout my experience in the Boston College (BC) doctoral program. I am especially grateful to Dr. María Estela Brisk, my dissertation advisor, who pushed me forward, provided an inspiring, world-class role model, introduced me to SFL, and opened her home to me. Dr. Patrick McQuillan guided and encouraged me throughout my doctoral experience. He served as a role model both as a researcher and teacher educator. I am immensely grateful to him for the chance to collaborate on the ELL study in his history methods class, for co-authoring my first publication, and reminding me all systems, especially human ones, need balance. Dr. Marilyn Cochran-Smith provided support and encouragement all through my experiences in the teacher education program, asked hard questions, and reminded me to consider my role in the research. I am grateful for all that I have learned from her and her work. Dr. Audrey Friedman shared insights on teacher development, teaching, literacy, life, and many kindnesses.

My dear friend, Dr. Annie Homza, provided support, advice, and encouragement both professional and personal throughout my experience at BC. A special thank you to Dr. Susan Bruce for sharing her videotape analysis protocols with me. I also appreciate the wisdom and many kindnesses of Professors Mariela Páez, Dennis Shirley, Patrick Proctor, Curt Dudley-Marling, Rebecca Lowenhaupt, Lauri Johnson, and David Scanlan. Fran Loftus and Melita O’Malley enabled me to observe student teachers and very kindly provided “home team support” by attending my presentations at AERA conferences in New Orleans and Vancouver. I am fortunate so many individuals took an interest in nurturing my growth as a doctoral student, researcher, and teacher educator.
I also am grateful for BC friends, Christina Pavlak, for collaborating with me on the study in the secondary bilingual methods class, which influenced this study, and Tracy Drysdale, Catherine Michener, and Kevin O’Connor, for support, friendship, collaboration, and inspiration throughout the doctoral program.

I am also immensely grateful for the research assistantships through BC’s Title III professional development grant, which supported the design and data collection for this study and to the Faculty Award Committee at the Lynch School, who supported the writing of this dissertation with a Fellowship.

As is typical in academia, with this project I stand on the shoulders of giants. I am indebted to Dr. Tamara Lucas, who provided helpful feedback in her review of an AERA paper on a preliminary study that led to this investigation and encouraged me to follow study participants into their early teaching experiences. Dr. Keith Barton also reviewed a later AERA paper and shared copies of his work, which enlarged my understanding of research in history education.

I also am indebted to scholars working with SFL-informed genre pedagogy at other colleges and universities in U.S. contexts, who provided inspiration by example, generously shared their work with me, and graciously supported and encouraged my efforts: James Nagle, Luciana de Oliveira, Meg Gebhard, and Pat Paugh.

I received constant support and unwavering encouragement from my family and friends: my husband, Tom, who has seen me through an undergraduate thesis, master’s thesis, now a dissertation, and everything in between; my mom, my first and best teacher; my dad, for his unconditional, generous support, which always has enabled me to pursue my dreams; my son, Jacob, for all manner of tech support and especially for sneaking up behind me, rubbing my
shoulders, and saying, “That’s enough. Time to save and stop working.” My daughter, Hannah, surrounded me with inspirational art and lavished me with lavender products. I especially appreciate her unique sense of style and occasion. I am enormously grateful to my older brother, Gary, my mindfulness guide; the Ecker Women, the dynasty of teachers in my family, all role models of perseverance, courage, and fun; and Anne, Nora, Michelle, and Henry, whose friendship, brilliance, passion, and creative ways of living have inspired, sustained, and comforted me through all my pursuits, intellectual and otherwise, for over twenty-five years; and my dear friend, Julie, who continues to meet me half-way.

My friends at the Hudson Public Library provided constant encouragement and a quieter, neater, and better-furnished room in which to write, and especially, Tina, for the mother-daughter book group. Hudson friends Denise, Glenda, and Karen provided welcome respites over a glass of wine or cup of tea and helped care for my children.

I am especially indebted to the five participants in this study: Sarah, Cammie, Olivia, Victoria, and Susana, and all my students from Bed-Stuy to BC, who have taught me more than I could ever teach them.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements  
List of Figures and Tables  

INTRODUCTION: A CONFLUENCE OF FACTORS INTENSIFIES THE NEED TO PREPARE HISTORY TEACHERS TO WORK WITH BILINGUAL LEARNERS 1  

CHAPTER TWO: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 17  
Part 1: Teaching the language of history through genre pedagogy 17  
Part 2: Preparing history teachers to teach bilingual learners 26  

CHAPTER THREE: STUDYING TEACHER LEARNING “FROM COURSEWORK TO THE CLASSROOM” 56  

CHAPTER FOUR: A TALE OF TWO (PRELIMINARY) STUDIES 78  
Part 1: Preparing history teachers to work with bilingual learners: Study of an ELL infusion in a history methods class 80  
Part 2: Preparing content teachers to scaffold instruction and to “think complexly” about instruction: Study in a secondary bilingual methods course 91  

CHAPTER FIVE: HOW STUDENT TEACHERS SCAFFOLDED INSTRUCTION AND TAUGHT THE LANGUAGE OF HISTORY TO BILINGUAL LEARNERS 114  
Susana- Tenth-grade world history student teacher 116  
Victoria- Ninth-grade humanities student teacher 124  
Olivia- Eighth-grade social studies student teacher 134  

CHAPTER SIX: HOW NOVICE TEACHERS SCAFFOLDED INSTRUCTION AND TAUGHT THE LANGUAGE OF HISTORY TO BILINGUAL LEARNERS 147  
Cammie- First-second year sheltered English immersion history teacher 150  
Sarah- Second-third year mainstream ninth-grade history teacher 169  

CHAPTER SEVEN: BEYOND VOCABULARY: IDENTIFYING AND TEACHING THE LANGUAGE OF HISTORY 185  
Part 1: A developmental perspective on learning to teach history to bilingual learners 187  
Part 2: How student and novice history teachers scaffolded instruction for bilingual learners 193  
Part 3: A framework for identifying and teaching the language of history 202  
Part 4: Toward a robust model to prepare history teachers to teach language 216  
Part 5: Implications for teaching, teacher education, and research 224
BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Semi-structured Interview Protocol
Appendix B: Videotape Analysis Protocol
Appendix C: Protocol for Analyzing How Participants Taught Language
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 How Prior Research Frames This Study of How History Teachers Learn to Teach BLs 26
Figure 3.1 How a Social Justice Vision of Student Learning Guided the Research Design 58
Figure 3.2 A Timeline of Participant Observations 62
Figure 7.1 Three Phases of Teacher Development 187
Figure 7.2 Outcomes of Three Phases of Development of History Teacher Candidates 188
Figure 7.3 Consequences of Mongols’ Invasion of Baghdad 209
Figure 7.4 Model of Content and Language Teacher Preparation: History 217

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 SIOP Tenets of Effective Instruction 36
Table 3.1 Observation Data from Student Teachers and Novice History Teachers 63
Table 3.2: Cross-section of Research Participants 66
Table 3.3: Alignment of Research Questions, Analysis Strategies, and Data Sources 70
Table 4.1: Focus Students 99
Table 4.2: Research Methods 101
Table 4.3: Matrix for Evaluating the Complexity of Participant Thinking 102
Table 7.1: How Student and Novice History Teachers Scaffold Instruction for BLs 194
Table 7.2: Framework for Teaching Key History Genres 203
Table 7.3: A Simple Formula for Expressing Cause and Effect 210
Table 7.4: A Simple Formula for Constructing Opinion Statements 214
Introduction: A Confluence of Factors Intensifies the Need to Prepare History Teachers to Work with Bilingual Learners

While the number of children from linguistically diverse backgrounds increases in urban, suburban, and rural schools throughout the nation, teachers who are unprepared to teach them still predominate in the U.S. teaching force (Bunch, 2010; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). “Record-high immigration” and high birth rates among immigrant families within the last decade have contributed to remarkable growth in the school-age population of bilingual children in “nontraditional immigrant states” like Nevada, North Carolina, Georgia, and Nebraska as well as “traditional immigrant destinations” such as border states, urban areas, and populous states like New York, California, and Texas (Capps et al., 2005; Pandya, Batalova, McHugh, 2011, p. 11). In 2008, approximately 10.9 million children in the United States spoke a language other than English at home, representing an estimated 21% of the school-age population (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011). It is projected that students who speak another home language will constitute 40% of K-12 students by 2030 (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). Within a burgeoning population of bilingual learners (BLs), the number of adolescent BLs enrolling in schools is increasing at an even faster rate than younger BLs (Capps et al, 2005). These older students are less likely to receive English-as-a-second language or bilingual instruction than their elementary-age counterparts (Ruiz-de-Velasco & Fix, 2000). As Páez (2009) noted:

Immigrant students who arrive in the middle and high school years encounter less support for language and literacy learning in schools and more complex

---

1 This project was funded in part through a U.S. Department of Education Title III National Professional Development Grant - PR/Number: T195N070133
academic content in school systems that are emphasizing rigorous, standards-based curricula and high stakes testing for all students. (p. 168)

In brief, adolescent BLs encounter less time and support to develop requisite academic English to meet higher standards (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Ruiz-de-Velasco & Fix, 2000). Schools have limited capacity, and more specifically, a critical shortage of mainstream teachers adequately equipped to teach adolescent BLs (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). All educators must be prepared to teach adolescents BLs in mainstream secondary classrooms to provide older learners equitable access to rigorous, standards-based instruction. However, there is a paucity of educational research to guide secondary educators who teach older BLs and those who prepare them to teach (Faltis, 1999; Garcia & Godina, 2004; Walqui, 2000). Not only do elementary-age BLs encounter more time and support to learn academic English (Páez, 2009), they also receive the preponderance of research attention (Harklau, 2000); comprehensive empirical studies of teaching and learning for adolescent and immigrant BLs are rare (Faltis & Wolfe, 1999; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008). Programs of research focused on the preparation of secondary educators are urgently needed so that effective educational approaches for adolescent BLs can be better understood and therefore more broadly disseminated and applied (Faltis & Wolfe, 1999; Garcia & Godina, 2004; Harklau, 2000; Walqui, 2000). This study aims to contribute to addressing this need by examining how student teachers and novice history teachers learn to teach adolescent BLs from pre-service coursework in a teacher education program to their early teaching practice in secondary schools.

Throughout the study, I used the asset-based term, bilingual learners (BLs)—because
these students speak another language—not English learners. While many BLs are proficient in English, they may not be fluent in discipline-specific academic English prerequisite to success in mainstream secondary content classes (Zwiers, 2005; 2008). Various research studies refer to BLs as English language learners (ELLs), English learners (ELs), English as-a-Second Language (ESL) students, Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, language minority (LM) students, and English as speakers of other languages (ESOL) students among other labels. The label “ESL students,” is a common misnomer for this group. English may not be a second language; it could be a third language, or if the student is being raised bilingually, it may be difficult to determine a language of dominance. English is used in certain contexts and another language in others. Our inability to agree on a common term of reference is perhaps indicative of a research target that is imbued with political, cultural, and social import, undergoing rapid change, and, thus far, has received inadequate attention.²

Disproportionately high dropout rates for BLs

Even though BLs represent the “fastest-growing population in U.S. schools . . . in all other respects they are being left behind” (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2007, p.1). Within the current U.S. education climate in which the standards movement has culminated in a federal testing regime that relies on standardized assessments to measure student, school, district, and state performance, the vast majority of BLs score at or below basic levels of academic proficiency (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006). Within the U.S. “Race to the Top” hyper-accountability context, adolescent BLs, in particular, may face insurmountable pressure to simultaneously learn English and academic content in English to pass high-stakes exams prerequisite to

² When citing research, I employ the terms used by the researchers.
high school graduation (Beykont, 2002). At no time in our nation’s history is a high
school diploma more critical to the future prospects of children, since “three quarters of
all jobs . . . require some postsecondary education” (Harklau, 2000, p. 36, cited in U.S.
Department of Labor, 1991). Yet dropout rates remain disproportionately high among
adolescent immigrants and U.S. born BLs (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco,
2008;Walqui, 2000). According to the 2000 Census, immigrant youth accounted for 8%
of all youth nationwide, but approximately 25% of school dropouts (Fry, 2003).
Moreover, 80% of BLs did not graduate from high school after five years in a large
urban district in Texas, whose high-stakes accountability system provided the template
for the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation of 2001 (McNeil, Coppola, Radigan,
Vasquez & Heilig, 2008). The academic achievement of adolescent BLs lags behind
native English-speaking peers on virtually all education measures (Seeking Effective
Policy for ELLs, 2007). First, it is urgent to consider why many adolescent BLs fail to
thrive in mainstream secondary schools, and second, what can be done about this
alarming scenario as the future of the increasingly linguistically diverse children of our
nation may hang in the balance.

Inclusion megatrend

In the current “inclusion megatrend,” an increasing number of BLs are rapidly
placed into inclusive mainstream classes with teachers who have received little to no
preparation to teach them (Lucas, 2011; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). Coincident with the
high stakes accountability culture of U.S. schools is a mounting political climate of
“English-only” policies, epitomized by ballot referenda in California, Arizona, and
Massachusetts, where voters eliminated bilingual programs (Brisk, 2006). Further, due
to costs associated with specialized language instruction, shortages of trained teachers, and recent influxes of BLs in non-traditional immigrant destinations without sound bilingual or ESL programs, BLs often are placed directly into mainstream classes (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). To complicate matters further, many schools have accelerated the process of moving BLs from specialized programming into mainstream classes in response to heightened pressures of yearly testing brought about by NCLB (Beykont, 2002; Brisk, 2006; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). In addition, although the vast majority of BLs in the United States speak Spanish, over 400 languages are spoken by students in U.S. schools (Ramsay & O’Day, 2010), so on a practical level, schools lack capacity to provide native language support to students from low-incidence language groups. Nationwide, fewer program options currently exist for bilingual students to learn academic content in their native language (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008) despite evidence that students who continue to develop first language skills in bilingual programs outperform students in English-only programs on academic achievement tests in English (Ramírez, 1992, cited by Brisk, 2006; Páez, 2009).

Immersion in restrictive mainstream settings that preclude native language instruction has had dire consequences for some adolescent BLs (Coulter & Smith, 2006; Uriarte & Tung, 2009). For instance, a large-scale mixed methods study of student outcomes during the three years following the elimination of bilingual education in Massachusetts found that high school dropout rates in the Boston Public Schools nearly doubled, middle school dropout rates tripled, and “the proportion of ELs enrolled in substantially separate special education classes more than doubled” (Uriarte & Tung, 2009 p. 6). In a comparatively small qualitative study of a comprehensive high
school, other researchers found that bilingual education “contributed to the . . .
marginalization of immigrant students and their teachers” (Coulter & Smith 2006, p.
309). Whether one regards the decrease in bilingual programs as a step toward
desegregation or as a misguided political attack with harmful consequences for
children, an escalating number of mainstream teachers now are charged with providing
content instruction to BLs due to a confluence of demographic, political, and financial
trends (Beykont, 2002; Reeves, 2006). Expanding the circle of educators who interact
with BLs holds the potential of increasing access to academic content (Adger & Peyton,
1999). However, this potential will remain unmet if teachers do not possess requisite
dispositions, knowledge, and skills associated with setting high standards for BLs and
enabling them to reach them (Clayton, 2008, Walqui, 2006). Currently, “mainstream
content classrooms in many US schools do not represent a promising atmosphere” for
BLs’ language or content development (Bunch, 2006, p. 285).

Given the aforementioned developments, secondary content teachers must be
equipped to teach BLs in pre-service and ongoing teacher education. Although there is
no consensus on what constitutes good teaching, researchers have identified a requisite
knowledge base for general education teachers. Effective teachers understand how
children learn, create classroom communities, use varied assessments, possess deep
content and pedagogical content knowledge and, reflect on and continually advance
their practice (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Lucas, Villegas & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008;
Shulman, 1987). In addition, to be effective with BLs, researchers suggest content
teachers need to develop sociolinguistic consciousness, value linguistic diversity, and
learn about BLs’ backgrounds and proficiencies (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). They also
must understand and apply key principles of second language learning (Lucas, Villegas & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011); have some familiarity with how languages work (Wong-Fillmore & Snow, 2005); employ strategies for scaffolding content instruction (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Walqui, 2006); and teach language demands of their content area (Anstrom & DiCerbo, 1998a; Anstrom & DiCerbo, 1998b; Anstrom & DiCerbo, 1999; de Jong & Harper, 2005; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). As Schleppegrell (2004) argues, teachers need a rich understanding of the “linguistic challenges of schooling” because “in the absence of an explicit focus on language, students from certain social class backgrounds continue to be privileged and others … disadvantaged . . . perpetuating the obvious inequalities that exist today” (p. 3).

*Academic literacy is key to school success for BLs*

Academic language is a second language for many students (De Oliveira, 2011), who more readily acquire the sort of informal speech used outside a school context (Bunch, 2006). Academic language is defined as specialized vocabulary, grammar, language functions, and discourse patterns used to “acquir[e] new knowledge and skills, interac[t] around a topic and impar[t] information” (Bailey, 2007, pp.10-11). For adolescent BLs to achieve school success, they must become proficient in academic language (Zwiers, 2005). However, there is no “single, monolithic English” for academic purposes (Hyland, 2009, p. ix). Content areas create, disseminate, and evaluate knowledge differently, and “these differences are instantiated in their use of language” (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008, p. 48). Since each academic discipline has a specialized knowledge-base and configures language in its own unique way, to demonstrate academic literacy, students must develop proficiency in the academic language of multiple
subject areas. Along similar lines, researchers studying the adolescent literacy crisis define academic literacy as follows:

[R]ead, writing, and oral discourse for school. . . . [that] varies from subject to subject [and] requires knowledge of multiple genres of text, the purposes for text use, and text media. [It is] influenced by students’ literacies in contexts outside of school [as well as their] personal, social, and cultural experiences. (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007, p. 2)

To demonstrate academic literacy, students must read, write, and speak in the varied discipline-specific ways that knowledge is presented in different academic content areas (Hyland, 2009; Schleppegrell, 2004). In other words, literacy is dependent upon context, but academic literacy must be taught and learned in schools. Moreover, as students advance through school, the language and literacy skills associated with particular content areas become increasingly specialized (De Oliveira, 2011).

Developing academic literacy skills is key to school success for BLs and many other students (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Current U.S. national standards—the Common Core State Standards (CCSS)—which have been adopted in 48 states, demand that students demonstrate high levels of literacy in varied academic disciplines (Santos, Darling-Hammond, Cheuk, 2012). According to the CCSS, students must “be proficient in reading complex information text in a variety of content areas” and adapt to the demands of audience, task, and purpose when reading, writing, speaking, and listening within specific disciplines for college and career readiness (CCSS, 2010, p. 4). The heightened literacy demands placed on BLs by CCSS require immediate and innovative teacher education responses (Santos, Darling-Hammond, Cheuk, 2012;
Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, forthcoming). More specifically, teachers must be equipped to teach the language and literacy demands of different content areas to linguistically diverse student populations (Anstrom & DiCerbo, 1998a; Anstrom & DiCerbo, 1998b; Anstrom & DiCerbo, 1999). Indeed, one widely used performance assessment of teaching candidates now measures readiness to teach academic language and literacy skills (http://aacte.org/Programs/Teacher-Performance-Assessment-Consortium-TPAC/teacher-performance-assessment-consortium.html). In fact, all teachers must be prepared to teach vocabulary, language features, and discourse practices of academic disciplines, since BLs must learn language and content simultaneously in and through English to succeed in school (Lucas, Villegas & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008).

**Academic literacy in history/social studies**

The “umbrella term” social studies represents an array of school subjects including “history, geography, economics, civics, sociology, psychology, and philosophy” (De Oliveira, 2012, p. 147). History, a key component of social studies, is particularly challenging for BLs and struggling readers (Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006) because historical concepts are typically situated in abstract vocabulary and complex language structures “quite different from [everyday] language” (Schleppegrell, Greer & Taylor, 2008, p. 176). For instance, history textbooks contain intangible concepts, figurative language, and complicated linguistic features like nominalizations—when a verb becomes a noun and key concepts are compressed into the subject or object position of another verb (for example, taxation without

---

3 The terms social studies and history are often used interchangeably despite this distinction.
representation led to revolution) (De Oliveira, 2010; Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). In addition, original and secondary sources are written in a continuum of genres from those organized by time like biographical recounts to increasingly abstract genres like historical arguments, which are organized rhetorically (Coffin, 1997; Coffin, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008; Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). BLs and many other students may lack requisite background knowledge to decipher history texts and make sense of history lectures (De Oliveira, 2011).

Additional factors further exacerbate the challenges of learning history. Because social studies is not “tested” in the required accountability metrics of NCLB, time spent on social studies—particularly in schools that serve urban youth in high poverty districts—has been greatly reduced (Burroughs, Groce & Webeck, 2005; De Oliveira, 2011, Weistheimer & Surtaam, 2010). Instruction in social studies and the arts has been replaced by an intensive focus on reading, writing, and mathematics to boost student performance on standardized tests (Westheimer & Surtaam, 2010). Burroughs and her colleagues (2005) noted, “fifty percent of principals of schools with large minority [populations] reported decreased time for social studies” (p. 14, citing the Council for Basic Education). To complicate matters further, despite efforts to promote inquiry-based, student-centered approaches in teacher education programs, history teachers continue to be socialized to see certain practices such as teacher-dominated instruction as customary, effective, and appropriate (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). On a related note, history teachers feel pressed by content coverage demands since learning standards for secondary U.S. and world history courses typically span vast geographical regions and extensive time periods (Barton & Levstik,
Now more than ever, Theodore Sizer’s observation thirty years ago that “high school history is the most difficult subject to teach well” seems to ring true (Sizer, 2004, cited by de Oliveira, 2011, p. 18). To summarize, urban youth currently receive less history instruction, and what they do get, often appears in a “stand and deliver” format that does little to help them develop proficiency in the academic language, literacy, and thinking skills associated with history.

Given this disheartening scenario, efforts to train history teachers to engage adolescent BLs in student-centered instruction and study their effectiveness are urgently needed. The purpose set forth by the National Council for the Social Studies (2010) represents an instructional ideal that should guide history teachers (and the programs that seek to prepare them):

Young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world. (p. 3)

This purpose for social studies education seems especially relevant in an increasingly ethnically and linguistically diverse nation, where as of 2011 minority newborns outnumber whites (http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb12-90.html), and “social networking” takes the form of individuals communicating via electronic devices in the privacy of their homes. Social studies education offers a setting in which to re-imagine the future of our American history as a diverse, inclusive nation that protects individual civil liberties while embracing E Pluribus Unum, that we are “better together” (Putnam, 2000). Some believe teaching social studies through a constructivist, experiential and activist
approach has the potential to promote “active and intelligent participation in American [society]” (Rugg, 1930, p. viii) and close the civic engagement gap that exists for poor, minority, and immigrant students (Levinson, 2005). Along these lines, this study is guided by a social justice vision for student learning in history with two foci: providing equitable opportunities for academic achievement and promoting the development of specific literacy skills that could prepare students for engaged citizenship, so they may act as change agents in their own lives, near, and distant communities (Coffin, 1997; Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012).

An explicit focus on teaching the language and genres of history can offer students a means to access historical content and develop targeted literacy skills while laying a foundation for advanced study and active participation in democratic society (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012; Schleppegrell, Greer & Taylor, 2008). Academic literacy in history and specifically, abilities to tell a compelling story, interpret texts, debate key events, and craft persuasive arguments could enhance the academic prospects, employability, and civic engagement of adolescent ELs as they come of age in U.S. society (Coffin, 1997, 2006; Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). Learning language and literacy skills associated with history, however, can challenge any student, but for BLs the challenge is more arduous since they must develop English proficiency concurrently with content learning (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). Moreover, a predominantly white, monolingual teaching force may not realize the complexity historical language poses for BLs (Bunch, 2010; de Jong & Harper, 2005). Before history teachers can teach language-specific demands of history, they must have some understanding of second language learning and language features of historical
discourse (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). Further, secondary teachers need to develop a repertoire of scaffolding techniques that enable BLs to actively engage in rigorous content instruction in mainstream settings as they acquire proficiency in academic English (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2008; Lucas, Villegas & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Walqui, 2006). Finally, history teachers must be able to analyze and teach conceptual, language, and literacy demands of history tasks and texts (De Oliveira, 2011; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008). Adolescent ELs can access content and develop academic literacy when history teachers develop lessons in which linguistic skills and content knowledge intertwine in authentic and engaging contexts that offer rich opportunities for BLs to interact (Omaggio, 2001; Verplaetse, 2008).

**Purpose of this study**

How student and novice history teachers learn to scaffold instruction and teach the language of history to BLs is a complex, multi-faceted topic that has not been analyzed in depth. While a small body of research has investigated professional development aimed at preparing experienced history teachers to teach reading and writing to linguistically diverse students (De Oliveira, 2011; de Oliveira & Schleppegrell, 2006; Schleppegrell, Achugar & Oteiza, 2004; Schleppegrell, Greer & Taylor, 2008), few studies have focused on dispositions, knowledge, and skills inexperienced history teachers need to work with BLs (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). In this study, I followed three student teachers and two novice history teachers, who completed coursework intended to prepare them to teach BLs within the teacher education program at Boston College, into secondary schools in the greater Boston area. To understand how participants scaffolded instruction and taught language,
multiple data sources were collected from teaching settings. I videotaped classroom observations, took field notes, and collected lesson plans and all relevant teaching materials. Post-observation interviews were conducted and digitally recorded. The purpose of this study was to investigate to what extent student and novice history teachers drew upon pre-service preparation when they taught history to bilingual students in urban secondary schools. Specifically, I sought to answer the following overarching research question and related sub-questions:

- What happens when student teachers and novice teachers, who completed pre-service coursework intended to prepare them to work with bilingual learners (BLs), teach history or social studies in secondary classrooms?

**Sub-questions:**

- To what extent do they scaffold instruction for BLs?
- To what extent do they teach the language of history to BLs?

Using data from classroom settings, I analyzed how student teachers and novice history teachers planned and implemented instruction for BLs, and more specifically, to what extent they drew upon their pre-service preparation to scaffold instruction and teach language demands of history.

The results of this study are important because I investigate an aspect of teacher education that has not been studied before: the preparation of history teachers to work with BLs “from coursework to the classroom.” Implications of this study can provide guidance to teachers, teacher educators, and researchers, who aim to improve learning opportunities for adolescent BLs to receive equitable access to content instruction and to develop specific literacy skills that could enable them to act as change agents in their
own lives. My hope is that greater understanding of how secondary content teachers
draw upon pre-service preparation in their early teaching experiences can inform
educators who seek to elevate the academic trajectories and improve the life chances of
bilingual youth.

Organization of this Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into seven chapters. The first chapter provides the
rationale, purpose, and significance of the study by introducing a confluence of factors
that have intensified the need to prepare history teachers to work with bilingual
learners. The second chapter outlines this study’s theoretical framework, which is based
upon genre pedagogy informed by Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) (Coffin,
1997; Coffin, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008; Rose & Martin, 2012). In the second part of
this chapter, I also review conceptual and empirical research related to preparing
history teachers to work with BLs. The third chapter describes the qualitative design
that guided this study of teacher learning from pre-service coursework to early teaching
practice. The fourth chapter introduces two preliminary studies that influenced this
investigation: a study of an ELL infusion in a history methods course and a second
study in a secondary bilingual methods course that examined the dynamic tension
between mastering particular instructional strategies and thinking complexly about
teaching BLs (Bartolomé, 1994). The fifth chapter presents my analysis of how student
teachers scaffolded instruction and taught the language of history, and the sixth chapter
presents a similar analysis of novice history teachers. In the seventh and final chapter, I
describe a developmental perspective on learning to teach history to BLs, and more
specifically, outcomes for three initial phases of teacher development: coursework
experiences, student teaching, and early years of teaching. I also present trends in how student and novice history teachers scaffolded instruction for BLs. In addition, I propose a genre-based framework for teaching the language of history that combines systemic functional linguistic (SFL) description of historical discourse (Coffin, 1997; 2006) with analysis of vignettes (tasks and texts) from secondary history classrooms. I also propose a model of teacher education intended to prepare secondary content teachers to develop requisite pedagogical knowledge and skills to integrate language and content instruction. Finally, I conclude with the implications of this study for teaching, teacher education, and further research.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

We are better off when children learn to care about the needs of others and when they learn to analyze, discuss, and act on important social issues in thoughtful, caring, and informed ways. (Westheimer & Surtaam, 2010, p. 592)

To support this study, I built on several relevant bodies of theoretical and empirical work. In the first part of this chapter, I introduce the theory of language that serves as the theoretical framework for the study: SFL informed genre-based literacy pedagogy (hereafter referred to as genre pedagogy). In brief, genre pedagogy provides a set of linguistic resources teachers can use to equalize educational opportunities for linguistically diverse students in schools (Rose & Martin, 2012) and that students can take up to demonstrate ways of knowing that are critical to individual achievement and engaged citizenship (Coffin, 1997, 2006). The second part of the chapter reviews literature related to preparing history teachers to work with BLs, and more specifically, empirical and conceptual research on teacher preparation, instructional practices for working with BLs in general, and teaching history to BLs in particular. Because no prior studies have examined history teacher learning related to working with BLs from “coursework to the classroom,” it is appropriate to review literature from an array of epistemological paradigms to situate this study, such as conceptual studies, empirical studies, and pedagogical manuals.

Part 1: Teaching the language of history through genre pedagogy

The over-arching goal of genre pedagogy is “to make the distribution of knowledge in schools more equitable” (Rose & Martin, 2012, p. 6). The idea is that educational outcomes can be democratized by explicitly teaching the language used
in schools to construct and present knowledge (Rose & Martin, 2012). Genre pedagogy as implemented by the Sydney School is informed by systemic functional linguistics (SFL).

SFL is a socio-cultural theory of language, which focuses on authentic use of language for a specific social purpose and audience in a particular cultural context (Gebhard, Willett, Caicedo & Piedro, 2011; Halliday, 1993). In brief, the intended function of a text largely shapes language choice (Derewianka, 1990; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008; Martin & Rose, 2008). In line with this perspective, Gebhard (2010) explained:

[SFL] offer(s) teachers and students a contextual basis for critically analyzing how language varies in relation to who is communicating with whom, what they are communicating about, and the modes through which they are interacting. (p.798, citing Halliday, 1996)

In other words, students and teachers consider who is saying what to whom, how they are saying it, and for what purpose. Accordingly, SFL provides a lens through which to examine linguistic features of the increasingly specialized texts of upper elementary, intermediary, and secondary schools. The focus in SFL informed genre pedagogy is on how academic disciplines use language in particular ways to construct knowledge (Schleppegrell, 2004). More specifically, students are taught typical language structures that constitute genres within content areas to interpret and create effective texts (Derewianka, 1990). In SFL, “genres are recognizable types of texts that have a particular purpose (Schleppegrell, 2005, p. 5). As Martin and Rose further elaborate, “Genres are . . . recurrent configurations of meaning . . . that enact social
practices of a given culture” (Martin & Rose, 2008, p. 6). Genres, from a functional perspective, are identified by recurrent linguistic patterns and understood by the ways in which they accomplish a particular purpose within a social context.

Nearly thirty years ago, educational linguists in Sydney, Australia began developing SFL informed genre pedagogy to prepare teachers to teach academic literacy skills to aboriginal and immigrant school children (Derewianka, 1990; Gebhard, 2010; Gibbons, 2003; Halliday, 1993). In the United States, there are a couple of established and several emerging programs of research influenced by the Sydney School to equip teachers with SFL-based strategies to make language demands of school reading and writing tasks apparent to students (Brisk, Hodgson-Drysdale & O’Connor, 2011; Brisk & Zisselsberger, 2011; Gebhard, 2010; Nagle & MacDonald, 2012; Pavlak, 2013; Schleppegrell, 2004). Educational linguists associated with the Sydney School have described historical discourse within schooling using SFL (Coffin, 1997, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008). Building on Coffin’s analysis of linguistic features of key genres of secondary school history (1997, 2006), some researchers have used SFL as a resource to prepare teachers to teach linguistically diverse students language and literacy skills associated with history in U.S. contexts (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012, Schleppegrell & De Oliveira, 2006; Schleppegrell, Greer & Taylor, 2008).

Coffin (1997) described a cline of key genres in secondary school history as a pathway through which learners progress as they develop linguistic resources, first to construct the past as story and then later as an argument (see p. 203). Based on Coffin’s work, Martin & Rose (2008) added the notion that this pathway could serve
as the basis for developing “a spiral curriculum” (see p. 138-9). That is, learners can be taught a continuum of genres from those organized by time, such as historical recounts to increasingly abstract genres like historical arguments, which are organized rhetorically (Coffin, 1997, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008). To reiterate, genres enact social purposes (Martin & Rose; Schleppegrell, 2005); the family of history genres has evolved as a means to “record, explain, and debate the past” (Martin & Rose, p. 99). There are recognizable, recurrent language patterns that constitute history genres, which can be identified, taught, and learned (Derewianka, 1990). Key history genres include narrative genres, explanatory genres, and arguing genres (Coffin, 2006). A historical narrative might recount the sea passage of an African slave to the American South. An historical explanation might explain causes and consequences of the Civil War. In an historical argument, the Civil Rights Movement might be interpreted as the fulfillment of aspirations of the Reconstruction Era. Coffin (2006) argues that the focus of instruction tends to be on historical narratives between the ages of eleven to thirteen, historical explanations from ages fourteen to sixteen, and historical interpretations or arguments from ages sixteen to eighteen (see p. 47). Moreover, she asserts that mastering literacy skills associated with “each genre plays an important role in scaffolding students” toward developing the increasingly abstract language and thinking associated with creating historical arguments based on interpretation (p. 138).

Narrative genres, which typically are organized chronologically, align with the metaphor of history as story. For instance, in a personal recount, the author uses first person to narrate an event that happened within a time sequence. An
autobiographical recount, also written in first person, tells a life story over a longer time period. Both types of recounts consist of “I statements” and temporal conjunctions: “then,” “first,” “next,” and connectors with time markers such as “in 1976” (Martin & Rose, 2008). A biographical recount shifts to third person and narrates an event in someone else’s life. Similarly, a biography is the story of someone’s life over a longer period of time. In the preceding genres, there are specific, named participants, and one event leads to another in a temporal sequence (Martin & Rose, 2008). With an historical recount, named participants are replaced by groups of people. For instance, “the first wave of … Indochine boat people came to Australia . . . between 1976 and 1981” (Martin & Rose, p. 105). Historical recounts chronicle events. In summary, narrative genres are accomplished through usage of past tense, prepositional phrases and connectors of time, movement from specific to general participants, and doing processes (action). Overall, historical narratives answer the question: What happened?

With historical accounts and explanations, chronological organization shifts toward organization by rhetoric. Beyond packaging events over time, historians, including textbook writers, explain what caused or resulted from events (Martin & Rose, 2008). Accordingly, historical accounts operate according to a subtle cause-effect structure; one event either is preceded by or follows another. To realize cause, evaluative language is used in noun phrases and verbs. For example, “The Howard government’s unwillingness to apologise” might be the subject of a sentence and verbs like “argued” or “sparked” are used (see Martin & Rose, p. 115). With an historical explanation, the cause-effect structure, use of rhetoric and evaluative language are more
apparent. Two types of explanatory genres are constructed according to the rhetoric of cause and effect. With factorial explanations, various causes precipitate a subsequent event. In consequential explanations, multiple effects result from a precipitating factor (Coffin, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008). In an historical explanation, the author might outline various reasons why a group behaved in the way that it did. The purpose is to explain why past events happened by examining causes and consequences. Linguistic features of an explanation include generalized participants like nominalizations and causal processes that express relationships of causation or determination, such as “influenced, brought about, or affected, led to, resulted in, created, or caused” (see Coffin, 2006, p. 124). Explanatory genres answer two types of questions: Why did it happen? And, what was the result?

Genres of argumentation are organized rhetorically (Coffin, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008). For instance, in an exposition, a thesis is argued with claims supported by evidence. In a challenge (or anti-exposition), an argument that counters conventional wisdom is set forth to attack an established position. A discussion is more nuanced; multiple interpretations are entertained with claims and evidence provided to support conflicting interpretations. Since arguments are based on rhetoric, associated language usage is most abstract. Connectors (mortar terms) linked with reasoning are employed like: “therefore,” “on one hand,” “on the other,” and so on. The purpose is to present evidence that advances an argument, promotes a position, or establishes an interpretation of events. Usage of first person is typically not appropriate, since the author is disassociated from the claims he or she makes, which are meant to stand on
their own merit based on the evidence provided. An historical argument typically answers the question: what is your judgment of what happened?

How can BLs and other students develop proficiency in ways of knowing associated with these genres of history? SFL informed genre pedagogy is enacted through a teaching and learning cycle with these phases: building knowledge of the field/modeling, joint construction, and independent construction (see Derewianka, 1990, pp. 6-9; Gibbons, 2009; Pavlak, 2013; Rose & Martin, 2012). First, the teacher introduces models (or mentor texts) and discusses their purpose, structure, and linguistic features with students. Next, the teacher and students jointly construct a text in the chosen genre. After analyzing exemplars and co-constructing texts in the genre, students independently construct a text in the given genre following process-writing steps. Teaching language structures associated with genres of history through a teaching and learning cycle can enhance active reading and writing skills for BLs and many other students (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008; Rose & Martin, 2012; Schleppegrell, 2005).

Clearly, language and content are inextricably linked in the construction of knowledge (Gibbons, 2009). “People use history in a variety of ways and for a variety of purposes” (Barton & Levstik, 2004, p. x). At a basic level, learning history is about understanding “what happened” and “why things happened” (Martin & Rose, 2008, p. 135). At a more complex level, students might recognize that historians employ particular linguistic resources when writing history to construct an account of why things happened in history. The goal of social justice-oriented history instruction is
not merely to transmit content but to empower students to critically examine how history is constructed. As Coffin (1997) explained:

Historical texts may resolve differences by construing the past as a simple line of narration… contemporary narrative practices (in school history) tend not to teach students to render visible the part played by gender, class, age, and ethnicity in reconstructing the past… texts will be written and read without a conscious understanding of the writer’s role in ascribing significance . . . .As a social practice, then, the narrative has the potential to produce compliant subjects. On the other hand, [narrative] also has the potential to produce subjects with the discursive means to challenge ‘naturalized’ worldviews. This will depend on whether the constructed nature of the historical narrative is revealed [and] . . . whether students are provided with a set of tools for recognizing, and if desired, resisting and challenging a particular ideological encoding of the past. (p. 215)

In other words, when authors narrate history, they decide how to tell the story; some stories are told and others are left out. Accordingly, reading history involves more than “decoding and comprehending” historical texts (Moje, 2008, p. 99). In teaching functional language patterns that construe history genres, students can acquire a set of linguistic tools to analyze historical narratives and “to resist and challenge a particular ideological encoding of the past” (Coffin, 1997, p. 215). Similarly, students can learn to tell a compelling story when they are guided through the process of deconstructing, co-constructing, and then independently constructing texts
that chronicle events in their own lives or others (Derewianka, 1999). As Schall-Leckrone and McQuillan (2012) concluded:

> When students grasp how history is constructed and how language can reveal knowledge, *all* students might develop the language resources to write their own stories into the unfolding historical narrative of their nation to drive progress toward more inclusive, pluralistic societies. (p.12, emphasis in original)

In addition, as BLs come of age in American society, developing proficiency in genres of argumentation can provide them with language resources to interrogate history and confront social problems. As Coffin observed:

> The acquisition of lexico-grammatical resources for persuading and positioning constructs a social subject able to argue issues of power and control. (1997, p. 227)

In summary, genre pedagogy that draws from SFL can be used to teach academic literacy skills of history to empower students to interpret texts, form an opinion, and take a stand: skills that fuel engaged citizenship (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012).

However, there is a learning curve associated with mastering the terms and analytical moves of SFL and using it in teaching practice (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012; Schleppegrell & De Oliveira, 2006). Content teachers may lack requisite background knowledge in language (Wong-Fillmore & Snow, 2005); history teachers, in particular, may feel pressed to cover substantial content and struggle with implementing efficient ways to integrate language instruction (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, forthcoming). Along these lines, benefits and challenges of existing methods of teaching bilingual
learners history, and the theory attached to them, will be reviewed in the second part of this chapter.

Part 2: Preparing history teachers to teach bilingual learners

Several related bodies of research literature frame this study of how history teachers learn to teach BLs from “coursework to classroom:” conceptual and empirical studies of teacher preparation in general, studies of teacher preparation and instructional approaches for working with BLs in particular, and, most specifically, studies of how to teach history (or social studies) to linguistically diverse students. Figure 2.1 shows the order in which I consider relevant literature, starting with the outer frame and working toward the center to home in on the focus of my study.

Figure 2.1: How prior research frames this study of how history teachers learn to teach BLs
I begin with a brief review of conceptual and empirical research that considers how teachers implement teacher preparation from teacher education programs in their early teaching practice. Next, I analyze research literature focused on teacher preparation and instructional approaches related to working with BLs. Finally, I center on empirical studies on teaching history to bilingual students, including studies that describe the language demands of history and how to teach them. This synthesis of extant literature suggests teacher educators can (and should) prepare history teachers to scaffold instruction for BLs and teach academic language and literacy skills associated with history to BLs.

From teacher preparation to teaching practice

My study of how student and novice history teachers learn to teach bilingual students seems to fill a fairly unique niche. Few research studies bridge the gap between teacher preparation and teaching practice to examine how teachers enact pre-service preparation in early teaching experiences (Cochran-Smith, et al., 2009; Grossman et al, 2000; Stairs, 2010). For this reason, to ground this study, I cast a wide net and review both conceptual pieces (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Levstik & Barton, 2004) and single studies (Cochran-Smith et al, 2009; Grossman, et al., 2000; Stairs, 2010) that describe aspects of teacher learning spanning pre-service teacher education through early years of teaching practice. Although this body of work does not strictly pertain to history education or preparing to teach BLs, it offers relevant insights about teacher learning from “coursework to the classroom.” Overall, researchers concerned with the earliest phases of becoming a teacher emphasize realistic expectations for pre-service preparation, the role of context in early years of teaching, and the influence of teachers’
prior experiences as students on their practice (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Lortie, 1975). As Britzman (1991) observed, “The story of learning to teach begins . . . much earlier than the time one first decides to become a teacher” (p. 3).

Feinman-Nemser (2001) examines the continuum of learning to teach from teacher education through early years of practice. She notes, “The typical pre-service program is a weak intervention compared with the influence of teachers’ own schooling” (p. 1014). For this reason, she argues sustained attention to teacher learning from pre-service to induction to professional development programs should be at the center of all educational reform efforts. Similar to Cochran-Smith (2010), Feiman-Nemser (2001) envisions a multi-faceted practice for reform-minded teachers, who engage in student-centered practices as “practical intellectuals, curriculum developers, and generators of knowledge in practice” (p. 1015). However, Feiman-Nemser (2001) concedes there is a danger that teacher education programs cram too much into pre-service programs because of perceived failings of induction and professional development programs.

Still, Feiman-Nemser (2001) identifies a comprehensive agenda for teacher learning during pre-service preparation. This is the time to “form visions of what is possible and desirable in teaching to inspire and guide . . . professional learning and practice” (Feiman-Nemser, 2001, p.1017). However, aspiring teachers may mistakenly believe they know more than they actually do about teaching and learning because of experiences observing teaching as students, which can interfere with embracing reform-minded teaching practices (Lortie, 1975). Accordingly, Feiman-Nemser (2001) recommends that prospective teachers analyze pre-existing beliefs to prevent misconceptions from filtering new ideas. In addition, prospective teachers need to
develop subject matter knowledge for teaching, both pedagogical content knowledge
and an epistemology of the content area— what and how scholars working in the field
“know.” Moreover, they need to develop the ability to learn about students and how
culture (and language) influence learning (see Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Feiman-
Nemser (2001) suggests teachers should develop a basic repertoire of teaching
strategies consisting of curriculum materials and varied models of instruction and
assessment. In addition, they need to develop the inclination and skill to reflect on their
practice in an ongoing fashion. Overall, pre-service programs can lay a foundation for
continued teacher learning when there is conceptual coherence throughout the program
and a “sequence of integrated learning opportunities” (Feiman-Nemser, 2001, p.1023;
also see McQuillan, Welch & Barnatt, 2012).

The findings of three empirical studies (Cochran-Smith, et al., 2009; Grossman,
et al., 2000; Stairs, 2010) align with Feiman-Nemser’s (2001) description of important
learning outcomes for new teachers. In a longitudinal study, Grossman and her
colleagues (2000) found that teacher education can provide a vision of ideal practice, a
repertoire of instructional strategies, and skills for reflective practice. Based on
classroom observations, interviews, and document analysis, these researchers studied
how new teachers drew upon pre-service preparation in writing instruction in their first
three years of practice. Generally, they found teachers used instructional techniques
they learned during teacher education classes. Even if teachers failed to apply concepts
learned during teacher education in their first year, they might do so in their second or
subsequent years. Teachers retained important concepts from graduate school even
when trying out antithetical practices, for instance valuing student voice in writing even
when using a rigidly scripted writing program. The researchers observed that the curriculum materials available to first-year teachers “dramatically influence[d]” their practice (Grossman, et al., 2000, p.654). For this reason, they recommend that teacher education programs provide opportunities for aspiring teachers to practice using “packaged” curricula they may encounter as beginning teachers (Grossman, 2000, p.655). Overall, context (school setting, available curriculum materials, and so on) influenced the degree to which participants in this study drew upon their pre-service preparation to teach writing.

Also interested in contextual factors that influence how teachers enact pre-service preparation, Stairs (2010) conducted a five-year case study of four white, middle class teachers working in an urban high school. Her study asked: “What does learning to teach urban high school English look like over time” (Stairs, 2010, p. 43)? Relying upon interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis, such as syllabi, lesson plans, and reflections, Stairs conducted “cross-case analysis to determine points of convergence and divergence in the four teachers’ experiences” (p.47), and then situated her analysis within Feiman-Nemser’s (2001) theory of a continuum of teacher learning. Although she found each teacher had a unique story, there were certain commonalities in their learning. During the pre-service phase, aspiring teachers analyzed pre-existing beliefs and solidified new visions that were “rooted in social justice and equity” (Stairs, 2010, p. 48). Social justice beliefs seemed to manifest in their early years of teaching as they focused on enacting responsive curriculum and instruction. For instance, one teacher, who used Hamlet as a core text to teach college-bound BLs how to write a literary research paper, provided students with contemporary
language translations of the text, modeled how to write a thesis statement, provided native language support and guided writing practice. Stairs (2010) concluded that teacher preparation must be designed for the urban contexts in which teachers practice. Then, novice teachers seem more likely to “enact their beliefs and learning . . . even several years after graduation” (Stairs, 2010, p.57). This encouraging conclusion must be understood in the context of the parameters of the study, based on a sample of only four, who were recruited precisely because they were exemplary student teachers.

As part of a larger research program, Cochran-Smith et al. (2009) examined how prospective teachers who attended a teacher education program with an explicit social justice mission understood and enacted their preparation in early teaching experiences. Interviews revealed what participants said about their social justice preparation whereas classroom observations revealed what they did about student learning in practice. Participants’ understandings of social justice teaching practice centered on four themes: first and foremost, student learning; second, building respectful, caring relationships with students and families; third, advocating for students; and finally, “recognizing inequities” in the current educational system and acting as agents for change (Cochran-Smith, et al., 2009, p. 356). Overall, participants “saw the work of teaching for social justice as implicitly linked to improving pupils’ learning and life chances” (Cochran-Smith, et al, 2009, p. 362). Three focal teachers implemented effective teaching practices such as using original historical sources, entertaining multiple perspectives, and engaging students in respectful dialogue, all promising enactments of social justice beliefs. However, researchers were somewhat disappointed that participants connected their social justice preparation to practice
aimed at promoting individual achievement within existing educational constraints, but
generally did not question inequities of the system (a broader goal of the teacher
education program); they attributed this finding to the novice status of participants.

What prevents teachers from enacting all aspects of pre-service preparation?
Barton and Levstik (2004)—experienced history teacher educators—provide a
thoughtful analysis of what impedes history teachers from putting pre-service
preparation into practice. To begin, although content knowledge is considered key to
teaching practice (Shulman, 1987), many history teachers lack sufficient understanding
of the interpretive nature of history. In addition, even history teachers with
sophisticated disciplinary knowledge may fail to put that knowledge into practice when
they teach. Similar to Feiman-Nemser (2001), Barton and Levstik (2004) note the brief
amount of time history educators spend in pre-service preparation in comparison with
“12 or more years . . . watching [history] teachers perform . . . daily tasks . . . and
develop[ing] an image of teaching that revolves around teacher control and the
coverage of textbook information” (p. 251). In brief, teachers may be exposed to a
variety of pedagogical practices and still fail to use them in their own teaching,
especially in secondary history classrooms where “predominant social practices” center
on covering the curriculum and maintaining control (Barton & Levstik, 2004, p. 252).
To change traditional pedagogical practices in history education, these researchers
contend that history teachers must be motivated by a higher purpose for student
learning: “to contribute to a participatory, pluralistic democracy” (Barton & Levstik,
2004, p. 259). Coverage and control, Barton and Levstik maintain (2004), are
inconsistent with preparing students to participate in a democracy.
A brief synthesis

On the whole, this body of work suggests that teachers exposed to social justice teacher preparation can enact responsive and effective teaching practices in the earliest phases of their teaching career (Cochran-Smith, et al., 2009; Stairs, 2010). Expectations for new teachers, however, must be tempered by understanding of inherent challenges of simultaneously learning to teach and teaching in particular contexts (Cochran-Smith, et al., 2009; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Grossman, et al, 2000; Stairs, 2011). Finally, the influences of prior experiences as students and social/institutional norms in teaching should be recognized and examined, particularly in history education, so aspiring teachers are more likely to connect their teaching to a social justice purpose and enact reform-minded teaching practices (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Barton & Levstik, 2004).

Preparing content teachers to work with BLs

Social justice oriented teacher education programs recognize the imperative of preparing teachers to work with diverse learners (Cochran-Smith, 2010; Westheimer & Surtaam, 2010). Given the increased likelihood that BLs will be placed directly into mainstream classrooms (Lucas, 2011; Lucas & Gringberg, 2008), a more general focus on preparing culturally responsive teachers (Villegas & Lucas, 2002) is shifting to heightened research attention on preparing linguistically responsive teachers: teachers who “draw on students’ linguistic resources and help them develop academic . . . English” (Lucas & Villegas, 2011, p. 56). Still, there is a paucity of empirical research on equipping content teachers to work with BLs (Lucas, 2011; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Even fewer studies examine the preparation of history teachers to work with linguistically diverse students (Schleppegrell & De Oliveira,
2006; Schleppegrell, et al., 2008); almost none look at pre-service history teachers (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). For these reasons, in identifying literature that supports this study, conceptual pieces and teaching manuals are considered along with empirical studies on equipping history teachers with instructional practices that meet the needs of BLs.

Approaches to teaching BLs in mainstream content classes often are referred to as “scaffolding” or “sheltering” instruction (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2008; Walqui, 2006). Before reviewing literature that explains these instructional techniques and suggests a research-base for their usage, I unpack figurative language contained in the terms “scaffolding” and “sheltering.” “Scaffolding” is a metaphor frequently used in reference to instructional approaches for BLs (and other students). The Oxford English Dictionary defines scaffolding as “a temporary platform . . . of planks supported on poles or suspended, for people engaged in the erection, repair, or decoration of a building” (p. 2681). Although Vygotsky (1978) did not coin the term, scaffolding is associated with socio-cultural learning theory; in brief, the idea is “what a child can do with assistance today she will be able to do by herself tomorrow” (p. 87). Temporary support is provided to a student in the form of a scaffold until s/he can complete a task independently (Gibbons, 2009; Zwiers, 2008). Gibbons (2003) explained, it is not helping someone to do something but helping someone to know how to do something. As Walqui (2006) further elaborates, BLs “[can] develop deep disciplinary knowledge and engage in challenging academic activities” when teachers provide pedagogical support via instructional scaffolds (p. 159). Scaffolding instruction has a more positive connotation than sheltering; the idea behind scaffolding is to create structures that
enable students to develop independent abilities whereas sheltering suggests building a structure to safeguard them.

Still, the shift toward rapid inclusion of BLs in mainstream instruction (Lucas, 2011) also has prompted frequent usage of the metaphorical term “sheltering.” Through sheltered instruction, students receive support in learning content in English (López, Scanlan & Gundrun, 2013) based on the premise that English learners learn English best by receiving comprehensible content instruction in English rather than exclusively focusing on language-learning (Wolfe, 1999). However, the term, “sheltering” implies that BLs need protection. When this sort of metaphorical thinking is not examined, even well-intentioned teachers may simplify instruction for BLs with basic readings (de Oliveira, 2012), rote writing tasks (Valdés, 1999), and limited or nonexistent opportunities to engage in classroom interactions (Verplaetse, 1998).

Nonetheless, “sheltered” instruction approaches are intended to provide BLs opportunities to learn academic language and content concurrently within mainstream classrooms (Echevarría, et al., 2008; Short, 1999). For instance, one widely influential model, the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), was designed to guide planning, implementation, and evaluation of effective mainstream content instruction for BLs (Echevarria, et al., 2008). With SIOP lessons, complementary content and language objectives are identified, presented to students, and implemented through a variety of instructional practices. See Table 2.1 for six SIOP tenets of effective instruction.4

---

4 I borrow usage of the word “tenet” to describe components of SIOP instruction and conceived of this table based on a presentation by Dr. C. Patrick Proctor within a secondary bilingual methods course at Boston College.
Table 2.1: SIOP Tenets of Effective Instruction (adapted from Echevarria, et al., 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenet</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 1</td>
<td>Activate Prior Knowledge and Build Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 2</td>
<td>Provide Comprehensible Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 3</td>
<td>Teach Learning Strategies and Strategic Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 4</td>
<td>Create Varied Opportunities for Student Engagement and Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 5</td>
<td>Provide Opportunities for Students to Practice and Apply Knowledge Using All Communicative Modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 6</td>
<td>Review and Assess Learning Objectives and Provide Feedback to Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sequential SIOP components provide a checklist both for planning content instruction and for evaluating such instruction for BLs (Echevarría, et al., 2008). Based on constructivist learning theory, teachers begin by activating prior knowledge and building background knowledge, which may include teaching key vocabulary. They provide comprehensible input by using extra-linguistic scaffolds such as visuals and graphic organizers, speak slowly and clearly, and use hand gestures. They model strategic thinking and explicitly teach learning strategies, and then create opportunities for students to engage in interaction through varied configurations: structured small group work and partner activities. Students also practice and apply content and language knowledge using all communicative modes: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Teachers assess students’ mastery of content and language objectives throughout the lesson. In addition, they provide feedback to students and review objectives with students at the conclusion of the lesson. The educational researchers who developed this sheltering approach assert that SIOP-trained teachers increase the academic achievement of BLs in mainstream settings (Echevarria, et al., 2008).
Despite the proliferation of SIOP teaching manuals, the intuitive appeal of a consistent step-by-step instructional model for mainstreamed BLs, and claims of an empirically validated research-base in SIOP books, few empirical studies link the SIOP model to improved student learning outcomes. Of two published SIOP studies currently available, and reviewed here, one focused on teacher learning, and the other showed modest student learning gains.

From 1997-2002, a small group of teachers collaborated with researchers in the design, field-testing, and revision of the SIOP model (see Short & Echevarría, 1999). Although the researchers mention SIOP was “used in four large urban school districts (two on the west coast and two on the east coast),” the number of teachers involved in different phases of the study, from SIOP development to implementation, is not specified (Short & Echevarría, 1999, p. 8). Anecdotal evidence is provided about SIOP benefits for teacher professional development. For instance, researchers observed too much teacher-centered instruction during one classroom observation, provided feedback to the teacher, and noted improved timing and delivery of a subsequent lesson. Examples of teacher responses to creating SIOP lessons also are provided. As one teacher remarked:

WHEW. This process has taken me a couple of hours today. For real. I’ve thoroughly enjoyed it, but we both know this kind of detail is impossible for five lessons every day. . . . Is there a short form? Maybe it just becomes second nature after doing it . . . two or three hundred times. I really want to improve my planning and skills, and this is really helping, so thanks for bearing with me!

(Short & Echevarría, 1999, p. 12, emphasis in original)
In other words, the teacher found SIOP a useful, but possibly cumbersome tool for planning and reflecting on instruction.

In a subsequent empirical study (Echevarria, Short & Powers, 2006), student results on a standardized writing assessment were compared across two groups of teachers: nineteen SIOP-trained teachers and four comparison teachers. First, classroom instruction of all the teachers was videotaped and evaluated according to SIOP, and not surprisingly, the comparison teachers received lower scores on the implementation of SIOP features. Next, the researchers analyzed pre-and post-test scores on a standardized writing assessment. They found students in the SIOP group made slightly higher gains on three of five subsections of a post-writing test than the comparison group. In other words, students whose teachers had two years of SIOP training did marginally better than students whose teachers received no comparable training during the study.

Although several additional SIOP studies appear to be under way, no other publications are currently available reporting their results (see http://www.cal.org/siop/research/history.html). Even though the SIOP model is being used in school settings and teacher education programs across the nation, its proponents concede, “Implementation of the SIOP model has outpaced research on its features” (http://www.cal.org/create/research/siopscience.html). In summary, SIOP provides a helpful template for teaching BLs in mainstream classes from which inexperienced (and veteran) teachers can draw as they develop a repertoire of scaffolding strategies that may increase access to content instruction. However, even though vocabulary instruction, language objectives, and fostering classroom communication are key SIOP components, the literature describing this model does not thoroughly describe language
features and literacy skills associated with content areas and how to teach them.

Systematic programs of research are needed that prepare mainstream content teachers to scaffold instruction, teach language, and study resultant student learning (including more SIOP studies), so effective instructional approaches can be better understood and more broadly applied. In the interim, the effectiveness of SIOP for teacher preparation, teaching, evaluating teachers, and promoting student learning must be studied further.

*Teaching history to BLs*

Within the small body of research available to guide content teachers who work with BLs, there is limited literature focused on teaching history to BLs. For instance, the SIOP team created a pedagogical manual for teaching history/social studies to English learners (Short, Vogt & Echevarría, 2011). The first chapter defines academic language in history and how to teach it according to the SIOP model. Subsequent chapters provide activities, techniques, lesson plans, and unit designs that can be used with elementary, middle, and high school students. One potentially useful chart is adapted from Coffin’s work on history genres (1997) and shows high frequency vocabulary words and sentence stems associated with historical recounts, historical accounts, historical explanations and historical arguments (see Short, et al., 2011, p. 10). Even though the table is organized into sections according to the four genres, no explanation of the genres, related vocabulary, or sentence stems is provided. To teach language, secondary history teachers without significant linguistic expertise may benefit from more explicit guidance on the purposes, organizational and linguistic features of these genres. The appendices also contain academic vocabulary lists adapted from state standards, graphic organizers, adapted texts, and handouts that can be
reproduced to use with students. A former ESL and a former social studies teacher contributed the activities, lessons, and unit plans to the book. The book cover bears the words, “scientifically based,” but it is based on virtually no scholarship in history. There are more than twice as many science references as history ones listed in the bibliography. Coffin (1997) is one of only three history references out of a total 105 references. Of the other two, one is an article about student performance on standardized U.S. history tests (Lee & Weiss, 2007). The other is an article (reviewed below) by one of the co-authors (Short, 2002) based on a qualitative study of sheltered social studies instruction at the middle school level. In brief, the history SIOP book provides some practical resources, but much more research-based guidance is needed to help secondary social studies or history teachers scaffold instruction and teach the language of history to BLs.

As part of a qualitative study, Short (2002) examined interactions between intermediate level BLs and teachers in four classrooms, two taught by ESL teachers and two taught by social studies teachers. Defining “interaction” as “the ability to understand and participate in the co-construction of knowledge in the classroom community” (p. 20), she created a framework with the term at the center of three overlapping circles representing language, content, and task to analyze teacher-student interactions (see Short, 2002, p. 19). Short (2002) found even ESL teachers emphasized content and tasks rather than language development. This finding was attributed to the pressure to cover history content in preparation for state tests. When language development was the instructional focus, Short noted teachers generally used ineffective approaches, for instance, orally explaining vocabulary words or
pronunciation. Most of class time was spent on teacher-directed, whole class activities with interaction limited to typical initiate, respond, evaluate patterns. Instead, Short (2002) suggested that teachers “expand their conception of language development beyond vocabulary” and explicitly teach: listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills; functional language; vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics; and language-learning strategies (p. 22). She concluded that teachers should identify and teach language objectives, use more comprehensive vocabulary techniques, and create tasks that integrate language and content instruction with increased opportunities for student interaction. These sensible recommendations for sheltering instruction for BLs were written into the aforementioned SIOP model, which Deborah Short helped to create.

Integrating language and content instruction also was the focus of an action research study Zwiers (2006) conducted with 60 middle school students in a summer program he taught. This research asked, “What types of instructional activities appear to develop historical thinking skills and related academic language among BLs” (Zwiers, 2006, p. 318)? Zwiers (2006) used a variety of instructional activities with students including jigsaws, chants, think-pair-shares, simulations, debates, quick-writes, peer editing and numerous instructional scaffolds, such as word banks, word walls, hand motions linked to new concepts, graphic organizers, sentence frames, and rubrics. He taught mini-lessons in which he modeled how to analyze a video clip or read a text and assigned a persuasive essay as a summative assessment. Along with student journals and digital recordings of class, the essay was used as a data source to examine students’ conceptual and academic language development. He identified the following key practices to teach language, content, and thinking skills to BLs: provide a choice
when assigning a persuasive essay, so students care about the assignment; model different aspects of historical thinking; engage students in authentic, hands-on learning; and use assessment to drive instruction. Zwiers’ (2006) contributions to this body of work seem especially useful given his vantage point as a teacher-researcher.

Another study of bilingual adolescents focused on student engagement (Salinas, Franquín & Reidel, 2008). In a case study of an exemplary teacher based on observations, interviews and artifact collection, Salinas and her colleagues (2008) found that teaching cultural geography provided “an access point for citizenship education” (p.72). Students in a Texas high school, who were recent immigrants, studied historical events like the Alamo in the context of contemporary issues of race and society. Since history can seem remote for students, encouraging them to make personal connections between their experiences and the past, as the teacher in this study did, can increase student engagement (Barton & Levstik, 2004).

Research on teaching history to BLs is extremely limited. Due to differences in the type, rigor, and availability of studies, evidence to support claims made in this body of work is uneven. Still, some suggested instructional practices can be gleaned from relevant empirical studies and teaching manuals:

- Integrate language and content instruction in secondary history or social studies classes (Echevarría, et al., 2008; Short, 2002; Short, Vogt & Echevarría, 2011; Zwiers, 2006).

- Use SIOP as a resource to develop a repertoire of techniques to scaffold instruction for BLs (Echevarría, et al., 2008).
• Identify content and language objectives, use consistent student-centered, constructivist instructional practices, and reflect on instruction in an ongoing fashion (Echevarría, et al., 2008; Short, Vogt & Echevarría, 2011).

• Increase and vary forms of student interaction (Short, 2002; Zwiers, 2006)

• Use instructional scaffolds and assessment to drive practice and integrate language, content, and thinking instruction (Zwiers, 2006).

• Engage bilingual learners in personally meaningful, socially-relevant instruction (Salinas, Franquís & Reideland, 2008).

There is much still to be learned about the extent to which these instructional practices impact student learning. In addition, and although the SIOP books (Echevarría, et al., 2008; Short, Vogt & Echevarría, 2011), Short (2002), and Zwiers (2006) all offer definitions of academic language and emphasize its importance in teaching history to BLs, other researchers contribute a more in-depth examination of the language of history and how to teach it.

**Identifying and teaching the language of history**

In this final section of the literature review, I consider scholarship related to heightened attention to the role of content teachers in teaching language (de Jong & Harper, 2005; Lucas, Freedson-Gonzalez & Villegas, 2008, Lucas & Villegas, 2011), and within this focus, studies that describe language demands of secondary history and how to teach them (Bunch, 2006; De Oliveira, 2010; De Oliveira, 2012). Research that attends to the linguistic demand of history instruction in different modes of communication (conversing, writing, and reading) typically is small-scale and qualitative, since in-depth analysis of particular contexts, classes, tasks, and texts is
required. As such, this work contributes to the description of language demand in secondary history or social studies classrooms and offers some approaches for teaching language, but lacks comprehensive evidence about the impact on student learning of these approaches.

Within the growing body of conceptual research focused on the need for content teachers to teach language (Bunch, 2010; De Jong & Harper, 2005; Gibbons, 2003; Gibbons, 2009; Zwiers, 2008), Lucas and her colleagues (Lucas, Freedson-Gonzalez, & Villegas, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011) outline a framework of essential understandings, knowledge, and skills of linguistically responsive teachers (LRT). Lucas et al (2008) named six essential LRT understandings, two of which are themes in research on teaching the language of history to BLs (see p. 363). First, structured classroom participation in social interaction fosters the development of conversational and academic language, and second, to develop academic language in specific content areas, explicit attention must be paid to linguistic form and function. Further, Lucas and Villegas (2011) offer three additional features of LRT instruction: “identifying language demands of classroom tasks; applying key principles of second language learning;” and scaffolding instruction for BLs (see p. 57). The empirical research considered here offers insights as to how history teachers can become LRT teachers; each study presents some analysis of how BLs engage in linguistic demands of conversing, reading, and writing in history classrooms.

Conversing in history classrooms

Bunch (2006) describes a university-school partnership aimed at improving social studies instruction for middle school BLs by providing access to rigorous
academic content while fostering proficiency in academic English. As Bunch (2006) recorded small group conversations of students who analyzed original historical sources, he observed that students used social language to access academic content:

Student 1: If you had like one wish granted of all these which one would you want?
Student 2: Well it would depend what kind of position I’m in.
Student 3: Well, they’re peasants.
Student 2: OK, I would want water. (p. 295)

Phrases such as “well,” “OK,” and “like”-- typical of informal communication, “serve[d] as resources for students to complete . . . academic work” as students prepared for class presentations (Bunch, 2006, p.295).

Student 3: I’m gonna be the narrator and say ‘there were two dudes.”
Student 4: No, don’t say dudes, okay?
Student 3: two people from …
Student 4: from another land
Student 3: from, from France and they wanted to trade their goods

As seen here, peer interaction provided scaffolding for student 3 to adapt his language use to the more formal register of a class presentation. While Bunch (2006) analyzed the role of conversation in promoting academic language and conceptual development, other researchers contribute insights as to how focused attention to language in texts can help students become more proficient readers and writers of history.
Recognizing history teachers need more than general sheltering techniques to work with BLs, a team of researchers led by Mary Schleppegrell developed content-specific, language-based reading and writing strategies teachers could use with students (De Oliveira, 2011; Schleppegrell, 2005). This multi-year “literacy in history” professional development program, known as the California History Project (CHP), consisted of summer institutes and year-round activities during which applied linguists trained in-service history and social studies teachers to use instructional practices that integrate language with content. Then, they observed teachers and students as they engaged in these practices. Several qualitative studies, which describe linguistic demands of reading and writing tasks in secondary history and suggest how they might be taught, emerged from the CHP research program (de Oliveira, 2010; 2011; Schleppegrell, 2005; Schleppegrell, Achugar & Oteiza, 2004; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006; Schleppegrell, et al., 2008).

CHP studies draw from language theory based on SFL (described earlier), which recognizes that content knowledge is constructed, mediated, and presented in and through language (Halliday, 1993; Halliday & Mathiessen, 2004). Accordingly, applied linguists, teachers, and students examined language structures in history texts to determine their function (Derewianka, 1990; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008; Martin & Rose, 2008). In doing so, the CHP produced an impressive amount of scholarship with overlapping content, methods, findings, and implications, so I synthesize and present pertinent themes rather than considering publications individually. Overall, associated researchers employed qualitative methods: observations, interviews, and document
analysis to describe linguistic challenges of history and to suggest instructional strategies to address these challenges (de Oliveira, 2008; 2010; 2011; Schleppegrell, 2005; Schleppegrell, Achugar & Oteiza, 2004; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006; Schleppegrell, et al., 2008). Evidence presented in these studies about the impact on student learning of these language-based approaches is primarily anecdotal, although an unpublished grant report (Schleppegrell, 2005) mentions improved scores on state standardized tests as an outcome of this work.

Reading history

Several CHP studies described linguistic challenges associated with reading history texts and textbooks for BLs and many other students (De Oliveira, 2008; De Oliveira, 2010). For instance, textbooks and original historical sources typically are written in dense, abstract language unlike everyday language (Schleppegrell et al, 2008; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006). Comprehending history textbooks (and lectures) may assume background knowledge about abstract concepts (Schleppegrell, Achugar & Oteiza, 2004). Textbook authors generalize about events; “people are effaced, action becomes things, and sequence in time is replaced by frozen setting in time” (Eggins, Wignell & Martin, 1993, cited by Schleppegrell, Achugar & Oteiza, 2004, p. 74), which may distance, bore or confuse adolescent readers.

Beyond highlighting what makes reading history difficult, CHP researchers used SFL to study typical language patterns found in history texts (Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006). For instance, abstractions in the form of complex nominal groups, including nominalizations, predominate in history textbooks (de Oliveira, 2010; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira). With nominalization, a verb becomes a noun and key
concepts are compressed into the subject or object position of another verb (de Oliveira, 2010). Schleppegrell, Achugar and Oteiza (2004) explained that the function of nominalization is to “present a series of events as a single grammatical ‘participant’ or hide the human actor behind history by presenting them as generalized classes (settlers, voters, etc.)” (p.74). When concepts are associated with actions, human agency is elided and “abstractions function as actors” (De Oliveira, 2012, p. 154). De Oliveira (2010) analyzed an example of this in a textbook excerpt on Agent Orange usage during the Vietnam War. The excerpt and De Oliveira’s analysis are juxtaposed here to show several linguistic challenges of history texts:

*United States forces also used chemical weapons against the Vietnamese. Pilots dropped an herbicide known as Agent Orange on dense jungle landscapes. By killing the leaves and thick undergrowth, the herbicide exposed Viet Cong hiding places. Agent Orange also killed crops, and later it was discovered to cause health problems in livestock and humans, including civilians and American soldiers.* (Cayton, Perry & Winkler, 1998, cited by de Oliveira, 2010a, emphasis in original, p. 195)

Here, “United States forces” is the first actor, being presented by the textbook author as being responsible for the action of using chemical weapons. The second actor, “pilots,” is less abstract and indicates the actual human actor causing the action. However, this agency is removed from the rest of the paragraph when the textbook author presents “the herbicide” and “Agent Orange” (a thing) rather than a pilot (a person) as doing the actions of exposing and killing. (de Oliveira, 2010, p. 195, emphasis in the original)
To begin, students need to understand the role abstract participants (e.g. U.S. forces, Agent Orange) play in the explanation of a sequence of events (Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006). To complicate matters further, cataphoric (forward) and anaphoric (backward) reference devices, including pronouns and synonyms are used to create cohesion in the text. For instance, “herbicide” and “Agent Orange” are used interchangeably, which may be confusing to BLs for two related reasons (De Oliveira, 2010a; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006). BLs (and other students) may not realize the words are associated, and synonyms often have different connotations. In the aforementioned textbook excerpt, there are three reference chains threading through the passage: 1) United States forces, pilots, humans, and American soldiers; 2) Vietnamese, Viet Cong, humans, civilians, and 3) chemical weapons, herbicide, Agent Orange, it. In order to comprehend the passage at a literal level, a reader must connect nominal groups (with different connotations) that are linked through chains of reference (de Oliveira; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira). Finally, students need to understand how cause-effect reasoning is realized in such explanations (Schleppegrell, Achuger & Oteiza, 2004). In this instance, Agent Orange use by U.S forces resulted in multiple consequences, among them killing vegetation and health problems for Vietnamese civilians and American soldiers. De Oliveira (2010) suggests several practical strategies derived from linguistic analysis of textbook passages that engage teachers and students in the close reading of texts: for instance, underlining features of text like nominalizations and connecting them or asking questions that link language usage to content.
Other publications that emanated from the CHP project also suggest language analysis can be used as a resource to teach students how to interpret history texts (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006; Schleppegrell et al, 2008). For example, in a book chapter, Fang and Schleppegrell (2008) describe a three-step process in which students deconstruct texts by, first, considering how the text is organized, next, parsing it into constituent parts, and then analyzing the author’s intent (see pp. 39-63). In an earlier study, Schleppegrell and de Oliveira (2006) observed and interviewed teachers who had participated in CHP training and provided anecdotal evidence that teaching students language-based strategies provides them with “greater understanding of the meanings embedded in [history] texts” (p. 262). For example, one high school teacher guided students to compare American and Japanese beliefs during World War II by analyzing complex noun groups in the speeches of President Truman and the Japanese Emperor. The teacher reported:

Students [used] words like brute and arrogant and idiocy (that) were . . . in . . . the complex noun groups built into the speech . . . to figure out what Truman was trying to say, what the Japanese were trying to say, and understand the bias of both sides during WWII. (Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006, emphasis in original, p. 261-262)

Differing perspectives in original historical sources can be revealed through structured activities that guide students through the process of interpreting language structures that convey meaning in history texts. Rather than simplifying readings, history teachers can provide access to grade level content and concurrently build academic language proficiency through a functional linguistic approach (Schleppegrell, Achugar & Oteiza,
2004). As evidence that students benefited from this approach, Schleppegrell and de Oliveira (2006) mention teacher reports, a program review by an outside evaluator that showed participating students had higher scores on a standardized California history test, and the researchers’ analysis that students performed better on a history writing task. However, the researchers concede that it took time (and one would presume ongoing support) for experienced history teachers to develop expertise with linguistic strategies and facility in using them with students.

Writing in history

Two additional CHP studies explored how SFL can be used to teach writing in secondary history classrooms (de Oliveira, 2011; Schleppegrell, 2005). In both studies, the researchers analyzed language usage in students’ history essays, then suggested ways to improve writing instruction. In her dissertation study, De Oliveira (2011) asked:

- What are the language features that enable students to write an expository genre in school history?
- How can we help students move from where they are to where they should be? (p. xvii)

To address these questions, De Oliveira sent out questionnaires to 44 CHP teachers, interviewed four focus teachers, and analyzed 63 essays from eighth and eleventh grade U.S. history students. Based on teacher reports, she observed that middle and high school students were expected to present and support an argument using evidence from a text. However, in her analysis of student writing, she found students generally “lack[ed] linguistic resources” to do so (De Oliveira, 2011, p. 26). As a result, de
Oliveira made several recommendations: teachers should provide more meaningful feedback to students on their writing; history teachers should receive additional support and preparation to teach language, and more specifically, history teachers might learn to show students how language is used to elaborate, explain, and evaluate the past. De Oliveira (2011) concluded: much work still needs to be done to develop “systematic and clear methods and approaches to making a linguistic focus accessible and usable for practicing history teachers” (p.136).

Schleppegrell (2005), de Oliveira’s dissertation advisor, also studied history essays to better understand implications for teaching how to write in history. She conducted a content analysis of 345 student essays from six eighth and eleventh grade classes at three schools to identify commonly used language features. The intention of this work was to identify linguistic knowledge and features teachers could incorporate into their writing instruction. According, she asked:

- What are the linguistic features that enable students to write the kinds of texts that are expected in middle and high school history classrooms?
- What is the linguistic knowledge teachers need in order to scaffold the writing development of ELLs and students with low literacy skills in history classrooms? (p. 3)

Similar to de Oliveira (2011), Schleppegrell observed that although students are expected to write arguments, they have difficulty doing so. To write effective arguments, students must incorporate language features of accounts and explanations,

---

5 Schleppegrell notes that this is a companion study to a large-scale evaluation of CHP work in which samples of student writing were evaluated by experienced raters. I could find no articles reporting results of the evaluation. In fact, Schleppegrell (2005) is a final report for grant funding available on-line, not an article from a peer-reviewed journal.
but they have to move beyond accounting or explaining events to interpret them and situate interpretations in a persuasive argument (Coffin, 2006). Along these lines, she suggested certain linguistic features be taught to students to help them make claims and back them up with evidence. For instance, students need to control modality—expressed through helping verbs like “can,” “should,” “might,” and so on—and employ consequential connectors, such as “since,” “because,” “therefore,” between *themes* (the beginning of clauses) and *rhemes* (the end of clauses) to persuade (p. 13, emphasis mine). Schleppegrell observed that teachers need to understand specific linguistic challenges of writing in history, so they can model elements of effective texts. Also, she recommended that teachers focus feedback on the meaning a student is attempting to convey rather than on error correction (also see Schleppegrell & Go, 2007; Valdés, 1999). Finally, similar to Martin and Rose (2008), Schleppegrell (2005) called for the development of a logical sequence of writing instruction; students should develop mastery in accounts and explanations as preparation for writing arguments.

This body of work has made several important contributions to our understanding of how to identify and teach the language of history. Students can develop conceptual understanding and academic language from abundant opportunities to interact with original historical sources and one another in structured group-work (Bunch, 2006). The CHP provided cogent explanations of the linguistic challenges of reading and writing history and insights into how these challenges might be addressed through instruction. Researchers involved in these studies also recognize the need to prepare history teachers to analyze language (Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006; De Oliveira, 2011). Some unanswered questions remain as to the impact of these strategies
on student learning and the amount and type of support inexperienced history teachers would need to implement similar strategies.

A brief synthesis

This investigation builds on extant research to analyze how student and novice history teachers learn to teach bilingual learners “from coursework to classroom.” My study is informed by a theory of history education for social justice, which assumes social studies education can serve as a lever for individual advancement and prepare students for engaged citizenship (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Cochran-Smith, 2010; Reeves, 2004). Current research suggests the importance of scaffolding instruction to provide BLs access to grade level secondary history instruction (Echevarría, et al., 2008; Short, Vogt, & Echevarría, 2011; Walqui, 2006). A growing body of work describes language demands of reading, writing, and conversing in history and suggests instructional strategies teachers can use to help students acquire academic literacy skills of history (Bunch, 2006; De Oliveira, 2010; De Oliveira, 2011; Schleppegrell, 2005; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006; Schleppegrell, Greer & Taylor, 2008). Description of key history genres can provide a framework to better understand how the language of history might be taught (Coffin, 1997, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008; Schleppegrell, 2005). Finally, existing conceptual and empirical research provides a guide for understanding to what extent student and novice teacher draw upon pre-service preparation in their classroom practice. When teachers first confront prior beliefs, embrace a vision for student learning, and develop a basic teaching repertoire, and the skills and inclination to continually improve their practice, and next, enter contexts in which they receive ongoing support, they seem most likely to implement reform-
This qualitative research study was designed to examine how student teachers and novice history teachers learn to teach adolescent BLs from “coursework to the classroom.” Accordingly, I followed five participants, all of whom were my former students, from their pre-service preparation in the teacher education program at Boston College (BC) to secondary history classrooms in the greater Boston area. As part of a larger action research agenda, iterative actions were undertaken in a systematic fashion to address the research focus (Herr & Anderson, 2005). Preliminary studies were conducted in two methods courses intended to prepare content teachers to work with BLs, which set the stage for my investigation (see Chapter 4). In this qualitative study, I sought to answer the following overarching research question and related sub-questions:

What happens when student teachers and novice teachers, who completed pre-service coursework intended to prepare them to work with BLs, teach history or social studies in secondary classrooms?

Sub-questions:

- To what extent do they scaffold instruction for BLs?
- To what extent do they teach the language of history to BLs?

As part of this study’s cross-sectional design, the experiences of student teachers and novice teachers were considered simultaneously. However, results for student teachers

---

6 I am grateful to have had the opportunity to collaborate with Dr. Patrick McQuillan and Dr. Anne Homza during the first study and with Christina Pavlak for the second study. Dr. Maria Estela Brisk supported both endeavors. Dr. Audrey Friedman guided analysis of data in the second study, and Dr. Marilyn Cochran-Smith suggested an analytical framework (Sleeter, 2009) for it.
and novice teachers are presented in separate chapters given intrinsic differences in their roles, responsibilities, authority, and time available to teach. Two key themes also derive from these research questions (Stake, 2006): the importance of scaffolding instruction and teaching the language of history to support the development of academic literacy in secondary history classrooms for BLs (and many other students). Scaffolding instruction signifies actions taken by teachers to engage learners in activities beyond their current independent capability (Vygotsky, 1978). Rather than simplifying tasks, teachers scaffold learning experiences for BLs, by using instructional strategies and providing additional supports that enable access to rigorous content instruction (Echevarría, et al., 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Santos, Darling-Hammond & Cheuk, 2012). In this study, teaching the language of history to BLs involved sequential processes: analyzing the linguistic demands of oral and written discourse, including content-specific texts and tasks in which students would engage (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Santos, Darling-Hammond, Cheuk, 2012, p.4), then identifying language objectives that would be explicitly taught (not just experienced) during a lesson (Echevarría, et al., 2008). In other words, teaching the language of history requires intentionality. To reiterate, linguistic features of content tasks and texts would be identified by teachers and taught to students; then students’ mastery of these linguistic features, which have been embedded in language objectives, would be assessed. To understand the extent to which student teachers and novice history teachers scaffolded instruction for BLs and taught the language of history to BLs, multiple data sources were collected from teaching settings. I videotaped all classroom observations, took field notes, collected lesson plans with language objectives and all
relevant teaching materials including texts, worksheets, and PowerPoint (PPT) presentations. Post-observation interviews were digitally recorded and I wrote an analytic memo after each observation (Charmaz, 2000). In sum, I followed a systematic multi-step process to collect, analyze, and interpret data. Figure 3.1 illustrates the conceptual framework that guided this study’s research design. More specifically, a social justice vision of student learning in history informed all facets of this study.

Figure 3.1: How a social justice vision of student learning guided the research design

A social justice vision of student learning with two interdependent components prompted the design of this study, as I and the persons with whom I worked believe that BLs in secondary history classes should receive equitable access to rigorous content instruction and develop specific linguistic skills that could serve as a foundation for individual achievement and engaged citizenship (Coffin, 1997; Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). Enacting this vision of student learning in a history classroom suggests the use of certain teaching practices: scaffolding instruction and teaching language (to which participants were exposed during pre-service coursework). Thus, data collection centered on how participants scaffolded instruction and taught the language of history in their teaching practice. I used existing frameworks—the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Echevarria, et al., 2008) and Lucas
and Villegas’s framework for Linguistically Responsive Teachers (LRT) (2011)—to assess the extent to which participants scaffolded instruction. In addition, I created an analytical framework to understand how participants taught the language of history based on SFL description of key genres of secondary history (Coffin, 1997, 2006; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). In summary, using a social justice vision to guide this study’s design was consistent with the intent of the research: to better understand teacher learning as a step toward improving student learning opportunities. In addition, this intent aligned with the mission of the university in which the study was conceived and nurtured.

Social Justice Mission of Boston College

This study was shaped by the social justice mission of the Jesuit University in which both participants and I advanced along intersecting paths toward degrees in education. In particular, the Lynch School of Education at Boston College (BC) seeks to promote social justice as a legitimate and integral goal of the teacher education program, that is, “to enhance the human condition, to expand the human imagination, and to make the world more just” (program website). Courses within the teacher education program address five related social justice themes, two of which are particularly germane to this study. The first asserts that, “Teaching is an activity with political dimensions.” Thus, “Educators [are] responsible for challenging inequities in the social order and working with others to establish a more just society.” The second theme, termed “affirming diversity,” recognizes that teachers need to be prepared to work with increasingly diverse school populations. Along these lines, all participants completed two courses intended to prepare history teachers to work with BLs: a history
methods course into which a series of ELL modules were infused and a designated secondary bilingual methods course.

The Bilingual Methods Course

All participants took ED 346, a 36-hour, semester-long secondary bilingual methods course, which I taught (see chapter 4). It is one of two courses in an optional teaching English language learners (TELL) certificate in the teacher education program. Thirty-five to forty aspiring and practicing math, science, history, English language arts, and world languages teachers would typically enroll each semester. Students in the course experience, practice, and reflect on varied methods for scaffolding instruction and teaching language and content in an integrated fashion to bilingual students in mainstream secondary content classes.

The History Methods Class

All participants in this study also took a history methods course, a requirement for undergraduate and graduate students preparing to become secondary social studies or history teachers. The course aims to help aspiring and novice history teachers develop a personal philosophy about history/social studies education, explore various instructional and assessment approaches, and learn to develop lesson plans. Participants experience activities intended to help them acquire the knowledge and skills to enable their own students to ‘do history,’ that is, to engage in analytical processes historians use to construct knowledge (Wineburg, 1991). Along with the history methods professor, I developed and co-taught a series of ELL modules in the course, which were designed to align with the knowledge, skills, and understandings promoted in the TELL program.

---

7 The TELL program also includes a 36-hour course on second language acquisition and a state-mandated 15-hour training on assessing comprehension and fluency in ELs.
certification program to prepare history teacher candidates to work with BLs (also described in the next chapter).

Preliminary studies

With this investigation, I built upon recent experience conducting two preliminary studies within the aforementioned methods courses in collaboration with others who had a stake in the research (Herr & Anderson, 2005). The first study took place in the history methods course. It examined the extent to which integrating ELL modules into the history methods class prepared history teacher candidates to teach BLs the language of history. The second study was conducted in the secondary bilingual methods course. It examined the development of secondary content teachers’ abilities to scaffold instruction and to think complexly about meeting the needs of BLs as demonstrated by surveys, coursework assignments, and written reflections. Both studies are described in the following chapter. Each laid important groundwork for this inquiry with respect to the impact of coursework on learning to scaffold instruction for BLs and to teach the language of history.

Learning to teach: From coursework to classroom.

In this study I observed the classroom teaching of participants to understand the extent to which they drew upon prior coursework aimed to prepare them to scaffold instruction and teach the language of history. Observations were scheduled at the convenience of participants, not to showcase a particular lesson or class. They lasted for the duration of one class period, typically 60 or 90 minutes depending upon the schedule. Each of three student teachers was observed twice during a ten-week period.
Two novice history teachers were observed three times over the course of two consecutive school years, as depicted in Figure 3.2.

Figure 3.2: A Timeline of Participant Observations

As is evident in Figure 3.2, observations of participants began in February of 2012. I observed student teachers over a shorter time period, since observations had to be scheduled during a ten-week practicum experience between February and April while the three participants were student teaching in and near Boston. There was an approximate four to six week time span between the two observations of each student teacher. None of the student teachers secured a position teaching social studies or history in the Boston area following program completion, so it was not possible to schedule additional observations of them in the fall of 2012.8

In contrast, observations of the two novice history teachers took place during two consecutive school years over an approximate eight-month time span. Observations of the novice history teachers also began in February of 2012 and ended mid-way through the fall of the following school year. More time elapsed between observations, especially between the second and third observations, which occurred before and after summer vacation. Given distinctions in the observation process between the two groups

8 Susana became a technology teacher at an elementary school in Boston. Victoria returned to her home state in the South to seek employment as a high school history teacher, and Olivia entered a graduate program in special education but soon left to teach math at a private high school in her home state.
of teachers— emblematic of more profound differences between student teaching versus full-time teaching— results for each group are presented in separate chapters.

Still, an identical protocol was followed for data collection for each observation. Prior to observations, I received lesson plans with language objectives and teaching materials associated with the lesson from participants. During observations, I used a tripod to videotape the class, so I could take field-notes at the same time. Following each observation, I interviewed participants. Table 3.1 shows data sources collected for each of twelve total observations: six of student teachers and six of novice history teachers.

Table 3.1: Observation Data from Student Teachers and Novice History Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Student Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotapes of Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Plans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-prepared materials (handouts, PPTs, and so on)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Total Observations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All classroom observations were videotaped with the teacher as the focal point. During observations, in addition to videotaping lessons and recording field notes, I also
occasionally interacted with the students or the teacher. Participants typically introduced me to students at the beginning of class as their “professor.” Sometimes, I spoke with students and assisted them with a class activity if the teacher was engaged with another student and they sought my help. In so doing, I hoped my presence in the classroom might seem natural to students, supportive to participants, and at the very least not impede the flow of class. I interviewed participants immediately following observed lessons (and sometimes informally prior to lessons). I collected all lesson plans and teacher-prepared materials (for instance, handouts, PowerPoints, and so on) for each observed lesson. As soon as possible following observations, I wrote an analytic memo (described in more detail in the section on data analysis).

**Interviews**

Interviews were conducted immediately following observations, typically in participants’ classrooms. During interviews, participants were asked to comment on the observed lesson using a semi-structured protocol (see Appendix A). I digitally recorded all interviews, which were transcribed in their entirety by a research assistant. Generally, in interviews participants considered how the lesson went, and specifically, how well students achieved their instructional objectives. I asked questions geared toward eliciting information about how participants scaffolded instruction and taught language during the lesson and to what extent they drew upon BC coursework to do so. We also explored topics, concerns, or questions of interest to participants or related to the observed lesson. Interviews provided a glimpse of how participants saw their teaching practice in their own words and beyond the observed class.

---

9 In Cammie’s SEI history classroom, these interactions with BLs usually took place in Spanish.
Selection of participants

As is typical in qualitative research, a purposive sample was selected tailored to the design of the study (Stake, 2006). More specifically, participants met two criteria: they completed pre-service coursework intended to prepare them to teach history to BLs and they were teaching secondary history or social studies in or near Boston.

- All participants completed ED 301, the history methods class at BC, in the fall of 2009, 2010, or 2011 when language-based strategies for teaching ELs were infused into the course. Three participants took ED 301 in 2009 or 2010 when the history methods professor and I co-taught ELL modules. Two participants took the course in 2011, when a teaching assistant, who helped design and teach the ELL modules in 2009 and 2010, took over teaching the course. I met with the teaching assistant, shared materials, and visited his class to provide support and ensure some continuity in the ELL infusion.

- All participants also took ED 346, the secondary bilingual teaching methods course at BC in the summer of 2009, fall of 2010, or fall of 2011. Four of five participants were my students in ED 346 in the fall of 2010 or 2011. The fifth, Sarah, took ED 346 with another instructor in 2009. I met with the doctoral student who taught that section of the course. He shared his syllabus, course readings, and assignments. Both this earlier course and mine conformed to state requirements regarding preparing teachers to work with BLs, so there was consistency between different course sections.

---

10 Sarah also was a case study student in the study in the history methods class whom I interviewed and observed at her practicum site.
• All participants taught or continue to teach social studies or history to bilingual students in a middle or high school setting in or near Boston.

Participants were recruited in two ways. I contacted former students who met these criteria directly and an email was sent on my behalf by a third party to students from the 2009 and 2010 sections of ED 301, who had taken ED 346 earlier with another instructor and since graduated. All six students I contacted consented to participate in the study, but one subsequently had to be removed because videotaping was not allowed at her practicum site. None of the BC graduates contacted via email by a third party responded. The resulting five participants represent a fairly homogeneous, convenience sample; all were female, in their twenties, and accomplished students. They received comparable training at BC to teach BLs history and were accessible as study participants, since they were my former students.

(see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2: Cross-section of Research Participants¹¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Teaching Context</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>Pre-service</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>White, monolingual from mid-Atlantic state</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susana</td>
<td>Pre-service</td>
<td>Urban High</td>
<td>Latina, bilingual from western state</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Pre-service</td>
<td>Urban High</td>
<td>White bilingual from a</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹Pseudonyms were assigned to protect anonymity.
As indicated in Table 3.2, three participants: Olivia, Susana, and Victoria were student teachers. Two taught in high schools with large bilingual populations in Boston. Olivia worked at a suburban middle school with a smaller number of identified BLs. When the study began, Cammie was a first year teacher exclusively teaching BLs in an urban high school in the greater Boston area. Sarah was a second year teacher working in another urban high school near Boston with a heterogeneous population of bilingual and monolingual students in her mainstream history classes. In addition, both Victoria and Cammie completed a cohort-based University Urban Teacher Education program and did their student teaching within the humanities program at the same Boston high school.

Participants in the study originated from different regions of the continental United States and claimed varying levels of proficiency in a second language. Olivia was monolingual whereas Susana was a bilingual (Spanish, English) Latina. Victoria was bilingual (French, English) of Canadian ancestry. Cammie spoke a little Spanish,
and Sarah had an advanced level of Spanish proficiency, having lived and studied in a Latin American country.

**Teaching Contexts**

Observations took place in five schools in the greater Boston area: four high schools and one middle school. Susana and Victoria student taught in large urban high schools with diverse student populations in Boston, where BC had longstanding arrangements for student teaching placements. Olivia student taught in a suburban middle school with a more homogeneous student population and fewer BLs. Cammie was employed as a sheltered English immersion (SEI) history teacher within the ESL program of a comprehensive high school in a small city north of Boston with a large Spanish-speaking population and a multi-generational history as an immigrant destination. Sarah taught world history to ninth graders in a high school in another small city near Boston that was experiencing a demographic shift with a more recent influx of immigrants. (Additional information about each teaching context is presented when individual participants are introduced in chapters 5 and 6.)

**Data Analysis**

Narration is an organizing feature of how qualitative analysis is presented in this study (Herr & Anderson, 2005). I created qualitative studies of each participant to capture what happened while she was teaching history to BLs. To address my research questions in a systematic manner, these studies of participants were created with the same process and structure; for each participant, I recounted lessons, analyzed instructional scaffolds, and assessed how language demands of history were taught (or not). Individual portraits of the extent to which each participant scaffolded instruction
and taught language were developed from multi-step analysis of varied data sources described below (Stake, 2006). Then, research themes were compared across individuals and groups by resituating findings into two additional analytical frameworks that aligned with research themes (also described in more detail below).

Three systematic phases of data analysis enabled me to move toward a more finely grained focus on my research questions. In truth, a soft form of analysis began as I entered participants’ classrooms, positioned the video camera, and began to take field notes, although this was not my primary intention at those times. Within twenty-four hours of each observation, I wrote an analytic memo with three components: an inventory of data from the observation, a brief narrative description of the lesson, and initial impressions of the lesson and post-observation interview. These memos served as a first step in studying emerging data: to ensure complete data collection from observations and to make preliminary connections between observations of the same individual and among participants (Charmaz, 1999).

The second phase of analysis consisted of thorough scrutiny of what happened during the observed lesson, and more specifically, how individual participants scaffolded instruction and taught language based on multiple data sources. It began as soon as the interview transcript was available for a particular post-observation interview. Then, I reviewed the research memo, lesson plan, all teaching materials associated with the lesson, and interview transcript multiple times in conjunction with analyzing the observation videotape to make sense of the teaching episode in the context of my research questions.
Analysis of videotapes

Video analysis entailed three consecutive steps. First, I viewed the videotape in its entirety to get a general sense of how the lesson went. As I did so, I recorded what teachers and students said and did in separate grids in ten-minute increments (see Appendix B for the videotape analysis protocol). Second, I used SIOP to evaluate the extent to which participants scaffolded instruction, since each component of SIOP had been practiced throughout the bilingual methods course and participants created SIOP lesson plans as the course’s culminating assignment (see Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2008, pp. 228-9). Third, I analyzed how participants taught language demands using a researcher-created framework (see Appendix C) that drew from SFL description of historical discourse (Coffin, 1996, 2007). Table 3.3 shows how research questions, analysis strategies, and data sources aligned.

Table 3.3: Alignment of Research Questions, Analysis Strategies, and Data Sources

| Overarching Research Question: | 
|---------------------------------|---|
| What happens when student teachers and novice teachers, who completed pre-service coursework intended to prepare them to work with BLs, teach history or social studies in secondary classrooms? | 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Strategies</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of an analytic memo</td>
<td>Field notes, Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a timeline of what teachers and students said and did during each observation</td>
<td>Videotapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Strategies</td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of qualitative studies for each individual participant</td>
<td>Lesson Plans, Videotapes, Interviews, Teaching Materials, Field notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-question:** To what extent do they scaffold instruction for BLs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Strategies</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of individual classroom observations using SIOP (Echevarria, Vogt &amp; Short, 2008).</td>
<td>Videotapes, Lesson Plans, Teaching Materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Strategies</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of individuals and groups based on LRT Framework (Lucas &amp; Villegas, 2011) using videotape analysis protocols and SIOPs.</td>
<td>Videotapes, Lesson Plans, Teaching Materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-question:** To what extent do they teach the language of history to BLs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Strategies</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examination of language objectives</td>
<td>Lesson Plans, Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of how language objectives were implemented.</td>
<td>Videotapes, Field Notes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of which genres of secondary history were enacted in participants’ lessons based on SFL.</td>
<td>Videotapes, Class Texts, Teaching Materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I constructed qualitative studies of what happened when participants taught history to BLs after creating an analytic memo and then a timeline of activities during classroom observations based on data from videos, field notes, interviews, lesson plans and
teaching materials. In these studies, I also portrayed the extent to which participants scaffolded instruction and taught the language of history. SIOP was used to evaluate how participants scaffolded instruction, since they studied all SIOP components and created SIOP lessons as a culminating assignment in pre-service coursework (Echevarría, et al., 2008). How participants created and implemented language objectives—the focus of pre-practicum training, pre-service coursework, and a required element of practicum lesson plans — was seen in this study as indicative of participants’ ability to identify and teach language. When a discrepancy existed between what participants identified as the language demand of their lessons and the actual language demand, I explained it by drawing from SFL description of the purposes and typical language features of genres of secondary school history (Coffin, 1997, 2006). SFL provided a lens through which to analyze how student and novice history teachers in this study, who were exposed to aspects of SFL in pre-service coursework (see Chapter Four), taught the language of history. More specifically, identifying what and how genres of history were enacted in observed lessons suggested to what extent they drew upon knowledge and skills presented during pre-service coursework.

In a third phase of data analysis, I sought to understand individuals in the context of their group—student teachers or novice teachers— and to theorize about the two research themes: scaffolding instruction and teaching the language of history. I reinterpreted and resituated findings in the LRT Framework (2011) to reveal trends in how student teachers and novice teachers employed scaffolds. To generalize about how participants identified and taught language, I created a model for teaching key history
genres that drew from SFL description of historical discourse (see Chapter Seven) (Coffin, 1997, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008). To summarize, I analyzed the classroom teaching of individual participants and then compared individuals and groups related to research themes “to look beyond initial impressions to see evidence through multiple lenses” (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 533).

I designed this study to better understand how history teachers learn to teach BLs at different intervals of the earliest phase of their teaching careers via a cross-sectional slice. The “coursework to classroom” experience of three student teachers, one first-second year teacher, and one second-third year teacher were juxtaposed. Key themes were compared among individuals and between groups. Multiple accounts of how individuals experience a common phenomenon, that is, learning to teach BLs history, can generate explanatory power when there is repetition among cases (Ayres, Kavanaugh & Knafl, 2003). Nonetheless, unique features of individuals cannot entirely be reduced to common themes. Therefore, every effort was made through a rigorous, inclusive, and systematic research process to balance the telling of nuanced portraits of individual participants with analysis of research themes to “build theory” that might inform history teachers preparing to teach BLs and teacher educators who aim to prepare them (Eisenhardt, 1989).

Limitations

This study was small by design. Occasional teacher observations offer only a bird’s eye view not a panorama of classroom practice. Given the limited sample size, number of observations, and brief time period in which the study occurred, one needs to be cautious in seeking to generalize across these persons’ experiences. However,
participants experienced much the same teacher education program (with minor
differences between the graduate and undergraduate experience) and they all worked
with BLs in their classroom context in the greater Boston area. As such, one would
expect that certain aspects of their transition from coursework to classroom teaching
might be shared in common. Consequently, implications and research tools, such as
analytical frameworks, derived from this study can inform the work of teachers, teacher
educators, and researchers in the local setting and beyond who seek to meet the needs
of BLs in mainstream secondary history or social studies classrooms.

Validity

Instead of validity, credibility, coherence, and rigor seem to be the standards by
which qualitative studies should be judged (Eisner, 1997; Herr & Anderson, 2005;
Maxwell, 1992). As Maxwell (1992) observed, “Validity, in a broad sense, pertains to
this relationship between an account and something outside of that account,” (p.283).
More specifically, the researcher creates an account based on documentation, analysis,
and interpretation in efforts to capture a reality seemingly outside her or himself.
However, s/he is implicated in that written account of reality and also must abandon it
to the reader, who then judges the extent to which it is credible. Since objectivity is not
possible (for authors or reviewers of research), the standard instead becomes
trustworthiness. Along these lines, Eisner (1979) offers the concept of “structural
corroboration,” which seems a fitting way to judge the trustworthiness of qualitative
studies.

Structural corroboration is a process of gathering data or information and using
it to establish links that eventually create a whole that is supported by the bits of
evidence that constitute it. Evidence is structurally corroborative when pieces of evidence validate each other, the story holds up, the pieces fit, it makes sense, the facts are consistent. (p. 215)

In this study, every effort was made to collect and analyze multiple forms of data in a systematic fashion prior to creating accounts of individuals, groups, and research themes; these accounts were intended to be credible, coherent, and rigorous. Herr and Anderson (2005) further offer these holistic criteria for action research: “a sound and appropriate research methodology; results that are relevant to the local setting;” and “the generation of new knowledge” (p. 55), all of which were aims of this qualitative study. Finally, since “we cannot step outside our own experience to obtain some observer-independent account of what we experience” (Maxwell, 1992, p. 283), I expand upon and clarify my relationship to research participants and themes in the next section.

*My positionality*

Positionality refers to the position the researcher occupies in relation to the research (Herr & Anderson, 2005). My dual role as a teacher educator and researcher influenced all decisions about how I conducted, analyzed, and presented this study (Herr & Anderson, 2005). In brief, I studied the teaching practice of my former students. This introduced certain tensions but also trust to the study since interactions were based on established relationships (Herr & Anderson, 2005). To explain inherent tensions in this study’s design, I offer a quick analogy; I believe tests are as much an evaluation of teaching practice as they are of student performance. In a similar fashion, in analyzing the teaching of my former students, I also was assessing the extent to
which coursework experiences prepared them to teach history to BLs. I taught one of those courses and co-taught modules in a second one (as explained in the next chapter), so I was indirectly evaluating my own instruction. Certainly, teacher educators are implicated in this study’s results, myself included. As their teacher, I also felt a sense of commitment and responsibility to participants (and their students) to offer any support they sought. This meant for instance that I coached Susana on how to be a more assertive presence in the classroom although this was outside the bounds of this study. Like her, I had grappled with establishing my authority as a high school teacher when I was in my twenties and looked no older than students. I also responded to any questions participants raised during interviews and email exchanges as thoroughly as possible. Given that they permitted me to observe their teaching practice at its earliest and most vulnerable phase, I hoped the experience might be of some benefit to them, as well. However, I created the design and questions that drove this study based on my own research interests not in collaboration with participants.

All decisions about how this study was conducted and presented were framed and filtered by over twenty years of experience as an educator primarily working in public schools with bilingual children. I taught for nine years in urban and suburban settings before becoming an administrator charged for seven years with helping to develop and evaluate teachers’ instructional practices. In my first year as a bilingual teacher in New York City, I was shocked to find myself transferred to another school mid-year due to a political stance I took in opposition to the principal related to a union grievance and reading instruction for my students. Wholly unprepared for the culture of schooling and specifically, how bilingual children, their families, and teachers were
situated in a particular urban school at that time, I failed to adapt to normative expectations for teacher behavior (Kozol, 1967). Further, I had no preparation to teach; I was hired without licensure to teach in an elementary bilingual classroom due to my proficiency in English and Spanish. Since then, I have developed relevant teaching experience as well as a more mature understanding of how schools function as socio-cultural and political institutions. I also taught social studies in Spanish to bilingual sixth graders as part of a dual immersion program and later served as a K-12 social studies curriculum director in the town that was formerly Salem Village, where the Witchcraft Hysteria began in Massachusetts. In that capacity, I led a program in which we integrated local history and service-learning into curricula that engaged community members, historic sites, and parents in inquiry-based student learning. These experiences fed my interest in learning more about how to prepare history teachers to teach BLs. Although participants were my former students, they also taught me a great deal. Overall, as a researcher, teacher educator, and learner, I felt a tremendous sense of commitment and empathy toward my former students as they negotiated the earliest phase of their teaching careers and their students. As Cochran-Smith (2010) keenly observed, the “[b]ottom line . . . is promoting students’ learning and enhancing their life chances . . .” (p. 461).
In this chapter, I describe my experience with two preliminary studies of the impact of coursework on preparing secondary content teachers to work with bilingual learners, both of which influenced this investigation in several ways. In the first study, a series of ELL modules were infused into a history methods course to prepare history teachers to integrate language and content instruction. The second study took place in a secondary bilingual methods course that I taught. It was an effort to equip secondary content teachers to scaffold instruction and “think complexly” about teaching BLs (Sleeter, 2009). These studies motivated me to follow student and novice history teachers from their coursework into classrooms where they taught history to BLs. In addition, these two studies took place within the two prerequisite courses completed by all five participants in my dissertation study: the history methods course and the secondary bilingual methods course. Accordingly, the design and results of these earlier studies offer insights about the coursework experiences of participants, and more specifically, strategies for scaffolding instruction for BLs and for teaching the language of history to which they were exposed. Moreover, in the final chapter of my dissertation, I synthesize findings from these two studies to describe the first phase of a continuum of teacher development: pre-service coursework experiences. Because these two prior studies share significant parts of the theoretical background and literature review that supports this study (presented in Chapter Two), I only briefly mention theory and extant research that influenced unique aspects of them in this chapter. Overall, description of these two studies of the influence of coursework on preparing secondary content teachers to work with bilingual learners (BLs) situates this qualitative study as the next step in an action research cycle (Herr & Anderson, 2005).
Throughout these preliminary studies, I collaborated with fellow teacher educators who shared my commitment to preparing teachers to work with bilingual adolescents. In addition, both studies were grounded by two principles described by Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009):

…[P]ractitioners are deliberative intellectuals who constantly theorize practice as part of practice . . . and . . . the goal of teacher learning initiatives is the joint construction of local knowledge. (p.2)

The first principle, and particularly usage of the word “deliberative” to modify intellectuals, suggests the importance of teachers intentionally theorizing and examining the influence of their practice with others who are invested in the work. As a teacher educator, I also understand this to mean that it is important to model these efforts for aspiring teachers and include them in the deliberation, which relates closely to the second principle. With research participants, practitioners can produce useable knowledge that informs practice. Each study described in this chapter was an attempt to do precisely that. Ideally, each study could influence practice related to improving learning opportunities for BLs in two realms—teacher education settings and secondary content classrooms. With my dissertation study, following a subset of participants into their early teaching experiences offered the chance to examine to what extent these coursework experiences did in fact influence participants’ practice.

Discussion of these preliminary studies is, therefore, intended to enhance understanding of the aims, scope, and results of the current investigation.
Part 1: Preparing history teachers to work with BLs: Study of an ELL infusion in a history methods course

This study represented a collaborative effort between an experienced history methods instructor and a bilingual educator. We aimed to equip history teachers with pedagogical content knowledge and some understanding of the specialized academic language of history to prepare them to teach literacy skills of history to BLs (DelliCarpini et al., 2012; Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). Dr. Patrick McQuillan, educational anthropologist, history methods course instructor, and former high school history teacher, volunteered to participate in a grant-funded university initiative aimed at assisting teacher educators in preparing content teachers to work with BLs. I was the research assistant and language specialist who helped Pat create EL modules for the history methods class. Together, we developed and taught a series of English language learning (ELL) modules then assessed what happened when the modules were infused into the methods course to equip history teacher candidates with the knowledge and skills needed to integrate language instruction into their history lessons.

Our collaboration linked Pat’s longstanding commitment to promoting a ‘doing history’ approach in history teacher education (Wineburg, 2001; Wineburg & Fournier, 2004) with language pedagogy drawn from SFL (Coffin, 1997, 2006; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006). Barton (2012) distinguishes between two types of history education: ‘doing history’ and ‘doing school.’ ‘Doing school’ implies a passive role for students reminiscent of Freire’s (2000) conception of “banking education” in which “the teacher teaches and the students are taught . . .” (p. 59). Such transmission models of instruction are common in secondary history

---

12 I collaborated with Dr. Patrick McQuillan and Dr. Anne Homza throughout this study. In addition, two publications co-authored with Dr. McQuillan emerged from the study. I offer an abridged version of the study here. For more detailed discussion, see Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012 and Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, forthcoming.

13 This project was funded in part through a U.S. Department of Education Title III National Professional Development Grant-PR/Number: T195N070133
instruction as teachers cover large swaths of content (Barton & Levstik, 2004). In contrast, ‘doing history’ connotes actively engaging students in the analytical processes historians use to construct and critique knowledge including sourcing, contextualizing, and corroborating (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Hynd, Holschuh, Hubbard, 2004; Wineburg, 1991). Sourcing involves analyzing the background, credentials, and intended audience of a text’s author. Contextualizing, as the term implies, entails examining the broader social, cultural, and/or political context in which historical artifacts, including texts, are produced. To corroborate, multiple sources are compared to assess their degree of alignment. In line with this perspective, Hynd (1999) explained the aim of ‘doing history’:

Students who learn to think of what they read (and hear and see) as acts of communication by an author, speaker, or actor who exists in a time frame, belongs to certain groups, has an agenda, and is operating in a system of power, can evaluate the message rather than merely understanding it at a perfunctory level. (p. 431)

However, many students may need to develop strategies to go beyond “understanding historical content at a perfunctory level” to “evaluate the message” (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006). For adolescent BLs, in particular, to ‘do history,’ they must become proficient in academic literacy skills of history, such as analyzing texts, debating key events, and creating a persuasive argument (Coffin, 1997; Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012).

As a functional theory of language, SFL provides language-based resources teachers and students can use to examine the purpose, organizational, and linguistic features of history texts (Coffin, 1997, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008). For instance, by studying language structures that construe meaning in history textbooks and original
historical sources, students can learn to interpret and then present historical knowledge more effectively (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008; Schleppegrell, 2005; Schleppegrell & De Oliveira, 2006). As Coffin and Donohue (2012) wrote:

[S]FL text analysis is not only the analysis of linguistic resources, but in addition, the analysis of their social, cultural, and ideological meanings. The theoretical framework and analytical tools are designed to make explicit the relationship between text and context. (p. 65)

In other words, SFL provides a meta-language and toolbox that complements ‘doing history’ as both attend to a text’s context, content, and purpose. A unique aspect of this study was the way in which we integrated SFL with ‘doing history’ in efforts to equip teachers with language-based strategies to use with BLs to interpret history texts in secondary history classrooms.

Research Design

This study involved a two-year action research design that integrated iterative cycles of planning, teaching, observing, and reflection intended to improve practice (Cassell & Johnson, 2006; Herr & Anderson, 2005). We sought to answer the following research questions:

- To what extent did infusing ELL modules into a history methods class influence pre-service teachers’ sense of preparedness to teach ELs in mainstream history classes?
- How [did] these modules shape their beliefs regarding the teacher’s responsibility for teaching the language of history to students?
- And, what effect [did] these modules have on pre-service history teachers’ ability to use SFL language analysis to ‘do history’ as a means to help students improve their
historical content knowledge and related linguistic skills while preparing them for
development (see Zwiers, 2006), and creating language objectives. In the second
module, participants experienced SFL strategies linked to ‘doing history’ to use with
their students (see De Oliveira, 2010; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008). In 2009,
participants practiced a three-step process for deconstructing history texts (see Fang &
Schleppegrell, 2008, pp.39-63). First, students examined how the text was organized.
Next they did a close reading of linguistic features of the text, and then, they analyzed
the author’s perspective based on what they discovered in the first two steps, thereby

ELL Infusion in the History Methods Class

In the fall of 2009 and 2010, we co-taught several ELL modules in the history
methods course. To encourage participants to adopt instructional practices aimed at
promoting students’ academic language development in history, we focused on
language usage in a history classroom. Modules emphasized how to implement
language objectives and instructional strategies associated with reading, conversing,
and writing in history. Each module contained readings, an interactive presentation, a
group activity, and written assignment. The first module introduced discipline-specific
features of historical discourse, strategies for scaffolding academic language
development (see Zwiers, 2006), and creating language objectives. In the second
module, participants experienced SFL strategies linked to ‘doing history’ to use with
their students (see De Oliveira, 2010; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008). In 2009,
participants practiced a three-step process for deconstructing history texts (see Fang &
Schleppegrell, 2008, pp.39-63). First, students examined how the text was organized.
Next they did a close reading of linguistic features of the text, and then, they analyzed
the author’s perspective based on what they discovered in the first two steps, thereby

To address these questions, in the fall of 2009 and 2010 we collected surveys and class
assignments from 55 participants in two cohorts of the history methods course. In addition, we
videotaped classes when infusion lessons were taught and selected three students from each
cohort for interviews. Surveys and interviews were conducted before and after a series of ELL
modules were infused into the history methods class.

ELL Infusion in the History Methods Class

In the fall of 2009 and 2010, we co-taught several ELL modules in the history
methods course. To encourage participants to adopt instructional practices aimed at
promoting students’ academic language development in history, we focused on
language usage in a history classroom. Modules emphasized how to implement
language objectives and instructional strategies associated with reading, conversing,
and writing in history. Each module contained readings, an interactive presentation, a
group activity, and written assignment. The first module introduced discipline-specific
features of historical discourse, strategies for scaffolding academic language
development (see Zwiers, 2006), and creating language objectives. In the second
module, participants experienced SFL strategies linked to ‘doing history’ to use with
their students (see De Oliveira, 2010; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008). In 2009,
linking SFL language analysis with ‘doing history.’ The third module emphasized how to decrease “teacher talk” while increasing student interaction through varied types of text-based discussions. In 2009, we taught a fourth module on genres of historical writing and a teaching and learning cycle for writing (Derewianka, 1990; Gibbons, 2009; Rose & Martin, 2012).

Between the first and second year, we eliminated the writing module due to time concerns. Also, after analyzing first-year data, we revised the modules to increase general literacy activities such as how to teach active reading skills and to simplify exposure to SFL. More specifically, we replaced the three-step analysis with a chain of reference strategy, we hoped participants would use with their own students to identify complex noun groups then trace the chain of reference in sample history passages (see Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, forthcoming). We also modeled how to create language objectives aligned with language-based activities based on vocabulary, morphology, sentence structures, and extended text. Beyond heightening novice history teachers’ awareness of features of historical language and their role as teachers of the language of history (de Jong & Harper, 2005), we sought to equip them with practical methods to teach language and content simultaneously (for a detailed discussion of the ELL infusion, see Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012).

Research Participants

In the fall of 2009, thirty students in the history methods class participated in our study. In 2010, 25 students participated for a total of 55 participants from an overall enrollment of 67 students over two years. We chose three students from each cohort for
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14 Dr. Anne Homza, Title III Director at BC, helped us develop the chain of reference strategy.
more in-depth study. In 2009, we interviewed Elena, a Latina graduate student; Charles, a monolingual undergraduate; and Sarah, a graduate student who had studied in Latin America.\textsuperscript{15} In 2010, we interviewed Olivia, an undergraduate who tutored ELs;\textsuperscript{16} Brett, a monolingual graduate student; and Oscar, a graduate student who spoke some French. These students were interviewed before and after the infusion modules.

\textit{Survey}

We administered pre- and post-surveys to 55 participants in two cohorts before and after we integrated the infusion modules into the methods class. The survey elicited information about student demographics and experiences with teaching, language-learning, and working with ELs. Using a Likert scale (1-strongly agree to 5-strongly disagree), participants responded to statements regarding their perceptions of preparedness to teach ELs history.\textsuperscript{17} On the post-survey, participants responded to the same statements regarding preparedness and rated how helpful they found components of the infusion modules. In an “open response” portion of the survey, participants noted strategies they learned for scaffolding the development of students’ skills with language and historical analysis, identified what they would like to learn more about, and stated what further support prospective history teachers might need to work with ELs.

\textit{Interviews}

We approached interviews as an opportunity to assess participants’ understanding about working with ELs. A standard set of questions guided each

\textsuperscript{15} All Pseudonyms.
\textsuperscript{16} Sarah and Olivia are also participants in the current study.
\textsuperscript{17} Some statements on teacher attitudes toward EL inclusion and coursework modification were adapted from a survey used by Reeves (2006) as were questions on the “benefits” and “challenges” of EL inclusion in a history class.
interview but we might deviate from that protocol to explore topics that were of interest or significance to participants.

Data Analysis

We used mixed methods to comprehensively assess the influence of the ELL infusion modules on prospective history teachers. Quantitative data revealed changes in participants’ perceptions of preparedness to work with ELs. That is, survey responses were tabulated and averaged for each cohort. Paired t-tests were conducted using SPSS to ascertain whether there were any statistically significant differences over the course of the semester in each cohort’s perceptions of preparedness to teach ELs, in general, and the language of history, in particular. We used standard qualitative content analysis to code raw data from the open response portion of surveys and from interviews (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Sipe & Ghiso, 2004). Interview transcripts were examined line by line to reveal emergent themes that represented participants’ perspectives. A constant comparative method helped us interpret and substantiate our findings as well as reveal limitations in our ability to ascribe meaning to perceived changes in participants’ attitudes and perceptions of preparedness (Charmaz, 2000; Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Results

In brief, after extensive analysis of multiple data sources, we found participants felt more prepared to teach BLs, recognized the complexities of historical language, and embraced their role as teachers of the language of history as a result of the ELL infusion in the history methods course (see Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012 for
detailed discussion of survey results). Oscar, for example, described how his sense of
the history teacher’s role expanded as he recognized the need to teach language:

When I entered the program, I [assumed] history teachers teach history, English
teachers teach English. ESL teaches English-as-a-second language. That has
totally been eradicated from my mind. All teachers teach language. And all
teachers need to know how to teach language in order to support their students
in furthering their education for that subject. I’ve seen firsthand, now that I’m at
a . . . school, the effects [of] knowing how to teach language and . . . language
objectives . . . how to work with students so that they can present their materials
orally, how much of that is actually involved in the teaching process, regardless
of subject . . . . The [modules] really gave me a heads-up on what to expect and .
. . prepared me. [W]hen I . . . make my lessons, I will know when . . . to include
aspects for supporting . . . [ELs], as well as [native speakers] in learning
language.

In addition, survey responses and subsequent interviews indicated most participants felt
more prepared to enact this role following the ELL infusion model, particularly the
second year. Indeed, class assignments revealed participants had learned how to
incorporate instructional scaffolds for teaching BLs history into their lessons. For
instance, Olivia identified various language-related strategies she utilized in a
culminating assignment:

[Throughout the unit plan], I used a lot of graphic organizers. I used the double-
entry journal at least two or three times in my lesson plan. I used think-pair-
share . . . A lot of my [strategies] came directly from Laura [who] gave us a
whole entire list of everything she used in class. And that’s like, “This’ll work for my lesson plan.”

Olivia’s response is consistent with the idea that novice teachers need to establish a basic repertoire of instructional strategies during pre-service preparation that can be widely applied in early teaching (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). In sum, aspiring history teachers seemed to embrace their role as language teachers, feel more prepared to enact that role, and could integrate strategies that scaffold academic language development for ELs into history lessons as a result of our collaboration.

Despite these promising outcomes, our presentation of language objectives and integration of ‘doing history’ approaches with SFL language analysis did not have the impact we hoped. Although surveys showed participants felt more prepared to plan language objectives for history lessons, in our assessment, we found they had difficulty actually creating language objectives for the unit plan assignment and on the final exam. In an interview, Olivia explained:

[I]n general, we struggle with . . . language objectives. A lot of us don’t understand the point of them . . . I think I need to know more about [them]. . . . [I]t’s not that I don’t want to write them, it’s more of like it’s not something that comes natural to me.

In examining why participants struggled to create language objectives, we identified several related explanations. To begin, aspiring and novice history teachers needed more background in linguistics and second language acquisition to identify language demands associated with history lessons. Further, given significant pressures to cover content, many were unsure how to address language issues in concise but effective
ways. In Olivia’s words, “[I]t’s not something that comes natural to me.” Finally, even though all students attended training on how to create language objectives prior to student teaching, program expectations among methods instructors, cooperating teachers and university supervisors lacked coherence regarding the use of language objectives.

In a similar vein, while surveys indicated most participants perceived benefits in using SFL language analysis to ‘do history;’ many were unsure how to apply specific techniques in their teaching. Oscar offered his thoughts on this matter:

In a perfect world . . . we would be able to analyze every document, go through in-depth analysis, and students would . . . have such a greater understanding of why documents are written, what they’re written for. . . . And it would all interconnect. Unfortunately, that’s not the case.

Unsure how to balance content coverage with the time required for in-depth analysis of texts, he elaborated:

One of the big hang-ups . . . I have is the lack of time that history teachers have . . . to get through . . . the chronological [dimensions of history] . . . from start to finish. And one of the things I worry about is that [in] spending a full lesson on teaching students how to analyze language . . . my students would be falling behind. And we would have to give up some aspect of learning history to teach them this method.

Oscar, like many history teachers, felt pressed to cover extensive content (Barton & Levstik, 2004). In addition, Oscar seemed unprepared to enact strategies we modeled, perhaps because he experienced simulations of the strategies but did not have guided
practice in adapting these strategies to chosen texts or developing language objectives for a selected lesson that he would implement during student teaching. In sum, history teachers felt more prepared, embraced roles as language teachers, and incorporated instructional scaffolds into lesson plans. Yet, most participants seemed to need additional support beyond a series of modules infused within a content methods course to create language objectives and to use SFL to ‘do history’ with their own students.

*How results of this study influenced my dissertation*

My experience with this preliminary study influenced my dissertation in several key ways. First and foremost, I was interested in learning to what extent participants would draw upon information presented in the ELL modules in their teaching practices, so I followed five individuals into their student teaching and full-time teaching experiences. I also learned that one content methods course was insufficient preparation for participants to integrate pedagogical content knowledge with language pedagogy. Since students struggled to create language objectives and use SFL language analysis as part of assignments within a series of modules in a course with other objectives, I wondered what would happen if participants had more opportunity to learn strategies for teaching language in a designated secondary bilingual methods class (the focus of the second preliminary study) and implement them with their own students during their teaching practice. With this study, we recognized that learning related to teaching BLs must be reinforced in multiple contexts and connected to real students in classroom environments. As is typical with action research, successive cycles of inquiry generated increased understanding of the nature of the research problem (Herr & Anderson, 2005): how to prepare history teachers to work with BLs.
In terms of the dissertation process, my experience working with an experienced qualitative researcher throughout this preliminary study enhanced every aspect of my ability to take an inquiry stance toward my practice as a teacher educator from designing to executing to analyzing and presenting a study (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). In addition, I reviewed two bodies of literature: SFL description of historical discourse (Coffin, 1997, 2006; De Oliveira, 2010; Martin & Rose, 2008; Schleppegrell, 2005; Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006) and conceptual and empirical research related to ‘doing history’ (Barton, 2005; Hynd, 1999; Wineburg, 199; Wineburg & Fournier, 1994) to prepare for the ELL infusion in the history methods class. In so doing, I began to articulate the social justice vision of student learning in history that guides my dissertation study. Further, I developed a sense of what extra support aspiring content teachers might need to assess the language demands of content texts and tasks and create language objectives, which influenced my efforts when I was given the opportunity to teach a secondary bilingual methods course. Finally, my experience with this study confirmed my commitment to practitioner research and motivated me to engage in the second study that influenced this dissertation.

Part 2: Preparing content teachers to scaffold instruction and to “think complexly” about instruction: Study in a bilingual methods course

This study began as a collaborative effort between two doctoral students intended to improve our practice as teacher educators committed to the social justice mission of Boston College. Christina Pavlak and I taught consecutive sections of a
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18 I collaborated with fellow doctoral student, Christina Pavlak throughout this study. Dr. Maria Estela Brisk, Dr. Marilyn Cochran-Smith, and Dr. Audrey Friedman supported the study. Dr. Friedman’s expertise with reflective judgment guided our efforts to analyze data regarding the complexity of teacher thinking. A class taught by Dr. Lauri Johnson inspired our collaboration; she also provided helpful feedback on an AERA paper that describes this study in more detail (see Schall-Leckrone & Pavlak, 2012).
bilingual methods course designed to prepare secondary content teachers to work with linguistically diverse learners. I had the opportunity to teach the course first. At that time, I developed a course syllabus after consulting with past course instructors, studying their syllabi, and observing a session of the course taught by Dr. Patrick Proctor in the spring of 2010. When I taught the fall 2010 section of the course, I collected data informally. Then I shared the syllabus and data with Christina as part of a curriculum review project we conducted in a spring 2011 graduate course,\(^{19}\) since she planned to teach the summer 2011 session. She added readings to the syllabus that reflected her critical theory background and we formalized our study. We interviewed past course instructors and systematically collected data from two sections of the course in the summer and fall of 2011. That fall, we added an electronic forum as an additional data source, and Christina observed several classes that I taught and took field notes. Together, we assessed the influence of the bilingual methods course on two cohorts of aspiring and practicing secondary content teachers. Two key research themes drove this investigation: the importance of preparing secondary content teachers to scaffold instruction for BLs (Echevarria, et al., 2008; Walquí, 2006) and to think complexly about such instruction in mainstream secondary classrooms (Sleeter, 2009). We were interested in studying what we perceived to be a dynamic tension in social justice oriented teacher preparation (Cochran-Smith, 2010) between mastering a particular systematic teaching approach intended to improve learning opportunities for BLs (Echevarria, et al., 2008) and thinking complexly about the instruction of linguistically

\(^{19}\)Dr. Lauri Johnson’s Curriculum Leadership for Diverse Learners course.
diverse individuals within the larger context of schools and schooling in the United States (Bartolomé, 1994; Sleeter, 2009).

A dynamic tension: Learning how to scaffold instruction and to think complexly about instruction

Teacher education programs with an explicit social justice mission envision a dual role for teachers: they provide quality instruction to all learners in the current status quo even as they work to transform educational systems from within (Cochran-Smith, 2010). The most important component of a social justice teaching practice is the ability to teach diverse learners well (McDonald & Zeichner, 2010). This demands that aspiring teachers learn to implement research-based instructional practices and to study the impact of instruction on student learning in an ongoing fashion. As explained in chapter two, the Sheltered Immersion Observation Protocol (SIOP) was designed to guide planning, implementation, and evaluation of effective mainstream instruction for BLs (Echevarría, et al., 2008). Sequential SIOP components provide a checklist both for planning and evaluating content instruction for BLs (Echevarría, et al., 2008). Researchers suggest that teachers trained in scaffolding approaches like SIOP can engage BLs in rigorous content learning in mainstream settings (Echevarría, et al., 2008; Echevarría, Short & Powers, 2006; Walqui, 2006). Nonetheless, teaching is more than a technical matter or a “politically neutral activity” (Bartolomé, 1994, p.178; Cochran-Smith, 2010); faithful mastery of particular teaching techniques does not guarantee student learning. Teachers also must learn to critically examine instructional methods like SIOP, which are intended to increase access to rigorous academic content, to understand their actual impact on diverse learners. As Richert, Donahue, and
Laboskey (2010) noted in regard to teaching students of color, but also applicable to working with BLs:

In addition to explicit engagement with issues of race and racism, . . . teachers need to learn . . . pedagogical approaches that have resulted in high achievement for students of color, but not in a rote fashion. If new teachers are to employ these strategies appropriately, they must understand their philosophical, theoretical, and empirical justifications. (p. 645)

With a social justice practice, a teacher thinks critically about instructional methods and the learning needs of actual bilingual learners at their school within the broader political, social, and economic context of the current educational system (Bartolomé, 1994).

In line with this perspective, Cochran-Smith (2010) suggests that a social justice theory of teaching practice is multifaceted, also engaging teachers in reflective, interpretive, relational, and critical work within classrooms and schools. In brief, it’s not just about “what teachers do” but “how [they] think about their work (Cochran-Smith, p.454, emphasis in original). Accordingly, teachers claim roles beyond their pedagogical practice to work within school communities as advocates and researchers along with other key stakeholders including students, parents and families “as part of larger social movements for change” (p. 457). Describing the complex nature of a social justice teaching practice, Cochran-Smith and Fries (2011) concluded:

Teaching practice must be theorized as an amalgam of: knowledge; interpretive frameworks; teaching strategies, methods, and skills; and, advocacy with and
for students, parents, colleagues, and communities, all with the larger goal of improving students’ learning and enhancing their life chances. (p. 3).

In other words, teachers who enact a social justice practice play multiple roles in the school community within and beyond the classroom. Further, they seek to know their students both as individuals and members of social, cultural, socio-economic, and language groups. More specifically, teachers critically examine their role, the role of students, and the power dynamics of historically marginalized groups in schools (Martin & Van Gunten, 2002); in so doing, they recognize the influences of their own background and experiences on how they teach and understand their responsibilities and relationships to students (Sleeter, 2010). As part of her efforts to translate these theoretical premises into constructs that can be measured, Sleeter (2009) maintains that teachers who think complexly about instruction develop specific skills in the areas of “perspective-taking” and “self-reflexivity;” that is, they “actively seek multiple perspectives” and “view uncertainty as a tool for learning, monitoring, questioning, and evaluating practice and the ethical impact of work on students” (Sleeter, 2009, p.5). In addition to developing critical awareness of oneself and students, teachers who enact a social justice practice seek to empower students to take an engaged stance in their immediate community and beyond (Cochran-Smith, 2010; Freire, 2000). Neutrality is neither possible nor desirable in teaching or teacher education; these are inherently “political and ideological activities” (Cochran-Smith, 2010, p. 447).

How does one prepare for social justice teaching practice? Cochran-Smith (2010) identifies pre-service “[t]eacher preparation [as] a key interval in the process of learning to teach with the potential to be a site for educational change” (p. 447). Some
Researchers claim that social justice preparation can enhance a teacher’s aptitude and inclination to advocate for students and foster democratic engagement, so students learn to advocate for themselves (Cochran-Smith, 2010; Sleeter, 2010). Given the complexity of a social justice teaching practice, which includes instructional knowledge and skill, abilities to critically examine instruction, students, and oneself, and the wherewithal to assume an expanded role in the school community, we believe it is important to situate such practice in a developmental perspective (see Feiman-Nemser, 2001). As Villegas and Lucas (2002) explained with regard to culturally responsive pedagogy, an intrinsic component of a social justice teaching practice:

It would be unrealistic to expect teachers to develop the extensive and sophisticated pedagogical knowledge and skills of culturally responsive teachers during their pre-service preparation. Such knowledge and skills develop only with experience. It is realistic, however, to expect prospective teachers to come away from their pre-service teacher education programs with a vision of what culturally responsive teaching entails and an understanding of what culturally responsive teachers do. (p. 30)

New teachers can develop foundational understandings, knowledge, and skills during pre-service preparation that can be refined with time and experience (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). In addition, some researchers claim that the ability to think complexly is part of the development of reflective judgment within the larger context of adult maturation (Friedman & Schoen, 2009; Kitchner & King, 1990). We believe that there is a developmental nature in learning to teach (Bullough, 1989; Feiman-Nemser, 2001) and to think complexly about teaching (Sleeter, 2009), which can be launched and enhanced
during teacher preparation. Accordingly, with this study, we examined to what extent teachers’ abilities to plan SIOP instruction and to think complexly about such instruction progress in the context of teacher education coursework. We wondered whether a dynamic tension exists between mastering a systematic process for scaffolding instruction like SIOP and learning how to critically examine one’s teaching practice, and more specifically, how bilingual students and their teachers are positioned within the larger accountability culture of U.S. schools.

**Research Design**

Our study took place within a secondary bilingual methods course that is part of an optional Teaching English Language Learners (TELL) certificate program at Boston College, which also includes a course on second language acquisition and a state-mandated training on assessing comprehension and fluency in ELs. Consistent with the social justice orientation of the Lynch School at BC, TELL courses are intended to prepare mainstream teachers to work with BLs. As such, we sought to answer the following research question:

What is the influence of a methods course on teacher development of instructional strategies to teach bilingual students in mainstream settings and to think complexly about their role as educators?

In this study, developing instructional strategies to teach BLs in mainstream content courses signified mastery of how to create SIOP lesson plans, a required course component (Echevarría et al, 2008). To us, thinking complexly about the instruction of BLs involved two practices defined by Sleeter (2009) as perspective-taking and self-reflexivity. First, with “perspective-taking,” one recognizes there is no uniformly
correct way to teach, but rather multiple perspectives on what knowledge is and how knowledge is acquired, and second, with “self-reflexivity,” instead of seeking certainty, one “view[s] uncertainty as a tool for learning” (Sleeter, 2009, p. 5). To understand the extent to which the methods course influenced participants’ abilities to plan SIOP lessons and to think complexly about instruction, we drew on multiple data sources including class observations, surveys, and collection of class assignments.

Secondary Bilingual Methods Course

The secondary bilingual methods course is designed to promote awareness of research-based approaches to teaching bilingual students. Thirty-five to forty aspiring and practicing English language arts (ELA), history, math, science, and foreign language teachers typically enroll in the course. Specific methods that help BLs in grades 6-12 develop academic language and content concurrently in mainstream classes are modeled, practiced, and discussed. Students also explore contextual factors of schools and schooling that influence how bilingual students negotiate the middle or high school experience, such as the interrelated influences of language and culture on learning. Class sessions typically consisted of an interactive PowerPoint presentation; experience with and reflection on particular teaching methods; and discussion of readings. Students were exposed to SIOP components through presentations, practice, readings, and videos. I also modeled how to create language objectives. Students practiced creating them and received feedback on their efforts multiple times throughout the course. The fact that participants in the study in the history methods course struggled to create language objectives suggested to me that students needed more guided practice in this area. In addition, students formed content interest groups,
in which they responded to readings selected to juxtapose alternate viewpoints and studied the language of their discipline. Through my experience with the history methods course study, I had learned content teachers benefit from some exposure to linguistics. So, students were guided in using SFL to analyze disciplinary texts and student writing in efforts to prepare them to identify and teach discipline-specific features of language.

Participants

Of 73 total students enrolled in the 2011 fall and summer sections of the course, 54 consented to participate in our study: 48 graduate students and 6 undergraduates. We selected four graduate students for more in-depth study from the fall 2011 course section when electronic journaling was added to increase the depth and frequency of student reflection. Four individuals were chosen to represent core content areas and a range of abilities and backgrounds but they shared one common characteristic. Each focus student appeared highly engaged in the course, so we felt we could learn the most from them about the complexity of their thinking and their progress toward developing skills to scaffold instruction for BLs (Sleeter, 2009). Table 4.1 provides basic information about each focus student.

Table 4.1: Focus Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evelina</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>White, female, monolingual from northeastern United</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 Pseudonyms were assigned to protect anonymity. Victoria also participated in my dissertation study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>White, female, monolingual from southern United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>White, bilingual (French-English) female from southeastern United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>Male of African ancestry who immigrated as a child from a Latin American country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our focus students ranged from 23 to 30 years of age. Three were white females and one, a man of color, perhaps reflecting a typical racial and gender balance in the female-dominated, predominantly white U.S. teaching force (Zumwalt & Craig, 2008). Their language-learning experience also varied; Victoria was a French-English bilingual; Becky and Gabriel both first spoke non-standard dialects of English, and Evelina was monolingual.

**Data Collection**

Overall, surveys and class assignments were used most extensively in our analysis. We administered surveys in the first class, mid-way through the semester, and in the final class. Surveys consisted of a series of open response questions, prompting participants to consider what they hoped to learn, what they were learning, and what they had learned regarding teaching BLs in secondary content classes. Class assignments included pre- and post course reflections, electronic journals in which participants responded to texts and one another four times over the course of the semester, and a culminating assignment in which students wrote a complete SIOP
lesson plan. Christina also observed class and took field notes several times when I taught the fall 2011 section of the course. (See Table 4.2.)

Table 4.2: Research Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Data Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>All 54 Students</td>
<td>Pre, Mid- and End of Semester</td>
<td>162 surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections</td>
<td>4 Students</td>
<td>6 times over the course of the semester: pre- reflection, 4 reading responses, and post-reflection</td>
<td>(4 students); 24 completed reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Assignments</td>
<td>4 Students</td>
<td>Evaluation of SIOP lesson plan. (4 students)</td>
<td>4 completed SIOPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Observations</td>
<td>33 Students</td>
<td>Four times over the course of the semester</td>
<td>4 sets of field notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We analyzed the pre-, mid-term, and post-surveys of all students in two sections of the bilingual methods course: my fall 2011 section and Christina’s summer 2011 session. Participants completed more assignments than those listed in Table 2, for instance, a choice was offered among inquiry projects such as a micro-ethnography of a school, case study of a BL, or SIOP lesson impact study. For consistency, we do not include them as data sources.

To summarize, we analyzed data in order to examine two explicit course goals: equipping content teachers with methods to teach BLs and fostering their ability to
think complexly about teaching BLs. Creating SIOP lesson plans is a required component of teacher preparation in the bilingual methods course, which is why I chose to use SIOP to analyze participants’ ability to scaffold instruction during my dissertation study. It was what they had been taught to do. Fostering teachers’ abilities to think complexly about instruction aligns with the social justice orientation of the teacher education program at BC.

Data Analysis

We analyzed two a priori themes derived from our research question: mastery of instructional strategies to teach bilingual students and development of the ability to think complexly about such instruction. We evaluated focus students’ abilities to plan instruction for BLs in SIOP lesson plans (Echevarria et al., 2008, see pp 228-9). Two dimensions of Sleeter’s (2009) rubric were used to assess participants’ thinking: perspective-taking and self-reflexity, which are adapted in Table 4.3 (see p. 5).

Table 4.3: Matrix for Evaluating the Complexity of Participant Thinking (adapted from Sleeter, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perspective Taking</th>
<th>Self-reflexivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>Assumes there is a correct body of knowledge and way to teach.</td>
<td>Strives for certainty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Willing to consider multiple ways of knowing and teaching.</td>
<td>Willing to acknowledge uncertainty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished</td>
<td>Actively seeks multiple</td>
<td>Views uncertainty as a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We rated participants’ thinking in journal entries (pre- and post- course reflections and electronic postings) according to three developmental levels identified by Sleeter (2009): novice, developing, and accomplished, as described in Table 4.3. We also coded surveys and reflections using constructivist grounded theory to identify themes during the analytical process (Charmaz, 2000). In other words, data was analyzed using both inductive and deductive reasoning. In line with this perspective, Lather (1986) observed:

Data must be allowed to generate propositions in a dialectical manner that permits use of a priori theoretical frameworks, but which keeps a particular framework from becoming the container into which the data must be poured (p. 266).

Consistent with Lather’s perspective on data analysis, multiple data sources were compared to explore a priori research themes and identify new themes that came from participants. Further, the validity of findings was enhanced by a consensual approach to data analysis in which all analytical decisions were made collaboratively (Hill, Thompson & Williams, 1997).

**Results**

We sought to ascertain the influence of one bilingual methods course on teacher development of instructional strategies to teach BLs in mainstream settings and to think complexly about such instruction. Our analysis also revealed three additional themes: content teachers as language teachers, the importance of getting to know students, and
teachers as change agents. Findings are briefly synthesized in five sections below according to these a priori and emergent themes.

Development of instructional strategies

Extensive analysis of surveys and reflections indicated that most students seemed to feel more prepared to scaffold instruction for BLs. Along these lines, one student noted, “I now feel even more comfortable to teach using effective strategies with … bilingual learners . . . after learning about the SIOP model.” Careful consideration of SIOP lesson plans, however, revealed a range in focus students’ abilities to plan meaningful instruction for BLs. Becky, an aspiring science teacher, met with me several times to plan her SIOP lesson and then revised the plan twice after the original submission. The resulting 21-page, single-spaced lesson was highly scripted and reflected painstaking attention to detail. Similarly, Evelina and Victoria incorporated key SIOP elements: precise language and content objectives, vocabulary instruction, opportunities for students to work in different configurations (e.g. whole group, small group, with partners, individually), usage of visuals, and multiple opportunities for students to express their thinking both orally and in writing in math and history lessons. Though less detailed than Becky’s lesson, these two students both received nearly perfect scores on the SIOP rubric without successive revisions. In contrast, Gabriel’s ELA lesson featured some SIOP elements but lacked sufficient detail to convey how various activities flowed. He identified content and language objectives, but it was unclear how objectives would be implemented. Although Gabriel showed the ability to think complexly about issues of teaching and learning (discussed below), he struggled with lesson planning. Even though students perceived they were
better prepared to teach BLs having been exposed to SIOP, their ability to create SIOP lessons varied.

“Every teacher is a language teacher”

Similar to findings in the history methods study, participants in this study expressed awareness of the need to teach language in content classes. As one noted, “I learned . . . that every teacher, no matter their content area, is a language teacher.” Likewise, Evelina also acknowledged a shift in her awareness of the importance of language in a mathematics classroom. “I’ve also developed a deeper appreciation for providing students with the opportunity to produce language in a mathematics classroom.” She sought to move beyond traditional math instruction characterized by “the teacher explaining information and the students listening, reading and taking notes, and then solving calculations-based problems.” Instead, she aimed to “increase language production” by “explicitly encouraging . . . students to engage in mathematical conversations with each other.” These encouraging results are discussed in more detail in the final chapter when I synthesize key findings across the two preliminary studies.

Thinking complexly about instruction

There was a range in how participants’ ability to think complexly progressed over the course of the semester. Most participants seemed to begin as novices “assum[ing] there is a body of ‘correct’ knowledge or attitudes to teach” and “striv[ing] for certainty” (Sleeter, 2009, p. 5). Over the course of the semester, however, many shifted towards a developing stance, characterized as being “willing to consider multiple . . . definitions of what is most worth knowing [and] ask what is most worth
teaching, and why” and “able to acknowledge how one’s . . . identity shapes perspective [and] uncertainty” (Sleeter, 2009, p. 5). For instance, throughout her electronic posts, Victoria, emphasized the importance of thinking critically about her eventual teaching practice. In response to a classmate, Victoria commented:

The danger in studying research is to accept it as a panacea—when, in fact, as strong critical thinkers (which we must be in order to be effective teachers), we should rage against the blind acceptance of any *one* [emphasis in the original] theory . . . We need to read these documents together and against each other in order to extract meaning relevant to our own practice.

This comment not only reflected Victoria’s ability to think complexly about her role as a teacher but also further demonstrates her tendency to emphasize the importance of practice. Even in the early weeks of class, Victoria asked deep questions such as, “Where do our responsibilities begin and end as educators if our students lives do not begin and end in our classrooms?” She continued with a critique of an overwhelming focus on methods in one reading:

The list of methods was useful insofar as it gets the discussion rolling, but without an explicit connection to students as individuals, I find myself growing frustrated with the onslaught of ‘method . . . method . . . method . . .’ Where is the human element?

To Victoria, teaching was about more than good strategies. Similarly, a critical thread ran through Gabriel’s electronic posts. For example, he made the following comment:

Teachers do need to realize that, with . . . schools, they are working within and against a system that reproduces what . . . society values and sees as norms. A
teacher’s ability to work outside [a] mentality that they themselves . . . have been brought up in and, maybe even held at one point, is fundamental to their success with the current needs of our [students].

Like Victoria, Gabriel seemed to “question how one’s own positionality, experiences, and point of view affect one’s work” (Sleeter, 2009, p. 5).

In contrast, Evelina, an aspiring math teacher, largely summarized course readings. In a discussion of a theory of voluntary and involuntary immigrants (Ogbu & Simons, 1998), she did, however, state, “such generalizations . . . may subconsciously seep into teachers’ thinking and affect their expectations for students. . . . Thus, teachers should get to know all . . . students individually and [not make assumptions] about individuals based on trends observed in the larger group” Of the focus students, Becky’s postings showed the least complexity. She worried about how students would perceive her and believed the provisions of NCLB would benefit BLs if teachers taught well, as expressed in the following: “In order for initiatives like NCLB to actually work, it is paramount that as a country we provide a more consistent curriculum to ELL students. Not only do these students all deserve to have qualified teachers, they also deserve to have a standard by which they are taught.” Still, Becky recognized “there is no ‘one size fits all’ strategy for teaching BLs. Each teacher has to discover what works best for them and for their class.” Though the depth of participants’ responses varied, online posts provided a forum for students to explore their thinking about complex issues as well as respond to the thinking of classmates. In his post-reflection, Gabriel wrote of the deep impact of the course on his perceptions of BLs:
I have served in various positions such as a counselor, a child care worker, a psychiatric attendant, youth advisor, case manager, student intervention specialist, and . . . as a teacher . . . . Yet, I have never served in a position that would have granted me such insight into the needs of ELLs the way . . . this course has.

At best, class readings, discussions, and assignments seemed to deepen the complexity of participants’ thinking about their teaching roles and student needs, and at the very least, provided a forum to showcase their thinking.

*Beyond methods: Getting to know students*

Though there was a range in the complexity of their thinking, participants generally recognized that teaching is more than implementing established instructional methods like SIOP. As one observed, “[T]his class . . . put faces on a too often intellectual issue. I learned specific methods for teaching ELLs, but I also got into the heads of ELLs.” Along similar lines, Evelina noted, “it is dangerous to rely too heavily on teaching methods as a ‘one size fits all’ approach to education . . . . As a teacher I will work hard to get to know my students and provide multiple modes of representation so . . . all students can access the material.” At the end of the semester, she continued, “I would like to have one-on-one conversations with ELLs to learn what works for them . . . which teaching methods they prefer, whether they like to work in groups or independently and any other concerns they have about the class.” For her, getting to know students was about learning what methods work best for individuals and differentiating instruction accordingly. Generally, participants became aware of the need “to teach the students, not the course” which was a promising development, but
we continued to wonder to what extent some students were able to think complexly about their own roles within the larger institution of schools.

*Teachers as Change Agents*

Some students expressed interest in acting as change agents. One participant remarked, “I wish to be an agent of change for all students, not just the ones who are most easily taught.” Another teacher thought more deeply about the high drop-out rate among Latino males in her school and what she might do about it: “Since January, I have lost three sophomore males, all Hispanic . . . I can’t let go of the fact that these boys are 15 years old and out in the world with barely a tenth-grade education.” She committed to identifying at-risk students earlier and contacting parents. Drawing from his own experiences as an immigrant, Gabriel noted:

Because of my background I feel that it is my responsibility to convey to my ELLs that they can succeed in an environment that . . . might . . . at first be foreign to them. Understanding . . . what they . . . go through . . . it is my responsibility to encourage and support them while finding the most effective way to reach and teach them.

The fact that some participants aimed to advocate for students is encouraging, since connections with supportive teachers can play a pivotal role in the academic success of adolescent BLs (Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008).

*Discussion*

We sought to determine the influence of one methods course on teacher development of instructional strategies to teach bilingual students in mainstream settings and to think critically about their instructional practice. In sum, participants felt
an increased sense of preparedness to plan instruction for bilingual learners in mainstream content classes though their actual skill in creating SIOP lesson plans varied. Aspiring and practicing content teachers embraced roles as language teachers, and many showed increasing ability to think complexly about their teaching. Some even claimed expanded roles as advocates for students, which is significant since teaching practice aimed at promoting social justice presumes that teachers take on multiple roles within the school community as learners, teachers, researchers, and advocates (Cochan-Smith, 2010).

Our analysis also prompted us to consider the complexity of teaching (and teacher preparation) in a more nuanced fashion. The ability to think complexly does not necessarily translate into being an effective lesson planner and vice versa. Becky, for example, mastered SIOP lesson planning, but we wondered if her attention to painstaking detail and desire to get it right precluded complex thinking. She assumed there was a “right way” to teach, which is compatible with Sleeter’s characterization of “novice” in perspective taking, in that students see “... a body of ‘correct’ knowledge or attitudes to teach” and “strive for certainty” (Sleeter, 2009, p. 5). Evelina also developed strong SIOP planning skills but thinking complexly for her was more about differentiating instruction for individual students as a form of “best” practice. Gabriel thought complexly but struggled with lesson planning. His case, in particular, shows that teaching requires substantial knowledge and a repertoire of skills, fundamental among them the ability to plan and implement lessons. Of this small focal group, only Victoria showed dual abilities to develop a detailed, comprehensive SIOP lesson plan and to think complexly as she questioned the readings, her classmates, and her own
presumptions throughout the course. We wonder whether people develop different propensities at different times. We believe pre-service preparation is a key interval in learning how to develop a repertoire of instructional strategies and a nuanced view of the role of teachers and students in order to teach for social justice (Cochran-Smith, 2010).

We also recognized the limitations of using constructs like checklists and rubrics to examine teaching practice and the complexity of teacher thinking. They provide tools to assess learning in particular categories, namely creating language objectives, taking perspectives, and being self-reflexive, which we believe are integral to effective teaching practice for BLs (really, for any students) but fail to capture learning in a holistic manner. In addition, we wondered whether a foundational skill like lesson planning should take precedence in methods course instruction and novice teacher practice. Ideally, lesson implementation could become a data source for subsequent lesson planning and further inquiry into teaching practice such that teaching and thinking complexly about teaching become recursive, integrated, and habitual (McQuillan, Welch, Barnatt, 2012). Moreover, we questioned how successfully one course can prepare secondary content teachers both to work with BLs and learn how to critically view the roles of teachers and BLs in mainstream public school settings. Learning to teach BLs is an ongoing process, which must be reinforced in multiple contexts, as I discuss in the seventh chapter. We took an inquiry stance toward our practice as teacher educators in efforts to better meet the learning needs of our current

---

21 Given these findings for Victoria, I was particularly interested in seeing how she would draw upon her experience in the bilingual methods course while student teaching during my dissertation study.
and future students with the hope that they would better meet the needs of their own eventual students.

*How this study influenced my dissertation*

There were two primary ways in which this study influenced my dissertation. I developed a more nuanced view of how learning to teach BLs develops during coursework experiences. In addition, given my experiences both teaching participants how to create SIOP lesson plans and studying the results of their (and my) efforts, I wanted to see to what extent student and novice teachers would use SIOP features to scaffold instruction in their classroom teaching. This study also provided some evidence about the influence of a designated bilingual methods course on preparing secondary content teachers to work with BLs. Similar to the study in the history methods course, participants in this investigation exhibited increased confidence in their ability to plan instruction and embraced roles as language teachers.

My experience engaging in two collaborative studies of the influence of coursework on preparing content teachers to work with BLs helped shape the design of my dissertation study in several key ways. First and foremost, I wanted to know what happened when aspiring content teachers, who completed pre-service coursework intended to prepare them to work with BLs, entered the classroom. Therefore, for my dissertation study, I followed students who took the history methods class and the secondary bilingual methods class into their early teaching experiences. Because of my longstanding interest in the potential social justice role of social studies education, I chose to observe only history or social studies teachers (Rugg, 1930). Based on the results of both preliminary studies and the vision of student learning that guides the
current study, I decided to focus on the extent to which study participants scaffolded instruction and taught the language of history as they went “from coursework to the classroom.”
The importance of scaffolding instruction to provide equitable access to history content instruction has been well documented (Echevarria, et al., 2008; Zwiers, 2006). By providing scaffolds, content teachers enrich BLs’ abilities to engage in rigorous content and language instruction (Gibbons, 2009; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). In addition, researchers recommend that content teachers teach language demands of oral and written discourse (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Teaching students language skills associated with history can equip them with literacy skills that support academic achievement and engaged citizenship (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012, forthcoming). For these reasons, I examined how student teachers and novice history teachers scaffolded instruction and taught the language of history to BLs. My extensive analysis revealed that all three student teachers employed numerous scaffolds from their pre-service coursework while student teaching. However, even though participants had completed two courses intended to prepare them to scaffold instruction for BLs and teach the language of history to BLs, their ability to choose scaffolds that adequately prepared students for the actual cognitive and linguistic demands of activities in their history lessons was inconsistent. In brief, for Susanna and Victoria, who were teaching high school students, a discrepancy existed between what they identified as the language demand of planned lessons and what students had to do with language to fulfill instructional tasks. The scaffolds Olivia used with middle school students aligned with the language demands of the activities, which may be explained in part by the fact that her cooperating teacher (CT) provided consistent, visible support and her younger
students experienced more structured activities that did not require that they produce extended text. Throughout this chapter, I argue that student teachers are still developing the capacity to scaffold instruction and to identify language skills needed in the history lessons they plan.

I present how Susana, Victoria, and Olivia scaffolded instruction and taught language by commenting on relevant portions of six lessons (two for each participant), culling and synthesizing data from observation videos, field notes, interviews, lesson plans and teaching materials to support my analysis. The Sheltered Immersion Observation Protocol (SIOP) was used to evaluate to what extent participants scaffolded instruction, since they studied SIOP and used it to create lessons as a culminating assignment in the secondary bilingual methods course. How participants created and implemented language objectives—the focus of pre-practicum training, pre-service coursework, and a required element of practicum lesson plans— is seen in this study as indicative of participants’ ability to identify the language demand of the history lessons they teach. When a discrepancy exists between what participants identified as the language demand of their lessons and the actual language demand, I explain it by drawing from a functional linguistic description of the purposes and typical language features of key genres of secondary school history (Coffin, 1997, 2006).

The focus of this chapter is on how student teachers scaffolded history instruction and taught language. Nonetheless, teaching is complex and especially so for new teachers (as indicated in Susana’s comment introducing the next section). How you understand history seems to influence how you teach it (Barton & Levstik, 2004). So, I
aim to recognize distinguishing features of each teacher’s efforts, her students, and context by presenting them in both a nuanced and systematic fashion. In so doing, first I recount lessons; next I identify SIOP features, and finally, I discuss the language demand of lessons. In brief, Susana aimed to provide BLs in her tenth grade U.S. history course access to history content; Victoria intended to foster her students’ ability to take alternate perspectives in her ninth grade humanities course; Olivia targeted instructional objectives and strategy instruction in concert with her cooperating teacher in hopes of improving eighth graders’ abilities to analyze artifacts and texts. Although participants employed varied instructional scaffolds, when scaffolds did not align with what students had to do with language in the lesson, students seemed unable to complete classroom activities. Student teachers’ ability to choose appropriate scaffolding—scaffolding that fits the lesson—seems to have everything to do with it, as Susana explains below.

Susana—Tenth-grade world history student teacher

You know as a teacher . . . there [are] so many different things you need to keep in mind as you’re teaching, as you’re presenting things, as you are giving them handouts. How does it lead out? Is it too much text? Is it too little text? [M]odeling it for them. So, it’s . . . keeping in mind all these things in a toolbox. And [so] now it’s like I’m pulling from there . . . I’m trying to see what fits for my class at this time while . . . not overwhelming them by just doing . . . what I’ve learned, but doing it because it’s a purpose for the lesson and it fits . . . the lesson (Susana, post observation interview, 3.27.12).
The large stone building where Susana did her student teaching sits on a hill like a citadel overlooking a densely populated urban neighborhood. Susana—a slight Latina woman with long black hair—stood at the front of a cavernous, poorly lit classroom to introduce a lesson on World War II (WWII) to her 10th grade U.S. History class. Sounds reverberated off the hard walls as her gentle voice competed for the attention of twenty students seated in two concentric half circles facing the white board.

Susanna planned several components to the 90-minute lesson. First, students brainstormed what they knew about WWII prompted by an image of newspaper headlines announcing the war. Next, Susana used PPT to introduce WWII vocabulary words: “totalitarianism,” “communism,” and “fascism” with slides consisting of a definition, bullet point descriptors, and a visual. For instance, the “communism” slide showed the Soviet flag with its hammer and sickle. Susana also pointed out related words (such as “communist”), reminding students how affixes change the meaning of the words, something she presumably had done before, since when she asked what “ism” means, a student responded, “It’s a belief.” Another student asked if they should be writing this down. Susana replied, “Don’t write down everything, just what’s important.” At this point, several students raised their hands, and she told them, “Write down your questions;” a practice she later explained:

Sometimes their questions are because they need . . . extra help or sometimes questions [are] for distraction. So it's . . . “Oh, Miss why didn't you call on me?” . . . We have a history of . . . weird questions [so] I'll just tell them, “Write it down and I'll come back to you,” because . . . students . . . like to derail class. [They know] it's off-topic but . . . want
to ask it anyways. So [I] just try to . . . keep the pace. I want . . . to be able to cover the material I want to cover.

Next Susana modeled how to read and take notes from the textbook. She explained:

I was a horrible note-taker. So these are skills you need to practice when you're in high school. So I try to teach them [to take notes] like tabs looking through a file cabinet. “What am I going to know about ‘Lenin’ or ‘Treaty of Versailles’ or ‘totalitarianism’?”

To model note-taking, she stood at the board and asked a student to read the first paragraph. When none volunteered, she read it herself, then placed names, dates, and questions on the left-hand side of a T-chart on the board, and descriptions on the right. Afterwards, students were told to read and take notes independently. During this portion of class, Susana’s cooperating teacher (CT) redirected off-task students. Toward the end of class, students received a handout with a chart to synthesize their notes on Italy and the Soviet Union according to these categories: dictator in power, his ideology, and examples of terror tactics. The final class activity was the following exit ticket:

With the information you learned today about dictators and other ideologies, explain in 2-3 paragraphs why you believe these governments were successful. What were their characteristics? How were these characteristics important to convincing and governing a country and its people?

In the last few minutes of class, Susana reminded students to quiet down and remain seated; it was unclear what was written on exit tickets some handed her as they left.
There were several SIOP features in the lesson. The free-write activity at the beginning of class elicited prior knowledge about WWII. Susana used visuals, graphic organizers (GOs), and hand gestures to provide comprehensible input. She modeled how to take notes with a read/think aloud and provided written and oral directions for tasks. However, language and content objectives were not introduced; lesson components were not connected. For instance, students did not share their free-writes from the beginning of class, which prevented Susana from affirming prior knowledge, addressing misconceptions, or using students’ ideas as a springboard during subsequent instruction. Student participation occurred only in response to Susana’s questions during whole class instruction when students raised hands or called out answers. Classroom management issues persisted throughout class.

In terms of language demand, Susanna identified and taught key vocabulary words and related word forms she believed students needed to understand content. After the lesson, she described her language objective:

[U]se the vocabulary about World War II and demonstrate . . . understanding of these terms with the countries that used them . . . [D]emonstrate that they’ve processed the definitions for these key vocab terms and how [they] relate to these key countries that we're looking at.

In other words, Susana’s objective was for students to apply vocabulary terms, but she did not specify how students would do so. There was a gap between what Susana identified as her language objective and the actual language demand of the lesson. Susana expected students to read accounts of Mussolini’s government and Stalinist Russia in the textbook, identify significant names, dates, and terms, record them on a
GO, and then describe them. Next, they needed to write a brief account of Mussolini and Stalin’s “ideologies” and “terror tactics” based on their notes. Finally, they were given a writing assignment in which they needed to evaluate why the two governments were “successful.” In other words, they needed to be able to write an explanation with topic sentences and evidence to demonstrate a causal relationship between government characteristics and how “these characteristics [were] important to convincing and governing a country and its people.” There was an implicit logic to the sequence of tasks: presumably accounts written by students of Mussolini and Stalin’s ideologies and terror tactics could be used to write the explanation of the governments’ “successes;” however this logic was not made explicit for students. Although Susana identified a language objective related to applying vocabulary terms, in fact students were expected to independently write a multi-paragraph consequential explanation organized around a cause-effect relationship.

*Six weeks later*

Several activities were planned in Susana’s lesson on the Cold War, but lingering classroom management issues continued to interfere with full lesson implementation. First, Susana prompted students to analyze a cartoon image of “communism” depicting an octopus with Stalin’s head extending over the world map. She asked students to consider these questions in their journals:

What do you see? Why were these images chosen? For what kind of audience?

What is the purpose of this image? What is the message? What do you think this image is about? [She prompted them to write] “I think the octopus is blank.”
Afterwards, Susana asked students to compare what they wrote with two standard definitions of “communism” and “capitalism” written on the board. When she next explained that she was going to read a Dr. Seuss book, a male student responded, “Are you serious, Miss?” She asked students to take notes on a half sheet of paper she provided because afterwards, they would be asked to explain how the book was like the Cold War. Before she began reading, she said, “It was called the Cold War because there was no direct military involvement.” Students were quiet during the read aloud and clapped when the story ended. After the story, Susana prompted students to consider how the competition between the “Zooks” and “Yooks” to get the most weapons was similar to the arms race between the U.S and Soviet Union. Students were then told they would read an excerpt from a speech on either the Marshall Plan or the Truman Doctrine with a partner. Afterwards, they would present a summary to a pair responsible for the other reading. As Susana distributed handouts and responded to questions, student volume increased, so Susana paused and said:

Excuse me. Excuse me. Just to clear this up as I’m still passing these out, you are reading the document and you’re reading it with your partner. Excuse me.

I’m giving directions. You’re talking and it’s distracting.

In the time it took to distribute readings, students continued to engage in off-task behaviors, which persisted until the end of class.

There were several SIOP elements to this lesson. Susana used a cartoon image and children’s book to build background knowledge about communism and the Cold War. She reviewed definitions of key vocabulary terms and planned a jigsaw reading with partner and group components for students to share information. However, few
students completed summaries of their assigned reading; even fewer presented information to another group. None seemed to summarize their partner group’s information and create a picture as Susana had planned. She struggled with direction-giving and transitions between activities. In the large dark noisy classroom, she seemed a decidedly small presence.

One reason may be that Susana’s language objectives again did not align with the actual language demand of the lesson. For this lesson, Susana identified these language objectives: for students to analyze the cartoon image and react to the Dr. Seuss book by writing journal entries; discuss the Cold War using key vocabulary; and define key vocabulary such as “the Truman Doctrine” and “Marshall Plan.” The last two objectives—similar to those in the first observed lesson—focused on vocabulary application although much more was asked of students. Specifically, they needed to summarize a primary source document: an excerpt of a speech either by President Truman or his secretary of state, George Marshall. On the handout containing each speech, a range of questions were listed, from lower-order thinking questions like “What kind of aid did Europe need from the United States,” with the answer, “economic aid” provided in a sentence introducing Marshall’s speech to more challenging questions such as, “Why would the United States want to help Europe?” On an additional handout they were prompted to write a paragraph explaining the goals, importance, and connection to the Cold War of the Truman Doctrine or Marshall Plan. Finally, they were supposed to use their paragraph summary and a visual to teach another pair. In sum, the assignment required students to make causal links between policies and an historical episode to show that the policies were an outcome of
precipitating factors. To do so would require students to describe abstract nominal
groups (the Cold War, the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan), explain a causal
connection between them, and evaluate the importance of the policies in the context of
an episode in history. Essentially, the lesson did not adequately prepare students for the
cognitive and linguistic demands of the tasks.

Instead, Susana’s language objectives emphasized vocabulary. When asked
what her students needed to be able to do with language in her lesson, Susana’s
explanation suggested an implicit connection between history content, historical
thinking, and language demands that she had yet to make explicit for students:

- I tell them you need to be able to study history and understand it, because most
  of these events repeat themselves. So it’s . . . being able to take one event from
  one piece of history and being able to fully understand it and express it in . . . in
  your own words and then being able to later compare the two. . . . Down the
  road you’ll need to be able to use that prior knowledge . . . to understand . . .
  why communism [is] a bad thing during the Cold War . . . . Starting off with . . .
  a lecture format . . . giving them information, and then doing notes, there’s a
  purpose for that because it gives them . . . the knowledge of what is going on.
  “Why do I need to know this vocabulary word? How does this connect to this
  event?” So it’s just them being able to know the rationale for . . . why they are
  learning . . . the Truman Doctrine . . . the Marshall Plan, which I will want to go
  over tomorrow to make sure they understand it’s not separate from the Cold
  War, but it’s part of the Cold War. So . . . they just need to know the connection
to the literacy and language that they are learning, plays a part in the bigger picture of them understanding the different events in history. Susana believed scaffolding with vocabulary instruction, lectures, and guided note-taking would facilitate BLs’ ability to understand events in history and make connections between them. Like many history teachers, she seemed to feel pressed to cover significant swaths of historical content (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, forthcoming). As she explained following the first observation, “So [I] just try to . . . keep the pace. I want . . . to be able to cover the material I want to cover.”

History, according to this view, is a “thing . . . that [can be broken] up into significant segments” (Rose & Martin, 2012, p. 106) and covered. The emphasis is on moving students through episodes in history in chronological order based on the contention that learning about earlier time periods will equip students to understand later ones, though there is little research to support that premise (Hynd, 1999). In sum, Susana’s lessons demanded that students explain causal relationships between historical figures, policies, and events over time. However, the scaffolds that Susana implemented did not align with the cognitive and linguistic challenges associated with writing extended text in the form of an explanatory genre. A similar gap existed between how Victoria—the second pre-service teacher considered here—taught and what she expected ninth grade students to do independently with language.

Victoria—Ninth-grade humanities student teacher

Victoria—a young, poised white woman with dark hair—student taught in a small school within a five-story industrial brick building on a campus in an affluent neighborhood. Most students, whose race, language background, and socio-economic
status did not reflect that of the surrounding predominantly white community, were bused from various parts of Boston. The seventeen students, seated in tables of four or five in Victoria’s co-taught ninth grade humanities class, examined instances of “appreciation” and “criticism” from Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian and their lives. Before the lesson, Victoria mentioned they were studying how “individual and group identity . . . come into conflict, how to overcome adversity with activism, and the nature of schooling“ but these foci were not obvious in the lesson, which featured few SIOP elements. For one, a ‘do-now’ journal activity activated prior knowledge as students were asked to record definitions of “criticism” and “appreciation,” then describe how they feel when they are criticized or appreciated by someone. But, no explicit connection was made between the ‘do now’ and subsequent activity. Most of class, students took turns reading aloud from the “semi-autobiographical” account of an Indian teen (Alexie, 2007), which they seemed to enjoy, while Victoria interjected questions and impromptu vocabulary instruction, for instance when a student paused to decode a multisyllabic word like “segregation.” Near the end of class, students were asked to compare two characters, Penelope and Junior, according to specified categories (race/ethnicity, home life, how they cope with stress, and so on) by citing evidence from the novel and supplying a quote and its page number. For homework, students were supposed to draw a picture of Junior from Penelope’s perspective and briefly describe it or write a longer description of how Penelope would illustrate Junior.

Language demand during the lesson primarily drew on students’ receptive communication skills as they spent most of class listening to the read aloud and teacher.
Still, Victoria’s overall objective for the lesson implied a more active role for students: “Students will be able to manipulate the terms ‘appreciate’ and ‘criticize’ relative to Junior's words and drawings.” The vague nature of the objective conveyed by usage of the phrases, “manipulate the terms” and “relative to” suggests the difficulty she, like Susana, experienced in naming specific language skills she would teach during the lesson that would prepare students for what they would later need to do independently. Instead, Victoria’s language objectives described the activities in which she planned for students to engage:

In small groups, students will use the provided definitions of ‘appreciate’ and ‘criticism’ to complete a side-by-side character comparison chart of Junior and Penelope. Students will then discuss in a whole-group setting how this perspective might change if Penelope were to be the artist or chief commentator in Part-Time Indian.

However, these small group and whole class discussions did not take place; instead the read aloud occupied almost the entire class. Victoria later explained she was still trying to figure out “how much ‘reading time’ versus ‘activity time’ to give [students] every day.” Implementing her full plan as well as identifying and teaching the language demand associated with the plan challenged her. Similar to Susana’s lessons, students were given the most linguistically demanding activity to complete independently, and in this case, outside of class for homework instead of a practice activity that might prepare them to do a complex task with the teacher’s guidance in class. Specifically, students had to imagine how one character would draw another character and “provide vivid details and evidence” for their depiction. With this assignment, they had the
option of writing a half page and drawing Junior or writing a full page, but beyond the length of the written component of the assignment, the actual form the writing should take was not specified. As Victoria observed afterwards, “Making my language and learning objectives explicit to myself [and] my class. Those are . . . skills . . . I look forward to . . . learning to harness as time goes on.”

One month later

There were two parts to Victoria’s second lesson, a simulation meant to provide students with a personal connection to the Montgomery Bus Boycott and a read-aloud from Coretta Scott King’s autobiographical recount of it. These instructions for the first activity were posted on the board:

1. Sit down and do not speak with your neighbor.
2. Write one fact or detail about where you sit in the classroom.
3. If you have more than one sibling, stand up.

Victoria asked students to consider, “What If I told each and every one of you that has two siblings you have to stand in the back of the room for the rest of the year? What does it mean to be told you have to move over something you have no control over?”

A male student shouted, “Discrimination.”

Victoria replied: We’re going to talk about discrimination. I’ll explain why in a minute.”

She used this kinesthetic activity as a hook to engage students in reading an excerpt from Coretta Scott King’s memoir about the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Afterwards, for approximately forty minutes, the class took turns reading the memoir aloud, while—similar to the first lesson—Victoria interjected commentary and questions. A third
activity was planned but not implemented due to time constraints. Students were supposed to complete a chart matching facts with opinions from the reading. For homework, students were told to write a letter to Coretta Scott King as if they experienced the boycott. Victoria explained, “You’re standing up against discrimination and segregation. You’re putting yourself in their perspective.” She concluded class by asking if there were questions about what they read today. “What is the main point? What is the take away?” she continued. When no one responded, she said, “Is this because we were not paying attention or are we just feeling shy?” After calling on a couple of students by name, a girl responded, “about the boycott.”

There were several SIOP elements in the lesson intended to scaffold instruction. Objectives were posted on the board. Victoria gave directions orally and in writing. She used a simulation to introduce the concept of discrimination and prompted students to make a personal connection to an historical event. Victoria also annotated the excerpt from Scott King’s autobiography with marginal notes, comments, questions, and glossed vocabulary words. She provided a graphic organizer with two columns, one labeled “fact/evidence” and the other “opinion/claim,” each with an example from the reading for the class activity on distinguishing fact from opinion. However, most of class, similar to the first one, students listened to a teacher-directed read aloud, but seemed less engaged than with the Alexie novel. Victoria moved one off-task student to a new seat; another disrupted class by graphically discussing her need to go to the bathroom.

In addition, the language objectives that Victoria identified were not realized in the lesson:
Students will individually read and annotate Coretta Scott King's memoir and complete accompanying fact vs. opinion chart before discussing strategies for distinguishing between fact and opinion in whole-class conversation. Instead, students were provided with the annotated reading and the reading was done as a whole class. In other words, objectives, activities, and language demand in the lesson did not align. During the read aloud, students were asked to summarize the main idea of paragraphs and note usage of literary devices like similes and figurative language. Afterwards, there was insufficient time for students to distinguish fact from opinion on the chart or discuss strategies they used to do so. For homework, they were asked to write a letter to Scott King as if they had participated in the Montgomery Bus Boycott:

Write one (FULL) PAGE letter to Coretta Scott King about your experience with nonviolent protest and the struggle to avoid taking the bus. Use specific details to keep it interesting! (Emphasis in original)

Language features associated with writing an imaginative personal recount in letter-form from the perspective of an individual in history were not identified or taught during the lesson. Victoria did not address tenor, that is, how the audience for the letter, that is, the relationship between the letter writer and recipient, would affect language choice. In addition, Victoria’s exhortation that students “use specific details to keep it interesting!” suggests that students should characterize their experience in the boycott by modifying participants with adjectives and processes with adverbials; students might have received instruction, for instance, through modeling and then joint

22 As an extra credit assignment, students were given “questions to ponder” about the role of memoirs.
construction as to how to use such evaluative vocabulary to project voice in the letter and more specifically, reveal their stance with regard to discrimination.

Instead, read-alouds dominated most of Victoria’s two observed classes. Both texts under consideration were from the family of autobiographical genres (see Martin & Rose, 2008), which Victoria explained during the second post-observation interview:

So yesterday, . . . [I] introduced the new genre of memoir. And students are familiar with the term ‘genre.’ I guess I should make that clear. And so it’s on a semi-autobiographical text, The Absolutely True Diary of a Part Time Indian. [I]t’s kind of an interesting transition to make where we are moving out of this idea of personal experience into a new kind of writing about personal experience, memoir, which . . . as we talked about yesterday, the big difference there, we did a big genre comparison chart between non fiction . . . autobiography and memoir.

Laura: Um hm.

Victoria: But these things have some similarities in who is speaking, some similarities in what story is being told, and some similarities and some differences in how long they last. So with the understanding that genre is a concept, they understand a type of writing, a type of literature, a form of communication . . . This has then become another category they can place under that broad title “genre.”

Victoria recognized the importance of teaching students about genres as “a form of communication” in which a “story is told” and that there are “similarities and differences” among genres. Although she focused student attention on underlined
portions in Scott King’s memoir, she did not connect the close reading either to her objective for the lesson—to distinguish fact from opinion—or to demonstrate stages or language structures used in a personal recount. The close reading activity might have highlighted the linguistic features of the memoir to prepare students to write the required letter for homework.

In addition, both texts in Victoria’s classes focused on social justice matters: issues of race and poverty in the Alexie novel and the Civil Rights era in Scott King’s memoir. The latter reading, entitled “How can we CHANGE society?” had the following introduction:

Key idea-You don’t have to be rich or powerful to change society. In “Montgomery Boycott,” Coretta Scott King describes how a major triumph in the civil rights movement started when a seamstress refused to give up her seat on a bus. DISCUSS. Think of something you would like to change in your community (emphasis in the original).

However, the activist orientation of the Scott King reading, and the way in which this was realized in language choices in the memoir, was not addressed, nor was the idea of being a change agent applied to students’ lives during the observed class. In short, students were not taught how language use can reveal one’s opinions either in the reading or for the writing they were asked to do for homework.

Victoria instead engaged students in making a personal connection to a historical event (through the simulation that launched her second lesson), and perspective-taking: in the first lesson by having them describe Junior from Penelope’s perspective; and in the second, by asking students to write a letter as if they participated
in the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Her lessons emphasized “historical empathy,” the idea that students should “imagin[e] the thoughts and feelings of people from their perspective” (Barton & Levstik, 2004, p. 206). For the first assignment, the option of creating an illustration provided an extra-linguistic means for students to do so. Still, the assignment also required students to create a written response based on a complicated premise: an appraisal of one character from another character’s perspective “with vivid details about HOW Penelope would draw Junior and WHY she would draw him that way” (emphasis in original). Although a sentence starter was not provided, such an assignment might begin with the conditional construction, “If I were Penelope, I would….” Evaluative language (adjectives, adverbials) would need to be employed to realize “vivid detail,” and evidence from the novel cited and situated in an explanation supporting the appraisal. To assist them in doing so, Victoria suggested they consult their character comparison chart, but the chart was not completed in class. In a similar vein, students were required to put themselves in a historical figure’s shoes to complete the homework assignment following the second lesson. To do so, students needed to recount an event as if they had experienced it: orient the reader (Scott King, the imagined recipient in the letter assignment), recount the event, and then comment on it. They would need to use first person, past tense doing and sensing processes (action and thinking verbs), and time connectives (such as “yesterday”, “in the morning,” “later” and so on). Victoria’s intended instructional objective: to distinguish fact from opinion, which was not realized during class, did not align with writing an imaginative recount in letter-form. In sum, Victoria’s instruction did not scaffold the independent written activities she assigned to her students. Her suggestion that students use “vivid” or
“specific detail” in these assignments was not clarified with instruction regarding the language structures they would need to do so. While naming genres, Rose and Martin (2012) argue, is a first step toward providing students with knowledge of language needed in literacy instruction, additional steps were necessary to prepare students for the cognitive and linguistic demands of the independent tasks Victoria assigned.

Although Susana and Victoria planned SIOP features as instructional scaffolds for their high school students, class and time management issues interfered with full implementation of their lesson plans. In addition, their instructional objectives, activities, and the language demand of the activities did not align. More specifically, language demands associated with lesson tasks were not identified or taught. Even though assigned tasks required students to use language in sophisticated ways, these student teachers did not identify or teach language features students needed to complete them. Instead, their language objectives primarily focused on vocabulary. For instance, when asked what she drew upon in preparing lessons, Victoria said:

Vocabulary, vocabulary, vocabulary, vocabulary . . . . The first place . . . I’ve chosen to focus is vocabulary, working . . . on words . . . they’re unfamiliar with . . . to combat . . . lack of confidence when something unfamiliar faces them . . . . When we work with vocabulary . . . we know we have the skill to break down words and to break down meaning.

While Victoria’s emphasis on the importance of teaching discipline-specific content words is well-documented (Zwiers, 2008), students in her class and Susana’s were asked to do much more with language than demonstrate comprehension of key concepts linked to vocabulary terms. Teacher-directed, whole class activities occupied the
majority of both pre-service teachers’ instruction. Susana’s CT interceded to re-direct and reinforce activities while Victoria’s CT and the co-teacher from the SPED department played no discernible role in either of her lessons. In sum, students were expected to do more with language during independent portions of class and for homework than was identified, taught, or practiced during these student teachers’ lessons. Although Olivia also had some difficulty identifying the language structures students might need to complete tasks in her eighth grade social studies class, her teaching differed in dramatic ways. With visible support from her CT, the instructional scaffolds she implemented enabled students to complete independent and group activities.

*Olivia—Eighth-grade social studies teacher*

Olivia—a fair-skinned undergraduate with long blond hair—student taught eighth grade world history at a middle school in a modern building in a residential suburban neighborhood. Since the forty-five minute class in which the first observation took place was the last period of day, Olivia explained she had adapted her plan throughout successive iterations of the lesson. Only eight of ten students were present in the small inclusive class, which contained special needs students but no bilingual learners. An even number of boys and girls, six white and two African-American students, sat in rows facing a smart board. First, Olivia modeled how to infer the meaning of vocabulary words from context with a reading on the Manchus in China to prepare students to use the same strategy to define a few words with a partner. After each pair reported definitions of their assigned words, Olivia displayed a definition for the class to record. She explained that they were going over the words because they
would see them in the text they were about to read. There were two versions of the reading. A modified version had larger font, more space between the lines, and simplified vocabulary. Students received guided questions and a double entry journal to record two quotes from the text (something they found surprising/important) on the left hand side of a grid and to comment on the significance of the quotes on the right-hand side. As they quietly worked, Olivia consulted with individual students. Before class ended, Olivia asked each student to share one surprise from the text. She elaborated on what they said, asked them to summarize what they had learned, reminded them about their homework, and told them they would finish the reading and questions the next day.

Olivia’s lesson incorporated connected SIOP elements, including written and oral instructions, targeted vocabulary instruction, a modified reading, and a double-entry journal graphic organizer (GO). The activities flowed, perhaps due to the fact that the plan was tweaked throughout the day with the support of her CT. In this small class, all voices were heard. The jigsaw activity involved a peer scaffold and reduced the number of items for which individual students were responsible. This activity and the double-entry journal provided opportunities for students to rehearse before they were required to speak in the whole group, which is good practice for BLs (Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2008).

In addition, even though Olivia began the lesson with vocabulary instruction, her language objectives, which were as follows, ranged beyond vocabulary:

1. SWBAT define the terms “neglectful, inept, feeble, rampage, recourse, cult, resentment, subvert, monumental, wane, and withered” orally and in writing.
SWBAT read the article “Teenagers take the Throne: Manchu China” and identify at least two important/surprising facts and describe the significance of their text selections.

After reading the article “Teenagers take the Throne: Manchu China” and completing the “during reading” text rendering activity, students will be able to analyze the material and answer fifteen guided reading questions that help them develop a deeper understanding of the material.

In sum, Olivia’s language objectives described the activities students would complete and which communicative modes they would use to do so (e.g. reading, orally, and in writing). The first one just lacked the detail that students would need to infer the meaning of words from contextual cues in the reading, which can be difficult for BLs. With the second language objective, students were to identify a fact in the text, and although Olivia used the verb “describe its significance,” she likely meant “explain,” since they would need to say why they selected it. The third corresponded with a lengthy list of reading comprehension questions her CT contributed to the lesson.

Following the lesson, Olivia described the process she uses to create language objectives and why she finds them difficult:

I’m terrible at writing lesson objectives, so . . . there’s . . . a protocol on a certain page . . . I’ll actually refer to [in] the SIOP book . . . I think it’s just the general idea of . . . trying to figure out how language is infused. I also struggle with the detail, like how detailed my language objectives are supposed to be. I think mine are pretty detailed for today. Still, I think I might also have too many of them.
Olivia continued to use “the SIOP book,” a required text in the secondary bilingual methods course, to create language objectives (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2008). Her assessment that the challenge lies in “trying to figure out how language is infused” is accurate for her, Susana, and Victoria. Olivia also suggested student teachers need more consistent support to learn how to create language objectives. Regarding the role played by university supervisors in this process, she observed:

Most of our supervisors are barely out of . . . undergrad and may not actually have heard the word, “language objective.” So, they’re given a crash course on what a language objective is, less than what we’ve gotten, and then . . . guide us through the process of writing them. And I’ve gotten so many renditions of what a language objective is. . . . [A]t least two of . . . four of my supervisors had no idea what a language objective was. . . . [T]hey are . . . trying to tell me what it is and correcting my lesson plans. . . . So they are what has kind of thrown off my language objectives . . . I don’t really know what’s expected of me simply because I’ve had x y z all over the place. And also I took most of my methods courses two years ago, so . . . I refer back to all of my course materials, but . . . I . . . have been hearing . . . various things throughout my BC career. [I]t’s thrown me off path a little bit.

Olivia identifies several holes in her preparation to write language objectives; inconsistent messages, supervision by clinical faculty who received less training than she has to create them, and a time lapse between when she learned to create them and when she had to implement them. Indeed, Olivia does not mention in her language
objectives what students would need to do with language to complete them. Unlike Susana and Victoria, however, Olivia’s language objectives aligned with her instructional activities; there were no classroom management issues, and students completed all planned activities.

_A month later_

Twenty-one students, including several BLs, were seated in small groups clustered around posters of Renaissance paintings. There were two unrelated activities during the class. During the first, students rotated around the room and used a three-step process to analyze the paintings. Olivia prompted students by asking:

What can you infer from the picture? How is it related to the Renaissance?

Infer is more than literal. How does this tie into the Renaissance particularly?

Students spoke quietly but with some exuberance in their groups. One student remarked, “I’m doing art all day today. We’re studying impressionism in art.” Another student responded, “It looks like the Buddhist prayer wheel” to which a classmate replied, “or a wheel of cheese.” Then a girl in the group said, “Yo, back on topic.”

After half an hour they transitioned to the second activity, a fast-paced teacher-directed homework review, consisting of questions from a video about the Mughuls. Olivia spoke quickly using idiomatic language. Students responded to a combination of factual and higher order thinking (HOT) questions and were asked to explain their responses. For instance, Olivia asked one girl, “What do you mean by that?” She also sought broad participation by asking, “Who else said yes or no?” Olivia deferred to her CT in response to one student’s question. As the CT continued to explain an aspect of the

---

23 The second observation took place during a different class than the first with twice as many students.
film, Olivia distributed a homework assignment; students would do a reading on the Renaissance and complete one of three graphic organizers: Cornell notes (a T-chart with key words/phrases on the left and notes on the right), a Brain Frame (a concept web), or a Four Square (with elements written in quadrants: words you expect to see, questions you expect to be answered, important facts, and a summary). Examples of each graphic organizer were displayed on the smart board as Olivia explained the assignment. Immediately following student dismissal, Olivia asked her CT if this iteration of the lesson went better, and he commented on the pacing of her lesson, since she tends to speak quickly.

Similar to Olivia’s first lesson, there were several SIOP features in this one. Objectives were posted on the board:

SWBAT explain how Renaissance artists were influenced by the time period.

Language objective: SWBAT analyze famous art pieces from the Renaissance by first recording what they objectively see using short phrases and then inferring what the image means from these observations.

Students were guided to analyze a visual with a graphic organizer they had used previously. As Olivia explained:

Because we are a pretty text heavy class, we’ve been trying to do . . . a lot of art stuff and movies . . . recently which is good for them. [With] history, you just tend to get into the habit of doing more text-based stuff. So . . . giving them a
variation in . . . the material is, is a nice thing for . . . those who are better at
analysis [of other forms of representation] rather than just the reading of text.

In other words, with paintings or movies students could utilize analytical strategies that
were not text-dependent. In addition, the art analysis was scaffolded with a three-step
process involving observation (list people, objects, and activities in the painting),
inferencing, and then questioning. Students could choose which painting to analyze
and to do so in a group. The art analysis and reading comprehension questions featured
a variety of questions that encouraged HOT skills. Also, there were numerous student-
to-student and teacher-student interactions. Olivia encouraged students to elaborate on
their responses in this activity and the whole class review that followed it. The
homework assignment, with its choice among GOs, signaled frequent usage of learning
strategies, which along with clearly defined instructional objectives, were focal points
of Olivia’s practicum, as she explained:

[T]hey have the objective written at the top [of the homework reading]. So my
goal . . . my hope is that if I inform them of what I’m expecting of them before
[they] read, that’s going to help their comprehension level . . . Because a lot of
them are very obsessive about facts. [T]hey will write tons and tons of stuff, but
if you go back and say, “What are you talking about? What’s the main idea?”
They really struggle with that. . . . I’m hoping . . . this scaffolding of . . . putting
an objective at the top, varying the reading strategies like I’ve been doing, will .
. . get them to . . . break down the material better and that main idea. ‘Cornell
notes,’ ‘brain frame,’ and ‘four square’ are strategies that are very ELL . . . are
very focused on learners who have learning-based issues. So those are good
strategies to use, so I’m hoping that the implementation of that with this objective will somehow get them to focus while they do this analysis. They’ll more focus on what I want them to focus on.

Olivia hoped that by providing clear objectives and aligned instructional scaffolds, students would read with focused comprehension, and in her words: “break down the material better,” and instead of just writing “tons and tons of stuff,” identify the main idea. In fact, studying the influence of implementing learning objectives and reading strategies were the foci of her inquiry project, a required component of the practicum experience.

Unlike Susana and Victoria, Olivia’s language objective aligned with her instructional activities. For the art analysis done in the first part of class, she identified the following objective:

SWBAT analyze famous art pieces from the Renaissance by first recording what they objectively see using short phrases and then inferring what the image means from these observations.

Following the observation, her commentary on her language objective showed some evolution in her thinking regarding the language demand of the activity.

My language objective was, “Students will be able to take an image and . . . analyze it and put . . . in written form what they were seeing.” So . . . the first part would be they are able to objectively record using paraphrasing short phrases what they are visually seeing. And then the second language objective would be along the lines of taking what they objectively saw and then expressing that into inferences. So you know developing two to three sentences
based off . . . what they objectively saw. And then after they inferred and processed say, “How does this relate to the Renaissance?” So that would be along the lines of a second language objective I should have probably written. I think I wasn’t as detailed as I should have been. But actually now that I think about it I should have two separate language objectives based off . . . the objective part on top of the [handout], subjective on the bottom. We’ll go back to review it on Monday. Language objective would be, “Students will be able to orally express what they visually saw then . . . put down in written form in class in two to three cohesive sentences that fit into the conversation based on the study of the Renaissance.”

Engaging in conversation about language objectives immediately following the lesson seemed to push Olivia’s thinking and scaffold her ability to create them. She elaborated on her initial language objective by recognizing there were two (or three) discreet parts to the art analysis activity: the first required students to use short objective phrases to describe the painting; the second, for students to write sentences making inferences based on their descriptions, then connect their inferences to the Renaissance. However, the real language objective in this lesson would have been to be able to use adjectives to describe what they saw in the painting. She spontaneously created an additional language objective for the following class based on how students would share their analysis in a whole class discussion, but she still failed to see how language was used to execute her objectives. Nonetheless, a distinguishing characteristic of Olivia’s ability to scaffold instruction and teach language was continuous reflection on fine-tuning her practice.
This habit was encouraged and supported by a constructive, reciprocal relationship with her CT. In fact, he taught a reading strategy Olivia shared from her secondary bilingual methods course to high school history teachers during a professional development (PD) day. The focus of Olivia’s inquiry project on the influence of learning objectives and instructional scaffolds was related to the goal of the PD: “to model learning strategies and provide students the opportunity to use a strategy that corresponds with their strengths as learners.”

Her CT characterized their interactions during a post-observation interview:

[A]s a veteran teacher what I can pull and what we can do in forty-seven minutes? When we were co-planning . . . I said, “I really want to set you up with success” and so trying to help . . . plan . . . and psyching her up for success in terms of instruction . . . it’s all well designed but sometimes it’s too much . . . That . . . can accentuate some of the pacing stuff we’ve been working on, but she has a great knowledge-base and it’s been really great and really helpful and . . . she’s growing and . . . the management part is coming.

With a relationship based on trust, she sought feedback from her CT in an ongoing fashion, which seemed to support her ability to scaffold instruction and identify and teach language in her lessons. Unlike Susana and Victoria, Olivia student taught eighth graders in an inclusive world history class in a suburban middle school not high school students in an urban area. Her CT played a more visible role in planning, executing, and revising lessons, and student behaviors did not test her classroom management skills.

24 This goal appeared on the cover of the packet of strategies he prepared for the training session and shared with me.

25 Olivia’s cooperating teacher was always present during observations. It seemed natural when he joined the post-observation discussion, so I include his comments here. I do not refer to interviews with CTs in the methods section because this was not a planned interaction.
A brief synthesis

Throughout this chapter, my analysis revealed that all three student teachers planned significant scaffolding techniques into their lessons, but the scaffolds they planned did not always align with the cognitive and linguistic demands of assigned activities. In addition, they responded to the challenge of implementing lesson plans in a range of ways: Susana struggled to keep students on-task especially during pair and independent activities; Victoria doubted students’ abilities to read independently, so she spent most of class reading with them; Olivia consistently revised lesson plans with the support of her CT after she taught them (and likely in the process was developing skill to habitually reflect on and improve her teaching). All three identified and taught key vocabulary and used varied graphic organizers; Susana reminded students of word families and affixes that change a word’s part of speech and meaning (for instance, adding “ism” means belief whereas “ist” signifies a person); Victoria selected words that represented key concepts like “appreciation” and “criticism” and planned multiple ways for students to engage with them; Olivia used a jigsaw, peer interaction, and strategy instruction to teach vocabulary. Vocabulary instruction and utilizing graphic organizers played a prominent role in the repertoire these pre-service teachers drew upon to scaffold instruction for BLs in their history classes. In sum, usage of scaffolds— a significant component of SIOP (Echevarría, et al., 2008) and linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2011) taught during pre-service coursework— was a prominent feature in these student teachers’ practice. However, Susana and Victoria had difficulty choosing instructional scaffolds that supported the linguistic and cognitive demands of class activities, whereas Olivia was more
successful in this regard. Their experiences suggest that planning several SIOP features in each lesson is not sufficient; scaffolds must align with the language objectives and instructional activities in which students engage to promote thinking and language development characteristic of learning. To align objectives with instructional scaffolds and independent tasks, my analysis suggests that teachers need more than SIOP. In brief, they needed to be able to identify the language demands of activities they chose.

However, analyzing the linguistic demand of classroom tasks and texts challenged all three student teachers in varying degrees. Victoria and Susana assigned the most cognitively challenging and linguistically complex tasks to students to complete independently. Susana expected students to write explanations that demonstrated causal connections among dense nominal groups, such as The Cold War, The Truman Doctrine or The Marshall Plan. Victoria’s homework assignments seemed to aim for students to develop historical empathy (see Barton & Levstik, 2004), for instance, by writing an imaginative personal recount from the perspective of a historical figure. Neither student teacher identified or taught language-based skills that might prepare students to accomplish these purposes. In comparison, Olivia identified communicative modes, that is, whether students would read, write, or converse to accomplish her objectives and aligned language objectives with classroom activities. In a post-observation interview, Olivia continued to consider the language students needed to complete multiple steps in an art analysis activity from objective description with short phrases to inferencing in sentences connected to Renaissance themes. The trusting relationship she shared with her CT and the feedback she also sought in our interactions may be instructive in this regard. It suggests student teachers would benefit from on-
site coaching during their practicum experiences on how to assess the language demand of instructional activities. It is also important to note that Olivia’s eighth graders, unlike Susana and Victoria’s high school students, were given carefully structured activities with clear objectives and familiar instructional scaffolds that did not require the production of extended text beyond a few sentences. In brief, middle school students were more prepared for straightforward tasks. Overall, although the student teachers employed numerous instructional scaffolds, they were not prepared to identify and teach language in their lessons. This finding, what they might have been done to teach the language of the classroom tasks they planned, and how to prepare future history teachers to work with BLs are discussed in the final chapter. In the next one, I present what happened when novice history teachers taught history to BLs, and more specifically, to what extent they drew upon prior coursework to scaffold instruction and teach language.
Chapter 6: How Novice History Teachers Scaffolded Instruction and Taught the Language of History to Bilingual Learners

My analysis revealed that novice teachers with relatively greater classroom experience than the student teachers increasingly enacted knowledge, skills, and practices to which they had been exposed in pre-service coursework over the two consecutive school years when observations took place. They incorporated numerous instructional scaffolds into their history lessons that enabled BLs equitable access to rigorous content instruction. Unlike the student teachers, the scaffolds novice teachers chose prepared students to complete challenging independent activities. Nonetheless, novice teachers did not consistently identify and teach language demands of the history texts and tasks in their lessons. Similar to the student teachers, they seemed unequipped to teach BLs specific linguistic skills associated with telling a compelling story, explaining a series of events, or crafting a persuasive argument that could serve as a platform for individual advancement and engaged citizenship.

Participants are presented in chapters five and six in order from least to most classroom experience to highlight a developmental perspective on learning to teach (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). In this chapter, I present Cammie and Sarah—full-time teachers who experienced the same pre-service preparation as Susana, Victoria, and Olivia aimed at preparing them to teach history to bilingual learners (BLs). They were in their first and second years teaching in high schools in small cities north of Boston when observations began in February of 2012 and in their second and third years when observations concluded in November of the next school year. Following the same format as the last chapter, I analyze what happened as these novice history teachers
taught history to BLs during six lessons: three each. First, I recount lessons, then
highlight instructional scaffolds, and finally, characterize their efforts to identify and
teach the language of history.

Similar to the student teachers, how Sarah and Cammie taught history relates to
how they view history and the role of history education (Barton & Levstik, 2004).
Consistent with her commitment to urban education, Cammie (like Victoria) aimed to
teach social studies with a social justice orientation; more specifically, she hoped to
help recent immigrants in her history classes develop knowledge associated with
democratic citizenship. As Cammie explained:

I want my kids to become informed citizens in the United States . . . If not . . .
citizens at least informed. So, . . . that’s why I’m a big proponent of social
studies education for ELs. Even though it is so difficult with the reading and the
writing. [W]e can’t leave the past in the past. We have to bring it to the front.
We have to look at the contemporary.

In brief, Cammie recognized the challenges history poses for BLs, the importance of
civics education, and connecting study of the past to the present. Her focus on
contemporary issues in American history was most evident during the second and third
observed lessons on the then impending 2012 presidential election. Sarah— the most
experienced teacher in the sample—more than any other study participant, embraced
the ‘doing history’ approach promoted in her history methods course; along these lines,
she guided ninth grade students to analyze what they could learn about history from
varied sources. Like the student teachers, the ways in which Cammie and Sarah
designed instructional scaffolds and taught language were shaped both by the overall
orientation of their instruction, that is, how they understood history and the amount of 
teaching experience each possessed.

There are also some inherent differences in my presentation of Cammie and 
Sarah in this chapter due to distinctions between student and full-time teachers. Susana, 
Victoria, and Olivia were available for observations only during a ten-week practicum. 
In contrast, I observed Cammie and Sarah over two consecutive school years, which 
increased the likelihood of seeing changes in practice. In addition, as full-time 
teachers, Cammie and Sarah played a more definitive role in shaping the class 
environment and procedures than student teachers. In brief, during observations they 
taught their own classes and, thus, had more time and authority to establish 
relationships and routines with students. They also had control over physical 
characteristics of the classroom environment. What was posted on walls, how seats 
were configured, and so on provided additional evidence (beyond direct observations of 
instruction) of the extent to which these teachers focused on language when teaching 
BLs history.

My extensive analysis revealed promising findings: both novice history 
teachers, similar to the student teachers, employed numerous scaffolds from their pre-
service coursework. In addition, Cammie and Sarah taught literacy skills associated 
with history content. Moreover, unlike the student teachers, the scaffolds and language 
objectives they identified generally aligned with activities in their lessons. Cammie— 
presented from her first to second year in the classroom— demonstrated the most 
visible growth of the five research participants in her practice. The ways in which she 
taught the language of history seemed to be evolving from impromptu vocabulary and
grammar instruction toward more strategic instruction, for instance, following the final observation she sought approaches to support her students in presenting oral arguments based on evidence from a newspaper article. Throughout the observation period, Sarah used active reading strategies and structured group-work as part of a ‘doing history’ approach. Interviews revealed specific ways in which Sarah’s practice had grown from her first to third year of teaching; in each observed lesson, she skillfully scaffolded content instruction to engage linguistically diverse students in analyzing rich and varied sources. Yet she was less explicit about how she taught language in her mainstream history classes than Cammie, who exclusively taught recent immigrants in a sheltered English immersion (SEI) history class.

Cammie—First-second year SEI history teacher

The comprehensive high school where Cammie taught boasted a large Spanish-speaking population primarily from the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico as well as bilingual learners who spoke 26 other first languages (L1s). Along with a linguistically diverse population, the city has a rich history of bilingual education; a previous generation (some of whom worked as teachers or administrators in the schools) attended a French-English parochial school. Up until the passage of a ballot initiative in 2002 eliminating bilingual education in Massachusetts, bilingual (Spanish-English) education flourished in the city’s public schools with several K-12 second language (L2) program options including a dual immersion program that once served as a model for other communities. Cammie’s teaching role was shaped by this context;

---

26 Demographic information was available on the district website.
27 I worked in the city’s public schools in a grant-funded K-12 leadership position focused on L2 instruction for five years ending in 2002.
as an SEI\textsuperscript{28} history teacher within the high school ESL program, she had the most extensive interaction with BLs of the five research participants. The SEI history classes Cammie taught were exclusively attended by recent immigrants, who were still developing proficiency in academic English.\textsuperscript{29}

A red-haired young woman with a warm smile and encouraging demeanor, Cammie was mid-way through her first year as a full time teacher when observations began in her SEI U.S. history class with a lesson on westward expansion. Nine students were seated in rows facing the white board: eight Dominicans and one Vietnamese girl. First, students wrote about why the U.S. sought more land in the 1800s. Then, Cammie used PowerPoint (PPT) to present the concept “manifest destiny” while students took notes on a two-column graphic organizer (GO) in interactive notebooks: binders organized into sections with numbered pages for their work. Next, pairs conversed in Spanish and English to answer factual questions on a map worksheet about how the United States obtained additional territories to expand beyond the original thirteen colonies. As the class consulted a world map to review the worksheet, Johnny asked, “But England is so small. The U.S. is ten times bigger. How does a small country gain control of a big one?” Cammie explained that England had more money and power at that time in history. For the final class activity, students analyzed an illustration of the Trail of Tears from that night’s homework. The implicit logic connecting the sequence of activities was not made explicit to students nor were lesson objectives reviewed at

\textsuperscript{28} Sheltered immersion, consisting of specialized instruction primarily in English, became the program model for bilingual learners after the elimination of bilingual education in Massachusetts although few guidelines were available for how to implement such instruction.

\textsuperscript{29} She also co-taught a class rotating though the vocational program of culinary arts, electrical, wood shop, and automotive classes and sought advice about her negotiating her role within that program to support BLs.
the end of class, which ended abruptly. As Cammie observed afterwards:

I went through it faster than normal . . . Well, I don't know if . . . I went
through it faster than normal but I think I under-planned a . . . bit. I ended a little
early.

Nonetheless, numerous SIOP features appeared throughout the lesson. The
content and language objectives were posted on the board: “describe the reasons for
manifest destiny/westward expansion in the 1800s” and “create image-specific
questions using a Think, See, Wonder.” Prior knowledge was activated with the ‘do
now’ activity and picture analysis. Supplemental materials were employed: a modified
reading, maps, and PPT. Cammie spoke loudly and clearly using hand motions with
visuals and simplified language to provide comprehensible input. Scaffolding
techniques like the interactive notebook, note-taking GO, and image analysis protocol
seemed to be class routines. Varied question types were asked including higher order
thinking (HOT) ones, most notably, the one posed by Johnny, “How does a small
country gain control of a big one?” Students, with the exception of the Vietnamese girl,
had the opportunity to clarify concepts and teacher directions in their L1. However, the
activities were not linked nor were the lesson’s objectives synthesized or reviewed at
the end of class.

Lesson objectives aligned with activities in which students engaged but did not
specify how language would be used to complete them. For instance, the first objective
was, “Students will be able to (SWBAT) describe the reasons for manifest
destiny/westward expansion in the 1800s.” Accordingly, students responded to a
question regarding why the U.S. sought more land as a written “do now” activity, then
took notes on “the reasons for manifest destiny/westward expansion in the 1800s.”

During the interactive presentation that guided this activity, Cammie provided impromptu vocabulary and grammar instruction, for instance, when it became evident that students did not understand the word “purchase” from “the Louisiana Purchase.” In addition, she reviewed how to construct comparative adjectives, such as “small, smaller, smallest,” when a student said, “the most small” to describe a land acquisition.

For the picture analysis and its related language objective: “SWBAT create image-specific questions using a Think, See, Wonder,” Cammie prompted them to write, “Three things I see in this picture are…” Then, she used the class to model for them, “I see students, I see a white board, I see a projector.” She also told them to write a specific question about the picture not just, “What is this picture about?” For homework, Cammie asked students to complete the reading in which the Trail of Tears illustration appeared and find the main idea, which corresponded with the third language objective: “SWBAT apply their knowledge of text structure to identify the main idea of a paragraph.” After the lesson, Cammie explained that finding the main idea had been the focus of prior lessons. Essentially, she taught language as needed based on student performance during the lesson and modeled how to complete the first part of the picture analysis by suggesting students complete the sentence, “I see . . .” However, the more complex constructions used to create a specific question about the picture or to write the main idea of a paragraph were not reviewed during the lesson.

This first lesson demonstrated promising scaffolding practices and some attention to language, but these practices were not fully developed to support the integration of language and content learning in the lesson.
Four months later (early June)

The SEI U.S. History class concluded the school year with a unit on famous people in modern America. Only six students were present during the second observation: three Spanish-speakers and the Vietnamese girl. A white board at the back of the room displayed the unit’s essential question: “How do ordinary people become extraordinary leaders?” Underneath it, a word wall listed a combination of brick and mortar terms (Zwiers, 2006): “Abraham Lincoln, president, emancipate, Martin Luther King, Jr., Civil Rights Movement, Barack Obama, Mitt Romney, fact, opinion, sequence.” Prior to the observation, Cammie explained the class had just completed a research project culminating in student PPT presentations of famous contemporary Americans like Steve Jobs or Oprah Winfrey.

Ending the year [with] . . . contemporary American history . . . It’s fun. Kids like biographies. It’s a way for them to interact with the language . . . write and research and read and create a presentation . . . What do you do in elementary school? You write biographies. You learn about people, so . . . they can interact with the language instead of worrying about . . . “[Does] this argument have a quote and makes sense?” and all . . . that stuff you do in high school, right? So, still doing research and still creating a presentation but . . . it’s . . . lowering that affective filter.

Cammie sought to “lower [recent immigrants’] affective filters” and engage them in “interacting with language,” by having them teach classmates about inspiring contemporary Americans. She also channeled student interest in Barack Obama’s life.

---

30 Three seniors had graduated.
and the upcoming presidential election into a lesson on distinguishing fact from opinion.

Kids love Obama. They talk about him all the time. Every time I ask a question and it’s the wait time that never ends—no one is answering the question—Emanuel just yells out, “Obama!”

First, students defined the words “fact” and “opinion” and wrote examples of the words. Then, Cammie taught a mini-lesson on distinguishing facts from opinions with two sentences: “Your shirt is blue. Your shirt is beautiful.” Students correctly noted the first sentence was a fact, and the second, an opinion.

Cammie elaborated: “If you can provide evidence to prove it, then it becomes a fact” Johnny responded: “But if you’re good like Obama, you don’t have to prove it,” to which Cammie said, “Is that a fact or an opinion?”

The class responded chorally: “Opinion!”

Cammie used Johnny’s remarks to connect their discussion to the upcoming presidential election when, she explained, candidates Barack Obama and Mitt Romney would have to convince people to vote for them. Next, she asked students to write two facts about the election and the president, two opinions, and one question. On the board, she wrote: facts, opinions, and questions. Students worked individually then volunteers contributed examples of each category to the board. For instance, for facts, students noted: “He is black, He is president. He is married. He has two sons,”31 and after some discussion, revised this sentence to “daughters.” For an opinion, one student wrote, “In my opinion, he is a good president because he helps poor people.” Cammie

---

31 This seeming mistake in the gender of Obama’s children can be attributed to language “interference” since in Spanish the masculine word “hijos” can be used to describe sons and daughters.
circled the word, “good,” and wrote “best” above it, then asked what words in the sentence make it an opinion. Students responded “good.” Then, she told them usage of a descriptive word like an adjective makes it an opinion statement. Next they discussed the questions students listed on the board. One question a student shared: “What will he do for us?” became two questions: “Why should we vote for him? What will he do for us?” Cammie used the question-writing activity to transition to the next activity, a reading on Obama’s childhood. She asked: “What was life like for him as a child?” Students were told to form a circle to read about Obama’s personal and political life. She said, “Look at the first page,” and requested that a volunteer read it aloud. Students took turns reading while Cammie interspersed questions. For instance, after a passage about Obama’s childhood move to Indonesia, she asked how many of them had moved to a new place, and a student in this class of recent immigrants responded, “Everyone!” Afterwards, as partners answered reading comprehension questions, highlighted facts and opinions in the text, then sequenced events in Obama’s life, they spoke quietly in a mix of Spanish and English. Afterwards, Cammie clarified the first section of the reading was full of facts. The second, explained Obama’s views as a presidential candidate, and therefore, showcased opinions. For homework, students were assigned “one, clear paragraph summarizing what they learned about Obama today.” Cammie asked, “What do I mean by “clear.” One student said, “Organized,” and Cammie elaborated, “The paragraph must have a topic sentence that states the main idea.”

Cammie’s teaching during the second observation showed significant growth in her ability to scaffold instruction. Similar to the first lesson, there were numerous SIOP elements, but this time, successive activities connected and links were explicitly made
to past learning. In addition, the activities integrated all communicative modes: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Cammie elicited prior knowledge and built background information about facts, opinions, and President Obama. She provided comprehensible input with varied techniques: PPT, a graphic organizer, clear explanations of academic tasks, and the interactive notebooks. Also, key vocabulary was emphasized throughout the lesson. The circle format of the brief guided reading exercise (just two pages unlike Victoria’s lengthy read-alouds) appeared to be a class routine. Native language support facilitated comprehension as students consulted one another to find the right word in English or clarify a concept in Spanish throughout the class.

Similar to the first observation, Cammie’s language objectives aligned with class activities and her teaching showed unrehearsed attention to grammar. For instance, the Obama reading had two sections: a biographical recount of his life and an explanation of his viewpoints. Cammie hoped students would recognize that the first section was where they would find facts, and the second, opinions. Prior to reading, she mistakenly told students opinions statements can be identified by the fact that they contain adjectives when she circled the word, “good,” in the sentence “He is a good president,” and asked students what word in the sentence made it an opinion. She later explained her thinking about this unplanned aspect of the lesson.

The adjective makes it an opinion . . . Any time you’re describing something, usually it becomes an opinion . . . We talked about adjectives when we talked about the author’s purpose. What kind of words we use for persuading, informing, and entertaining . . . So we talked about what kind of loaded
describing words and adjectives we can use for propaganda [during a unit on the Civil War]. Well, I mean that’s . . . why I tried [pointing that out]. It wasn’t something I planned on because I didn’t know he was going to [use that example: “Obama is a good president”] when I wrote it on the board. But we’ve talked about how adjectives usually change the purpose or how or why we say something.

While Cammie understood that “loaded describing words” and “adjectives” are used in persuasive writing or even propaganda, she had not planned to point this out during her mini-lesson on distinguishing facts from opinions. In reality, the two examples she gave during the mini-lesson: “Your shirt is blue. Your shirt is beautiful,” contradicted her observation that adjectives signify an opinion. The sentence meant to exemplify a fact: “Your shirt is blue” contained the adjective “blue.” Cammie’s instinct to highlight the function of language features to distinguish fact from opinion needed further development. Students had some difficulty with this aspect of the lesson. The worksheet that accompanied the Obama reading contained three parts: reading comprehension questions, a section to record two facts and two opinions from the reading, and a sequencing activity. Immediately following the lesson, she reflected on what she might have done differently.

There were too many recall and not enough critical thinking [questions]. . . The next time I teach that lesson, I’m going to change the questions.

She continued:

So, if I were to change the lesson . . . I would change that part of it . . . I put the sequencing in there as a review . . . I would . . . make that a homework part,
so I can really focus on developing the skill we were looking at [distinguishing facts from opinions].

Cammie recognized the need to revise the lesson to promote more focused attention “to identifying fact and opinions in a text,” the skill targeted in her instructional objective. However, she did not have an immediate solution as to how to teach the language associated with that skill. Although Cammie recognized the importance of pointing out linguistic features to differentiate between fact and opinion statements, her impromptu effort to do so—pointing out the usage of adjectives—was misleading. (In the next chapter, I suggest what she might have done differently in the context of explaining a framework for teaching language associated with key genres of history.)

Nonetheless, Cammie also demonstrated the ability to proactively assess and teach language features associated with particular history genres. She understood that sequencing is a conceptual feature of biographies, which typically are organized chronologically. In an interview, Cammie explained how she approached teaching about the role of sequencing in biographies:

We did a whole lesson on sequencing and signal words and how stories can be sequenced in different ways. We talked a little bit about . . . flashbacks and things like that in stories [and] what their purpose [is]. . . .

She continued by explaining why she asked students to number events in Obama’s life:

Today was just . . . a review exercise. It was very short. There are some events without signal words, without dates, without those clues that they just had to sequence and put them in order 1 to 6.
Laura: [When you taught this before,] what did you give them as examples of signal words aside from the dates?

Cammie: First, then, second. All the number words. At the beginning, since, when, meanwhile. Some of them are transition words. Those kinds of words . . . that either showed progression of time, [or] happening at the same time.

Laura: And this was associated with the biography unit?

Cammie: We did do some of it with biography. We talked about it a couple of different times, which is why today was merely just, “Hey, we’re still remembering that sequencing exists!”

Cammie taught students organizational and linguistic features associated with biographies, for instance, sequencing and as she enumerated: “transition words, number words, words that showed progression of time” or “happening at the same time.”

Although it was not possible to observe how she did so, in interviews Cammie demonstrated some knowledge of language and a sense for how teaching language fit into her overall approach:

I focus more on not just structure of language and grammar of language, but also on main ideas and details and how arguments are put together . . . In the History Department, they . . . read from the textbook a lot. So knowing how to read a textbook . . . is important for . . . their success. So . . . my SEI class is . . . a reading skills class too. And I . . . focus on that a lot, like, “What’s the structure of the paragraph?” We did a lesson on structuring paragraphs . . . which you don’t
... always see ... in history classes. So moving beyond ... any sort of ... translation or “What does this mean?” “What does that brick word mean? What does this word mean?” But really [teaching] reading skills. So, those are ... the main purposes of my course.

Rather than teaching vocabulary or grammar in isolation, her intent was to link attention to language structures with helping students understand how to construct arguments with “main ideas” and “details.” In addition, she believed students needed to learn how to read textbooks in order to transition into mainstream history classes. She recognized the importance of, “moving beyond translation,” and “What does this word mean?” Teaching reading skills and writing structured paragraphs were main purposes of her course. As a first year teacher, however, Cammie was still developing the capacity to identify language features and approaches to teaching about language that would equip her students for content and literacy demands of secondary history.

_Mid fall (third observation the following school year)_

Thirteen students were present for a lesson on political parties and the upcoming presidential election: twelve native Spanish speakers, and one Haitian girl. These essential questions were posted on the wall: “What is Politics? What are my rights? How is the President elected?” A word wall listed the following brick and mortar terms (Zwiers, 2006): “Democrat, Republican, election, political party, Barack Obama, Mitt Romney, compare, contrast.” First, students answered factual questions in a geography packet. Next, students brainstormed information about the presidential candidates, which Cammie recorded on blank posters: one labeled “Democrats” with a picture of Barack Obama, and the other, “Republicans” with Mitt Romney. When Cammie
pointed at the picture of the Republican presidential candidate, a student shouted, “Romney,” and another student joked, “He’s my friend.” Then, they all laughed. Students also offered: “His first name is Mitt. He was governor of Massachusetts. He wants to be president,” and Cammie responded, “I’m surprised you know. You all always talk about him,” indicating Obama. Afterwards, Cammie showed a brief Youtube video with young students in school uniforms singing a song about voting with the refrain, “It’s your civic duty. Vote for somebody.” Then, Cammie led a brief discussion of civic responsibility:

Cammie: “Why did kids make this video? To remind you to do what?”

Students shout: “Vote!”

Cammie: “What’s your civic duty? What’s responsibility?”

A male student said: “Responsibilidad.”

Cammie: “Thank you Google translator!”

Then, they all laughed. Cammie explained it’s her responsibility to teach them American history, and asked, “What’s your responsibility?

One student replied, “Education.”

Others suggested: “To save money. Go to work. Prepare to go to college.”

Cammie responded: “What about taking care of a brother or sister? Are all of your responsibilities about school?”

Afterwards, Cammie modeled how to annotate a brief reading on political parties. Then she showed students how to complete a Venn diagram comparing and contrasting the Federalist and Anti-Federalists with information culled from the reading. When

32 Students could be heard singing this catchy refrain under their breath the rest of class. The song was set to the tune of the pop song, “Call Me Maybe.”
Cammie asked the purpose of a Venn diagram, Isaac explained: “a Venn diagram is to classify and organize information,” suggesting students were accustomed to using this type of GO. Then pairs compared the Republicans and Democrats on another Venn diagram and responded to the following prompt, “Would you say today’s Democratic Party is more like the Federalists or Anti-Federalists? Explain your answer.” While checking the work of a student who finished early, Cammie told him:

I like that you wrote, “They’re more like the Federalists because,” but I think you can have a better reason here [she pointed at the dependent clause after “because”] Do you get what I’m saying?

He nodded in reply.

A few minutes later she returned to him and said, “Can I see your new reason? Then, she gave him a high five and said, “Nice job.” Cammie told another student her answer was okay, but she could have a stronger argument as to why the Federalists and Democrats are different. Afterwards, while they were reviewing the Venn diagram comparing Democrats with Republicans, Abby—a recent immigrant from Haiti—said, “There’s nothing similar about the Democratic and Republican parties.”

Cammie responded: “They both care about freedom.”

Abby replied: “No, they don’t miss. Republicans are negative. They have nothing in common.”

Cammie said, “Obviously, you like the Democrats!” then she asked for information from the reading on the Republicans.

Abby blurted out, “They’re wicked!”

Cammie laughed and said, “Abby, you’re on another level.”
Then, Cammie continued, “They both want to make sure all countries have peace, freedom, and human rights, which is a good thing.”

Abby murmured: “No.”

After they finished reviewing the Venn diagram, Cammie asked Jonathan to share his comparison of the Democrats with the Federalists, and he read: “Democratic party is more like Federalists because they believe in a strong national government.”

“Excellent!” Cammie said in response. For homework, students were given sentences to complete with vocabulary words used throughout class, such as “Democratic Party,” “liberal,” and so on; the words were listed in a word bank alongside their definitions on the handout.

Observations revealed growth in Cammie’s ability to scaffold instruction for BLs from her first to second year as an SEI history teacher. Like Cammie’s previous lessons, numerous scaffolds were implemented in this one. Unlike the first observed lesson, however, most activities connected (except the geography ‘do now’ packet) and built on one another. Comprehensible input was facilitated with hand gestures, visuals (posters with pictures of presidential candidates), a video, graphic organizers, and repetition of key vocabulary like the brick words “Democrats” and “Republicans,” displayed on the word wall. In addition, a brainstorm activated prior knowledge and built background information about Democrats and Republicans. Using Venn diagrams to compare and contrast information appeared to be a class routine, since Isaac could clearly explain their purpose: “to classify and organize information.” Cammie modeled how to annotate a reading and reviewed how to complete a Venn diagram before asking students to do so with a partner. As before, native language and peer support occurred
throughout class. In sum, students were highly engaged throughout class as was most evident in Abby’s impassioned contributions to the discussion.

Similar to past observations, the language objectives: “SWBAT to list details from a reading passage,” and “SWBAT to categorize details from a reading passage into differences and similarities,” aligned with class activities. Students listed details from a reading passage to identify important information about political parties. Then, they categorized details from the passage to compare and contrast the Democratic and Republican parties. Essentially, students compared nominal groups by grouping their traits. Then, they wrote a comparative statement regarding whether the Democratic party was more like the Federalist or Anti-Federalist party with a brief explanation following the word “because” in the dependent clause of the sentence. Analyzing differences and similarities, comparing and contrasting events, individuals, or groups, establishes point of view, which is a building block in argumentation. Indeed, Cammie prompted Isaac to find a stronger argument as to why the Democrats were similar to the Federalists and write it in the dependent clause following “because.” A logical next step might be to articulate in a thesis statement why differences and similarities between political parties matter. In brief, Cammie appeared to be taking a preliminary step toward developing students’ abilities to create arguments, based on the rhetorical trope of comparison, although this instructional objective was not explicitly stated.

It seemed promising that Cammie wanted to foster students’ ability to create arguments based on evidence. For instance, following the third observation, Cammie held a Socratic seminar on the role of the Latino vote in the outcome of the 2012
presidential election. In preparation, students read a newspaper article, answered factual questions about the results of the Latino vote in Florida and nationally, and stated reasons for their opinions regarding the importance of the Latino vote. Prior to the Socratic seminar, they received these sentence starters:

- I think the Latino vote was important because…
- I do not think the Latino vote was important because…
- I agree with ______________________ because…
- I disagree with _______________________ because…

In Cammie’s assessment, all students—even those usually reluctant to participate—expressed opinions during the seminar. But, they had difficulty supporting their opinions with evidence from the newspaper article. In retrospect, she wondered whether the proficiency level of her students was adequate to engage in a Socratic seminar, which as Cammie observed, requires “reading, understanding perspective in reading, speaking, listening to each other, and then responding” (from email exchange). Also, she thought she might have chosen a more debatable topic: for instance, “How did ethnicity and gender influence the 2012 Presidential Election?” She planned to continue to support her students in developing oral and written arguments based on evidence.

Overall, as a relatively new teacher Cammie sought to build a repertoire of approaches to teach language, history, and connect with students’ lives. With the Socratic seminar and the lesson that prompted Abby’s appraisal of the Republican party, Cammie engaged recent immigrants in studying contemporary issues that captured their interest. She used essential questions to frame curriculum units (see Wiggins & McTighe for an explanation of essential

33 Cammie emailed me following the Socratic seminar to discuss what happened and seek advice about next steps in her instruction.
Her essential question, “What are my rights as a new citizen of the United States?” was particularly relevant given her students’ status and the upcoming election. Connecting curriculum content to student’s lives not only promotes engagement, it supports literacy development (Finn, 1999). Cammie understood that students are more likely to invest in arguing about something they care about; that is, engagement is a resource that can be channeled into learning literacy skills of argumentation. Yet, as a novice teacher, she was still developing the ability to identify language structures and develop lessons that would equip students to create oral and written arguments based on evidence.

Nonetheless, she exemplified many promising practices. Varied activities involved students in listening, speaking, reading, and writing during history lessons. In addition, the class environment and routines demonstrated systematic efforts to scaffold instruction: word walls, the interactive notebook (a model of which was available to students), consistent displays of the day’s agenda and instructional objectives, and usage of graphic organizers. Moreover, while Cammie encouraged students to practice English in class as she said, “to get better at it,” students frequently, and she occasionally spoke in Spanish. Native language support occurred among students to clarify concepts and directions. However, sole students who spoke low-incidence languages (Vietnamese, the first year, and Haitian-Creole, the second) were excluded from these conversations.

In terms of how Cammie addressed language demands in her lessons, she both improvised and taught about language issues proactively. Beyond simply naming genres as Victoria did, Cammie demonstrated some knowledge of language and language pedagogy associated with teaching history (Rose & Martin, 2012). For instance, she reported in an interview that she had taught students three purposes for
texts: to persuade, to inform, to entertain, as well as language functions associated with each text type. In addition, Cammie described how she taught about sequencing and signal words in biographies. Although it was not possible to observe these lessons, her discussion of them demonstrated some awareness of linguistic characteristics of historical discourse. In sum, she showed promising practices, including habitual reflection on her practice. She articulated and demonstrated a clear sense of purpose: to involve recent immigrants in relevant lessons to promote engaged citizenship, but she was still developing the knowledge and skills needed to integrate conceptual and language development in these lessons. From her first year to second year teaching BLs history, Cammie demonstrated the most visible growth of the five research participants. The promising SIOP features in her first lesson were not connected, whereas by the third observation eight months later, almost all lesson components met aligned objectives in a logical sequence to scaffold instruction. Her emerging ability to identify and teach language structures associated with genres of secondary history, as evidenced in her desire to prepare students to create oral and written argument based on evidence, could serve as a foundation for further development. She seemed ready for more in-depth focus on genres of history, their purposes, conceptual underpinnings, and typical language features as a means to equip her students with literacy skills in history—an approach that will be outlined in the final chapter (Coffin, 1997, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008).

Perceived changes in Cammie’s practice may be attributed to several interrelated explanations. Cammie consistently reflected on her practice in efforts to fine-tune it, and, like Sarah (as will be evident in the next section), had a strong rapport
with her students. Like Victoria, Cammie had committed to teaching in an urban context, and within this broader commitment, to work exclusively with BLs in a comprehensive high school in a culturally and linguistically diverse city. Also, a developmental window may exist from the first to second-year teaching when a teacher’s motivations, commitments, and pre-service preparation begin to gel into more coherent instructional practice (Grossman et al., 2001). On a related note, Sarah mentioned that she often struggled with classroom management as a first-year teacher; yet there were no visible classroom management issues during any observations of her second and third years as a history teacher.

Sarah—Second-third year teacher mainstream ninth-grade history teacher

The small city northwest of Boston, where Sarah was employed after completing her graduate degree, contained an increasingly linguistically diverse student population. Sarah taught in a large brick building on a high school campus set back from a busy road. The school’s ELL department served BLs who spoke Spanish, Portuguese, and Haitian-Creole, as well as numerous additional low-incidence languages. Sarah taught within the mainstream history department, so BLs in her classes officially had transitioned out of the ELL program though some were still developing proficiency in academic English. A woman in her late twenties with long dark hair, sparkling dark eyes, and a loud clear voice, Sarah had significant “border-crossing” experiences having lived, studied, and traveled abroad (Bartolomé, 2002, p.179).

34 Demographic information about the town and school are available on their websites.
Sarah’s teaching practice showed the influence of her pre-service preparation. For instance, Sarah emphasized ‘doing history;’ her ninth graders analyzed multiple sources, including Hollywood films, a painting, Shakespeare, a New Yorker article, and an excerpt of Machiavelli’s *The Prince* to assess what they could learn about history from them (Hynd, 1999). Another distinguishing characteristic of her teaching practice was frequent usage of structured group-work in which students analyzed complex texts, as she explained:

> [When] it’s a difficult reading . . . I think they need more than a couple of brains to pick it out . . . For a tough reading I feel like one person says, “I think it’s this.” And then [another] might say “This.” . . . With verbose stuff, . . . I want a few brains . . . working at it . . . . And then I love to put in questions . . . they . . . have seen . . . before [like]: “Do you ever think it’s okay for leaders to lie to their people?” We talked about that when we talked about the Crusades . . . is it ever okay for a leader to be untruthful? I think that those [questions] promote discussion.

In other words, Sarah felt that consideration of recurring essential questions within structured small group discussions would facilitate understanding of difficult readings. In addition, she had a weekly ritual of posting student-generated word walls with “mortar” terms that she attributed to her pre-service preparation (Zwiers, 2006). An oral history project she adapted from a history methods course assignment and introduced her first year in the school during which students interviewed someone of another faith, became a grade-wide requirement. Sarah explained the importance of the project in setting the tone for her class:
You're a freshmen, this is stepping outside your shell. You have to talk to someone. We know that's a big deal. I tell the parents about it on parent night and it's good because it gets right at the heart of things. We talk a lot about diversity

. . . we're not judging. We just are learning because this is the world we live in and we need to have knowledge of everything around us. And then we can be educated and make decisions . . .

In sum, instructional approaches to which Sarah had been exposed during pre-service coursework were not only visible in her classroom, she seemed to be adapting them to meet the needs of students in her context and sharing them with others.

For the first observation, seventeen ninth graders, including five BLs, were seated in rows facing the whiteboard. The world history class began with a recap of the Republican presidential primary and the day’s agenda. Next, she directed students to actively read and answer questions from an adapted excerpt from the New Yorker on “the Sacking of Baghdad.” For instance, students put sentences like the following one from the article into their own words: “For the cities and cultivated places in the Mongols’ path, they were a natural disaster on the order of an asteroid collision.” Then, Sarah showed a map to explain they were concluding their study of the Age of Islam. To begin the next unit, students brainstormed what they already knew about the Middle Ages. During an interactive PowerPoint (PPT) presentation, Sarah explained several names for the Middle Ages: the Dark Ages, Medieval Times, and the Age of Faith, suggesting a good test question would be, “What name do you think best describes the Middle Ages and why?” Then, students watched a clip from the Hollywood movie, A
Knight’s Tale, and were asked to distinguish fact from “fluff” in the source. Sarah’s ‘doing history’ focus was evident in frequent reminders that students consider evidence from the film and texts and the nature of sources. Posters with the terms “Source,” “Contextualize,” and “Corroborate” also were displayed on the front wall.

Numerous SIOP features appeared in the lesson. Sarah activated prior knowledge, built background knowledge, and linked units of study. She emphasized multiple meanings of vocabulary like “sack” and “fluff” and incorporated supplemental materials and GOs. Comprehensible input was facilitated with visual aids, gestures, her loud, clear voice, an adapted reading, and the film clip. Students considered a range of literal, interpretive, and analytical questions, for instance: what could they learn about the Middle Ages from a Hollywood movie? Indeed, ‘doing history’ seemed to be a consistent approach. After the observation, Sarah explained she tells students:

When a policeman goes to investigate a case, he talks to lots of different people. He needs to get the full story, so he doesn’t just go hear one. He gets evidence. So, I show . . . he corroborates between them.

During the lesson, students answered higher-order thinking questions, sourcing the film and reading. Overall, Sarah’s lesson demonstrated skilful implementation of a logical sequence of scaffolded instruction.

Yet there was little attention to language beyond vocabulary. For language objectives, Sarah indicated that students would explain multiple meanings of words like “sack” and “fluff” and compare life in the Middle Ages to Roman times based on the film clip.35 However, active student participation in this lesson was limited, since all

---

35 Sarah revealed she had picked up Zwiers’ Building Academic Language, a required text in ED 346, in response to my request that she email her content and language objectives in advance of the lesson.
activities were teacher-led. Instead, students read, took notes, and viewed a film clip. Following the lesson, Sarah explained her thinking regarding the role of active reading and note-taking in her class:

To me, read[ing] actively means pencil in hand, things are moving. And I [say], “As you read the article make brief notes in the margin about what happened in each paragraph. When you refer to the text, which you will, these notes will help you find what you need.” So, in the beginning, I . . . have this . . . note-taking sheet . . . straight from [university where Sarah prepared to teach].

Laura: Do you model how to do that?
Sarah: I spend . . . the first month modeling note taking . . . So, I created easy readings with obvious headings and it’s funny because last year I didn’t do this modeling of the note-taking until . . . half the way through the year, because I didn’t think of it, but now I did it the first week of school and . . . I made up this step by step note-taking sheet . . . I tell them how I want them to use headings. If it’s a really long heading maybe try to shorten it . . . They put the name and the date and they have to put a line and that’s what I call connections. This I got from . . . my literacy class . . . [Names professor]. We start . . . with text to self. “What connections do you have with this information? What text to another text? What to do with the world?” So, they don't get full credit on notes if they don't have the connections. And, I say if we don’t have connections, we're not actively reading, we're just note-taking and we're not thinking.

In the transition from her second to third year, Sarah recognized the need to teach students how to read and take notes at the beginning of the year and drew upon pre-
service literacy coursework to do so. In fact, the written directions for the adapted New Yorker reading on the Sacking of Baghad had the following admonition:

READ ACTIVELY. As you read the article, make brief notes in the margin about what happened in each paragraph. When you need to refer back to the text, which you will, these notes will help you find what you need. (Emphasis in the original)

In addition, the annotated text, which interspersed genre features of an historical account and explanation, had key concepts in bold-face, glossed vocabulary, and underlined portions that corresponded with particular questions. My observation revealed that students had in fact written notes in the margins of the reading. In sum, Sarah drew upon her pre-service preparation to provide students access to rich sources and engage them in actively reading (interpreting) them, but did not explicitly attend to issues of language in history during the first observation.

Second observation (May)

Only thirteen students were present for a lesson on the Renaissance.36 As a brief warm-up activity, students wrote down two aspects of a Raphael painting (displayed on a bulletin board) that represented Renaissance themes. As students shared responses, Sarah reminded them to take notes, suggesting, “It would be a good test question to analyze a painting and tell why it’s representative of the Renaissance.” Next, Sarah introduced Machiavelli and an adapted version of The Prince. She explained, “You are reading a primary source. It should be hard, but don’t let it stop you. College students read this in political science classes.” First she read the text aloud to them and modeled

---

36 There were several absences due to a band field trip.
how to paraphrase bold-faced portions of it. Then students were divided into three small groups with student facilitators, two of whom were BLs, to analyze the document. She explained how the groups would function, showed a poster with a visual representation of names, facilitators, and desk arrangements, asked if there were any questions, and said, “Can I get some head nods? Does everyone understand?” Finally, she told them, “Before anyone moves, show me you have the handout and a pen or pencil.” After scanning the room, she said, “O.K, moderators, get your groups going.” Although Sarah mentioned in her first year the day frequently ended in tears, no classroom management issues were visible in this or any other lesson. During the activity, she circulated, asking for students to interpret the reading and one another’s points of view. In the last five minutes of class, students returned to their seats. Sarah asked for someone to put Machiavelli’s view of human nature in their own words, and reminded them to think about the context “He’s sort of an angry man right now. Overall he thinks people are not so good, right?” Then, she asked for a summary of the reading, which Aura— one of the bilingual facilitators— provided. Sarah responded, “Good,” then restated Aura’s contribution. She told them, “We will have to discuss why Machiavelli thinks that.” She asked students to raise their hands if they agreed or disagreed with Machiavelli. As class concluded, she reminded them about their homework and an upcoming project deadline. They would finish the reading the following class.

Scaffolding features from the first lesson also appeared in this one. Sarah used hand motions, a loud clear voice, visuals (the Raphael painting and group-work diagram), an adapted reading, and peer scaffolding to provide comprehensible input.
Academic tasks were clearly explained; directions were given orally and in writing with time for student questions (unlike Susana’s class). Students were engaged in a well-paced lesson with ample opportunity for interaction. In introducing a complex text, Sarah first did a read and think-aloud. Group discussions led by BLs were a prominent lesson component. Moreover, group-work was punctuated with what Sarah called “discussion breaks” so that students would respond to HOT questions and all voices were heard. Finally, she assessed comprehension throughout class, in her words: “Can I get some head nods?” and used the last few moments of class to review key concepts of the lesson. In sum, Sarah used varied scaffolding approaches to engage students in a challenging activity rather than reducing the rigor of her instruction.

Sarah’s instructional objectives described key lesson concepts and the communicative modes in which students would engage with them. For instance, her content objective was “SWBAT distinguish and identify that there is a difference between a leader who is good and honest and a leader who appears to be good and honest.” The corresponding language objective was, as follows:

Through written summary, students will . . . exhibit understanding [of] how a prince should appear to be a good person, but does not need to actually have those qualities. Students will be able to orally state his/her opinion on this, write it, and listen for agreement or disagreement among the other students.

Students would listen, converse, and write an opinion summarizing Machiavelli’s view of human nature. Group-work served a process function; Sarah believed peer interaction would facilitate understanding of complex ideas. Indeed, Bunch (2006) has argued that small group discussion of original sources fosters BLs’ development of “the
language of ideas,” conversational language used to discuss issues (see 293-8). In addition, such discussions equip linguistically diverse students for the more formal demands of the “language of display,” used in oral presentations and written compositions. In fact, Sarah read the Bunch article as part of the ELL infusion in her history methods class (described in Chapter 4) and considered the role of interpersonal communication in developing academic language proficiency. Indeed, there were visible links between Sarah’s pre-service preparation and classroom practice related to integrating language and content instruction for BLs.

In terms of addressing the language demand in the lesson, Sarah did a read and think aloud, and modeled how to paraphrase complicated vocabulary and phrases by “putting them into basic words.” And, as noted, students engaged in structured group work. Nonetheless, Sarah did not identify or teach linguistic features associated with analyzing the central premise of the text “whether it is better to be loved than feared or feared than loved.” In short, students participated in a language-rich activity rather than meeting specified language objectives. What she might have done to teach language in this lesson will be explored further in the last chapter.

Third observation (November)

For a lesson on the role of ambition in Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar, twelve of twenty-four students were BLs, whose L1s included: Portuguese, Spanish, Haitian-Creole, Hindi, and Polish. The agenda on the board listed the following lesson components: warm-up, notes: Caesar in power, Marc Antony speech: groups, and class discussion. First students responded to the following prompt: “In what ways are you an ambitious person?” Afterwards, Sarah led a discussion of what students wrote, which
generally related to sports or academics. Then, she asked, “Anyone have an example of when you or someone else was too ambitious?” A student mentioned Lance Armstrong’s use of steroids, and Sarah responded:

His ambition grew too such an extent that it was no longer a good thing.

We’re going to be thinking about Julius Caesar today. Was he ambitious? Was he too ambitious? That’s what we’re going to be thinking about today.

Next, Sarah asked students to recall a definition of ambition recorded from a PPT.

So we’ve got what it means to be ambitious in mind . . . Roman times [are] perfect for drama. There’s violence, relationships, death. All that stuff. It’s been in movies and on stage for years. We’re going to take a look at one of Shakespeare’s works entitled Julius Caesar.

Then, she asked students to copy an additional slide with background information about Julius Caesar to set the stage for the lesson. They also briefly discussed students’ prior experiences with Shakespeare. As students viewed a handout with Marc Antony’s speech in the play, Sarah asked, “Why is Julius Caesar in italics?” and a girl responded: “It’s the name of the play.” Sarah continued: “We know what happens to Caesar in the end. Who can tell us?” And, another student replied: “He got stabbed and killed.” Next, she showed a black and white film clip with Marlon Bando delivering Marc Antony’s speech at Caesar’s funeral. Afterwards, she read directions from the handout. “You’re trying to digest this . . . Head nods if that makes sense. That’s why we’re going to do it in groups.” In their groups, students alternated reading aloud and when a girl noted, “They worded it really weirdly,” a boy replied: “It’s Shakespearean English.” Sarah
circulated among the groups asking questions like “What does that mean?” and encouraging them.

Sarah: “You’re doing well, guys. Keep going. You’re getting through it. He says, I offered him the crown how many times and what did he do?”

Student: “He turned it down.”

Sarah: “So Marc Antony is saying if [Julius Caesar] were ambitious what would he have done?”

Student: “He would have taken it.”

Sarah reiterates: “If he were ambitious he would have taken it. Right? Good.”

Before they finished, Sarah stopped them:

OK, Ladies and gentleman. Done or not, we’re going to get back into five rows of five and have a quick discussion. OK. Move.

The class briefly considered whether the evidence in Marc Antony’s speech implied that Julius Caesar was ambitious. Then, Sarah told students not to do the assigned homework, which would have been to write a journal entry as if they heard Marc Antony’s speech at Caesar’s funeral. Instead, they should finish responding to questions on the handout. As class ended, one girl asked, “What happened to Marc Antony?” and Sarah responded, “Just wait. We’ll find out. I’ll leave you on a cliff hanger.” Then she smiled and said, “Or, you can look in your textbook.”

As before, Sarah skillfully scaffolded instruction by incorporating a sequence of SIOP components to provide access to rigorous content instruction. Explicit links were made to students’ background experiences and past learning. In addition, Sarah built background information and provided comprehensible input through her PPT and by
showing a brief film clip of Marc Antony’s speech prior to asking students to read it. Academic tasks were carefully explained and a variety of techniques were used to make content concepts clear. Sarah checked for student comprehension by asking for “head nods” and by having students paraphrase excerpts of Shakespeare with peers. Text-based questions prompted students to use HOT skills as they interacted with one another and the teacher. Sarah also reviewed key lesson concepts at the end, (and unlike Susana or Victoria) determined that students were not sufficiently prepared for the homework, and adjusted accordingly, something she afterwards explained, she would not have done as a first- or even second-year teacher.

Sarah taught language during the lesson by having students work together to put Shakespeare into their own words, as indicated by her language objective: “SWBAT paraphrase selections from Marc Antony’s speech by working with classmates.” As before, peer conversations were structured to help students comprehend a complex text. There were two parts to the group-work: first, students paraphrased portions of the text, then they answered a series of questions regarding the motivations of Caesar, Marc Antony, and Brutus and the effect of repetition in the text. Following the lesson, Sarah planned for students to create a collection of fictitious primary source documents as exemplified by the postponed homework assignment:

Writing Assignment as a Plebeian at Caesar’s Funeral: You are a Roman plebeian who is loyal to the republic and . . . Caesar. You . . . just heard of Caesar’s death and came . . . to hear Marc Antony at the funeral. Caesar did a great deal for you in terms of reforms in the republic, but could Brutus be right about him? Write about your experience listening to Marc Antony. What do you
think? Do you fear the collapse of the republic? What do you think will become of Rome?

The assignment, which required students to create an imagined personal recount, corresponded with a second language objective, “SWBAT translate . . . historical information into a creative written work, which will not only . . . express content, but also feeling and opinion.” Sarah explained how she prepared students for the assignment, which was part of a mini-project on Rome’s transition from Republic to Empire during which students would “create primary sources from different perspectives.”

I usually give them examples, because they’ll be like, “What do you mean?” [I say] “Imagine you don’t have that much money. You have a big family. Caesar provided . . . changes that helped you out. You also love this idea of the Roman Republic, but here he’s been stabbed . . . . Think about how you feel about things in your own life when something happens.” And, we’ll come up with a few ideas. But, I’ll be like, “You can be creative. You can be the person that feels . . . upset, and . . . You wish that he had stayed alive. You don’t care about this Republic. You just wanted him to be in power. Or, you can be the person that sides with Brutus and says, “That was wrong. That’s not what Rome was about’…. Most of them latch onto the idea of getting creative. And, then I’ll tell them start with something like, “I just saw Marc Antony coming down the steps.” [I advise them to] Tell us what is happening to make it creative as opposed to saying, “I’m sad and I hope it all works out.” I normally tell them to tell the story to me back.
Sarah prompted students to make a personal connection to an historical event (similar to Victoria); she encouraged them to consider different perspectives and adopt one in their writing; further she advised them to “tell the story,” and to orient the reader: “I just saw Marc Antony coming down the stairs.” In other words, students were coached in how to write a personal recount from the perspective of a, “A Plebeian at Caesar’s funeral.” Sarah explained her decision to postpone the journal assignment, which would have been for homework. In her assessment, students did not demonstrate sufficient understanding of the text during the group-work and class discussion that followed. In addition, our post-observation conversation prompted her to reconsider how she would prepare students to write. She planned to show the film clip again and ask students to focus on the reaction of the audience to Marc Antony’s speech. Then, she would have them write the journal entry in class:

What I’ll do which sort of makes more sense. I’ll have them do this journal in class to be able to set it up and then walk around and make sure that they’re getting the idea, so sort of thinking about that right now, makes more sense for the first journal . . . .I’ll give them ten minutes to work on the journal. . . . I want the content to come full circle. It’s key that they’re going from a Republic to an Empire. I would just want to make sure that the main ideas are there, that they understand.

In other words, Sarah reflected on how she prepared her students to write the imagined journal entry and seemed to be fine-tuning her practice from one year to the next and also in response to the opportunity that discussing her practice afforded. For example, she also explained how her practice had evolved related to teaching students how to
write an analytical essay based on the aforementioned oral history assignment when students interviewed a person of another faith:

It’s a hard assignment … I [now] do an example of the essay. My first year, these did not come out well. My second year, I got here in the morning, and I was like, “I’m writing an essay!” I’m writing an essay about a fake person that I interviewed on Islam . . . And, I showed it to them. Because sometimes they’re like, “I don’t get it. What are you looking for?”

Sarah recognized the importance of discussing an exemplar text after her first year when essays “did not come out well.” She also described conferencing with students to help them identify interview themes for a thesis statement for their analytical essays. Interviews revealed that Sarah taught different genres of historical writing: fictitious personal recounts and analytical essays and that how she prepared students to write had evolved from her first year based on trial and error. Now, she sought to build content knowledge and context, used exemplars, provided guided practice, and conferenced with students.

To summarize, students in Sarah’s classes ‘did history,’ often working in groups to analyze what they could learn from rich and varied sources (Bunch, 2006; Hynd, 1999). She used varied scaffolds to provide explicit instructions and engage all students in rigorous content instruction. Sarah also incorporated principles of second language learning to which she had been exposed during pre-service coursework into classroom routines such as weekly word walls with student-selected “mortar” terms and structured group-work to foster conceptual and academic language development (Bunch, 2006).
Like Cammie, she seemed poised to look more deeply at the role of language in constructing particular genres of secondary history.

_A brief synthesis_

In this chapter, I analyzed to what extent novice teachers scaffolded instruction and identified and taught the language of history. As Cammie and Sarah gained teaching experience, they seemed increasingly skilled at choosing from a range of instructional scaffolds and implementing them to support history content instruction. How they taught, similar to the student teachers, appeared to reflect their level of teaching experience and what they deemed important in history education. In line with this perspective, Del Prete (2010) observed, “How a teacher understands content matters as much as what content is known” (p.22). Cammie (like Victoria) seemed motivated by social justice purposes in teaching social studies to linguistically diverse students. Sarah had students interpret what they could learn about history from varied sources and by working in groups. Both novice teachers employed numerous instructional scaffolds that prepared BLs to engage in content instruction. However, my analysis revealed inconsistent attention to teaching the language needed to develop literacy skills of history that might serve as a foundation for individual achievement and engaged citizenship. Therefore, in the next chapter, I present a framework for teaching the language of key history genres based, in part, on how language might have been taught during observed history lessons.
Chapter 7: Beyond Vocabulary: Identifying and Teaching the Language of History

Language is not a domain of human knowledge . . . language is the essential condition of knowing, the process by which experience becomes knowledge (Halliday, 1993, p. 94).

This study of teacher learning was guided by a social justice vision of student learning with two interdependent components: first, BLs should be provided equitable access to rigorous content instruction as a route to individual achievement (Echevarria, et al., 2008). Second, BLs should have ample opportunities to develop knowledge and linguistic skills of citizenship (Coffin, 1997; Levinson, 2005; Rugg, 1930) so they may act as change agents and work with others toward creating a more just world (Westheimer & Surtaam, 2010). Two themes were considered in this study as intrinsic to enacting this vision of student learning in history education: scaffolding instruction to promote equitable access to rigorous content learning and teaching the language demands of classroom tasks to promote disciplinary and critical literacies. Thus, the study was designed to examine the extent to which student teachers and novice history teachers draw upon pre-service preparation to scaffold instruction and teach the language of history to BLs in their teaching practice. Results suggest history teachers can be prepared to scaffold instruction through pre-service coursework and early teaching experiences to provide equitable access to history content instruction. As participants gained classroom experience, they increasingly implemented instructional scaffolds aligned with classroom activities to engage students in rigorous content instruction. This was most apparent when BLs in Sarah’s ninth grade world history class facilitated small group discussions of Machiavelli’s *The Prince*. Yet participants did not consistently teach language demands of history, so BLs might develop specific
linguistic skills such as telling a compelling story, explaining past events, or creating a persuasive argument that could serve as a foundation for academic achievement and engaged citizenship.

Consequently, in this final chapter, I propose two models intended to improve opportunities for BLs to learn language in history classrooms: one focused on teaching and the other on teacher preparation. I outline a framework for teaching BLs the language of history that draws from Coffin’s description of secondary history genres (1997; 2006) illustrated with vignettes from classroom observations. I also recommend a model to prepare teachers to simultaneously teach language and content specific to history but also applicable to other secondary content areas. In so doing, I suggest outcomes for phases of teacher development regarding learning how to teach BLs in secondary content classes by synthesizing key findings (from chapters four, five, and six) on pre-service coursework, student teaching, and full-time teaching, respectively. In addition, I show what types of scaffolds inexperienced content teachers adopt and how student teachers and novice teachers differ in their abilities to implement scaffolds by situating findings into a larger framework for linguistically responsive instruction (Lucas & Villegas, 2011).

Finally, I conclude with implications for teaching, teacher preparation, and research that would shift the focus to improving student learning opportunities. But first, in the next section, I highlight findings from three phases of teacher development: coursework experiences, student teaching, and full time teaching to show how history teachers in one teacher education program currently learn to teach BLs from “coursework to the classroom.”
A developmental perspective on learning to teach history to bilingual learners

This study supports a developmental perspective on learning to teach; that is, knowledge, skills, and practices of expert teachers are learned over time not innate (Bullough, 1989; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Grossman, et al., 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2001). Student and novice teachers, who completed targeted coursework in an education degree program with a longstanding commitment to preparing teachers to work with diverse learners, were not fully prepared to plan and implement history instruction for BLs when they entered the classroom and began teaching. Indeed, Bullough (1989) argues even well-prepared new teachers are unprepared for the complexities of teaching, and most enter a “survival stage” before beginning to master the craft of teaching “in a step-by-step fashion” (p.17). Along these lines, incremental differences were evident in participants as I presented findings from three phases of teacher development: taking coursework within a teacher education program (chapter 4), practicing as student teachers within the same program (chapter 5), then practicing as full-time novice history teachers (chapter 6) (see Figure 7.1).

Figure 7.1: Three Phases of Teacher Development

In this study, participants proceeded through three phases of teacher development: from coursework experiences to student teaching to full-time teaching. All participants took two courses intended to prepare them to teach history to BLs before student teaching
within a teacher education program. Two participants, Cammie and Sarah, also secured full-time positions teaching history to BLs after the program. In figure 7.2, key findings are synthesized to show outcomes for each phase of teacher development regarding the preparation of history teachers to work with BLs.

Figure 7.2: Outcomes of three phases of development of history teacher candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework Experiences</th>
<th>Student Teaching</th>
<th>Full-time Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Felt more prepared to teach BLs.</td>
<td>• Used instructional scaffolds.</td>
<td>• Used most instructional scaffolds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Embraced roles as language teachers.</td>
<td>• Created language objectives that described activities.</td>
<td>• Created language objectives that described activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporated scaffolds into lesson plans.</td>
<td>• Varied in ability to align scaffolds with thinking demands of activities.</td>
<td>• Aligned scaffolds with thinking demands of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrated range of abilities in creating language objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coursework experiences

Findings from two studies of the influence of coursework experiences on a larger cohort, which included participants in this investigation, were presented in chapter four. In brief, aspiring history teachers, who took coursework designed to prepare them to teach BLs, experienced an increased sense of preparedness to teach BLs and an enhanced commitment to teach language. These are promising findings,
since content teachers must recognize they too are language teachers and must integrate language and content instruction to meet the academic literacy needs of BLs (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2008; de Jong & Harper, 2005; Zwiers, 2008). The language of history became visible to teacher candidates in the history methods class, which is a necessary precursor to being able to identify and teach features of historical discourse (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). In both the history methods course and the secondary bilingual methods course, participants incorporated instructional scaffolds into lesson plan assignments, which is encouraging, since scaffolding is a component of effective instruction for BLs in mainstream content classes (Echevarría, et al., 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Zwiers, 2008). Nonetheless, participants in the history methods course struggled to create language objectives as part of a course with other important and compelling objectives (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). With modeling and supported practice throughout a designated bilingual methods course, participants demonstrated more skill in creating language objectives; still, the quality of SIOP lesson plans and language objectives varied (Schall-Leckrone & Pavlak, 2012). To summarize, history teacher candidates perceived they were more prepared to teach BLs, embraced roles as language teachers, and incorporated scaffolds into lesson plans. Even though they engaged in guided practice in which they analyzed the language of history texts and crafted language objectives in both courses, they did not independently identify linguistic demands in history lessons in their assignments. In addition, participants were exposed to approaches to meeting the needs of BLs within coursework they might not encounter in their student teaching settings. University supervisors and cooperating teachers had not received comparable training. Without a
cohesive, coordinated experience from pre-service coursework to early teaching, further developing inclinations, knowledge, and skills to which teacher candidates are exposed during teacher education becomes a matter of individual initiative.

**Student Teaching**

Student teachers incorporated numerous instructional scaffolds that were modeled during coursework into their lessons; however, their scaffolds did not consistently prepare students for the challenges of independent activities they assigned. With coaching from her cooperating teacher, Olivia implemented instructional scaffolds such as graphic organizers that enabled students to complete classroom tasks, habitually reflected on improving her teaching practice, and recognized the challenge of creating good language objectives. Olivia also provided insights as to why student teachers struggled with language objectives. In her experience, expectations regarding language objectives were inconsistent in the teacher education program. To complicate matters further, a significant amount of time had elapsed between when she took the methods courses and began her student teaching. As Schall-Leckrone and McQuillan (2012) observed, for teacher candidates to develop facility with teaching approaches like creating language objectives “learning [must be] reinforced in multiple contexts” (p.257). In sum, all three student teachers seemed to need additional support within the practicum setting to create language objectives and to select and implement scaffolds that would equip students to engage in rigorous content instruction.

**Full-time teaching**

Novice history teachers employed a wider range of instructional scaffolds than the student teachers during full-time teaching, and even more importantly, they began
to master the use of scaffolds; scaffolds they chose prepared students to complete independent classroom tasks. Nonetheless, like the student teachers, their language objectives generally described how students would communicate during activities rather than specific language structures they would teach and students would demonstrate as they executed content objectives. Cammie taught language in an improvised fashion during her lessons with recent immigrants, for instance, when students did not recognize the word “purchase” from the “Louisiana Purchase,” or when she incorrectly stated descriptive words like adjectives signify opinion statements in a lesson on differentiating facts from opinions. Sarah, the most experienced teacher of the research participants, engaged students in rigorous content instruction; she employed ‘doing history’ approaches in which BLs led structured group-work to analyze a variety of complex texts. She also could describe in concrete terms how her practice in preparing students to write different types of texts from fictional primary sources to analytical essays had evolved from her first to third year of teaching.

Overall, this study of history teacher candidates “from coursework to the classroom” suggests learning to teach history to BLs is a developmental process. Aspiring secondary content teachers felt more prepared to work with BLs, embraced roles as language teachers, and incorporated varied instructional scaffolds into their lesson plans as a result of pre-service coursework. As part of student teaching, Susana, Victoria, and Olivia incorporated numerous scaffolds into their teaching. During full-time teaching, Cammie and Sarah increasingly chose instructional scaffolds that aligned with lessons to engage BLs in rigorous content instruction. These findings support extant research that suggests a developmental window may exist from the first
to second year of teaching when pre-service preparation begins to gel into more coherent instructional practices (Grossman et al, 2001).

Research that demonstrates “becoming a teacher is a developmental process” (Bullough, 1989, p. 16) has important implications for teacher preparation. This study, in particular, suggests expectations for teacher learning regarding working with BLs might be aligned with phases of teacher development, such as pre-service coursework, student teaching, full time teaching and beyond. The following outcomes seem reasonable for teacher candidates who have participated in pre-service coursework aimed at preparing them to work with BLs in mainstream settings: experiencing an enhanced sense of preparedness, recognizing content teachers also serve as language teachers, and developing a basic repertoire of instructional scaffolds. However, student teachers needed more than a designated bilingual methods course and practicum experience to develop facility in creating language objectives. With a supportive mentor, student teachers can align instructional scaffolds with classroom tasks and develop the habitual inclination to reflect on their practice. Novice history teachers can independently align scaffolds with instruction, reflect on improving their practice, and identify and teach language in an improvised fashion. However, they too struggled with language objectives. (Later in the chapter, I propose what may be needed to equip history teachers to plan language objectives and teach language.) In sum, inclinations, knowledge, and skills associated with addressing the needs of BLs in secondary content classes must continue to be developed, supported, and refined over time.

In this study, certain preconditions and practices facilitated teacher learning during student teaching and full-time teaching experiences. These include habitual
reflection on improving instruction as demonstrated especially by Olivia, Cammie, and Sarah during post-observation interviews. Each seemed to benefit from dialogue and coaching on how to plan subsequent lessons. In addition, a supportive, reciprocal relationship with a job-embedded coach (like Olivia’s cooperating teacher) enabled a student teacher to work toward targeted student learning goals and reflect on her own growth as a teacher in the process. Developing skills and dispositions of a reflective practitioner—while critical to teacher learning—is insufficient, since BLs need “more than just good teaching” (De Jong & Harper, 2005). For this reason, this study examined to what extent novice history teachers scaffolded instruction and taught the language of history. None of the student and novice history teachers considered in this study consistently identified and taught language structures needed to complete literacy tasks in their history lessons. They seemed to more readily incorporate scaffolds into their instructional repertoire.

**How student and novice teachers scaffolded history instruction for bilingual learners**

The importance of scaffolding instruction for BLs to provide equitable access to rigorous content instruction in mainstream classrooms has been well documented (Echevarria, et al., 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Walqui, 2006; Zwiers, 2006). In this study, as participants gained classroom experience, they became increasingly accomplished at scaffolding history instruction for BLs. This promising trend was apparent when I situated how student teachers and novice history teachers scaffolded instruction into Lucas and Villegas’s larger framework (2011) for linguistically responsive instruction. In the framework, scaffolding is divided into four categories: using extra-linguistic supports; supplementing or modifying written texts;
supplementing or modifying oral language; and providing clear, explicit directions.

Each category consists of corresponding criteria that could be observed (or not) in participants’ teaching. For instance, using visual cues, graphic organizers, or hands-on techniques all are examples of extra linguistic supports. Table 7.1 shows both how individuals scaffolded instruction and trends in which scaffolds were employed.

Table 7.1: How Student and Novice History Teachers Scaffold Instruction for BLs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scaffolds</th>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>Novice History Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use Extra-Linguistic Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visual Cues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Graphic Organizers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hands-on Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alternative Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supplement/Modify Written Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Study guides/Vocabulary lists</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adapted text</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highlighted text</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annotated texts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Summary presentation of central ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supplement/Modify Oral Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimize use of idiomatic expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Native language support</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explain difficult words/ideas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide outline of lectures/lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Give examples</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in the table, there were several types of scaffolds that all participants adopted into their teaching practice. All five routinely used graphic organizers, annotated texts, and explained difficult words or ideas to students by teaching key vocabulary. In addition, four of five participants provided lesson outlines, used visual cues with students, highlighted features of text, and employed wait time. These practices seemed to be the type of scaffolds student teachers and novice history teachers could readily incorporate into their instructional repertoire. However, almost none used hands-on techniques (which likely are more common in secondary science than history), provided alternative assessments or native language support. Only Cammie permitted recent immigrants in her SEI classes to use Spanish to clarify concepts and directions even though Sarah was more fluent in Spanish. Sarah’s students greeted her in Spanish and she reported using Spanish on occasion, but native language support did not occur during any scheduled observations in her class or those of the student teachers. Context may explain why. Cammie’s students had the lowest levels of English proficiency.
proficiency of any observed in the study. In addition, legislation that restricted bilingual education in Massachusetts is frequently misinterpreted. Although native language support is allowed, in this “English-only” context, it is reasonable to surmise that many teachers, and inexperienced teachers especially, might be hesitant to provide or permit it.

Beyond scaffolding trends, the table also shows some differences between novice history teachers and student teachers. Cammie (16) and Sarah (13) employed more instructional scaffolds than Olivia (11), Susana (10), and Victoria (9). Indeed, Cammie—who exclusively taught BLs—used the most scaffolds. Not only did Cammie and Sarah use more scaffolds, but also their scaffolds consistently aligned with the objectives of instructional activities and prepared students to complete independent activities. As relatively more experienced teachers, they modeled what students needed to do before students engaged in group, pair, or independent activities unlike Susana and Victoria, who assigned the most cognitively and linguistically challenging activities as independent activities and for homework. Another way in which novice teachers distinguished themselves from student teachers was their skill in giving clear and explicit directions: overall, Susana, Victoria, and Olivia demonstrated fewer instructional scaffolds associated with direction-giving (3) than Sarah and Cammie (6), who engaged the following steps: listing procedures for task completion; including all details in oral and written directions; and asking students to paraphrase directions. Often immediately following her instruction delivery, Sarah would gauge understanding by asking, “Can I get some head nods?” It is encouraging to note that among this small sample, participants seemed more skilled at teaching, in general, and
scaffolding instruction for BLs, in particular, with support (as in Olivia’s experience) and over time (as Cammie and Sarah demonstrated during observations and explained in interviews). Aspects of pre-service preparation aimed at providing BLs with equitable access to content seemed to be embedded in proactive and coherent instructional practices as these teachers gained classroom experience. Nonetheless, even though participants demonstrated some attention to second language learning in a content classroom, they did not consistently identify and teach language demands of instructional tasks or texts during history lessons.

*Beyond vocabulary: Identifying and teaching the language of history*

Participants enacted some features of language teaching in a secondary history context. For instance, all five routinely taught vocabulary associated with key history concepts. As previously mentioned, when asked what she drew upon in preparing lessons, Victoria said, “Vocabulary, vocabulary, vocabulary, vocabulary.” She elaborated, “When we work with vocabulary . . . we know we have the skill to break down words and to break down meaning.” Her emphasis on the importance of teaching content-specific vocabulary terms to promote reading comprehension, has been recognized (Proctor, Uccelli, Dalton & Snow, 2009; Zwiers, 2008). In addition, Sarah demonstrated understanding that students need to acquire polysemous words that have different connotations in different subject areas such as “analyze” or “mean” and “mortar terms” that are used to create logical and cohesive extended text (Zwiers, 2008). Students in all her classes selected “mortar terms” for a rotating word wall display and weekly vocabulary quiz—a classroom routine she attributed to her pre-service preparation. Sarah also recognized peer interaction can serve as a scaffold to
develop academic language proficiency and content knowledge for BLs (Bunch, 2006; Lucas, Villegas & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Vygotsky, 1978). So, she frequently structured group activities in which ninth graders used active reading protocols she developed to analyze rich and varied sources including excerpts from Shakespeare, the New Yorker, and Machiavelli’s The Prince. As she explained: “[When] it’s a difficult reading... I think they need more than a couple of brains to pick it out.” Along these lines, Bunch (2006) maintains that guided small group discussion of complex texts fosters BLs’ development of “the language of ideas” and “the language of display” (see 293-8). That is, student interaction linked to authentic communicative and academic purposes can facilitate disciplinary literacy (Bunch, 2006; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2008). Although she did not explicitly teach language, Sarah did apply a “key principle of second language learning” to which she had been exposed in pre-service coursework in her teaching practice with BLs—peer interaction fosters social language, academic language, and conceptual development. (Lucas & Villegas, 2011, p. 57)

Beyond teaching vocabulary and providing ample opportunities for interaction (Verplaetse, 2008), content teachers also need to teach language demands of content-specific tasks to foster disciplinary reading, writing, and oral discourse skills (Schleppegrell, 2004). Indeed, Lucas and Villegas (2011) argue:

To promote language development as well as academic content and skills development, teachers of ELLs must be able to analyze the linguistic demands of oral and written discourse. (p. 62)
Nevertheless, among the student and novice history teachers I observed, typically language objectives focused on vocabulary or described how students would communicate during classroom activities. They did not embed “linguistic demands of oral and written discourse” into targeted objectives that would be taught, learned, and assessed as students engaged in instructional activities.

The five participants in this study were well-intentioned individuals and accomplished students who chose to complete degree programs in a teacher education with an explicit social justice mission to become classroom teachers. They fully satisfied requirements of two courses intended to prepare history teachers to work with BLs. Such coursework was developed within a program with a longstanding commitment to equipping teachers (and teacher educators) with knowledge, dispositions, and skills needed to work with bilingual learners (Costa, McPhail, Smith & Brisk, 2005). Chapter 4 describes the degree of specificity with which language objectives and language-based activities were modeled and practiced during targeted coursework experiences. Given all these factors, why did student and novice history teachers, who voluntarily participated in this study and were familiar with its objectives, fail to identify and teach the language demands of history texts and tasks?

Schall-Leckrone and McQuillan (2012) explained similar findings in a mixed methods study with a larger sample: student and novice history teachers feel pressed to cover vast geographies and time periods. On a related note, pre-service preparation may be a weak intervention compared to seat time as history students (Feiman-Nemser, 2001), since history teachers are socialized into a profession that largely sees its task as covering content (Barton & Levstik, 2004). In addition, some history teachers lack
understanding of the importance of teaching language, as Olivia admitted, “A lot of us don’t understand the point of [language objectives].” To complicate matters further, in her experience, expectations regarding language objectives during her practicum were “x, y, and z, all over the place.” One participant in the study in the history methods class suggested language analysis only could take place “in a perfect world.” He “would have to give up some aspect of learning history to teach students how to analyze language.” Understanding how to integrate language objectives and linguistic analysis into history instruction in effective, time efficient ways seemed beyond the purview of these prospective and novice history teachers.

When they encountered the complexity of classroom teaching, some student teachers entered “the survival stage” (Bullough, 1989). As Susana observed:

You know as a teacher . . . there [are] so many different things you need to keep in mind as you’re teaching, as you’re presenting things, as you are giving them handouts. How does it lead out? Is it too much text? Is it too little text? . . . I’m trying to see what fits for my class at this time while . . . not overwhelming them by just doing . . . what I’ve learned, but doing it because it’s a purpose for the lesson.

A soft-spoken, slight woman, she struggled to apply what she learned during pre-service preparation in her initial teaching experiences with a large group of tenth graders in a cavernous classroom in an inner-city high school. Class and time management issues interfered with Susana and Victoria’s abilities to implement lesson plans. In contrast, Olivia’s instructional practice as a student teacher was fully supported by her CT, but the focus of that support was on implementing instructional
scaffolds linked to graphic organizers not on teaching language. Learning how to analyze language demands of history tasks and texts, plan language objectives, and teach them as a student teacher seems unlikely unless you are guided in doing so while planning and teaching a real class.

In terms of the full-time teachers, Cammie, who worked exclusively with BLs as an SEI history teacher, did teach language but in an improvised, incomplete, and occasionally incorrect fashion, for instance when she told students that adjectives mark opinion statements. Even though as many as half of Sarah’s students were BLs and she incorporated important principles of language learning into her classroom practice, she did not explicitly teach language. Teachers seem to perceive that SEI classes are second language classes whereas mainstream content classes teach content when in fact both types of classes need to integrate academic content and language instruction to promote the development of advanced academic literacy skills for BLs. All five participants seemed to lack sufficient pedagogical and linguistic expertise to identify language demands of history texts and tasks and embed them into history lessons. On a related note, although linguists and researchers emphasize the need for content teachers to analyze and teach language demands of instructional activities, little guidance seems available for secondary history teachers, and particularly novice ones, to actually do so (De Oliveira, 2010; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008; Schleppegrell & De Oliveira, 2006). In essence, a gap seems to exist between theory and practice regarding teaching the language of history. Coffin (1997) described a continuum of key genres in secondary school history as a pathway through which learners progress as they develop linguistic resources, first to construct the past as a story and later as an argument (see p. 203).
Building on Coffin’s work, Martin and Rose (2008) added the notion that this pathway could serve as the basis for developing “a spiral curriculum” (see p.138-9); in brief, there are recognizable organizational features and recurrent language patterns that constitute secondary history genres, which can be identified, taught, and learned (Derewianka, 1990). Building upon extant theory and the results of this study, I propose a framework that translates genre-based description of historical discourse into instructional practices that can be adopted by novice and experienced history teachers.

A framework for identifying and teaching the language of history

The framework for teaching language demands in secondary history classrooms, proposed here, is intended to foster disciplinary literacy in history for BLs (and many other students). First, a word of caution: this heuristic is necessarily both contrived and incomplete. Although SFL genre theory provides a tool to categorize types of historical discourse into ways of knowing with important implications for pedagogy (Coffin, 1997, 2006; De Oliveira, 2011; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008; Martin, 2009; Martin & Rose, 2008; Schleppegrell, 2005), this framework is an artificial construct. Sanctioned texts like history textbooks mix genre types, for instance moving from narration to explanation within a passage (Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006). So do original historical sources and student essays. Pieces of historical writing can be assigned to particular genres based on evident linguistic features but genres do not exist in a pure form as they may subsume aspects of more than one genre (Martin & Rose, 2008). In addition, participants’ teaching did not exemplify all the genres listed in Coffin’s typology of secondary history (see Coffin, 1997, p. 203). Even if all genres (and
subgenres) had appeared in their teaching, space limitations would preclude elaboration and illustration of each one.

Therefore, in Table 7.2, I outline a framework for teaching three representative families of genres: narratives, explanations, and interpretations (arguments) for three fundamental reasons. Aspects of these genres appeared repeatedly in participants’ teaching and the texts they chose. In addition, these genres showcase key ways of conceptualizing the past (Coffin, 1997, 2006). Finally, for the framework to serve as a useful guide for history teachers, who are still developing pedagogical and linguistic expertise, it should be streamlined and adaptable to varied content foci, tasks, and texts. In developing this framework, I built upon work by Coffin (1997, 2006) and Martin and Rose (2008), who used SFL to describe genres of historical discourse, and Schleppegrell (2005) and Gibbons (2009), who emphasized the importance of teaching the purpose, organizational and linguistic features of genres as a means to scaffold academic literacy development for BLs.

Table 7.2: Framework for Teaching Key History Genres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genres</th>
<th>Purpose/Question it Answers</th>
<th>Classroom Example</th>
<th>Cognitive Scaffold</th>
<th>Linguistic Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Narrative genres | To retell events in a chronological sequence  
  *What happened?* | Write a letter to Coretta Scott King as if you participated in the Montgomery Bus Boycott | Timeline | Past tense  
Doing processes (action verbs)  
Specific and general participants (named individuals, groups, events)  
Reference to dates or periods of time |
| Explanation genres | To explain causes/consequences of an event  
  *Why did it happen?* | Explain the connection of the Truman Policy or Marshall Plan | Concept Web | Past tense  
General, abstract participants  
Dense nominal groups, nominalizations, |
Narrative, explanation, and interpretative (arguing) genres represent three ways historical knowledge is presented: to record, explain, advance (or contest) an interpretation of past events (Coffin, 2006). Textual representations of each genre can be identified by their overarching purpose, linguistic characteristics, and conceptual underpinnings and taught as part of genre pedagogy in secondary history classrooms (Coffin & Donohue, 2012). In SFL informed genre pedagogy, teachers model literacy strategies by showing students how language structures are used to construct and present knowledge associated with discipline-specific ways of knowing: genres (Rose & Martin, 2012). I added cognitive scaffolds to the framework for two significant reasons: student teachers and novice history teachers readily incorporated graphic organizers into their instructional repertoire. Also, graphic organizers provide an extra-linguistic means to clarify the thinking demands of key history genres, which is beneficial for BLs (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Therefore, in Table 7.2, I recommend cognitive scaffolds and linguistic features that align with each genre; for instance, students can be taught to use a timeline and past tense action verbs to retell events in a chronological sequence.
I explain the proposed model by using it to present what participants did and what they might have done to teach key history genres. Accordingly, examples from participants’ teaching are situated in the framework with specific teaching suggestions. Given the range of challenges new history teachers face, recommended strategies for teaching language should be realistic and feasible (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). Therefore, these teaching suggestions are intended to be brief and readily adopted by novice history teachers, who may feel pressed by content coverage and lack linguistic expertise (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012, forthcoming). Overall, I build on the results of this study to demonstrate that disciplinary ways of knowing and functional language associated with them can be made visible to novice history teachers and then taught to BLs through integrated reading and writing activities.

History as story: What happened?

The family of narrative genres—including autobiographical recounts, biographical recounts, and historical recounts—chronicle events from the past. Since history is packaged into significant time segments in this family of genres (Rose & Martin, 2012), a timeline can serve as a conceptual scaffold that enables students to organize key episodes over time. Linguistic features associated with narrative genres include usage of past tense doing process (action verbs), specific participants such as named individuals (Rosa Parks, Coretta Scott King), and general participants like groups (white bus drivers, black ministers) or events (the Montgomery Bus Boycott). References to dates or time periods connect sentences and clauses in narrative genres. Examples of narrative genres frequently appeared in participants’ teaching. For instance, Victoria’s students were asked to write a letter as if they had participated in
the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Sarah’s students were charged with writing a collection of fictitious “primary source” documents from the perspectives of individuals from different social stations during ancient Roman times. Cammie’s students chronicled the lives and significant contributions of famous contemporary Americans in PPT presentations. In addition, Cammie’s students had difficulty differentiating facts from opinions in a reading on President Obama’s life.

This lesson can serve as a vehicle for showing how language and thinking demands associated with narrative genres can be taught. During the guided reading portion of the lesson (described in chapter 6), students might have been prompted to notice how the Obama reading was organized. In brief, the first section listed events in President Obama’s life whereas the second section explained his viewpoints. Next, students could examine how linguistic features, and more specifically, “process types” in the two sections differed (see Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008, pp 45-7 for an explanation of process types). The first section—a biographical recount—was meant to provide students with a source for factual statements in Cammie’s lesson as in the following excerpt:

At the age of ten, Barack moved back to Honolulu to live with his grandparents…He graduated from high school in 1979. . . . Then he moved to New York City to attend Columbia University. . . . He studied political science and earned a college degree in 1983. (Emphasis added)

Close reading of this excerpt reveals the doing processes (or action verbs): “moved,” “graduated,” “moved,” “studied,” and “earned.” These doing processes mark factual statements each of which signified an action that Obama completed in the past.
Following close reading of the passage, students might be asked to do a hands-on activity in which strips of paper with *doing processes* were taken from an envelope and placed in order on a timeline leading to the presidency. After deconstructing and reconstructing a model text in this or a similar fashion, students could be guided to jointly and then independently create timelines and employ linguistic features of narratives (write sentences with time markers as connectors and action verbs in the past) to chronicle another historical (biographical or personal) event. (I take up analysis of the second section of the text, which contains Obama’s viewpoints, in my discussion of arguing genres below.) In summary, students may need to understand and control linguistic resources that construe what happened before they can explain why it did (Coffin, 2006; Martin & Rose, 2008).

*History as explanation: Why did it happen?*

The purpose of historical explanations is to explain why things happened as they did. History textbooks and teachers (like Susana) frequently present history as a series of causes and consequences (Fang & Schleppegrell, 2008). In exploring why things happened, Rose and Martin (2012) recommend that “causal links . . . be made explicit and abstractions and their causal relations . . . unpacked in terms . . . all students can understand” (p.195). However, the logic and linguistic features of explanations were not explicitly taught in participants’ lessons. Although Susana asked students to explain the connection among the ideologies, terror tactics, and “successes” of fascist governments, few students completed the assignment. In a subsequent lesson, she asked students to write a paragraph explaining the goals, importance, and connection of the Truman Doctrine or Marshall Plan to the Cold War, and again,
students engaged in off-task behaviors. The second assignment required students to make causal links between policies and an historical episode to show that the policies were an outcome of precipitating factors. To do so, students would need to describe abstract nominal groups (the Cold War, the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan), explain a causal connection between them, and evaluate the importance of the policies in the context of an episode in history, which they seemed unprepared to do. In addition, ninth graders in Sarah’s world history class read a complex text, an excerpt from a New Yorker article that explained the Mongols’ Sacking of Baghdad. As part of structured group-work, Sarah asked students to put loaded sentences like the following one into their own words, presumably to check comprehension:

For the cities and cultivated places in the Mongols’ path, they were a natural disaster on the order of an asteroid collision (emphasis added).

Instead, students might have been guided to consider how language functions in the sentence. Two dense and lengthy nominal groups: “the cities and cultivated places in the Mongols’ path” and “a natural disaster on the order of an asteroid collision” are placed in relation to one another and linked by the being process “were.” These dense noun phrases are embedded with plot elements: the building of highly civilized cultures and their devastation by invaders. Further, the author’s interpretation is construed within the evaluative language used in the noun groups as in “a natural disaster on the order of an asteroid collision,” which subsumes a great deal of background information not to mention judgment. Guided analysis of a single sentence such as this can reveal a “frequently exploited grammatical device for packing information into texts”: dense

---

37 A flow chart might be a useful graphic organizer to clarify the logic of this assignment.
nominal groups (Wong-Fillmore & Fillmore, 2012, p. 4). Further close reading of the article from which the sentence was extracted can demonstrate how the logic and language features of explanations can be taught.

Concept webs can be used to make causal links explicit. For instance, Sarah’s *New Yorker* excerpt spelled out multiple consequences resulting from the Mongols’ invasion of Baghdad, which could be embedded in a concept web (see Figure 7.3).

**Figure 7.3: Consequences of Mongols’ Invasion of Baghdad**

After completing a concept web, students might be taught a formula for expressing cause and effect relationships using linguistic features associated with explanations (see Table 7.3 below). Historical explanations (like narrative genres) are written in past tense. Explanations feature specific participants (named individuals like “the Caliph”), generalized participants such as groups of individuals (“the Mongols” or “hundreds of thousands”), and dense noun groups or nominalizations as indicated in the sentence from the New Yorker article. With nominalization, a verb becomes a noun and a past action or series of actions are compressed into the subject or object position of a
sentence, which creates lexical density and removes human agency (see De Oliveira, 2010; Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012). In addition, “causal processes,” express relationships of causation or determination, such as “influenced, brought about, or affected, led to, resulted in, created, or caused” (see Coffin, 2006, p. 124, for a more complete list of causal processes). For example, Sarah’s students might have been guided to recreate cause and effect relationships outlined in the Sacking of Baghdad article with sentences like those in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3: A simple formula for expressing cause and effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause (Nominalization)</th>
<th>Causal Process</th>
<th>Effect or Consequence (Nominalization)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Mongols’ invasion</td>
<td>resulted in</td>
<td>the killing of hundreds of thousands to a million (depending upon source).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mongols’ invasion</td>
<td>led to</td>
<td>the destruction of the Caliph’s palace and Mosques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mongols’ invasion</td>
<td>brought about</td>
<td>the obliteration of Baghdad’s libraries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A sentence like “The Mongols’ invasion resulted in the killing of hundreds of thousands to a million (depending upon source),” has a simple formula. A nominalized form establishes cause in the subject position. It is linked to an outcome in the object position “the killing of thousands…” by the causal process “resulted in.” Instead of simplifying texts or asking students to paraphrase them as participants did, they might have taught students to recreate complex texts using graphic organizers and linguistic features associated with them (Rose & Martin, 2012). Learning how lexically dense
sentences are created within explanatory genres can serve as a cognitive and linguistic linchpin between narrative and arguing ones. If students proceed from retelling the past to explaining the past to arguing for (or against) an interpretation of the past, they develop proficiency in linguistic resources that construe historical knowledge (Coffin, 1997, 2006).

*History as argument (contested)— what is your interpretation of what happened?*

Historical arguments—the most abstract of history genres— are organized rhetorically to advance an interpretation of the past supported by evidence (see Coffin, 2006 for three sub-genres of arguments: expositions, challenges, and discussions). Even though historical interpretation is highly valued in high school history (de Oliveira, 2011), few models of this genre are provided in history textbooks (Coffin, 2006), and only aspects of argumentation were evident in participants’ classes. For instance, Sarah introduced students through “doing history” approaches to the premise that underlies the creation of historical arguments; that is, historical knowledge is both constructed and contested (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Hynd, 1999; Wineburg, 1991). Although Sarah described the analytical essay she assigned to students as the culmination of an oral history project, I did not observe lessons during this unit. In fact, observations of student teachers and novice history teachers revealed no comprehensive approaches to teaching the interpretive (arguing) genres. Instead, participants’ instructional objectives contained rhetorical features associated with the development of arguments: for instance, recognizing perspectives; making comparisons; and distinguishing between facts and opinions. While I was in the classroom, none taught linguistic characteristics

---

38 I use the terms argumentation and interpretation interchangeably here, since the creation of an historical argument requires interpretation.
associated with argumentation such as how to form thesis statements, topic sentences, or present claims supported with evidence (De Oliveira, 2011). So, first I describe how novice history teachers taught aspects of historical interpretation in their lessons. Then, I suggest how they might have taught linguistic features of arguments based on two scenarios: Sarah’s lesson on Machiavelli’s *The Prince* and Cammie’s lesson on identifying fact and opinions in the context of the presidential election.

Student teachers and novice history teachers embedded conceptual features of interpretation into their lessons. For example, recognizing (and empathizing with) different perspectives is fundamental in democratic deliberation (Barton & Levstik, 2004). Along these lines, Victoria’s students were asked to adopt the perspectives of different fictional characters in one lesson, and in another, to create an imaginative recount of the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Also, Sarah had students assume the identities of individuals from different stations of ancient Roman society for a collection of writing. Another rhetorical trope commonly used in historical argumentation is to compare (and contrast) sources, groups, individuals, events, or related ideas. Accordingly, Cammie asked students to use Venn diagrams to compare the Republicans and Democrats and Federalists and Anti-Federalists. Then, she prompted students to decide whether the Democrats were more like the Federalists or Anti-Federalists and explain why in a summative statement. Sarah asked students to take a stand regarding Machiavelli’s argument that it is better to be feared than loved and to support it by considering leaders from different units of study over the course of the year.
In this activity, students might have been shown the comparative structure that sets up the choice: “whether X is better than Y or Y is better than X.” As a cognitive scaffold, a T-chart with “feared” on one side, and “loved” on the other could have been completed with evidence from units of study from the year. Then, they could practice using linguistic features of comparison, which include usage of present tense, sensing or being processes, non-human, abstract participants, and rhetorical devices as connectors (for example: “on one hand,” “on the other hand,” “in comparison” and so on). Such focused attention to language could help students analyze text and simultaneously learn linguistic and conceptual features associated with establishing point of view based on comparison.

In addition, several participants had students differentiate facts from opinions. In one lesson, Victoria’s students were supposed to match “facts/evidence” with “opinions/claims” from Coretta Scott King’s memoir. Sarah’s students distinguished facts from “fluff” in a Hollywood portrayal of the Middle Ages. And, Cammie’s students were asked to cull facts and opinions from an Obama reading. As previously mentioned, factual statements (with actions completed in the past in the form of doing processes) could be found in the first portion of the reading, whereas the second section, which explained Obama’s opinions, contained sensing processes, as in the following examples:

Obama believes that preschool, after-school, and summer programs help children. He thinks students should learn more math and science. . . . Obama

---

39 Due to time and classroom management issues, this part of the lesson was not implemented.
thinks all Americans should have health insurance, children most of all.

(Emphasis added)

Usage of the sensing processes: “believes” and “thinks” (twice) marks these sentences as opinion statements. Students can be shown that opinion statements are constructed in the present tense with a named individual (in this case, Obama) in the primary clause of the sentence and generalized participants (summer programs, students, Americans) in the secondary clause of the sentence (see Table 7.4).

Table 7.4: A simple formula for constructing opinion statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Clause</th>
<th>Secondary Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obama believes</td>
<td>that preschool, after-school, and summer programs help children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He thinks</td>
<td>students should learn more math and science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obama thinks</td>
<td>Americans should have health insurance, children most of all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each sentence, the first clause: “Obama believes that,” “He thinks,” and “Obama thinks,” could be dropped. The remaining secondary clauses contain the kernel of a thesis statement: “preschool, after-school, and summer programs help children,” “students should learn more math and science,” “all Americans should have health insurance, children most of all.” The modal verb, “should,” in the latter two sentences also marks these statements as opinions. Showing students how opinion statements are constructed can serve as a building block toward the creation of thesis statements in arguments.

In general, students (and teachers) can learn that language structures such as process types mark the difference between fact, opinion, and explanatory statements when they read and write different genres of history. Further, focused attention to
linguistic and conceptual features of key history genres could serve as a mechanism to integrate reading and writing instruction to promote disciplinary literacy: knowledge of the specialized texts of the content area (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). Again, teaching students how to use expository text strategies linked to linguistic analysis and accompanied by graphic organizers could promote comprehension and production of historical texts. Moreover, learning how to create real or imagined narratives, analyze complex texts, and form arguments justified by evidence are critical literacy skills that transcend history. These skills appear repeatedly in the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), which have been adopted by 48 states, as vital to college and career readiness. Finally, the ability to tell a compelling story or create a strong argument is a means to assume an empowered position in the dominant culture (Coffin, 1997). If history teachers consistently teach language demands of history, BLs might develop specific linguistic skills that could serve as a foundation for their eventual roles as citizens in a democratic society (Coffin, 1997; Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, 2012).

Language and content are inextricably linked in mediating, constructing, and presenting knowledge (Schleppegrell & de Oliveira, 2006). For this reason among others, I demonstrated what student teachers and novice teachers might have done to identify and teach language in the context of their own lessons. The proposed framework was illustrated with texts and activities from participants’ classes to demonstrate how linguistic analysis and cognitive scaffolds can be incorporated into history lessons in brief, targeted activities that support language and conceptual development. Wong-Fillmore and Fillmore (2012) observed promising results when teachers (without significant linguistic expertise) guided students in urban contexts to
examine the language of complex texts one sentence at a time. It would stand to reason that embedding such analysis into genre-based pedagogy would provide students (and teachers) a more comprehensive framework to understand how discipline-specific knowledge is constructed in and through language. The goal would be to apprentice students into school-based ways of knowing by teaching thinking and language demands of key genres, so that language is no longer “a hidden curriculum” (Schleppegrell, 2004). Achieving this goal for student learning as a matter of social justice would seem to require a robust model of teacher preparation.

*Toward a robust model to prepare history teachers to teach language*

History teachers need targeted, coherent, and continued support to learn to teach language (and thinking) demands of history. Two courses intended to prepare history teacher candidates to work with BLs, student teaching, and full-time teaching experience did not equip participants to analyze linguistic demands in written and oral historical discourse. A cross-section of participants did, however, learn to scaffold content instruction for BLs in their trajectory from “coursework to the classroom.” In creating the proposed model to prepare history teachers to teach language, I draw from results that demonstrate how participants in this study learned to scaffold history instruction. Consistent with a developmental perspective of teacher learning, this model suggests a sequence of coordinated experiences is necessary to prepare history teachers to teach language from coursework to student teaching to full-time teaching.⁴⁰

---

⁴⁰ For a comprehensive framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers, see Lucas and Villegas (2011). For essential understandings, knowledge, and skills of linguistically responsive teachers, see Lucas, Villegas & Freedson-Gonzalez (2008). These frameworks also include socio-cultural understandings and principles of second language acquisition and learning among other vital elements.
As part of existing coursework experiences, participants in this study were exposed to a template for creating language objectives, analyzed language demands in history texts, and created lesson plans with language objectives. In addition to these experiences, I recommend that aspiring history teachers be exposed to the framework for teaching key genres of history presented in the previous section. I also recommend that they use the framework to practice analyzing the linguistic demand of instructional tasks. For
instance, as part of group-work within a course, they might use components of the framework that correspond with narrative genres to develop language objectives and activities for a lesson based on Victoria’s assignment that students write a letter to Coretta Scott King as if they had participated in the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Study participants seemed to benefit from systematic exposure to the SIOP model in learning how to scaffold instruction for BLs. During the bilingual methods class, they were presented with SIOP features, read research literature supporting their usage, engaged in practice with SIOP components and were required to create SIOP lesson plans. Based on the fact that student teachers then implemented various SIOP elements as scaffolds in their lessons, I would suggest that aspiring history teachers would benefit from similar exposure to and practice with a systematic organizational framework for teaching language and the requirement that they include language-based activities aligned with language objectives in lesson plan assignments and receive guidance and feedback on their efforts during coursework experiences.

During student teaching, students might observe cooperating teachers (CTs) teaching the language of history. Olivia was supported in learning how to scaffold instruction for middle students by observing her CT do so. In addition, her CT coached her on developing lessons using graphic organizers as instructional scaffolds for middle school students to develop reading comprehension, which meshed well with what she learned during her pre-service preparation. In a comparable fashion, student teachers might practice implementing lessons that integrate language and content tasks and receive feedback and guidance from CTs and university supervisors. To analyze and teach linguistic demands of content tasks and texts, student teachers likely would
benefit from “demonstrations and face-to-face feedback” as they tried out these
techniques with BLs at their school sites (Rose & Martin, 2012, p. 65) and received
explicit guidance on their efforts (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, forthcoming).

To provide language-based support to student teachers, history teachers and
teacher educators that serve as CTs and university supervisors would need to receive
substantive prior training in how to create language objectives as well as analyze and
teach language demands of history texts and tasks. Experienced history teachers could
also be prepared to recognize key history genres, choose texts, develop lessons and
activities that include usage of cognitive scaffolds and explicit instruction of associated
linguistic features as suggested in the teaching framework presented here. Unless CTs
and supervisors are provided with this type of support, student teachers like Olivia will
continue to receive messages about language objectives that are “x, y, and z all over the
place.” Student teachers seem less likely to try out new practices learned during
coursework experiences if they do not see these practices modeled and encouraged in
their practicum settings. Based on this study’s results, I would argue that coherent,
ongoing support and practice-based coaching while implementing language-based
activities with real students during practicum experiences all are necessary to equip
student teachers to teach the language of history. Ideally, student teachers might begin
to develop skill in analyzing the linguistic demands of tasks and texts as well as a basic
repertoire of language-based instructional practices comparable to SIOP scaffolds that
they could then readily implement in various lessons as novice teachers.

With these additional supports and experiences during coursework and student
teaching, ideally novice history teachers would enter their full-time teaching
experiences with some foundational knowledge, skills, and resources to teach the language of history. More specifically, they could draw upon the proposed framework for teaching the language of history, lesson templates, and a beginning repertoire of practices they developed during coursework and student teaching to teach the linguistic demands of history texts and tasks as full-time teachers. They, presumably, would be more accustomed to planning and implementing integrated language and content objectives during history lessons after the suggested coursework and student teaching experiences. Study participants with prior knowledge and skills in scaffolding instruction became more accomplished at aligning scaffolds with actual lesson demands as they gained classroom experience. Having experienced more robust preparation to teach language, ideally full-time teachers would likewise become more accomplished at aligning language and content instruction with the linguistic and cognitive demands of their history lessons. Novice history teachers would learn effective, time efficient ways to prepare students for the thinking and linguistic demands of their assignments to help BLs develop disciplinary literacy skills in history that could serve as a platform for individual achievement and engaged citizenship. In sum, teacher preparation from pre-service coursework to student teaching to full-time teaching must be coordinated to prepare history teachers to teach language.

*Enacting a coordinated model of content and language preparation for history teachers*

To enact a coordinated model of content and language preparation for history teachers, a coherent social justice vision of social studies education, school and university partnerships, collaboration between content and language specialists in secondary and tertiary settings, and professional development for teacher educators all
seem necessary. Arts and science instructors, education instructors, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers each play a role in nurturing history teacher candidates. This broader group of teacher educators likely needs targeted professional development in linguistically responsive teaching practices before they can equip content teachers to work with BLs (Costa, McPhail, Smith & Brisk, 2005; Lucas, et al., 2008). The various teacher educators who supported Olivia’s practice had different expectations regarding language objectives; indeed, she (and the other participants in this study) had received more language-based preparation than her university supervisors. In a more robust model of teacher preparation, content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, language pedagogy, and knowledge of language would be taught in a coordinated, integrated, and systematic fashion by history faculty, education faculty, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors, so history teacher candidates receive coherent support. There is a pressing need for those who teach teachers to further develop knowledge and skills related to improving learning opportunities for BLs (Lucas et al, 2008).

K-12 and university partnerships also would support the enactment of this model of continued teacher learning for student teachers, novice history teachers, and the experienced teachers who serve as cooperating teachers. Classroom teachers can work with university researchers to implement instructional practices and collect data on student learning as part of fine-tuning opportunities for BLs to learn discipline-specific literacy skills. Other researchers have observed positive outcomes when university staff collaborate with classroom teachers to use SFL-informed genre pedagogy with diverse learners (Brisk, Hodgson-Drysdale & O’Connor, 2011;
Gebhard, Harman & Seger, 2007; Paugh & Moran, 2013). Such work draws on the expertise of practitioners from both school and university settings to ensure strategies that are developed bridge theory and practice and address local needs.

Collaboration between language and content experts in higher education and K-12 settings also seem essential in supporting the development and implementation of instructional strategies that combine pedagogical content knowledge with language pedagogy (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, forthcoming). In the preliminary study that led to this investigation, an experienced history methods instructor collaborated with a language specialist to develop, teach, and study the impact of exposing history teacher candidates to language-based strategies for teaching BLs. In the process, the content expert refined his knowledge of language and language pedagogy, and the language specialist developed more sophisticated pedagogical content knowledge, which informed both their practices as teacher educators (Schall-Leckrone & McQuillan, forthcoming). Such collaborations within universities can provide professional development to teacher educators. Similarly, collaboration between content and language specialists in school settings also can be a source of continued teacher learning. In this study, Cammie and Sarah both lacked sufficient linguistic expertise to identify and teach the language of history in a correct and consistent fashion. Accordingly, history teachers might work in collaboration with ESL teachers to pool their areas of expertise, co-plan, and co-teach integrated content and language objectives to promote disciplinary literacy for BLs (Schall-Leckrone & O’Connor, 2012).
When all who participate in the teacher preparation process operate from a common vision, it seems more likely that vision will be realized (McQuillan, Welch & Barnatt, 2012). Along similar lines, Barton and Levstik (2004) argue that teachers must embrace a civic purpose for history education to adopt reform-minded teaching practices since content coverage is inconsistent with preparing students to participate in democratic society. Accordingly, I wonder if participants believed that learning literacy skills of history is a matter of social justice for BLs (as I do) and had received consistent, coherent support in analyzing and teaching language from pre-service coursework to student teaching to full-time teaching, if they would have demonstrated initiative, progress, and eventual success in identifying and teaching the language of history. In school settings, university-supported, practice-embedded professional development for novice history teachers like Cammie and Sarah targeted toward teaching language should continue. Given the developmental nature of learning to teach, coordination, communication, and support must be sustained from coursework to the classroom, so that inclinations, knowledge, and skills to which aspiring teachers are exposed during pre-service preparation take root and grow into consistent practices. Extant research and the results of this study suggest that if teachers embrace a vision for student learning, develop a basic instructional repertoire, and the skills and inclination to continually reflect on and improve their practice, then enter into school contexts where they receive ongoing support, they are most likely to teach the language of history.

The increased pressures placed on BLs and their teachers given the higher standards of CCSS require innovative, collaborative, and sustained teacher education
responses (DelliCarpini et al., 2012). Models of teacher learning (such as the one proposed here) must continue to be developed and refined based on research efforts that integrate content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and knowledge of language and language pedagogy, so all teachers are prepared to equip BLs with disciplinary and critical literacy skills for academic achievement, career readiness, and civic engagement.

*Implications for teaching, teacher education, and research*

This research study was small by design with a limited number of participants, school sites, and classroom observations. Although its results cannot be generalized beyond the immediate setting (Kilbourn, 2006), useable knowledge produced in this study can be funneled back into the local contexts in which it took place and beyond to inform the practice of those who seek to prepare secondary content teachers to work with BLs (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Herr & Anderson, 2005).

From pre-service coursework to early teaching experiences, history teachers can learn to scaffold instruction for BLs to provide them with equitable access to rigorous content instruction as a route to individual achievement. More work needs to be done, however, within and between university and K-12 settings to prepare history teachers to teach language in order to equip BLs with knowledge and linguistic skills of engaged citizenship. Overall, these implications and recommendations for teaching, teacher preparation, and further research are suggested.

*Implications and recommendations for teaching*

Inexperienced content teachers can develop an instructional repertoire to scaffold instruction for BLs. Specifically, they can provide diverse learners equitable
access to rigorous content instruction by using graphic organizers, annotating texts, teaching vocabulary, providing lesson outlines, supplying examples, using visual cues, highlighting features of text, using expository text strategies, and employing wait time. In addition, teachers should develop instructional activities that explicitly teach cognitive and linguistic features of key history genres. Doing so according to the model proposed here, might serve to democratize opportunities for BLs to develop school-based ways of knowing and academic literacy skills to demonstrate them. Finally, history teachers should analyze, identify, and teach language demands of history, so BLs might develop specific linguistic skills that can serve as a foundation for their eventual roles as citizens in a democratic society. To ensure that history teachers are equipped to scaffold instruction and teach language, certain teacher preparation practices are recommended.

**Implications and recommendations for teacher preparation**

In order to enact targeted objectives such as scaffolding instruction and identifying and teaching the language of content areas for BLs, learning experiences from pre-service coursework to student teaching must be coordinated and mutually supportive. For instance, cooperating teachers can coach student teachers during their practicum experiences on selecting instructional scaffolds that align with the demands of classroom activities. In addition, student teachers would benefit from coaching on how to assess the language demand of instructional activities and disciplinary texts in preparation to teach targeted language objectives. Student teachers also need supported practice in giving clear, explicit directions. Content teachers need ongoing, coherent, and substantial practice-embedded coaching, guidance, and support to learn how to
analyze the linguistic demand of oral and written discourse. Content teachers and ESL teachers could benefit from working in collaboration to pool their content knowledge and linguistic expertise to co-develop and co-teach disciplinary literacy skills. To assess whether these suggested teaching and teacher preparation practices achieve desired results, the following research practices are recommended.

*Implications and recommendations for research*

Researchers, teacher educators, and teachers might collaborate to develop lessons associated with the model presented here for teaching key history genres, implementing them, and collecting data on student learning. In addition, the proposed model of content and language teacher preparation might be implemented in part or in its entirety and data collected on the learning of different constituents: students, student teachers, full-time teachers, and various types of teacher educators such as clinical supervisors, and cooperating teachers. In addition, a longitudinal study is recommended to follow research participants for a longer period of time, observe classroom practice more frequently, and continue to study the extent to which novice teachers scaffold instruction and teach language as they gain classroom experience. Further, it would be interesting to determine whether history teachers’ inclination and commitment to teach language would be enhanced if they saw it as a matter of social justice for their students. Overall, approaches to teaching, teacher preparation, and research must be developed, implemented, and conducted in a collaborative fashion between university and school partners to improve learning opportunities for BLs.

This exploration of how novice history teachers learn to teach bilingual learners “from coursework to the classroom” raises questions about the preparation of secondary
content teachers in general. If each academic discipline has a specialized knowledge base and configures language in its own unique way (Hyland, 2009; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008), how can adolescent BLs develop academic literacy? In collaboration, researchers, teacher educators, and teachers might study key genres of content areas to create frameworks (like the one proposed here for history) that guide the development of lessons that promote literacy in specific disciplines. Such lessons could include graphic organizers as cognitive scaffolds and explicitly teach how knowledge is presented in and through language. BLs (and many other students) must be equipped to read, write, and engage in oral discourse to demonstrate “knowledge of multiple genres of text and the purposes for text use” in varied disciplines to achieve academic literacy (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007, p. 2). Additionally, although the proposed model of content and language teacher preparation was developed with history teachers in mind, it could be piloted with content teachers from other subject areas as well.

This study was designed to examine history teacher learning “from coursework to the classroom.” Iterative actions were undertaken to address the research focus (Herr & Anderson, 2005). The first phase of research focused on teacher preparation and the second phase, teaching practice. Further research for a third phase of inquiry is recommended that shifts the focus to student learning. Important, unanswered questions remain. To what extent do scaffolding instruction and teaching the language of history improve learning opportunities and outcomes for bilingual students? One approach to addressing this complicated question would be to engage in collaborative research with history teachers to implement the framework for teaching key history genres proposed in this chapter: developing, teaching, and studying the impact of lessons aimed at
helping BLs, for instance, to advance oral and written arguments supported by evidence. Such practitioner research enacts a model for continued teacher, teacher educator, and researcher learning that is directed toward change in students, participants, and practitioners, themselves (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Herr & Anderson, 2005).

---

41 Both Cammie and Sarah have expressed interest in continuing to participate in this research.
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APPENDIX A: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Post-Observation Protocol—Dissertation Study

Thank you for letting me observe you teach and making time for a brief conversation now. I am interested in getting a sense of how your coursework at BC prepared you teach history to bilingual learners (BLs). I would like to ask a few questions about how the lesson went, and specifically, approaches that you use to meet the needs of BLs in your classroom.

1. So how do you think the lesson went?

2. Tell me how you prepare your lessons to work for bilingual learners?
   
   a) What were your language objectives in this lesson? How well do you think your students achieved them?

   b) What strategies did you use to scaffold instruction? How do these strategies fit into your teaching practices overall?

3. Do you feel your coursework in history or our course, ED 346, helped in particular ways?

   a) In what ways did your BC coursework prepare you to teach bilingual learners history?
   b) In what ways did you feel unprepared?
   c) What are areas that you are still working on?
Videotape Analysis Protocol

Step 1. View videotape in its entirety for general sense of how lesson went and record what teacher and students did in 10-minute increments

Step 2: Use SIOP protocol to assess SIOP elements of lesson

Step 3: Use researcher-created analytical framework based on genres of history described by Coffin (1997, 2006) to assess how teacher identifies and teaches language of history during lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (Mins)</th>
<th>Teacher Action(s)</th>
<th>Student (Actions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: PROTOCOL FOR ANALYZING HOW TEACHERS TAUGHT LANGUAGE

Participant: Status:
Date: Obs: Length:

Identifying and Teaching Language Demands: Historical Discourse

Language objectives(s):

Texts under consideration during lesson¹:

Communicative modes observed during lesson (e.g. reading, writing, conversing in small groups, whole group discussion, listening to teacher presentation):

What teacher says and does:

What students say and do:

History genres observed during lesson:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genres</th>
<th>How they appeared in the lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s Objectives/Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narratives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory genres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguing genres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Similar to Coffin (2006) “refers to any stretch of language- spoken or written” (p.xvi)